

California Violence Intervention and Prevention (CalVIP) Grant Program

Cohort 3 Grantees

Guidance for the Development of Local Evaluation Plans (LEPs) and Local Evaluation Reports (LERs)

February 26, 2021

Prepared for:

Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC)
2590 Venture Oaks Way, Suite 200
Sacramento, CA 95833

Prepared by:

Social Policy Research Associates, Inc.
1333 Broadway Street, Suite 310
Oakland, CA, 94612

Contents

Local Evaluation Plan Guidance.....	1
A. Cover Page	1
B. Project and Evaluation Background.....	1
C. Project Logic Model	3
D. Process Evaluation Method and Design	5
E. Outcome (and Impact) Evaluation Method and Design	6
F. Timeline and Reporting.....	9
G. Appendices (if applicable)	9
Local Evaluation Report Guidance.....	10
H. Evaluation Results	10
I. Grantee Highlight.....	12

Local Evaluation Plan Guidance

The guidance below is intended to assist grantees in developing their Local Evaluation Plans (LEPs) and builds directly off the guidance previously provided by the BSCC at the Grantee Orientation in November 2020. The goal in providing this guidance is to offer additional considerations and specificity in an effort to give grantees important information to consider in developing their LEPs and to prepare them for the review and feedback that the BSCC and SPR will provide on these plans after they are submitted. Furthermore, as noted in the next section of this guide, these LEPs form the basis for grantees' Local Evaluation Reports (LERs) that all grantees must produce at the end of the grant period.

As noted in the earlier guidance provided by the BSCC, the BSCC will make public the LEP from each grantee, either by posting them to the BSCC website or as part of a statewide summary report to be shared with the Governor's Administration, Legislature, and the public. As detailed in that earlier guidance, all grantees must submit an LEP on Wednesday, March 31, 2021 (to Katrina Jackson, Katrina.Jackson@bscc.ca.gov).

The following sections outline the key elements of each LEP.

A. Cover Page

The cover page provides a descriptive report title, and identifies the grantee, authors, contact information, project time period, and funding source.

B. Project and Evaluation Background

The project background should provide information essential to understanding the nature of and motivation for the project (i.e., the programs, services, and activities supported by the grant), and identify the purpose and general scope of the evaluation. It should also briefly review the evidence base the evaluation is intended to address and identify how the evaluation will contribute to that evidence base. Critical components of the project background and questions to address include the following.

- What information can you provide that is essential to understanding the need for the project and the project itself, including information on:
 - the nature of the problems facing the target community;
 - the history of the grantee within the target community;
 - the purpose of the grant relative to these conditions; and
 - other similar services available within the community?

- What is the scope of the project?
 - Is there one component (i.e., mental health services) or are there multiple components?
 - Is there one set of services that everyone receives, or are services varied by individual?
 - Is there a single program (i.e., a separate track with its own enrollment goals, eligibility requirements, service delivery model and output/outcome goals) or are there multiple different programs?
 - How many organizations are involved in delivering program services and how are programs and services distributed across these different organizations?
- What information can you provide about the target population for your project and for any specific programs within the project, including:
 - age, gender, and race/ethnicity;
 - risk levels and risk factors;
 - point of diversion within and type of criminal justice system involvement; and
 - other background factors such as education level, level of or interest in employment, access to housing and access to and/or use of other supportive services?
- What criteria will be used to determine participant eligibility, including:
 - needs assessments;
 - risk assessments;
 - analysis of criminal justice history; and
 - any prior offenses that make one ineligible (i.e., sex offenses)?
- How will you determine which services and/or interventions an individual receives?
 - Will an individualized service plan be developed?
 - Will your program use a risk assessment or another other assessment tool? If so, which one?
 - How will services be targeted to individuals based on their needs?
- What is the timeline for the project overall, each particular component of the project, and any programs that are part of the project? What is the timeline for any evaluation activities and the evaluation as a whole?

- Based on the goals/objectives in your workplan, what are the general research questions the evaluation intends to address, including:
 - process or implementation questions;
 - outcomes-related questions;
 - questions of program impact; and
 - system/community-level change questions?
- Are there certain research questions within these that are more important for you to answer as compared to others?
- What are the primary outcomes of interest for the program and the evaluation?
 - Individual participant outcomes? Agency/organization outcomes? Community-level outcomes?
 - Are these outcomes in a single domain (i.e., recidivism, education) or across multiple domains?
- Do the outcomes described above differ at all from the goals/objectives in your Work Plan ? If so, why?

C. Project Logic Model

The logic model for the evaluation should detail the logical relationships between the project’s goals, inputs/resources, activities/services, outputs, outcomes, and impacts. It should provide a visual depiction of these relationships in a way that makes it easy to understand the justification for setting the project up as you have. An example/sample simple logic model tool is shown in Table 1 and may be useful for adapting if you do not have one available or a place to start in thinking through these relationships. Key components of a logic model include:

- **Inputs/resources:** These describe the specific resources available to support the project, including partner organizations, program staff, curricula, funding, equipment, and materials. These represent the resources the project will rely upon.
- **Activities/services:** These are the things the project does as well as how often and how long it does them, including the services available to participants, either directly through the program or through partnerships or leveraging other resources. These would include services, classes, stipends/incentives, training, etc.

Table 1: Sample Project Logic Model

Inputs/Resources	Activities/Services	Outputs	Outcomes and Impacts
Planning/Service Partners [partners that provide services, manage programs, or program planning/oversight]	Programs and Services [Services and groups of services as delivered to participants or as organized by distinct programs within the project]	Enrollment [enrollment numbers]	System Level Outcomes [changes at the organizational or community level]
Referral Partners [partners that refer participants]		Service Receipt [Amount and types of services actually received by participants]	Participant Outcomes [changes at the participant level, ideally positive/improvements in condition]
Funding [grant and leveraged funds]	Supports [incentives, stipends]	Exit/Completion [numbers and types of participants completing services or otherwise exiting the program.]	Impacts [changes in outcomes associated with program activities]
Staffing [number and type of staff, roles, staff supports, including training and agreements]	Dosage and Duration [prescribed length, frequency, and duration of service components]		
Equipment/Materials [assessment tools, equipment, program space]			

- **Outputs:** These represent things “produced” by the project, including the number of services provided, the number of participants served, etc. Outputs often are counts that link the activities and services provided to individuals participating in the project.
- **Outcomes:** These represent the specific measurable results of the project, including individual participant results and system/community-level results. Outcomes of interest should be identified in the project and evaluation background section and be directly relatable to project activities and goals. Outcomes typically are measured based on the expected time frame to complete them, including:
 - Short-term: typically either during a participant’s time in the program or within a few weeks or months following it.
 - Medium-term: typically a few months to a year following program participation.
- **Impacts:** These represent direct effects of the project’s efforts. Impacts combine the outcomes described above with some level of evidence that connects them to project activities. In other words, measurable changes are associated with (or caused by) the activities of the project. In short, impacts represent any changes brought about because of the project. Such changes could occur at the individual, organizational, community, or systems levels.

D. Process Evaluation Method and Design

Process or implementation evaluations examine how a project is implemented and operated, its context, and structure, including how resources are made available, what outputs there are (services or activities provided, enrollment, etc.), how partnerships are established and maintained, etc. At a minimum, this section should address the following questions.

- The specific research questions that guide the process evaluation, such as:
 - How will the project be structured?
 - Will the program’s inputs be put in place as planned, including partnerships, funding, staffing and other resources?
 - What will be the typical sequence and duration of services?
 - Who is intended to provide which services or activities?
 - What outputs will be produced?
 - What is the timeline for project implementation?
- How will services and activities, including participants progress and outcomes, be tracked and documented (i.e., database, signup sheets)? Items might include:

- Baseline/background information
- Start and end dates
- Attendance/key service activity and timing
- Completion/dropout information
- Key milestones
- Certificates/credentials
- What tools or data instruments will be used to collect information for the process evaluation and how will it be collected? Some possibilities include:
 - Questionnaires/surveys
 - Interviews and focus groups
 - Document review/checklists
 - Program Management Information System (MIS) or service tracking data
- How will project implementation be monitored over time, and modified as needed?
- Was the projected implemented according to its original plan, or were deviations from that plan required? If the latter, what were these deviations and what caused them?
- What is the analysis plan?
 - How will data be collected and gathered?
 - How will the process evaluation data be analyzed? Will you use particular tools such as qualitative data analysis software?
 - How will you identify key themes or trends in the data?
 - How will you identify promising practices as well as key challenges?
 - How will data be reported on and shared?

E. Outcome (and Impact) Evaluation Method and Design

Outcome evaluations examine how the outcomes observed, at the project and individual level, change over time. At a minimum, this section should describe:

- The specific research questions that guide the outcome evaluation, such as:
 - What are the key outcomes of interest? For each, what is the unit of analysis (i.e., are these individual outcomes or project outcomes)

- How do these outcomes relate to the project inputs, services and activities (i.e., why should we expect the project to have any effect on these outcomes)?
- Do these outcomes vary by type of participant, type(s) of services received, or other factors?
- Over what time period do you expect these outcomes to be observable (i.e., when should they be measured)?
- Are there benchmarks/goals that the project is trying to achieve for each outcome? If so, what are they?
- What is the outcome evaluation design? Examples include:
 - Descriptive outcomes only: designed to measure and report on outcomes obtained, with no comparison to similar individuals that did not participate or to any baseline measures
 - Quasi-experimental impact study: measures changes in outcomes over time or between groups to draw associations between outcomes and program elements. You need:
 - A pre-post design or a way of selecting a comparison group, including how it would be selected
 - An approach to obtaining consent or permission to access data that requires such consent (i.e., matching to data not directly collected by you)
 - (If applicable) Experimental impact study: using comparisons between comparable groups to conclude definitively that changes are caused by program services. Grantees that choose to use this approach need to describe:
 - A method for randomly assigning individuals to groups
 - An approach to obtaining consent from all individuals to participate
 - A method of monitoring to ensure experimental procedures are maintained
 - (If applicable) Cost study: can examine costs, cost-effectiveness or costs compared to benefits. Grantees that choose to include a cost study in their evaluation, should consider the following:
 - How will costs be collected?
 - What categories of costs will be recorded?
 - Will costs be compared to benefits?

- For these designs, how will outcomes be defined and measured?
 - What tools or data sources will be used? Are these existing data sources or new ones proposed for the study?
 - How frequently will data be collected?
 - What are the potential sources of error or nonresponse in the data and how will you address them?
- What data will be collected at baseline?
- What is the analysis plan?
 - What analytic methods will be used for the outcome study? Possible options include:
 - descriptive statistics for outcomes only;
 - basic inferential statistics to compare differences in outcomes (i.e., chi-squared, or t-tests);
 - multivariate analysis to explore impacts (include what variables will serve as controls);
 - (if an impact study is proposed) what are the detectable effect sizes, or power calculations; and
 - methods for handling missing data, non-response, or other forms of error within the data.
 - Are there specific analytic models that you will be testing?
- (If applicable) For (non-experimental) impact studies, how will you determine whether impacts are due to the project, and not some alternative explanatory factor?
 - Are you planning a pre-post comparison? If so, what are the scheduled points of measurement? How will you ensure the data are comparable at both points of measurement?
 - If there is one, how was the comparison group selected? What strategies were employed to mitigate/eliminate selection bias?
 - What mechanisms do you use to rule out alternative explanations?
 - What are the primary threats or confounds to internal validity (i.e., alternative explanations for the results, why should we believe the results observed were caused by your program)

- What are the primary threats to external validity (i.e., generalizability to the broader population)?
- (If applicable) How will you gather data on costs and, if applicable, on benefits?

F. Timeline and Reporting

This section should provide a clear indication of the overall timeline for the evaluation, as compared to project implementation, and discuss the reporting or dissemination of results being proposed. Key elements of this section would include:

- a description of the timeline of the evaluation, and how it corresponds to project implementation;
- a description of when each of the major evaluation components (i.e., participant intake, data collection, data analysis, reporting) would be conducted and completed;
- how the timing of evaluation components is linked or related to other components;
- a description of any reports that will be produced, including a brief outline for the report(s); and
- a discussion of any other dissemination activities (i.e., briefings, memos, summary files, etc.).

G. Appendices (if applicable)

Include any relevant supplementary evaluation and project materials in appendices. These may include but are not limited to data collection instruments, more detailed descriptions of activities and interventions, training materials, educational materials, operational definitions, additional analyses, and presentations.

Local Evaluation Report Guidance

The Cohort 3 CalVIP Grant program for funding period October 1, 2020 through June 30, 2023 requires a 3-year Local Evaluation Report (LER) to identify whether the project “worked” in terms of achieving its goals and objectives. The LER will be the documentation of activities completed with the support of grant funds. The BSCC will use these reports to verify the grant money was well spent and to describe the impact the grant had on the participants and their families. Assuming the projects have successful outcomes, other organizations may want to adopt the project components/intervention(s) you have demonstrated to be effective. Therefore, the report should include enough information to allow other organizations to replicate your project strategies.

Furthermore, the LER must be based on each grantees’ original LEP, which will be submitted, reviewed, and finalized in 2021. Any modifications to the LEP must be explained in the LER. As such, this guidance is intended to assist grantees in writing an LER that, at a minimum, addresses the information required of an LEP (see the guidance provided above) as well as the LER-specific guidance included below.

As noted in the LEP guidance, the BSCC will make public the LER from each grantee, either by posting them to the BSCC website or as part of a statewide summary report to be shared with the Governor’s Administration, Legislature, and the public. As detailed elsewhere, all grantees must submit an LER to the BSCC no later than 5 pm PST on Sunday, December 31, 2023.

In addition to the section outlines and guidance provided above for the LEP, the LER should include the following two sections. In developing the LER, grantees must update the LEP sections to report their actual plan as implemented and to describe any changes from the LEP that occurred. In addition, an LER should include the following two sections.

H. Evaluation Results

This section provides a description of the project outcomes or impacts. Key elements of this section include:

- Data conducted as part of the process evaluation. These include a:
 - Description of the project’s implementation, including the local/community context, staffing, partnerships, administrative structure, services provided, etc.
 - Key themes/trends in findings, such as challenges in implementation, lessons learned from implementing specific activities, etc.
- Total number of participants served (unduplicated)

- Basic demographic information about participants (age, gender, race/ethnicity, education levels, justice system involvement, etc.)
- Types of services received as well as the time/duration spent participating in these services (for example, number of days/weeks/months spent participating, if available)
- If you provide more than one program as part of your project, the total number and types of participants served, and the service receipt data (i.e., which services were provided).
- Progress toward project goals and objectives, including:
 - Summary of the degree to which project goals and objectives were achieved
 - How achievement of these goals or objectives was measured
 - Factors that aided or impeded that achievement of goals or objectives and how these supportive factors were arrived at or challenges were overcome.
- Outputs and outcomes from the project
 - Provide descriptive counts of outputs attained and outcomes achieved, including project-level and participant-level outputs and outcomes
 - Describe how outcomes vary by specific subgroups of interest
- Impact evaluation results, if applicable
 - Describe results from a quantitative analysis of impacts, including a comparison of participant outcomes with those of a comparison group (or with their baseline scores, for a pre-post assessment)
 - Describe potential confounds to the analysis
- Discussion of results
 - Discuss the effectiveness of different strategies implemented in the project
 - Provide recommendations with specific guidance for what to replicate or do differently
 - Discuss the external validity of the results (i.e., how well they can be generalized to or adopted by similar grantees)

I. Grantee Highlight

This section should provide a brief, one-page, visually appealing highlight or success story that provides additional information on the project's success over the grant period. Note that this highlight may be included in a statewide report. You may include optional graphs, charts, or photos.¹ While every effort will be made to include these in a statewide report, inclusion in the report is not guaranteed.

¹ The BSCC will only accept photographs in which all persons depicted are over 18 years of age and have consented both to being photographed and to the use and release of their image. By submitting photographs to the BSCC, the submitter acknowledges that all approvals have been obtained from the subjects in the photograph(s) and that all persons are over 18 years of age. Further, by submitting the photographs, the submitter irrevocably authorizes the BSCC to edit, alter, copy, exhibit, publish, or distribute the photographs for purposes of publicizing BSCC grant programs or for any other lawful purpose. All photographs submitted will be considered public records and subject to disclosure pursuant to the California Public Records Act.