



Enhancing your SPI Strategy by Targeting High-Rate Offenders

Prospects, Practices and Concerns

April 26, 2012 - Scott Decker

Problem Selection and Analysis

- ❖ The starting point of every SPI strategy
- ❖ Focuses attention on places, persons and “criminal commodities” (weapons, drugs, etc.)
- ❖ Often leads to a conclusion that “...a small number of offenders account for a disproportionate amount of crime.”
- ❖ Thus the importance of targeting, for efficient use of resources and effective outcomes



What is Offender Targeting?



- ❖ Identifying chronic, high rate or particularly troublesome offenders (6% account for >50% of crime) or places (2% of calls for service account for 80% of calls)
- ❖ Coupling the identification of those offenders with a prosecution, supervision and intervention strategy that will enhance its overall impact
- ❖ A SMART practice in using resources where they will do the most good
- ❖ A means of involving community members in your SMART Policing Strategy
 - ❖ A valuable tool that produces results

Why employ Offender Targeting as part of a SMART Policing Strategy?

- ❖ Efficient use of Resources
 - ❖ Allows the police to focus efforts
 - ❖ Produces force multipliers and is results driven
 - ❖ Enhances Officer Safety
 - ❖ Demonstrates to the community that their crime problems are being addressed
 - ❖ Enhances deterrence by focusing resources on high rate offenders
 - ❖ Increases deterrence by targeting high rate offenders throughout the criminal justice system

STOP AND THINK



- ❖ If you confronted an increase in street robbery in a neighborhood what would your first step be?
- ❖ What information would you need to better understand the problem?
- ❖ How would you go about determining if there were high rate offenders?
- ❖ What partners could help you get that information?

Who is targeted?



- ❖ A small group of high rate offenders
- ❖ Offenders who have been chronic problems in the criminal justice system and haven't been affected by other interventions
- ❖ Offenders who reside in the target community or who commit their crimes there
- ❖ Probationers or parolees who continue to offend

How are they targeted?

- ❖ Identify high rate offenders using an **objective** set of criteria (i.e. multiple arrests, committing offenses while under supervision, specific offenses, convictions)
- ❖ Through the participation of multiple agencies, including the police, prosecutors, probation and parole as well as community groups
- ❖ “Threshold” criteria, for example three felony arrests in a four month period



Developing the list



- ❖ How long? A manageable number (25-50)
- ❖ What information to use? Arrests, Convictions?
- ❖ Objective versus Subjective information? (Can nominations be made to the list by law enforcement, prosecutors or the community?)
- ❖ Should points be assigned to rank order the list?
- ❖ How many jurisdictions should be involved?
- ❖ How many agencies should be involved?

Maintaining the Validity of the List

- ❖ The list is only as good as the information used to put it together in an honest and open dialogue
- ❖ Names should be removed from the list based on certain agreed on criteria, such as no arrests in a six month period. Offenders who are inactive for a period of time should be removed from the list
- ❖ Use current information and update regularly
- ❖ Use information from multiple and diverse sources (arrest AND probation data)



Using the List

- ❖ Lists are more effective when they are widely shared, so have them accessible electronically and from CAD systems.
- ❖ (CID, Narcotics) and patrol both can use these lists effectively
- ❖ Officer alerts when pedigrees of individuals on the list are run through RMS
- ❖ Web based applications that display criminal background information for individuals on the list
- ❖ Review progress periodically to improve the strategy.



Stop and Think



- ❖ For those of you participating today, how many of you have such a list?
- ❖ What information do you find to be most helpful from the list?
- ❖ What did you include that you later dropped?
- ❖ What advice would you offer to sites just getting started with this process?

Operational Questions

- ❖ Should offenders be told they are on a chronic offender list? Pros and cons of each approach?
- ❖ How do we assure the public that this is not another form of racial profiling?
- ❖ Are nominations to the list allowed?
- ❖ What is the role of probation and parole in the process of finding the individuals on the list?
- ❖ What input should the community have in placing individuals on the list?



The Role of Technology

- ❖ Technology can enhance the use of offender lists.
- ❖ CAD based information
- ❖ Officer alerts when an individual on the list is stopped



- ❖ Communication between law enforcement, prosecution and probation and parole when an individual on the list is contacted

Challenges Faced and Overcome

- ❖ Are there specific challenges you faced in devising, implementing or using such a list?
- ❖ How did you maintain the confidentiality of the list? Was there a formal agreement among partners?
- ❖ Did anyone consider using information collected from offenders about problem assessment or the most effective levers to use?



Some examples



- ❖ St. Louis Project Safe Neighborhoods and the WOW (worst of the worst)
- ❖ Three or more of the following must be present to appear on the WOW List:
 - 2 or more arrests for first degree assault
 - 6 or more felony arrests in the prior 9 months
 - Documented gang member
 - On probation at the time of the last arrest
 - Two or more felony convictions

The Boston Police Department and “Impact Players”



- ❖ Number of prior arrests a key measure to get on the list
- ❖ Nomination to the list is also possible, for things like known involvement in gangs, guns or drugs, for example
- ❖ 800 individuals identified citywide
- ❖ Offenders were targeted for arrest OR placement in a prevention or intervention program

The Lansing Police Department and Drug Market Intervention (DMI)



- ❖ Lansing uses intelligence and arrests to identify offenders, and a “drop-pending” strategy to engage them; charges can be dropped pending completion of certain requirements
 - ❖ Partnered with the Michigan Intelligence Operation Center to compile data on gangs that are involved in drug trafficking and violence. Data allows for planned targeted enforcement of the most violent offenders.
- ❖ Lower level offenders are screened for referral to their “call-in” program
- ❖ Community-based follow-up

The Baltimore Police Department's Gun Offender Registry (GOR)



- ❖ Baltimore uses gun crime convictions as the criteria for placing offenders on their GOR
 - ❖ An offender remains on GOR for 3 years.
 - ❖ Once on GOR, an offender must provide verification of residence in a similar fashion as sex offender registries.
 - ❖ Offenders can graduate at the end of 3 years, and some are just starting to.
 - ❖ More offenders are being put on the Registry than being taken off.
- ❖ They, too, use lever-pulling call-ins to work directly with active and troublesome offenders

The Savannah-Chatham Police Department's Impact Project



- ❖ Identified the Top 100 violent offenders using data from the regional intel center (SARIC)
 - ❖ Using weighting based on Federal Sentencing Guidelines
 - ❖ Updated bi-weekly and the SARIC website
 - ❖ Create intelligence packets on each offender - also on website
- ❖ Offenders receive special attention from law enforcement and the Savannah Impact (offender re-entry) Project
 - ❖ Police officers in all units have full awareness of the list and monitor subjects whenever possible
 - ❖ Partnered with the Chatham County District Attorney's Office to assist in the assessment of new/repeat offender's from new cases

Making the strategy more effective by keeping it “fresh”

- ❖ Periodic assessment of “how it is going”
- ❖ Change elements that aren’t working
- ❖ Working with community partners
- ❖ Validating information by reviewing the list and keeping it current
- ❖ Making successes public and using news media to help publicize successes...Or not...
- ❖ Knowing when to move on to another strategy



More on Keeping the strategy “fresh”

- ❖ Revise the names on the list (dropping and adding)
- ❖ Determining when to move on to other names
- ❖ Change up the strategy for each offender from time to time
- ❖ Review the criteria to get on the list to enhance effectiveness



Questions to consider



- ❖ How does an offender list complement our other SMART Policing strategies?
- ❖ Can we use technology to make our lists more effective?
- ❖ Do we have a strong enough community partnership to involve them?
- ❖ Is our criminal justice partnership strong enough (police to prosecutor, police to probation) to make this work?

Wrapping it up

- ❖ Are there any final thoughts to be offered?
- ❖ Any unresolved questions?
- ❖ Thank you everyone for your participation, this has been a most interesting and useful discussion.