

Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed:

A first year process and impact evaluation of a local
Weed and Seed Community site in Phoenix, Arizona

Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed:
A first year process and impact evaluation of a
local Weed and Seed Community site in
Phoenix, Arizona

Prepared by

David E. Choate
Center for Violence Prevention and Community Safety
College of Human Services
Arizona State University

May, 2008

CENTER *for*
VIOLENCE | PREVENTION
and | COMMUNITY SAFETY
ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

About the Center for Violence Prevention and Community Safety

Arizona State University, in order to become more committed to the Arizona community and to society as a whole, is setting a new standard for research universities through the model of the New American University. As a New American University, ASU is measured not by who we exclude, but by who we include; we pursue research that considers the public good; and we assume major responsibility for the economic, social, and cultural vitality of our community. Social embeddedness is core to the development of ASU as the New American University. Social embeddedness is a university-wide, interactive, and mutually-supportive partnership with the communities of Arizona. Toward the goal of social embeddedness, Arizona State University established the Center for Violence Prevention and Community Safety in July 2005 to respond to the growing need of Arizona's communities to improve the public's safety and well being. The Center for Violence Prevention and Community Safety is a research unit within the College of Human Services at Arizona State University. The Center's mission is to generate, share, and apply quality research and knowledge to create "best practice" standards. Specifically, the center evaluates policies and programs, analyzes and evaluates patterns and causes of violence, develops strategies and programs, develops a clearinghouse of research reports and "best practice" models, educates, trains and provides technical assistance, and facilitates the development of and construction of databases. For more information about the Center for Violence Prevention and Community Safety please contact us using the information provided below.

Mailing Address

Center for Violence Prevention and Community Safety
Arizona State University
P.O. Box 37100
Mail Code 3250
Phoenix, Arizona, 85069-7100

Street Address

Center for Violence Prevention and Community Safety
Arizona State University
4701 West Thunderbird Road
Glendale, Arizona 85306-4908

Phone

(602) 543-5959

Web site

<http://cvpcs.asu.edu/>

Acknowledgements

The author is particularly grateful to Jak Keyser for his tremendous help with the formation and maintenance of the site, his recruitment and support of the evaluators during implementation, and overwhelming optimistic attitude in the face of difficult tasks.

The evaluators would also like to thank the Canyon Corridor Site Coordinator, Nellie Ramon, and Neighborhood Enforcement Team (NET) Supervisor, and Canyon Corridor's "personal officer", Sergeant Steve Wamsley of the Phoenix Police Department for their invaluable support and feedback.

And of course, sincere thanks goes to all of the people associated with the Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed community, without whose considerable cooperation during data collection, this project would have been much more difficult to accomplish.

Opinions contained in this report are those of the authors and do not represent the position of the Arizona State University or the Center for Violence Prevention and Community Safety as a whole.

© 2008 by the Arizona Board of Regents for and on behalf of Arizona State University and its Center for Violence Prevention and Community Safety.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
ABSTRACT	iv
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	v
INTRODUCTION	1
Organizational Structure and Strategy of Weed and Seed	1
Law Enforcement	2
Community Policing	3
Prevention, Intervention, and Treatment	6
Neighborhood Restoration	10
THE PRESENT STUDY	12
METHODS	12
Establishment and Recognition of the Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed site	12
Site Characteristics	13
<i>Exhibit 1: Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed Site Characteristics</i>	14
Process Evaluation	14
<i>Official Documents</i>	16
Impact Evaluation	19
Analysis	21
<i>Exhibit 2: Crime Measures Constructed from Uniform Crime Report Categories</i>	22
FINDINGS	23
Process Evaluation Findings	23
<i>Exhibit 3: Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed Coalition Goals</i>	26
Law Enforcement	27
Community Policing	30
Prevention, Intervention, and Treatment	33
Neighborhood Restoration	40
Process Summary	46
Impact Evaluation Findings	47
<i>Exhibit 4: Uniform Crime Reports and Percent Annual Change by Program Year</i>	52
<i>Exhibit 5: Calls for Service and Percent Annual Change by Program Year</i>	55
Impact Summary	56
CONCLUSION	57
Limitations	60
Recommendations	61
REFERENCES	62

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the present study was to conduct an evaluation of the Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed, using both qualitative and quantitative data to conduct process and impact evaluations. The process evaluation relied on official documents detailing site activities and interviews with key stakeholders. The impact evaluation relied on Uniform Crime Report (UCR) and call for service (CFS) data from the Phoenix Police Department (PPD) from 2002 through 2007, divided into two categories represented by a four-year “pre-test” and two-year “post-test”. The results of the process evaluation indicated that the Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed was actively engaged in activities pursuant of their original site goals, and adapting them as the site developed. The impact evaluation indicated that the crime rates in the Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed area experienced mixed declines and increases during the past two years of official programmatic activities when compared to the four years prior for crimes related to violent, property, drugs, and total crimes.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction and Background

The purpose of this study was to conduct an evaluation of the Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed. The Weed and Seed strategy is a planned response to complex social and community issues. The comprehensive approach that Weed and Seed employs speaks to the underlying philosophy of its design: that the conditions of violence, substance abuse, and other crimes, and the widespread physical and social disorder of disadvantaged neighborhoods, are complex problems that arise and thrive for a myriad of reasons, and a multi-pronged response, using diverse resources, is the only logical solution.

The Weed and Seed strategy uses four central components: 1) law enforcement; 2) community policing; 3) prevention, intervention, and treatment; and 4) neighborhood restoration. Weeding activities are carried out by law enforcement agencies and include community policing techniques. The seeding processes are carried out by residents and public and private social service providers, and include prevention, intervention, and treatment programs, and neighborhood restoration projects.

Methods

The Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed site is located in Phoenix, Arizona. The designated area is approximately 1.9 square miles of mixed residential and commercial land, with a 2000 U.S. Census population of about 20,000 people, 60% of which are of Hispanic or Latino origin, and 5.4% African-American. The median household income is about 69% of the median for the rest of the City of Phoenix.

First, a process evaluation was conducted to examine the implementation of the Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed site's policies, goals, and planned activities. Second, an impact evaluation was conducted to assess the impact of Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed on crime and disorder in the designated program area.

The process evaluation for this study included: 1) a historical examination of the procedures and activities that contributed to the formation of the Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed; and 2) an examination of the specific activities that were implemented and the extent to which they were implemented.

The impact evaluation focused on the influence that the Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed activities had on crime and disorder in the Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed area. For Weed and Seed sites in general, measures of program impact are based on reductions in crime and improvements to quality of life in the targeted neighborhood. The impact evaluation relied on Uniform Crime Report (UCR) and call for service (CFS) data from the Phoenix Police Department (PPD) from 2002 through 2007.

Findings

The process evaluation revealed several major findings. Generally, the evaluation revealed that the Canyon Corridor site pursued the attainment of their originally defined goals and objectives, and maintained relationships and engaged in activities that maintained the effort. The analysis indicated to evaluators that the 14 goals defined in the site's original strategic plan were largely adhered to through a sustained commitment by community residents, social service providers, civic leaders, local police, and criminal justice system professionals.

The impact evaluation found that in the different categories of crime, there were both statistically significant decreases and increases in the crime rates in the Canyon Corridor area as compared to the rest of the city. While other extraneous factors may have influenced the changes in crime rates, either solely or cumulatively in conjunction with Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed efforts, the data does indicate a significant change in the Canyon Corridor area during Weed and Seed program implementation.

Limitations

Even though there is evidence of the success of the Canyon Corridor site, data was occasionally lacking that would have allowed for a more rigorous assessment of program goals. The 14 originally defined goals included outcome measures for the various tasks that might have been used to measure programmatic success. Many goals called for percentage reductions or increases in crime or community involvement to serve as quantifiable measures of success. The site's strategic plan did not however clearly delineate the measures that would be collected to measure these goals, nor was a process of collection identified. During the process of program development and implementation, setting up the mechanisms through which one can assess progress toward program goals is critical for evaluation, and when necessary, program improvement.

Recommendations

Suggestions for program improvement include revisiting the site's goals and objectives and developing strategies for collecting the data needed to assess program performance and effectiveness. This process would include both clearly identifying the specific data that would be used to measure specific outcomes, as well as the policies and procedures used to collect, maintain, and analyze the data. With further refinement of the goals and objectives and putting in place mechanisms for assessing those goals and objectives, the Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed site could improve upon their successes, bringing even more tangible benefits to neighborhood residents.

INTRODUCTION

The U.S. Department Justice (DOJ) developed Operation Weed and Seed in 1991 as a crime reduction strategy for high crime neighborhoods across the country, specifically targeting violent crime and drug-related offenses. The Community Capacity Development Office (CCDO) administers Weed and Seed as a unit of the DOJ's Office of Justice Programs. Operation Weed and Seed began as a pilot project in three cities: Kansas City, Missouri; Trenton, New Jersey; and Omaha, Nebraska (Dunworth & Mills, 1999). The number of Weed and Seed sites grew rapidly from the three pilot sites in 1991, to 300 officially recognized Weed and Seed sites in 2005 (Dunworth, Mills, Corder, & Greene, 1999; CCDO, 2005c). The guiding principle for the strategy is to reduce violent and drug crime rates in high crime neighborhoods by combining traditional law enforcement tactics, public and private sector participation, and providing social services. The difficulty in developing and maintaining dedicated partnerships presents the strategy's biggest challenge, and its greatest strength, because the collaboration of a broad range of people and organizations motivated to reduce violent and drug crimes, and improve the quality of life for residents in neighborhoods, leverages far-reaching resources into a common goal.

Organizational Structure and Strategy of Weed and Seed

The Weed and Seed strategy is a planned response to complex social and community issues. The comprehensive approach that Weed and Seed employs speaks to the underlying philosophy of its design: that the conditions of violence, substance abuse, and other crimes, and the widespread physical and social disorder of disadvantaged

neighborhoods, are complex problems that arise and thrive for a myriad of reasons, and a multi-pronged response, using diverse resources, is the only logical solution.

The Weed and Seed strategy uses four central components: 1) law enforcement; 2) community policing; 3) prevention, intervention, and treatment; and 4) neighborhood restoration. Weeding activities are carried out by law enforcement agencies and include community policing techniques. The seeding processes are carried out by residents and public and private social service providers, and include prevention, intervention, and treatment programs, and neighborhood restoration projects. The sections below discuss these activities as they pertain to the Weed and Seed program.

Law Enforcement

The law enforcement component is perhaps the most visible element of the weeding process. Traditional law enforcement activities such as patrol, arrest, investigations, prosecutions and probation and parole are the key tools used in this component. The U.S. Attorney's Office plays a central role in every Weed and Seed site, and is an important part of the law enforcement component. The U.S. Attorney (or his/her designate) helps with the formation of the steering committee and is central to building cooperation between federal, state, tribal, county, and local law enforcement agencies.

Weed and Seed sites are communities with higher rates of violent and drug crimes than the larger surrounding community of which they are a part. These areas typically see high rates of homicide, serious and misdemeanor assaults, robberies, auto thefts and burglaries, well-developed open drug markets, high substance abuse rates, domestic violence prevalence, significant gang activity, and public nuisance complaints (Dunworth

et al, 1999; JRSA, 2004a; JRSA, 2004b). Traditional police enforcement strategies can be effective in reducing crime rates when appropriate levels of resources are committed to a targeted area. Part of the creation process of a Weed and Seed site is the definition of its designated area, which becomes the geographical focus, or targeted area, for enforcement resources. Law enforcement strategies in Weed and Seed targeted neighborhoods might include sting and reverse-sting drug trafficking operations, dedicating officers to identify and serve arrest warrants, improved responsiveness to calls for service, targeted prosecutions, and more frequent patrol. Accordingly, the law enforcement component of Weed and Seed, in its simplest form, is comprised of intensified traditional policing strategies targeted at specified geographic areas.

Community Policing

Community policing also plays a major role in Weed and Seed programs. It serves as the bridge between the law enforcement (or the weeding process) component of weed and seed and the social services and neighborhood revitalization (or seeding process) component. Community policing as defined by the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services is “a policing philosophy that promotes and supports organizational strategies to address the causes and reduce the fear of crime and social disorder through problem-solving tactics and police-community partnerships” (Community Oriented Policing Services, 2006).

Weed and Seed programs embrace the community policing concept of developing “police-community partnerships.” Community Oriented Policing focuses on developing relationships between members of the community and law enforcement. The importance

of the relationship between the public and the police is the central issue addressed by the basic assumptions of the community policing philosophy. In defining the police-community relationship, Peter K. Manning details eleven assumptions that typically underlie the concept of community policing, cited from *Community Policing: Contemporary Policing* (Alpert and Piquero, 1998):

Contemporary Policing (Alpert and Piquero, 1998):

1. People desire to see police officers in their local areas of residence and business on a regular and casual basis.
2. The more police they see, the more they will be satisfied with police practices.
3. The more police they see (to some unknown limit), the more secure they will feel.
4. People yearn for personal contact of a non-adversarial character with police.
5. The public is more concerned about crime than disorder.
6. There is a single public, a single public mood, and a 'common good' that is known and coherently represented.
7. People are dissatisfied with current police practices.
8. Previous policing schemes have been shown to have failed.
9. Public satisfaction as measured in polls is a valid index of public opinion.
10. The police are responsible for defending, defining, expanding, and shaping the common good of the community by active means.
11. Community policing best meets the above needs.

The assumptions detail some of the critical guiding principles of the Weed and Seed strategic philosophy. The central focus of the relationship and interaction between police and the public is a tool for crime prevention, increased public satisfaction, and reducing citizens' fear of crime in their community.

Law enforcement tactics can effectively weed-out criminals and criminal activity in an area through enhanced, focused enforcement. However, for these tactics to have a

sustainable effect the community must be supportive of the police and participatory in crime control and prevention efforts. Researchers have asserted that “the success of community policing is assumed to be highly dependent on citizen awareness, understanding, and support of the concept and a willingness to be involved in crime prevention and crime reduction activities” (Webb and Katz, 1994).

Through community policing activities, targeted communities attempt to build positive, cooperative relationships with the police that have perhaps not previously existed. Because of the history of neglect, mistrust, and lack of respect between the police and the public in many weed and seed neighborhoods, a number of Weed and Seed sites focused on building a positive and supportive relationship between neighborhood residents and the police (CCDO, 2005a; Geller, 1998; JRSA, 2004c). Under community policing, police officers are not only responsible for crime fighting, but also for working with the community to address broader quality of life issues confronting the community. Officers aid with public disorder complaints, anti-gang and drug education programs in schools and after school programs, assist neighborhood watch groups, help neighbors with dispute resolution, and educate residents about Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED).

For officers to effectively engage the community and mobilize support for law enforcement activities, they must understand the community they serve. Specifically, it is important that the police understand the historical relationship between the police and neighborhood residents (Miller, 2001), the specific problems and conditions residents face, (including their fears and concerns), and the priorities of community members (CCDO, 2005e; JRSA, 2004c). To this end, the Weed and Seed strategy requires law

enforcement to engage in community policing efforts by developing formal relationships with representative members of the community. During the early planning stages of developing a Weed and Seed site, community members work with the police to develop a Weeding plan that will satisfy the needs of the community. This agreement will inform the police about those police services the community believe are most important, and will educate the community about what the police can do to help improve their community in a non-traditional capacity (CCDO, 2005e).

Prevention, Intervention, and Treatment

Prevention, intervention, and treatment (PIT) tasks are designed to identify, reduce, and eliminate physical conditions and social constructs that contribute to violence, crime, and disorder in the community (CCDO, 2005e). For Weed and Seed to be considered effective, significant changes beyond that of declining crime rates typically need to occur. The seeding process is much of what differentiates Weed and Seed from many other crime abatement programs (Dunworth, et al, 1999). While the weeding process begins, and crime reduction efforts are taking shape, the community can begin seeding the neighborhood with initiatives that will maintain and strengthen crime abatement efforts. The prevention, intervention, and treatment component addresses the specific needs of the community to empower itself and assist the at-risk members to desist and resist criminal involvement.

The PIT component of the Weed and Seed strategy is the first stage of the seeding process. Improving the community's access and participation in crime prevention and abatement programs and other social services are the primary purpose of the PIT

component. PIT activities include, but are not limited to, building partnerships with, and increasing residents' access to community organizations, businesses, mental health practitioners, healthcare providers, and substance abuse treatment providers. Increasing resident awareness and access to job training, family counseling, and other social services offers residents opportunities of assistance before resorting to crime. Many of these organizations and individuals already provide these services in or around the designated Weed and Seed site, and may present excellent sources of collaboration. Individual Weed and Seed communities build partnerships with various agencies based on the individual needs of the community.

Weed and Seed sites are not funded by the CCDO to meet all of their program goals. Weed and Seed sites receive funding to initiate programs, to recruit and leverage funding from other public or private sources, and to provide supplemental support to existing programs and services that are already working with the community. Leveraging the resources allows the Weed and Seed community to attract existing social service programs into their targeted area. The leveraging of these resources allows the Weed and Seed community to achieve some of their goals of providing prevention, intervention, and treatment services to the residents of their community (CCDO, 2005e; Dunworth et al, 1999; JRSA, 2004c). It is through this cooperative effort that the Weed and Seed site can pursue prevention, intervention, and treatment goals that would otherwise be too expensive to achieve independently. For example, a designated Weed and Seed community that wants to provide more accessible substance abuse treatment to its residents, where an existing substance abuse treatment program is already functioning in or near the designated site, might establish a partnership that will enhance the service

delivery to the Weed and Seed community, and minimize the wasting of resources with redundancy, or expand the delivery of services to more people.

Prevention, intervention, and treatment efforts have slightly different form and function from one another, but primarily focus on immediate issues and current conditions that adversely affect the community. Prevention activities may include improving neighborhood notifications and communication by informing citizens of recent home burglaries, establishing block watch groups, or initiating a domestic and sexual abuse awareness program in schools, providing literature and helpline numbers in a confidential manner. Intervention activities typically involve a more comprehensive response to specific issues the community wants addressed. Some sites have used truancy reduction programs (JRSA, 2004c) to keep kids in school and out of trouble; others have employed adult literacy programs, vocational training, or parenting classes. Treatment activities are obviously more protracted, intensive, and costly to establish and maintain than most other PIT program activities. However, many designated areas already have organizations and individuals providing the kinds of treatment services in Weed and Seed communities, or in the surrounding jurisdiction. Leveraging resources to provide greater accessibility to substance abuse treatment programs, family counseling services, and health and medical assistance are all examples of treatment efforts used in various Weed and Seed communities.

Part of the philosophy of the Weed and Seed strategy is to provide community groups the support, framework, and initial resources to create a coalition in their community, with a comprehensive foundation of disparate groups and individuals gathered under a common banner (CCDO, 2005e). Aligning with this philosophy, the

focal point of the prevention, intervention, and treatment component for a Weed and Seed site is the Safe Haven. Every Weed and Seed site is mandated to establish at least one Safe Haven. The Safe Haven is a center that provides a multitude of services to both the youths and adults of the community, it may serve as a coordination center for Weed and Seed activities, be the primary location for educational and other services, and literally a safe place where residents can go to find help (CCDO, 2005e). The guiding principles for a Safe Haven require it to be a multi-service facility that is community, education, and prevention based, culturally relevant, and easily accessible. The Safe Haven must be a multi-service facility, sometimes referred to as a 'one-stop shop', serving as a clearinghouse and a central point of community connection. Weed and Seed recognizes the difficulties facing a disadvantaged community to be multifaceted, and developing solutions to these difficulties must be multifaceted. The Safe Haven is a place that centralizes and coordinates these activities. The Safe Haven may host after school activities, sports or fitness programs, adult education classes, community meetings and events, or be an access point to medical or mental healthcare, or substance abuse treatment providers.

The most important guiding principle for a Safe Haven is that it must be community based, meaning it must function based on the needs and resources of the community it serves. The second guiding principle, that it be educationally based, illustrates its role in intervention activities, hosting community education classes. Similarly, the prevention basis emphasizes the importance of a community level commitment to prevention initiatives. The fourth guiding principle for the Safe Haven to be effective, is that it must be culturally relevant, reflecting the local community's culture

and diversity. The fifth guiding principle is perhaps an easily overlooked characteristic, that the Safe Haven is easily accessible. A Safe Haven needs to be physically accessible to members of the community, in an area visible, and easy to find and get to, as well as have sufficient hours of operation to be of service to the community when residents need it most. All of these guiding principles for Safe Havens contribute to the prevention, intervention, and treatment mission of the Weed and Seed site, by making the Safe Haven a “home” for the community.

Neighborhood Restoration

The fourth major component of Weed and Seed is neighborhood restoration. Neighborhood restoration embodies the tasks that directly deal with the physical improvement of the community, but also some of the social disorders issues as well. Restoration of the neighborhood focuses on improving homes and blighted areas in the designated community by leveraging resources to provide help to residents and encourage the rebuilding of dilapidated infrastructure. Municipal departments involved with neighborhood blight, including neighborhood services, city prosecutors offices, as well as neighborhood associations work together to increase code enforcement, eliminate properties with consistent violation problems, and penalize negligent landlords. Neighborhood clean-ups are one example of early neighborhood restoration efforts, where both community and Weed and Seed coalition members partner to eradicate weeds, clean up trash, remove graffiti, and otherwise improve the condition of the neighborhood.

Another important approach used in the restoration process brings federal, state, tribal, local, and private agencies and organizations into cooperation with one another, encouraging residential and commercial redevelopment in the Weed and Seed community. Weed and Seed communities often are populated with many empty, abandoned, or condemned homes and businesses (CCDO, 2005e; Dunworth et al, 1999). Demolishing neighborhood eyesores, building new housing and reintroducing businesses to the designated area, are examples of neighborhood restoration efforts aimed at significantly improving residents' quality of life and reinforcing long-term benefits from the seeding efforts. Revitalizing economic development through business and employment opportunities within the community, and replacing or renovating dilapidated properties is intended to support sustained community growth and improvement.

As much as the community policing component relies on the principles set out by Wilson and Kelling in their influential work *Broken Windows* (1982), so too does the purpose of the neighborhood restoration component. Wilson and Kelling argued that communities that exhibit higher levels of social and physical disorder would also experience higher levels of crime in general (Wilson and Kelling, 1982). The importance of neighborhood restoration then is directly tied to sustaining crime reduction efforts and preventing future criminality. The theory asserts that if neighborhoods are clean, people are more likely to keep them clean, and by extension, if neighborhoods do not tolerate crime, then there will be less crime in the neighborhood. The neighborhood restoration component of the Weed and Seed process becomes the most important for cultivating a sustained reduction in crime for the community.

THE PRESENT STUDY

The purpose of this study was to conduct an evaluation of the Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed site. First, a process evaluation was conducted to examine the implementation of the Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed site's policies, goals, and planned activities. Second, an impact evaluation was conducted to assess the impact of Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed on crime and disorder in the designated program area. The sections below describe the site characteristics and explain in detail the methodology used to conduct the process and impact evaluations.

METHODS

Establishment and Recognition of the Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed Site

The Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed site received official recognition in October 2006, due in no small part to the cooperative efforts of community leaders from neighborhood organizations (Black Canyon Community Leaders Organized for Urban Transformation), social service providers (TERROS), community partners (Grand Canyon University), and city of Phoenix partners from Neighborhood Services Department (NSD), the police (PPD), and the Phoenix City Prosecutor's Office. The early efforts to organize the community for the Weed and Seed application led to the formation of the Canyon Corridor Alliance in 2004, spearheaded by a neighborhood leader, Jak Keyser, and a Phoenix City Prosecutor, Umayok Novell.

The Canyon Corridor Alliance eventually formalized into the Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed Steering Committee, bringing together two neighborhood associations, Granada and Cordova, and community stakeholders from schools, faith-based groups,

businesses, and government agencies. Phoenix's NSD was tapped to be the fiscal agent, and with their combined expertise in Weed and Seed site management and in-kind matching funds positioned Canyon Corridor to be a competitive grantee.

Site Characteristics

The Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed site is located in Phoenix, Arizona. The officially designated site includes two neighborhoods within its boundaries: Granada and Cordova (Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed 2005 Site Strategy). The Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed site, hereafter referred to as Canyon Corridor, is in a centrally located area of Phoenix, just north of the downtown area of the city. The designated area is approximately 1.9 square miles of predominantly residential and mixed commercial land (CCDO, 2007). Commercial properties in the area are primarily focused on retail uses, and the site lies a short distance south of a major retail and commercial office development for the city of Phoenix. The site is bounded on the east by Interstate 17, a major freeway that passes through the Phoenix metropolitan area. Travelling north-south I-17 essentially bisects Phoenix. The proximity to the interstate significantly impacts the community's characteristics. Many communities located adjacent to major thoroughfares tend to have a clustering of retail outlets, commercial office parks, multiunit housing developments, and hotels and motels. The Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed community is no different. These conditions and how they contributed to many of the problems facing the community are evident in the process of the site selection, and in its initial strategy development illustrate. The site is further bounded by Indian School Road to the south, 35th Avenue to the west, and Missouri Avenue to the north. Exhibit 1 below shows

the key socio-demographic characteristics of the Canyon Corridor area and Phoenix (U.S. Census 2000 and CCDO, 2007).

Exhibit 1: Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed Site Characteristics

Socio-Demographic Characteristics	Canyon Corridor	Phoenix
Geography		
Area, sq. mi.	1.87	516.28
Demographics		
Population	19,764	1,321,045
Percent Males, Age 18 and Up	35.3	36.0
Percent Females, Age 18 and Up	31.3	35.1
Percent Males, Age 17 or Less	17.5	14.9
Percent Females, Age 17 or Less	15.9	14.1
Family Structure		
Total Households	6,082	465,834
Percent Households with Families	65.2	66.0
Percent Households with Children	46.3	35.7
Percent Single Parent Families with Children	20.0	8.1
Percent Non-Family Households	34.8	34.0
Education		
Percent Adult population without a high school diploma	28.1	23.4
Race/Ethnicity		
Percent White	57.9	71.1
Percent Black	5.4	5.1
Percent American Indian/Eskimo	3.9	2.0
Percent Asian/Pacific Islander	4.5	2.0
Percent Other	24.1	19.8
Percent Hispanic Ethnicity	60.1	34.1
Income/Housing		
Per Capita Income	11,135	19,833
Median Household Income	28,466	41,207
Percent Renting	57.7	39.3

Process Evaluation

Process evaluations allow researchers to examine the implementation of program goals and activities. By definition, process evaluations are primarily concerned with the systematic procedures of the subject of evaluation, and are not concerned with programmatic outcomes or results (Creswell, 1994). Process evaluations are an important

part of any comprehensive evaluation, and are a critical means of examination. The examination of the implementation procedures and programmatic activities provide validity to any observable differences of program activities, because for any program to demonstrate effectiveness, it must be able to demonstrate that the program was implemented and maintained as intended. A process evaluation often uses fieldwork to provide a descriptive understanding and definition to the issues being evaluated (Creswell, 1994).

The process evaluation for this study included: 1) a historical examination of the procedures and activities that contributed to the formation of the Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed site; and 2) an examination of the specific activities that were implemented and the extent to which they were implemented. The process evaluation also examined the integrity of implementation of selected program activities, and the course of modifications throughout the site's development. The principal methods used to gather data for the process evaluation were: 1) a review of official site documents; and 2) routine attendance and record of steering committee meetings by members of the evaluation team.

The process evaluation relied on data collected from official documents of the Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed. Through the analysis of historical documents, the foundation of the original goals and plans were compared to the progression and implementation of those goals and plans to offer an assessment of those processes. As such, the process evaluation was not focused on the direct or indirect outcomes of the Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed efforts, but rather the methods, policies, procedures, and routines employed to select, assess, adjust, or replace program initiatives.

Official Documents

Official documents maintained by the site were collected for the present study. Researchers collected 92 separate official documents from Canyon Corridor stakeholders. Stakeholders providing official documents included the Canyon Corridor site coordinator, service delivery agents, Phoenix Police Department, faith-based community leaders, and citizen representatives and leaders from the community. The official documents included steering committee meeting agenda and minutes (n=28), Phoenix Police Department progress reports (n=18), letters from U.S. Attorney's Office (n=1) announcements of site activities and events (n=12), update memos from site coordinator and committee chairs (n=8), progress reports from service providers (n=9), activity reports from faith-based partners (n=3), Safe Haven workgroup progress reports (n=5), the site's applications and summary reports (n=4), and stakeholder interview data (n=4).

The Canyon Corridor site had a nearly comprehensive collection of these official documents, and evaluators had been able to gather documents throughout the site's development. Evaluators collected additional documents through specific requests of various stakeholders as necessary. For example, we were supplied with steering committee meeting agenda and minutes on a continuous basis, providing a significant portion of the site's official documentation.

Documents that were collected included, but were not limited to: the original application for official recognition as a Weed and Seed site; subsequent application submittals to the CCDO; community meeting minutes; police enforcement plans and schedules; community intervention program curricula; and community activity announcements. These records were important because they documented the planned

interventions and the actual implementation of those plans. The original and supplemental applications filed with the CCDO served as data indicating the specific strategies the Canyon Corridor intended to use for both weeding and seeding program activities. Other official documents allowed us to compare the intended program strategies to those that were actually implemented, and examine the processes used to adapt to challenges and modify strategies during implementation. These documents included, but were not limited to: Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed Steering Committee meeting minutes; Canyon Corridor Steering Committee Policies and Procedures Guide; memoranda detailing policing enforcement strategies; police enforcement and community policing assignment scheduling; police progress reports; letters of support from the local United States Attorney's Office representative; and public announcements and flyers of program activities. Some of these documents detailed the early community meetings discussing official Weed and Seed designation strategies, what neighborhoods to include, boundary decisions, and prioritizing the needs of the community.

The Phoenix Police Department (PPD) is perhaps one of the more important stakeholder groups involved in the weeding efforts of the Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed site. The steering committee membership focusing on weeding efforts for Canyon Corridor includes representatives from Phoenix Police Department command staff for the precinct serving the area, a Sergeant and a patrol officer with the PPD serving as the community policing officers assigned to the Canyon Corridor area, a supervisor with the Maricopa County Adult Probation, a liaison from the U.S. Attorney's Office, an agent from the Phoenix office of the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), and representatives from the Phoenix City Prosecutor's Office. Evaluators collected PPD

official briefing notes, scheduling, and command instructions regarding the commitment and distribution of resources specifically aimed at the Canyon Corridor area. Reviewing the PPD documents provided an official record of early enforcement efforts and verified the process of committing police resources to weeding activities.

Representatives for the seeding efforts included membership from wide-ranging foci. Most notably was the extensive representation and participation from TERROS Behavioral Health Services, which provided membership include some of their senior staff, working closely with the development of the original application strategy, and continuing post Official Recognition, leading various seeding program efforts. No less important were the early and continuing efforts from active residents and community members, particularly from the area's neighborhood associations, specifically the Granada and Cordova neighborhoods. The steering committee also had representation from the following groups: faith community leaders serving the area, particularly from Lynnhaven Community Church, Iglesia Luterana Vida Nueva, and the Rehoboth Saints Center, Church of God in Christ; public relations officials from Grand Canyon University; community leaders from Black Canyon CLOUT; specialists from both City of Phoenix Neighborhood Services and the Parks and Recreation Departments; business partners from Basha's Food City; educational partners including leadership from Bourgade Catholic High School, Alhambra School District, and Granada East School; senior officers from the PSA/Art Awakenings; representatives from Value Options; and leaders from the International Rescue Committee.

Representatives from a handful of other groups regularly participated and attended steering committee members, although remained largely non-voting members,

these included: representatives from Phoenix City Council, specifically the offices of Councilmen Mattox and Simplot; the Phoenix Mayor's Office; and the director of development from Chicanos Por La Causa, Inc.

Impact Evaluation

The impact evaluation focused on the influence that the Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed activities had on crime and disorder in the Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed area. Impact evaluations examine the results of programmatic expectations. Whether significant differences can be observed in the targeted area/population because of program interventions determine the program's effectiveness in achieving its goals. For Weed and Seed sites in general, measures of program impact are based on reductions in crime and improvements to quality of life in the targeted neighborhood.

The impact evaluation relied primarily on Uniform Crime Report (UCR) from the Phoenix Police Department (PPD) from 2002 through most of 2007. The Uniform Crime Report program was created in 1930, and continues to be sponsored by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). The UCR data are collected by local law enforcement, compiled and reported to the FBI. The FBI gathers, maintains, and disseminates UCR data on various geographical scales, nationally. The data reflect those crimes reported to police (known offences), and that fall into specifically designated categories. The UCR data provided to evaluators included those in what is called Part I offenses, specifically: murder and non-negligent manslaughter, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft, and arson. These data are the most commonly distributed and well-known crime rate statistics used in the United States, and are what

most laypersons are exposed to when hearing reports about crime rates in their community.

Accordingly, the impact evaluation relied on a quasi-experimental, pre-test/post-test design (Campbell and Stanley, 1963). This design is well suited for studies involving large populations, as in this case, where a targeted population receives a treatment, and another population does not receive the treatment, theoretically serving as a control, or comparison group. For the purposes of this evaluation, the Canyon Corridor area and its residents were regarded as our ‘target’ or ‘experimental’ group and were compared to the rest of the City of Phoenix, which served as our ‘comparison’ group. The two groups are further examined in a pre-test/post-test environment through our examination of UCR data dating four years before Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed strategies were initiated, throughout the Canyon Corridor site’s implementation to November 2007, specifically, all of the UCR data from January 2002 through November 2007 is included in our analyses.

These data permitted us to examine the crime patterns for the Canyon Corridor neighborhoods prior to initiation of program activities, and since program implementation. Additionally these data allowed us to compare the Canyon Corridor area to the surrounding community of Phoenix, and assess the relative impact Weed and Seed program activities implemented by examining change between each area.

Additional analyses were conducted using call for service (CFS) data for the Canyon Corridor designated area and the City of Phoenix. Calls for service data were obtained from the Phoenix Police Department (PPD). We examined differences between the designated Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed area and the remainder of the City of

Phoenix. Call for Service (CFS) data is a record of all calls placed to the PPD requesting some form of police assistance, including: emergency 911 calls, citizens' calls to report crimes; traffic accidents; and non-emergency, non-criminal calls for police assistance. Evaluators used six years of CFS data, dating from January 2001 to December 2007. These years represented data that illustrated the crime patterns for the Canyon Corridor neighborhoods for four years prior to program implementation, and two years of Weed and Seed activity.

As in our analysis of UCR data, calls for service were coded into one of four specific categories: 1) violent crime; 2) property crime; 3) drug-related crime; and 4) non-criminal, disorder related issues. Similar to UCR data, CFS data allowed researchers to compare official records for rates of crime, but also provided a different examination, particularly for some police-related quality of life concerns.

Analysis

Dependent samples T-tests were conducted to examine changes in the rates for: 1) violent crime; 2) property crime; 3) drug-related crime; and 4) total crimes. These tests allowed us to examine: changes in crime and disorder in the Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed site as well as corresponding changes in crime and disorder in Phoenix (i.e., comparison area.). Both UCR and CFS data were examined using the same statistical procedures.

Our measures of crime were constructed from UCR data that PPD collected and reported as official incidents. Using the individual rates for various individual offenses, we selected and categorized them into one of the four measures: 1) violent crime; 2)

property crime; 3) drug crime; and 4) total. Our violent crime measure included homicides, aggravated assaults, sexual assaults and robberies; property crime included burglaries, motor vehicle thefts, other thefts, and arson; drug crime was defined using crimes related to marijuana, dangerous drugs, and narcotic drugs, both for possession and sale; and the total crimes category was a summation of these categories, excluding other, uncategorized crimes. See Exhibit 2 below for a breakdown of these categories.

Exhibit 2: Crime Measures Constructed from UCR Codes

Violent	Property
Homicide	Arson
Aggravated Assault	Burglary
Robbery	Larceny / Theft
Sexual Assaults	Motor Vehicle Theft
Drug Related Crimes	Total Crimes

Evaluators converted the UCR data from raw frequencies to rates based on population. Specifically, we divided the number of crimes in a given period by the estimated population for the appropriate calendar year, and multiplied the result by 100,000. This yielded rates representing the number of crimes per 100,000 persons. Converting the raw frequencies into rates standardized the data, and allowed evaluators to make comparisons between the designated Weed and Seed area and the rest of the City of Phoenix across years by controlling for changes in population.

The analyses of CFS data collapsed the call type codes used by Phoenix PD from nearly 400 distinct codes into the four crime categories – violent, property, drugs, and disorder – and a summary of those categories. Certain call types were excluded from our

analyses, specifically those not directly related to criminal activity – i.e. reports of an injured animal, debris in the roadway, or picking up newspapers. Other calls that could not be confidently assigned to our categories were also excluded from analyses, which included calls related to traffic accidents, undefined status offenses like “juvenile disturbances”, or vague concerns such as “unwanted guest”.

For the CFS categories violent, property, and drugs, the offenses included were clearly identifiable as being related to a crime of that type, i.e. assault, burglary, or drug possession. For the disorder category, evaluators used those call types closely associated with quality of life issues, including, but not limited to: public intoxication, loud parties, graffiti, and prostitution.

FINDINGS

Process Evaluation Findings

We evaluated the Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed site by examining the formal and informal mechanisms by which they developed, adapted, and maintained their intended goals as defined by each of the four components of the Weed and Seed strategy: 1) law enforcement; 2) community policing; 3) prevention, intervention, and treatment; and 4) neighborhood restoration. The Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed site developed its site goals around these four components of the Weed and Seed strategy.

The initial application to the CCDO for official recognition as a Weed and Seed site detailed 14 distinct goals, each with specific objectives, divided into the four cores Weed and Seed categories. The 14 goals were developed from the high priority unmet needs for the Canyon Corridor community, as identified during the initial planning and

needs assessment process. The community needs assessment sought guidance for developing an informed plan guided by the self-identified needs of the community itself. Intended to provide a customized set of goals and objectives designed to directly address the most serious issues of the community, the broad concerns were organized into six categories of high priority, unmet needs. The six high priority needs included:

1. Illegal drug market, especially how drug sales in the area place youth at risk for use;
2. Prostitution, particularly juvenile female participation;
3. Residential blight, i.e. poorly managed or maintained properties;
4. Public infrastructure decay, specifically street lights, sidewalks, and landscaping;
5. Lack of youth programs and resources, such as community centers, libraries, educational attainment support, in close proximity; and
6. Improved local business support, including both helping locally owned neighborhood businesses succeed, and improving physical appearances.

The community needs assessment identified serious problems related to youth, both criminal and non-criminal. One example of these youth-related issues from the list above, illegal drug activity was described as a serious problem within the community. Residents reported concerns about the volume of open drug market transactions, and the risk to which this market exposed the community's youth. The volume of drug sales in the community made illicit drugs readily available to youth, encouraging the use of, or least making accessible, numerous dangerous drugs. Also, the community described serious concerns about prostitution in the area. Many citizens reported that they commonly saw prostitutes working nearly every arterial street passing through the community. They suspected many of the prostitutes were juveniles, and feared that girls from their community would also fall victim to the trade. Residents feared that the blighted

conditions of many properties, particularly rental properties, had gotten worse and their neighborhoods were becoming “a reservoir for criminals to live and carry out destructive behaviors” (Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed Strategy, 2005). The community assessment also revealed that residents felt their neighborhoods needed significant infrastructure improvements; specifically wanting more street lights, sidewalks repaired, landscaping beautification along arterial and collector streets, and improvements to the appearances of strip malls in the area. Beyond the significant fears associated with drugs and prostitution, residents also reported other needs for the area’s youth. Residents voiced a need for community centers and libraries in close proximity to public parks, and programs to improve youths’ success in school and in the community. The community assessment also revealed a serious unmet need regarding the business community in the designated Weed and Seed area. Residents wanted to curb the loss of neighborhood-oriented businesses, to find resources to help the small business owners succeed, and limit the expansion of undesirable businesses, such as pawn shops and payday loan centers. To address these six identified community problems, the Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed site’s strategic plan focused on achieving 14 goals, shown in Exhibit 3 below.

Exhibit 3: Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed Site Goals

Law Enforcement

- 1 Implement the Violence Impact Project
- 2 Establish a hotel/motel police partnership program
- 3 Conduct warrant roundups

Community Policing

- 1 Adopt-a-community program
- 2 Police blight elimination

Prevention, Intervention, and Treatment

- 1 Canyon Corridor Youth Development Program
- 2 Substance abuse treatment to youth and adults
- 3 Establish a Safe Haven
- 4 Implement Art Awakenings program

Neighborhood Restoration and Economic Development

- 1 Small business courses
- 2 Community blight elimination
- 3 English as a second language courses
- 4 Community Information Center
- 5 Little Canyon Trail Project

Source: Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed Application for Official Recognition, 2005

Analysis of official documents and stakeholder interview data revealed that the Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed site had pursued implementation of all 14 of the original 14 goals during initial year recognition and implementation.

We generally found that stakeholders had a positive impression of the Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed project and they believed that the Canyon Corridor had adhered to its originally intended mission, consistent with its goals. In the below section we discuss our findings pertaining to Canyon Corridor implementation of activities related to the 14 goals that they established for themselves by the four central components of Weed and Seed: 1) law enforcement; 2) community policing; 3) prevention, intervention, and treatment; and 4) neighborhood restoration.

Law Enforcement

The Law Enforcement component of the Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed site's original site plan called for accomplishing three distinct goals. These three distinct goals are listed below, followed by a discussion of what we found from official documents and key stakeholders. We discuss whether the Canyon Corridor site adhered to its site plan, whether activities were employed to implement and accomplish a particular goal, and an overall assessment of the process regarding the efforts related to that specific goal.

Goal 1: Create and maintain a Canyon Corridor Weeding Steering Committee

The first law enforcement goal of the Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed site was to implement Phoenix's Violence Impact Project, in an effort to reduce overall violent crime in the target area. Specifically, this goal included four tasks to achieve its objectives. The tasks were: 1) continue to maintain and develop law enforcement partnerships; 2) meet weekly with Phoenix Police Department specialty units (homicide, drug enforcement bureau, gang squad, and vice) and partner agencies (ATF, ICE, County Attorney, Phoenix Community Prosecutors, and U.S. Attorney's Office); 3) analyze violent, drug, and prostitution crime data on a weekly basis; and 4) develop and review action plans on a weekly basis to target violent, drug, and prostitution crimes in the area. Reviews of these tasks confirmed that this goal was largely met early in the process and has been maintained throughout the implementation period.

The data indicated that the law enforcement partnerships identified in Task 1 were sufficiently maintained to adhere to the objective of the task. Evaluators did not have direct documentation of weekly meetings with members representing all of the Phoenix

Police Department's specialty units and partner agencies. However, other official documents did provide details that indicated at least some routine communication across these groups. The Neighborhood Enforcement Team representative, Sgt. Steve Wamsley provided regular updates at steering committee meetings, providing documentation of ongoing efforts regarding Task 3 of Goal 1. These updates did not clearly indicate whether review of the action plans occurred on a weekly basis, as indicated in Task 4. While evaluators did not find documentation for continuous *weekly* review of the action plans, we did find support that review and adaptation occurred on an ongoing basis, generally adhering to the perceived intent of the objective.

Goal 2: Implement the Phoenix Police Department's Hotel/Motel Program

The second law enforcement goal sought to establish partnerships with corporations that owned hotels and motels in the designated Weed and Seed area, specifically for the purpose of identifying transients with active felony warrants. Goal 2 included five specific tasks: 1) increase the time officers spend conducting this operation; 2) create a list of hotels/motels in the area, contacting corporate leadership and security supervisors for the property; 3) conduct warrant checks of registered guests; 4) cooperate with other agencies to coordinate possible additional charges; and 5) ensure charges stemming from warrants are coordinated with federal and state prosecutors to aid dispositions resulting in maximum penalties.

Official documents revealed that Tasks 1, 2, and 3 were thoroughly implemented. Reports from the Phoenix Police Department clearly indicate a commitment of officers that routinely engaged in contacting and visiting hotels and motels in the area, and that

warrant checks were conducted. Official documentation supported a cooperative effort with Maricopa County Adult Probation, largely satisfying Task 4. However, evaluators found little documentation regarding efforts applied in implementing Task 5.

Goal 3: Warrant Roundups

The third and final goal of the law enforcement strategy plan included four specific tasks aimed at targeting known suspects with outstanding warrants, and increasing the number of violent probation warrant arrests. The four tasks described for Goal 3 were: 1) partner with Maricopa County Adult Probation to target known probationers in the Weed and Seed designated area with outstanding warrants; 2) obtain monthly updated probation warrant lists for locations of probationers with warrants; 3) officers who have adopted apartment complexes will use the lists to identify targeted probationers; and 4) conduct a coordinated warrant roundup between Phoenix Police Department, Maricopa county Adult Probation, and prosecutors.

Overall, evaluators found that Goal 4 was well-adhered to. Coordination between Phoenix Police and Maricopa Adult Probation in identifying known probationers with outstanding warrants and an effort to have officers routinely use this information in their adopted apartment complexes was found in the official documents. The evaluators were unable however to find in the review of official documents a record of comprehensive, continuous (i.e. monthly) updates to this list of probationers with outstanding warrants. Evidence that updates to the list did occur was found, but it could not be determined if they occurred monthly.

Law Enforcement Summary

The Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed site predominately followed a process that adhered to the originally intended goals, either through formalized programs and operations, or informally through embeddedness with the Canyon Corridor community. Evaluators collected evidence that supported active engagement in programmatic activities toward attaining all three goals. The data collected and reviewed did find limited documentation for individual tasks with each goal, typically concerning the verification of the frequency with which each task was engaged. While unable to verify the frequency of the action described by the task (i.e. weekly or monthly updates), evaluators were able to reliably verify that the specified activities had at least occasional occurred.

Community Policing

The Community Policing component of the Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed site's planned strategy included only two expressed goals. The focus of the community policing goals was aimed at improving those elements of social and physical disorder that hinder efforts to reduce crime, minimize the public's fear of crime, and foster positive collective efficacy.

Goal 1: Adopt a Community Program

Data collected from official documents supported that the Canyon Corridor site significantly engaged in implementing their first community policing goal, the Adopt-a-Community program. Data from PPD and the Steering Committee indicated that

throughout the implementation period, officers from the Neighborhood Enforcement Team and the patrol units established and maintain relationships with the management and residents of multiunit housing complexes in the designated area. Specifically, the plan called for six individual tasks to achieve Goal 1, they were: 1) identify the apartment communities in the Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed area with the highest violent and drug crime rates, and identify ownership; 2) each squad from the Cactus Park Precinct that serves the Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed area be assigned at least one of the identified problematic apartment complexes; 3) create a tracking book for each complex site, with maps, contact information, and previous police contact data for use by officers; 4) train officers on goals, tasks, and objectives for this project; 5) provide support to officers with CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design), abatement, and specialty units, as needed; and 6) use of directed patrol strategies in targeted apartment complexes.

Evaluators found significant support in official documentation and progress reports that the tasks for this goal were actively implemented and maintained. The PPD provided routine, detailed progress reports about the specific efforts made at various apartment complexes, including updates about management turnover, CPTED efforts, targeted specialty enforcement, and results of arrests made while patrol officers were engaged in directed patrol efforts, all indicative of adherence to all six tasks within the Community Policing Strategy's Goal 1.

Goal 2: Blight Elimination

The second goal identified as part of the Community Policing Strategy listed four specific tasks aimed at engaging Community Action Officers (CAO) and patrol officers in an effort to reduce blight-specific code violations per the Phoenix neighborhood Preservation and Zoning ordinance. The goal called for the implementation of four tasks: 1) train patrol officers to recognize blight-specific code violations; 2) create maps documenting observed code violations and subdivide the area into specific assignment grids for officers; 3) officers will contact residents, notifying them of their violations and provide information on how they can remedy the problem; and 4) conduct follow-ups and provide the Neighborhood Enforcement Inspector the properties still in violation after the initial warning period.

The review of official documentation found that efforts to implement all four identified tasks were followed according to the strategy. Overall, evaluators found that the intended implementation process was present for all four tasks directed at achieving Goal 2. Official documents indicated that during the first year of implementation, the police reported 2,208 parking citations, 1,512 Blight-Light educational flyers distributed, 436 vehicles were “red-tagged” for violations, and 29 vehicles were towed, all as part of the Weed and Seed law enforcement efforts. While adherence to the plan as written was found, and the process of implementation was very good, evaluators did find that the strategy only called for a single follow-up period, and would like to note as part of a policy recommendation that efforts at reducing neighborhood blight and code compliance enforcement should be specifically identified as a continuous effort in the strategy.

Community Policing Summary

The review of official documents and site progress reports provided significant support that the Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed site's process of implementing its identified Community Policing goals were thoroughly adhered to. Evaluators found sufficient support indicating that the strategies and tasks were implemented as described and intended, and that the implementation of the specific tasks identified in each of the two goals were well documented.

Prevention, Intervention, and Treatment

The Prevention, Intervention, and Treatment (PIT) component of any Weed and Seed site is concentrated on delivering human services targeted at the specifically determined needs of the designated community. It also serves as an important link in the coalition of law enforcement agencies, social service organizations, treatment providers, the private business sector, and neighborhoods (CCDO, 2007). The Prevention, Intervention, and Treatment component is the first part of the Seeding portion of the Weed and Seed strategy. The Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed identified four PIT goals in its original plan.

Goal 1: Canyon Corridor Youth Development Program

The objective of the Goal 1 in Canyon Corridor's Prevention, Intervention, and Treatment (PIT) strategy is to provide a community based program that develops drug-refusal skills in youths aged 12 to 17. The program is a prevention effort aimed at reducing early initiation to use of alcohol, tobacco, and illicit drugs by focusing on

enhancing a youth's coping and life skills, personal and cultural development, and promoting community awareness, mobilization, and prosocial activities.

The goal calls for five tasks to achieve its intended outcome: 1) provide weekly culturally responsive and linguistically appropriate group activities incorporating part of the *Keeping' It REAL* prevention curriculum; 2) develop a Youth Council to enhance participants' responsibility and leadership skills; 3) promote community mobilization through classes, trainings, and workshops about substance abuse; 4) develop a curriculum teaching community mobilization skills; 5) enhance community development through collaborations seeking the reduction of outlets selling alcohol, tobacco, and drugs to youths.

Goal 1 was administered by TERROS Behavioral Health. All documentation used to evaluate the process of implementation of this goal and its supporting tasks were secondary sources, i.e. progress reports provided by TERROS to the Canyon Corridor Steering Committee.

Evaluators reviewed documentation supporting the described implementation process for Task 1, and found that the process was consistent with the intended plan, as was documentation supporting Tasks 3 and 4. Evaluators found limited documentation supporting the implementation process for Task 2. The only documented implementation of this particular task was from a brief presentation on April 20, 2006 however, it does provide some support regarding the effort at developing a Youth Council. Evaluators could not find clear documentation regarding the implementation of Task 5. Review of official documents did not provide a clear indication of further development or use of the

Youth Council, nor did documentation find supporting evidence of collaborations and efforts to reduce outlets of alcohol, tobacco, and drug availability.

Goal 2: Substance abuse treatment to youth and adults

The second goal in the PIT strategy sought to reduce the potential for family and community violence by lowering the alcohol and drug use of persons within the family by enhancing the family and social functioning on an individual level by addressing their drug and alcohol abuse. To achieve this goal, the strategy developed five tasks: 1) develop and analyze a needs assessment of the community with the emphasis on individuals with substance abuse related to crime; 2) collaborate efforts between the service provider (TERROS) the Phoenix Police Department, and the Maricopa County Adult Probation Department to obtain referrals for individuals with substance abuse and crime related problems; 3) enroll referred adults into group counseling services at TERROS; 4) develop individualized intervention plans for each participant; and 5) refer youth with alcohol or drug problems to counseling services with other local behavioral health agencies.

Evaluation of official documents found that TERROS identified an adult re-entry population needing significant substance abuse treatment, and life and family skills. The specific documentation concerning the determination of this community need and its link to Task 1 was not readily available. Documentation supporting the planned implementation of Task 2 indicated that collaborations were established, had been maintained, and were providing referrals. Of particular note, the collaborations also indicated such success that agencies not specifically mentioned in the plan were

contributing to the referrals, enhancing the overall effort of this particular task. Evaluators found that referred participants were being recruited into the treatment program and documents indicated participants being administered the group treatment sessions and individualized plan as intended. Task 5, the referral and recruitment of juvenile participants was not found in the document review. Although the target population and services provided would indicate that this is an intended result of necessary programmatic modification.

Overall, there was weak support that Task 1 had been adhered to according to the planned process. Tasks 2, 3, and 4 were sufficiently supported to indicate they were each implemented according to the original planned process. The provider, TERROS, provided quarterly progress reports to document support for programmatic activities. Our analyses of the documentation revealed that Task 5 was implemented according to the original plan, however, changes to the actual referral and recruitment adult population suggests a modification to the original plan, but evaluators could not find sufficient documentation delineating these modifications.

Goal 3: Establishment of a Safe Haven

An integral part of the Weed and Seed strategy is for each site to have a least one Safe Haven. The Safe Haven is described as a highly visible and accessible multiservice center that serves as a community gathering place, as well as a safe location for the community to receive a variety of services for both adults and juveniles (CCDO, 2004). Data collected from official documents and stakeholder interviews indicated that the Canyon Corridor Steering Committee sought to establish an original and unique location

within the designated area to serve as the Safe Haven for the site, rather than adopt an existing facility, as many other sites across the country do, to serve as its Safe Haven.

Canyon Corridor identified four tasks to achieve this goal: 1) contract with the property owners of Black Canyon Professional Plaza for 3,000 square feet of office space on the first floor of an office building; 2) identify operational needs of the center (phones, computers, furniture, etc.); 3) develop a strategy to staff the center with probation officers, trained volunteers, and other local resources; and 4) open the center to the community, and publicize it through the schools, community newsletters, businesses, and local media.

The implementation of this goal has had numerous challenges. Evaluators found significant documentation regarding the early efforts to implement Task 1, including documentation detailing the failure of the contract. Canyon Corridor leadership documented their efforts in implementing this task, and the eventual withdrawal of the offer by the lessor. Subsequently Task 3 could not be implemented as intended prior to or shortly after Official Recognition of the site. Evaluators did find significant documentation regarding the efforts in redefining Task 1. Specifically, two separate Safe Haven plans were developed, and documentation showed significant effort at identifying a suitable location, securing said location, and determining the relative needs to amend it to the needs of the Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed's Safe Haven. Efforts were made to place the Safe Haven on the property of the Iglesia Luterana Vida Nueva (New Life Lutheran Church), and documentation showed significant effort in modifying the original plan to adopt the tasks to assess the new location for suitability, and preparing it for such. Ultimately, this location also became unsuitable and plans were again modified. Canyon

Corridor established a permanent Safe Haven located at the Lynnhaven Church. This location is serving as the Safe Haven, but in a limited capacity. Safe Havens in the Weed and Seed strategy are intended to be the centralized location for services within the community, but as some of the efforts of the Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed specifically target segments of the convicted offender population to receive services, the initial Safe Haven did not offer a place to those individuals. The Steering Committee continued to develop an implementation plan for a permanent, fully-accessible Safe Haven for the community, and in February 2008 opened a fully-accessible Safe Haven (2850 West Camelback Road, Suite 140) to serve as the office of the Site Coordinator, offering meeting space to small groups, to be a clearinghouse of community information, and to further advance the presence of Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed in the community.

It must be noted that, while evaluators found that significant challenges occurred with implementation of the Safe Haven plan, site leaders documented the challenges and changes sufficiently to track the process of implementation. While the plan, as currently implemented, does not resemble the original ambition for a full service community center, the process of implementation, and the documentation of changes and adaptations indicate the site's adherence to the *intent* of the original goal to establish a Safe Haven.

Goal 4: Art Awakenings

Art Awakenings is a community based program that uses creative expressive therapy designed to enhance community efficacy aimed at improving community and family living, educational performance, personal and cultural development, and increase

positive choices. The Art Awakenings goal was defined by setting four tasks: 1) develop a curriculum focused on improving self-esteem, impulse control, and improved awareness of the impact of individual choices on the community; 2) provide culturally relevant services during evening and weekend hours; 3) develop community art projects to enhance community member involvement in blight reduction; and 4) develop community based garden projects to promote community mobilization.

Review of official documentation found evidence that Tasks 1, 2, and 3 had been implemented as intended. Numerous documents detailed mural efforts, the exceptional number of individual participation, and the widely positive feedback given organizers from participants support the intended efforts. Evaluators found the overall the intended implementation process followed the strategic plan.

Prevention, Intervention, and Treatment Summary

The Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed site has followed a process of implementing prevention, intervention, and treatment programs that largely conforms to achieving its originally intended goals for this component. The data collected offered strong support that the first goal, establishing the Canyon Corridor Youth Development Program, was adhered to, and followed a consistent process of emphasis. The bulk of Goal 2, providing substance abuse treatment to youth and adults, was largely adhered to, although little documentation regarding changes to the original plans could be found, the principal objectives for the defined tasks were followed, with the exception of detailing the shortfall in juvenile services. Additionally, the implementation of Goal 4: Art

Awakenings was found to have sufficiently comprehensive documentation that the original plan for implementation was adhered to, and the intended process followed.

The implementation of Goal 3, the Safe Haven showed mixed results. Evaluators found a significant amount of documentation supporting the efforts to implement and achieve the outcome for this particular goal, as well comprehensive records of alterations made to the plan. While the original plan has undergone numerous modifications and manifestations, the Canyon Corridor leadership documented these changes well; this alone indicates to the evaluators the intended adherence to the process of implementation for this goal, if not the specifically defined tasks.

Neighborhood Restoration

The Neighborhood Restoration component of the Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed strategy detailed five goals. The neighborhood restoration component may be the most important piece to sustaining reductions in crime and improvements in the community, because the central focus is developing lasting physical and social reforms. Building a cooperative coalition of federal, state, and local government agencies, together with private-sector businesses, social service providers, and residents is an integral part of neighborhood restoration efforts. Weed and Seed sites were expected to focus on advancing: economic revitalization or development; employment opportunities; and improving the physical environment of the community (CCDO, 2007).

Goal 1: Small business course

The first goal of the Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed site was to develop, in cooperation with Grand Canyon University's Ken Blanchard College of Business, a certificate program aimed small business owners in the area. There were four intended tasks delineated to achieve this goal, they were: 1) "develop a curriculum with Grand Canyon University's Ken Blanchard College of Business focusing on the foundations of developing a successful small business in a culturally diverse community" (Canyon Corridor, 2005); 2) establish a partnership with the Arizona State Bar for an attorney to teach a portion of the class covering business law ethics; 3) set a date to offer the classes and work on advertising the class to local businesses in the area; and 4) provide weekly classes, two hour blocks, for a total of six weeks.

Evaluators were informed that Grand Canyon University's Ken Blanchard College of Business created a curriculum with a strategy to offer certificate classes in Spanish and English. The curriculum was not executed in the first year. The program has been designed to be implemented in two phases. Phase 1 is designed for businesses that can pay for the classes and has already been implemented. Phase 2 is intended for micro-enterprise and is planned for later implementation pending funding to underwrite the program to be provided at free or discounted rates for small businesses. The evaluation indicated that Tasks 1 and 3 have been sufficiently adhered to, and that Task 4 has been suitably modified to support adherence to the original objective. Specific programmatic descriptions do not clearly indicate whether Task 3 was implemented.

Goal 2: Community blight elimination

The second goal for the Neighborhood Restoration strategy focused on coordinating biannual community clean-ups, together with Bourgade Catholic High School and Maricopa County Adult Probation (MCAPO), intended to reduce the number of homes in the designated area with significant blight related code and zoning violations. Two tasks were set to achieve this goal: 1) set two months each year to have a community clean-up, with the assistance of the Granada and Cordova Neighborhood Associations; and 2) acquire the assistance of MCAPO in organizing a date and time to have probationers ordered to serve community service hours earn those hours by providing labor for the clean-up.

Evaluators found that both tasks in the plan were well-adhered to, and that the site has continued to pursue continuous implementation of the goal. Both initial clean-ups documented more than 100 participants each, and were able to extend the geographic scope further than originally anticipated for each clean-up. Evaluators also found documentation detailing specific efforts of coordination and planning that were not included as part of the originally defined tasks. The site was able to coordinate with one of their local business partners, Food City (a local grocery store in the designated area) to provide food and drinks for the volunteers.

Goal 3: English as a second language courses

The original Goal 3 for the Neighborhood Restoration component called for providing two English as a second language (ESL) classes for parents of minor children in the Weed and Seed area. The plan intended to achieve this goal through two specific

tasks: 1) expand the partnership with Rio Salado Community College to increase staffing for the ESL courses; and 2) increase the number of ESL classes offered at Granada east School to two per semester. Evaluators were unable to find sufficient documentation regarding the implementation of this goal to assess its process.

Goal 4: Community Information Center

The Community Information Center was intended to provide a publicly available source of information about the resources available to the community particularly those residents and services in the Weed and Seed designated area. The goal had three defined tasks: 1) create an area near the entrance of the store for brochures; 2) decide on the information and resource brochures of the greatest benefit to the community; and 3) designate a community member to stock the shelves on a regular basis.

Reviewing official documents, evaluators found support for this goal early in the implementation period, and there appears to be support for the implementation of Tasks 1 and 2, although documentation specifying the designated community member as part of Task 3 could not be found. It is unclear whether the implementation of Task 3 was completed, but there is a lack of documentation regarding continuation of the effort. Subsequently, evaluators would find that the process of implementation for Tasks 1 and 2 seem to have been satisfied, and while a community member must have been selected to carry-out Tasks 1 and 2, documented support identifying that individual and any possible succession could not be determined from official documents. The new Safe Haven site is the new location for the Community Information Center and the site coordinator will be responsible for its maintenance.

Goal 5: Little Canyon Trail Project

The intended outcome for Goal 5 of the Neighborhood Restoration component of Canyon Corridor's strategy called for the transformation of a blighted and crime ridden section of canal into a landscaped, recreational trail, through a coordinated partnership with the Cordova neighborhood stakeholders, local businesses, irrigation utility, the City of Phoenix, and federal agencies. The hope is that the enhancement of this particular blighted area will serve as a publicly available community asset that will strengthen pride in the community, foster a desire among residents to adopt anti-blight habits for their own homes and neighborhoods, and ultimately reduce crime by significantly reducing signs of serious physical disorder in the area. The goal was set with three initial tasks: 1) create a working committee of all parties necessary for the development and implementation of the project; 2) develop and obtain commitments for multiple funding sources for the project; and 3) obtain a broad-based community involvement in the planning and design processes.

Evaluators found significant documentation in support of the site's adherence to the implementation plan, and that the process as designed and intended had been carried out. Review of official documents found numerous references to contributor involvement and continuous pursuit of external funding sources to fund multiple aspects of the project in both small and large parts.

Neighborhood Restoration Summary

The Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed site developed a planned process, and implemented programs that supported its originally intended neighborhood restoration

goals. Evaluators found substantial support for their commitment to Goals 2 and 5. Both of these goals were well documented and the process by which they were implemented thoroughly followed the implementation plan. We found mixed support for the process to which Goal 4 was implemented, and little to no documentation regarding the process of implementation of Goals 1 and 3.

Outside the specifically intended Neighborhood Restoration goals, the Canyon Corridor site engaged in other activities specifically targeting the restoration and improvement of their neighborhood and community. One accomplishment the site is most proud of is a mural project conducted with support from multiple stakeholders and local youth. The mural is intended to be a contemporary product of community unity and a visual reminder of positive changes occurring in the community. The site has also conducted three community clean-ups, totaling more than 100 volunteers from every corner of the community.

The Chairperson of the Neighborhood Restoration subcommittee, Gwen Relf, and her organization Rehoboth CDC formed the Canyon Corridor Neighborhood Alliance (CCNA) in 2007 with technical assistance from St. Luke's Health Initiative. The CCNA has met regularly, working specifically on developing goals for economic revitalization in the target area. Regular attendees have included Gwen Relf, Jak Keyser, Nellie Ramon, and Larry Fallis, and have held meetings at sites throughout the community (Lynnhaven Church, Rehoboth Saints Center, International Rescue Committee offices, and the Canyon Corridor Safe Haven on Camelback).

The continued support of key stakeholders like Grand Canyon University (GCU), whose partnership has been instrumental in the success of the site, will continue to be an

important part of the Weed and Seed site's efforts to stay connected with the whole Canyon Corridor community. GCU has provided monthly meeting space, coordinated and hosted large-scale community events, and has been a champion for the efforts of the Canyon Corridor Steering Committee and their supporters.

Canyon Corridor has also enjoyed tremendous support from the faith-based community, which have served as Safe Havens, provided services, serve on the steering committee, and have helped protect the neighborhood with strong grassroots support. Specifically, the faith-based partners helped collect more than 400 petition signatures, aiding the Canyon Corridor Steering Committee in its effort to fight the opening of an adult-oriented business in the community. The business – a strip club – was attempting to use grandfathered city ordinance zoning guidelines to open a large, topless, alcohol-serving business in the heart of the community. The Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed group and its coalition of partners was able to prevail in a zoning hearing to deny an issuance of an Adult Use-Permit; and prevailed in an appeal case brought by the applicant whereby the original denial was upheld. The group continues to organize opposition to a further appeal by the applicant to Superior Court. This signals a tide of change coming from the residents of one of the most disadvantaged and crime-stricken neighborhoods in the city.

Process Summary

Overall, the review of official documents and other data collected from stakeholders indicated that the Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed site had largely adhered to its intended goals, and followed a process of achieving those goals. Through the course

of implementation, the Canyon Corridor site adapted the originally intended 14 goals into a more relevant and achievable set of goals, and overall, provided sufficient documentation indicating an appropriate process of adaptation of those goals within the organization of the Steering Committee. While evaluators found a number of goals that seem to have been modified without sufficient documentation, the predominance of support is found that the site has established a sound system of implementation, and generally follows appropriate processes. The shortfalls in documentation could be easily remedied if the site were to keep a single source checklist of program activities and progress regarding each goal's delineated tasks.

Impact Evaluation Findings

Uniform Crime Report Data

Exhibit 4 below shows the number of known Part I UCR offenses per 100,000 population and the percent change for a given year relative to the preceding year's UCR rate, for the period spanning January 2002 through November 2007.

The exhibit includes the results of our pre/post analyses. Comparing the mean UCR rate for 48 months of data during the pre-test period to the mean UCR rate for 23 months of post-test data, we conducted dependent samples t-tests. The results of these significance tests are shown in the column labeled as Pre-Post Change.

As shown in Exhibit 4, the Canyon Corridor area and the rest of the city of Phoenix experienced varying rates of reported crime. Although during 2005, the year representing the immediate, pre-official recognition, Canyon Corridor saw declines in each crime category. The site had dramatic declines of nearly 11 percent in the property

crime rate, more than 29 percent in violent crimes, and nearly 51% in drug crimes, resulting in more than a 19 percent decline in the total crime rate. These dramatic declines can be explained in a number of ways, but one possible explanation might be explained in part when we examine the rates for the rest of the city during the same time period. Rates for Phoenix during this period also predominately saw declines, although not as dramatic as those in Canyon Corridor, and Phoenix actually saw an increase in the violent crime rate of nearly 2 percent. Phoenix had declines of almost 7 percent in property crimes, 5 percent in drug crimes, and 6 percent in total crimes. While sharing a similar trend of declines, the rates in Phoenix were more tempered. These differences are perhaps explained by the Canyon Corridor site's pre-recognition implementation efforts. As is typical of most Weed and Seed sites, and of which Canyon Corridor is included, are the early implementation of enforcement strategies. Canyon Corridor began implementing its planned enforcement strategies before official recognition, and may have significantly impacted the crime rates during this officially pre-implementation period.

Looking at the violent crime rates changes in Canyon Corridor during the pre- and post-implementation periods, we see notable fluctuations. Our baseline rates remain relatively stable between 2002 and 2005, with rates ranging from 114.2 crimes per 100,000 to 126.5. The dramatic decline during 2005 saw the rate drop to 97.9, unfortunately during the first year of official recognition, the rate rose back to 126.4, an increase of nearly 23 percent. However, during the site's second year, the violent crime rate fell to 109.5, more than a 15 percent decline from the previous year. Any explanation for these swings in the violent crime rate would be speculative, as evaluators lack

sufficient data to adequately examine alternative hypotheses. It should be noted that during the same period, the violent crime rates for the rest of Phoenix remained very stable, with 4.6 percent the largest change in rates between years. The overall pre-test to post-test change in violent crime rates is good news for Canyon Corridor, with a net decline of 12.6 percent, particularly when compared to the fact that the rate for Phoenix remained effectively unchanged at a 0.7 percent increase overall.

Property crime rates for canyon Corridor were less promising. The highest rate in Canyon Corridor for any year in our data was in 2003, at almost 713 crimes per 100,000 people. The rate for Phoenix that same year was about 585. Phoenix saw steady declines in property crime rates from 2002 through 2006, but during 2007 increased by 18 percent over the 2006 rate. Canyon Corridor similarly saw declines in 2004, 2005, and 2006, but increased dramatically, by more than 21 percent, in 2007. Overall, between 2002 and 2007, Phoenix's property crime rate fell by 2.3 percent, while Canyon Corridor increased 7 percent during the same time. While the increases are disappointing, what may be adversely impacting the Canyon Corridor rate could be the overall increase across Phoenix. Taking the 18 percent increase in Phoenix as part of the contribution to the rate in Canyon Corridor, the Weed and Seed area might have only seen slightly more than a 3 percent increase independently, which would have resulted in an overall reduction in the property crime rate.

The examination of the rates for drug crimes are very different than those for violent and property offenses. Between 2002 and 2007, Phoenix saw an overall increase of more than 14 percent to its drug crime rate, from 51 per 100,000 in 2002 to about 60 in 2007. Canyon Corridor has seen a much more dramatic increase, overall nearly 49

percent. From 2002 to 2003 and 2003 to 2004, Canyon Corridor's drug crime rate increased more than 30 percent each year, but then saw a remarkable decline in 2005, dropping almost 51 percent from 2004, to just over 101 crimes per 100,000. That rate remained stable at 100.6 in 2006, but has since increased sharply to 137.6 crimes per 100,000 population, a nearly 27 percent increase. While still much lower than the 5-year peak of 152.6, the rate and the recent increase are of serious concern for Canyon Corridor residents and the site's implementation strategy. Taking into account the increase in the rest of Phoenix, from a rate of 51.4 to 59.5 from 2006 to 2007, the increase in Canyon Corridor is still requires serious review. Drug crimes have historically been a serious problem for the Canyon Corridor site, as evidenced in our crime rate data, and it should be expected to have a well-rooted and difficult to reduce drug market. It must be noted that Canyon Corridor faces a difficult challenge, exemplified by the fact that the lowest recorded drug crime rate in the UCR data for Canyon Corridor was 70.7 in 2002, and the highest for the rest of Phoenix was 59.5, in 2007. The trend across the UCR data for the past six years suggests that the overall footprint of drug related crimes throughout Phoenix is growing. Given that Canyon Corridor has in recent history been more susceptible to open drug markets than other parts of Phoenix as a whole, it may be speculated that emerging drug market trends will continue to see increasing in drug offenses, and that Canyon Corridor is merely showing the symptoms sooner. The evaluators would like to strongly note that this is merely speculative, and that continued further analysis of future crime rates would be necessary to substantiate this hypothesis. A viable alternative explanation given the data available might suggest that enhanced enforcement efforts have artificially inflated some of the increases, which clearly

illustrates the difficulty of fully understanding the impact of the Weed and Seed enforcement efforts without further review.

Exhibit 4 also shows the total crime rates for our three principal measures. Overall, the rates for Phoenix remained very stable, with a marginal drop of less than 1 percent between 2002 and 2007. The overall change in the total rate for Canyon Corridor shows an increase of about 11 percent. The rate in 2005 showed a decline of more than 19 percent from 2004, and remained stable in 2006, unfortunately increasing nearly 18 percent in 2007 to 883.1 crimes per 100,000. This increase is predominately influenced by the increase in the property crime rate, which grew by 135 crimes per 100,000 between 2006 and 2007.

Exhibit 4: Uniform Crime Report Part I Offenses and Percent Annual Change by Program Year

	Pre-Test Period				Post-Test Period		Pre-Post Change
	Year -4	Year -3	Year -2	Year -1	Year 3	Year 4	
	Jan 2002 to Dec 2002	Jan 2003 to Dec 2003	Jan 2004 to Dec 2004	Jan 2005 to Dec 2005	Jan 2006 to Dec 2006	Jan 2007 to Nov 2007 ^a	2002 – 2005 vs. 2006 – 2007
Violent							
Canyon Corridor							
% Change	n/a	-7.97	9.72	-29.21	22.55	-15.43	-12.60 *
UCR per 100,000 Pop.	123.3	114.2	126.5	97.9	126.4	109.5	
Phoenix							
% Change	n/a	-3.79	4.63	1.88	-3.81	1.48	0.69
UCR per 100,000 Pop.	57.8	55.7	58.4	59.5	57.3	58.2	
Property							
Canyon Corridor							
% Change	n/a	16.97	-21.67	-10.87	-5.47	21.24	6.97
UCR per 100,000 Pop.	591.7	712.6	585.7	528.3	500.9	636.0	
Phoenix							
% Change	n/a	-6.24	-7.38	-6.93	-2.36	18.08	-2.29
UCR per 100,000 Pop.	621.9	585.4	545.1	509.8	498.1	608.0	
Drugs							
Canyon Corridor							
% Change	n/a	30.57	33.30	-50.79	-.067	26.90	48.62 *
UCR per 100,000 Pop.	70.7	101.8	152.6	101.2	100.6	137.6	
Phoenix							
% Change	n/a	0.00	7.03	-4.95	-1.40	13.52	14.45 *
UCR per 100,000 Pop.	50.9	50.9	54.7	52.2	51.4	59.5	
Total Crimes							
Canyon Corridor							
% Change	n/a	15.40	-7.10	-19.20	0.06	17.58	11.04 *
UCR per 100,000 Pop.	785.6	928.6	867.1	727.4	727.8	883.1	
Phoenix							
% Change	n/a	-5.59	-5.11	-5.92	-2.41	16.38	-0.68
UCR per 100,000 Pop.	730.5	691.9	658.2	621.4	606.8	725.6	

* Significant at $p \leq 0.05$

a Year 2 Crimes estimated from 11 months data (January 2006 to November 2007) using 2007 monthly average, adjusted by average percentage difference of available UCR data from each December from 2002 through 2006.

b Total crimes reported for this analysis includes only those crimes reported by the Phoenix Police Department into one of the above three categories.

Call for Service Data

Exhibit 5 below shows the number of calls for service per 1,000 population and the percent change for a given year relative to the preceding year's CFS rate, for each of the four pre-test period years, January, 2002 through December, 2005, and two post-test period years, January, 2006 through December, 2007. The exhibit includes the results of our pre/post analyses. Comparing the mean CFS rate for 48 months of data during the pre-test period to the mean CFS rate for 24 months of post-test data, we conducted dependent samples t-tests. The results of these significance tests are shown in the column labeled as Pre-Post Change.

As shown in Exhibit 5, the Canyon Corridor area experienced declines in the rates of calls for service for violent, property, disorder, and total crimes between 2002 and 2007. The rate of violent crime CFS in the Canyon Corridor area declined significantly from 2002 to 2007 by 9.4 percent. A more dramatic decline was seen in the calls for property crimes, which declined by nearly 22 percent during the six-year time period of our analyses. A non-significant decline of 2.5 percent was seen for disorder related calls during this same period. Overall, total CFS declined by more than 11 percent in this period. Consistent with the UCR findings, CFS related to drug offenses climbed in Canyon Corridor during this period, by 21.6%.

Overall, the findings of the CFS data as presented in Exhibit 5 are consistent with the findings from the UCR data. The analyses of the different measures provide some encouragement that the crime suppression and community oriented policing efforts in the Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed area seem to be influencing reductions in most types of

crime. The increases in drug-related offenses, while discouraging, may be due to a wide variety factors, ranging from increased enforcement, awareness, and reporting, to actual increases in the scope and volume of drug crimes due to market displacement from other enforcement zones. Further investigation and analyses would be necessary to determine more precisely the causal influences on these changes.

Exhibit 5: Calls For Service and Percent Annual Change by Program Year

	Pre-Test Period				Post-Test Period		Pre-Post Change 2002 to 2007
	Year -4	Year -3	Year -2	Year -1	Year 3	Year 4	
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	
Violent *							
Canyon Corridor							
% Change	n/a	-2.07	-2.42	3.73	-8.53	0.81	-9.42 *
CFS per 100,000 Pop.	14.19	13.90	13.56	14.07	12.87	12.97	
Phoenix							
% Change	n/a	-6.41	1.59	-0.95	-3.50	-6.02	-17.08 *
CFS per 100,000 Pop.	8.74	8.18	8.31	8.23	7.95	7.47	
Property *							
Canyon Corridor							
% Change	n/a	7.59	-11.06	3.76	-14.10	-3.68	-21.72 *
CFS per 100,000 Pop.	13.08	14.08	12.52	12.99	11.16	10.75	
Phoenix							
% Change	n/a	-7.24	-3.31	-3.01	-2.08	-5.19	-23.82 *
CFS per 100,000 Pop.	14.63	13.57	13.12	12.73	12.46	11.81	
Drugs *							
Canyon Corridor							
% Change	n/a	-1.25	27.40	34.81	-29.56	6.70	21.55 *
CFS per 100,000 Pop.	0.84	0.83	1.06	1.43	1.00	1.07	
Phoenix							
% Change	n/a	-3.68	10.38	-6.50	1.39	1.85	2.58
CFS per 100,000 Pop.	0.55	0.53	0.58	0.55	0.55	0.56	
Disorder *							
Canyon Corridor							
% Change	n/a	3.45	13.62	-0.94	-10.05	-6.89	-2.54
CFS per 100,000 Pop.	7.03	7.27	8.26	8.18	7.36	6.85	
Phoenix							
% Change	n/a	-7.09	1.17	4.93	-1.79	-8.59	-12.93 *
CFS per 100,000 Pop.	4.47	4.15	4.20	4.41	4.33	3.96	
Total Crimes *							
Canyon Corridor							
% Change	n/a	2.65	-1.87	3.58	-11.66	-2.31	-11.06 *
CFS per 100,000 Pop.	35.14	36.08	35.40	36.67	32.39	31.64	
Phoenix							
% Change	n/a	-6.89	-0.82	-1.16	-2.41	-5.88	-19.27 *
CFS per 100,000 Pop.	28.39	26.43	26.22	25.91	25.29	23.80	

* Significant at $p \leq 0.05$

a Total Calls For Service for this analysis includes only those calls coded by the Phoenix Police Department that could be assigned to one of the above four categories.

Impact Summary

Both the UCR and CFS data yielded mixed results for the crime rate changes in the Canyon Corridor area. Overall, property crime rates are up slightly, although when controlling for the increases in the rest of Phoenix, the increase becomes an insignificant change. Similarly, the increase in the total crime rate being predominately driven by the property crime rate increase is less of a concern when taken into context of the changes throughout Phoenix. Of particular concern is the drug crime rate. The Canyon Corridor site has seen a statistically significant increase, and while the rest of Phoenix has also seen a significant increase, the increase in Canyon Corridor remains significant when controlling for Phoenix. While evaluators recognize that there may be multiple factors that might explain the difference, they cannot be identified and examined through UCR and CFS data alone.

The violent crime rates in Canyon Corridor represent the most promising changes in the designated area. Over the six years of crime rate data, Canyon Corridor is currently 12.6 percent lower than it was in 2002, a statistically significant decline. Evaluators found that during this same period Phoenix has remained unchanged, further strengthening the success of Canyon Corridor's efforts in violent crime reduction. The violent crime rate is measured by constructing the occurrences of homicides, aggravated assaults, sexual assaults, and robberies. While reducing all forms of crime are a necessary and important part of the Weed and Seed strategy, at the end of the day, most residents and criminal justice professionals would share a belief that reducing these most serious

and heinous of crimes are at least a little more important. Canyon Corridor has been able to significantly reduce the occurrence of these most serious violent crimes.

CONCLUSION

The present study involved both a process and impact evaluation as an assessment of the site's performance following its second year cycle. The Weed and Seed strategy is founded as a community-based crime abatement and prevention initiative, and is closely related to principles of community oriented policing.

The evaluation examined the Canyon Corridor site's adherence to their defined goals and objectives, and the relative success in attaining those goals. The evaluation was conducted over the course of approximately 14 months, from initial interviews with site representatives through final analysis. A report was prepared for publication by Arizona State University's Center for Violence Prevention and Community Safety, and disseminated to the Canyon Corridor Site Coordinator, Steering Committee members, and select members of the Canyon Corridor community.

Evaluators employed both qualitative and quantitative methods for the evaluation. Qualitative methods relied on interviews with key stakeholders, committee meeting observations, and an examination of official documents and records maintained by the site. The quantitative methods used relied on analyses of Uniform Crime Reports (UCR) and call for service (CFS) data from the City of Phoenix Police Department. The use of these combined methods permitted evaluators to compare the reported processes to the

originally intended processes, and to examine whether any change in crime, as expressed in these measures, occurred as a result of Weed and Seed program implementation.

The process evaluation revealed several major findings. Generally, the evaluation revealed that the Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed pursued the attainment of their originally defined goals and objectives, and maintained relationships and engaged in activities that maintained the effort. The analysis indicated to evaluators that the 14 goals defined in the site's original strategic plan were largely adhered to through a sustained commitment by community residents, social service providers, civic leaders, local police, and criminal justice system professionals.

Analysis revealed that the community policing efforts in the Canyon Corridor community had made significant strides toward establishing a strong bond between the police and the community since the start of the project. Qualitative data suggested that the efforts to establish prevention, intervention, and treatment programs were successful. Some of the site's involvement in such issues supported the finding of continued commitment, activity, and focus by Canyon Corridor to sustain crime abatement successes in the community, and movement toward sustained neighborhood restoration and revitalization.

The impact evaluation relied on six years of UCR and CFS data from the Phoenix Police Department. Evaluators analyzed the data by comparing measures of crime in the Canyon Corridor area to the rest of the city, dividing the data into 47 months of UCR and 48 months of CFS data for pre-test and 23 months of UCR and 24 months of CFS for

implementation period data. Using paired samples t-tests, evaluators assessed the changes in rates per 100,000 (UCR) and 1,000 (CFS) population for each area.

We found that the rate of UCR violent crime in the Canyon Corridor area declined by more than 15 percent during the second year of implementation, and an overall decline of nearly 13 percent. So at a time when the rest of Phoenix was experiencing a relative flattening in the rates of violent crimes, the Canyon Corridor community experienced a significant decline. The pre/post analyses of property crime rates revealed no significant changes during the six year period, although increases from 2006 rates to 2007 rates do present some concern and need for further attention. The CFS data revealed similar trends, with a decline of 9.4% from 2002 to 2007.

Examining the UCR rates for drug crimes, the pre-post analysis showed that Canyon Corridor had experienced a significant increase of 36 crimes per 100,000 population for drug crimes between the first pre-test year and the end of the second implementation year. Phoenix also reported increases in UCR drug crimes, with rates increasing by more than 7 crimes per 100,000 during the same period. The CFS data also indicated an increase of 21.5% over the analysis period.

The data available to evaluators provides evidence that the strategies adopted by the Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed site have been successful. Of particular note was the significant decline in the violent crime rate, which included homicides, aggravated assaults, sexual assaults, and robberies, in the Canyon Corridor area as compared to the rest of the city. While other extraneous factors may have influenced the changes in crime rates, either solely or cumulatively in conjunction with Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed

efforts, the data does indicate a significant change in the Canyon Corridor area during Weed and Seed program implementation.

Limitations

The purpose of Weed and Seed is to develop and implement a strategy that will over time have an impact on the quality of life in the neighborhood. It will take time for that strategy to have the desired impact, and will require a multitude of specific programmatic activities. The development and adherence to a well-defined process allows not only for an assessment of that individual site, but allows for an evaluation of the specific programs and activities used, in the furtherance of identifying model programs.

Even though there is evidence of the success of the Canyon Corridor site, data was occasionally lacking that would have allowed for a more rigorous assessment of program goals. The 14 originally defined goals included statements that might have been used to measure programmatic success. Many goals called for percentage reductions or increases in crime or community involvement to serve as quantifiable measures of success. The site's strategic plan did not however clearly delineate the measures that would be collected to measure these goals, nor was a routine process of collection identified. During the process of program development and implementation, setting up the mechanisms through which one can assess progress toward program goals is critical for evaluation, and when necessary, program improvement.

Recommendations

Evaluators suggest that routine processes be developed for the collection of identifiable, objective quantitative data to assess those individual goals and tasks calling for quantifiable results. Suggestions for program improvement include revisiting the site's goals and objectives and developing strategies for collecting the data needed to assess program performance and effectiveness. This process would include both clearly identifying the specific data that would be used to measure specific outcomes, as well as the policies and procedures used to collect, maintain, and analyze the data. With further refinement of the goals and objectives and putting in place mechanisms for assessing those goals and objectives, the Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed site could improve upon their successes, bringing even more tangible benefits to neighborhood residents.

The final recommendation emphasizes the importance of cooperation among Weed and Seed partners. Cooperation among the diverse groups that make-up a Weed and Seed site is useful not only for program activities, but also to any evaluation. Evaluators experienced a great deal of cooperation and a willingness to participate in the evaluation process, which was critical to the successful completion of the evaluation. Cooperation among the site's partners is crucial to programmatic activities, but sites should also include as part of their strategic plan an expressed commitment to participate and cooperate in a meaningful way with site evaluations from the beginning. The insight and guidance at the earliest planning stages enables sites to develop, maintain, alter, and achieve their goals in a demonstrable way.

REFERENCES

Alpert, G.P. and Piquero, A. (1998). Community policing: Contemporary readings.

Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

City of Hartford. City of Hartford Weed and Seed. Available:

<http://www.hartford.gov/police/Weed&Seed/weed.htm>

City of Pittsburg. City of Pittsburg Weed and Seed. Available:

http://www.city.pittsburgh.pa.us/weed&seed/assets/05_Weed&Seed_and_PSN-combined_Exec_Summ.pdf

Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed (2005). 2005 Official Recognition Site Strategy.

Phoenix. Canyon Corridor Weed and Seed.

Community Capacity Development Office (2005). Developing a Sustainability Plan for

Weed and Seed Sites. Washington, D.C. Community Capacity Development

Office.

Community Capacity Development Office (2005). 2005 Official Recognition Guidelines

and Application. Washington, D.C. Community Capacity Development Office.

Community Capacity Development Office (2004). The Weed and Seed Strategy.

Washington, D.C. Community Capacity Development Office.

Community Capacity Development Office (2005). Weed and Seed Implementation

Manual. Washington, D.C. Community Capacity Development Office.

Community Capacity Development Office (2007) Weed and Seed website homepage

available: <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/ccdo/ws/welcome.html>.

Community Capacity Development Office (2007) Weed and Seed Data Center Canyon

Corridor webpage available:

<http://www.weedandseeddatacenter.org/sitedetail.aspx?sitekey=0583S00>.

Community Oriented Policing Services. "What is community policing?" Accessed June,

2006. Available: <http://www.cops.usdoj.gov/default.asp?Item=36>

Driscoll, L.N., Bora, D.J. and DeTardo-Bora, K.A. (2003). Program Evaluation of the

O.N.E. Wheeling Weed and Seed. November 2003. Wheeling Jesuit University.

Dunworth, T., & G. Mills, (1999). National Evaluation of Weed and Seed. Research In

Brief. Washington, D.C. National Institute of Justice.

Dunworth, T., G. Mills, G. Cordner, & J. Greene (1999). *National Evaluation of weed*

and Seed: Cross-Site Analysis. Washington, D.C. Executive Office for Weed and Seed.

Geller, W. (1998). "As a Blade of Grass Cuts Through Stone: Helping Rebuild Urban

Neighborhoods Through Unconventional Police-Community Partnerships." *Crime & Delinquency* 44, 1: 154-177.

Harris, R.J., O'Connell, J.P. and Wilhite, S. (2001). Evaluation of Operation Weed and

Seed in Wilmington, Delaware. July 2001. Delaware Statistical Analysis Center.

Josi, D.A., Donahue, M.E., Magnus, R.E. and Bennett, K.J. (2000) Savannah's Weed and

Seed Program Evaluation (1999): Final Report. August 2000. Public Service

Center, Armstrong Atlantic State University.

- Justice Research and Statistics Association (2004). A Comparison of Homicide Trends in Local Weed and Seed Sites Relative to Their Host Jurisdictions, 1996-2001. Washington, D.C. Justice Research and Statistics Association.
- Justice Research and Statistics Association (2004). Weed and Seed Crime Pattern Data Analysis. Washington, D.C. Justice Research and Statistics Association.
- Justice Research and Statistics Association (2004). Weed and Seed Local Evaluation Meta Analysis. Washington, D.C. Justice Research and Statistics Association.
- Lowell, Massachusetts Police Department. Lowell Weed and Seed. Available: http://www.lowellpolice.com/about_lpd/policing_ini/weed_and_seed.htm
- North Central Florida Health Planning Council (NCFHPC), Inc. (1999) City of Ocala Weed and Seed Evaluation Final Report. August 1999.
- Manning P.K. (1998). Community-Based Policing. In G.P. Alpert & A. Piquero (Eds.), *Community policing: Contemporary readings* (pp. 23-34). Prospect heights, IL: Waveland Press, Inc.
- Miller, L. (2001). "Looking for Postmodernism in All the Wrong Places: Implementing a New Penology." *British Journal of Criminology* 41: 168-184.
- Milhalic, S. & K. Irwin (2003). "Blueprints for Violence Prevention: From Research to Real-World Settings – Factors Influencing the Successful Replication of Model Programs." *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 1, 4: 307-329.
- Morrison, S. (2000). Evaluation of Albuquerque Weed and Seed Sites: Trumbull and La Mesa Neighborhoods. Albuquerque. University of New Mexico.

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Truancy Reduction demonstration

Program. Available:

<http://ojjdp.ncjrs.gov/Programs/ProgSummary.asp?pi=36&ti=11&si=32&kw=&strItem=&strSingleItem=&p=topic&PreviousPage=SearchResults>

Ohio Office of Criminal Justice Services (2005). Evaluation of the Akron Weed and Seed Program, 2000-2004. Columbus. Ohio Office of Criminal Justice Services (2005).

Roehl, J. (2002). Evaluating a Weed and Seed Strategy. Washington, D.C. Justice Research Center.

Roehl, J., R. Huitt, M.A. Wycoff, A. Pate, D. Rebovich, & K. Coyle (1996). National Process Evaluation of Operation Weed and Seed. Research In Brief. Washington, D.C. National Institute of Justice.

Seattle Neighborhood Group. Southeast Weed and Seed. Available:

<http://www.sngi.org/sews1.html>

Substance Abuse and Mental Health Administration. Drug Free Communities Support

Program. Available: <http://drugfreecommunities.samhsa.gov/history/history.html>

United States Attorney, Northern District of Alabama. Weed and Seed Northern District

of Alabama. Available: <http://www.usdoj.gov/usao/aln/Pages/weedandseed.htm>

Webb, V.J. and Katz, C.M. (1998). Citizen ratings of the Importance of Community

Policing Activities. In G.P. Alpert & A. Piquero (Eds.), *Community policing:*

Contemporary readings (pp. 427-444). Prospect heights, IL: Waveland Press, Inc.

Watters, J.K. and Biernacki, P. (1989). Targeted sampling: Options for the study of hidden populations. *Social Problems*, 36, 4, 416-430.

Wilson, J.Q. and Kelling, G.S. (1982). Broken Windows. *The Atlantic Monthly*, March, 1982. Volume 249, No. 3; 29-38, New York.