Welcome! We will begin at 2:00 p.m. ET

- Please enable your speakers for audio. If you are unable to hear the webinar through your speakers, please call 408-600-3600. You will be asked to enter the 9-digit event number listed in your confirmation email.

- It is always a good idea to close other windows while viewing the webinar.

- To ask a question during the session, use the chat tool to send a message to the moderator/facilitator.

- At the end of the session, you will be redirected to an evaluation.

- For problems during the webinar, please contact PGi Technical Support at 888-569-3848.
Help Us Count!

If you are viewing as a group, please go to the chat window and type in the name of the person registered and the total number of additional persons in the room, e.g. Tammy Jones, 15. This will help us with our final count.
Advanced Program Logic

Webinar Series
Assessing Project Performance: Building Blocks of Evaluation and Performance Measurement
Presented by OJJDP
in conjunction with the
National Juvenile Justice Evaluation Center
a project of the Justice Research and Statistics Association

Presenters: Stan Orchowsky, Mary Poulin and Carrie Williamson, JRSA
Justice Research and Statistics Association (JRSA)
Welcome to NJJEC!

The National Juvenile Justice Evaluation Center (NJJEC) is designed to assist state, local, and tribal entities with the evaluation of juvenile justice programs and implementation of evidence-based initiatives. We provide a number of resources to guide juvenile justice agencies and practitioners to select, implement, evaluate, and sustain programs supported by research evidence.

NJJEC is a project of the Justice Research and Statistics Association (JRSA). JRSA previously had a similar project called the Juvenile Justice Evaluation Center (JJEC). Many resources from the JJEC project are available on this website.

Notice of Federal Funding and Federal Disclaimer
This Web site is funded through a grant from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. Neither the Department of Justice nor any of its components operate control, are responsible for, or necessarily endorse, this Web site (including, without limitation, its content, technical infrastructure, and policies, and any services or tools provided).
Webinar Objectives

• Address common challenges associated with logic model development
• Describe strategies for improving program performance with logic models
Poll Question One
Logic Models
Refresher: Key Components of Logic Models

- **Goals** speak to the overarching mission of a program, and may not be achieved during the program’s operation.
- **Objectives** are measurable, identify the target population, offer a timeframe for completion and expected direction of change.
- **Activities** are very specific tasks that will be pursued during the program’s operation.
Refresher: Logic Models and Performance Measurement

• **Process measures** to demonstrate how well program *activities* are being implemented
• **Outcome measures** to determine if program is accomplishing its *objectives*
Styles of Presenting Program Logic

• If-then statements
  – IF I [activity], then I will [objective].
  – IF I [objective], then I will [goal].

• Schematic

Consider logic model’s purpose and audience when choosing a style.
Challenges Associated with Program Logic and Logic Modeling
Challenge: Show Me the Evidence!

• Why do you think activities will produce desired outcomes?
  – Review research (e.g., Model Programs Guide, Crimesolutions.gov, NCJRS, ICPSR)
  – Include in narrative statement
  – Search for evidence to support innovation if needed
Challenge: Show Me the Evidence!

• Example: Program based on Blueprints Promising Program *Good Behavior Game (GBG)*

**WHY?:**

• Activities → Objectives
  – Consistency, visibility of penalties

• Objectives → Goals
  – Accountability to peers and positive reinforcement for good behavior reduces bad behavior
Challenge: Defining the Problem

• Need evidence that the problem exists in my area
• Link problem to target population
• Establish baseline to demonstrate improvement
• Target activities in most efficient way
Challenge: Working Backwards

• Creating a logic model based on currently operating program or practice

• Bring together stakeholders
  – Is there agreement on the program purpose?
  – Do program activities still relate to objectives and goal?
  – What has changed since the program’s inception? Why?

• Logic model should be assessed periodically
Challenge: Reassessing Performance Measures

• Are data being collected uniformly?
  – Timing of pre/post-tests

• Are measures good indicators?
  – Measure of participation
    • Total number of individuals participating vs. number of individuals consistently participating
  – Services rendered
    • Intake form vs. satisfaction survey
Challenge: Defining Appropriate Objectives

• Benchmarks/standards
  – *Reduce number of youth reporting that they have consumed alcohol in the previous week*
  – *6 weeks into the program, reduce the number of youth reporting that they have consumed alcohol in the previous week by 50%*

• Need comparison data

• Consider timeframe: Is it reasonable?
Challenge: Defining Outcomes

- Proximal (short-term) and distal (long-term)
- Consider length of program, realistic length of impact
- External factors’ effects on outcomes, particularly long-term
Sample outcomes for a wraparound reentry program for juvenile offenders

• **Long-term goal:** for juvenile offenders to become healthy, productive, law-abiding citizens

• **Short-term goal:** to prevent additional adjudication in the juvenile justice system
Challenge: “P________” Logic?

• “Program” Logic for a *practice* or *policy*

• Define the scope
  – A practice may be more extensive than a program or overlap with other programs or practices
  – A policy may have few activities but many objectives

• Can make separate logic model for a new practice/policy within a program
Sample Program Logic for a Risk Assessment Tool (Practice)

Goal: To reduce overpopulation in a juvenile detention facility.

- **Activity:** Obtain risk assessment scores for all juveniles in county
- **Objective:** To only incarcerate juveniles determined to be high risk
Sample Program Logic for School Uniform Policy

Goal: To improve students’ ability to be successful in school by eliminating disruptions related to student dress.

- **Activity**: Implement a school uniform policy
- **Objectives** might include: improving students performance in the classroom; reducing incidence of bullying; increasing student perceptions of unity; reducing dress code violations; reducing gang-related violence
Challenge: Program Logic and Innovation

• Changes to an established or evidence-based program or practice
  – Frequently change target population
• Add/remove/alter components appropriate for context
• Justify changes via program logic
• May help identify critical elements of an EBP
EXAMPLE: Juvenile probation

• Goal: Prevent reoffending through community supervision and rehabilitation of juvenile offender

• Innovation: For specific target population [high risk] add new objective [increase face-to-face interaction with PO/caseworker]
EXAMPLE: Juvenile probation with *intensive supervision* component

- **Same** goal: Prevent reoffending through community supervision and rehabilitation of juvenile offender
- **New** objective: Increase interaction between juvenile and PO or caseworker
- **New** activities: Juvenile and PO meet 4 times per week at juvenile’s home; juvenile and counselor have 3 therapy sessions per week; etc.
Challenge: Program Logic and Innovation

• *Explain why* the change was made; *support* with research evidence
  – Believe more interactions will deter high risk offenders from committing new offenses
Challenge: How Much is Too Much?

- “Elevator speech”
- Measures: need clarity in what and how to measure, but not a codebook
- Program elements: relationships should be clear, but not an explanation of program theory
Challenge: How Much is Too Much?

• *Narrative* should contain:
  – Summary of relevant research/program model
  – Theory: X should cause Y because....
  – Target population
    • Who should participate in the program or be affected by the practice/policy? Why?
Challenge: How Much is Too Much?

• *Narrative* should contain:
  – Detailed explanation of measures
    • *Logic model*: Number of 18-21 year old program youth rearrested within 6 months of program completion
    • *Narrative*: Number of 18-21 year old program youth rearrested within 6 months of program completion for a new criminal offense; does not include technical violations of community supervision; records will be collected in Washington DC, Virginia, and Maryland
Poll Question Two
Is This A Good Logic Model?

- Streamlined
- Clear to program outsiders
- Useful tool for examining program successes and failures
- Reviewed throughout the course of the program
- Includes goal, objectives, activities, and measures
Logic Models and Program Improvement

• Is the program/practice succeeding or failing?

• Logic model provides a roadmap for assessing the how and why of program success

• Describe program elements and operation with precision

• Revisit logic model throughout the program
Logic Models and Program Improvement

Logic models demonstrate weaknesses in:

- Implementation
- Program Logic
- Data Collection
- External Factors
“Mission Creep”

• Project or practice may have extended beyond its original scope

• Compare:
  – What we set out to do
  – What we are doing now
“Mission Creep”

• *How* has our goal changed?
• Are we changing our goal to justify program activities?

• Add or modify objectives/activities to capture program operation accurately

**OR**

• Return activities/objectives back to the original program plan
Reassessing Performance Measures

• Important to be able to analyze and understand data collected
• Examine measures in the context of the logic model
• EXAMPLE: Using program participant logs as a measure of participation
  – Staff not collecting consistently or including forms for those not actually participating
  – Forms are partially or incorrectly filled
Reassessing Program Components

• Are we doing too much?
  – Reduce activities to focus resources

• Are we not doing enough?
  – Increase activities to achieve objectives

• Should we modify our objectives?
  – Reasonable to achieve during timeframe
  – Representative of implementation
### EXAMPLE: Reassessing Process Measures

**Goal:** To decrease disruptive classroom behavior.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Process Measures</th>
<th>Outcome Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To reduce aggressive and disruptive behaviors in the classroom</td>
<td>Give a penalty to each peer accountability group when one of its members displays a disruptive behavior</td>
<td>Total number of penalties assigned per week for the class</td>
<td>Number and percent of students exhibiting fewer aggressive or disruptive behaviors at the end of the semester, per teacher’s report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To increase awareness of the difference between appropriate and inappropriate behaviors</td>
<td>Reward peer accountability groups receiving fewer than 5 penalties in one week</td>
<td>Number and percent of groups per week with fewer than 5 penalties receiving reward</td>
<td>Number of students who are able to define and explain at least three more good and bad behaviors than they were able to at the beginning of the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Define and explain good and bad behaviors at least once a month in a classroom setting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consider key elements of EBP—the mechanisms we expect to cause change. **Consistency** and **visibility** of penalties and rewards are important here.
Example: Reassessing Process Measures

• Total number of penalties assigned per week per class
  – Shows *visibility* of penalties but not *consistency* in assigning penalties for disruptive behaviors

• Percent of disruptive behaviors observed by teacher’s aide that result in penalty being assigned to peer accountability group
For more information on ways to collect, present, and use program data for program improvement, attend the third webinar of this series:

Data Collection and Analysis

March 22\textsuperscript{nd}, 2012

Visit the NJJEC website at

http://www.jrsa.org/njjec/
Questions submitted during the presentation will now be addressed!
Please take 5 minutes to fill out the online evaluation which will be available immediately upon exiting WebEx.
Webinar Archives

Approximately 10 business days after the webinar, you can access the slide presentation, audio recording and transcript at [www.nttac.org](http://www.nttac.org).
For more information, please contact:

OJJDP’s National Training and Technical Assistance Center (NTTAC)

http://www.nttac.org

OJJDP Contact
Please take 5 minutes to fill out the online evaluation which will be available immediately upon exiting WebEx.