



2024 Data & Research Fact Sheet

Developed by [Wellstone Collaborative Strategies](#) for Trailhead Institute

Overview

To define and monitor the problem, our process must be informed by data. Data and research are critical tools to identify the populations, locations, and even time periods for when firearm-related incidents occur. We also need data and research to understand the potential and actual effectiveness of interventions. Here we share existing data sources, some information about collecting data, and lastly some evaluation techniques.

Existing Statewide Data Sources

Colorado has several data sources available to understand firearm-related data. Note that specific data requests can be made for all the CDPHE-related data sources if needed.

- [Colorado Suicide Statistics](#) & [Colorado Homicide Statistics](#). Developed by the Colorado Department of Public Health and the Environment (CDPHE) using Colorado Violent Death Reporting System (CoVDRS) data.
- [Colorado Firearm Data Dashboard](#). Developed by the Colorado Office of Gun Violence Prevention (OGVP) at CDPHE in collaboration with the Injury and Violence Prevention Center at the University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus. This dashboard also pulls from CoVRDS data as well as several other state and national sources.
- [Healthy Kids Colorado Survey Dashboard](#). Biannual survey administered to middle and high school students. This data will be particularly useful to fill gaps from other sources. This survey is one of the only sources that includes sexual orientation and gender identity beyond male/female, which helps illuminate risk and protective factors for LGBTQIA+ young people.
- [Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System \(BRFSS\)](#). The BRFSS collects data on health-related risk behaviors and safety practices among adults. CDPHE adds questions about suicidal ideation and firearm safety. The BRFSS collects information about gender identity and sexual orientation.
- [Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment Data Home Page](#). The home page breadth of data CDPHE has for public use. In particular, rates of firearm-related injuries associated with emergency departments is available [here](#).
- [The Gun Violence Archive](#). The database “is an online archive of gun violence incidents collected from over 7,500 law enforcement, media, government and commercial sources daily in an effort to provide near-real time data about the results of gun violence.”
- [Evidence-based programs](#). There are also some repositories of evidence-based programs. For instance, the [Blueprints Program](#) provides evidence-based programs for youth.

1. Original Research

While the statewide data sources are incredible resources for understanding the problem, there is both a delay and a limited number of questions that can be asked from these sources. Therefore, it may be necessary to tap local sources to understand specific questions - such as risk and protective factors, the broader impact of firearm-related death and injury to the community, and information about perpetrators of violence -, delve deeper into topics, or understand the effectiveness of a new effort.

Quantitative: Quantitative data can be gathered locally and has the potential of being received closer to real time compared to statewide databases. These can be on near term lead indicators, typically about processes or programs. For instance, indicators may include how many people an initiative reached or what percentage of people thought an intervention would reduce firearm-related harm or violence. These indicators should predict whether we can achieve long-term outcomes and intermediate indicators. Long-term outcome measures typically focus on death and injury rates. Intermediate indicators focus on other important changes at the population level. Examples include the percentage of people making a plan to carry out suicide, drug/alcohol levels, or levels of gang violence or activity. Intermediate measures can be early signs of an increase or decrease of firearm-related harm or violence.

Qualitative: While numbers provide the overall picture, qualitative data can provide the insights necessary to understand a topic better. Qualitative data can help illustrate the challenge, understand the community’s vision, and identify potential solutions. Oftentimes qualitative research better highlights community perspectives. Surveys, interviews, focus groups, affinity focus groups, meetings in a box (where a community member hosts a conversation with their peers), online forums, and other methods can be highly effective at gathering important qualitative data.

2. Evaluation

Tracking progress is discussed in the implementation factsheet. We must also think about evaluation at the collaborative level, where more than one strategy is likely being implemented. Here is a brief overview of some evaluation techniques. In general, evaluation efforts will need to measure impact on three aspects of the work:

- 1) How the collaborative is functioning,
- 2) Whether strategies are collectively reducing harm and saving lives, and
- 3) If novel strategies look promising along the way.

This means several types of evaluation methods will be needed to determine effectiveness. Ultimately, however, they can fit into one evaluative framework to measure outcomes and leading indicators.

Lead Indicators are the near-term measures that the group believes will predict achieving outcomes. They are also within the group’s control. Lead indicators may include both process measures about how the collaborative work is going and external measures directly related to the efforts underway. This could include how effectively a strategy is being implemented (e.g., the number of people who participate in a program; the number of interventions; % of participants who thought an intervention was effective).

Intermediate Indicators might also be used. These are a bit outside the control of the group, but not quite outcomes. This could be measures like school climate or survey results from people who believe a program they participated in will help.

Long-Term Outcomes (or lag measures) are the ultimate impact the project is trying to achieve, such as a reduction in firearm-related suicides, domestic/intimate partner violence, community violence, or mass and targeted shootings.

Example Safety Indicators and Measures

Example Near-Term Leading Indicators	Example Intermediate Indicators	Example Long-term Outcome (Lag) Measures
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No. of participants • No. of participants indicating expected high impact. • Speed at which high-risk individuals are provided intervention. • Collaborative member attendance. • Ratio of early warning protocol being activated vs. early warning signs indicated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percent of people who made a plan to carry out suicide. • Levels of sobriety. • Levels of gang violence or activity. • Number of intimate partner violence related calls to public safety. • School culture measures. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of fatalities for focus population(s). • Rate of fatalities for focus population (s). • Number of injuries for focus population(s). • Rate of injuries for focus population(s).

