Evaluation 101

with illustrations from OCJS evaluation studies
Structure of Training

• Introduction
• Planning and Process evaluations
• BREAK
• Outcome and Cost/Benefit evaluations
Training Will Cover

• Evaluation 101 document

• Illustrations from
  – Ohio Mental Health Court evaluation
  – Ohio Drug Court evaluation
  – OCJS project performance reporting program
What we hope to achieve

• Provide training in program evaluation

• Illustrate points through research we have conducted

• Provide you information and findings from that research
What do you wish to achieve?

• Your name
• Agency
• Position
• Have you conducted an evaluation?
• What you hope to learn about program evaluation?
Genesis of the Evaluation 101 Document

• Justice Stratton’s Advisory Committee on Mentally Ill in the Courts
What is “evaluation”?

- The simple answer, dictionary definition:
  $e + valuer = to establish the worth or value of.$
Why Evaluate?

- Requirement of funding agencies
- Establish model programs and best practices
- Tool of good management and quality improvement
Types of Evaluations

• Planning evaluation
• Process evaluation
• Outcome evaluation
• Cost-benefit evaluation
Overview of Ohio Mental Health Court Evaluation

• Kent State
  – ODMH funded study
  – OCJS funded study

• OCJS
Planning and Process Evaluation
Goals

• 1) To examine developmental issues prior to setup
• 2) To assess the steps that occur within the court’s set-up
  – How was the court initiated?
  – What agencies are involved in its daily operation?
  – How were collaborations developed, and how are they sustained?
  – Overall, how does the court function to serve the clients?
Akron Mental Health Court

- Specialized docket within Municipal Court
- Operates on drug court model
- Two-year program
- Appropriate services available for dual diagnosis clients
Who are the MHC Clients?

• Criteria for eligibility in Akron MHC
  – Schizophrenia, schizoaffective disorder, or bipolar disorder
  – Non-violent misdemeanor offense, unless victim consents; no sex offenses
  – Willing to take medication
  – Is understanding of the requirements of MHC, is able/willing to comply with the court, and is aware of the consequences of non-compliance
  – Repeat offenders targeted for program, but first time offenders are not automatically screened out
How to Collect Data for a Process Evaluation

- Interviews
- Focus groups
- Observation
- Questionnaires/Surveys
- Analysis of existing documents
Types of Data to Collect for a Process Evaluation

• Quantitative

• Qualitative

• Which is more useful?
Planning Evaluation--Topics

• Why is the program needed?
  – Identify target population

• Who needs to be involved in the planning?
  – Identify key players/agencies

• What are the goals of the program?
  – Identify goals from perspective of various key players/agencies
Planning Evaluation (continued)

• What resources are necessary?
  – Identify financial resources
  – Identify non-financial resources

• What is the timeline?
  – Determine timeline to program implementation
Process Evaluation--Topics

- Clients served
  - Is program hitting its identified target population?

- Collaboration
  - How is collaboration achieved? Where are weaknesses in collaboration/communication? How to improve upon collaboration?

- Services/Gaps in service
  - What services are being provided? Are they adequate?
Process Evaluation (continued)

- Sanctions and rewards (specific to MHC)
  - Under what conditions are they given? Do they help change behavior? Can this be improved upon?
- Successes, impediments to success
- Team-based recommendations
Who was Interviewed

• The court
  – MHC judge
  – Probation officer/program manager
  – Defense attorney
  – Other municipal court judges
Who was Interviewed (cont.)

- The ADM board
- The treatment providers
  - Treatment manager and treatment supervisor
  - Court liaison
  - Caseworkers
  - Vocational specialists
  - Treatment psychiatrist
  - Jail screening psychiatrist
  - Clinical therapist
  - Substance abuse counselors
Types of Data to Collect For Outcome Evaluations

• The essence of outcome evaluation is comparison
  – Control group (experimental)
  – Comparison group (quasi-experimental)
  – Pre- and post- (time series)
Short-term vs. Long-term Outcomes

• Many funding agencies want long-term outcomes

• Some – especially the Princeton Group – argue there are too many intervening variables for most long-term outcomes

• The key is to pick the type of outcomes that best answer the goal of the evaluation
Short-term vs. Long-term Outcomes

• NIJ Guidelines for Byrne Formula Grant program use three-part distinction:
  – Implementation (i.e., “process”)
  – Results (i.e., “short-term”)
  – Outcomes or impacts (i.e., “long-term”)

• OCJS has used this model for its project performance reporting program
OCJS Project Performance Reports

- Implementation: monitoring of required elements

- Results information: collected through semi-annual performance reports

- Long-term outcomes: assessed through formal, usually independent, evaluations
Illustrations From Multi-Jurisdictional Law Enforcement Task Forces

• Implementation:
  – Control group formed and meeting regularly
  – MOUs on criminal asset forfeitures

• Results:
  – Number of investigations
  – Number of arrests
  – Amount of drugs seized
  – Amount of criminal assets seized and forfeited

• Outcomes (long-term):
  – Are communities with task forces better able to control drug trafficking?
Ohio Drug Court Evaluation

• Illustration of long-term outcome evaluation
  – Impact on recidivism
  – Cost-benefit analysis

• Illustrates how process, short-term, and long-term evaluations can work together

• Illustrates use of outside evaluators
Genesis of the Drug Court Evaluation

- Governor’s Office
- Growing presence of specialty courts
University of Cincinnati

- Quasi-experimental design
- Quantitative assessment of impact on recidivism
- Data collection methodology
Findings: UC Experimental and Control Groups

- 4 Courts of Common Pleas: 788 drug court participants, 429 comparison offenders
- 3 Municipal Courts: 556 drug court participants, 228 comparison offenders
- 3 Juvenile Courts: 310 drug court participants, 134 comparison offenders
Findings: Types of Other Services (UC)

- Alcohol Abuse
- Employment
- Family
- Housing
- Education
- Mental Health
- Physical Health

www.uc.edu/criminaljustice/researchreports.html
Findings: Program Retention (UC, OSU, and OCJS)

- 70% of drug court participants complete Phase I of treatment

- However, low graduation rates (those in the program counted as not graduated)

- Graduation rates improve over time
Findings: Recidivism
(UC, OSU, and OCJS)

- Common Pleas: lowered the probability of re-arrest by 19%
- Municipal: lowered the probability of re-arrest by 9%
- Juvenile: lowered the probability of re-arrest by 16%
- The longer the drug court is in existence the greater the lowering of recidivism
Findings: Factors Predicting Lower Recidivism (UC)

- Drug court participation was predictive for all three types of courts

- Predictive factors varied by type of drug court
  - Common Pleas: employed, complete High School, no prior record
  - Municipal: employed, complete High School, caucasian, time at risk
  - Juvenile: complete High School, no prior record, caucasian, time at risk, female
For every $1 spent on drug courts, there were savings to other systems of:

(a) $2.56 in criminal justice;
(b) $2.72 for domestic violence;
(c) $2.93 mental health;
(d) $2.92 in accidents;
(e) $3.30 in child support; and
(f) increase in earnings of $5.58.
Cost-Benefit: Northwest Professional Consortium

• Drug courts cost the court more than traditional court procedures

• Drug courts produce substantial benefits to the courts and – even more so – to related service systems

• http://npcresearch.com/
Where do we go from here?

- UC cost-benefit study
Closing

• Any questions, comments, or problems?