

Updated Gang Assessment (2014)

Recommendations – *Updated 2/1/2017*

The following recommendations were developed based on information gathered in the Updated Gang Assessment.

“Without data, we’re just another group of people with opinions”

Law Enforcement

#	Recommendation	Indicator(s)
1.1	Reduce number of aggravated assaults with firearms involving multiple victims via enforcement efforts, political means, court support and community education.	1.1a: % of all aggravated assault victims where there were multiple victims and where a firearm was used [baseline = 30%] (2011-13 average) CY 2015 = 44% CYTD 2016 (392 of 947) or 41% (as of 12/8/2016)
1.2	Seize more guns per year than the 5-year average.	1.2a: # of guns seized per year [baseline = 591] (5-year average provided by DPD) CY 2015 = (596) CY 2016 = (574) 1.2b: # of weapons crimes/year with validated gang member as suspect or victim [baseline = 64/year] (2010-12 avg.) CY 2014 = (65) CY 2015 = (67)
1.3	Reduce juvenile involvement in gang crime and violent crime by engaging court-involved youth in evidence-based programming.	1.3a: # of gang-involved incidents/year where a juvenile is listed as a suspect or victim [baseline = 75/year] (2010-12 avg.) CY 2014 = (53) CY 2015 = (88) 1.3b: violent (Class A-E) complaint rate/year for Durham County juvenile population ages 10-17 per 1,000 [baseline = 1.53 per 1,000] (2010-12 avg.) CY 2014 = 2.21 per 1,000 CY 2015 = 4.01 per 1,000
1.4	Track the percentage of Security Risk Group (SRG) offenders returning to Durham County from prison who pick up new charges within one year	1.4a: % of returning SRG offenders who pick up new (non-traffic) charges within one year of returning to Durham [baseline = 46.1%] (data from 2013 releases) CY 2014 = 40.0% CY 2015 = 57.1%
1.5	Law enforcement will work with the new Misdemeanor Diversion Program (MDP) to reduce first-time arrests for misdemeanors of 16 and 17 year olds	1.5a: # of youth successfully completing the Misdemeanor Diversion Program per calendar year [baseline = 56] In the first full calendar year of operation (CY 2015) there were 56 successful completions CY 2016 = (86)

1.6	GRS Suppression Team meetings to coordinate efforts between law enforcement, Parole/Probation, and the District Attorney’s office shall be conducted on a regular basis.	1.6a: # of Suppression Team meetings held per calendar year [baseline = 4] (average # of meetings/year in 2012 and 2013) CY 2015 (5) CY 2016 (5)
-----	--	--

Durham Public Schools

#	Recommendation	Indicator(s)
2.1	Accurately quantify chronic truancy, then continue and expand strategies to aggressively reduce it where rates are highest	<p>2.1a: # of certified “ten-day letters” sent by district principals to parents of elementary, middle and high schools students [baseline = 1,818] (total 10-day letters/22 petitions sent by DPS in SY 2012-13) SY 2013-14 (532 letters and 12 petitions) SY 2014-15 (745 letters and 8 petitions)</p> <p>2.1b: DPS statewide attendance ranking (from 1 to 115, 1 being the best) [baseline = 75] (SY 2012-13 ranking) SY 2013-14 (83) SY 2014-15 (75) SY 2015-16 (84)</p> <p>2.1c: % of Truancy Court students who show overall improvement in attendance [baseline = 55%] (average of 2012/13 and 2013/14 school years) SY 2014-15 (53%)</p> <p>2.1d: % of Truancy Court students who are connected to services [baseline = 39%] (average of 2012/13 and 2013/14 school years) (No recent data available)</p>
2.2	Continue and expand strategies to continually reduce the DPS dropout rate each year	<p>2.2a: North Carolina Consolidated Data Report for DPS dropout rate [baseline = 3.21] (SY 2012-13) SY 2013-14 = (2.88) SY 2014-15 = (2.67) SY 2015-16 = (3.06)</p> <p>2.2b: 4-year graduation rates for DPS [baseline = 79.6%] (SY 2012-13, DPS data) SY 2013-14 = (81.5%) SY 2014-15 = (80.7%) SY 2015-16 = (82.1%)</p>

2.3	Continue and expand work within the schools and the community to develop alternatives to short-term/long-term suspension and create effective in-school suspension programs	<p>2.3a: NCDPI reported rates for DPS short-term suspensions [baseline = 28.85/100 students] (SY 2012-13 rate) SY 2013-14 = (25.05 per 100) SY 2014-15 = (19.76 per 100) SY 2015-16 = (17.97 per 100)</p> <p>2.3b: # of NC Consolidated Report reported long-term DPS suspensions per school year [baseline = 58] (2011-12 to 2012-13 average) SY 2013-14 = (69) SY 2014-15 = (64) SY 2015-16 = (67)</p>
2.4	Examine reasons for, and implement strategies to reduce the two most reportable acts in Durham high schools - 1) possession of a controlled substance in violation of the law, 2) possession of a weapon excluding firearms and powerful explosives	<p>2.4a: NCDPI reportable act rate per 1,000 DPS students grades 9-13 [baseline = 18.66/1,000] (SY 2012-13) SY 2013-14 = 19.31 per 1,000 SY 2014-15 = 18.96 per 1,000 SY 2015-16 = 18.53 per 1,000</p> <p>2.4b: % of total complaints (NC JOIN data) for youth age 6 to 17, that were school based [baseline = 44%] (Statewide 3-yr average 2012-15) SY 2013-14 (21%) SY 2014-15 (25%) SY 2015-16 (23%)</p>
2.5	Reduce percentage of DPS high school students who agree or strongly agree that gang activity is a problem at their school	<p>2.5a: Centers for Disease Control bi-annual Youth Risk Behavior Survey [baseline = 58%] (CDC-YRBS 2011 data) Update: This question was not asked in the 2013 or the 2015 CDC-YRBS survey</p>
2.6	Integrate Student Support Services in schools that address mental and behavioral health needs	<p>2.6a: Number of School Psychologists employed full-time by DPS [baseline = 29] (Full-time SY 2013-14) SY 2014-15 = (32) SY 2015-16 = (30) SY 2016-17 = (30)</p>

Service Provision

#	Recommendation	Indicator(s)
3.1	Support evidence-based program evaluation and recommend that evaluation be a central element for resource allocation decisions.	<p>3.1a: % of JCPC-funded programs that are evidence-based [baseline = 100%] (JCPC FY 2013-14 Annual Plan) n=8 programs FY 2014-15 (100%) n=9 FY 2015-16 (100%) n=8</p>

3.2	Assessment of local government-funded programs shall include consideration of the number and type of participants served and level of collaboration with other programs	3.2a: Local government cost/client for JCPC program participants [baseline = \$466/participant] (JCPC 2013-14 Annual Plan data, \$220,990 government cash match and 726 participants) FY 2014-15 (\$453/participant) FY 2015-16 (\$236/participant)
3.3	Increase coordination between agencies serving high-risk youth	3.3a: # of GRS Prevention/Intervention Team coordination meetings held per calendar year [baseline = 5/year] (average meetings/year in 2012 and 2013) CY 2014 = (5) CY 2015 = (6) CY 2016 = (5)
3.4	Durham County will continue to implement coordinated gang prevention, intervention, and suppression strategies, utilizing the OJJDP Comprehensive Gang Model.	3.4a: Adherence to the Model Fidelity Checklist as developed by the National Gang Center [baseline = Durham implemented the six key elements of the Model Fidelity Checklist in FY 2013-14] (February 13, 2013 Model Fidelity Report to the GRS Steering Committee)