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## Overview of Local Evaluation Plans, Purpose, and Suggestions for Drafting

All BSCC grants require grantees to conduct an evaluation of how funds were spent and if project goals were met. The evaluation provides an opportunity to understand how the project was implemented; how the project evolved from the time that it was proposed to the time that it was completed; and what the outcomes of the project were. The BSCC uses this information to better understand how limited grant funds should be spent in the future and to develop more appropriate means to assist grantees in achieving what they set out to do with the funding.

The BSCC approach for evaluation asks the grantee to submit two documents. The Local Evaluation Plan (LEP)-- submitted near the start of the grant period—which outlines how each grantee plans to conduct the evaluation. The Local Evaluation Report (LER)-- submitted at the end of the grant period-- sums up the results of the evaluation. The LEP, the focus of this template, describes how the implementation and outcomes of the project will be monitored.

This template provides guidance for writing a LEP for your project. The sections that follow (“Project Background,” “Project Logic Model,” “Process Evaluation Method and Design,” and “Outcome Evaluation Method and Design”) will provide considerably more detail about the components, but they are summarized here:

1. Project Background: In this section, you will provide an overview of what you plan to do with the grant funds. This may include hiring staff (e.g., Research/Criminologist Analysts, Admin Staff, etc.), installation/deployment of surveillance equipment, task operations, MVAT/MAT operations, staffing real-time information/crime center, installation/implementation of software/database, public engagement, establish formal agreements/partnerships, diversion programs, etc.
2. Project Logic Model: In this section, you will create a visual depiction of your project. The logic model summarizes how your project operates, including the resources you need (e.g., funding, staff); the core project activities; and the intended outcomes of your program (e.g. increase in response time, increase in ORT cases filed, increase in ORT reported incidents, increase in investigative leads, increase in vehicles and goods recovered, etc.) Developing the logic model will also help form the backbone of your evaluation.
3. Process Evaluation Method and Design: A process evaluation focuses on understanding how the project was implemented. For example, if you set out to operate and staff a real-time information/crime center, were you able to? Did anything get in the way? What made it possible? This section will walk you through the steps of developing a process evaluation plan using your logic model as a guide.
4. Outcome Evaluation Method and Design: An outcome evaluation focuses on determining whether your project achieved its goals. For example, did you actually increase the number of ORT cases filed? Increase in response time to an ORT incident? This section will walk you through the steps of developing an outcome evaluation plan using your logic model as a guide.

Note: BSCC does not prescribe the research design or methodological rigor of your evaluation. Each grantee should design an evaluation that meets their needs and capabilities.

## Project Background

In this section you’ll provide information essential to understanding the nature and motivation for the project (i.e., the activities supported by the grant). Critical components of the project background and questions to address include:

* What information can you provide that is essential to understanding the need for the project, including information about:
* The problem(s) that the project is intended to address or the need(s) within the community.
* The purpose of the project as it relates to the identified problem(s)/need(s) and the grantee.
* What is the scope of the project?
* What activities and/or services will the project provide and what was the process for determining those activities and/or services?
* Are there or have there been similar projects with other community-based organizations or government entities (if known)? If so, describe them and explain how this project is or is not different.
* How will the project’s activities and/or services address the problem(s)/need(s) described?
* Who/what area is the target of the project? Is it aimed at a certain city, county, retail area? Specific retailers in need of ORT prevention/deterrent? If your project also includes a diversion program, how many participants is your program expected to serve?
	+ What is the process for determining target areas and what they need and will receive?
* What are the project’s goals and objectives (these were the ones you outlined in your application and contract for the grant)?
	+ Goals are defined by broad statements of what the program intends to accomplish, representing long-term intended outcome of the program.
	+ Objectives are defined by statements of specific, measurable aims of program activities. Objectives detail the tasks that must be completed to achieve the goals.
	+ Examples:
		- **Goal:** Improved response to ORT and motor vehicle (MV) thefts in Example city and the region.
			* **Objectives:** 1) implement proven theft prevention and investigation technology (ALPRs, patrol, etc.), 2) develop a dedicated ORT Team to conduct investigations and special field operations, and 3) collaborate with regional law enforcement partners, DA offices, and retailers/businesses.
		- **Goal:** Increased Awareness that Example Agency is emphasizing preventing and deterring ORT.
			* **Objectives:** 1) conduct public outreach and education, 2) place paid advertisements in local and regional print and online media, 3) issue press releases to successes including significant arrests, case progress, etc., and 4) be active in social media.
		- **Goal:** Reduce Catalytic Converter Theft in Example City.
			* **Objectives:** 1) Implement a crime prevention program to permanently mark/etch the catalytic converters on high-risk vehicles, 2) use hotspot policing and problem solving to target locations likely to have a disproportionate amount of catalytic converter theft, and 3) create focused deterrence by using undercover officers to purchase stolen catalytic converters in an undercover storefront recycling operation.
		- **Goal:** Standardize all County LEAs on a single investigative and reporting platform.
			* **Objectives:** 1) implement Countywide LE platform for all participating agencies, 2) implement the Ai Ex Machina reporting solution for all County LEAs, and 3) train staff on new platform.

Start your narrative for the Background section here.

## Project Logic Model

The logic model is a visual representation of the project. It demonstrates how the project functions, including the resources needed to operate the program and the activities that the program offers. It also depicts how these project activities are expected to contribute to the program’s goals or expected outcomes. All of the project goals should be represented in the logic model in some way (typically in the expected outcomes and/or impacts). The goals will likely be reflected in the outcomes column, as they reflect the outcomes you hope to achieve through your project. The objectives will likely be reflected in the activities/outputs, as they reflect the tasks that must be completed to achieve the goals. It is valuable to develop a logic model for your project because it helps to guide evaluation efforts. In Appendix A, we provide a more examples of what might go into each logic model category.

Logic models typically include the following categories:

* Inputs/Resources:
	+ - What resources are being used to support the project? This should include anything the project uses to operate grant-funded activities. Common examples: staff, funding, partners, etc.
* The ORT VP Grant funds are one resource. Are you drawing on other funds? Will you be partnering or contracting with another agency, such as a community-based organization, police department, sheriff’s department, or DA office(s)? Will staff time be needed to execute the project and activities?
* Activities:
	+ What does the project do with the inputs or services (in alignment with project goals)?
	+ For example, for a project that is designed to increase in response time to calls relating to ORT, you might include “deploy/install surveillance equipment (e.g. ALPRs, PTZ /FLOCK cameras, Drone, tracking devices, etc.)” as an activity. For a project that is designed to increase ORT cases filed, the activity might be “Install and implement software/database systems to aid in ORT investigations (e.g. investigative software, Starchase, etc.).”
* Outputs:
	+ - The outputs section typically quantifies what happens as a result of the activities. For example, if the project accomplishes the activity of hiring of staff, then the output might be the number FTE staff assigned to ORT over the course of the grant. If the project sets out to conduct Task Operations (e.g. patrol, blitz, enforcement, fence, sting, etc.), the output may be number of arrests per month of the grant. If the project plans to conduct public engagement (e.g. community events, educational/informational publishing or social media posting, press releases, advertisement, etc.), the output may be the number social media posts, billboards, posters, press releases, etc. relating to ORT per month/year of grant.
* Questions you might ask yourself to identify outputs include: As a result of the activity, how many of X is the project expected to deliver throughout the grant or per month/year of the grant? How will I know when the activity accomplished what it set out to do (e.g., all staff were trained on new equipment/software; formal agreements were established).
* Outcomes:
* What immediate, specific, and measurable changes are expected to be observed due to the project?
	+ - If the outputs are achieved, then this is the change we expect to see.
		- Outcomes can be grouped by:
			* Short-Term: occur during the grant cycle; observable over weeks or a couple of months.
			* Medium-Term: occur during the grant cycle; observable over several months or years.
		- If your project is installing surveillance equipment (e.g. ALPRs, PTZ /FLOCK cameras, Drone, tracking devices, etc.) then the outcome might be things like increase in response time or increase in ORT cases filed (due to evidence from surveillance equipment). If your project is to standardize all County LEAs on a single investigative and reporting platform, a short-term goal might be improvement in timeliness and organization of ORT cases or increase in ORT cases, and the medium-term goal might be improved conviction rates for ORT cases.
* Impacts:
* How is the project expected to affect the community, city, and/or county?
	+ - This can include fundamental, intended or unintended, changes that occur in organizations, communities, or systems because of the project activities beyond the grant cycle.
		- Impacts are societal/economic/civic/environmental-focused and may be the same or similar to long-term outcomes (typically occurring beyond the grant cycle). This is where you might think “big picture” about the downstream effects of your program.

**Sample Logic Model:**

**Examples:**

- Hiring (e.g. Research/Criminologist Analysts, Admin staff, etc.)

- Installation of surveillance equipment (e.g. ALPRs, PTZ /FLOCK cameras, Drone, tracking devices, etc.)

- Task Operations (e.g. patrol, blitz, enforcement, fence, sting, etc.)

- MVAT/MAT operations (e.g. bait car, catalytic converter etching, etc.)

- Real-time information/crime center

- New equipment and technology training

- Software/database system (e.g. investigative software, Starchase, etc.)

- Public engagement (e.g. community events, educational/informational publishing or social media posting, press releases, advertisement, etc.)

- Formal agreements or partnerships with online or local retailers and businesses

- Diversion programs

### Outcomes

Activities

Impacts

Outputs

Inputs

**Examples:**

- Financial support (e.g., ORT Prevent Grant funding)

- Staffing

- Organizational tools (e.g., committees, data collection and tracking tools, etc.)

- Partners (e.g. DA offices, police departments, sheriff departments, academic institutions, community organizations, etc.)

- Other (e.g., resources that are unique to your program, the region, state, etc.)

Intended Result

Planned Work

**Examples:**

- Improved economic outcomes

 > Business decrease in shrink/loss

 > Business stay in neighborhoods/communities

- Reduced recidivism

- Safer community through reduced ORT crimes

**Examples:**

- Increase in public awareness and knowledge of ORT

- Improvement in response time

- Increase in ORT cases filed

- Improvement in timeliness and organization of ORT cases

* Improved conviction rates for ORT cases

- Improved quality and timeliness of information sharing between law enforcement, DA offices, and local and online retailers

- Increase in reported ORT incidents from businesses

- Increase investigative leads in ORT

- Improved knowledge of ORT trends (e.g. large ORT operations, hot spots/areas, hot vehicles targeted, etc.)

- Increase in vehicles and goods recovered

**Examples:**

- Surveillance added to 3 retail/shopping areas

- 6 FTE staff assigned to ORT over the course of the grant

* Quarterly meetings with local and online retailers and businesses

- 800 ORT incidents recorded per month of grant

- 400 arrests relating to ORT per month of grant

- 25 ORT case referrals provided to DA per year of the grant

- 16 hours/year of new equipment and technology training

- 300 catalytic converters etched and tracked per year of grant

- 100 stolen vehicles tracked per year of grant

- 120 social media posts relating to ORT per year of grant

- 5 task operations per month of grant

- 50 individuals provided alternatives to incarceration

**Provide a logic model for your project.**

The template for the logic model is provided below as an option. Use of this template is not required but may help save some time when developing the project’s logic model.

**Sample Logic Model:**

### Outcomes

Activities

Impacts

Outputs

Inputs



Intended Result

Planned Work

## Process Evaluation Method and Design

A process evaluation documents the services and activities that were implemented. It aims to determine if the program was implemented as expected. Process evaluations typically focus on the first three columns of your logic model: inputs/resources, activities, and outputs. Process evaluations often answer questions such as:

* What resources were needed to implement the project?
* What activities were offered during the course of the project? What was the intensity of activities (e.g., how many ALPRs were installed? How many tracking devices used? How many trainings were offered? How often were diversion programs used? How often was the new equipment/software installed used? How many task operations were conducted? How many MVAT/MAT operations?)? Did the activities conducted align with the expected activities?
* Who were the target(s) of the activities that were offered (e.g., How many staff were trained? How many staff did you hire? How many staff were part of task force/MVAT/MAT operations? Which areas did the task operations take place?)? Did the number of staff hired/required align with expectations? Did the task operations lead to the expected number of arrests?
* What were the barriers or challenges to implementing the program? What facilitated implementation of the program?

In this section of the LEP, you should cover the following topics:

* What are the inputs/resources, activities, and outputs that you will be assessing?
* What is the specific data element you’ll be looking for to measure each of those inputs/resources, activities, and outputs? Examples might be number of ORT incidents recorded per month of grant, stolen vehicles tracked per year of grant, catalytic converters etched and tracked per year of grant, social media posts relating to ORT per year of grant, task operations per month of grant, ORT investigations per year of the grant, or ORT cases filed per year of the grant.
* What data sources will you use for each data element? Some possibilities include case management information system, agency database and other tracking systems/software.
* How often will you collect the data?
* If implementation goes as expected, how will you document project facilitators – that is, the factors that were in place that helped you to be able to execute this project (e.g., presence of certain staff members, availability of funding, collaboration with external partners)? If implementation does not go as expected, how will you document project barriers or challenges?

To create this plan, it is highly suggested you create an evaluation matrix based on the input/resources, activities, and outputs column of your logic model. In this table, there is a single column for you to indicate the inputs/resources, activities, and outputs from your logic model; a column to identify the data element; a column to indicate the data source; and a column to indicate the frequency of data collection.

Additionally, your LEP must answer the following items in narrative form:

* What is the process evaluation research design to be used (Mixed Methods, Quantitative, Qualitative, Descriptive, etc.)?
* What is the project oversight structure and overall decision-making process for the project? Who will be responsible for leading the team(s) and making project-level decisions?
* How will the project components will be monitored, determined effective, and adjusted as necessary? Who will be responsible for these processes? Perhaps the project lead in conjunction with an informed outside evaluator will direct these steps.
* What are the procedures which ensure that the project will be implemented to fidelity?
* How will all quantitative and qualitative process data will be analyzed? Include a description of the statistical tools used to analyze quantitative data (e.g., descriptive statistics, chi-square, etc.) and your method used for analyzing qualitative data, if applicable (identifying themes, content analysis, etc.).

For example:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Input/Resource/Activity/Output**  | **Data Element(s)** | **Data Source(s)** | **Frequency of Data Collection** |
| 400 arrests relating to ORT per month of the grant | # of arrests | Case management system, database | Each time an individual is arrested, or monthly/quarterly? |
| 300 catalytic converters etched and tracked per year of grant | # of catalytic converters etched | Internal database, investigative software, records | Each time an operation is completed, monthly/quarterly? |
| 6 FTE staff assigned to ORT over the course of the grant | # of staff assigned to ORT | Employment records, Case management system | Annually throughout duration of grant |
| Installation of surveillance equipment (e.g. ALPRs, PTZ /FLOCK cameras, Drone, tracking devices, etc.) | # of equipment installed/deployed | Internal database, investigative software, invoicing, records | Monthly/quarterly |
| Public engagement (e.g. community events, educational/informational publishing or social media posting, press releases, advertisement, etc.) | # of events attended, # of social media posts, # of paid advertisements, # of press releases | Internal database, investigative software, invoicing, records | Each time a case an event occurs throughout duration of grant, monthly/quarterly |
| Utilization of Diversion programs | # of individuals diverted, provided alternatives to incarceration | Case management system  | Each time an individual is provided alternative to incarceration throughout duration of grant |
| 50 ORT cases filed per year of the grant | # of ORT cases filed | Case management system | Each time a case is filed |
| Improved conviction rates for ORT cases | # of ORT prosecutions and # of ORT cases filed | Case management system | Each time a case is closed |

Note that sometimes the entries in the activity and output sections of your logic model may seem redundant. For example, if the activity is “hire and train Research Analysts,” your outputs might be “number of Research Analysts hired” and “number of Research Analysts trained.” In this case, you do not necessarily need a separate row for each of those three entries. Instead, as in the example, you might include just the more specific outputs. That is, you don’t need to include a row in your table for “hire one Research Analyst” and “train one Research Analyst”. Instead, you could just include rows for “number of Research Analysts hired” and “number of Research Analysts trained” because they are more specific, as shown in the “6 FTE staff assigned to ORT over the course of the grant” example above.

 Start matrix and narrative for the Process Evaluation Method and Design section here.

## Outcome Evaluation Method and Design

An outcome evaluation examines the project’s results, or outcomes and impacts. It answers the questions such as:

* Did the project achieve its expected changes at the targeted area, city, community, or county level?
* Was there anything you learned during the process evaluation that might explain outcomes? For example, if you conducted five task force operations a month, but then had less arrests than expected, does it explain how effective those task force operations were?

Your outcome evaluation will focus on the short-term and medium-term outcomes identified through your logic model, as you likely will not have the opportunity to observe the long-term impacts during the grant period. If you will not be able to measure the long-term impacts during the grant period, you can simply include it in your description but indicate why it cannot be observed.

In this section of the LEP, you should cover the following topics:

* What are the outcomes that you will be assessing? For example, this might be “increase in reported ORT incidents from retailers/businesses.” Or “increase investigative leads in ORT.”
* What is your definition of the outcome? For example, to define “improvement in response time,” you might specifically look for changes in the amount of time it takes for LEAs to be present at an ORT incident that is reported/called in. To define, “Increase investigative leads in ORT,” you might look at changes to the number of ORT cases being actively worked. To define “improved conviction rates for ORT cases,” you might look for changes in the number of ORT convictions in relation to the number of ORT cases filed.
* What data source will you use? For example, when measuring changes in the increase in vehicles and goods recovered, what database or software tracking system will you use? When measuring improved quality and timeliness of information sharing between DA offices, law enforcement, and local and online retailer, will you track results based on the number of partnerships, joint activities, and/or time it took for the case to be filed? Are the data sources you describe currently available through existing records or systems, or are they new ones proposed specifically for the project?
* How often will data be collected?
* How will you know that the change was due to the project, and are there any limitations to your approach?
	+ For example, the goal of increasing ORT cases filed might be due to other factors that were not an expected output from your activity. Will you track the number of ORT cases filed as a result the added staff and be able to compare it to when you did not have the staff? Or were the increase/decrease in number of ORT cases due to the availability of evidence provided from the Real-time information/crime centers and investigative software? Do you have the resources to compare with a control group possibly, so you can see if the change was a direct result of your hiring of new staff or your deployment of RTIC/RTCC and improved investigative software.
	+ As another example, should you want to improve timeliness and organization of ORT cases, measuring the number the time it took to file an ORT case before and after allotting additional resources to those efforts would be the ideal way to determine if the change (increase) seen was a result of these efforts and not some outside influence.
* How will you analyze data, if relevant? Will you simply compare over time? Do you have staff capability or expertise that would allow for any more sophisticated statistical analysis?

To create this plan, it is highly suggested you create an evaluation matrix based on the outcome and impacts columns of your logic model. You may also be able to draw on the program goals and objectives as described above, as the goals might map onto the “outcomes” and the objectives might map onto the “definitions.”

Additionally, your LEP must answer the following items in narrative form:

* What is the outcome evaluation research design to be used (Mixed Methods, Quantitative, Qualitative, Descriptive, etc.)? This design may be the same or similar to the process evaluation research design, but each should be detailed in the narrative.
* What is your project’s evaluation questions? These must include the goals and objectives from the original proposal. And align with the intent of the LEP and evaluation matrix.
	+ What are the estimated number of activities accomplished?
	+ What are the criteria for determining the activity completion and/or success in the project? What steps must be accomplished for the project to deem that activity successfully completed (e.g. one ALPR camera installed, one drone deployed, one training session is conducted, one task force operation is conducted, an ORT case is opened, one ORT case referral made)?
* How will all quantitative and qualitative outcome data will be analyzed? Include a description of the statistical tools used to analyze quantitative data (e.g., descriptive statistics, chi-square, etc.) and your method used for analyzing qualitative data (identifying themes, content analysis, etc.). This description may be the same or similar to the process evaluation methodologies, but each should be detailed in the narrative.
* What is the strategy for determining whether outcomes are due to the project and not some other factor(s) unrelated to the project? Was a comparison group used? Was a review of policy and system changes outside of grantee efforts reviewed and noted throughout the project?

For example:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome** | **Definition** | **Data Source(s)** | **Frequency of Data Collection** |
| Improvement in response time | Decrease in the amount of time it takes for LEA to be present at an ORT incident that is reported/called in | Internal database, investigative software, Case management system | Each time an incident is reported, monthly/quarterly? |
| Increase in reported ORT incidents from businesses/retailers | Increase in the number of ORT incidents reported/called in by businesses/retailers | Internal database, investigative software, Case management system | Each time an incident is reported, monthly/quarterly? |
| Increase investigative leads in ORT | Increase in the number of ORT cases being actively worked | Internal database, investigative software, Case management system | Each time an action is taken on an ORT case, monthly/quarterly |
| Increase in stolen vehicles and goods recovered | Increase in the number of stolen vehicles and the amount of goods recovered | Internal database, investigative software, Case management system | Each time an operation is completed, monthly/quarterly |
| Increase in ORT cases filed | Increase in the number of ORT cases filed | Case management system | Each time a case is filed |
| Improved conviction rates for ORT cases | Increase in the number of ORT convictions in relation to the number of ORT cases filed. | Case management system | Each time a case is closed |
| Improved quality and timeliness of information sharing between DA offices, law enforcement, and local and online retailer | Increase in collaboration between agencies in gathering information and evidence to file ORT cases | Case management system | Each time a case is filed |

Start matrix and narrative for the Outcome Evaluation Method and Design section here.

## Appendix A: Additional Logic Model Guidance

In this section, we provide additional guidance for developing your logic model. If you find that the information above contains too much evaluation jargon, or you are having a hard time articulating the inputs/resources, activities, outputs, and outcomes of your project, some of the applied examples in this section might help.

Inputs/Resources: Describe the resources that you will be using for your project. One key resource is grant funding through the ORT VP Grant Program. Are there other resources you will be drawing on? For example, is there a specific evidence-based programming curriculum you plan to use? Partnerships for joint activities/operations, trainings, and/or referrals? Are staff going to be trained on the new equipment/software? What systems will be used to collect data for evaluation? These would all be listed as inputs/resources.

Activity: Put into a sentence, your primary intention (or *activity* in classic evaluation-speak). For example, “Install ALPRs at retail location to deter and prevent ORT;” “Hire 3 FTE staff and assign them to ORT to aid in installation and implementation of software/database;” or “Staff and operate the RTIC/RTCC to provide real-time information and gather evidence in aiding arrests relating to ORT.”

Outputs: Next, think about what would happen if you performed the activity as intended. In classic evaluation-speak those results are known as *outputs*. We are not talking about the ultimate consequences of the activity (outcomes), but instead, merely describing what is supposed to happen as a result of the activity. For example, the output might be “6 FTE staff assigned to ORT over the course of the grant;” “800 ORT incidents recorded per month of grant;” “100 stolen vehicles tracked per year of grant;” “quarterly meetings with local and online retailers and businesses;” “25 ORT case referrals provided to DA per year of the grant;” “35 individuals provided alternatives to incarceration through Diversion programs;” or “40 ORT investigations per year of the grant.” An obvious purpose of the LER will be to inform BSCC of the degree to which these outputs were actually achieved and to describe the reasons for any shortfall.

Outcomes: Then, think about the immediate reason for the outputs if they are in fact achieved. You didn’t seek grant funds simply to spend money hiring people, buying things, etc. Instead, you were hoping to achieve some sort of tangible purpose (*outcomes* in evaluation-speak). Outcomes might be stated as “increase in public awareness and knowledge of ORT,” “increase in reported ORT incidents from businesses,” “improved knowledge of ORT trends (e.g. large ORT operations, hot spots/areas, hot vehicles targeted, etc.),” “increase in ORT cases filed”, or “improved conviction rates for ORT cases.”

Identifying outcomes is a very important aspect of a logic model and development of an LEP because they pinpoint areas that might serve as datapoints for measuring progress towards project goals and objectives. For example, one could compare the number of arrests relating to ORT cases prior to the task force operations. An increase in that value would be evidence that the project had moved towards its goals and objectives. Note that a final report that described a stable number or a decrease would not necessarily be a negative finding. It could have been, for example, that the number of arrests did not see an expected increase, due to the task force operations occurring during times when ORT was not as active. It could also be that various issues delayed the operations (e.g. weather, staffing, equipment, public safety, etc.). Similarly, a high number or increase in the number of arrests related ORT could be representative of other programs or activities in operation (e.g. RTIC/RTCC, ALPRs, etc.). It is important that the grantee documents why expectations were not met.

Impacts: Finally, consider the high-level, broader results (*impacts* in evaluation-speak) of the grant if the outputs are achieved as hoped for and the outcomes evidence progress. These are the potential long-term effects of the grant project, which may involve your organization, your participants, your community, or even the criminal justice system. Unlike outputs and outcomes, your LER may not be reporting on whether impacts are actually achieved as intended, in part because they might not happen for within the duration of the grant period, and in part because they can be extremely difficult to measure. Nevertheless, describing potential impacts is a helpful thought-exercise and provides policymakers with a long- term perspective of what grants like the one(s) you’ve received might accomplish. Don’t be afraid to consider potential impacts that are not necessarily positive.

Examples of impacts might include safe community as a result of reduction in ORT; or improvements economic outcomes due to business growth and decrease in shrink losses, as well as reduced recidivism for repeat offenders in ORT cases from Diversion programs.