

Developing Evidence-Based Crime Prevention Practice: The Dimensions of Effective Implementation¹

Edmund F. McGarrell,² Natalie Kroovand Hipple³

This paper presents the findings of a study of the dimensions critical for the successful implementation of evidence-based crime prevention practices. The goal is to advance both research and practice in the effective implementation of evidence-based crime prevention. The research began with a review of prior literature from implementation science as well criminal justice implementation. This was supplemented with insights gathered through process evaluations of three major crime prevention strategies developed in the U.S. The research utilized a modified Delphi survey approach using multiple rounds of surveys and small focus groups involving subject matter experts experienced in crime prevention. Thirty-five subject matter experts participated in the study. The research suggested four major dimensions of implementation capacity: governance and project management; partnerships; data and analysis; and feedback and awareness. The implementation capacity dimensions are consistent with prior research and theory but need to be validated in future research. The findings will be of interest to those interested in reducing crime and promoting safety through evidence-based crime prevention practice.

Keywords: crime prevention, evidence-based practice, implementation

UDC: 343.9

1 Developing Evidence-Based Crime Prevention Practice: Introduction

The last several decades have witnessed increasing attention to the development of evidence-based policy and practice in many human service sectors (Hjørland, 2011). Such calls for the development of evidence-based practice are visible in medicine, nursing, education, psychology, and other fields (Buysse & Wesley, 2006; Chambliss & Hollon, 1998; Cochrane, 1972; Munroe, Duffy, & Fisher, 2008; Pring & Thomas, 2004). The field of criminal justice and criminology has experienced similar trends. This is evident in the U.S. Department of Justice's evidence integration and crime solutions programs (Office of Justice Programs, 2010; CrimeSolutions.gov – www.crime-

solutions.gov), the Center for Evidence-Based Crime Policy (www.cebc.org), the Campbell Collaboration (www.campbellcollaboration.org), the Jill Dando Institute on Security and Crime Science (<http://www.ucl.ac.uk/jdi>), and similar efforts to develop evidence-based crime prevention and control practice (e.g., Blueprints for Healthy Youth Development, 2014; Sherman, Farrington, Welsh, & MacKenzie, 2002).

Whereas the identification and dissemination of information about evidence-based crime prevention practice is a key dimension of improving crime prevention practice and thereby improving public safety and justice outcomes, the thesis of this paper is that *effective implementation* of such practices is just as important. Further, research suggests that effective implementation may be as, or more, challenging as identifying evidence-based practices.

This paper begins by reviewing some of the criminological research surrounding the challenge of effective implementation of promising, evidence-informed, and evidence-based, crime prevention and control policy. This is followed by a description of the methods used to identify dimensions believed important for effective implementation of evidence-based practice. The process findings are then presented and the paper concludes with a summary of the findings, study limitations, and the next steps in this research project.

¹ This project is supported by Award #2010-GP-BX-K002 and Award #2012-DP-BX-K001 awarded by the Bureau of Justice Assistance, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. The opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this publication/program/exhibition are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect those of the Department of Justice.

² Edmund F. McGarrell, Ph.D., Director and Professor of Criminal Justice, School of Criminal Justice, Michigan State University, Michigan, USA. E-mail: mcgarrel@msu.edu

³ Natalie Kroovand Hipple, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Criminal Justice, Department of Criminal Justice, Indiana University, Bloomington, USA. E-mail: nkroovan@indiana.edu

2 The Challenge of Effective Implementation

Since Pressman and Wildavsky's (1973) classic work on implementation failure of urban economic development programs, scholars have paid attention to the critical dimension of implementation of policy and practice. In that case, despite significant consensus among key policymakers, and a large infusion of fiscal and technical assistance resources, the urban development policy was never implemented in a manner that could significantly affect local conditions. Nearly forty years after their study, their admonition that "We would consider our effort a success if more people began with the understanding that implementation, under the best of circumstances, is exceedingly difficult," is worth recalling (Pressman & Wildavsky, 1973: xii-xiii).

Criminological research also found that the adoption of new policy or practice often suffers from implementation failure. Efforts to divert juveniles from the court system were frequently found to actually bring new youths under formal control (Klein, 1979) and policies intended to divert youths and deinstitutionalize juvenile corrections facilities had varying levels of implementation across the United States (Handler & Zatz, 1982). Similarly, gun crime policies were seldom adequately implemented to have their intended effects (Heumann & Loftin, 1979; Zalman, 1982). Efforts to change court, detention, and sentencing practices similarly demonstrated implementation failure (Feeley, 1983; Casper & Brereton, 1984; Harland & Harris, 1987). Similar to Pressman and Wildavsky (1973), even in cases where there was support by key decision-makers and resource constraints were not an issue, weak implementation limited the impact of pretrial detention policy change (McGarrell, Rivera, & Patton, 1990). Many causes for these implementation failures were identified including ideological conflict, resource constraints, opposition from line-level actors, poor communication, and lack of clarity and consistency in policy or intended practice.

Rosenbaum's (1986) study of crime prevention practices highlighted different reasons for program failure. Program failure reflected the inability to *implement* the crime prevention program as intended, or with the level of intensity necessary to produce desired results. In such instances, the evaluation was not a true test of the intervention because of non- or weak implementation. Theory failure referred to situations where the theory of crime prevention being followed in the crime prevention intervention was defective. The idea of developing evidence-based crime practice is that through testing and replication, theory failure will be minimized.

Many evidence-informed or evidence-based practices involve multi-agency and multi-sector collaboration and part-

nerships. These multi-agency approaches are seen as offering the advantages of bringing multiple perspectives to a particular problem as well as additional resources that may not be available within a single agency. Thus, for example, many problem-solving crime prevention initiatives call for public- and private sector collaboration between police, prosecutors, local business owners, and residents.

Although such partnerships may offer the advantages of multiple perspectives and expanded resources, they also present challenges to effective implementation. These include cultural and structural factors. For example, the organizational culture of law enforcement and prosecution agencies orientates them toward the enforcement mission that may conflict with a clinical, therapeutic orientation of social workers or school officials (e.g., McGarrell & Sabbath, 1994). Structurally, issues of authority, decision-making, and sharing of information may create challenges to effective collaboration (Bowers & Johnson, 2006). Diffused authority may equate to lack of accountability.

Indeed, research in both the United States and the United Kingdom suggests that these multi-agency partnerships do present implementation challenges. One of the promising approaches to preventing and controlling gangs and gang violence is the so-called Spergel comprehensive model. The promise of the Spergel model was suggested in an evaluation conducted in the Chicago community of Little Village (Spergel et al., 1994). The Little Village program was developed by a multi-agency network of police, probation officers, court staff, outreach youth workers, and former gang members that attempted to reduce violence between conflicting Latino street gangs. The results indicated reduced violence, increased community organization, and the increased involvement of gang-involved youths in education programs and jobs (Spergel & Wa, 2000; Spergel, Grossman, & Wa, 1998). Despite these promising findings, subsequent research produced mixed findings with significant implementation problems (Spergel, Wa, & Sosa, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004a, 2004b)

The comprehensive gang model was evident in a series of initiatives sponsored by the U.S. Department of Justice's, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. These programs included Safe Futures, Comprehensive Communities, the Anti-Gang Initiative, the Gang Free Communities and Schools programs, and the Gang Reduction Program (Cahill & Hayeslip, 2010; Decker, 2007). Yet, research has found that implementation has been uneven with very limited evidence of reduced gang involvement and reduced gang crime (Cahill & Hayeslip, 2010; Klein & Maxson, 2006; Maxson, 2011). This limited impact was observed despite the fact that many of these programs involved significant investment of resources.

On a more positive note, in some places, where effective implementation occurred, there was evidence of reduced gang involvement and gang crime (Cahill & Hayeslip, 2010).

More recently, the multi-agency, multi-component strategy was followed in the Comprehensive Anti-Gang Initiative that was part of the U.S. Department of Justice's Project Safe Neighborhoods Program (PSN). Known as CAGI, the program provided significant levels of funding to a select group of federal judicial districts that included 13 cities and a group of smaller cities in eastern Pennsylvania. The funding supported a three-prong comprehensive model of suppression (enforcement), prevention, and inmate reentry. Similar to the Klein and Maxson (2006; Maxson, 2011) and Cahill and Hayeslip (2010), the evaluation of CAGI generated mixed results. Where implemented with the most intensity, significant violent crime reductions occurred. However, implementation across the cities was very uneven with resulting variation in impact (McGarrell et al., 2013).

The CAGI findings were quite consistent with the evaluation of the PSN Program. PSN was the largest gun crime reduction program ever sponsored by the U.S. Department of Justice. Beginning in 2002, PSN invested over one billion dollars in communities across the United States. The PSN model was based on strategic problem solving conducted by multi-agency teams of law enforcement, prosecution, corrections, social services, and community partners working with research partners. These multi-agency teams tended to implement a variety of strategies including promising practices built on Boston Ceasefire, Richmond Exile, joint case screening and prosecutorial decision-making, and similar concepts (McGarrell et al., 2010). The PSN evaluation found that cities participating in PSN experienced a significant decline in violent crime when compared to cities not participating in PSN. More telling was that, the research revealed the greater intensity of the implementation the more significant the reductions in violent crime. Consistent with the above-described gang program evaluations, effective implementation appeared to be the key to crime prevention (McGarrell et al., 2010).

The finding of the critical role of implementation is not confined to the United States. Darroch and Mazerolle (2013) studied the implementation of Intelligence Led Policing (ILP) in New Zealand. They found variation across agencies in the adoption of ILP and that the commitment of agency executives to crime reduction was essential for meaningful implementation.

Mawby and Jones (2007) studied the Sunnybay Burglary Reduction initiative (United Kingdom) that focused on reducing burglaries in hotels. Like the U.S. examples, the Sunnybay

Burglary Reduction initiative employed a multi-agency model with police and local planning councils working with hotel managers. Despite significant resources provided by the Home Office, and the finding that hotel burglary was indeed a recognized problem, there was significant implementation failure. The authors reported that the planned model was never fully operational and there was no enhanced hotel security (Mawby & Jones, 2007).

Similar findings were reported by Bowers and Johnson (2006) following several case studies of crime prevention initiatives in the U.K. On the basis of these studies, the authors argued that some prevention models carry greater risks, and potentially greater benefits, and thus may be less likely to be implemented. They emphasized the need to think through implementation issues before choosing a prevention strategy.

Even in the absence of the multi-agency context, implementation problems were also reported in the context of a police crime prevention initiative, also in the U.K. In this instance, re-deployable closed-circuit cameras were provided to the police in an effort to curb illegal drug market activity. Both technical and human resource issues appeared to prevent the effective utilization of the cameras and there was little evidence of overall effective implementation, much less impact on drug market crime (Gill, Rose, Collins, & Hemming, 2006).

In summary, this line of research suggests that improving the capacity for implementation will be critical to the adoption of evidence-based crime prevention practices. This paper presents the findings from a research project intended to identify the key dimensions necessary to support effective implementation. Ultimately the goal of the research project is to develop an assessment tool and related resources to measure implementation capacity, address gaps, and support meaningful implementation. This paper focuses on the first stage of the overall research project that seeks to identify the dimensions of effective implementation.

3 Methods

Multiple methods have been deployed in this research effort. The first involved the research team's experience in studying two major multi-agency crime prevention and control initiatives. These are Project Safe Neighborhoods (PSN) and the Comprehensive Anti-Gang Initiative (CAGI), both of which involved significant funding from the U.S. Department of Justice to local multi-agency teams. The research team gathered process data from these local teams from 2002 through 2014. From 2002 to 2011, this involved periodic contacts with teams located in the 94 federal judicial districts covering the

United States. After 2011, the PSN program occurred in a smaller number of jurisdictions (approximately 12 per year). The CAGI study occurred from 2007 to 2011 and included 13 cities as well as a group of smaller cities in one region of Pennsylvania. The findings from these studies have been reported elsewhere (McGarrell et al., 2009, 2010, 2012, 2013), and the experience provided insight into factors that appeared to support more meaningful implementation. These insights were compared with findings from implementation science research (e.g., National Implementation Science Network, 2013).

With this background, a modified Delphi survey method (Linston & Turoff, 2002) was utilized to identify the key dimensions of implementation. Although usually used in forecasting research, the Delphi approach in the current study was used to determine if consensus would emerge among a group of experts on the dimensions of effective crime prevention practice implementation. A pool of subject matter experts (SMEs) who had been involved in multi-agency strategic crime reduction efforts was initially identified. These included representatives from law enforcement, prosecution, social services, community leaders, and researchers.⁴ Of 42 individuals identified as SMEs, an invitation letter was distributed explaining the research project and the Delphi approach. A total of 35 of the 42 SMEs (83%) agreed to participate as part of the larger SME group. A web-based survey was used to collect a first round of responses. The results were tallied and a second survey was conducted. The results of the two surveys were summarized and presented to a ten-person subset of the SMEs in a small focus group meeting. This allowed further discussion and refinement of the dimensions and terminology. At this point there appeared to be consensus on the key dimensions that these SMEs believed were critical for effective implementation of crime prevention practice. This led to another round of the online survey to the ten small group SMEs that was primarily focused on terminology to best describe the dimensions.

4 Results

The modified Delphi approach began with an open-ended question, “What are the critical ingredients of effective implementation of a criminal justice initiative (please list up to five)?” The initial answers clustered around six categories:

1. Partnerships
2. Strategic Planning

⁴ The PSN and CAGI programs included local research partners that worked with the crime prevention task forces. The researchers included as SMEs had experience working in these research collaborations.

3. Problem Identification and Analysis
4. Monitoring and Reporting
5. Capacity
6. Awareness (Training, Education, Awareness)

The respondents were then asked to identify any additional characteristics. Specifically, they were asked, “Are there any additional ingredients you did not list [above] that are necessary for effective implementation... (please list up to five)?” The additional characteristics generated included:

1. Commitment
2. Reporting
3. Strategies
4. Community
5. Flexibility
6. Research Partnership
7. Shared Understanding of Model
8. Training and Technical Assistance
9. Follow Through

The most common responses to both questions were commitment to the crime prevention intervention and partnerships to support the intervention. The results were summarized and returned to the SMEs in a second round web-based survey. The results from the second survey identified ten categories plus a recommendation to collect community and organizational demographics to allow for understanding implementation context.

1. Commitment and Leadership
2. Management and Decision Making
3. Criminal Justice Partnerships
4. Community Partnerships
5. Research and Analytic Capacity
6. Data Access and Quality
7. Data Sharing
8. Monitoring/Reporting/Feedback
9. Training and Awareness
10. Strategies

As noted in the methods section, the modified Delphi approach was complemented by a small group meeting with a subset of the SMEs. As with the full pool of SMEs, the small group meeting included law enforcement, prosecution, social services, community leaders, and researchers. The group went through the findings from the two Delphi surveys and reached consensus on four overall categories believed supportive of effective implementation. Within each dimension several sub-dimensions were also identified. The four key dimensions included:

- Governance and Project Management
- Partnerships

Data and Analysis
Feedback and Awareness

The modified Delphi Process and the results are displayed in Figure 1.

inclusion of line-level workers resulted in greater adoption of reform (Toch & Grant, 1982; see also McLaughlin, 1976). Similar findings were reported in the implementation of community corrections reforms (Musheno, Palumbo, Maynard-Moody, & Levine, 1989, 1990).



Figure 1: Key Implementation Dimensions via a Modified Delphi Process

4.1 Governance and Project Management

The SMEs consistently identified commitment and leadership from the organizations responsible for implementing crime prevention practice as a critical dimension. This included both commitment and leadership from chief executives but also from line level actors responsible for day-to-day implementation. This is consistent with the findings of much prior research. Indeed, McGarrell et al. (2010) reported that commitment among chiefs of police and U.S. Attorneys was a critical factor in distinguishing high and low implementation sites involved in PSN. Similar findings are reported in relation to the implementation of community policing (Rosenbaum, Yeh, & Wilkinson, 1994) and intelligence led policing (Darroch & Mazerolle, 2013). Toch and Grant's (1991) study of problem-solving policing also suggested the critical role of mid-level management for the implementation of problem-solving. This finding was consistent with their study of human service organization reform where they found that the

Beyond commitment and leadership, the SMEs noted several additional sub-components of leadership and governance. These included sound project management skills and the commitment of personnel and resources for a period of time long enough to complete the project. These sub-dimensions seem consistent with Pressman and Wildavsky's (1973) point that implementation is difficult. The SMEs point out that there must be sound management of the crime prevention intervention, decision-making structures, and sufficient resources (people, funding, knowledge) to carry out the initiative.

4.2 Partnerships

The SMEs consistently ranked effective partnerships as critical to the implementation of crime prevention interventions. These included two broad categories of partnerships: those involving criminal justice agencies, and those involving non-criminal justice agencies such as state institutions, non-

governmental organizations, and citizens and community groups. The perceived value of partnerships is that they bring additional knowledge and perspectives to addressing a crime issue, additional resources, and the potential for increased legitimacy (Klofas, Hipple, & McGarrell, 2010).

The emphasis on criminal justice partnerships may be particularly relevant in the United States. The highly decentralized and federated structure of law enforcement and police, court, and correctional agencies in the U.S. may create a particular need for multi-agency cooperation, communication, and collaboration. Problem-solving initiatives have demonstrated the value of police partnerships with probation and parole officers, community prosecutors, court officials and other actors within the criminal justice system. However, even in the context of more centralized, federal agencies such as a national police force, there may be similar needs for partnerships across various units within the same organization as well with external agencies/groups. Indeed, Darroch and Mazerrole (2013) found that within the New Zealand National Police, certain police districts developed cultures more supportive of the adoption of ILP. The cultures more open to ILP were also supportive of partnerships to support problem-solving.

External partnerships beyond the criminal justice system may be important for effective implementation for similar reasons. Again, the problem-solving movement has demonstrated the benefits of external partnerships whereby other governmental agencies (e.g., code inspectors; social services; school officials) as well as with business owners, faith leaders, neighborhood associations and the like. External relationships with various elements of the community may also be critical for legitimacy of the policy or intervention (Klofas et al., 2010).

4.3 Data and Analysis

According to the SMEs that participated in this research, successful implementation of Evidence-Based Practice (EBP) requires the capabilities to gather, share, and interpret data. Analytical capability and access to relevant data supports implementation of EBP in several ways. First, it is critical that the crime problem be properly analyzed to ensure that the EBP aligns with the nature of the crime problem and the factors generating the problem. In the case of PSN, careful problem analysis of gun crime in various communities indicated different types of gun crime. These included group-related violence, hotspots that might indicate a poorly managed business or housing complex, domestic violence, and violence committed by chronic violent offenders (McGarrell, 2010). Failure to accurately assess the drivers of the crime problem could result

in selection of an inappropriate prevention strategy. The use of data and analysis for problem analysis is a key ingredient in problem-solving policing (Center for Problem-Oriented Policing – <http://www.popcenter.org/>) and problem-solving courts (Wolf, 2007).

Data and analysis are also critical to ongoing assessment of the intervention. It is important to collect data on the intensity and dosage of the intervention in order to assess the fidelity of the intervention to the logic model of the EBP. In the CAGI gang program described above, the researchers found that a gang intervention was not being delivered to the highest risk youths as was intended by the comprehensive gang prevention model. Although the program delivered services to youths in need, they were not at high risk for gang involvement and thus the intervention was unlikely to have the intended effect on gang violence (Melde, Gavazzi, McGarrell, & Bynum, 2011).

Additionally, data and analysis is a critical part of the evaluation of EBP. The history of uneven implementation suggests the importance of evaluation in order to ensure that EBP is having its intended effects on preventing crime and reducing victimization.

4.4 Feedback and Awareness

The final dimension identified by the SMEs was labeled feedback and awareness. Ultimately, effective implementation requires that all key stakeholders understand the goals of the EBP and are aware of the logic model behind the intervention. This relates to the earlier dimensions. Specifically, absent such awareness the commitment of executives, line-level actors, and criminal justice and community partners is problematic. Feedback is critical for maintaining commitment. Feedback and awareness mechanisms were described as being a proactive step to addressing the common problem of staff turnover. Such turnover often derails effective implementation as prior champions move to new assignments and new personnel are assigned to roles that are critical to implementation of EBP.

The SMEs advocated for developing reporting mechanisms as a strategy for increasing feedback and awareness. These could include regular meetings of various partners' representatives; briefings to executives and the community; electronic distribution of newsletters; and community celebrations of milestones. Additionally, the SMEs argued for training. This could range from roll-call briefings in the case of police to cross-functional training of partnering agencies and organizations.

5 Conclusion

As noted at the outset, recent years have witnessed increasing attention to the development of Evidence-Based Crime Prevention Practice. As with developments in the health, education, and human services fields, policymakers increasingly call for policy and practice that is supported by empirical evidence. For those dedicated to enhanced public safety and reduced levels of victimization, the commitment to EBP would seem to be rational and desirable.

The commitment to EBP is one step toward improved crime prevention practice. Equally important is developing capacity for the effective implementation of EBP. The modified Delphi process, based on processes intended to identify consensus among a group of subject-matter experts, resulted in a set of dimensions hypothesized to be crucial for effective implementation of evidence-based crime prevention policy. The first dimension included governance and project management consisting of commitment and leadership at executive, mid-management, and street-levels. Multi-agency and multi-sector partnerships involving criminal justice agencies, governmental and non-governmental agencies, and community partnerships represented the second dimension. Research and analytic capability, access to data, and sharing of data were viewed as the third dimension. Finally, mechanisms for feedback and awareness such as regular meetings, briefings, training, newsletters, and community celebrations were seen as supporting and sustaining the implementation of EBP.

Theoretically, the results are consistent with the political-economic model of implementation of social policy (Hasenfeld & Brock, 1991). Although developed to address broad social policy implementation, the dimensions appear compatible with the findings of the present research and applicable to local-level implementation of crime prevention practice. The political-economy model focuses on three driving forces of power, economic, and technological factors. The theory also considers the inter-organizational network, intra-organizational relationships, and the role of stakeholders. The theory seeks to account for the "correspondence index," or the degree to which the policy outcomes reflect the intended social policy. In the current case of the implementation of evidence-based crime prevention practice, this can be thought of as the fidelity to EBP and the associated crime prevention outcomes.

The role of power is reflected in the management and governance dimension. Commitment and leadership at executive, middle management, and street level actors reflects critical power relations necessary for effective implementation. Typically, power is critical to the allocation of economic resources including funding, personnel, expertise, and facilities.

The emphasis on partnerships reflects the important dimension of inter- and intra-organizational relationships that can facilitate or block effective implementation. Research capability, data quality and access relate to technical rationality. As noted above, careful problem analysis is a crucial step in identifying appropriate evidence-based crime prevention policy. Ongoing assessment of the implementation intensity and dosage can enhance the fidelity of implementation and long-term evaluation can build political support through evidence of impact. Similarly, the feedback and awareness dimension can support the political and economic dimensions by increasing commitment, enhancing effective program management, and building and sustaining network relationships. Similar to the emphasis the SMEs placed on these dimensions, the political-economic theory of implementation hypothesizes that the greater congruence across these power, economic, and the technological factors the greater the implementation.

The results of this research also have implications for practice. At a minimum, criminal justice executives interested in implementing EBP need to express their commitment and to work to develop support throughout their organizations. Further, they should recognize the important role of partnerships with other criminal justice agencies, governmental agencies, and community stakeholders. Building analytical capacity or establishing relationships with research partners and providing access to data may not routinely be thought of as critical to implementation but these results suggest their importance. Similarly, developing mechanisms for building and maintaining awareness and shared understanding can be important aspects of implementation. Clearly, implementation of evidence-based crime prevention practice involves more than issuing statements supporting EBP.

The current study is subject to limitations that suggest further research. First, the results of the research point to key dimensions of implementation suggested in prior research and agreed upon by a group of subject matter experts with prior experience in implementing evidence-based or evidence-informed practice. The next step of this research endeavor involves attempts to measure and validate these dimensions. Second, the research is based on the U.S. context that involves a highly decentralized and federated structure of criminal justice institutions. Implementation may be less complex in more centralized institutional contexts. Research in cross-cultural contexts can address this question. Third, this study focused on the implementation of evidence-based crime prevention. As Bowers and Johnson (2006) noted, however, implementation is likely to be influenced by characteristics of the crime prevention practice itself. Some crime prevention strategies are more complex than others and this is likely to influence the degree of implementation. Future studies could employ

the Bowers and Johnson typology and measure whether and how these dimensions relate to the effectiveness of implementation across the types of crime prevention practices.

References

1. *Blueprints for healthy youth development*. (2014). Boulder: Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence, Institute of Behavioral Science. Retrieved from <http://www.colorado.edu/cspv/blueprints/index.html>
2. Bowers, K. J., & Johnson, S. D. (2006). Implementation failure and success: Some lessons from England. In J. Knutsson, & R. V. Clarke (Eds.), *Putting theory to work: Implementing situational prevention and problem-oriented policing* (pp. 163–197). Monsey: Criminal Justice Press/Willow Tree Press.
3. Buysse, V., & Wesley, P. W. (2006). Evidence-based practice: How did it emerge and what does it mean for the early childhood field? *Zero to Three* (1), 27(2), 50–55.
4. Cahill, M., & Hayeslip, D. (2010). *Findings from the evaluation of OJJDP's gang reduction program*. Washington: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
5. Casper, J. D., & Brereton, D. (1984). Evaluating criminal justice reforms. *Law and Society Review*, 18(1), 121–144.
6. Chambless, D. L., & Hollon, S. D. (1998). Defining empirically supported therapies. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 66(1), 7–18.
7. Cochrane, A. L. (1972). *Effectiveness and efficiency: Random reflections on health services* (Vol. 900574178). London: Nuffield Provincial Hospitals Trust.
8. Darroch, S., & Mazerolle, L. (2013). Intelligence-led policing: A comparative analysis of organizational factors influencing innovation uptake. *Police Quarterly*, 16(1), 3–37.
9. Decker, S. H. (2007). Youth gangs and violent behavior. In D. J. Flannery, A. T. Vazsonyi, & I. D. Waldman (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of violent behavior* (pp. 388–402). New York: Cambridge University Press.
10. Feeley, M. M. (1983). *Court reform on trial*. New York: Basic Books.
11. Handler, J. F., & Zatz, J. (1982). *Neither angels nor thieves*. Washington: National Academy Press.
12. Harland, A. T., & Harris, P. W. (1987). Structuring the development of alternatives to incarceration. In S. D. Gottfredson, & S. McConville (Eds.), *America's correctional crisis* (pp. 179–195). New York: Greenwood.
13. Hasenfeld, Y., & Brock, T. (1991). Implementation of social policy revisited. *Administration and Society*, 22(4), 451–479.
14. Heumann, M., & Loftin, C. (1979). Mandatory sentencing and the abolition of plea bargaining: The Michigan felony firearm statute. *Law and Society Review*, 13(2), 393–430.
15. Hjørland, B. (2011). Evidence-based practice: An analysis based on the philosophy of science. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 62(7), 1301–1310.
16. Gill, M., Rose, A., Collins, K., & Hemming, M. (2006). Redeployable CCTV and Drug-Related Crime: A Case of Implementation Failure. *Drugs: Education, Prevention and Policy*, 13(5), 451–460.
17. Klein, M. W. (1979). Deinstitutionalization and diversion of juvenile offenders: A litany of impediments. In N. Morris, & M. Tonry (Eds.), *Crime and justice: An annual review of research* (pp. 145–201). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
18. Klein, M., & Maxson, C. (2006). *Street gang patterns and policies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
19. Klofas, J. M., Hipple, N. K., & McGarrell, E. F. (2010). The new criminal justice. In J. M. Klofas, N. K. Hipple, & E. F. McGarrell (Eds.), *The new criminal justice* (pp. 3–16). New York: Routledge.
20. Linstone, H. A., & Turoff, M. (2002). *The Delphi method: Techniques and applications*. Newark: New Jersey Institute of Technology. Retrieved from <http://is.njit.edu/pubs/delphibook/>
21. Mawby, R. I., & Jones, C. (2007). Attempting to reduce hotel burglary: Implementation failure in a multi-agency context. *Crime Prevention & Community Safety*, 9(3), 145–166.
22. Maxson, C. L. (2011). Street gangs: How research can inform policy. In J. Q. Wilson, & J. Petersilia (Eds.), *Crime & public policy* (pp. 158–182). New York: Oxford University Press.
23. McGarrell, E. F. (2010). Strategic problem solving, Project Safe Neighborhoods, and the new criminal justice. In J. Klofas, N. K. Hipple, & E. F. McGarrell (Eds.), *The new criminal justice* (pp. 28–36). New York: Routledge.
24. McGarrell, E. F., & Sabbath, M. J. (1994). Stakeholder conflict in an alternative sentencing program: Implications for evaluation and implementation. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 17(2), 179–186.
25. McGarrell, E.F., Rivera, B. & Patton, J. (1990) Obstacles to seemingly simple reform: A case study of bail reform. *Policy Studies Review*, 9(3), 433–443.
26. 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(2), 165–190.
27. McGarrell, E. F., Corsaro, N., Melde, C., Hipple, N., Cobbina, J., Bynum, T., et al. (2012). *Assessment of the comprehensive anti-gang initiative: Final project report*. Submitted to the National Institute of Justice. Washington: National Criminal Justice Reference Service.
28. McGarrell, E. F., Kroovand Hipple, N., Corsaro, N., Bynum, T. S., Perez, H., Zimmermann, C. A., et al. (2009). *Project safe neighborhoods: A national program to reduce gun crime: Final project report*. Submitted to the National Institute of Justice. Washington: National Criminal Justice Reference Service.
29. McGarrell, E., Corsaro, N., Melde, C., Hipple, N., Bynum, T., & Cobbina, J. (2013). Attempting to reduce firearms violence through a Comprehensive Anti-Gang Initiative (CAGI): An evaluation of process and impact. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 41(1), 33–43.
30. McLaughlin, M. (1976). Implementation as mutual adaptation: Change in classroom organization. In W. Williams, R. F. Elmore (Eds.), *Social program implementation* (pp. 167–180). New York: Academic Press.
31. Melde, C., Gavazzi, S., McGarrell, E. F., & Bynum, T. (2011). On the efficacy of targeted gang interventions: Can we identify those most at risk? *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 9(4), 279–294.
32. Munroe, D., Duffy, P., & Fisher, C. (2008). Nurse knowledge, skills, and attitudes related to evidence-based practice: Before and after organizational supports. *Medsurg Nursing*, 17(1), 55–60.
33. Musheno, M. C., Palumbo, D. J., Maynard-Moody, S., & Levine, J. P. (1989). Community corrections as an organizational innovation: What works and why. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 26(2), 136–167.
34. Musheno, M., Palumbo, D., Maynard-Moody, S., & Levine, J. (1990). Evaluating the implementation of community corrections. In D. E. Duffee, & E. F. McGarrell (Eds.), *Community corrections: A community field approach*. Cincinnati: Anderson.

Edmund F. McGarrell, Natalie Kroovand Hipple: Developing Evidence-Based Crime Prevention Practice: The Dimensions of Effective Implementation

35. National Implementation Science Network. (2013). *Implementation drivers: Assessing best practices*. Chapel Hill: Frank Porter Graham Child Development Institute.
36. Office of Justice Programs. (2010). *Evidence integration initiative: Research at work* (Justice Resource Update, Nov. 2010). Washington: Office of Justice Programs.
37. Pressman, J. L., & Wildavsky, A. B. (1973). *Implementation*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
38. Pring, R., & Thomas, G. (2004). *Evidence-based practice in education*. McGraw-Hill International.
39. Rosenbaum, D. P. (1986). *Community crime prevention: Does it work?* Beverley Hills: Sage.
40. Rosenbaum, D. P., Yeh, S., & Wilkinson, D. L. (1994). Impact of community policing on police personnel: A quasi-experimental test. *Crime and Delinquency*, 40(3), 331–353.
41. Sherman, L. W., Farrington, D., Welsh, B., & MacKenzie, D. (2002). *Evidence-based crime prevention*. London: Routledge.
42. Spergel, I. A., & Wa, K. M. (2000). Combating gang violence in Chicago's little village neighborhood. *On Good Authority*, 4(2), 1–4.
43. Spergel, I. A., Grossman, S. F., & Wa, K. M. (1998). *Evaluation of the little village gang violence reduction project: The first three years: Executive summary*. Washington: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance.
44. Spergel, I. A., Wa, K. M., & Sosa, R. V. (2001). *Evaluation of the Bloomington-Normal comprehensive gang program: Technical report*. Chicago: School of Social Service Administration, University of Chicago.
45. Spergel, I. A., Wa, K. M., & Sosa, R. V. (2002). *Evaluation of the Mesa gang intervention program (MGIP): Technical report*. Chicago: School of Social Service Administration, University of Chicago.
46. Spergel, I. A., Wa, K. M., & Sosa, R. V. (2003). *Evaluation of the Riverside comprehensive community-wide approach to gang prevention, intervention and suppression: Technical report*. Chicago: School of Social Service Administration, University of Chicago.
47. Spergel, I. A., Wa, K. M., & Sosa, R. V. (2004a). *Evaluation of the San Antonio comprehensive community-wide approach to gang prevention, intervention and suppression program: Technical report*. Chicago: School of Social Service Administration, University of Chicago.
48. Spergel, I. A., Wa, K. M., & Sosa, R. V. (2004b). *Evaluation of the Tucson comprehensive community-wide approach to gang prevention, intervention and suppression program: Technical report*. Chicago: School of Social Service Administration, University of Chicago.
49. Spergel, I., Curry, D., Chance, R., Kane, C., Ross, R., Alexander, A., et al. (1994). *Gang suppression and intervention: Problem and response: Research summary*. Washington: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
50. Toch, H., & Grant, J. D. (1982). *Reforming human services: Change through participation*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
51. Toch, H., & Grant, J. D. (1991). *Police as problem solvers*. New York: Plenum.
52. Wolf, R. V. (2007). *Principles of problem-solving justice*. New York: Center for Court Innovation.
53. Zalman, M. (1982). Mandatory sentencing legislation: Myth and reality. In M. Morash (Ed.), *Implementing criminal justice policies* (pp. 61–69). Beverley Hills: Sage.

Razvijanje na dokazih temelječe prakse preprečevanja kriminalitete: dimenzije učinkovite implementacije

Dr. Edmund F. McGarrell, direktor in profesor za kazensko pravosodje, School of Criminal Justice, Michigan State University, Michigan, USA. E-pošta: mcgarrel@msu.edu

Dr. Natalie Kroovand Hipple, docentka za kazensko pravosodje, Department of Criminal Justice, Indiana University, Bloomington, USA. E-pošta: nkroovan@indiana.edu

Članek predstavlja izsledke študije o dimenzijah, ki so odločilnega pomena za uspešno implementacijo na dokazih temelječe prakse preprečevanja kriminalitete. Cilj je nadgraditi tako raziskovanje kot tudi prakso učinkovitega izvajanja na dokazih temelječega preprečevanja kriminalitete. Raziskava se je začela s pregledom predhodne literature o izvajanju znanosti kot tudi o izvajanju kazenskega pravosodja. Pregled je bil dopolnjen s spoznanji, zbranimi s pomočjo procesa vrednotenja treh glavnih strategij preprečevanja kriminalitete, razvitih v ZDA. Raziskava je uporabila modificiran Delphi raziskovalni pristop, ki uporablja več krogov anketiranja in manjše fokusne skupine, ki vključujejo strokovnjake z izkušnjami s področja preprečevanja kriminalitete. V študiji je sodelovalo 35 strokovnjakov s predmetnega področja raziskovanja. Raziskava je predlagala štiri glavne dimenzije zmogljivosti implementacije: upravljanje in vodenje projektov; partnerstva; podatki in analize ter povratne informacije in ozaveščanje. Dimenzije zmogljivosti implementacije so skladne s predhodnim raziskovanjem in teorijo, vendar je treba njihovo veljavnost preveriti v prihodnjih raziskavah.

Ugotovitve bodo zanimive za tiste, ki se ukvarjajo z zmanjšanjem kriminalitete in spodbujanjem varnosti s pomočjo na dokazih temelječe prakse preprečevanja kriminalitete.

Ključne besede: preprečevanje kriminalitete, na dokazih temelječa praksa, implementacija

UDK: 343.9