

THE PLAYBOOK

*Plays for law enforcement officers to help prevent crime
and increase citizen trust and confidence.*

Revised

December 2023

Developed by Cynthia Lum and Christopher S. Koper
Center for Evidence-Based Crime Policy
George Mason University

in collaboration with law enforcement partners

This Playbook was developed through the [Matrix Demonstration Project](#) (PIs: Cynthia Lum and Christopher Koper),¹ which provides ideas on using research in practice. All demonstrations, including the Playbook, and other resources referenced in this guide, are freely available at www.cebcp.org.

The Playbook is a living document. More plays will be added to the Playbook as more evidence becomes available. We encourage agencies to develop their own plays from the research evidence and share them with the MDP team to include.



The Center for Evidence-Based Crime Policy
Department of Criminology, Law and Society
George Mason University
4400 University Drive, MS 6D12
Fairfax, VA 22030
www.cebcp.org

¹ Funded by the Bureau of Justice Assistance, 2011-DB-NX-K012.

Contents

How to use this Playbook.....	4
Identifying Crime Conditions.....	5
Crime Prevention Plays	6
The General Play	7
Directed “Koper” Patrols	8
The 4Gs of Hot Spots Patrol.....	9
Traffic Problems & Accidents.....	10
Graffiti.....	11
Gun Crimes and Shootings.....	12
Focused Deterrence.....	13
Larceny from Auto.....	14
Open-Air Drug Markets	15
Street Robberies.....	16
Burglary Prevention.....	17
Develop a “Case on a Place”	18
Thefts from Construction Sites.....	19
Trust & Confidence Plays	20
The 3-1-1 Play	21
Follow-Up Play.....	22
Improving Exchanges with Citizens	23
Seeking Partners for Prevention	24
Refreshers	26
Refresher: CPTED.....	27
Refresher: Responding to Domestic Violence	28

Refresher: Hot Spot Policing.....	30
Refresher: SARA Model and Problem-Oriented Policing	31
Refresher: Situational Crime Prevention	32
Refresher: Stop-and-Frisk	34
Other Ideas & Resources.....	35
Ten Ideas for Supervisors.....	36
“One-Pagers”	38
Resources & Videos.....	41
About the Authors	44

How to use this Playbook

The Playbook contains evidence-based and operational ideas for law enforcement officers to use and adapt during daily patrol deployments to reduce, prevent, and deter crime.

The plays address specific “conditions” or crime problems and are built from research knowledge about effective strategies and tactics (and hence are “evidence-based”) combined with law enforcement experience. Much of this knowledge comes the [Evidence-Based Policing Matrix](#), a freely available online tool.

Patrol officers should consider implementing plays during their “non-committed” time (the periods during their shift that are not dedicated to answering calls for service).² The effective use of this time has been shown to improve an officer’s ability to reduce calls for service (in both the short and long run), thus preventing crime. This time can also be used to strengthen relationships with citizens and communities, and improve the agency’s legitimacy with the public.

Two types of plays are within this Playbook—“**Crime Prevention Plays**” and “**Trust & Confidence Plays**.” We also include “**Refreshers**” which are short definitions and summaries of strategies referred to within the Playbook. We also include “**Other Ideas and Resources**.”

² Other units who don’t answer calls can use the Playbook to structure their daily activities.

Identifying Crime Conditions

The plays in the Playbook were developed for specific crime “conditions” (e.g., street robberies, open air drug markets, larceny from auto) in collaboration with a police department. However, officers are encouraged to identify additional crime conditions by:

1. Asking local crime analysts for assistance in identifying “hot spots” (see [Refresher on Hot Spots](#)) and “hot times” of crime, repeat offenders or victims, or other crime patterns on which to implement plays.
2. If crime analysis is not available, find ways to quickly identify patterns of crime problems in your area. For example, make a list of addresses/blocks with repeat calls for service or determine when certain crimes tend to occur.
3. Asking community members for their input about their crime concerns and where they are located.
4. Asking other officers from opposite shifts or who are familiar with the area for their input about crime patterns.
5. Spending time observing your area, noting and recording activities in those places that might contribute to crime.
6. Employing a systematic approach to identifying crime conditions. Three are found in this Playbook: (1) [Case of Places](#), (2) [CPTED](#), and (3) [SARA Problem-Solving Model](#).

NOTE: If you develop and employ a new play that works, please consider submitting the play to the unit that modifies the Playbook.

Crime Prevention Plays

The General Play

CONDITION: Most plays in the Playbook are designed for specific conditions and problems. However, they do not address all problems. When creating plays, using the principles below can increase the likelihood of the play being effective in preventing crime, as these principles are evidence-based:

1. Target your efforts in specific places where crime concentrates (a specific address, alleyway, intersection, block, or cluster of blocks). Crime is highly concentrated: approximately 50% of a jurisdiction's crime occurs in less than 5% of its addresses. In suburban and rural areas, this concentration may be even *greater*.

2. Proactive strategies are much more effective than reactive ones. General response to 911 calls, random patrols, and arrests after the fact are less effective in preventing crime. Proactive tactics use past information to anticipate hot spots and hot times of crime, repeat offenders and victims, and high-risk situations to direct activities.

3. Effective proactivity requires problem-solving and developing tailored strategies. You are more likely to be effective if you tailor your strategy to a particular problem/condition. Strategies to target specific problems such as the [SARA Problem-Solving Model](#), the [Case of Places play](#), and [CPTED](#) are included in the Playbook.

4. Citizens' reactions matter. The most proactive, place-based and problem-solving plays will not be effective if they lead to negative community or citizen reactions or are unlawful or unconstitutional. Anticipating reactions and working with communities are needed for many plays.

Directed “Koper” Patrols

*CONDITION: This is a basic, go-to play if you only have short periods of time between calls for service.*³

1. Select a few (2-5) crime concentrations in specific places (problem blocks, intersections, and alleys) to focus on during your shift using crime maps and analysis, or if not available, addresses noted in CAD that have high levels of calls for service. See the [Refresher on Hot Spots Policing](#).
2. When not answering calls for service, go to these locations and patrol them for at least 10-15 minutes. At the basic level, try implementing [The 4Gs Play](#) while on these patrols. Repeat periodically and unpredictably. If problems are inside a store or business, walk inside of that location in addition to patrolling the outside of the store.
3. In violent crime locations, consider conducting traffic and pedestrian stops.

Two important notes:

- (a) Legality and professionalism are imperative when conducting traffic and pedestrian stops and engaging in stop-question-and-frisk. Please review the [Refresher on Stop and Frisk](#) for more information.
- (b) How officers treat individuals whom they stop matters. Courtesy, professionalism, restraint, and empathy should always guide officer behavior. For more advice, see the [“Improving Exchanges with Citizens”](#) play.

³ <http://cebcp.org/wp-content/onepaggers/KoperHotSpots.pdf>

The 4Gs of Hot Spots Patrol

When conducting a 10-15 minute [Directed Koper Patrol](#) stop in a crime hot spots, the 4Gs provide a basic deployment strategy to maximize an officer's deterrent effect.

1. GO. Make sure you go to a hot spot a couple of times a shift, and doing so unexpectedly. This can enhance a patrol officer's deterrent effect at hot spots. Each time you go to a hot spot, try changing your entry, exit, and patrol pattern within the hot spot.

2. GET OUT. Make sure you stop and get out of your vehicle when in a crime hot spot. Doing so increases your visibility and shows commitment and authority at the location.

3. GO UP TO. When approaching individuals either for enforcement purposes or friendly exchanges, those interactions must be lawful, legitimate, procedurally just, purposeful, and respectful (see the play "[Improving Exchanges with Citizens](#)").

4. GO IN. Hot spots often have public places within them that generate large amounts of calls for service (for example, a specific store, abandoned building, location within a park, etc.). Walking into these locations can enhance your visibility and deterrent effect.

Traffic Problems & Accidents

CONDITION: Persistent traffic problems, accidents, speeding, or other motor vehicle violations

1. Identify the specific nature and location of the problem and the possible causes of that problem. Use crime analysis information when available, information from traffic units, or past call history information from that area. Talk to pedestrians or residents in the area to better understand the problem.
2. Work with the traffic unit and municipality to implement solutions, which may include traffic cameras, speed bumps, signage, speed cameras, and/or license plate recognition (LPR) technology.
3. Increase patrol visibility at peak problem times and places, using both enforcement and compliance techniques to change driver behavior.
4. For traffic problems related to specific situations, such as bar closing times, work with traffic enforcement units to consider erecting barriers or redirecting traffic and pedestrian movement.
5. Consider employing “DDACTS”, or [Data-Driven Approaches to Crime and Traffic Safety](#).
6. The traffic unit may have an analytic approach to determine the “top ten (or 15, 20, etc.)” intersections/streets with traffic problems. Consider conducting traffic stops and visible patrols at those locations during peak hours of accidents and moving violations.

Graffiti

CONDITION: Persistent graffiti in specific places.

1. Consider the specific suggestions in the POP guide on graffiti that are applicable to officers (see www.popcenter.org/problems/graffiti/1):

- a. Detecting graffiti rapidly and routinely
- b. Removing graffiti rapidly
- c. Increasing natural observation of graffiti locations
- d. Increasing formal observation of graffiti locations
- e. Increasing electronic security
- f. Conducting publicity campaigns
- g. Vandal-proofing graffiti-prone locations
- h. Controlling access to graffiti-prone locations
- i. Focusing on chronic offenders
- j. Controlling graffiti tools
- k. Channeling behavior into more acceptable activities
- l. Providing alternative activities and services
- m. Involving youth in developing programs (NOTE: Some programs have not been shown to be effective)
- n. Holding parents accountable
- o. Increasing sanctions for offenders
- p. Applying new technologies
- q. Establishing juvenile curfews (NOTE: This has not been supported by research)
- r. Warning offenders

2. Additionally, research indicates that high-risk juveniles on blocks predict crime on those blocks. Addressing them through identification, connecting them with social services, and focusing on services that reduce their risk of dropping out of school or assisting them in obtaining jobs may help.

Gun Crimes and Shootings

CONDITION: Gun crimes and shootings at specific locations, for example, around a club, bar, or establishment, or on specific streets, parks, alleys, etc.

1. Conduct directed patrols in gun crime hot spots focused on detecting gun carrying on a person. For gun crimes, pedestrian stops can be effective. See the [Refresher on Stop and Frisk](#) and “[Improving Exchanges with Citizens](#)” play for advice on conducting these lawfully and respectfully.
2. The [Focused Deterrence](#) play has been effective when used for gun offenders and those at risk for gun violence. More generally, officers should be aware of high-risk people linked to gun crime hot spots, including known gun offenders, probationers, parolees, and gang members. See your crime analysis or intelligence units for assistance with such information. Monitoring these people and making contact with them may be an effective way to deter their involvement in future gun violence.
3. Examine underlying causes at gun crime locations, which may be connected to other problems such as open-air drug markets, problem night clubs, retaliation shootings, or gang disputes. Consider applying a [case of place](#) or [SARA](#).
4. If there has been a recent shooting, consider the possibility of retaliation and help detectives who may not be as familiar with the area identify possible future offenders or victims. Some communities have critical incident teams or other groups that try to reduce the possibility of retaliation. These may already be operational, such as those under [Project Safe Neighborhoods Interventions](#).
5. In [domestic violence](#) cases, try to determine whether a gun is in the home and whether local and/or state laws allow you to remove guns from the home. More information can be found [here](#) on directed patrols to reduce gun violence.

Focused Deterrence

CONDITION: This is a general play that can be used in conjunction with other plays, and focuses on targeting high-risk repeat offenders of serious crimes.

1. Establish a working group partnership (see “[Seeking Partners for Prevention](#)” play) consisting of crime analysts, probation, parole, prosecution, and social service providers to assist with the below tasks.
2. Identify high-risk repeat offenders with the help of crime analysis. Be targeted and specific; for example, if you are working on reducing an armed robbery problem in your area of responsibility, those with repeat misdemeanor offenses or low-level disorders may not be appropriate to target.
3. Make contact personally to inform individuals that the agency is partnering with probation, parole, and the state’s attorney to focus on violent crimes in this area, discussing specific consequences of their future offending.
4. When possible, try to connect high-risk offenders with social services.

The above reflects a “pulling levers” approach. For more information on this approach and also “[Operation Ceasefire](#)” visit this resource:

<http://cebcp.org/evidence-based-policing/what-works-in-policing/research-evidence-review/focused-deterrence/>

Larceny from Auto

CONDITION: Persistent larcenies from automobiles (tags, car parts, items inside of the vehicle) in specific places)

Numerous approaches have been tried to reduce theft from vehicles. Research supports a few:

1. A hot spots approach to increased guardianship in specific hot spots of theft from automobiles, using the [Directed Koper Patrols](#) play and during the specific times of night/early morning when thefts are most prevalent.
2. [Strengthening partnerships with place managers](#) to help guard places like parking lots and garages.
3. Improved use of CCTV in an area, with signage warning offenders about the use of CCTV.
4. Target victims and offenders by identifying them through crime reports and contacting them directly. Victims could be given suggestions to target harden (see the [Refresher on Situational Crime Prevention](#)), while offenders could be notified of increased guardianship.

Open-Air Drug Markets

CONDITION: Persistent open-air drug markets.

Mazerolle, Soole and Rombouts have conducted a systematic review of research on “[Street Level Drug Enforcement](#)” for the [Campbell Collaboration](#).

They find the following tactics are promising:

1. Geographically targeted problem-oriented policing interventions, involving partnerships between police and municipal department, community groups, and/or place managers (businesses, residential managers), tend to be more effective at disrupting street-level drug markets than policing efforts that involve partnerships but are spread across a community. (*NOTE: We also suggest coordinating efforts to the timing of drug markets*)
2. Increasing police presence or intervention (e.g., arrests) is more effective when targeted on micro hot spots rather than spread across neighborhoods. However, increasing presence or intervention at hot spots alone is less effective than: 1) [forging productive partnerships with others](#) and; 2) making efforts to alter the underlying conditions that exist in places that may contribute to street-level drug market problems.
3. Some recent research indicates that patrol cars with license plate cameras on them seem to reduce drug calls in crime hot spots.

NOTE: Problem-solving approaches in this review also included nuisance abatement, closing down problem locations, and contacting appropriate municipal agencies regarding code violations. Also, see the [Focused Deterrence](#) play, variations of which have been used successfully to target actors in drug markets.

Street Robberies

CONDITION: Persistent street robberies at specific locations.

1. Intermittent, unpredictable directed patrols at high crime locations (see the [Directed Koper Patrols play](#)).
2. Understand why some places bring together potential victims with valuables and suspects who wish to rob them (e.g., convenience stores, check-cashing locations, drug markets, banks and ATMs)
3. Using a CPTED unit or CPTED processes (see the [Refresher sheet on CPTED](#)) as well as the [case of places play](#), identify opportunities connected to street robberies (ATMs, lack of lighting, alleys, unattended parking lots, intoxicated patrons, open-air drug dealing), addressing opportunities specifically (through, for example, CCTV, improved lighting, working with municipality to fence off cuts in between buildings, signage, etc.).
4. Consider pedestrian and traffic stops when dealing with armed street robberies. See the [Refresher on Stop and Frisk](#) and the “[Improving Exchanges with Citizens](#)” play.
5. For cell phone snatch and grabs, consider placing signage and providing pedestrians with information about cell phone robberies in an area to increase awareness and reduce victimization.
6. Carry out focused deterrence efforts on repeat and other known offenders (like probationers and parolees) and/or gang members (see the [Focused Deterrence play](#)).

Burglary Prevention

CONDITION: An increase in residential burglaries in an area; the occurrence of a burglary in a block or high rise.

1. Research indicates that once a home or apartment unit is burglarized, homes and units next door or very nearby have a heightened risk of burglary, particularly over the next two weeks.
2. After a burglary, warn nearby neighbors of their increased risk and suggest methods to target harden their homes, including locking windows and basement/back doors, engaging their alarm systems regularly, and encouraging more guardianship of their neighbors. See the [Refresher on Situational Crime Prevention](#).
3. Work with place managers and residents of buildings to determine the underlying mechanism contributing to burglaries. Is a roof door unsecured? Are residents leaving their doors unlocked (e.g., college dorms), or are windows left open? Removing material below fire escapes or windows can reduce the ability of offenders to access fire escapes from the ground.
4. Work with place managers and residents for longer-term solutions, including using CCTV if available.
5. Have the agency's CPTED unit conduct an environmental analysis of the area to determine what opportunities contribute to crime. If a CPTED unit is unavailable, use the [Refresher Sheet on CPTED](#).
6. Research indicates burglars often commit crimes within one mile of their own residence or activity space. Knowing, monitoring, and making contact with burglary probationers nearby may help prevent future crimes.

Develop a “Case on a Place”

Crime often concentrates in specific locations (i.e., addresses and blocks), and these concentrations are often stable over long periods. Officers can develop more effective responses to these chronic problem places by creating a “case” on a place (just as a detective might open a case file investigating a crime), collecting “evidence” such as crime trends and problems, as well as actors, social and physical features, and other aspects of places which facilitate the persistent crime problems.

The [“case of place” template](#)⁴ is a freely available case folder template to create an investigative case file on a place. This tool provides guidance on collecting and using police data, observations, and other community information to analyze crime problems at hot spots to develop responses. This involves analyses of:

- A location’s crime patterns and trends;
- Specific persons or groups who are linked to crime problems at the location, particularly as repeat offenders or victims;
- Specific problem addresses that are the subject of repeat calls for service;
- Businesses (such as convenience stores and bars) and environmental conditions (such as poorly lit areas and abandoned buildings or vehicles) that may cause, facilitate, or attract crime;
- The presence of guardians (examples are provided in the [“Seeking Partners for Prevention”](#) play) that might assist law enforcement in their efforts to deter offending and address problems.

⁴ Developed by Lum and Koper for the Matrix Demonstration Project

Thefts from Construction Sites

CONDITION: Copper wire and other materials theft from construction sites or other unsecured property.

1. Request problem analysis from crime analysts on highest-risk places, times, and types of locations. Also request information on high-risk scrap shops nearby.
2. Meet with place managers at the site to work together on target hardening, including signage, secured fencing, cameras, etc. Partner with detectives unit to push for investigative resources into scrap shops
3. Increase targeted, intermittent and unpredictable patrols in high-crime locations. See the [Directed Koper Patrols](#) play.
4. Apply specific suggestions on addressing this problem using the POP Center's Problem-Oriented Approach (<http://www.popcenter.org/library/reading/pdfs/constructiontheft.pdf>)

Trust & Confidence Plays

The 3-1-1 Play

CONDITION: This play is designed to improve positive exchanges and customer service with citizens. Like the Directed Koper Patrol play, this play is especially amenable to shorter periods when an officer is not committed to answering a call for service but may not have enough time to develop a problem-solving approach.

SUPERVISORS: Be a resource to your officers by knowing how to access “open” 3-1-1 calls that have yet to receive a follow-up.

1. Find out how to access 3-1-1 calls, (see supervisory note above) and determine which calls have not received a response.
2. Follow up on specific calls for service in your area of responsibility, preferably by visiting individuals in person if the issue is not sensitive, or by calling the individual.
3. Even if a complaint cannot be remedied, a follow-up visit to ask for more information or to express empathy can foster trust, confidence, and citizen satisfaction with police service.
4. Use the information provided by 3-1-1 calls to assist with other problem-solving activities you are conducting.
5. If possible, develop tangible approaches to dealing with a particular problem, and when tasks are completed, report back to the complainant as to what was done.

Follow-Up Play

CONDITION: This play can be used for various conditions but can be helpful after a crime has been reported to the police. The Follow-Up Play may be particularly useful when a crime is not assigned to a detective for further investigation.

1. Make multiple attempts to contact the victim of the reported crime. Officers should use their judgment when interacting with each individual and do their best to express empathy and understanding. For example, “I’m sorry this happened to you.” “We just wanted to check in to see if you are okay.” “How have you been doing since this happened?”

2. Review the crime report with the victim and try to gather additional information. The victim may remember additional information about the crime event, suspect, witness, or other information, or have other information to provide the officer. Write a supplemental report for any information gathered and provide new information to detective units when applicable.

3. Thank the individual for their time and provide additional contact information or resources as needed. There may be additional resources available for various types of crimes and victims (domestic violence, victim assistance fund, substance abuse or mental health support, etc.) that officers can provide (or serve as a connecting agent).

4. Conduct additional investigative activity if needed. Victims may provide additional information that requires follow-up or investigative activity by patrol, specialized, or investigative units.

Improving Exchanges with Citizens

Here, we provide general guidance for high-quality exchanges with citizens, including those who report crime, suspects, victims, witnesses, bystanders, and others. [Research shows](#) that when officers act in these ways, they can increase citizen satisfaction with their services and potentially increase cooperation and compliance, even when outcomes may not be favorable to that individual (e.g., the person is being arrested or a case cannot be resolved).

1. Treat parties professionally, respectfully, fairly, and with restraint and empathy. This includes avoiding foul language, judgment, and ridicule.
2. Respect an individual's privacy.
3. Be neutral to all parties involved.
4. Explain to individuals the reason why you stopped them and the actions you will or have taken.
5. Explain to individuals your broader crime prevention goals and the reasons for your actions.
6. Ask victims and witnesses what they want to see happen, or ask community members for input on addressing a problem.
7. Be empathetic by imagining yourself in the individual's shoes.
8. Thank people for their time, statements, and cooperation.

Seeking Partners for Prevention

Research indicates that police can improve their effectiveness and legitimacy by partnering with others to solve problems. Partners you may consider for your problem-solving efforts can include the following:

1. Place managers can help increase your ability to strengthen guardianship at a location: Place managers include apartment/high-rise owners and property managers, supervisors, valets, door/front desk attendants, parking garage attendants, private security guards, school principals, church leaders, neighborhood block captains, and even non-person managers such as surveillance technologies. Ways to partner: Know who they are and where they are located; make contact and have regular meetings or follow-ups; ask them for input on how to deal with problems; keep them informed through an email or social media system.

2. Your local crime analyst. Many of the proactive strategies in this Playbook require information that crime analysts can generate. Learn what they do, how they can help, the types of information they collect, and their thoughts on how you might be more proactive. The CEBCP has free resources on using crime analysis for [operations](#), [command](#), and [first-line supervision](#). Leaders should advocate for increasing personnel and resources for crime analysis units.

3. Social and community services. In the area you patrol, social and community services may be available for high-risk families and youth that provide addiction services or reentry and employment resources, or community groups

that specialize in tackling retaliation after critical incidents. You can provide this information to citizens but also consider partnering with these groups to help facilitate certain plays.

4. **Municipal services** that can help with physical disorder (clean-up and repair); agencies that enforce various health and safety codes; and civil attorneys for the jurisdiction that can assist with nuisance abatement

5. **Probation and parole.** Understanding who the high-risk individuals are may require accessing updated information on repeat offenders through probation and parole offices. This may be useful for plays such as [Burglary Prevention](#), [Focused Deterrence](#), or [Gun Crimes and Shootings](#).

6. **State's Attorneys.** Partnering with the state's attorneys is needed for the [Focused Deterrence play](#), but might also be useful for gang-related interventions related to [gun crimes](#).

7. **Researchers.** Many researchers are interested in partnering with local police agencies to develop strategies to prevent crime and improve citizen trust and confidence. A bank of nearby university-affiliated researchers who work on crime projects and evaluation can be found at the [eConsortium](#), a free resource from the CEBCP that links university researchers with criminal justice practitioners.

Refreshers

Refresher: CPTED

This material is summarized from the Center for Problem Oriented Policing's CPTED Resource, located at popcenter.asu.edu/content/using-cpted-problem-solving.

CPTED, or “Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design,” focuses on examining features of the environment and determining the opportunities they create for crime. Examples of these features are: bus stops where individuals congregate, trees and shrubbery that block visibility, lack of lighting, traffic direction or lack of signaling, abandoned buildings, alleyways or cuts in-between buildings, empty lots hidden from the street, etc.

CPTED focuses on reducing the opportunity for offending and crime by adjusting these environmental features. For example, this might include cutting down shrubbery to increase visibility, adding lighting to a dark alley, boarding up abandoned homes used for drug distribution or prostitution, or improving traffic conditions by adding signage, signals, speed bumps, etc.

The strategies and goals of CPTED are varied. Adjustments can be implemented to:

- control or make access more difficult
- deter offenders by increasing the risk of apprehension
- increase visibility
- increase or encourage guardianship
- regulate or adjust behaviors and routines
- reduce the rewards for crime

A related approach is “[Situational Crime Prevention](#)”, also provided below as a Refresher.

Refresher: Responding to Domestic Violence

Research evidence on police responses to domestic violence is complex. Studies examining the effects of arrest for misdemeanor domestic violence have produced mixed findings; some suggest that arrest deters future violence, while others indicate that it has no effect or that it may increase subsequent abuse by some offenders and have other long-term negative effects on the well-being of victims and offenders.

Several studies have also examined programs in which police conduct follow-up home visits with specially trained social workers (these are often referred to as “second responder” tactics). These visits are intended to provide the victim with information and access to resources and services, answer any questions the victim has about the complaint or the justice process, and encourage a sense of trust in the justice system. It is not clear that these visits reduce repeat violence, though evidence suggests they encourage more reporting of future abuse by victims.

Police can also use research-based, risk assessment instruments to identify cases at high risk for particularly severe (i.e., lethal or near-lethal) violence. One such instrument called the Lethality Assessment Program (which is being used in Maryland and elsewhere) is available here:

<https://www.mnadv.org/lethality-assessment-program/lap-program-overview-2/>. Officers can refer high-risk victims to social service providers for safety planning and other services. Recent evidence suggests that this strategy can reduce the frequency and severity of future violence experienced by victims and that it increases victims’ use of protective strategies.

Establishing a designated domestic violence unit that focuses on intensive investigation and victim assistance in domestic violence cases has also been successful in some studies.

Other tips that may improve the handling of domestic violence situations include the following:

1. Take photos of the victim, suspect, and scene if possible.
2. Speak to all parties, including the suspect, and try to lock in their version of the events.
3. Obtain from the victim the background and history of abuse, rather than only what happened in the particular incident to which you have responded. Add to the report any call or incident history you can obtain from the agency's information systems that provide more information about this victim or suspect.
4. Obtain a working phone number(s) from the victim and update it in the agency's information systems if necessary so the detective can follow up with the victim.
5. Obtain the names and ages of children present so the information can be forwarded to child protective services.
6. Forensic nurses may be available at the hospital to fully document the victim's injuries and account for what happened.
7. Ask if any of the assaults took place while the victim was calling 9-1-1 and include that information on the report so that detectives can pull the 9-1-1 call for court.
8. Leave a copy of any emergency protective order with the agency's domestic violence unit.

Information about grants designed to develop the nation's capacity to reduce domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking by strengthening services to victims and holding offenders accountable is also available here:

<http://www.justice.gov/ovw/grant-programs>.

The tips provided above were developed from a checklist used by a Fairfax County (Virginia) Police Department's domestic violence unit.

Refresher: Hot Spot Policing

We know that crime is incredibly concentrated: research studies in multiple jurisdictions continue to find that about 50% of a city’s serious crime is located at less than 5% of its addresses and street blocks. Hot Spot Policing is a general strategy of targeting crime concentrations with police resources.

Note: The term “hot spots policing” does not point to a specific tactic. A “hot spot” approach can be applied to many plays and simply means that a play is targeted to a specific place with high levels of persistent crime problems. However, what police do at hot spots matters to both their ability to prevent crime and maintain citizen trust and confidence. General visibility at crime hot spots may have some effect on deterring crime, but problem-solving approaches at crime hot spots may have greater long-term effects. Some strategies used at hot spots, such as high dosages of misdemeanor arrests or stop-question-and-frisks, have led to negative community reactions.

There is no agreement on what the size of hot spots should be. However, successful interventions tend to target locations that are much smaller than neighborhoods—they are often specific addresses, street blocks, intersections, alleys, floors/sections of a high-rise building, a section of a mall, certain places within a school or airport, or a section of a park.

Plays that target hot spots are more likely to be effective.

For more on Hot Spot Policing, see this handy summary: <http://cebcp.org/evidence-based-policing/what-works-in-policing/research-evidence-review/hot-spots-policing/>

Refresher: SARA Model and Problem-Oriented Policing

The SARA Model builds on Goldstein's *Problem-Oriented Policing* and was developed and coined by John Eck and William Spelman (1987) in *Problem solving: Problem-oriented policing in Newport News*. Washington, DC: Police Executive Research Forum.

The SARA model is a decision-making model that incorporates analysis and research, tailoring solutions to specific problems, and most importantly, evaluating the effectiveness of those responses. The acronym SARA stands for:

SCANNING: Identifying, prioritizing, and selecting problems that need addressing using data from police sources (like CAD or RMS) and community and citizen input.

ANALYSIS: Deeply analyzing the causes of the problem, including the underlying causes of repeated calls for service and crime incidents.

RESPONSE: Determining and implementing a response to a particular problem. Ideas for responses should be “evidence-based” when possible (see, for example, the [Matrix](#)) or at least tailored to the specific problem at hand using general principles of good crime prevention.

ASSESSMENT: Often the most ignored part of the SARA model, this requires assessing and evaluating the impact of a particular response, and the willingness to try something different if the response is ineffective.

For more information see [this Matrix resource](#) as well as the POP Center (<http://www.popcenter.org/>)

Refresher: Situational Crime Prevention

Ronald Clarke defined situational crime prevention as “comprising measures directed at highly specific forms of crime that involve the management, design, or manipulation of the immediate environment in as systematic and permanent a way as possible so as to reduce the opportunities for crime and increase its risks as perceived by a wide range of offenders.” (p. 225, in R.V. Clarke. (1983). *Situational Crime Prevention: Its Theoretical Basis and Practical Scope.*” In *Crime and Justice: An Annual Review of Research*, vol. 4, ed. by Michael Tonry and Norval Morris. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.)

In 2003, he and Derek Cornish produced the following chart, providing examples of 25 techniques for situational crime prevention in “Opportunities, Precipitators and Criminal Decisions: A Reply to Wortley’s Critique of Situational Crime Prevention” *Crime Prevention Studies* 16: 41-96.

The chart is reprinted here for your use. The 25 techniques are organized into five categories of measures, intended to (1) increase effort; (2) increase risks; (3) reduce rewards; (4) reduce provocations; and (5) remove excuses. These suggestions, while not all directly applicable to police work, may help officers to think about actions they can take on their own or in cooperation with other government and community partners to reduce opportunities for crime.

Increase the Effort	Increase the Risks	Reduce the Rewards	Reduce Provocations	Remove Excuses
1. Target harden: Steering column locks and immobilisers; Anti-robbery screens; Tamper-proof packaging	6. Extend guardianship: Take routine precautions: go out in group at night, carry phone; “Cocoon” neighborhood watch	11. Conceal targets: Off-street parking; Gender-neutral phone directories; Unmarked bullion trucks	16. Reduce frustrations and stress: Efficient queues and polite service; Expanded seating; Soothing music/muted lights	21. Set rules: Rental agreements; Harassment codes; Hotel registration
2. Control access to facilities: Entry phones; Electronic card access; Baggage screening	7. Assist natural surveillance: Improved street lighting; Defensible space design; Support whistleblowers	12. Remove targets: Removable car radio; Women’s refuges; Pre-paid cards for pay phones	17. Avoid disputes: Separate enclosures for rival soccer fans; Reduce crowding in pubs; Fixed cab fares	22. Post instructions: “No Parking”; “Private Property”; “Extinguish camp fires”
3. Screen exits: Ticket needed for exit Export documents Electronic merchandise tags	8. Reduce anonymity: Taxi driver IDs “How’s my driving?” decals School uniforms	13. Identify property: Property marking Vehicle licensing and parts marking Cattle branding	18. Reduce emotional arousal: Controls on violent pornography Enforce good behavior on soccer field Prohibit racial slurs	23. Alert conscience: Roadside speed display boards Signatures for customs declarations “Shoplifting is stealing”
4. Deflect offenders: Street closures; Separate bathrooms for women; Disperse pubs	9. Utilize place managers: CCTV for double-deck buses; Two clerks for convenience stores; Reward vigilance	14. Disrupt markets: Monitor pawn shops; Controls on classified ads; License street vendors	19. Neutralize peer pressure: “Idiots drink and drive”; “It’s OK to say No”; Disperse troublemakers at school	24. Assist compliance: Easy library checkout; Public lavatories; Litter bins
5. Control tools/ weapons: “Smart” guns; Disabling stolen cell phones; Restrict spray paint sales to juveniles	10. Strengthen formal surveillance: Red light cameras; Burglar alarms; Security guards	15. Deny benefits: Ink merchandise tags; Graffiti cleaning; Speed humps	20. Discourage imitation: Rapid repair of vandalism; V-chips in TVs; Censor details of modus operandi	25. Control drugs and alcohol: Breathalyzers in pubs; Server intervention; Alcohol-free events

Refresher: Stop-and-Frisk

Stop, question and frisk, also known as “Terry stops,” “Terry frisks,” or “pedestrian stops” should only be used when legally/constitutionally justified, and with the highest levels of [professionalism, respectfulness, restraint and empathy](#). Some important points to remember:

1. Stop and frisk are two separate acts with two separate legal standards. For the stop *only* (no frisk), officers must have reasonable suspicion that an individual **is about to commit/has just committed a crime**.
2. If the officer chooses to stop *and* frisk, the officer must have reasonable suspicion that the individual **is armed and presently dangerous**. Note that it is unconstitutional to conduct a stop and frisk to search for drugs.
3. If the officer does have reasonable suspicion that the individual is armed and proceeds with patting down a person’s outer clothing, and it becomes immediately apparent that what the officer is touching is contraband, then those drugs can be seized.
4. Stop and frisk has increasingly led to negative citizen reactions to police behavior, likely because of its excessive use in searching for drugs. Stop and frisk can only be used when constitutional, within high-violence areas, and with professionalism, respectfulness, restraint and empathy.

Other Ideas & Resources

Ten Ideas for Supervisors

The Playbook relies on a stronger relationship between supervisors and officers. Below are ten ideas for first line supervisors to help their officers implement the Playbook:

1. Consider a **working group approach** with your units, meeting regularly to determine conditions and problems, working on existing and new plays, and developing ideas for implementing plays during non-committed time.
2. **Analyze the amount of non-committed time** in your squad on an average day. Determine the style of each officer in your unit in terms of how they use their downtime and encourage them to adapt their own styles and interests in using various plays.
3. **Acknowledge and recognize officers** who use plays and help them record the use of plays on their monthly performance measures. Develop regular exchanges with officers, providing them with **feedback and suggestions**.
4. **Review and discuss “Refreshers”** with officers as a group. For the “[Improving Exchanges with Citizens](#)” play, try roll playing with officers with specific scenarios.
5. **Understand the body of knowledge** regarding effective measures police can take to reduce crime and increase citizens’ trust, confidence and satisfaction (see the many [resources](#) provided below).

6. Help **connect officers with crime analytic resources**. Many plays require officers to access crime analysis, crime maps, repeat offender information, etc.
7. If crime analysis is not readily available, **help officers develop alternatives** to identify problem places or conditions. For example, identifying specific addresses that generate high levels of calls for service, collecting and examining past incident reports, or asking community leaders about specific problem places or people.
8. **Be a resource for “[The 3-1-1 Play](#)”**. Know where to access past 3-1-1 calls so that officers can follow up with them on their downtime.
9. **Conduct plays with officers** and then debrief with them about their implementation of those plays, discussing their assessment of their activities and providing feedback to improve their actions when needed.
10. **Encourage officers** to be proactive, place-based, and problem-oriented. **Encourage officers** to consider the consequences of their actions with citizens and the community.

“One-Pagers”

Below is a list with links of all of the one-page summaries of research at the Center for Evidence-Based Crime Policy’s website that are relevant to policing.

1. [A Randomized Controlled Trial of Different Policing Strategies at Hot Spots of Violent Crime in Jacksonville](#) (Bruce G. Taylor, Christopher S. Koper, and Daniel J. Woods)
2. [An Experimental Study of Compressed Work Schedules in Policing: Advantages and Disadvantages of Various Shift Lengths](#) (Karen Amendola, David Weisburd, Edwin Hamilton, Greg Jones, and Meghan Slipka)
3. [Assessing Police Efforts to Reduce Gun Crime: Results from a National Survey](#) (Christopher Koper)
4. [Community Policing or Zero Tolerance? Preferences of Police Officers from 22 Countries in Transition](#) (Cynthia Lum)
5. [Do Broken Window Cause Crime?](#) (Sue-Ming Yang)
6. [Does Crime Just Move Around the Corner? A Controlled Study of Spatial Displacement and Diffusion of Crime Control Benefits](#) (David Weisburd, Laura Wyckoff, Justin Ready, John E. Eck, Joshua C. Hinkle, Frank Gajewski)
7. [Effect of Business Improvement Districts on Violent Crime in Los Angeles](#) (John MacDonald and Ricky Bluthenthal)
8. [Effects of Focused Deterrence Strategies on Crime](#) (Anthony Braga and David Weisburd)
9. [Effects of Second Responder Programs on Repeat Incidents of Family Abuse](#) (Robert C. Davis, David Weisburd, and Bruce Taylor; abstract from the Campbell Collaboration)
10. [Examining Research-Practice Partnerships in Policing Evaluations](#) (Julie Grieco, Heather Vovak, and Cynthia Lum)
11. [General Deterrent Effects of Police Patrol in Crime “Hot Spots”: A Randomized, Controlled Trial](#) (Lawrence W. Sherman and David Weisburd)

12. [Hot Spots of Juvenile Crime: A Longitudinal Study of Arrest Incidents at Street Segments in Seattle, Washington](#) (David Weisburd, Nancy A. Morris, and Elizabeth R. Groff)
13. [Hot Spots of Juvenile Crime: Findings From Seattle](#) (David Weisburd, Elizabeth Groff, and Nancy Morris)
14. [Impact of Project Safe Neighborhoods on Violent Crime](#) (Edmund F. McGarrell)
15. [Intelligence-Led Policing to Reduce Gang Corners and Crime in Camden](#) (Jerry Ratcliffe)
16. [Just Enough Police Presence: Reducing Crime and Disorderly Behavior by Optimizing Patrol Time in Crime Hot Spots](#) (Christopher Koper)
17. [License Plate Recognition Technology Project](#) (Cynthia Lum, Linda Merola, Julie Willis Hibdon, Breanne Cave)
18. [Police Efforts to Address Street-Level Drug Markets](#) (Cynthia Lum)
19. [Police Interventions to Reduce Violent Crime: A Review of Rigorous Research](#) (Cody W. Telep)
20. [Police Officers on Drug Corners in Philadelphia, Drug Crime, and Violent Crime: Intended, Diffusion, and Displacement Impacts](#) (Brian Lawton, Ralph Taylor, and Anthony Luongo)
21. [Police Officers on Drug Corners in Philadelphia, Drug Crime, and Violent Crime: Intended, Diffusion, and Displacement Impacts](#) (Brian Lawton, Ralph Taylor, and Anthony Luongo)
22. [Police Strategies to Reduce Illegal Possession and Carrying of Firearms: Effects on Gun Crime](#) (Christopher S. Koper and Evan Mayo-Wilson)
23. [Police Strategies to Reduce Illegal Possession and Carrying of Firearms: Effects on Gun Crime](#) (Christopher S. Koper and Evan Mayo-Wilson)
24. [Policing Crime and Disorder Hot Spots: A Randomized Controlled Trial](#) (Anthony Braga and Brenda Bond)
25. [Problem-Oriented Policing in Violent Crime Places: A Randomized Controlled Experiment](#) (Anthony Braga, David

Weisburd, Elin Waring, Lorraine Mazerolle, William Spelman, and Frank Gajewski)

26. [Project Safe Neighborhoods: A National Strategy to Locally Address Gun Violence](#) (Timothy S. Bynum)
27. [Receptivity to Research in Policing](#) (Cynthia Lum, Cody W. Telep, Christopher Koper, and Julie Grieco)
28. [The Effects of Problem-Oriented Policing on Crime and Disorder: A Systematic Review](#) (David Weisburd, Cody W. Telep, Joshua C. Hinkle, and John E. Eck)
29. [The Effects of Problem-Oriented Policing on Crime and Disorder: A Systematic Review](#) (David Weisburd, Cody W. Telep, Joshua C. Hinkle, and John E. Eck)
30. [The Impact of Higher Education on Police Officer Attitudes Towards Abuse of Authority](#) (Cody Telep)
31. [The Influence of Places on Police Decision Pathways: From Call for Service to Arrest](#) (Cynthia Lum)
32. [The Philadelphia Foot Patrol Experiment](#) (Jerry Ratcliffe, Elizabeth Groff, Jennifer Wood, Travis Taniguchi, Lallen Johnson, Caitlin McGuire-Taylor, Evan Sorg, and Cory Haberman)
33. [The Receptivity of Officers to Empirical Research and Evidence-Based Policing: An Examination of Survey Data from Three Agencies](#) (Cody W. Telep & Cynthia Lum)
34. [Trajectories of Crime at Places: A Longitudinal Study of Street Segments in the City of Seattle](#) (David Weisburd, Shawn Bushway, Cynthia Lum, and Sue-Ming Yang)

Resources & Videos

EVIDENCE-BASED POLICING RESOURCES

[What is Evidence-Based Policing?](#) Watch these free four 15-minute modules introducing evidence-based policing. Also visit the [CEBCP research program on Evidence-Based Policing](#).

[The Evidence-Based Policing Matrix](#) provides access to evaluations of police crime control interventions. Summaries of each study as well as groupings of studies and their findings by type of target are provided.

[The Matrix Demonstration Projects](#) provide ideas on using how to incorporate research findings into policing.

[The Evidence-Based Policing Hall of Fame](#). Read about others who have successfully implemented evidence-based approaches.

[Handy One-Page Summaries](#) of research studies on a wide variety of topics related to policing, crime and criminal justice more generally. These are also provided in the [One Pagers](#) resource above.

[CrimeSolutions.gov](#) provides summaries of evaluations on a wide variety of criminal justice practices, not just policing. <https://www.crimesolutions.gov/>

[Campbell Collaboration Systematic Reviews](#) provides reviews of rigorous research evaluations grouped by specific areas, for example, “drug enforcement”, “hot spots policing”, or “procedural justice”.

[Translational Criminology Magazine](#) provides examples of how research is being used in practice in multiple police agencies and criminal justice forums in the US as well as the UK and Australia.

RESOURCES ON THE USE OF CRIME ANALYSIS

[Crime Analysis for Operations](#). Watch these free mini-modules on how crime analysis can be effectively used for operations. Featuring Jamie Roush, crime analyst.

[Crime Analysis for First Line Supervisors](#). This video featuring Jamie Roush, crime analyst, focuses on crime analysis for first line supervisors.

[Crime Analysis for Commanders](#). Watch these free mini-modules on what commanders should know about crime analysis. Video featuring Jamie Roush, crime analyst.

[Crime and Place](#) video featuring David Weisburd

RESOURCES ON COMMUNITY TRUST

[Procedural Justice and Police Legitimacy](#) video featuring Professor Stephen Mastrofski

[Police-Youth Encounters](#). Watch this briefing featuring Professor Dennis Rosenbaum on police-youth encounters.

[Tackling Youth Crime and Disorder](#) video featuring John Paterson of the Scottish National Police.

[Young People's Encounters with the Police](#) video featuring Professor Susan McVie of the University of Edinburgh.

RESOURCES ON PROBLEM SOLVING

[The Center for Problem-Oriented Policing](#) provides ideas to law enforcement for specific crime problems and how to prevent them through a problem-solving approach. <http://www.popcenter.org/>

[Research on Problem-Oriented Policing](#). A summary of the research on problem-oriented policing.

RESOURCES ON SPECIFIC STRATEGIES

[Calibrating Hot Spots Policing for Deterrence](#) video featuring Professor Christopher Koper.

[Reducing Violence Across Cities and Cultures](#) video featuring Professor Robin Engel.

[Phoenix Ceasefire and Implications for Policing Gangs](#) video featuring Professor Chuck Katz

[What is the research on community policing?](#) Read more here.

RESOURCES ON POLICE POLICIES

[Research Evidence for Supervisors: Use of Force and Police Pursuits Policies](#) video featuring Professor Geoff Alpert

[Shift Study by the Police Foundation](#) video featuring Karen Amendola discussing study examining 8, 10, and 12 hour shifts

About the Authors

Cynthia Lum and Christopher Koper developed the Playbook in collaboration with law enforcement agencies to help translate crime prevention research in policing into everyday operations. They are professors in the [Department of Criminology, Law and Society at George Mason University](#). Professor Lum directs the [Center for Evidence-Based Crime Policy](#) at Mason, and Professor Koper is the Principal Fellow of the Center.

Together, they have sixty years of experience working with police agencies in the United States and abroad. Dr. Lum, a former police officer and detective specializes policing research and evaluation, with an emphasis on police technology, patrol, investigations, research translation and evidence-based policing. Dr. Koper, formerly a director of research at a policing think-tank specializes in firearms crime, hot spots policing, and research evaluation of police tactics and technologies.

They welcome your comments, questions, and suggestions on how to improve the Playbook.

[Cynthia Lum](#)

clum@gmu.edu

[Christopher Koper](#)

ckoper2@gmu.edu

Center for Evidence-Based Crime Policy
Department of Criminology, Law and Society
George Mason University
www.cebcop.org