

# **Kino Weed and Seed Coalition:**

A process and impact evaluation of a local Weed  
and Seed Community site in Tucson, Arizona

Prepared by

David E. Choate

Center for Violence Prevention and Community Safety  
College of Human Services  
Arizona State University

December, 2006

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. The center specifically 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) 543-6607

### **Web site**

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

## Acknowledgements

The author wishes to first and foremost thank his committee chair Charles M. Katz, Ph.D. for his tireless (and sometimes ruthless) review, feedback, and guidance throughout this project and report.

The author would also like to extend additional thanks to Stephen Schnebly, Ph.D., for catching glaringly obvious errors in analysis that I somehow overlooked early-on; and to Steve Ballance for his valuable feedback and advice.

The author is grateful to Mitch Halfpenny for his tremendous help with data collection, particularly in the tremendous job he did wrangling the massive database of CFS data with which we began. Additional thanks are extended to the other folks at the Statistical Analysis Center of the Arizona Criminal Justice Commission and the Justice Research and Statistics Association for making this project possible.

And of course, sincere thanks goes to all of the people associated with the Kino Weed and Seed Coalition, without whose considerable cooperation during data collection, this project would have been much more difficult to accomplish. Some of whom include: Kino site coordinator, Katie Valenzuela; Captain Perry Tarrant, Lt. Kathy Rau, Officer Ricardo Fernandez, and Autumn Figueroa, of the Tucson Police department; Jamal Givens, Aimee Graves, and Eddie Danyfield of CODAC Behavioral Health Services; personnel from Tucson City Councilman Steve Leal's office; and especially Mr. Willie.

This project was funded by the Justice Research and Statistics Association through the Arizona Criminal Justice Commission. Opinions contained herein are those of the authors and do not represent the position of the Arizona Criminal Justice Commission or the Justice Research and Statistics Association.

© 2007 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

<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b>	3
<b>ABSTRACT</b>	5
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b>	6
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	8
Organizational Structure and Strategy of Weed and Seed	8
Law Enforcement	9
Community Policing	10
Prevention, Intervention, and Treatment	13
Neighborhood Restoration	17
<b>THE PRESENT STUDY [1]</b>	19
<b>METHODS</b>	19
Site Characteristics	19
<i>Exhibit 1: Kino Weed and Seed Site Characteristics</i>	20
Process Evaluation	21
<i>Exhibit 2: Kino Weed and Seed Stakeholder Organizations</i>	23
<i>Exhibit 3: Focus Group Data Collection Summary</i>	29
Impact Evaluation	30
Analysis	32
<i>Exhibit 4: Crime Measures Constructed from Calls For Service Codes</i>	33
<b>FINDINGS</b>	34
Process Evaluation Findings	34
<i>Exhibit 5: Kino Weed and Seed Coalition Goals</i>	36
Law Enforcement	37
Community Policing	44
Prevention, Intervention, and Treatment	48
<i>Exhibit 6: Prevention, Intervention, and Treatment Programs and Providers</i>	50
Neighborhood Restoration	58
Process Summary	69
Impact Evaluation Findings	69
<i>Exhibit 8: Calls For Service and Percent Annual Change by Program Year</i>	72
<b>CONCLUSION</b>	74
Limitations	77
Recommendations	79
<b>REFERENCES</b>	82
<b>APPENDIX</b>	87

[1] This evaluation was approved by Arizona State University Research Compliance Office, IRB #0606000898.

**ABSTRACT**

The purpose of the present study was to conduct an evaluation of the Kino Weed and Seed Coalition, using both qualitative and quantitative data to conduct process and impact evaluations. The process evaluation relied on official documents detailing site activities and focus group interviews with key stakeholders. The impact evaluation relied on call for service (CFS) data from the Tucson Police Department (TPD) from 1999 through 2005, divided into two categories represented by a three-year “pre-test” and four-year “post-test”. The results of the process evaluation indicated that the Kino Weed and Seed Coalition was actively engaged in activities pursuant of their original site goals, and adapting them as the site developed. The impact evaluation indicated that the rates of calls for service in the Kino Weed and Seed area declined significantly during the four years of official programmatic activities when compared to the three years prior for calls related to violent, property, drugs, and total crimes. Quality of life, or disorder, issues did have a slight increase during the implementation years compared to the pre-test years, but the change was not significant.

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

### **Introduction and Background**

The purpose of this study was to conduct an evaluation of the Kino Weed and Seed Coalition. 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 Kino Weed and Seed Coalition site is located in Tucson, Arizona. The designated area is approximately 6.3 square miles of mixed residential and industrial land, with a population of about 10,000 people, 77% of which are of Hispanic or Latino origin, and 12.7% African-American. The median household income is about 78% of the median for the rest of the City of Tucson.

First, a process evaluation was conducted to examine the implementation of the Kino Weed and Seed Coalition site's policies, goals, and planned activities. Second, an impact evaluation was conducted to assess the impact of Kino 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 Kino Coalition; 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 Kino Weed and Seed Coalition activities had on crime and disorder in the Kino 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 call for service (CFS) data from the Tucson Police Department (TPD) from 1999 through 2005.

### **Findings**

The process evaluation revealed several major findings. Generally, the evaluation revealed that the Kino Coalition 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 26 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 most categories of crime, there was a statistically significant decrease in the rate of calls for service in the Kino area as compared to the rest of the city. While other extraneous factors may have influenced the changes in CFS, either solely or cumulatively in conjunction with Kino Weed and Seed efforts, the data does indicate a significant change in the Kino area during Weed and Seed program implementation.

### **Limitations**

Even though there is evidence of the success of the Kino site, data was frequently lacking that would have allowed for a more rigorous assessment of program goals. The 26 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 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 identified the lack of objective quantitative data to assess some of the goals. 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 Kino Coalition 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, Cordner, & 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<sup>1</sup>**

The purpose of this study was to conduct an evaluation of the Kino Weed and Seed Coalition. First, a process evaluation was conducted to examine the implementation of the Kino Weed and Seed Coalition site's policies, goals, and planned activities. Second, an impact evaluation was conducted to assess the impact of Kino 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**

### **Site Characteristics**

The Kino Weed and Seed Coalition site is located in Tucson, Arizona. The officially designated site includes four neighborhoods within its boundaries: South Park, Western Hills II, Las Vistas, and Pueblo Gardens (Kino Weed and Seed Action Plan, 2004). A fifth neighborhood, Millville, was created exclusively from a section of the South Park neighborhood. The Millville neighborhood remains within the Kino Weed and Seed designated area and is predominately commercial property. The Kino Weed and Seed site, hereafter referred to as Kino, is in a centrally located area of Tucson, just southeast of the downtown area of the city. The designated area is approximately 6.3

---

<sup>1</sup> This evaluation was approved by Arizona State University Research Compliance Office, IRB #0606000898.

square miles of mixed residential and industrial land (CCDO, 2006). Commercial properties in the area are primarily focused on industrial uses, due to the proximal access to an interstate and railroad lines. Part of the southern boundary demarcation is an interstate, and a large portion of the northern boundary is shaped by the wide train field of the railroad lines. The Kino site rests in an area just east of Tucson's first Weed and Seed site, South Tucson, and just west of its newest, the 29<sup>th</sup> Street Coalition. The following shows the key socio-demographic characteristics of the Kino area and Tucson (U.S. Census 2000 and CCDO, 2006).

### **Exhibit 1: Kino Weed and Seed Site Characteristics**

<b>Socio-Demographic Characteristics</b>	<b>Kino Area</b>	<b>Tucson</b>
<b>Geography</b>		
Area, sq. mi.	6.3	194.7
<b>Demographics</b>		
Population	9,981	507,362
Percent Males, Age 18 and Up	31.8	35.7
Percent Females, Age 18 and Up	32.1	38.8
Percent Males, Age 17 or Less	18.5	13.2
Percent Females, Age 17 or Less	17.6	12.2
<b>Family Structure</b>		
Total Households	2,763	208,342
Percent Households with Families	79.6	58.1
Percent Households with Children	56.1	28.8
Percent Single Parent Families with Children	22.7	13.2
Percent Non-Family Households	20.4	41.9
<b>Education</b>		
Percent Adult population without a high school diploma	50.2	82.9
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>		
Percent White	37.7	65.3
Percent Black	12.7	3.8
Percent American Indian/Eskimo	3.5	2.9
Percent Asian/Pacific Islander	1.2	2.5
Percent Other	40.2	22.3
Percent Hispanic Ethnicity	77.0	40.8
<b>Income/Housing</b>		
Per Capita Income	\$9,983	\$18,813
Median Household Income	\$26,663	\$34,241
Percent Renting	36.9	46.6
Percent Lived in Residence for Less than Five Years	49.8	57.2

## **Process Evaluation<sup>2</sup>**

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 Kino Coalition; 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 two methods used to gather data for the process evaluation were: 1) a review of official site documents; and 2) focus group interviews conducted with key stakeholders.

The process evaluation relied on data collected from official documents and focus group interviews with key stakeholders to the Kino Weed and Seed Coalition. Kino

---

<sup>2</sup> For detailed information regarding the official documents used and which goals were addressed from each, see Appendix 1.

Weed and Seed site stakeholders included a wide range of people, agencies, and organizations involved in some segment of law enforcement, community policing, crime prevention, intervention, treatment, or neighborhood restoration of the Kino Weed and Seed site's initiatives and activities. Exhibit 2 shows stakeholder organizations participating in the Kino Weed and Seed project. The exhibit is divided into six different partnership groups, based on their organizational characteristics and role in the Kino Weed and Seed site. Each partnership group is identified as being primarily involved in: 1) law enforcement or community policing activities (weeding); 2) intervention, treatment, or neighborhood restoration efforts (seeding); or 3) providing guidance or assistance to overall efforts (support).

---

**Exhibit 2: Kino Weed and Seed Stakeholder Organizations**


---

**Law Enforcement Partners (Weeding)**

Tucson Police Department  
 City of Tucson Attorney's Office  
 Arizona National Guard  
 Pima County Attorney's Office  
 Pima County Adult Probation  
 Arizona Department of Public Safety –  
 GITEM

**Community Partners (Seeding)**

Las Vistas Neighborhood Association  
 Pueblo Gardens neighborhood Association  
 South Park Neighborhood Association  
 Western Hills II Neighborhood Association  
 Holmes Tuttle Boys and Girls Club  
 Kino Teen Center  
 Pueblo Gardens Elementary School  
 Quincie Douglas Neighborhood Center  
 Southside Community School  
 CODAC Behavioral Health Services  
 Tucson Community Food Bank  
 Tucson Urban League  
 Pima Council on Aging  
 The Youth Corps of America

**Business Partners (Seeding)**

Mr. K's BBQ  
 Arizona Federal Credit Union  
 PEBEE, Inc.

**Faith-Based Partners (Seeding)**

Grace Temple Baptist Church  
 Cross Horizon Ministries  
 South Highland Church

**Local Government Partners (Seeding)**

Ward 5 Council Office (also Weeding)  
 Pima County Supervisor District 2  
 City of Tucson Community Services and Hope VI  
 City of Tucson Parks and Recreation  
 City of Tucson Neighborhood Resources  
 Tucson-Pima Public Library

**Federal Partners (Support)**

United States Attorney's Office  
 U.S. Department of Justice  
 Housing and Urban Development  
 Office of National Drug Control Policy  
 Drug Enforcement Administration

---

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 Kino Coalition's 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 69 separate official documents from Kino stakeholders. Stakeholders providing official documents included the Kino site coordinator, service delivery agents, safe haven representatives, Tucson Police Department, neighborhood association leaders, faith-based community leaders, and Tucson City Council representatives.

The Kino site did not have a comprehensive collection of these official documents, and evaluators employed three different strategies to collect the data. First, we asked stakeholders to provide virtually any document they had maintained that was related to Kino Weed and Seed. Stakeholders were asked to gather and provide anything that documented early planning sessions, activities, and communications. Second, as we gathered documents following the initial request, we began asking for additional documents similar to those already provided. For example, we were supplied with steering committee meeting minutes from one meeting after our initial request, and as part of our second strategy, we asked for all such meeting minutes that had been maintained during the life of the Kino Coalition. The third strategy for collecting official documents stemmed from our focus group sessions with key stakeholders. As discussions led into programmatic activities evaluators had not yet been aware of, stakeholders were asked to provide any documents related to those programmatic activities.



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 Kino Coalition 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: minutes of neighborhood association meetings; Kino Coalition Steering Committee meeting minutes; Kino Coalition Policies and Procedures manual; 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. Some of these documents detailed the early community meetings discussing official Weed and Seed designation strategies, what neighborhoods to include, and prioritizing the needs of the community.

However, this methodological strategy does have limitations. Because the Kino Coalition did not have a formalized routine of data collection for the purpose of a comprehensive evaluation from the onset, official documents were not necessarily and consistently maintained. Many early documents, such as planning meeting minutes,

public event announcements, and community meetings were not well maintained, leaving better documentation for some stakeholder groups or activities than for others.

The Tucson Police Department (TPD) is perhaps one of the more important stakeholder groups involved in the weeding efforts of the Kino Weed and Seed site. The Weeding Steering Subcommittee for Kino includes representatives from Tucson Police Department command staff for the area, a community policing officer assigned to the Kino area, a TPD gang unit detective, Pima County Adult Probation and the Tucson City Prosecutor's Office. Evaluators collected TPD official briefing notes, scheduling, and command instructions regarding the commitment and distribution of resources specifically aimed at the Kino area. Reviewing the TPD documents provided an official record of early enforcement efforts and verified the process of committing police resources to weeding activities.

The principal provider of social services selected for the Kino area was CODAC Behavioral Health Services, Inc. Documentation of seeding activities and programs offered by CODAC were very detailed and included curriculum materials of selected programs, evaluation forms and feedback, and community information packets. Evaluators collected data from CODAC representatives detailing the "Strengthening the Families" program, including its curriculum, selection and implementation strategies used, and participants' assessments.

Official documents were also collected from other key stakeholders, such as: 1) officials from the Ward 5 office of the Tucson City Council; 2) representatives from Tucson Parks and Recreation; 3) members from the Tucson-Pima Public Library; 4) local faith-based leaders; 5) representatives from the Tucson Urban League facility located in

the Kino area; 6) leaders from the Boys and Girls Club located in the Kino area; and 7) the City of Tucson Neighborhood Resources Department.

### *Focus Group Interviews*

Focus group participants were self-selected for their individual roles as stakeholders in the Kino community, or to the Kino Weed and Seed Coalition activities. Stakeholder organizations and individuals were identified using three strategies. First, during initial meetings with the Kino Site Coordinator, evaluators supplied a list detailing the types of organizations and individuals who might typically be considered stakeholders in a Weed and Seed site. This list included: the local police agencies; city prosecutor; county probation department; neighborhood associations; community service organizations working in the area or providing services to area residents; businesses associated with the site; faith-based organizations; and city departments providing services in the designated area.

This list was used as a guide by the Kino Site Coordinator to contact relevant stakeholders and asked if they would volunteer to participate in a focus group session. Volunteers recruited by the Site Coordinator were further instructed by evaluators at the time of the interview session that: 1) their participation was voluntary; 2) they would not be identified by name; 3) no foreseeable harm would come to them for their participation; and 4) their participation was intended for the sole benefit of conducting an evaluation of the Kino Weed and Seed Coalition and its activities.

Second, members and representatives from stakeholder groups who volunteered for participation in focus group interviews were asked to identify other stakeholder

organizations and individuals. These additional organizations and individuals were considered for participation based on their potential value to the evaluation. Evaluators considered the described role of other potential participants, using the assessed values of the identifying stakeholders.

The third strategy evaluators used was to contact additional potential participants identified during previous stakeholder focus group interview sessions. These potential participants were also instructed as to the voluntary nature of the sessions as initial stakeholder participants above. Collectively, these strategies are sometimes referred to as a 'snowball' method (Watters and Biernacki, 1989). Among the 39 organizations identified as partners to the Kino Weed and Seed Coalition, 27 were represented during stakeholder focus group interviews, or more than 78% of all organizations. Most of the absentees among participant organizations came from business and federal partners, where none of the eight organizations from those two partnership groups was represented.

Stakeholder organizations were represented by individual representatives from CODAC, the primary social service provider and seeding activity manager; clergy from several local places of worship involved in the community; representatives from Tucson Parks and Recreation, who manage the Quincie Douglas Neighborhood Center and the recently opened public swimming pool; local area school officials, including a principal and school counselor; representatives from other Kino Safe Havens; youths from the community; and community and neighborhood association leaders. Among participants chiefly engaged in weeding activities were: the lead TPD patrol officer assigned as the community policing officer assigned exclusively to the Kino area; a TPD gang unit

detective who works in the Kino area; a Lieutenant from TPD who serves as the fiscal manager of weeding funds; the Captain of the Operations Division South of the TPD, the police subdivision that serves the Kino area; representatives from Pima County Adult Probation; and a prosecutor from the Criminal Division of the Office of the City Attorney for Tucson. Exhibit 3 below summarizes the focus groups conducted.

---

**Exhibit 3: Focus Group Data Collection Summary**

---

Focus Group	Date	Participants
CODAC Program Coordinators	3/27/2006	5
CODAC Program Staff	3/27/2006	7
Neighborhood Associations and Citizens	3/27/2006	6
Ward 5 Council Office	3/27/2006	2
Faith-based Groups	3/27/2006	6
Safe Haven Representatives	3/29/2006	3
Kino Executive Committee	3/29/2006	6
Teen Advisory Board	3/29/2006	3
Weeding Steering Committee	4/12/2006	7
Total Participants		45

---

Focus groups were conducted in a semi-structured format, with evaluators serving as the facilitators. Facilitators began each session with a brief description of the purpose and nature of the focus group session and the contribution the interviews would make to the evaluation of the Kino site. Facilitators used a pre-defined list of twelve questions (Appendix 1) to begin and guide focus group discussions, but individual groups were allowed significant latitude to discuss topics or issues as they arose during the interview. Participants routinely explored topics that were triggered, but not directly in response to,

guiding questions, and offered breadth and depth to discussions beyond the guided discussion questions. Focus group discussions included information about the historical foundation of the Kino site, transitions and challenges during implementation, current activities, and future goals and expectations.

Our focus groups were structured in a manner so that they fostered open discussions that elicited detailed and honest perceptions of the implementation of the Kino Weed and Seed site. As noted by Krueger (1994) focus group interviews “have been helpful in assessing needs, developing plans..., testing new programs and ideas, improving existing programs, and generating information for constructing questionnaires” (Krueger, 1994: 37). While focus groups have been found to be an effective tool for understanding processes, they do have some limitations, which include: 1) complex qualitative data can be difficult to analyze; 2) they require skilled moderators; and 3) allow only limited cross-group comparisons (Krueger, 1994).

### **Impact Evaluation**

The impact evaluation focused on the influence that the Kino Weed and Seed Coalition activities had on crime and disorder in the Kino 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 on call for service (CFS) data from the Tucson Police Department (TPD) from 1999 through 2005. Call for Service (CFS) data are a record of all calls placed to the TPD 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. The initial data consisted of almost 2.2 million individual calls. The CFS data collected from TPD was delivered in geographic information systems (GIS) shape-files, which allowed the evaluators to identify and separate data for the Kino Weed and Seed designated area from the rest of the city.

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 Kino area and its residents were regarded as our 'target' or 'experimental' group and were compared to the rest of the City of Tucson, which served as our 'comparison' group. The two groups are further examined in a pre-test/post-test environment through our examination of CFS data dating four years before Kino Weed and Seed strategies were initiated, throughout the Kino site's implementation to the end of 2005.

These data permitted us to examine the crime patterns for the four Kino neighborhoods for three years prior to the formation of the Coalition, and four years after program implementation. Additionally these data allowed us to compare the Kino area to

the surrounding community of Tucson, and assess the relative impact Weed and Seed program activities implemented by examining change within each area.

### **Analysis**

Dependent samples T-tests were conducted to examine changes in the rates of calls for: 1) violent crime; 2) property crime; 3) drug-related crime; and 4) non-criminal, disorder related issues between the 36 months of pre-test CFS data and the 48 months of post-test CFS data. These tests allowed us to examine: changes in crime and disorder in the Kino Weed and Seed site as well as corresponding changes in crime and disorder in Tucson (i.e., comparison area

Our measures of crime were constructed from CFS data that TPD coded into various types of offenses. Using the TPD codes, we selected and categorized them into one of the four measures: 1) violent crime; 2) property crime; 3) drug crime; and 4) disorder. Additionally, we constructed a fifth measure that represented the total number of calls from the four measures above. Calls to police that were not criminal events, such as abandoned vehicles and loitering offenses, but instead associated with physical and social disorder were labeled as quality of life. We excluded calls coded as duplicates by the TPD, calls related to traffic stops or accidents, civil matters, alarms, and other calls not directly related to crime and disorder.

After re-coding CFS into our four measures and excluding the remainder, more than 632,000 individual calls remained in our analysis, which included more than 13,500 calls from the Kino neighborhoods, and almost 619,000 for the rest of the City of Tucson. Our violent crime measure included calls such as homicides, assaults, and robberies;



property crime included crimes such as burglaries, motor vehicle thefts, fraud, and criminal damage; drug crime was defined using narcotic drug laws; and our disorder measure included concerns such as prostitution, public intoxication, and vagrancy. For specific call codes assigned to our four constructed measures see Exhibit 4 below.

---

**Exhibit 4: Crime Measures Constructed from Calls For Service Codes**

---

**Violent**

Homicide  
 Aggravated Assault  
 Other Assaults  
 Robbery  
 Sexual Assault  
 Other Sex Offenses  
 Weapons

**Disorder**

Disorderly Conduct  
 Juvenile Violations  
 Prostitution  
 Public Intoxication  
 Vagrancy

**Property**

Arson  
 Burglary  
 Criminal Damage  
 Embezzlement  
 Forgery & Counterfeiting  
 Fraud  
 Larceny  
 Motor Vehicle Theft  
 Stolen Property

**Drugs**

Narcotic Drug Laws

---

Evaluators converted the calls for service data from raw frequencies to rates based on population. Specifically, we divided the number of calls in a given month by the estimated population for the appropriate calendar year, and multiplied the result by 1,000. This yielded rates representing the number of calls for service per 1,000 persons. Converting the raw frequencies into rates standardized the data, and allowed evaluators to make comparisons across years by controlling for changes in population.

## **FINDINGS**

### **Process Evaluation Findings**

We evaluated the Kino Weed and Seed Coalition 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 Kino Weed and Seed Coalition 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 26 distinct goals, each with specific objectives, divided into the four core Weed and Seed categories. The 26 goals were developed from four high priority unmet needs for the Kino community 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 four categories of high priority, unmet needs. The four high priority needs included:

1. Illegal drug activity, especially involving youth and gangs.
2. Gun violence, especially involving youth and gangs.
3. Poverty and unemployment, especially as they effect youth and young adults.
4. Lack of involvement in community efforts due to changing racial, ethnic, or language differences and barriers (Kino Weed and Seed Coalition, 2001).

The community needs assessment identified serious problems related to youth and youth gangs. 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

seeing open drug market transactions in broad daylight, conducting their illegal trade with complete disregard for citizen scrutiny. Also, the community described serious problems with gunfire and shootings in the neighborhood, primarily assumed to be related to gang activity and violence. Poverty and unemployment and a lack of community involvement or efficacy were also identified as serious problems facing the Kino neighborhoods. To address the four community problems, the Kino Weed and Seed Coalition's strategic plan focused on achieving 26 goals, shown in Exhibit 5 below.

---

**Exhibit 5: Kino Weed and Seed Coalition Goals**


---

**Law Enforcement**

- 1 Create and maintain a Kino Weeding Steering Committee.
- 2 Increase police patrols in the Kino area at least 25%.
- 3 Increase public awareness of positive law enforcement efforts.
- 4 Reduce recidivism in the neighborhood by 5% each year.
- 5 Reduce drug dealing within the neighborhood by 5% each year.
- 6 Decrease the illegal use of guns and gang graffiti by 5% each year.
- 7 Reduce incidences of speeding and traffic problems by 10% each year.

**Community Policing**

- 1 Increase participation in crime prevention programs by 5% each year.
- 2 Maintain neighborhood access to police and communication between community members and police officers.

**Prevention, Intervention, and Treatment**

- 1 Utilize the Kino Weed and Seed Coalition Seeding Committee to establish and nurture a coalition of service providers working in the Kino neighborhoods.
- 2 Increase successful completion of probation by 5% each year.
- 3 Increase participation in drug use and gang prevention programs by 5% each year.
- 4 Ensure that health intervention and treatment opportunities are available within the community.
- 5 Reduce adolescent and teen birth rates.
- 6 Increase educational achievement for all ages of residents by 5% each year.
- 7 Improve participation in job readiness programs by 5% each year.

**Neighborhood Restoration and Economic Development**

- 1 Increase resident participation in community activities.
- 2 Maximize efficiency by minimizing duplication of efforts and leveraging resources through partnerships across neighborhood organizations.
- 3 Increase opportunities for social connections within the community.
- 4 Provide a clean and safe environment within the neighborhoods.
- 5 Improve housing conditions in the neighborhoods.
- 6 Increase homeownership rates in the neighborhoods.
- 7 Advocate for increased public reinvestment in the neighborhood's infrastructure.
- 8 Improve commercial environments and business success.
- 9 Improve personal savings and investment in housing, education, training, and micro-enterprise.
- 10 Improve job opportunities for residents in the area.

Source: Kino Weed and Seed Coalition Application for Official Recognition, 2001

---

Analysis of official documents and stakeholder interview data revealed that the Kino Weed and Seed Coalition had pursued implementation of 25 of the original 26 goals in the five years of official activities.<sup>3</sup> Goal 5 of the Prevention, Intervention, and Treatment component was the single goal for which evaluators were unable to gather sufficient information to determine any measure of process toward achievement. This goal focused on reducing adolescent and teen pregnancies. Evaluators were unable to trace any record that the site had identified, gathered, or maintained appropriate records to measure these rates. Necessarily, evaluators determined that no process for attaining this goal had been established or redressed during programmatic implementation.

We generally found that stakeholders had a positive impression of the Kino Weed and Seed project and they believed that the Kino Coalition had adhered to its originally intended mission, consistent with its goals. In the below section we discuss our findings pertaining to Kino Coalitions implementation of activities related to the 26 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 Kino Weed and Seed Coalition's original site plan called for accomplishing seven distinct goals. These seven distinct

---

<sup>3</sup> Several official documents were used to delineate which of the original goals were addressed at different times during the implementation of programmatic activities, including: 1) Kino's Community Action Plan; 2) the Kino Weed and Seed Coalition's Annual Progress Report; 3) the Kino Weed and Seed Coalition's official Policies and Procedures manual; and 4) Tucson Police Department Operations South Division's Action Plans for Pueblo Gardens, Western Hills II, South Park, and Las Vistas, the four neighborhoods making-up the Kino community; and 5) Tucson Police Department Operations South Division memoranda detailing standing orders for personnel assignments related to the Kino area.

goals are listed below, followed by a discussion of what we found from official documents and focus group interviews with key stakeholders. We discuss whether the Kino Coalition 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 Kino Weeding Steering Committee*

The first law enforcement goal of the Kino Weed and Seed Coalition was to create a Weeding Steering Subcommittee. Reviews of both official documents and responses from stakeholder interviews confirmed that this goal was met early in the process and has been maintained throughout the implementation period.

The data indicated that the subcommittee routinely discussed ongoing issues related to the general strategies for which they were responsible. A Kino Weeding Subcommittee was established, and maintained monthly meetings throughout the implementation period. While several members of the subcommittee have remained over the implementation period, other subcommittee members have changed. Specifically, most of the individual changes were a result of changes in professional assignment, and where occurring, the individual replacing the position within the given agency became a member of the subcommittee. The interview data supported that the subcommittee had been continuously involved with its mandated goals from the original plan throughout implementation. These data also supported that the subcommittee continued to scan, analyze, respond, and assess their operational plan to incorporate tasks and objectives

supportive of the Kino Weed and Seed Coalition's law enforcement and community policing strategies.

*Goal 2: Increase police patrols in the Kino area at least 25%*

Official documents revealed that two officers were committed to full-time directed patrol and community policing in the Kino area, and did not respond to calls for service outside the area unless it involved a priority emergency. In early 2004, TPD reduced their commitment to one full-time officer.

Stakeholder groups also provided support that there was an increase in police patrol in the Kino area. Notably, the neighborhood association and citizens' group described changes in their community that resulted from an increased police presence and positive relationship with police. The police commented about the increased frequency in which they attended neighborhood association meetings and community events. Command staff also reported that officers assigned to D.A.R.E. (*Drug Abuse Resistance Education*) and G.R.E.A.T. (*Gang Resistance Education And Training*) programs, gang unit detectives, and other officers became more involved in community events and gatherings as well. Accordingly, while data was not available to show a 25% increase in police presence, there were multiple, corresponding, indirect indicators that suggested that police presence in the Kino community had increased substantially.

*Goal 3: Increase public awareness of positive law enforcement efforts*

As indicated above, stakeholder interviews, particularly those from citizens' and faith based groups, provided support for changes in the public's perception of police and

their activities. Analysis of citizen focus group data indicated that citizens observed a substantial increase in police presence during the study period observed. The residents also reported that their neighborhoods had become safer, and attributed much of these changes to law enforcement presence by the TPD drug and gang detectives, but also cited the importance of the Pima County Adult Probation Department (PCAPD), particularly in clean-up efforts. Additionally, the faith-based focus group indicated being more aware of policing activities in recent years, observing changes in enforcement, attendance at community meetings, and staging community safety events and fairs.

*Goal 4: Reduce recidivism in the neighborhood by 5% each year*

Focus group interview data indicated that the efforts to reduce recidivism was addressed to some degree, but did not provide quantifiable data to measure 5% annual reductions. These representatives discussed the occasional use of joint patrols throughout program implementation. The purpose of the joint patrols was to conduct routine check-ups on probationers in the area, as well as provide support from the probation department when police contacted a probationer when responding to calls. Specific measures of the frequency and regularity of the joint patrols was unavailable. Their occurrence was described during stakeholder interviews as “occasional” and that they would do them “from time to time.” The joint patrols were directed patrols within the Kino community that included a TPD officer and patrol car, with a probation officer riding along. The participants described this as an effective means of informing probationers living in the area that they would be closely monitored, and to further discourage recidivism.



*Goal 5: Reduce drug dealing within the neighborhood by 5% each year*

Reducing open-air drug markets in the Kino area was identified as an important goal by several participants in multiple stakeholder focus group interviews. Citizens and criminal justice professionals alike described the drug trade in the Kino community as a serious problem. Participants from the citizens' group reported that before Kino Weed and Seed even the police were afraid to come into their neighborhoods, they would see open market drug deals taking place in broad daylight, and "residents simply wouldn't leave their homes at night." Stakeholders representing the city council reported that the TPD has staged "three or four sweeps in recent years," effectively reducing open drug markets and crime in the area.

Additionally, the Weeding Subcommittee reported the successes of two undercover drug interdiction operations. The first operation used undercover narcotics investigators to identify drug houses and dealers, and resulted in 40 arrests. A second operation in 2002 resulted in 33 arrests. When describing the undercover operations, one city council group participant asserted that "intelligence [about criminal activity] is driven by the neighborhood."

We reviewed official documents collected from stakeholders detailing drug enforcement activities. Records of the interdiction from TPD discussed the successes of the operations, the number of search warrants served, arrests, and resulting convictions. The documents supported claims that weeding efforts toward reducing open drug markets had been implemented pursuant of this goal. Evaluators were able to determine that the Kino Coalition engaged in efforts to create and sustain reductions in drug dealing activity in the Kino community, as a matter of process.

*Goal 6: Decrease the illegal use of guns and gang graffiti by 5% each year*

Data measuring annual rates of illegal gun use and gang graffiti was not collected by evaluators, as a result we were unable to analyze if Kino experienced 5 percent annual declines in graffiti and gun crimes. A review of the official documents collected did not yield data about specific programmatic activities that were aimed at reducing the illegal use of guns. One stakeholder group reported that law enforcement had participated in community events, sponsoring different booths, which included gun safety information.

Stakeholder focus group participants identified that the TPD gang unit officers and detectives were active in the area. Gang officers conducted the Gang Resistance Education And Training (G.R.E.A.T.) program for area youth, and brought educational materials, presentation vehicles, and officers to community events. A gang unit detective from the TPD also reported having conducted numerous presentations at neighborhood association meetings, Kino Steering Committee meetings, and other public venues. These presentations were intended to educate the public about gangs and gang crime, how to identify gang related graffiti, graffiti abatement programs, and warning signs of at-risk youth.

Evaluators reviewed documentation that gang and gun education activities had taken place in the Kino community during the Weed and Seed implementation period. The official documents included information about the programs, the public events, and the school-based activities that provided educational intervention for gangs, guns, and graffiti. However, neither the official documents reviewed, nor the anecdotal evidence supported a finding that enforcement practices in particular were aimed at reducing these

problems, nor was any information available that could be used to assess the intended annual 5% reduction in the illegal use of guns and gang related graffiti.

*Goal 7: Reduce incidences of speeding and traffic problems by 10% each year*

Citizens reported to evaluators during focus group interviews that speeding, reckless driving, and traffic concerns were a problem for them at the time the Kino Weed and Seed Coalition was formed. The importance of these concerns is evident by their inclusion in the goals for law enforcement. The stakeholder focus groups for the Weeding Subcommittee, the Executive Council, the residents, and the city council all reported that the Kino Coalition, at the urging of residents, approved purchasing two radar speed detection devices for TPD, and provided funds for overtime expenses to enhance traffic enforcement in the Kino community.

Official documents supported the additional support of traffic enforcement, although whether it was expressed through overtime hours or a reallocation of officers from one area into the Kino area could not be determined. Representatives from TPD verbally confirmed that the Kino Weed and Seed Coalition had provided funds for speed enforcement equipment, and said that the equipment had been purchased and used to specifically enhance traffic enforcement in the designated area. Official documentation that might have detailed the extent of traffic enforcement in the Kino area were not known to exist, and thus not collected by evaluators, therefore an assessment of the extent to which these devices were employed is unknown, however, stakeholders from the groups that discussed the traffic concern issue reported that problems with speeding and reckless driving have declined.

### *Law Enforcement Summary*

The Kino Weed and Seed Coalition predominately followed a process that adhered to the originally intended goals, either through formalized programs and operations, or informally through embeddedness with the Kino community. Evaluators collected evidence that supported active engagement in programmatic activities toward attaining goals 1, 2, 3, and 5. The data collected about joint patrol activities lend support to recidivism reduction efforts (goal 4), and focus group data provided evidence that the Kino Coalition had pursued reductions in traffic related problems, although documentation was not available. Law enforcement goal 6, reducing illegal use of guns and gang graffiti was the only one of seven that lacked sufficient evidence to indicate a process of achieving the goal through enforcement policies and practices.

### Community Policing

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

#### *Goal 1: Increase participation in crime prevention programs by 5% each year*

Data collected from official documents supported that the Kino Coalition engaged in bringing the community into crime prevention programs from the outset. Data from TPD, the Executive Committee, and from Kino Coalition Safe Havens

indicated that throughout the implementation period, several outreach events and programs were used to educate and involve the community in crime prevention. Data from focus group sessions and from official documents detailing public events where crime prevention programs were highlighted were reviewed by evaluators.

Focus group data from stakeholder interviews with the Weeding Subcommittee, city council, residents, safe havens, and the Kino Executive Committee all reported various outreach efforts to extend the exposure and availability of crime prevention programs for the Kino community. Programs identified included: G.R.E.A.T. gang education program; gun safety; and graffiti abatement programs. Official documents and focus group data supported that the police had made efforts concerning educating parents and children about child safety. Evaluators also collected data from both official documents and focus group interviews detailing motor vehicle theft reduction efforts. Specifically, the Kino Weed and Seed Coalition in cooperation with TPD hosted as part of other community events, window etching events aimed at reducing the problem of motor vehicle theft through the vehicle recovery improvement program.

Official documents recording enrollment or participation in specific crime prevention programs were unavailable and not collected. The site also did not gather or maintain citizen participation in crime prevention programs at public events. As a result of the site not recording participation and trends, the 5 percent annual increase objective could not be measured.

*Goal 2: Maintain neighborhood access to police and communication between community members and police officers.*

Stakeholders participating in different focus group sessions reported that police officers, probation officers, and community prosecution unit attorneys have attended neighborhood association meetings and community meetings and events. They further described that police officers routinely attended community meetings and events, including, but not limited to: hosting a booth and giving safety lessons at the Kino community's annual Halloween Party; staging safety fairs; hosting four Vehicle Identification Number (VIN) etching events; promoting the use of gun locks at community events; and offering free child fingerprinting.

Other community policing activities included TPD and probation officers riding together in the neighborhood, making routine checks on probationers in the area, and engaging community members to improve familiarity with, and communication between, law enforcement and Kino residents. One resident recalled how neighborhood association presidents were provided cell phones, giving them immediate access to community policing officers to report non-emergency crimes or neighborhood disorder problems directly, without having to go through more impersonal, routine channels. They also described the TPD officer assigned to the Kino community as *their* officer.

The community policing officer said that he has witnessed a "huge turnaround," that he is frequently invited to celebrate birthdays, weddings, graduations, and residents from the Kino area "never would have done that [invited a police officer to personal events] before." He also explained that residents "have become very helpful and friendly", have learned to call on other city services to help with non-criminal issues, and take pride in the neighborhoods like never before. Another participant said that residents "almost cried when they thought [the community policing officer] was going to leave [the

Kino area].” The captain in charge of Operations South Division said of residents in the Kino community, “they’re making calls, asking for the police to be a part of the community, where they would never have done that before.”

Evaluators reviewed official documents of the Kino Coalition and found substantial support for routine interaction between law enforcement agencies and professionals, and the community. Data collected from TPD clearly identifies resources allocated to community policing goals. Data of scheduling and patrol assignments indicate that at least one full-time community policing officer had been assigned to the Kino neighborhoods during the implementation period. Data also indicated that substitute officers were used to cover regular days off, or vacation and sick days, using officers familiar with the area, and, perhaps more importantly, whom the community was familiar. Data collected from official documents also recorded community event participation, meeting attendance, and routine, open lines of communication between the police and Kino residents. Some of the annual community events attracted more than 200 residents, and both weeding and seeding subcommittee meetings were regularly attended by a majority of committee members. Official documents included, but were not limited to: event announcement fliers; meeting minutes; schedules; and quarterly summaries of police activity reports.

### *Community Policing Summary*

Participants from the Executive Committee, the Weeding Subcommittee, and the Ward V City Council’s Office reported feedback they have had from residents. They reported that the perception and feelings toward police has changed so dramatically that

in the past residents would have been apprehensive to have a police officer around. However, today if the police do not attend community events people have their “feelings hurt.” The attitudes of police about the neighborhood have also changed. The police also described differences in the community, describing that before Kino Weed and Seed, officers would respond to a call for service with six cars, lights flashing, no matter what the particular issue, but now calls are usually responded to with just one car, one officer. Residents and members of the Executive Committee reiterated these sentiments. The stakeholders consistently reported an improvement in neighborhood cohesion and communication with the police. Residents reported feeling safer and being treated with more respect as a community.

Because an accurate analysis of actual participation and enrollment in crime prevention programs was unable to be conducted due to insufficient data, we were unable to determine the extent to which crime prevention programs were administered. This limitation did not restrict our analysis of the process of the Kino Weed and Seed Coalition’s efforts in achieving its intended community policing goals. The level of commitment and dedicated resources observed, and the overall perception of collective efficacy among Kino residents and law enforcement agencies and personnel, indicated to evaluators that the Kino Coalition adhered to a process of achieving its intended community policing goals.

#### 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, 2006). The Prevention, Intervention, and Treatment component is the first part of the Seeding portion of the Weed and Seed strategy. The Kino Weed and Seed Coalition identified seven PIT goals in its original plan.

*Goal 1: Utilize the Kino Weed and Seed Coalition Seeding Committee to establish and nurture a coalition of service providers working in the Kino neighborhoods.*

The Kino Weed and Seed Coalition's 2004 Community Action Plan (CAP) was one of the official documents collected, and provided data from the approximate midpoint in the life of the Kino Coalition. The 2004 CAP presented the community service providers and their sponsored projects for 2004, detailing what risk factors and problem behavior would be addressed in furtherance of Site goals (CAP, 2004). The CAP used results from the 2002 Arizona Youth Survey (AYS) to track several measures of risk and protective factors among area youth. The AYS is conducted every two years in Arizona schools with 8<sup>th</sup>, 10<sup>th</sup>, and 12<sup>th</sup> grade students, measuring a number of issues with the self-report, voluntary survey. Among questions asked on the AYS are several measures of the respondent's risk and protective factors for: a) family structure; b) household composition; c) community and school social embeddedness; and d) criminal and delinquent behaviors. The CAP summarized different programs as provided to the Kino community and which risk and protective factors could be addressed in each program. Using these program summaries, we delineated which programs as part of the 2004 Community Action Plan could be directly tied to satisfying goals from the original

Kino strategy. Exhibit 6 below lists examples of programs and their respective service providers implemented to address the needs of the Kino weed and Seed community.

---

**Exhibit 6: Prevention, Intervention, and Treatment Programs and Providers**

---

Provider	Program
AZ Army National Guard	DEFY – Drug Education For Youth
Boys and Girls Club	Keystone Service Club
Boys and Girls Club	Smart Moves / Street Smarts
CODAC	PATHS – Promoting Alternative THinking Strategies
CODAC	Strengthening Families (6-11 and 10-14 age groups)
Head Start	Head Start
HUD	Hope VI
Kids Forever	Kids Forever
Kino Teen Center	Teen Parents Classes
Kino Teen Center	Prenatal Care Classes
Neighborhood Associations	MLK Breakfast
Neighborhood Associations	Community events (i.e. community Halloween Party)
Pueblo Gardens	Mentoring
Quincie Douglas, SCS	Homework help/tutoring
Southside Community School	Parent Connection - Moms & Tots
Southside Community School	Family Literacy
Tucson Parks and Recreation	KIDCO
Tucson Parks and Recreation	Youth Sports Leagues
Tucson Parks and Recreation	Strength and Fitness
Kino Weed and Seed Coalition	Safe Havens

---

Stakeholder focus group sessions provided extensive data about social services delivered to residents of the Kino community during program implementation years. The participants from two focus groups, CODAC staff and CODAC program coordinators, were each active in programs aimed at Prevention, Intervention, and Treatment efforts. One program identified as a programmatic success was the Strengthening Families

Program (Molgaard, Kumpfer, and Fleming, 2001). They asserted that the Strengthening Families Program was very successful and they have had very positive feedback from program graduates. The participants also identified other programs they were involved with, these included: Stop Bullying Now (Health Resources and Services Administration, 2006), a bullying prevention program delivered to middle school students; a family violence prevention program sponsored by a grant from the United Way; the Teen Advisory Board, a body made-up of local Kino area teens; and receiving training through the Community Anti-Drug Coalitions of America (CADCA), which aids neighborhood coalitions in developing “safe, healthy, drug-free communities” (CADCA, 2006).

*Goal 2: Increase successful completion of probation by 5% each year*

Data measuring successful completion rates of probationers in the Kino area was not collected, therefore we could not make a determination regarding 5 percent annual increases in completion. Official documentation that detailed actual program activities aimed specifically at successful probation completion was not collected. Data was collected that addressed enhanced monitoring of probationers, i.e. the aforementioned joint patrols of TPD and PCAPD officers, indicated that Kino engaged in efforts pursuant of increased successful completion of probation.

Focus group participants from the Weeding Subcommittee and the Kino Executive Committee reported that officers from Pima County Adult and Juvenile probation were active in the Kino community. They reported that individual officers were assigned to probationers in the area, which ensured that probation officers would be familiar with the community, the residents, and the probationers living in Kino. Both

focus group interviews and official documents indicated that adult and juvenile probation officers had been continuously active in the Kino Weed and Seed community and its program efforts. However, collected data did not provide any clear indication that any of the involvements and activities were specifically aimed at improving the rates of successful probation completion.

*Goal 3: Increase participation in drug use and gang prevention programs by 5% each year*

Data collected from official documents and stakeholder interviews indicated that drug use and gang prevention programs had been implemented in the Kino area. Specific data measuring the enrollment rates of the programs was not collected or made available and therefore we were unable to determine if participation rates experienced 5 percent annual increases during program years.

Collected data included program information from the National Guard sponsored Drug Education For Youth (DEFY) program. The DEFY program has recruited youth from the Kino area for their summer programs, which teach participants about drug and alcohol risks, resistance strategies, effective peer pressure management, and promoting healthy lifestyles (DEFY, 2006). Stakeholder interviews also produced data indicating drug and gang prevention program activities made available to Kino residents through Weed and Seed efforts. Members from the Weeding Subcommittee, the Executive Committee, CODAC, and the Safe Havens reported that the G.R.E.A.T. program was made available at community events and area schools throughout the implementation period. They also reported that the DEFY program was part of the Kino Weed and Seed initiatives during the implementation period.

Reviewing data collected from official documents and stakeholder interviews indicated that drug use and gang prevention programs were made more accessible to Kino youths and residents through Kino Weed and Seed program activities. Precise measures of enrollment and participation rates were not gathered and maintained by the site. Data indicated that opportunities for, and participation in, substance abuse and gang prevention programs were available to members of the targeted community during program implementation years. The evidence indicated that the Kino Coalition adhered to a process of increasing drug and gang prevention program participation among community members.

*Goal 4: Ensure that health intervention and treatment opportunities are available within the community.*

Data collected from official documents and stakeholder interviews confirmed that the Kino Weed and Seed Coalition had followed a process of increasing accessibility to health intervention, education, and treatment to community members. The data collected from our document review indicated that a mobile clinic had been stationed at the Quincie Douglas Neighborhood Center for several days of each month, for more than three years. The mobile clinic provided non-emergency health care and screening services to economically disadvantaged residents. The mobile clinic, Community Health Action On Wheels, sponsored by CODAC and the Rural Health Office in the College of Public Health at the University of Arizona, established regular services in the community, delivering health care to the underserved and uninsured residents of the Kino community.

Stakeholder interviews also yielded data that substantiated efforts by the Kino Coalition to improve healthcare availability to the community. One Safe Haven, the

Kino Teen Center, reported offering numerous healthcare services, including, but not limited to: routine physicals for youth sports programs; sexually transmitted disease education and STD testing, immunizations; and prenatal care. Services at the Kino Teen Center were continuously offered to juveniles and adults up to 21 years, and clients were charged fees based on a sliding scale of what they could afford. Representatives from CODAC and the Kino Teen Center provided documents detailing programs available to youths from the Kino community seeking these services. The selection and scope of these services were not previously available within the boundaries of the designated area. The change in availability of these services indicated that the efforts of the Kino Weed and Seed Coalition pursued and attained the goal of ensuring that health intervention and treatment opportunities were available within the community.

*Goal 5: Reduce adolescent and teen birth rates*

Official documents that detailed programs aimed at reducing teen birth rates, if they existed, were not made available to evaluators, and therefore not collected. Interviews with stakeholders also yielded limited information regarding efforts aimed at this particular goal. Stakeholders from the Safe Haven group reported offering teen parenting education and prenatal care, and participants from CODAC reported that some programs offered education about the risks of destructive decisions and how to avoid them, including sex, pregnancy, and parenting issues. Specific counts of how frequently these services were offered were unavailable. Overall, there was very little evidence showing that the Kino Weed and Seed Coalition maintained a consistent process of addressing and achieving this particular goal.

*Goal 6: Increase educational achievement for all ages of residents by 5% each year*

The goal of increasing educational achievement in the Kino community was originally defined in the official recognition application as focusing on dropout prevention programs and increasing access to educational opportunities. Indirectly related to this goal, evaluators collected data that indicated that the Kino Coalition worked with the Tucson Urban League, the Southside Community School, Pueblo Gardens Elementary, Quincie Douglas Neighborhood Center, Kino Teen Center, and the Holmes Tuttle Boys and Girls Club to support improved access to a wide range of educational opportunities.

Evaluators did not collect any data that indicated the Kino Coalition had directly been involved in dropout prevention programs. The collected data provided evidence that the Kino Coalition had worked with schools and social service groups to increase educational opportunities to community members of all ages. Safe Haven stakeholders provided documentation and reported educational programs for adolescents and adults that included: sex education; parenting; computer use training; job interviewing skills; vocational training; literacy programs; English classes for Spanish-speakers; science and math summer school programs; after-school tutoring; youth leadership and public speaking programs; GED classes; sewing classes; and programs teaching youth about peer pressure, the influence of media, and critical thinking strategies. The data did not indicate how many times each of these individual educational programs were offered. Generally, the data supported a process of improving the educational achievement for all ages, as the variety of educational programs that were offered would support educational improvement for diverse populations. The stakeholder discussions that cited dropout

rates as an important factor related to this goal was not substantially supported by documentation of programmatic activities.

*Goal 7: Improve participation in job readiness programs by 5% each year*

Specific data measuring job readiness program participation was not collected, so evaluators could not determine the progress of 5 percent annual participation increases. We collected data from official documents and stakeholder interviews that indicated that the Kino Weed and Seed Coalition had included job readiness training in its programmatic activities. Two separate Safe Havens reportedly offered occupational training through job readiness classes, interviewing strategies, computer skills, literacy classes, and GED certifications, but specific data about the frequency and participation in these services were not available. Stakeholders discussed the challenges many residents face regarding employability, and cited English language classes as also being an important part of vocational training.

Data regarding specific job readiness programs was not collected, but stakeholders and document reviews both indicated that the Kino Coalition had supported programs that would improve the quality, quantity, and accessibility of vocational training for Kino residents. The review of official documents offered minimal support that computer skills training, job interviewing strategies, GED certification classes, and English language literacy classes were made available to the community through the efforts of seeding providers.

*Prevention, Intervention, and Treatment Summary*



The Kino Weed and Seed Coalition 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 and nurturing a coalition of service providers, was adhered to, and followed a consistent process of emphasis. The six Kino Safe Havens were all involved in these activities, as was CODAC, Kino's primary service provider.

The implementation of other individual goals within this component showed mixed results. There was little evidence that showed that processes designed to address such goals as successful probation completion (#2), teen pregnancy (#5), and job readiness (#7), had been implemented. While there were anecdotal reports of these programmatic activities, there was little or no evidence from official documents that suggested these programs were implemented. However, our analysis showed that healthcare (#4), education achievement (#6), and drug and gang prevention programs (#3), were actively pursued through programmatic activities throughout the implementation period.

Stakeholders working as service providers discussed some of the challenges and failures faced by Kino. They identified that finding culturally appropriate and inclusive prevention, intervention, and treatment programs was difficult, and that securing sufficient resources continued to be challenging. Limited resources mean limited implementation saturation, quoting one participant, "if we had the resources to delivery more programs to more people, we could reach more people in need."

## Neighborhood Restoration

The Neighborhood Restoration component of the Kino Weed and Seed strategy detailed ten 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, 2006).

### *Goal 1: Increase resident participation in community activities*

Numerous examples from our collected data support that the Kino Coalition routinely engaged in community outreach events and activities throughout program implementation years. Data collected from official documents and stakeholder interviews reported program activities such as: an annual community Halloween Party at the Quincie Douglas Neighborhood Center; community clean-ups; painting street addresses and signs; an annual Martin Luther King, Jr. Day Breakfast for the community; a 'senior prom' event staged for senior residents with youths from the neighborhood handling decorations and hosting; and special events for the openings of a new public library and swimming pool in the Kino community.

These events relied on the member organizations of the Kino Coalition to provide sponsorship for games, prizes, food, and other activities at no charge to community

members. The impact on resident participation was evidenced by the creation of new public resources that had never been in the area previously, such as the public swimming pool and public library, but also by the building of a new community center. Several stakeholders described that having these new community gathering places, and staging free public events at them, created an environment within the Kino community where residents had opportunity to gather in a safe, comfortable place.

Anecdotally, these enhanced community infrastructures and public events were believed to be instrumental in increasing community involvement, however whether any actual increases in resident participation in community events took place could not be measured. Kino Coalition members did not record the level of community participation in such events prior to the Weed and Seed implementation period, nor did they keep records of attendance at said events. Even though actual participation counts were not recorded, data from focus groups and official City of Tucson Parks and Recreation Department documents substantiated that both physical resources for gathering and the staging of public events were improved upon. These improvements lent anecdotal support that resident participation in community events did increase, if due to nothing but an increased opportunity to participate.

*Goal 2: Maximize efficiency by minimizing duplication of efforts and leveraging resources through partnerships across neighborhood organizations.*

As previously discussed, the Kino Weed and Seed Coalition established numerous partnerships with government agencies, businesses, non-profit service providers, and community members. The data collected from official documents and stakeholder

interviews demonstrated that the Kino Coalition had developed a process of building partnerships, leveraging resources, and maximizing efficiency.

One representative from the Safe Haven stakeholders reported that Pueblo Gardens Elementary School leveraged resources by hosting after-school tutoring for neighborhood children, provided free facilities for the Strengthening Families Program (SFP), worked with the National Guard and its DEFY (Drug Education For Youth) program, and served the community by offering referrals to other Kino Coalition and CODAC services available to the residents in the community.

Official documents provided data about the Pueblo Gardens tutoring program, and the DEFY and SFP programs. Data also showed extensive cooperation and leveraging of resources among Tucson Parks and Recreation, Tucson-Pima Public Library, Tucson Urban League, the Holmes Tuttle Boys and Girls Club, area churches and ministries, and the Kino community. Documents detailing programmatic activities indicated the participation, roles, and responsibilities of these various partners in a variety of efforts throughout the implementation period. The breadth and depth of the cooperative partnerships was a clear indication of efforts to maximize efficiency and leverage resources.

*Goal 3: Increase opportunities for social connections within the community*

The original goal for increasing social connectedness in the Kino community was defined by two key objectives: 1) host regular neighborhood unity events, such as barbeques or block parties; and 2) host fun days for kids. Each of these two objectives,

and thus, this goal was adequately addressed by the Kino Coalition in programmatic activities described in the first Neighborhood Restoration goal above. The same activities and initiatives aimed at increasing resident participation in community events were activities that met the objectives for this goal as well.

*Goal 4: Provide a clean and safe environment in the neighborhoods*

Law enforcement activities of the Kino Weed and Seed contributed to the goal of providing a clean and safe environment in the neighborhoods, through directly improving safety. Neighborhood restoration efforts contributed to making the community environment cleaner. The weeding efforts contributed to making the neighborhoods safer by targeting open-air drug markets, aggressively removing criminals from the community, and increased police presence. The specific programmatic activities were described in the law enforcement goal section above.

Data collected during stakeholder interviews from the City Council, the Weeding Subcommittee, the Kino Executive Committee, and residents reported cooperative neighborhood clean-up efforts. They described that from the very beginning, the Coalition used probationers for clean-up projects in the area. By taking advantage of required community service hours, leveraging resources, and minimizing costs to the Kino Coalition, the Pima County APO supervised the removal of trash and weeds from vacant lots and abandoned properties, and painted house exteriors. Resident stakeholders reported their perception that the streets were safe again, the neighborhoods were cleaner, and police removed vagrants and drug dealers from the community's public park, through

two undercover drug stings, and the responsiveness of community policing officers to citizen complaints of vagrancy.

The collection and review of official documents did not result in evaluators finding documented support for the coalition's clean-up efforts. If records were ever kept describing the dates and participation rates for the clean-up projects, they were unavailable to evaluators. However, evaluators did have opportunity to review photographs that were described as 'before' and 'after' pictures of some of the dilapidated residential properties, and the trash and weed build-up in vacant lots. These photos provided evidence that the neighborhoods of the Kino community had benefited from clean-up efforts at some time or another.

*Goal 5: Improve housing conditions in the neighborhoods.*

The improvement of housing conditions is one of the elements of the National Weed and Seed strategy, used as part of obtaining official recognition because Weed and Seed sites are traditionally economically depressed areas with substandard housing conditions (CCDO, 2006). Using data collected from official documents and through stakeholder focus group sessions we found that during the early stages of the formation of the Kino Coalition, it was citizens and local Tucson government officials working on a housing improvement initiative that looked at Weed and Seed as a strategy for sustainability.

Many residents noted that a previous neighborhood association president from South Park was instrumental in the creation of the Kino area. They reported that the South Park neighborhood had received a Hope VI grant to improve housing conditions in

the neighborhood, and it was this program, coupled with knowledge about the South Tucson Weed and Seed site adjacent to the South Park neighborhood, that led neighborhood leaders into discussions of forming their own Weed and Seed coalition. From the beginning, this same early South Park resident leader wanted to include the adjoining neighborhoods of Las Vistas, Pueblo Gardens, and Western Hills II. The merging of these four neighborhoods seemed a logical fit because of their demographic similarity to one another and dissimilarity to the rest of Tucson, and the geographic features that lent cohesion as a singular designated area.

The efforts to improve housing conditions using the Hope VI grant fostered the development of the Kino Weed and Seed Coalition, and the Coalition continued to seek revenue and support to continue improving living conditions for residents in the Kino community. Both focus group interviews and documents provided by the Tucson City Council Ward V supported that the Kino Coalition had actively sought a variety of residential development and improvement of living conditions in the community, pursuant of this goal.

*Goal 6: Increase homeownership rates in the neighborhoods.*

The Kino Coalition set a goal of increasing homeownership rates among Kino residents with the belief that higher rates of owner-occupied housing contributed to sustained reductions in crime. Evaluators collected data that substantiated program activities that contributed to achieving this goal. We collected data from official documents that referred to classes teaching residents about savings, credit scores, and the

home buying process. Stakeholder sessions also revealed Kino Coalition activities aimed at supporting homeownership.

Stakeholders from the Residents group, the City Council, and the Executive Committee reported on some of the economic developments in the area resulting from Kino Weed and Seed advocacy efforts. These included helping attract a homebuilder to construct a new development of homes within Kino, and advocating for the limitation and improved control of multiunit housing. They also supported a developer who converted a dilapidated old ice making facility located on the north end of the Kino area into luxury lofts.

Again, thorough examination of this goal was not possible due to the non-existence of official documents that indicated pre and post test homeownership rates for the Kino area. We were unable to collect data detailing changes in homeownership rates, but to the end of engaging in a process of pursuing the goal, the Kino Coalition made efforts that could have contributed to increased homeownership.

*Goal 7: Advocate for increased public reinvestment in the neighborhood's infrastructure*

We found that programmatic efforts and successes in other goals also supplied data that illustrated that the Kino Coalition had developed formal activities that substantiated the process of achieving this goal. Evidence of public and private reinvestment included: the new Quincie Douglas Neighborhood Center; the new public library; community swimming pool; the Southside Charter School, which was formed to serve the students living in the Kino community, and is a Safe Haven; new housing developments; and street signage and resurfacing.



Focus group interviews revealed that members of the Kino Weed and Seed Coalition were active advocates in many of these developments, as well as in ongoing residential and commercial revitalization and development. Corroborating documentation was unavailable, or did not exist, specific to the advocacy of Kino Weed and Seed members for increased public investment in neighborhood infrastructure. The official documents that were available and reviewed that supported the efforts from neighborhood restoration goals one and two, increased community involvement and leveraging resources respectively, also supported this goal, at least peripherally. The collected documents supported that the Kino Coalition had engaged with, and leveraged the resources of, various governmental agencies (i.e. Parks and Recreation and Tucson-Pima Public Library) to improve the Kino community through significant reinvestment. While this goal most likely was intended to address other infrastructure needs besides these examples, the data does support a commitment to achieving at least part of the community's expected infrastructure needs.

*Goal 8: Improve commercial environments and business success*

We found through stakeholder interviews that the Kino Coalition had advocated for improved commercial development, seeking to attract a major grocery chain, a large box store, and a retail center. Seeing their community as underserved by available retail stores, residents advocated together with the City Council to develop large sections of undeveloped, vacant properties, condemned businesses, and renovate industrial zones. Focus group interviews with resident groups, the steering committee, and the Ward V

city council office each indicated that Kino community members were continuously active in seeking commercial developments and growth.

There are few retail businesses operating in the Kino area, and several participants from multiple stakeholder groups emphasized the community's need to expand commercial development, both for improved quality of life and sustained progress on crime reduction and neighborhood restoration. Participants were commonly aware of commercial development efforts, and well-informed about both favorable and unfavorable forms of commercial development. Favoring retail developments for both the tax revenue and job base such businesses supply over expansion of industrial businesses that do little to improve, or even undermine, the quality of life in the community.

*Goal 9: Improved personal savings and investment in housing, education, training, and micro-enterprise*

The Kino Weed and Seed Coalition helped develop and open a credit union in the community, dedicated to serving the needs of the Kino residents. We found that stakeholders reported having advocated for the credit union as an alternative to payday loan check cashing businesses that proliferated in the Kino area. Stakeholders described the payday loan businesses as “preying on people,” taking advantage of those in need.

We found evidence that improved housing conditions, education, and training of a variety of programs were commonly available in the Kino area because of program activities. Job training, computer skills, healthy life choices, parenting classes, and sewing classes that were offered as part of other Kino Coalition activities also contributed

to the programmatic process of this goal. Focus group participants, particularly those from the Safe Havens and from CODAC, provided documentation about programmatic activities in the Kino community aimed specifically at achieving this goal. The document review indicated that a variety of services and opportunities were made available to residents of the Kino community, specifically targeting the residents' needs for financial planning and independence.

This goal was further supported by both focus group participants and documentation in that the Kino Coalition was instrumental in partnering with an existing credit union organization to open a branch in the heart of the Kino community that would accept residents as members with no qualification other than residency in the Kino community. This effort, coupled with the educational opportunities, provided strong support that the Kino Coalition had adhered to a process of attaining this goal. The credit union has since been purchased by a larger credit union organization, so specific participation rates were unavailable, although the site continues to operate as a credit union, and is used by residents of the area.

*Goal 10: Improve job opportunities for residents in the area*

Combined with the efforts involved with other goals, we found that various program activities of the Kino Coalition attempted to improve job opportunities in the community. Review of official documents revealed that the Kino Coalition built a broader range of occupational availability for residents through educational programs such as GED classes, computer classes, and vocational training, although records were not sufficient to measure actual enrollment rates and changes. Through the advocacy for

commercial development, particularly retail outlets, the Kino Coalition hoped to create numerous entry-level jobs, well suited to those residents living nearby. The data we collected from official documents and information from focus group interviews supported that Kino had developed and implemented programs that would contribute to improved job opportunities and other economic development, although records were insufficient to know how many people benefited from their efforts.

### *Neighborhood Restoration Summary*

The Kino Weed and Seed Coalition developed a planned process, and implemented programs that supported its originally intended neighborhood restoration goals. Evaluators found substantial support for their commitment to goals 1 through 4. We found that residents had greater opportunity to participate in community activities, increase their connectedness, and felt that Kino's neighborhoods were safer and cleaner than before. We further found that the Kino Coalition had fostered numerous relationships, and maintained a broad coalition of members, which afforded them excellent opportunities to leverage resources and maximize efficiency.

Other neighborhood restoration goals were found to have been largely addressed by program activities that addressed other program goals. The Hope VI grant supported improved housing conditions and homeownership rates. We also found that increased public investment, improved commercial development, training and education, and improved job opportunities were part of the Kino Coalition's program activities throughout the implementation period.

### Process Summary

Overall, the review of official documents and data collected during stakeholder interviews indicated that the Kino Weed and Seed Coalition had largely adhered to its intended goals, and followed a process of achieving those goals. Through the course of implementation, the Kino Coalition developed the originally intended 26 goals into a more synthesized and concise set of goals, with specific objectives that continued to adhere to the intent of the original goals. Data that would have precisely measured the frequency or dosage of programmatic activities were unavailable for several identified goals. A more thorough collection of appropriate program measures might have altered the process evaluation.

### **Impact Evaluation Findings**

Exhibit 8 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 three pre-test period years, March 1999 through February 2002, and four post-test period years, March 2002 through February 2006. The exhibit includes the results of our pre/post analyses. Comparing the mean CFS rate for 36 months of data during the pre-test period to the mean CFS rate for 48 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. Also shown is the percent change in CFS rates for the first year of program implementation and the most recent year, listed as the Post-Test Period Change.

As shown in Exhibit 8, the Kino area routinely experienced declines in the rates of calls for service. The rate of violent crime CFS in the Kino area declined by more than 11 percent during the first year of implementation, and in year four experienced a decline of more than 17 percent. When compared to the 36 month average of pre-test rates, the mean post-test rate significantly declined by 0.91 calls per 1,000 people. For the same pre-test/post-test comparison period, the violent crime CFS rate for Tucson experienced a slight increase of 0.03, but was not a significant change.

Exhibit 8 shows the property crime measure for Kino, by year, over the implementation period. During the projects first year property crime declined by more than 15 percent, increased by slightly more than 1 percent in the second year, and then declined in the third and fourth years by almost 14 and 23 percent, respectively. Over the course of the four year implementation period the area experienced a decline of almost 33 percent. The results show that during the same period the City of Tucson experienced a decline of almost 26 percent. The pre/post analyses revealed that during the course of Kino's implementation period property crime significantly declined by 1.55 calls per 1,000 population. During the same period the City of Tucson's property crime rate did not change significantly. Specifically, over the implementation period the city experienced a decline of 0.11 CFS per 1,000 population.

Exhibit 8 further shows that CFS rates for drug crime had an erratic pattern in the Kino area, with a slight decrease in the first year of about 3 percent, declining by nearly 20 percent in the second year, then seeing a sharp increase of more than 22 percent in the third year, and then dropping dramatically in year four by more than 38 percent. Overall, the pre-post analysis showed that Kino had experienced a significant decline of 1.12 calls

per 1,000 population for drug crimes. Conversely, Tucson experienced a significant increase of 0.11 in its pre/post drug crime CFS rates.

Exhibit 8 also shows that rates for disorder calls increased more than 11 percent during the first year, followed by decreases in each subsequent year, of approximately 5.6, 10.0, and 19.6 percent. When compared to the pre-test period, CFS rates for disorder increased by 0.03, although it was not a significant change. Disorder rates for Tucson has declined each year since 2003, and overall post-test rates were 0.11 lower, which represented a significant decline.

Total CFS for the Kino area showed consistent declines throughout implementation years, with an almost 10 percent drop the first year, followed by drops of 4.8 percent, 5.1 percent, and 23.9 percent in each of the subsequent years of implementation. When compared to the pre-test period, total CFS rates in Kino declined significantly by 3.54 calls per 1,000 population during the post-test period. Tucson's post-test rates did not change significantly over the course of the study period.

## Exhibit 8: Calls For Service and Percent Annual Change by Program Year

	Pre-Test Period			Post-Test Period				Pre-Post Change	Post-Test Change
	Year 3	Year 2	Year 1	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4		
	Mar 1999 to Feb 2000	Mar 2000 to Feb 2001	Mar 2001 to Feb 2002	Mar 2002 to Feb 2003	Mar 2003 to Feb 2004	Mar 2004 to Feb 2005	Mar 2005 to Feb 2006 <sup>a</sup>	3/99 – 2/02 vs. 3/02 – 2/06	Year 1 vs. Year 4
<b>Violent</b>									
Kino									
% Change	n/a	4.95	-7.62	-11.09	-6.16	0.03	-17.29		-22.36
CFS per 1,000 Pop.	4.16	4.36	4.03	3.58	3.36	3.36	2.78	-0.91*	
Tucson									
% Change	n/a	-1.03	4.40	-0.74	-2.57	1.72	1.12		0.21
CFS per 1,000 Pop.	2.63	2.60	2.72	2.70	2.63	2.68	2.71	0.03	
<b>Property</b>									
Kino									
% Change	n/a	-10.10	17.77	-15.47	1.16	-13.94	-22.79	-1.55*	-32.78
CFS per 1,000 Pop.	8.11	7.29	8.58	7.26	7.34	6.32	4.88		
Tucson									
% Change	n/a	4.17	9.47	-2.72	5.51	-6.62	-24.70	-0.11	-25.81
CFS per 1,000 Pop.	9.32	9.71	10.63	10.34	10.91	10.19	7.67		
<b>Drugs</b>									
Kino									
% Change	n/a	-56.51	19.93	-3.09	-19.56	22.25	-38.14		-39.17
CFS per 1,000 Pop.	5.00	2.17	2.61	2.53	2.03	2.49	1.54	-1.12*	
Tucson									
% Change	n/a	7.31	-0.25	1.77	6.77	4.93	-0.13		11.89
CFS per 1,000 Pop.	0.89	0.95	0.95	0.97	1.03	1.08	1.08	0.11*	
<b>Disorder</b>									
Kino									
% Change	n/a	0.54	8.15	11.35	-5.56	-10.05	-19.62		-31.72
CFS per 1,000 Pop.	1.51	1.51	1.64	1.82	1.72	1.55	1.25	0.03	
Tucson									
% Change	n/a	-7.25	1.28	3.72	-7.73	-3.16	-10.42		-19.96
CFS per 1,000 Pop.	1.53	1.42	1.44	1.49	1.38	1.34	1.20	-0.11*	
<b>Total Calls For Service<sup>b</sup></b>									
Kino									
% Change	n/a	-18.28	9.91	-9.90	-4.82	-5.14	-23.86		-31.26
CFS per 1,000 Pop.	18.77	15.34	16.86	15.19	14.46	13.72	10.44	-3.54*	
Tucson									
% Change	n/a	2.19	7.15	-1.52	2.90	-4.20	-17.19		-18.36
CFS per 1,000 Pop.	14.38	14.69	15.75	15.51	15.96	15.29	12.66	-0.09	

\* Significant at  $p \leq 0.05$

<sup>a</sup> Year 4 Calls for Service estimated from 10 months data (March 2005 to December 2005) using 2005 monthly average, adjusted by average percentage difference of available CFS data from each January and February from 1999 through 2005.

<sup>b</sup> Total Calls For Service for this analysis includes only those calls coded by the Tucson Police Department into one of the above four categories.



*Impact Summary*

Calls for service in the Kino Weed and Seed area declined significantly during the study period for violent, property, and drug crimes; whereas changes in CFS for these offense categories either did not change or increased for the city as a whole. Likewise, Kino experienced a significant decline in total CFS, whereas the city's total CFS did not change significantly over the study period. However, CFS for disorder did not change significantly over the course of the study period in the Kino area, but decreased significantly for the city of Tucson. .

It should be noted that there are important limitations to using Tucson as a comparison area to Kin. First, direct statistical comparison cannot necessarily be drawn between groups because any findings could arguably be influenced by uncontrolled factors. Given this caveat, the rates for Tucson did provide a snapshot of what was happening to CFS rates in the community surrounding the Kino Weed and Seed area. Second, Kino is geographically embedded within Tucson and is thus necessarily influenced, culturally, economically, and politically to the city. Therefore, it was not possible for us to determine the extent to which larger forces might impact Kino.

Some CFS rates demonstrated increases during years of program implementation, particularly in disorder related concerns. These increases were not unexpected and do not necessarily indicate a programmatic failure. Other evaluations of Weed and Seed sites have found that measures of crime may increase during program implementation (NIJ, 1999), only to experience declines in subsequent years. Observed changes may be a result of many factors external or internal to Weed and Seed program activities, and may be an indication of a positive program outcome such as improved community and law

enforcement communication and support (NCFHPC, 1999; Josi, et al, 2000; Harris et al, 2001; and Driscoll et al, 2003). For example, some programs seek to increase residents' awareness of quality of life problems in their neighborhood, which in turn can result in increased calls for service related to neighborhood quality of life due to increased awareness.

## **CONCLUSION**

The present study was conducted in cooperation with the Arizona Criminal Justice Commission (ACJC) under a grant with the Justice Research and Statistics Association (JRSA), as an evaluation of the Kino Weed and Seed site in Tucson, Arizona. The study involved both a process and impact evaluation as an assessment of the site's performance at its five-year watermark for official recognition. 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 Kino Coalition'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 seven months, from initial interviews with site representatives through final analysis. A report was prepared for publication by ACJC, and disseminated to JRSA, Kino Coalition Steering Committee members, and select members of the Kino community.

Evaluators employed both qualitative and quantitative methods for the evaluation. Qualitative methods relied on focus group interviews with key stakeholders and an examination of official documents and records maintained by the site. The quantitative

methods used relied on analyses of call for service (CFS) data from the City of Tucson. 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 CFS, occurred as a result of Weed and Seed program implementation.

The process evaluation revealed several major findings. Generally, the evaluation revealed that the Kino Coalition 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 26 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 Kino community had established 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. For example, the expansion of the Quincie Douglas Community Center, the building of a public library and swimming pool, and the growth of the Southside Charter School have provided permanent, safe, and comfortable community gathering places, which should help to sustain changes in the community. Results also showed signs of future economic improvement in the building of new homes and the coalition's willingness to participate in zoning decisions. Some of the Coalition's involvement in such issues supported the finding of continued commitment, activity, and

focus by the Kino Coalition to sustain crime abatement successes in the community, and movement toward sustained neighborhood restoration and revitalization.

The impact evaluation relied on seven years of CFS data from the Tucson Police Department. Evaluators analyzed the data by comparing CFS in the Kino area to the rest of the city, dividing the data into 36 months of pre-test and 48 months of implementation period data. Using paired samples t-tests, evaluators assessed the changes in rates per 1,000 population for each area.

We found that the Kino area experienced declines in the rates of calls for service. The rate of violent crime CFS in the Kino area declined by more than 11 percent during the first year of implementation, and in year four experienced a decline of more than 17 percent. When compared to the 36 month average of pre-test rates, the mean post-test rate significantly declined by 0.91 calls per 1,000 people. For the same pre-test/post-test comparison period, the violent crime CFS rate for Tucson experienced a slight increase of 0.03, but was not a significant change. So at a time when the rest of Tucson was experiencing a relative flattening in the rates of violent crime calls for service, the Kino community experienced a significant decline. Similarly, the pre/post analyses of property crime rates revealed that during the course of Kino's implementation period property crime significantly declined by 1.55 calls per 1,000 population. During the same period the City of Tucson's property crime rate did not change significantly.

Examining the CFS rates for drug crimes, the pre-post analysis showed that Kino had experienced a significant decline of 1.12 calls per 1,000 population for drug crimes. Conversely, Tucson experienced a significant increase of 0.11 in its pre/post drug crime CFS rates. The rates for disorder calls in the Kino area increased 0.03 percent from the

pre-test period to the post-test, although it was not a significant change. Disorder rates for Tucson were 0.11 lower, which represented a significant decline. This finding, as indicated previously in the findings section, is consistent with previous findings at other weed and seed sites, and has been explained as a product of improved police-community relationships.

The data available to evaluators provides evidence that the strategies adopted by the Kino Coalition Weed and Seed site have been successful. In most categories of crime, there was a statistically significant decrease in the rate of calls for service in the Kino area as compared to the rest of the city. While other extraneous factors may have influenced the changes in CFS, either solely or cumulatively in conjunction with Kino Weed and Seed efforts, the data does indicate a significant change in the Kino area during Weed and Seed program implementation.

### **Limitations**

Even though there is evidence of the success of the Kino site, data was frequently lacking that would have allowed for a more rigorous assessment of program goals. The 26 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 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.

For some of the Kino Coalition's goals, assembling the appropriate data was a difficult task. The Kino site's fourth law enforcement goal of reducing recidivism by five percent annually is one example of a goal that was created without establishing the processes to assess whether the goal was met. To properly assess reduction in recidivism among neighborhood residents, a database of those living in the neighborhood who were arrested in a given (or base) period of time (e.g., the year prior to program implementation) would have had to be assembled. Then the individual persons in the database would have to be tracked to determine if they recidivated. As illustrated above, measuring neighborhood resident recidivism rates is not impossible, but would require a well-defined plan to collect and assess the data related to the particular measure. Unfortunately, the steps needed to establish the appropriate data collection strategy were not taken, rendering the quantifiable measurement of progress toward achieving the goal difficult to assess.

For other goals (e.g. reduction of adolescent and teen birth rates) data may be available, but not easily accessible at the neighborhood level. Additionally, this particular goal also points at an incongruence in goal setting: confusion between the role of process versus impact measures. Given the developmental stage of the Kino site, a more useful goal might have been the establishment of a model teen pregnancy prevention program, through which the Coalition could have tracked the implementation and participation of the program as an indicator of available resources to community members in need. 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. Therefore, in the absence of explicit strategies that address the problem of teen pregnancy, an intermediate step in the Weed and Seed process that would generate measurable data, would be the establishment of a model teen pregnancy prevention program, and not necessarily the outcome or impact of the program itself.

### **Recommendations**

Evaluators identified the lack of objective quantitative data to assess some of the goals. 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 Kino Coalition Weed and Seed site could improve upon their successes, bringing even more tangible benefits to neighborhood residents.

The experiences of the Kino Weed and Seed site may also serve as a guide to future Weed and Seed Communities. The limitations in the effective measurement of Kino's original strategic plan are educational for those communities that might receive future recognition and funding. Future Weed and Seed Communities should ensure not

just clearly identified goals and objectives, but also ensure that mechanisms for effectively measuring those goals and objectives are a well developed component of the overall strategy. Building the site's strategic plan, while keeping the long term assessment and evaluation of procedural processes and quantifiable outcomes, future sites will be better positioned to assess programmatic successes and failures.

Evaluators also recommend using additional sources of data for measuring crime. Notably the inclusion of official Uniform Crime Report (UCR) figures for both the designated area and the rest of the city of which the community is part, would serve multiple purposes. First, all potential and officially recognized Weed and Seed sites are required to report UCR to describe crime in their area. The inclusion of UCR data will support the site's continued assessment for funding renewal, but will also be an additional measure of crime in the area. Second, UCR data is a widely available, used, and understood measure of crime, and using it in the analyses of any particular Weed and Seed site allows other Weed and Seed sites to make relative comparisons in a meaningful way that is less burdensome than the use of CFS data.

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

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 (2005). 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 (2006) Weed and Seed website homepage available: <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/ccdo/ws/welcome.html>.

Community Capacity Development Office (2006) Weed and Seed Data Center Kino Coalition webpage available:

<http://www.weedandseeddatacenter.org/sitedetail.aspx?sitekey=365S0>.

- 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.
- Drug Education For Youth (2006). DEFY website available at: <http://www.hq.navy.mil/defy/default.htm> .
- 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.
- Health Resources and Services Administration (2006) *Stop Bullying Now*. Available online at: <http://stopbullyingnow.hrsa.gov/index.asp?area=main> . U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
- 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.
- Kino Weed and Seed Coalition (2004). *Kino Weed and Seed Coalition Action Plan*.
- Kusche, C.A. & Greenberg, M.T. (1994) *The PATHS Curriculum*. Seattle: Developmental Research and Programs.
- Lowell, Massachusetts Police Department. Lowell Weed and Seed. Available: [http://www.lowellpolice.com/about\\_lpd/policing\\_ini/weed\\_and\\_seed.htm](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.

## **APPENDIX 1**

### **Official Documents for Process Methods**

#### *Kino Coalition Progress Report 2005 and Changes in Goals*

The Kino Weed and Seed Coalition prepared progress reports, detailing site activities over the preceding year, and the tasks and programs aimed at achieving their identified goals. We collected data from these progress reports to examine which activities the report identified that could be tied to our template of originally intended strategies. The most recent of these progress reports, detailing the Kino Coalition's 2005 fiscal year, contained data that illustrated changes in the structure and language of Kino's goal statements and objectives, providing important markers for the process evaluation. The changes largely stayed consistent with the goals of the original plan submitted with the initial application for official recognition. The goals were restructured with a condensed list of modified goals that synthesized similar goals and objectives from the original plan into a more concise statement of goals and objectives.

The modified goals for the law enforcement component detailed in the annual report synthesized most of the original goals into a more concise format, however a few specifically defined objectives and tasks were excluded. They were 1) increased patrols, Law Enforcement Goal #2 from Exhibit 5 above; and 2) reduced speeding and traffic related problems, Law Enforcement Goal #7 from Exhibit 5 above. The newly synthesized goals for the law enforcement component included goals from other components of the original Kino Weed and Seed strategy, specifically: 1) improving successful completion of probation, Prevention, Intervention, and Treatment Goal #2 from Exhibit 5; 2) leveraging resources; 3) providing a clean and safe environment; and

4) improving housing conditions in the neighborhood, from Neighborhood Restoration Goal numbers 2, 4, and 5 in Exhibit 5 above, respectively.

The modified goals and objectives for the community policing component addressed both of the original goals, but was expanded to support goals from other components in the original plan, including: 1) increasing public awareness of positive police activities; 2) coalition building; 3) increase participation in gang and drug use prevention programs; 4) increasing resident participation in community activities; 5) leveraging resources; 6) increasing social connectedness in the community; 7) improving housing conditions; and 8) providing a safe and clean environment.

The modified goals for the prevention, intervention, and treatment component included provisions specifically relevant to all of the original goals, except for increasing probation success. However, it also detailed objectives and tasks that provided support to eight of the ten original neighborhood restoration goals. Excluded from being part of the specific tasks and objectives were goals 5 and 6, improving housing conditions and increasing homeownership rates.

The new neighborhood restoration goals retained objectives and tasks that supported all 10 of the original goals, as well as tasks directly related to the prevention, intervention, and treatment goal of fostering coalition building, goal number 1 of the original PIT goals. The newly synthesized goals and objectives while continuing to include the original 10 restoration goals, also added tasks that expanded the scope of the restoration. Two specific tasks that were added to the new plan were improving voter registration opportunities, and providing training to residents about community organization and political advocacy.



Collectively, the current goals and objectives detailed in the 2005 Kino Weed and Seed Coalition Annual Progress Report continue to support all 26 of the original goals established in the initial application for official recognition. The reorganized plan provides clearer direction for the community by narrowing the goals to overarching issues, and then describing objectives and tasks that will serve the attainment of those broad goals. The new plan presents in a more concise manner, which, according to at least two representatives from the steering committee, “will allow people to really see and know what we’re doing.” The evaluators’ review of the 2005 report also documented the Kino Coalition’s continued adherence to a process of attaining their originally intended goals.

#### *Kino Weed and Seed Coalition Policy and Procedures*

The second key document used to assess the process of the Kino Weed and Seed Coalition’s adherence to their originally intended site plan was the Kino Weed and Seed Coalition Policies and Procedures guide. The data collected from the site’s self-created policies and procedures manual describe the site’s emphasis on particular programmatic activities and plans. In part, the organizational structure as defined in the Policies and Procedures manual indicates Kino’s commitment to some of the original goals: 1) the creation and maintenance of a Seeding Subcommittee; 2) the creation and maintenance of a Weeding Subcommittee; 3) to maintain neighborhood access to police and communication between community members and police officers; 4) to establish and maintain a coalition of service providers in the Kino area; 5) to increase resident participation in community activities; 6) to increase opportunities for social connections

within the community; 7) to leverage resources through partnerships across neighborhood organizations; and 8) to advocate for increased public reinvestment in the neighborhood's infrastructure. While not all of the goals and objectives set forth in the original strategic plan are represented in the Policies and Procedures, those goals related to the organizational structure of the site are supported.

Data obtained from official documents collected from the Tucson Police Department detailed the personnel assignments, enforcement strategies, and planned community policing activities of the Operations Division South, the TPD division responsible for the Kino area, and allowed us to examine the implementation processes of the law enforcement and community policing goals as defined by the original plan's intended goals and objectives. Data used in this part of our analysis included memoranda, action plans, and personnel scheduling from various periods ranging from 2001 through 2005. The data from TPD indicated that the original goals for both the law enforcement and community policing elements of the Weed and Seed strategy for Kino were a routine part of the standing orders and action plans for officers working in the Kino designated area.

Exhibit A1 below reiterates the original goals of the Kino Weed and Seed Coalition and indicates whether data collected from a given source of official documents suggested adherence to the intended processes. The three sources listed included large summary data as well as supporting documents, directly related to three primary sources: the Community Action Plan 2004; the Kino Coalition's Annual Report 2005; and Tucson Police Department records.

---

**Exhibit A1: Kino Weed and Seed Coalition Original Goals and Process Adherence**


---

Original Goals	Community Action Plan 2004	Tucson Police Department	Annual Progress Report 2005
<b>Law Enforcement</b>			
1 Create and maintain a Kino Weeding Steering Committee.		X	X
2 Increase police patrols in the Kino area at least 25%.		X	X
3 Increase public awareness of positive law enforcement efforts.	X	X	X
4 Reduce recidivism in the neighborhood by 5% each year.		X	X
5 Reduce drug dealing within the neighborhood by 5% each year.		X	X
6 Decrease the illegal use of guns and gang graffiti by 5% each year.	X	X	X
7 Reduce incidences of speeding and traffic problems by 10% each year.		X	X
<b>Community Policing</b>			
1 Increase participation in crime prevention programs by 5% each year.	X	X	X
2 Maintain neighborhood access to police and communication between community members and police officers.	X	X	X
<b>Prevention, Intervention, and Treatment</b>			
1 Utilize the Kino Weed and Seed Coalition Seeding Committee to establish and nurture a coalition of service providers working in the Kino neighborhoods.	X	X	X
2 Increase successful completion of probation by 5% each year.			X
3 Increase participation in drug use and gang prevention programs by 5% each year.	X		X
4 Ensure that health intervention and treatment opportunities are available within the community.	X		X
5 Reduce adolescent and teen birth rates.	X		X
6 Increase educational achievement for all ages of residents by 5% each year.	X		X
7 Improve participation in job readiness programs by 5% each year.	X		X
<b>Neighborhood Restoration and Economic Development</b>			
1 Increase resident participation in community activities.	X		X
2 Maximize efficiency by minimizing duplication of efforts and leveraging resources through partnerships across neighborhood organizations.	X		X
3 Increase opportunities for social connections within the community.	X		X
4 Provide a clean and safe environment within the neighborhoods.	X		X
5 Improve housing conditions in the neighborhoods.	X		X
6 Increase homeownership rates in the neighborhoods.	X		X
7 Advocate for increased public reinvestment in the neighborhood's infrastructure.	X		X
8 Improve commercial environments and business success.	X		X
9 Improve personal savings and investment in housing, education, training, and micro-enterprise.	X		X
10 Improve job opportunities for residents in the area.	X		X

---