**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.
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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

1. Identify reasons why it is important to construct a good logic model
2. Define the elements typically included in a logic model
Today’s Topics

• Why logic models
• Common parts of a logic model
• Styles of logic models
• Discuss how to develop a logic model
Program Logic

• Connects the elements of a program: goals, objectives, activities, performance measures

•Explains why program activities should result in the achievement of program objectives and ultimately the program goal
Why Do I Need a Logic Model?

• Internally examine how activities, objectives, and goal are related
  – Highlights areas of weakness in program

• Make sure everyone is on the same page

• Reassess program logic if needed
Why Do I Need a Logic Model?

• Convey program operation and purpose clearly to stakeholders
  – “Elevator speech”

• Provide clear definitions for achievement

• Document measures by which program will be assessed
Key Components of a Logic Model

• **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
What to Include in a Logic Model

• Process and outcome measures
• May also include: problem statement, inputs (resources), short and long-term goals, sub-problems, etc.
• Consider program complexity, logic model audience
What to Include in a Logic Model

- Logic model: visual display of program logic
- AT LEAST: goal, objectives, activities, performance measures
- Schematic or IF-THEN statements
What’s Not on a Logic Model

• Explanation of program theory
• Summary of relevant research
• Details of program operation
• Secondary objectives and activities (i.e., not primary parts of a program design)
Sample Basic Logic Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Process Measures</th>
<th>Outcome Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Table continues with blank rows for additional entries]
Brainstorm: To stop students from misbehaving... to encourage good behavior in the classroom... To reward students’ good behaviors.... To use peer pressure to encourage good behavior....

**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>
</table>

The goal is the “big picture” purpose of a program. It may not be achieved during the time the program is in operation. Some programs have more than one goal.

A behavioral modification program that uses peer pressure to discourage disruptive behavior in the classroom; Based on the **Good Behavior Game (GBG), a Blueprints for Violence Prevention Promising Program**
**Activities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal: To decrease disruptive classroom behavior.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectives</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give a penalty to each peer accountability group when one of its members displays a disruptive behavior</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To increase awareness of the difference between appropriate and inappropriate behavior</td>
<td>Reward peer accountability groups receiving fewer than 5 penalties in one week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Define and explain good and bad behaviors at least once a month in a classroom setting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objectives must be *measurable* to show what the program has accomplished.

- Words like “reduce” and “increase” mean we need to have these measures *before* program activities occur for comparison.
- Multiple activities may be used to achieve the same objective.
<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 of times teacher reviews good/bad behaviors in classroom during the semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To increase awareness of the difference between appropriate and inappropriate behavior</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 times teacher reviews good/bad behaviors in classroom during the semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Define and explain good and bad behaviors at least once a month in a classroom setting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You should have at least one process measure for each activity.
### Outcome Measures

<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></td>
<td>Give a penalty to each peer accountability group when one of its members displays a disruptive behavior</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>To increase awareness of the difference between appropriate and inappropriate behavior</td>
<td>Reward peer accountability groups receiving fewer than 5 penalties in one week</td>
<td>Number of times teacher reviews good/bad behaviors in classroom during the semester</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></td>
<td>Define and explain good and bad behaviors at least once a month in a classroom setting</td>
<td>Number of times teacher reviews good/bad behaviors in classroom during the semester</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>
</tbody>
</table>

**You should have at least one outcome measure for each objective.**
How to Create a Logic Model

• Include program managers and line staff in development

• Why?
  – Importance of collaboration
  – Explain the logic
    • How should the program affect the outcome?
    • Are there discrepancies in what we’re doing and why we’re doing it?
• How?
  – Review available documents
  – Schedule meeting with managers and line staff
  – Open conversation about logic
  – Compare to available documents
  – Draft formal logic model
  – Review logic model with all staff
How to Begin

• Begin with GOAL and work through objectives and activities
  – Common understanding of the program purpose/mission

• Or, begin with ACTIVITIES, work through objectives and goal
  – Common understanding of what is involved in program operations
  – Avoid tendency to form goal to justify activities
Differentiating Objectives and Activities

- Plan to do = Activity
- Want to do because... = Objective

- We plan to hold 2 workshops per week [activity] IN ORDER TO increase high school youth’s knowledge of non-violent problem-solving skills [objective].
IF-THEHEN Program Logic Models

• **IF** we hold 2 workshops per week...
• **THEN** youth will learn.... And
• **IF** youth learn....
• **THEN** they will be less likely to use forms of violence in response to conflict.

*Logic model* includes IF-THEHEN statements

*Narrative* includes research base and program theory
## Beyond Logic Models

**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 behavior</td>
<td>Reward peer accountability groups receiving fewer than 5 penalties</td>
<td>Number and percent of groups per week with 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>

**Good Behavior Game (GBG) employs a similar logic**

*In narrative, use research to support choice of activities, objectives; justify how objectives impact the goal.*

**EBP**
Poll Question Two
Why Include Performance Measures in Logic Models?

- Performance measures show how the components of a logic model will be assessed.
- Program staff are aware of the purpose of data collection.
- Clearly link measures to objectives/activities:
  - Efficient data collection.
Performance Measures

• **Process (a.k.a. Output) Measures**: address program implementation; directly tied to activities

• **Outcome Measures**: address program accomplishments; directly tied to objectives
Developing Performance Measures

• Clearly defined and appropriately specific
  – What each term means
  – How each item is measured

• Clear comparisons across agencies—collect the same type of data in the same way

• Obvious to outsiders what the measure represents
A good Performance Measure is....

• Objective
• Relevant
• Able to indicate gradations of success
• Reliable
• Valid
Improving Performance Measures

• Does the measure provide you with information you can analyze and understand?
  – How can you make the data more useful?

• Is it practical to collect this information?
  – How can it be simplified or more easily obtained?

• Can your measures show both good and bad results?
Improving Process Measures

• Number of high school youth who attended non-violent conflict resolution workshops
  – Provides a count of youth who have attended at least one workshop
  – Poor measure of consistent attendance
Improving Process Measures

• **BETTER**: Number of high school youth who attended at least 6 non-violent conflict resolution workshops this month
  – Clearer and more specific
  – Better indicator of attendance— we know the same youth attended workshops consistently
Improving Outcome Measures

• Number of high school youth who learned new conflict resolution skills
  – Unclear how “learning” is measured
  – No specific about how many skills should be learned
Improving Outcome Measures

• **BETTER:** Number and percent of high school youth who were able to list 5 *new* non-violent conflict resolution skills after completing the program
  
  – Clearly measured
  
  – Indicator of *new* skills—can compare to a pre-test on the same information
Tomorrow’s Webinar:
Advanced Program Logic
February 23rd, 2012

• Address common challenges associated with logic model development
• Describe strategies for improving program performance with logic models
For more information on ways to collect, present, and use program data for program improvement, attend the final 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!
Webinar Archives

Approximately 10 business days after the webinar, you can access the slide presentation, audio recording and transcript at 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.