CalVIP Evaluation Design Report

Cohort 3 Grantees

Produced for:

California Board of State and Community Corrections

Social Policy Research Associates

June 1, 2021

SPR SOCIAL POLICY RESEARCH ASSOCIATES

Contents

I. Introduction

The California State Legislature established the California Violence Intervention and Prevention (CalVIP) grant program in Fiscal Year (FY) 2017-2018. Prior to that point, the California Gang Reduction, Intervention and Prevention (CalGRIP) grant program, as it was known, was only open to California Cities. With CalVIP, grantee eligibility expanded to include Community-Based Organizations (CBOs). Under this approach, with a budget of $9 million per year, the State awarded two rounds, or cohorts of funding to grantees for FY 2017-2018 and FY 2018-2019.

FY 2019-2020 saw two major changes to the CalVIP program. First, the legislature provided a sizeable one-time appropriation of $21 million, boosting the annual allocation to $30 million. Second, the signing of Assembly Bill (AB) 1603, known as the *Break the Cycle of Violence Act*, codified the CalVIP grant program, establishing its purpose, the distribution of funds, and the authority and duties of administering it, with those falling to the Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC). Under this new mandate, the BSCC awarded its third cohort of CalVIP grants to 13 medium to large cities, six small cities, and 14 CBOs. Funding included $27.5 million in competitive grants and $1 million in funding earmarked for the City of Los Angeles.[1] These 33 grantees began operating their grant-funded projects amid the COVID-19 pandemic, in October 2020 (see Exhibit I-1 for a list of the Cohort 3 grantees).

Exhibit I-1: CalVIP Cohort 3 Grantees

Cities	Small Cities	CBOs
• Bakersfield • Fresno • Long Beach • Los Angeles • Oakland • Oxnard • Richmond • Sacramento • Salinas • San Bernardino • San Francisco • San Jose • Stockton	• Grass Valley • Greenfield • Gustine • King City • Marysville • Parlier	• Catholic Charities of the Diocese of Oakland • Fresh Lifelines for Youth, Inc. • Fresno County Economic Opportunities Commission • Kitches for Good • Los Angeles Brotherhood Crusade • Lundquist Institute • Safe Passages (Advance Peace) • Sierra Health Foundation Center • Soledad Enrinchment Action, Inc. • South Bay Community Services • Southern California Crossroads • The Regents of UC Davis • Watts Gang Task Force Council • Youth ALIVE!

As part of this same funding, the BSCC also awarded $350,000 to Social Policy Research Associates (SPR) to evaluate the Cohort 3 grantees' project implementation and outcomes. The

[1] The FY 2019-2020 budget calls for the BSCC to set aside 5 percent ($1.5 million) for administrative operations.

following document is SPR's evaluation design report, which maps out the approach and research methods that our organization plans to use in conducting this mixed methods evaluation.

A. Program Goals and Objectives

Based on the legislation and the BSCC's own materials, the purpose, goals, and approach of the CalVIP program—and the criteria that helps to frame the BSCC's funding decisions—can be broken down into the following three components.

First, the program is focused on the implementation of coordinated, community-based strategies for reducing violence in communities heavily impacted by that violence. As indicated in AB 1603, the purpose of CalVIP is to "improve public health and safety by supporting effective violence reduction initiatives in communities that are disproportionately impacted by violence, particularly group-member involved homicides, shootings, and aggravated assaults."[2] The legislation also goes on to state that "CalVIP grants shall be used to support, expand and replicate evidence-based violence reduction initiatives, including without limitations, hospital-based violence intervention programs, evidence-based street outreach programs, and focused deterrence strategies, that seek to interrupt cycles of violence and retaliation…"[3] In other words, CalVIP grants are to utilize various evidence-based approaches and other community-based strategies for reducing violence and specifically some of the more serious types of violence noted in the legislation.

Second, the program is designed to target individuals at the highest risk of either perpetrating or becoming victims of violence. In other words, programming need not target only those causing violence but those affected by it as well. Furthermore, the program is focused on understanding circumstances and locations where people live where violence is particularly acute and thus hopes to stem the causes of violence for both perpetrators and victims.

Third, grants are designed to help build a network of public agencies and CBOs that coordinate to deliver services within these communities. As noted above, and consistent with the legislation, grantees include both "cities that are disproportionately impacted by violence" and "CBOs that serve the residents of those cities." Furthermore, it is important to note that city grantees must pass through at least half their grant funds to either CBOs or city agencies dealing with community safety or violence prevention that are not law enforcement agencies.

---

2 Assembly Bill No. 1603, Chapter 735. https://www.bscc.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/AB-1603-Signed101819.pdf

3 Ibid.

B. Evaluation Goals and Research Questions

Our goal for this evaluation is to inform the BSCC, grantees, and other relevant stakeholders about the answers to three research questions.

- ***To what extent do grantees achieve their CalVIP project goals*?** This question involves two separate, but related components. First, we will identify whether grantees, at the end of the evaluation, were able to address their own stated goals and objectives, which include a variety of implementation, process, and outcome goals that are specific to their projects. Second, we want to examine in a standardized way, across grantees, the outputs and outcomes of the evaluation, including: the number of people that entered into services and how many cycled through multiple times, the number of people that received various project services, the number of people that exit services (successfully or unsuccessfully), and how these services (positively) changed the lives of program participants, i.e., their outcomes. Furthermore, we want to try and situate these outputs and outcomes, as best we can, within local and larger statewide criminal justice system contexts these grantees are operating within, utilizing existing and publicly accessible data. Our approach to answering this research question is to first understand grantees' enrollment, service delivery, and output- and outcome-related goals and objectives through an analysis of their proposals and local evaluation plans, taking note of their local crime contexts (and the larger statewide crime context). We then plan to track both their progress towards their project-specific goals and objectives and various standardized output and outcome measures at key intervals and cumulatively at grant completion. We will do so through the grantees' required quarterly reporting and their own evaluation reports.
- ***What factors support or hinder project implementation?*** To answer this question, we plan to learn about the ways in which grantees implemented and operated services or managed their grants and what factors made it easier or harder for them to achieve their goals. We also hope to learn about the ways in which partnerships, supplemental funding, staffing, training, or other contextual factors affected the implementation of CalVIP-funded programs and how and to what extent grantees pivoted or developed innovated strategies when approaches did not work as planned. Our approach to answering this research question will involve examining the qualitative data contained in grantees' quarterly reports as well as information we collect through interviews with selected grantees and their own evaluation reports. Our goal will be both to better explain any variations in expected outputs and outcomes (see the first research question above) and to develop lessons and practices that can be shared with a wider stakeholder audience interested in implementing similar programs.

- ***Do different grantees (e.g., different grantee types, those using different service delivery strategies, those with different partnership approaches, etc.) experience different outputs or outcomes than others?*** For this question, we would like to understand the factors that may be associated with any grantees that more successfully achieve their output or outcome goals than others. Doing so will involve analyzing a wide range of data sources to help us both group grantees into distinct types (e.g., cities, CBOs, or small cities) or other groupings (e.g., those using different service strategies, those operating across or against very different levels of crime or crime contexts, those employing different partnership models, etc.) and then to identify those with greater or lesser success at achieving outputs and outcomes and the specific factors associated with them.

Our overall process for answering these research questions involves collecting and analyzing several different data sources including grantees': proposals, Local Evaluation Plans (LEPs), Quarterly Progress Reports (QPRs), and Local Evaluation Reports (LERs). Our approach also involves being heavily engaged in preparing grantees for data collection and analysis activities through the development of the QPR, LEP/LER guidance, LEP/LER reviews, and providing evaluation-based training and technical assistance to grantees around data collection and evaluation activities.

C. Report Overview

The rest of this report is organized as follows. Chapter II describes the work the evaluation team has already completed to help develop the evaluation's key data collection tools and analytic approach. Chapter III presents our subsequent data collection plans, as well as the ways we plan to process that data and prepare it for analysis. Chapter IV discusses the ongoing evaluation technical assistance the evaluation team will provide to grantees throughout the evaluation, reinforcing and supporting quality data collection. Chapter V then discusses our analysis, reporting, and dissemination plans, including how we plan to bring together each task of the evaluation to help address all three research questions. Finally, Chapter VI summarizes the evaluation workplan and timing for the remainder of the project. Throughout the report, the task and subtask numbers listed in the closing chapter are referenced in parenthesis.

II. Tool Development and Analysis Framework

The first main task of the evaluation involves activities designed to make the rest of the evaluation possible, including learning about grantee program plans, setting up data collection activities, providing tools to help grantees design their own local evaluations, and refining the statewide evaluation. More specifically, this task involves five main subtasks: 1) holding a kickoff meeting with the BSCC; 2) reviewing grantee proposals; 3) developing the QPR template and guidance; 4) developing the LEP and LER guidelines; and 5) writing an evaluation design report. With the completion of this design report, the evaluation team has now completed each of the activities in this first task. This chapter summarizes these design activities, including the development of the overall CalVIP logic model, and identifies the ways in which this early work is relevant to the remaining evaluation.

A. Grantee Proposal Review

After holding our evaluation kickoff meeting (task 1.1) with the BSCC, we completed our review of grantee proposals (task 1.2), which were the best available description of grantee projects at the time.[4] From these proposals, we extracted the following information about each proposed project (to the extent it was available).

- **Grantee organizational structures**, including grantee locations, project names, grant and match amounts, and pass-through amounts (i.e., the amount cities passed through to CBO or non-criminal justice public agencies).
- **Planned partnerships**, including partner organization names, organizational types, role in the project, and funding required to support them.
- **Staffing information**, including the number and full-time equivalence (FTE) of staff involved as well as what organizations they are from, their roles, and the funding involved in supporting them.
- **Target populations**, including the numbers and demographic profiles of participants grantees intend to enroll.
- **Services**, including the types and duration of services grantees plan to provide and the enrollment levels in each type of service.
- **Goals and outcomes**, which include a combination of grantee- and participant-level outputs and various system-level and participant level outcomes.

[4] Grantees have subsequently refined these plans through their contracts and their recently completed, or, in some cases, soon-to-be-completed LEPs. The LEPS are currently still under review by the evaluation team.

We then turned this information into a spreadsheet-based matrix of grantee information, which we submitted to the BSCC back in March.

B. CalVIP Logic Model

Utilizing the information from the matrix and additional information gathered throughout our development of the evaluation's data collection tools (see below), we developed the CalVIP logic model shown in Exhibit II-1. This logic model incorporates the full range of all 33 CalVIP projects through the lens of four main evaluation components (inputs, services, outputs, and outcomes) and then, within each of these components, presents the range of possible design elements that may be applicable to individual grantee projects. The logic model components can be summarized as follows.

1. **Inputs** are the factors that feed into projects and vary by grantee in terms of grantee types, the funding and funding pass-through requirements, the staffing models, partner organization types (and roles), and choices about the types of participants that each grantee choses to identify for services.

2. **Services** include two main elements. The service design is one element and includes decisions about whether there are multiple service tracks or programs within projects (that would serve distinct participants with different sets of services) and how services are organized across partners within a project (specific services by distinct partners, each partner delivering a different program, etc.). The other element are decisions around the services that each project includes. The logic model shows a complete list of service categories that exist across projects. Individual projects typically include many (but by no means all) of these services categories.

3. **Outputs** are what is produced or delivered by projects, including the grantee-level outputs (e.g., whether the project has been established/implemented as planned and whether certain grant-level requirements are completed) and the participant-level outputs (e.g., numbers and types of participants enrolled, the services delivered and the numbers of participants in them, and the numbers and types of participants exited).

4. **Outcomes** refer to the positive changes in their lives that participants experience due to their participation in the project, or at least those that can be associated with that participation (depending on the way in which the outcomes are measured). Different projects will seek to produce various types of outcomes, most likely focusing on those that are short-term in nature (due to being relatively easier to measure in the time allotted), though some of which could include those that are long-term.

This logic model serves as a map to the overall CalVIP evaluation. It is aligned with our research questions and will help to guide our overall approach in our analysis. More specifically, our first research question—whether and to what extent grantees achieved their goals—focuses

Exhibit II-1: CalVIP Cohort 3 Overall Logic Model

INPUTS

Grantees
- CBOs
- Cities
- Small Cities

Funding
- CalVIP + match funds
- >50% pass through for city grantees

Staffing
- Numerous full/part-time staff
- Funded through Grant & leveraged dollars

Partners
- CBO/Non-Profit
- K-12 education
- Post-Secondary Education (PSE)
- Health care provider
- Police/Sheriff
- Parole/Probation
- Workforce system
- Other public agencies

Participants
- Children, youth, and adults
- At risk of committing crimes or becoming crime victims

SERVICES

Service Design
- Projects can have one or more service tracks (each one with unduplicated enrollment goals, different target populations, and distinct services)
- Services can be provided by one or more than one partner, including the grantee and/or other subcontracted partners

Service Categories
- Case management
- Conflict resolution/anger management
- Cognitive-Behavioral Therapy
- Culturally responsive services
- De-escalation/intervention
- Diversion
- K-12 education/PSE
- Mental/Physical Health
- Housing
- Life/career planning
- Life skills/healthy choices
- Mentoring
- Motivational interviewing
- Pro-social skills
- Substance abuse treatment
- Tattoo removal
- Trauma-informed care
- Vocational skills
- Work readiness training

OUTPUTS

Grantee-Level Outputs
- Inputs established/secured (partners, staffing, additional funding)
- Service delivery model/service plans implemented
- Exit definitions established/ outcomes defined
- Planned monitoring and data collection occur
- Funding expended as planned
- Process-based goals and objectives achieved
- LEPs/LERs completed

Participant-Level Outputs
- Enrollment of new, unduplicated participants reached for each program
- Participant composition/ demographics is as planned
- Planned services are delivered
- Levels and dosage of services is as planned
- Number and composition/ demographics of participants exited is as planned
- Variation from plans can be sufficiently explained

OUTCOMES

Shorter-Term Outcomes
- Criminal Justice (reduced violent activity/fewer arrests)
- K-12 education (enrollment/credit completion, improved attendance, reduced disciplinary actions)
- PSE (enrollment/credit completion)
- Psychosocial (feeling more: engaged, connected, safer, able to make good choices, able to meet basic needs)
- Skills/Knowledge (improved justice system awareness, conflict resolution skills, life skills, work readiness skills)

Longer-Term Outcomes
- Criminal justice (fewer convictions/sustained petitions and incarcerations)
- Employment (found/retained jobs, increased earnings, improved job satisfaction)
- K-12 education (credits obtained, earned diploma/GED)
- PSE (credits obtained, certificate/degree completion)
- Health (improved mental/physical health, reduced substance use, reduced victimization)
- Housing (more stably housed)

primarily on the outputs and outcomes sections of the logic model (the two right-most sections). In our analysis, we will examine the extent to which grantees achieved their specific output and outcome goals, both at the grantee level and at the participant level, for both shorter- and longer-term outcomes. Our second research question focuses mostly on program implementation and the extent to which grantees were able to put program elements in place as planned. To answer this question, we will be focusing largely on the inputs and services columns to understand whether they were able to put these program elements in place as planned and what factors inhibited or supported them doing so. Our third research question brings these two sides of the logic model together and compares different input and service delivery configurations with different levels of output and outcome goal achievement to examine associations between the two.

C. QPR Tool Development

Another activity, now completed, that fell under this first main task was to develop the QPR tool as well as guidance for it (Task 1.4). We developed the QPR tool in the online survey platform Alchemer, as well as a guide that provides additional instructions and an overview of the QPR, a scripted power point presentation that instructs grantees on how to use Alchemer to complete their QPR, and a recorded training that walks through the power point presentation. We delivered these tools to the BSCC at the end of March, and as discussed in Chapter IV below, we have shared these with grantees in multiple ways.

Importantly, the QPR relates closely to the logic model and can be used to provide grantee-level data about components within the logic model. The QPR includes questions related to all four components and will help to address the ways in which grantees implemented their projects and the outputs and outcomes observed rather than just what grantees planned. Chapter III provides greater detail on these data collection activities.

D. LEP/LER Guidelines

The final activity that fell under this first task was the development of the LEP and LER Guidelines (task 1.5), which we also completed and delivered at the end of March. These guidelines convey information to grantees they can use to build strong local evaluations. Importantly, as discussed further in Chapter III, the information we will learn from grantees' LEPs will further help define the goals that grantees hope to achieve in the implementation of their projects and thus provide additional information we can use to analyze grantee projects through the framework set forth by the logic model.

III. Data Collection

SPR's data collection task includes the following activities: reviewing and providing feedback on LEPs and LERs, collecting and processing QPR data, conducting grantee interviews, and gathering local and statewide extant crime data.

A. LEP/LER Review

A key part of our work involves our reviewing and providing feedback to grantees on their LEPs (task 2.1) and LERs (task 2.4). While these activities do not directly involve data collection, our feedback ideally improves the quality of grantees' internal evaluations, thus indirectly supporting data collection in two ways. First, we hope that grantees who are better informed about research will supply better data and have a greater understanding of our project-wide data collection efforts. Second, since grantee LERs will be a data source for our final report, we want to ensure they are as high quality as possible.

To conduct the LEP and LER review, we have developed a checklist which reflects our LEP/LER guidance (task 1.4) and references both required components of the LEP and LER and elements designed to build good evaluation practices and strengthen grantees' self-evaluation. For example, the checklist includes required elements, such as having a cover sheet that identifies the evaluation team or the inclusion of clear research questions and a plan for answering them, using appropriate data sources. However, the checklist also includes areas for reviewers to identify where local evaluators might consider other research methodologies or somewhat different approaches to answering local evaluation questions. The checklist also includes an overall rating (approved, approved with reservations, or needs revisions) and a high-level summary of the review as well as detailed feedback to grantees. We have trained our evaluation team on this checklist and have engaged in inter-rater reliability checks of selected LEPs (and will do so with selected LERs at that time). After completing this review and providing grantees with this feedback, we will also follow up and meet with grantees (as needed) to further clarify questions about the review.

B. QPR Data Collection

One of the most significant data collection activities for this evaluation involves the collection and processing of the grantees' QPR data. In total, there will be 10 QPRs for each of the 33 grantees.[5] We will use these data to address each of our research questions.

[5] Grantees will submit 10 QPRs, reflecting 11 quarters. Quarters 1 and 2 are reported in a single report with the subsequent reports each reflecting one quarter.

The QPR includes three types of data, each of which needs to be collected and processed somewhat differently. The QPRs include:

- **Project plans.** These data are useful in establishing the baseline against which we can measure progress. This is especially true for the first QPR where grantees describe their project goals and objectives, the services they plan to offer (either overall, or as organized into different programs), the ways they measure completion or exit, information on project funding, and enrollment goals.
- **Qualitative data**. These data will be useful in understanding the success and challenges grantees faced in implementing their projects (our second line of inquiry). For example, grantees will provide written internal assessments of progress towards goals and objectives and overall progress in implementing projects as planned. We can use these data to better capture how implementation progresses and challenges grantees faced in successfully implementing their programs.
- **Quantitative data**. These data will primarily help to answer our first and third research questions, which include reporting on the outputs and outcomes produced by grantee projects and associating those with grantee types and project models. These quantitative data include tallies of new and recurring participants enrolled in the projects, numbers of participants receiving different types of services, new and recurring exits, and quarterly and cumulative outcomes.

We plan to process these data in three ways. First, we will generate grantee-level summaries for each grantee each quarter. This PDF will resemble the format of the QPR guide in Appendix A, but of course will be filled in with the answers provided by the grantees. We will share these with the BSCC to use for monitoring purposes and will keep a copy so that we can review grantee responses as part of checking the input they are providing, and since we may occasionally need to look back at the raw data at a given point in time for a given grantee.

Second, we will import qualitative data contained in each of the QPR's open text fields into a qualitative analysis software (i.e., NVivo) package where we can more easily analyze the data. We will group these data by question type to review answers provided to similar questions across grantees (and rounds of QPRs). We will identify key implementation themes that cut across questions, such as challenges specific to COVID, recruitment challenges, staffing issues, etc. We can then pull together grantee data and identify the numbers of grantees that experienced these issues, the individual variations of challenges within these issues and strategies that grantees used to overcome them. This latter part will help form the basis for our interviews, described immediately below.

Third, we are planning to develop a program for exporting (and simultaneously running quality checks on) quantitative data which we will then import into a set of interactive data dashboards built with R-Shiny. The role of these dashboards is to describe the outputs and outcomes grantees report in their QPRs at the aggregate level and to make them filterable so that the viewer can examine the data in multiple ways. While we still need to design and obtain approval (from the BSCC) for the final set of tables to include, we are currently planning to develop dashboards that show: grant expenditure data; implementation progress (captured in close-ended measures); and the numbers of participants enrolled, receiving different types of services, exiting, and with positive outcomes. To the extent possible, we will also include these outputs and outcomes relative to grantee-stated goals. We also plan to make the data filterable, when possible, so that viewers can filter the data factors such as: quarter, grantee, type of grantee, services, and demographic groups.

We are presently working on the layout for these dashboards with the goal of having them available to the BSCC, and possibly the grantees, by the time the second QPR is completed. Then, based on feedback we have already received from the BSCC, we would plan to make these dashboards public at approximately the midway point of the grantee's reporting timeframe, or around the completion of the fifth or sixth QPR (to ensure that grantees have had ample time to get their program underway before displaying these data publicly). Additional information on how the evaluation team will analyze qualitative and quantitative data are included below in Chapter V.

C. Grantee Interviews

In addition to the qualitative data we will capture through the QPRs, we plan to conduct video/phone interviews (of about an hour) with selected grantees in early 2023. These interviews, which we anticipate involving staff from about 10-15 grantees, will be designed to collect more in-depth data on selected topics we identify in our analysis of the QPR data. These interviews will focus on lessons learned and promising practices for grantees where we observe either a high degree of success (in terms of either implementation, achieving output or outcome goals, or both) and/or notable challenges that grantees overcame. We may also look to include grantees that explored particularly novel program or evaluation strategies. The goal will be to capture a greater level of detail than will be shared through the QPRs and thus to provide rich examples and quotations to help illustrate the types of implementation lessons identified in our high-level analysis of QPR qualitative data or to provide a more nuanced understanding of the observations made around the summary level quantitative data. For instance, we might identify that a grantee with unique or extensive partnerships succeeded at meeting or even exceeding enrollment goals. We could then use an interview to delve more into the specific factors that enabled those partnerships to work successfully. We also might be able to use these interviews to explore unanticipated challenges such as the need to provide additional types of services that grantees realized their participants faced only after beginning to serve them, understanding the ways these projects adapted.

For the interviews, we will first develop a semi-flexible protocol based on our initial review of grantees' QPR data at approximately the midway quarterly reporting point. We will also identify a select group of grantees for the interviews. We will then seek input from the BSCC on both the protocol and the pool of selected grantees to ensure that the included topics address the issues of importance to the BSCC and to be sure that our proposed pool of grantees is suitable. Once these interviews are completed, we will either write-up notes or have recordings transcribed and upload these data into the qualitative database.

D. Extant Criminal Justice Data

In addition to gathering these project-specific data, SPR will identify and collect various existing, publicly accessible data and data sources to be incorporated into our analysis and discussed in the final report. This data collection effort will supply the extant data we indicated above that we would use in answering the evaluation's three research questions. Examples of such data sources include: the Open Justice Project by the California Department of Justice, Measures for Justice, the Criminal Justice Administrative Records System (CJARS), and various U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics tools. Much of this data collection effort will involve cataloging these data sources to identify whether they contain data relevant to this analysis, preparing that data for the analysis, and noting the usefulness of the information.

To the extent data are available, we plan to examine how or whether there are observable changes in key indicators that may be attributable to project activities. For example, if violent crime activity decreases in some project areas, especially relative to areas not being served by a CalVIP grant, this could suggest that project activities played a role in helping to reduce such activity. Though there are numerous alternative explanations for why such patterns exist, we will explore data availability and report out those data that may suggest the effect of project activities on crime.

IV. Evaluation Technical Assistance

An important set of activities, some of which we have already completed and some of which we plan to continue throughout the rest of the evaluation, are those involving evaluation technical assistance (TA). These TA activities support grantees' understanding of the evaluation and thus indirectly support data collection, analysis, and reporting. Based on our experience providing this type of assistance to grantees in other evaluations, we believe that evaluation TA helps improve data quality by clarifying data collection procedures and by creating buy-in among grantees; it helps them understand why evaluations are important. While we do have a distinct TA-related task (Task 3) in our workplan, there are several activities that are part of other formal tasks (discussed in prior chapters and summarized here) that play a TA or TA-like role.

First, we develop documents and tools that grantees can use and refer to throughout the grant. These include the guide, instructional slides, and recorded training we developed around the use of the QPR (Task 1.4) and the guidance that helps grantees develop their LEPs/LERs (Task 1.5). We have already shared these documents with grantees, making them available (with the assistance of the BSCC) on the BSCC CalVIP web page so that grantees can easily access them. Throughout the rest of the evaluation, we plan to update these tools as needed.

Second, we are currently reviewing grantees' LEPs (Task 2.1) and plan to review grantees' LERs (Task 2.4) near the end of the grant to ensure they meet the standards set out in the LEP/LER guidelines. While these reviews are technically part of our data collection task (Task 2), they are an important aspect of our TA work. The feedback we provide on these documents, especially the LEP, will help grantees run more effective local evaluations while simultaneously improving their understanding of evaluations. Ideally this leads to a better and more nuanced understanding of their own programs and is reflected in their QPR data. Furthermore, since we hope to incorporate findings from the LERs in our final report, the better this information is, the stronger these reported findings in our final report will be.

Third, we plan to regularly engage with grantees by hosting grantee convenings (Task 3.1) and attending quarterly project director meetings (Task 3.2). The first of these are annual events. The convening we held in March 2021 was a general evaluation orientation where we introduced the QPR and LEP/LER guidance to grantees and discussed the evaluation more generally. Our second and third convenings will focus on evaluation findings and provide an opportunity for us to share with grantees some preliminary analysis of the data from their QPRs and possibly other sources (such as grantee interview data).

Fourth, we have assigned each grantee to a study team liaison, based on grantee type (CBOs, cities, and small cities). These liaisons are responsible for answering questions raised by their grantees and can proactively reach out as major milestones (like QPRs) approach. We also have set up a TA-specific email address where grantees can email if they have question about evaluation activities and where our assigned staff can respond. We have an internal exchange and tracking system for monitoring grantee responses and for sharing answers to questions that come up across grantees, and we have grantee contact information available should we need to reach out to grantees proactivity.

V. Analysis, Reporting, and Dissemination

The final task of our evaluation involves the analysis of evaluation data, the reporting of evaluation findings generated through the analysis, and the dissemination of those findings to stakeholder audiences through sharing the report and presentation.

A. Data Analysis

In our analysis of the data discussed in prior chapters, we plan to pursue three main lines of inquiry that follow directly from our three research questions: 1) to what extent did grantees achieve their goals; 2) what factors supported or hindered implementation; and 3) what trends exist between different project models and grantee types and different outputs and outcomes.

For our first line of inquiry, most of what we wish to answer will already be available within the grantee dashboards. For example, we will be able to describe overall and with some granularity (over time and for distinct groups of participants) what the outputs and outcomes of the CalVIP program were. We will also be able to compare these outputs and outcomes to grantees' own stated goals. Finally, using QPR data in combination with additional details from grantees' LERs and extent data, to the extent we find relevant and useful data from these sources, we should be able to determine the extent to which grantees were able to achieve their other stated goals and objectives that are more process or implementation focused.

For our second line of inquiry, we will use data (especially narrative data) from QPRs, grantee interviews, and LERs to describe how programs evolved over time. We will pay special attention to the extent to which grantees implemented planned program elements and factors that they suggest may have helped them meet output or outcome goals as well as obstacles that prevented them from doing so. These findings will help us both further categorize grantees (ideally rating them in terms of levels of implementation success) as well as providing insights to policymakers and other programs around critical elements to include or be aware of when planning similar programs in the future, or program elements the BSCC may wish to fund differently or provide support around in future iterations of its programs.

For our third line of inquiry, we will explore how different types of grantees and different service models vary in their achieved outputs and outcomes. To do this, we will select the most salient categories identified in our development of grantee dashboards and in our analysis of qualitative and extant data. Some examples of grantee categories that we are likely to consider include: grantee type (city or CBO); the criminal justice context or crime types a project is meant to address; service delivery strategies (more or less intensive services or different types of services); overall input levels (funding, partnerships, staffing); and overall level of successful implementation. We plan to examine outputs and outcomes as a function of these categories, using OLS regression to isolate the estimated impacts of specific approaches or categories. This line of inquiry would provide suggestive findings about which types of grantee contexts, service strategies, or approaches are associated with better outcomes overall.

There are some limitations to this final approach which we will need to appropriately caveat in our final report. To the extent that grantees vary too much from one another, it may be difficult to identify any salient groups. Also, should grantees end up setting unreasonably low goals for themselves or that extant data do not prove all that informative, the final analysis may not be all that telling. While we hope to address many of these types of issues as part of our LEP assessment, some factors (such as grantee variation) may simply create too much noise for an analysis of this kind to be meaningful. Fortunately, should this third line of inquiry tell us relatively little, the first two lines of inquiry should still produce considerably important and valuable information to help understand the implementation and outcomes of the overall program.

B. Final Evaluation Report

In January 2024, we plan to submit a final statewide evaluation report (task 4.1). This report will start with a summary of the CalVIP program, provide context for the evaluation, summarize the evaluation approach, explain the data, and describe the ways in which we collected them. It will also describe, in detail, results of the analyses outlined immediately above, including an overview of grantee programs, implementation successes and challenges, outputs and outcomes of the program, and associations between different project models and grantee types and these outputs and outcomes. We will also include a discussion of the findings, reflecting on the programs and approaches that worked well and which encountered greater levels of challenges and the limitations or strengths of the evaluation approaches taken and ways that future evaluations could be improved upon. We will then revise and update the report as needed based on BSCC feedback and produce the final report by March 13, 2024.

C. Dissemination

Our final activity in the evaluation will be to disseminate the evaluation's findings. The first way we will do so will be to publish the report by having it posted on the BSCC's website and, assuming the BSCC permits it, on SPR's website as well. We also (again, with the BSCC's permission) plan to disseminate findings through SPR's social media platforms, including LinkedIn and Twitter. Importantly, we will also prepare a final briefing, summarizing key findings from the report which we will plan to present in person (Task 4.2). We will work with the BSCC, as the report nears completion, to identify the most suitable audience for this briefing whether it is to the BSCC itself, or to some broader set of stakeholders, such as members of the state legislature. Our goal in this endeavor is to help disseminate and interpret report findings and answer questions that key stakeholders may have. Finally, should the BSCC approve, we would also likely consider submitting proposals to present findings at conferences, such as the Association for Criminal Justice Research – California, or other appropriate venues.

VI. Workplan

As noted throughout this report, we have organized evaluation activities into four main tasks, each with its own sub-tasks. Our work began in December 2020 and continues through March 2024. Immediately below is a summary of our proposed tasks and, following that, Exhibit VI-1 displays an updated workplan that provides greater detail for each subtask, including dates for conducting and completing it and the milestones associated with it.

- **Task 1: Research Design and Evaluation Planning**. For this task, we conducted several activities that built upon on one another and were designed to get the evaluation underway. Subtasks included: (1.1) our evaluation kickoff meeting with the BSCC; (1.2) our grantee proposal review, which resulted in our grantee categorization matrix; (1.3) this design report that includes the evaluation research methodology, overall logic model, and updated work plan; (1.4) our QPR template and accompanying procedures guide and training slides for the QPR; and (1.5) our guidance for the LEP and LER.
- **Task 2: Data Collection and Analysis.** For this task, we are working with the BSCC to gather, process, analyze, and provide feedback on grantee-related data collection activities. Subtasks include: (2.1) reviewing and providing grantee-level feedback on LEPs; (2.2) gathering and processing QPR data and producing grantee dashboards; (2.3) conducting grantee phone interviews (early 2023) to generate additional information around lessons learned; and (2.4) reviewing and providing grantee-level feedback and analyzing data from LERs.
- **Task 3: Technical Assistance.** For this task, we will, throughout the evaluation, engage in activities designed to support grantees around evaluation activities. Subtasks include: (3.1) presenting on the evaluation at the grantee orientation meeting and hosting two additional grantee convenings in 2023 and 2024; (3.2) attending and contributing to quarterly project director meetings; and (3.3.) providing ongoing QPR, LEP, and LER support to grantees through phone and email support.
- **Task 4: Reporting and Dissemination**. For this task, we will conduct analyses and present our findings to the BSCC and other key stakeholders (as determined in coordination with the BSCC). Subtasks include: (4.1) submitting a draft and final revision of our final report to the legislature describing the CalVIP program and its outcomes; and (4.2) disseminating findings through a briefing to key stakeholders.

Exhibit VI-1: Evaluation Workplan

Task #	Task Name	Timeline	Milestones
1.1	Kickoff meeting	December 2020	Memo summarizing meeting and key goals/plans
1.2	Proposal review	December - January 2020	Grantee categorization matrix and logic model
1.3	Evaluation plan	June 1, 2021	Evaluation design report
1.4	QPR template and guidance	2/12/21 Week of March 1 3/31/21	Draft QPR template, guidance, and slides to BSCC Present draft QPR to grantees at orientation Final QPR template, guidance, and slides to BSCC
1.5	LEP/LER Guidelines	2/12/21 2/26/21 Week of March 1	Draft LEP and LER guidelines for grantees to BSCC Final LEP/LER guidelines for grantees to BSCC Present LEP/LER Guidelines to grantees at orientation
2.1	LEP Review	March 31, 2021 April - July 2021	LEPs submitted Inidividual LEP checklist review. Review revisions as needed. Summary memo to BSCC.
2.2	QPR Processing and Analysis	(Quarterly) Q2 2021 - Q3 2023	Grantees first submit mid-May 2021. Individual grantee reports and grantee dashboards.
2.3	Grantee interviews	Q1 2023	Interview summary memo
2.4	LER Review	Q3 2023 - Q1 2024	LER summary memo and individual LER comments
3.1	Grantee Orientation/ Convenings	March 4, 2021 February 2022 and 2023	Evaluation Orientation Additional Grantee conveenings
3.2	Project director meetings	(Quarterly) Q1 2021 - Q2 2023	Notes on evaluation from quarterly meetings
3.3	Grantee evaluation support	Q1 2021 - Q4 2023	Ongoing QPR/LEP/LER support for grantees
4.1	Final report to the legislature	Draft: January 2024 Final: March 13, 2024	Final evaluation report
4.2	Briefing	Q1 2024	Briefing to key stakeholders