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Executive Summary

The Justice Research and Statistics Association (JRSA) launched the National Juvenile Justice Evaluation Center (NJJEC) in 2010. The goal of the project, which is funded by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), is to increase the evaluation and performance measurement capacity of state, local, and tribal grantees. The project provides training and technical assistance (TTA) through a variety of means, including webinars, an online tutorial, a Web site, and the dissemination of a newsletter called the NJJEC Bulletin.

In 2011, the National Juvenile Justice Evaluation Center conducted a national needs assessment of all state, local, and tribal OJJDP grantees. Training and technical assistance providers and organizations with research-only grants were excluded. An online survey was e-mailed to these grantees in June 2011. The assessment included separate instruments for state/local respondents and tribal respondents, and further delineated agencies and organizations by their function: service provider, grant-making, and dual-role agencies both making grant awards and providing direct services. The survey instrument contained both open and close-ended questions covering a variety of topics including agency/organization evaluation and performance measurement activity, training and technical assistance level of need and topics of interest, and challenges and successes related to evaluation and evidence-based programs and practices (EBP).

The respondents provided valuable information about their evaluation and performance measurement-related training and technical assistance needs. Key findings include:

- The majority of all respondents have used OJJDP materials on evaluation and referenced OJJDP’s Model Programs Guide. Grant-making agencies were slightly more likely to have utilized these resources than service provider agencies and organizations.
- Most state and local respondents rated their need for training and technical assistance at moderate or higher levels. Tribal respondents rated their own needs for training and technical assistance slightly higher than state/local respondents.
- Overall, common needs across state and local respondents included sustaining EBP, interpreting research evidence on EBP, and establishing baseline data. Service providers indicated need for TTA on performance measurement development, program logic and logic models, and cost-benefit analysis, while grant-making agencies indicated interest in learning more about implementing EBP and how to make use of evaluation results.
The majority of state, local, and tribal respondents collect performance measures beyond those required by OJJDP’s Performance Measures Program and Data Reporting System (DCTAT).

Unique challenges of tribal communities included data collection and information sharing, as well as cooperation among multiple aspects of the criminal justice system responding to crimes committed in Indian country.

The data indicated that information about evaluation, performance measurement, and evidence-based practices has reached grant-making agencies to a greater extent than service provider agencies. As service provider agencies were more likely to report having developed their own performance measures and logic models, it is critical that information on these topics continues to disseminate through agencies and organizations working directly with youth in service provision, treatment, and policies affecting youth in the criminal justice system. Tribal responses reflected state and local responses in many ways, but revealed some specific concerns and issues faced by the tribes with regard to evaluation and performance measurement. These tribal-specific issues include low retention of youth in programs and difficulty obtaining high-quality baseline data.
Introduction

The goal of the National Juvenile Justice Evaluation Center (NJJEC), a project of the Justice Research and Statistics Association (JRSA) funded by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), is to increase the evaluation capacity of state, local, and tribal OJJDP grant recipients. Project activities include the creation and maintenance of a Web site providing publications and online resources related to juvenile justice evaluation and evidence-based practices (http://www.jrsa.org/njjec/), training and technical assistance for agencies and individuals involved in juvenile justice programming, and the generation of electronic newsletters providing information on evaluation studies, conferences, and training events.

In 2011 NJJEC conducted a national assessment of current state, local, and tribal recipients of OJJDP grant funds to determine the needs of these grantees related to evaluation and evidence-based practices. Information derived from the needs assessment will be used to shape project activities, and determine which areas of training and technical assistance are most useful to different types of agencies and organizations receiving OJJDP funds.

The assessment was intended to be an extension of OJJDP’s 2010 National Needs Assessment of Juvenile Justice Professionals, but focused exclusively on questions pertaining to current OJJDP grant recipients involved in program performance measurement and evaluation activities. The needs assessment was developed to specifically assess the needs of this group of grantees, and account for the differences between grantees providing direct services in the field and those agencies or organizations that distribute federal grant monies to state and local sub-recipients. We excluded OJJDP training and technical assistance providers, projects exclusively focused on research and evaluation, and others outside the scope of NJJEC’s target audience of state, local, and tribal juvenile justice grantees in order to more specifically tailor the questions to this audience.

Drawing upon the 2011 survey results, this report describes the needs of juvenile justice direct service providers and granting agencies related to evaluation and evidence-based practices.
Methods
NJJEC conducted the needs assessment of active FY 2011 OJJDP grant recipients, the target audience of the National Juvenile Justice Evaluation Center, using an online data collection tool. Multiple versions of the survey were developed to capture nuances in the activities and training and technical assistance needs of different types of agencies and organizations. Data collection occurred from June to August 2011. Staff compiled contacts from multiple lists of project contacts provided by OJJDP contractors Lockheed Martin and Consulting Services and Research (CSR) Incorporated, as well as 18 additional lists received from Juvenile Justice Specialists and Enforcing Underage Drinking Laws (EUDL) coordinators in the states who were contacted individually by NJJEC staff. Tribal grantees were differentiated based on the type and description of the grant award provided from each of these sources.

Survey Development
In order to develop the surveys, JRSA staff consulted relevant documents as well as OJJDP personnel and contractors. This included a review of the National Needs Assessment of Juvenile Justice Professionals, a 2010 needs assessment conducted by OJJDP’s National Training and Technical Assistance Center (NTTAC) to avoid repetition with this survey. The NTTAC survey was distributed to a wider audience of juvenile justice professionals, and respondents were classified as management/administrators, frontline staff, or volunteers. Staff met with NTTAC and OJJDP representatives to discuss the content of this assessment, and how we might tailor the NJJEC surveys to be well-suited to NJJEC’s narrower target population. We also met with OJJDP staff who work with tribal grantees, to discuss the assessment content, method for data collection, and the potential implications of the Tribal Law and Order Act on the survey. As a result of this meeting we determined that a separate survey would be needed for tribal grantees to ensure that question wording would be appropriate and to include questions pertinent only to tribal grantees. After we drafted an initial tribal survey, we solicited feedback from OJJDP staff who work with tribal grantees, an OJJDP consultant that provides training and technical assistance to tribal grantees, and a few of the tribal grantees themselves regarding on the language and content of the tribal assessment to ensure appropriateness.

JRSA’s Internal Review Board reviewed and approved the survey instruments to ensure the protection of survey respondents. See Appendix A for the full text of the state and local assessment instrument and Appendix B for the full text of the tribal assessment instrument.
Survey recipients received an e-mail providing a brief explanation of the project and needs assessment. Each e-mail contained links to both the state/local survey and the tribal survey to permit respondents to self-identify as a member of one group or the other. Respondents were asked to enter an e-mail address to confirm their consent to participate. We were unsure if the contacts we identified were the appropriate person(s) to answer questions about the award; therefore, we requested that potential respondents forward the survey to other individuals if they were not in a position to answer these questions.

Survey Design

We assumed the needs and evaluation knowledge of grantees working directly with youth would differ from those of grantees involved in making funding decisions. Therefore, the surveys were designed to identify whether needs differed by type of respondent. First, the assessment placed respondents into one of three groups based on agency function: 1) respondents from agencies or organizations providing direct services to youth or operating one or more components of the juvenile justice system, 2) respondents from agencies or organizations sub-granting awards to others to provide direct services to youth, 3) respondents from agencies or organizations both sub-granting awards and providing direct services or operating one or more components of the juvenile justice system (i.e., dual-role agencies/organizations). These categories distinguish agencies and organizations providing direct services to youth from those responsible for allocating funds to these service providers. We included a third category to account for dual-role agencies and organizations that both provide direct services and administer grant awards to other service providers, as we were unsure if the activities and needs of these agencies would be unique or similar to either of the other two classifications. In this report, we refer to agencies receiving grant awards to provide services or operate juvenile justice programs as “service providers,” while agencies allocating federal funds are described as “grant-making/ administering” or “grantor” agencies.

The surveys asked all respondents to rate their own level of need and select topics of interest with regard to training and technical assistance, but also asked an additional question of grant-making agencies regarding the level of need and topics on which they would like to see their grantees receive training or technical assistance. Granting agencies have an informed perspective about the training and technical assistance needs

---

1 Sometimes the person listed as a contact was primarily responsible for financial or other aspects of the program, but was not the project manager or the person involved in the project on a day-to-day basis.
of their grantees due to their review of funding applications and program data. This question provided us with the ability to compare and examine the consistency of responses from juvenile justice practitioners with responses from their funding agencies and organizations.

Finally, the surveys contained both open- and close-ended questions. The open-ended questions permitted respondents the opportunity to express relevant issues not otherwise captured in close-ended questions.

The tribal grantee survey was structured similarly and addressed the same major topics as the state and local survey, but the language was altered to be more appropriate for the tribal system. Further, the tribal assessment included an open-ended question regarding the respondent’s view of the Tribal Law and Order Act of 2010—specifically, whether the respondents felt this act would impact evaluation or the use of evidence-based practices for tribal youth.
Results

The surveys were emailed in June 2011 and two additional e-mails were sent to remind individuals to respond to the surveys. Data collection ended in August 2011. As a result of allowing the survey to be forwarded, we are unable to ascertain an exact response rate because we could not track the number of times the link was forwarded. However, e-mails were sent directly to an initial pool of 2,223 recipients: 2,055 state or local grantees or sub-grantees, and 168 tribal grant recipients or sub-recipients. We received 962 responses from state and local grant recipients (approximate response rate of 47 percent), and 39 responses from tribal grant recipients (approximate response rate of 23 percent). Because all respondents did not answer every question, the total number of respondents included in each table varies.

Agency Composition

Both the state/local and the tribal surveys included an initial question asking respondents to classify their agency, organization, or group as one of the following:

1. Receives grant awards to provide direct services and/or operate one or more components of the juvenile justice system (“service provider”);
2. Makes grant awards to others to provide direct services and/or operate one or more components of the juvenile justice system (“grant-making” or “grant-administering”);
3. Both makes and receives grant awards to provide direct services and/or operate one or more components of the juvenile justice system (“both receiving and making grant awards’”); or
4. Neither of these applies to my agency/organization/group; for example, my agency/organization/group is an OJJDP training or technical assistance provider or a university or other organization with a research grant.

This question directed respondents to a set of questions appropriate to their agency/organization function and was also used to screen out individuals not targeted by the survey. Individuals selecting the fourth category were screened out.

During the survey design, we expected to see differences between agencies and organizations only responsible for administering grant awards to sub-grantees and those agencies or organizations administering grant awards but also providing services or operating components of the juvenile justice system. However, this was not the case, as most responses were similar for these two groups, and a relatively small number of respondents worked for agencies or organizations that only administer sub-grants and do
not provide direct services. As such, for the majority of the needs assessment discussion, we group together agencies making grant awards and those both making and receiving grant awards. Where appropriate, all three groups are delineated. Data derived from tribal respondents are discussed separately from data collected from state and local respondents.

Agency Function

State and Local Respondents

There were 916 valid respondents to the state and local survey. As shown in Figure 1, the vast majority (78 percent) classified themselves as agencies, organizations, or groups that receive grant awards to provide direct services to youth or operate one or more components of the juvenile justice system (i.e., grant-receiving agencies). Only 5 percent (46 respondents) of state and local respondents classified their agency or organization as grant-making only, while 17 percent stated that their agency or organization both makes grant awards and provides direct services or operates a component of the juvenile justice system. This question screened out an additional 46 respondents whose agency or organization did not fit into one of the targeted categories.

Agency Type

State and Local Respondents

Respondents were asked to describe their place of employment as state government, local government, non-governmental agency or organization, or “other.” Table 1 shows that
most of the state and local service providers were affiliated with non-governmental agencies or organizations (47 percent) or local government agencies (38 percent). Only 9 percent were affiliated with state government agencies, and the remaining respondents did not classify themselves into any of the above categories. The respondents from grant-making agencies predominantly (66 percent) described their places of employment as state government agencies. The remaining respondents were equally distributed between local government agencies (17 percent) and non-governmental agencies or organizations (17 percent).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1: State and Local Respondents Agency/Organization Type</th>
<th>Service Providers</th>
<th>Grant-Making Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Which of the following best describes where you work?</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-governmental agency or organization</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government agency</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State government agency</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of respondents</td>
<td>686</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We also inquired if respondents from grant-administering agencies were members of a Governor-appointed State Advisory Group (SAG), and whether or not the SAG has an evaluation subcommittee. Though only 10 percent of the 185 individuals responding to this question were members of a SAG, one third of respondents (33 percent) indicated that the SAG has an evaluation subcommittee.

**Tribal Respondents**

Tribal respondents provided 39 completed surveys. Nearly all (38 of 39) respondents classified themselves as recipients of grant awards or subcontracts providing services and/or operating one or more components of the tribal youth system. Only one respondent self-identified as a grant-making agency also providing direct services or

---

2 SAG members are appointed by the governor to provide information and guidance on juvenile justice policies and practices. States are required to have a SAG to receive OJJDP formula grant funds.

3 Eight of the 39 tribal respondents responded to the state and local survey, but were determined to be tribal respondents.
operating a component of the tribal youth system. As a result, we present tribal respondent data collectively rather than by agency function.

While nearly all tribal respondents stated that they receive grants to provide services or operate a component of the tribal youth system, we did collect some additional detail about the agency or organizational environment in which they work. Of the 39 tribal respondents, the majority (16 respondents) classified their agencies as direct service providers. Seven respondents were members of a tribal council or other government entity, and an additional seven were tribal law enforcement or tribal court employees. The remaining nine respondents were members of a tribal advisory group or community organization not considered to be a government or administrative agency, employees of tribal social or human service agencies, or selected the “other” category or declined to classify their place of employment.

**Agency Activities**

The surveys asked respondents to select general activities conducted by their agency or organization during the past year. Knowledge about the activities in which OJJDP grantees are participating helps determine not only what topics NJJEC should address, but also whether the topic should be at a more introductory or advanced level.

**General Activities**

**State and Local Respondents**

Regardless of agency function, a substantial number of respondents had participated in data collection, submission, and reporting activities during the previous year (see Table 2). The data demonstrate that service providers and grant-making agencies participate in data collection to a similar degree. In addition, most respondents, regardless of agency function, had participated in writing grant proposals during this period. More than 90 percent of service provider respondents indicated that their agencies or organizations collect performance measures, oversee/manage program operations, and write grant proposals. Of respondents who classified themselves as service providers, 87 percent deliver direct services to youth (leaving the remaining 13 percent as operators of components of the juvenile justice system not directly providing services to youth). Slightly more than half (57 percent) make project funding decisions, while only 35 percent write solicitations. More than 80 percent of grant-making respondents collect performance measurement data, oversee/manage program operations, write grant
proposals, write solicitations, and make project funding decisions. Only 18 percent of grant-making agencies deliver direct services to youth.

### TABLE 2: Agency Activities of State and Local Respondents

In the past year or so, have you or others at your agency participated in any of the following activities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Service Providers</th>
<th>Grant-Making Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Report on program performance/outcomes</td>
<td>663 96.9</td>
<td>186 96.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collect performance measurement data</td>
<td>647 94.6</td>
<td>171 88.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write grant proposals</td>
<td>642 93.9</td>
<td>163 84.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit performance measurement data</td>
<td>640 93.6</td>
<td>179 92.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oversee/manage program operations</td>
<td>635 92.8</td>
<td>164 85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliver direct services to youths</td>
<td>598 87.4</td>
<td>34 17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make project funding decisions</td>
<td>391 57.2</td>
<td>172 89.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write solicitations/RFPs/calls for proposals</td>
<td>241 35.2</td>
<td>163 84.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of respondents 684 193

*Note: Percentages exceed total of 100 because respondents were able to select more than one activity*
**Tribal Respondents**

All 37 tribal respondents providing an answer to the question regarding agency activities stated that their agencies deliver direct services to tribal youth, collect performance measurement data, and report on program performance/outcomes (see Table 3). The majority of respondents’ agencies or organizations oversees or manages program operations (97 percent) and are responsible for submitting performance measurement data (95 percent). Thirty-one tribal respondents’ agencies or organizations (84 percent) write grant proposals, while only 12 (32 percent) are responsible for writing solicitations or other calls for proposals. Twenty-four respondents (65 percent) reported that their agencies make project funding decisions.4

| TABLE 3: Agency Activities of Tribal Respondents |
|---|---|
| **In the past year or so, have you or others at your agency participated in any of the following activities?** | N | Percent |
| Deliver direct services to youths | 37 | 100.0 |
| Collect performance measurement data | 37 | 100.0 |
| Report on program performance/outcomes | 37 | 100.0 |
| Oversee/manage program operations | 36 | 97.3 |
| Submit performance measurement data | 35 | 94.6 |
| Write grant proposals | 31 | 83.8 |
| Make project funding decisions | 24 | 64.9 |
| Write solicitations/RFPs/calls for proposals | 12 | 32.4 |

**Total number of respondents** | **37**

*Note: Percentages exceed total of 100 because respondents were able to select more than one activity.*

The tribal responses concerning agency activities generally reflect those of state and local respondents, and support the need to emphasize strong data collection and reporting practices among all grantees. It is noteworthy that all tribal respondents report that they deliver direct services to youth, collect performance measurement data, and report on program performance/outcomes.

4 Since only one tribal respondent classified his/her agency as a grant-making agency, we assume these responses reference budgeting a single grant award within a program.
Evaluation-Related Activities of Agency/Organization

To determine which activities related to evaluation and evidence-based practices were most frequently carried out by our pool of respondents, we provided a list of relevant tasks and asked respondents which of these tasks they or others at their agencies had participated in during the past year. These tasks fell along three dimensions:

1. **Use of Evaluation Resources:** read articles or books on evaluation, read OJJDP materials on evaluation, referenced OJJDP’s *Model Programs Guide*, received training or technical assistance on evaluation or evidence-based programs/practices, read research articles/reports on juvenile justice programs/practices,

2. **Program Evaluation and Performance Measurement:** helped create a program logic model, incorporated an evaluation plan or findings into a funding proposal, implemented an evidence-based program/practice, developed performance measures, conducted or helped with an evaluation, had an evaluation by an evaluator contracted by your agency or other source, used findings from an evaluation to improve program function, and

3. **Advanced Evaluation/EBP Activities:** provided information, training, or technical assistance on EBP to others; recommended an evidence-based program/practice be implemented/funded; made/assisted in funding decisions on evidence-based programs/practices.

**State and Local Respondents**

The majority of state and local respondents reported having used a wide array of evaluation resources in the past year. Table 4 shows that regardless of agency function, nearly 70 percent of all state and local respondents read articles or books on evaluation, and more than 70 percent read research articles or reports on juvenile justice programs and practices. Similarly, more than half of both types of respondents had received some form of training or technical assistance on evaluation or evidence-based programs and practices during the previous year: 60 percent of respondents from service provider agencies, compared to 64 percent of respondents from grant-making agencies or organizations.

With regard to resources provided by OJJDP, 78 percent of respondents from grant-making agencies had referenced the *Model Programs Guide* in the previous year. Fewer respondents from service provider agencies (59 percent) utilized this resource. More than three fourths (139 respondents) of respondents from grant-making agencies read
OJJDP materials on evaluation during this time period, while only two thirds of service-providers read OJJDP materials on evaluation during the past year.

<p>| TABLE 4: Evaluation-Related Activities of State and Local Respondents: Use of Evaluation Resources |
| In the past year or so, have you or others at your agency participated in any of the following activities? |
| Service Providers | Grant-Making Agencies |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Read research articles/reports on juvenile justice programs/practices</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read articles or books on evaluation</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read OJJDP materials on evaluation</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received TTA on evaluation or evidence-based programs/practices</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referenced OJJDP’s Model Programs Guide</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of respondents 649 182

Note: Percentages exceed total of 100 because respondents were able to select more than one activity.

There was variation among respondent types in their program evaluation and performance measurement activities (see Table 5). The dual-role agencies and organizations carried out activities similar to service provider agencies and organizations. Respondents from agencies receiving grant awards to provide services, including the dual-role organizations, were more likely than agencies only making grant awards to be involved in most of the program evaluation and performance measurement activities. Grant making agencies were less likely to have developed performance measures, incorporated an evaluation plan or findings into a funding proposal, implemented an evidence-based program or practice or helped create a logic model than other respondent types. The most common evaluation and performance measurement activity of grant-making agencies was using findings from an evaluation to improve program function (55 percent) while the most common activity of grant receiving agencies was developing performance measures (approximately 74 percent for each type of grant receiving agency). The remaining evaluation and performance activities were among the least common, but still used by a substantial proportion of respondents. More than 55 percent of all three respondent types indicated that they have used findings from an evaluation to improve program function. Similar proportions of all three respondent types have
participated in or conducted their own evaluation, or had an evaluation conducted by an outside evaluator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 5: Evaluation-Related Activities of State and Local Respondents: Program Evaluation and Performance Measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>In the past year or so, have you or others at your agency participated in any of the following activities?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service Providers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed performance measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implemented an evidence-based program/practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used findings from an evaluation to improve program function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporated an evaluation plan or findings into a funding proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helped create a program logic model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducted or helped with an evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had an evaluation conducted by an evaluator contracted by your agency or other source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of respondents</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Percentages exceed total of 100 because respondents were able to select more than one activity.*

As might be expected, providing information, training, or technical assistance on evidence-based programs and practices to others is an activity more frequently carried out by grant-making agencies than other agency types given their role in making grant awards (see Table 6). Over 60 percent of grant-making agencies provided information or TTA on evidence-based practice in the past year, compared to only 39 percent of service-provider agencies or organizations. Similarly, 72 percent of grant-making agencies or organizations recommended that an evidence-based program be implemented or funded, compared to only 41 percent of agencies receiving grant awards. Funding decisions regarding evidence-based programs and practices are primarily made by agencies making grant awards: nearly 70 percent of respondents from grant-making agencies had made these decisions in the past year, compared to less than 30 percent of respondents from agencies or organizations only receiving grant awards.
TABLE 6: Evaluation-Related Activities of State and Local Respondents: Use of Evaluation Resources

In the past year or so, have you or others at your agency participated in any of the following activities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Service Providers</th>
<th>Grant-Making Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommended an evidence-based program/practice be implemented/funded</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided information, training, or technical assistance on evidence-based programs or practices to others</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made/assisted in funding decisions on evidence-based programs/practices</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of respondents</strong></td>
<td><strong>649</strong></td>
<td><strong>182</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Percentages exceed total of 100 because respondents were able to select more than one activity.*

**Tribal Respondents**

The top five evaluation-related activities carried out by tribal respondents during the past year were:

1. Read OJJDP materials on evaluation,
2. Developed performance measures,
3. Helped create a program logic model,
4. Incorporated an evaluation plan or findings into a funding proposal, and
5. Read research articles/reports on juvenile justice.

More than half of tribal respondents had undertaken these five activities (see Table 7). Though not quite as common, 50 percent had implemented an evidence-based program or practice in the past year or so, and an equal number had referenced OJJDP’s *Model Programs Guide*. Fifteen (42 percent) indicated that their organization or agency had an evaluation by an evaluator contracted by the respondent’s agency or other source during the previous year. Only one tribal respondent had not participated in any sort of evaluation-related activities in the past year.
TABLE 7: Evaluation-Related Activities of Tribal Respondents

In the past year or so, have you or others at your agency participated in any of the following activities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of Evaluation Resources</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Read OJJDP materials on evaluation</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>69.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read research articles/reports on juvenile justice programs/practices</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received TTA on evaluation or evidence-based programs/practices</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>52.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read articles or books on evaluation</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referenced OJJDP’s Model Programs Guide</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program Evaluation and Performance Measurement

| Developed performance measures                                       | 25 | 69.4    |
| Helped create a program logic model                                  | 24 | 66.7    |
| Incorporated an evaluation plan or findings into a funding proposal  | 21 | 58.3    |
| Used findings from an evaluation to improve program function         | 20 | 55.6    |
| Implemented an evidence-based program/practice                       | 18 | 50.0    |
| Conducted or helped with an evaluation                              | 17 | 47.2    |
| Had an evaluation conducted by an evaluator contracted by your agency or other source | 15 | 41.7 |

Advanced Evaluation/EBP Activities

| Recommended an evidence-based program/practice be implemented/funded | 17 | 47.2 |
| Provided information, training, or technical assistance on evidence-based programs or practices to others | 11 | 30.6 |
| Made/assisted in funding decisions on evidence-based programs/practices | 4  | 30.6 |
| None                                                                  | 1  | 2.8   |

Total number of respondents 36

Note: Percentages exceed total of 100 because respondents were able to select more than one activity.

Performance Measurement

Use of DCTAT and Collection of Additional Performance Measures

Respondents were asked if they had worked with OJJDP’s Performance Measures Program and Data Reporting System (DCTAT), the performance measurement system OJJDP grantees are required to use to assess the performance of their award.
State and Local Respondents

More agencies making grant awards reported having worked directly with DCTAT during the past year compared to respondents from service provider agencies and organizations. This is not surprising even though all recipients of OJJDP funds are required to submit performance measure data to DCTAT. Not every person working with a juvenile justice program would be responsible for this task, and many may not be aware of the kinds of information that are being reported and the sources from which this information is derived. Further, it is our understanding that many sub-recipients do not report directly into DCTAT, but rather report measures to their grantor who enters the data into DCTAT.

Table 8 shows that, among respondents working with agencies or organizations who make or both make and receive grant awards, 79 percent had worked directly with DCTAT, while only 63 percent of service provider respondents had worked with DCTAT. This implies that many direct service providers report performance measures to their granting agencies who in turn report into DCTAT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 8: State and Local Respondents</th>
<th>Have you worked with OJJDP’s Performance Measures Program and Data Reporting System (DCTAT)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service Providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>645</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We asked respondents if their agencies collected additional performance measures beyond those required by DCTAT, and if so, why. There was little across-group variation, regardless of whether the respondent was affiliated with a service providing or grant-making agency, more than half of respondents indicated that they do collect additional performance measurement data beyond what is required by OJJDP (see Table 9).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 9: State and Local Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does your agency or organization collect performance measures beyond those required for DCTAT?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Percentages may not equal 100 due to rounding.*

We asked these respondents to provide reasons for why they collect additional performance measure data. We received 595 responses from 454 respondents to this question. We identified the following themes in these responses:

- **Requirement from an Additional Funding Stream.** Legislative, state, or non-government granting agency or funding stream requires the collection of these measures;
- **Other Requirement.** It is a licensing or accreditation, court-order, or other requirement of program partner or parent agency;
- **Program Planning.** It is done to help program planning, improvement, sustainability; including need to collect additional information for future grant applications and funding support;
- **Program-Specific Measures.** Data of interest are not included in DCTAT measures, and grantee desires more program-specific, localized measures;
- **Program Evaluation.** In furtherance of outcome-oriented program evaluation; to more accurately assess the impact of program activities; and
- **In-House Assessment.** It is used for organizational quality control or internal records; agency policy; internal management.
As shown in Table 10, more than 40 percent of respondents from both groups had performance measurement requirements from other funding agencies or funding streams, including government and non-government agencies and organizations. About 35 percent of grant-making agencies and 20 percent of service providers noted the need for more program-specific information, and collected additional measures that were tailored to their programs. The need for additional data to conduct program (outcome) evaluation and in-house assessment of performance were also highly cited reasons for collecting additional measures beyond those required by DCTAT.

### TABLE 10: State and Local Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why does your agency/organization collect additional performance measures than those required by DCTAT?</th>
<th>Service Providers</th>
<th>Grant-Making Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional funding stream requirement</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program planning</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-house assessment</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program-specific measures</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program evaluation</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other non-funding related requirement</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of respondents 347 107

*Note: Percentages exceed total of 100 because respondents were able to provide more than one reason.

*Percent of total respondents
Tribal Respondents

Of the 35 tribal respondents who provided an answer to this survey item, the vast majority (86 percent) have worked directly with the DCTAT system, as shown in Table 11. Similar to state and local respondents, more than half of tribal respondents indicated that they collect performance measures beyond those required by DCTAT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 11: Tribal Respondents</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does your agency or organization collect performance measures beyond those required for DCTAT?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of respondents</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Percentages may not equal 100 due to rounding.*

Seventeen respondents provided 26 answers to the question regarding the reason for collection of additional performance measures beyond those required by DCTAT, as shown in Table 12. These responses were consistent with those provided by state and local respondents. The most frequently cited reasons for the collection of additional measures were program planning, additional funding stream requirements, program evaluation, and the need for additional data to conduct in-house assessment of program activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 12: Tribal Respondents</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Why does your agency/organization collect additional performance measures than those required by DCTAT?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program planning</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional funding stream requirement</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program evaluation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-house assessment</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other non-funding-related requirement</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program-specific measures</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of respondents</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percents exceed total of 100 because respondents were able to provide more than one reason.*
Training and Technical Assistance (TTA) Needs

The surveys asked agencies receiving grant awards to rate their level of need for training and technical assistance (TTA) on evaluation, as well as choose specific topics they would like to know more about. We asked respondents who make grant awards the same questions, but also asked them about their perception of their grantees’ need for TTA. As these agencies review funding applications, they are a valuable source of information about their grant applicants’ level of knowledge and comprehension. This provided an opportunity to compare internal and external perception of the need for TTA.

**State and Local Respondents**

Service provider respondents rated their own level of need for training and technical assistance at an average of 2.79 on a 5-point scale where 5 indicates greatest need. Of these respondents, 138, or 23 percent, rated their need for TTA at a level 4 or 5 (“great need”) (See Figure 2). In contrast, grant-making agencies, including dual-role agencies who make and receive grant awards, rated the TTA needs of their grantees (service providers) substantially higher at an average of 3.59, with 99 (57 percent) stating that grantees’ need ranked at a level 4 or 5. Grant-making agencies had an average self-described need for training and technical assistance of 2.85, with 50 respondents (29 percent) indicating their need for TTA was at a level 4 or 5. So, grant-making agencies perceived themselves as having less need for TTA in the area of evaluation than they perceived their grantees to have. Altogether, average needs for TTA on evaluation were moderate (near level 3).

**Figure 2:** Average Scores of State and Local Respondents’ Perception of Need for TTA

*On a scale from 1 to 5, how would you rate your agency/organization/grantees’ need for evaluation training/technical assistance?*

- **Granting Agency Perception of Need for SELF**: 2.85
- **Granting Agency Perception of Need for GRANTEES**: 3.59
- **Service Provider/Practitioner Perception of Need for SELF**: 2.79
Respondents were presented with the list of training and technical assistance topics and asked to select all topics on which they were interested in receiving training and technical assistance. Service provider respondents were asked to select their needs, while all grant-making agencies were asked to select needs for themselves and their grantees.

Of the TTA needs of service providers (both self-identified and identified by grant-making agencies), the most frequently cited was sustaining evidence-based programs and practices—54 percent of grant-receiving agencies declared a need for this type of assistance, compared to 70 percent of grant-making agencies who responded that their grantees need training in this area (see Table 13). If we consider the top five most frequently cited needs, there was agreement between service providers and grant-making agencies on two other of the top five TTA needs for service providers: establishing baseline data (fourth) and interpreting research on evidence-based programs (fifth).

There were disparate responses, however, with regard to other needs in the top five list for service providers. Cost-benefit analysis and developing performance measures were in the top five most frequently chosen topics of need by service providers for themselves, but grant-making agencies were less likely to select these needs for their grantees. In contrast, grant-making agencies were more likely to choose TTA needs for their grantees in areas of implementing evidence-based programs and how to use evaluation results.

Respondents were also able to list other additional training and technical assistance needs not provided in the list of topics. Though few respondents did this, a few respondents from service provider agencies noted a desire to acquire the recognition or label “evidence-based” for the programs they are currently operating, and the need for assistance selecting and implementing EBP with limited resources.
**TABLE 13: State and Local Respondents**

**On which of the following topics would you like to receive training or technical assistance?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Providers selected topics for themselves</th>
<th>Grant-Making Agencies’ selected topics for their grantees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustaining evidence-based programs and practices</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost-benefit analysis</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing performance measures</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing baseline data</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collecting and interpreting research on evidence-based programs</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey design and methodology</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to use evaluation results</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing evidence-based programs</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing a database</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporating performance measures into a Request for Proposals</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing for an evaluation/conducting an evaluability assessment</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting an evaluation</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy concerns for human subjects</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of respondents: 620 | 169

*Note: Percentages exceed total of 100 because respondents were able to select more than one topic.*
Respondents from grant-making agencies most frequently selected sustaining evidence-based programs and practices (58 percent) as a topic on which they would like to receive training and technical assistance (See Table 14). The second most frequently selected topic for TTA was cost-benefit analysis (50 percent). How to use evaluation results (42 percent) and the collection and interpretation of research on evidence-based programs (41 percent) were also frequently selected by respondents from grant-making agencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 14: State and Local Grant-Making Agencies Only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On which of the following topics would you like to receive training or technical assistance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustaining evidence-based programs and practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost-benefit analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to use evaluation results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collecting and interpreting research on evidence-based programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing baseline data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey design and methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporating performance measures into a Request for Proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing evidence-based programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing for an evaluation/conducting an evaluability assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing performance measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting an evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing a database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy concerns for human subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of respondents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percentages exceed total of 100 because respondents were able to select more than one topic.

Tribal Respondents

Of the 36 tribal respondents who provided responses to the question concerning their need for training and technical assistance, the average rating of need was 3.39 on a scale
from 1 to 5 where 5 indicates “great need.” Ten of the 36 respondents indicated that their tribes had a “great need” for training and technical assistance.

We asked tribal respondents to select topics on which they would like to receive training and technical assistance. The most frequently selected topic was sustaining evidence-based programs and practices (67 percent) (See Table 15). More than half of tribal respondents indicated that they would also like to receive training or technical assistance related to establishing baseline data, implementing evidence-based programs, survey design and methodology, and how to use evaluation results. Cost-benefit analysis was also a frequently selected topic, as 45 percent of tribal respondents chose this topic as an area of interest for training and technical assistance.

| TABLE 15: Tribal Respondents  
On which of the following topics would you like to receive training or technical assistance? | N    | Percent |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustaining evidence-based programs and practices</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to use evaluation results</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing baseline data</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing evidence-based programs</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey design and methodology</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost-benefit analysis</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing a database</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing performance measures</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>41.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing for an evaluation/conducting an evaluability assessment</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting an evaluation</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collecting and interpreting research on evidence-based programs</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporating performance measures into a Request for Proposals</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy concerns for human subjects</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of respondents 36

Note: Percentages exceed total of 100 because respondents were able to select more than one topic.
Challenges and Successes Related to Evaluation and Evidence-Based Practices

In order to learn more about the evaluation and evidence-based practice activities of survey respondents, we asked respondents which evidence-based or evaluation related policies and practices are working well in their agencies and organizations as well as what challenges they are facing related to these topics.

State and Local Respondents’ Successes
When asked what evidence-based or evaluation-related policies or practices are working well in their agency/organization, 501 respondents provided 603 responses. The responses were analyzed for recurring themes, and classified into the following 13 general categories:

- **Program impact or effect.** Specific program (not necessarily evidence-based) is perceived to be effective at meeting its goals or increasing compliance with the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (JJDPA);
- **Data collection methods;**
- **Reporting practices.** Accurate or timely reporting of performance measurement data; performance measures are perceived as useful;
- **Program planning.** Logic models, development of program logic;
- **Program implementation.** Good training for frontline staff; staff following planned program activities;
- **Partnerships and assistance.** Partnerships with an outside evaluator, agency, consultant, or other collaborator; training or technical assistance from an outside agency or individual;
- **Internal and external support for evidence-based programming.** Substantial support for EBP from grantors, local/state policy, etc.;
- **Data quality.** Consistency of measures; collecting high-quality, useful information;
- **Program improvement.** Using data to increase effectiveness and sustain program;
- **Self-generated performance measures.** Collecting program-specific measures that are useful for evaluation; collecting standardized measures from multiple program sites or extensions;
- **Evidence-based practice.** Specific evidence-based or data-driven practice or program is working well in jurisdiction; promising practices viewed as effective;
- **Program evaluation.** Participation of program staff in evaluation; using better methods for program evaluation; and
- **NA or Unknown.**
The most frequently cited success among all respondents was a specific program, practice, or policy that was perceived to have the intended effect on outcomes. Two of the top five most frequently cited successful practices involved data collection. A number of these respondents mentioned specific data reporting systems that made it easier for grantees to enter performance measurement data, or spoke of new methods or technologies they had begun to use to facilitate and improve data collection efforts.

Respondents perceived their data to be more consistent and uniform than in the past. Table 16 presents these responses separately for service provider respondents and grant-making respondents. There are a few notable differences between the responses provided by each respondent type. Nearly 16 percent of grant-making agencies said both internal and external support for evidence-based programs and practices was a notable success, compared to less than 5 percent of service provider respondents. This suggests that buy-in and support for evidence-based programs and practices may be greater at the grant-making level than the practice level. Grant-making agencies also indicated partnerships and assistance more frequently than service providers (18 percent compared to 11 percent) as evaluation or evidence-based practices/policies that were working well. It is unclear whether this is occurring because grant-making agencies participate in partnerships or receive assistance more frequently or because they have greater success when they attempt this activity. Respondents from agencies providing direct services noted program impact and data collection efforts as practices that work well more frequently than grant-making agencies.
TABLE 16: State and Local Respondents
What evidence-based or evaluation-related policies or practices are working well in your agency/organization?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Providers</th>
<th>Grant-Making Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program impact or effect</td>
<td>61 15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence-based practice</td>
<td>60 15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection methods</td>
<td>58 14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program implementation</td>
<td>42 10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships and assistance</td>
<td>42 10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data quality</td>
<td>41 10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program evaluation</td>
<td>30 7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting practices</td>
<td>29 7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program improvement</td>
<td>27 6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program planning</td>
<td>18 4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal and external support for EBP</td>
<td>18 4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-generated performance measures</td>
<td>17 4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA or Unknown</td>
<td>34 8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of respondents</strong></td>
<td><strong>399</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percent of total respondents

Note: Percentages exceed total of 100 because respondents were able to provide more than one success.

State and Local Respondents’ Challenges

In addition to being asked about their successes related to evaluation and evidence-based practices, respondents were asked, “What are the most substantial issues or challenges currently with regard to evaluation and evidence-based programs and practices in your agency/organization?”

The 595 respondents provided 866 responses. These responses classified into 12 themes:

- **Understanding “evidence-based.”** Understanding what qualifies as evidence-based and the proper method for selecting a program, finding evidence-based program components that are applicable for program context;
- **Stakeholders.** Stakeholder understanding of evidence-based programs; buy-in for the idea of evidence-based programs and practices;
• **Data collection.** General knowledge about the appropriate way to collect, clean, and analyze data;

• **Data collection technology.** Technological aspects of data collection, including building a database and streamlining data input processes;

• **Developing useful performance measures.** Developing program-specific measures that focus more on program outcomes;

• **Funding.** Financial constraints on program operation or funding data collection and evaluation;

• **Knowledge of Evaluation Methods.** Training and knowledge of evaluation methods;

• **Use of data.** How to report program results or data, using evaluation and performance measurement for program improvement;

• **Sustainability.** Maintaining consistent funding and other forms of support from stakeholders, program/service delivery expansion;

• **Client participation.** Sufficient client participation and communication to facilitate data collection, program attrition;

• **Program implementation and program characteristics.** Adherence to the program plan, having enough resources to follow program model; management difficulties, staffing limitations, or time constraints; agency characteristics restrict availability of resources to implement program models (e.g., small size, rural location, etc.); and

• **Grant requirements.** Requirements for grant proposal submission, reporting requirements during course of grant award.

Examined collectively, the most frequently provided EBP and evaluation-related challenges of state and local respondents were funding and program implementation/characteristics. Data collection, cleaning, and analysis was the third most frequently cited challenge, followed by training and knowledge of evaluation methods and developing useful and informative performance measures (See Table 17).
TABLE 17: State and Local Respondents
What are the most substantial issues or challenges currently with regard to
evaluation and evidence-based programs and practices in your
agency/organization?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Service Providers</th>
<th>Grant-Making Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program implementation</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of evaluation methods</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing useful performance measures</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding &quot;evidence-based&quot;</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client participation</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of data</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection technology</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program implementation</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant requirements</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA or Unknown</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of respondents</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percentages exceed total of 100 because respondents were able to provide more than one challenge.
*Percent of total respondents

It is noteworthy that data collection was a frequently cited success for this pool of respondents in addition to being a frequently cited challenge. This suggests substantial variation across grantees with regard to data collection issues. As shown in Table 17, when challenges are examined separately by agency function, the data show that data collection efforts are more frequently mentioned as a challenge by service providers (23 percent) than grant-making agencies (12 percent).

Tribal Respondents’ Successes and Challenges

Twenty-four tribal respondents reported their challenges and successes related to evaluation and EBP. The most frequently mentioned successes were specific program activities that respondents perceived as impactful, including the delivery of culturally appropriate services (nine respondents). Respondents also noted success with the quality
or consistency of data collection, as well as support for programming from funding agencies. The most frequently cited challenges of tribal respondents were funding, data collection/cleaning/analysis, management/staffing/time constraints, and training or knowledge of evaluation methods. Other challenges cited included difficulty in trust building, poor communication between tribal groups, and inconsistent program participation by youth. Tribal respondents also noted the need for evidence-based programs tailored to tribal target populations, as well as the difficulty of coordinating data collection among sovereign tribal nations. Inconsistent participation and program attrition in programs operating with a small group of youth represent a particularly difficult challenge for tribal programs as they try to assess program performance.

**Tribal Law and Order Act**

The Tribal Law and Order Act (TLOA) of 2010 was enacted to encourage interjurisdictional cooperation and information-sharing between tribal justice systems and federal, state, and local law enforcement. It mandates that the Bureau of Justice Statistics facilitate the collection and analysis of data concerning crimes committed in Indian country, where previously reporting and information sharing were sparse. To determine grantees’ perspective on the TLOA, we asked tribal respondents, “What impact, if any, do you expect the Tribal Law and Order Act of 2010⁵ to have on evaluation or evidence-based practices for tribal youth?”

Sixteen of the 39 tribal respondents provided an answer, but many of the respondents indicated that they were unsure what to expect, if anything. There was a general interest in the increase of justice in the tribal legal system, most notably with regard to sexual and violent victimization of tribal women. Respondents hoped the implementation of standardized measures across tribal agencies might further their ability to obtain outside funding and increase access to resources they need to collect quality data.

However, there were also several negative potential repercussions mentioned by the respondents, including concern that the increased responsibilities create “an added burden” on staff to compile data. Respondents also noted that they do not currently have sufficient resources to meet standards for reporting, and that the mandates themselves will be unfunded.

---

⁵ The Tribal Law and Order Act of 2010 requires the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) to establish and implement a tribal data collection system, support tribal participation in national records and information systems, and provide yearly reports to Congress on the data that has been collected.
Discussion

The surveys provided valuable insight into the evaluation-related training and technical assistance needs of OJJDP’s state, local, and tribal grantees. Given the high proportion of respondents who reported engaging in a wide variety of evaluation activities and the high proportions requesting assistance on various topics related to evaluation and EBP, there is a clear need to provide assistance to ensure that the work that OJJDP grantees do in this area is of high quality.

Generally, we found that responses provided by agencies and organizations administering grant awards and also providing services or operating components of the juvenile justice system are more similar to agencies who only administer grant awards than to those who deliver direct services to youth.

State and Local Needs

When service providers and grant-making agencies from states and localities self-rated their needs on evaluation-related assistance, we found that they have a moderate level of needs. However, service providers appear to have greater evaluation-related needs than agencies making grant awards. We conclude this based on two findings from the survey: 1) when respondents of grant-making agencies were asked about the evaluation-related needs of their grantees, they rated the level of need as substantially higher, and 2) service providers were less likely to access OJJDP-produced resources on evaluation and evidence-based practices than grant-making agencies.

Shared Needs

When presented with a list of TTA topics, we identified a number of needs that service providers and grant-making agencies on the state and local level shared. Here we discuss the identified needs and consider project activities to help address those needs.

With regard to evidence-based practices, we found that these respondents want assistance in interpreting research on EBP and how to sustain EBP. Together, this indicates that the push for implementation of evidence-based programming has been successful enough that continuation of these programs and practices has become a prioritized issue. Further, these respondents sought assistance on how to do cost-benefit analysis and establish baseline data. Baseline data would help programs report on changes that occur during the course of their programs. Funding and sustainability were
among the most frequently cited responses of both service providers and grant-making agencies in response to an open-ended question regarding challenges related to evaluation and EBP. A practitioner-friendly toolkit on sustainability could be a useful resource for NJJEC to develop. This resource might be most useful from a two-pronged approach: facilitating sustainability at the service provider level through high-quality data collection, analysis, and use of data for program improvement; and a top-down approach for grant-making agencies that focuses on the emphasis of best practices at the service-provider level, and the usefulness of data analysis and reporting for program improvement and continued funding. A substantial percentage of granting agencies stated that they have a need for TTA related to cost-benefit analysis, a critical element in continuing both individual evidence-based programs and practices as well as pushing a more broad-based approach to evidence-based policy decisions.

The ability to adhere to a program model was also cited as a challenge by both service providers and grant-making agencies. Finally, data collected on state and local respondents’ use of existing evaluation resources show that these resources are widely available and utilized, especially by grant-making agencies, but there is also substantial room for improvement. Any TTA approach that NJJEC uses should promote existing resources as well as develop new ones. Grant-making agencies may be a valuable partner in the effort to promote these resources to their grantees who are service providers.

The data indicate that the majority of state and local respondents collect additional performance measures beyond those required by OJJDP’s performance measurement system, DCTAT. This is an important factor to consider in designing training and technical assistance for OJJDP grantees for several reasons. The frequent use of additional performance measures calls for an emphasis on developing appropriate measures and data collection methods for these measures when these activities are performed by the grantee, as well as for conveying appropriate sources for data and units of measurement. Tools to facilitate the efficient collection, analysis, and reporting of data are also important given the additional time and resources required to collect additional data. While more than 40 percent of respondents indicated that they collect additional measures because they are required by agencies other than DCTAT, we know a number of funding streams and state/local government agencies require grantees to develop their own performance measures as part of the grant proposal process. As such, this group of grantees would benefit from training on developing high-quality performance measures, and this should be a strong focus of the resources made available by NJJEC.
Variation in Needs

Though service providers and grant-making agencies shared some evaluation-related needs and challenges, there were significant variations as well. This suggests tailoring training and technical assistance to the audience.

Service providers were more focused than grant-making agencies on wanting assistance to develop performance measures. Grant making agencies were more concerned than service providers with getting assistance on how to use evaluation results. Though both of these topics address the issue of demonstrating program/project effectiveness, they reflect different stages in the process. Perhaps staff of grant-making agencies are more comfortable than service providers in writing performance measures and are now more focused on using the performance measure data collected. Regardless, given the high percentage of all respondents noting participation in the collection, submission, and reporting of performance measurement data and their requests for assistance, NJJEC should address these needs.

When respondents were asked to list challenges related to evaluation and EBP, there were some variations across respondent types with funding being a greater challenge for grant-making agencies than service providers and issues related to data collection and analysis a greater concern for service providers than grant-making agencies.

One of the broad takeaways from this assessment is a lack of resources. Three of the most frequently cited challenges of state and local respondents—lack of funding, factors affecting ability to implement programs as designed, and need for training/knowledge of evaluation methods—reflect a general lack of available resources to dedicate to evaluation and performance measurement efforts that extend beyond the provision of direct services. For example, many respondents specifically cited the cost of materials and resources related to implementing evidence-based programs and practices as a substantial constraint, particularly for small agencies or programs and those operating in rural areas. There is a great need for increased efficiency for these agencies and organizations regardless of their roles as service providers or grant administrators. Though it is not possible for NJJEC to address the lack of funding, the development of resources to facilitate data collection and analysis efforts can later be used to help agencies understand the implications of making modifications to designs of evidence-based programs.

Tribal Needs
As we consider what was learned about tribal needs, it is important to keep in mind that the response rate from this community was quite low, much lower than that of the state and local respondents. We are unsure of the extent to which the respondents represent the tribal justice needs related to youths. Tribal respondents’ agency activities reflected a number of the state and local activities such as involvement in data collection and reporting. Tribal grantees specified a few unique challenges that are important to consider in the delivery of assistance to tribal justice systems, particularly with regard to communication between tribal groups and low levels of program participation by youth.

Considering tribal respondents’ evaluation-related activities during the previous year and that nearly half of the tribal respondent had not had training and technical assistance related to evaluation or evidence-based practices in the past year, there is need for training and technical assistance on some basic evaluation issues like program logic model development and the creation of performance measures, as well as how to collect data. In addition, we noted that a number of tribal respondents—30.6 percent—have provided training or technical assistance to others. Given this experience, “train the trainer” TTA efforts throughout the tribal community might be a fruitful means of reaching the tribal community.

More than half of tribal respondents indicated that they collect additional performance measures beyond those required by DCTAT. The two most frequently cited reasons for collecting additional performance measures were that the measures were required for an additional funding stream or that measures were needed for program planning purposes. Similar to the state and local respondents, we view the high percentage of tribal grantees collecting additional measures as an indicator that training and technical assistance should include the development of appropriate measures as a training topic.

Tribal respondents face challenges specific to their award and program sizes related to sustaining evidence-based programs and practices, the most frequently selected topic of interest for training and technical assistance by this group of grantees. TTA created for tribal grantees related to sustainability should address these issues. Tribal respondents’ high level of interest in training and technical assistance related to establishing baseline data is a key component of the ability to sustain programs as baseline data provide the ability to demonstrate changes in youth and communities over time. Many typical sources of baseline data have caveats in the tribal community, specifically related to crime reporting and arrest data. For example, underreporting of criminal offenses has been a
longstanding problem in Indian Country\textsuperscript{6}, and is further exacerbated by the complexity of data collection and information sharing among federal, state, local, and tribal jurisdictions, who may each be involved in responding to crimes in Indian country. While the Tribal Law and Order Act places new emphasis on the quality and accessibility of these data, training and technical assistance related to establishing baseline data for tribes should carefully consider the current limitations of the available data.

\textsuperscript{6} See, for example, Bachman et al.'s 2008 report \textit{Violence Against American Indian and Alaska Native Women and the Criminal Justice Response: What is Known} available at \url{http://www.nij.gov/topics/tribal-justice/vaw-research/prior-research.htm}. 
Appendix A
State and Local Needs Assessment
Introduction

In order to conduct a needs assessment for its National Juvenile Justice Evaluation Center (NJJEC) project, the Justice Research and Statistics Association (JRSA) is soliciting responses from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) awards to answer a series of questions regarding evaluation activities of you and/or your agency. The needs assessment will be used to identify the type of training and technical assistance that would increase juvenile justice evaluation capacity for OJJDP grantees. The assessment is an extension of OJJDP's 2010 National Needs Assessment of Juvenile Justice Professionals, and explores issues related to evaluation capacity and evidence-based programs and practices. There are no anticipated risks associated with participating in data collection.

Your participation in this research is voluntary, and you may stop at any time by exiting the web site. We will not identify individuals or their states when we summarize the findings from questions, but we may follow up with you to clarify a response. It should take approximately 20 minutes to answer the questions. By entering your e-mail address on the next page, you acknowledge that you have read and understand these conditions and agree to participate in data collection. Thank you for your participation.

Here are definitions for two key terms used in the questions:

PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT:
- Measured inputs, outputs, and outcomes over time
- Concerned with collecting information to determine whether a program is achieving its objectives

EVALUATION:
- Like performance measurement, assesses the effectiveness of a program in achieving its objectives
- Distinguishes a program's effects from those of other forces
- Aims at program improvement through a modification of current operations
1. Please confirm your e-mail address.

2. Indicate what your agency/organization/group does (check all that apply):
   - RECEIVES GRANT AWARDS to provide direct services and/or operate one or more components of the juvenile justice system
   - MAKES GRANT AWARDS to others to provide direct services and/or operate one or more components of the juvenile justice system
   - BOTH MAKES AND RECEIVES GRANT AWARDS to provide direct services and/or operate one or more components of the juvenile justice system
   - Neither of these applies to my agency/organization/group (For example, my agency/organization/group is an OJJDP training or technical assistance provider or a university/other organization with a research grant)

Note: The survey instrument employed a skip pattern based on the response to question 2. Respondents from agencies/organizations receiving grant awards to provide services to youth were directed to question 3, respondents from grant-making agencies were directed to question 20, and respondents from dual-role agencies both making and receiving grant awards to provide services were directed to question 44.
Background

3. In which state do you work?

Other (please specify)

4. Which of the following best describes where you work?

- State government agency
- Local government agency
- Non-governmental agency or organization
- Other (please specify)

5. What is your job title?

6. Does your agency or organization:

- Deliver direct services to youth: Yes ☐ No ☐
- Collect performance measurement data: Yes ☐ No ☐
- Submit performance measure data: Yes ☐ No ☐
- Report on program performance/outcomes: Yes ☐ No ☐
- Oversee/manage program operations: Yes ☐ No ☐
- Write grant proposals: Yes ☐ No ☐
- Write solicitations/RFPs for the proposals: Yes ☐ No ☐
- Make project funding decisions: Yes ☐ No ☐
Evaluation and Performance Measurement Policies/Practices

7. In the past year or so, have you or others at your agency/organization participated in any of the following activities? (Check all that apply)

- Read articles or books on evaluation
- Read OJJDP materials on evaluation
- Referenced OJJDP’s Model Program Guide
- Received training or technical assistance on evaluation or evidence-based programs/practices
- Read research articles/reports on juvenile justice programs/practices
- Helped create a program logic model
- Incorporated an evaluation plan or findings into a funding proposal
- Implemented an evidence-based program/practice
- Developed performance measures
- Conducted or helped with an evaluation
- Had an evaluation by an evaluator contracted by your agency or other source
- Used findings from an evaluation to improve program function
- Provided information, training, or technical assistance on evidence-based programs/practices to others
- Recommended an evidence-based program/practice be implemented/funded
- Made/assisted in funding decisions on evidence-based programs/practices
- None

Other (please specify):

[Text area for additional information]
### Evaluation and Performance Measurement Policies/Practices

8. Have you worked with OJJDP's Performance Measures Program and Data Reporting System (DCTAT)?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

9. Does your agency or organization collect performance measures beyond those required for DCTAT?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Don't Know
10. Why does your agency/organization collect additional performance measures beyond those required by DCTAT?

11. Who develops the additional performance measures? (Check all that apply.)

- [ ] Grantee
- [ ] Granting agency

Other (please specify)
12. On which of the following topics would you or your agency like to receive training or technical assistance? Select all that apply.

- Collecting and interpreting research on evidence-based programs
- Establishing baseline data
- Developing a database
- Developing performance measures
- Incorporating performance measures into a Request for Proposals/solicitation
- Implementing evidence-based programs
- Preparing for an evaluation/conducting an evaluability assessment
- Other (please specify)

- Conducting an evaluation
- Cost-benefit analysis
- Survey design and methodology
- Privacy concerns for human subjects
- How to use evaluation results
- Sustaining evidence-based programs and practices
- None

13. Have you ever evaluated your program(s) or worked with others to have them evaluated?

- Yes
- No
### Copy of page: Training/Technical Assistance Needs

14. On a scale from 1 to 5, how would you rate your agency’s/organization’s need for evaluation training/technical assistance?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Need</th>
<th>Little Need</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Great Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. What are the most substantial issues or challenges currently with regard to evaluation and evidence-based programs and practices in your agency/organization?

16. Conversely, what evidence-based or evaluation-related policies or practices are working well in your agency/organization?
17. Would you be willing to participate in a focus group over the phone to discuss innovative ways for training and technical assistance providers to share evaluation information?
- Yes, I would like to participate.
- No, I would not like to participate.

18. Would you like to receive the National Juvenile Justice Evaluation Center (NJJEC)'s electronic newsletter?
- Yes
- No

19. Do you have any additional comments?
20. In which state do you work?

Other (please specify)

21. Which of the following best describes where you work?

- [ ] State government agency
- [ ] Local government agency
- [ ] Non-governmental agency or organization
- [ ] Other (please specify)  

22. What is your job title?

23. Does your position require you to (check all that apply):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deliver direct services to youths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collect performance measurement data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit performance measurement data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report on program performance/outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oversee/manage program operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write grant proposals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write solicitation/RFPs/other calls for proposals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make project funding decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
24. Are you a member of a Governor-appointed State Advisory Group (SAG) for juvenile justice?

- Yes
- No

25. Does your SAG have an evaluation subcommittee?

- Yes
- No

26. In your state, what groups/agencies/organizations are most involved with evaluation in juvenile justice?

- State Advisory Group (SAG)
- Governor’s office
- State juvenile justice/services agency
- State Administering Agency (SAA)
- Other (please specify)
Evaluation and Performance Measurement Policies/Practices

27. In the past year or so, have you or others at your agency/organization participated in any of the following activities? (Check all that apply)

- Read articles or books on evaluation
- Read OJJDP materials on evaluation
- Referenced OJJDP's Model Program Guide
- Received training or technical assistance on evaluation or evidence-based program practices
- Read research articles/reports on juvenile justice program practices
- Helped create a program logic model
- Incorporated an evaluation plan or findings into a funding proposal
- Implemented an evidence-based program/practice
- Developed performance measures
- Conducted or helped with an evaluation
- Had an evaluation by an evaluator contracted by your agency or other source
- Used findings from an evaluation to improve program function
- Provided information, training, or technical assistance on evidence-based program practices to others
- Recommended an evidence-based program/practice be implemented/funded
- Made/assisted in funding decisions on evidence-based program practices
- None

Other (please specify):

28. Does your agency/organization have an individual or group of individuals who is/are responsible for conducting program evaluations?

- Yes
- No
### Evaluation and Performance Measurement Policies/Practices

**29. What is the best description for the individual or group who conducts program evaluation?**

- A position, subcommittee, or office within my agency.
- A position, subcommittee, or office in another government agency.
- A private agency, nonprofit organization, university, or other external entity.

**30. Has this individual/group participated in any of the following activities in the past year or so? Check all that apply.**

- [ ] Made a policy recommendation.
- [ ] Conducted a program evaluation.
- [ ] Made a recommendation to change or improve a program.
- [ ] Produced a report with program evaluation/analysis results.
- [ ] Analyzed performance measurement data.
- [ ] None.
- [ ] Conducted a cost-benefit analysis.

Other (please specify):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other (please specify)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Training/Technical Assistance Needs

31. Have you worked with OJJDP’s Performance Measures Program and Data Reporting System (DC TAT)?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

32. Does your agency or organization collect performance measures beyond those required for DC TAT?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Don’t Know
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training/Technical Assistance Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

33. Why does your agency collect additional performance measures beyond those required by DCTAT?

[ ]

34. Who develops the additional performance measures? (Check all that apply.)

- [ ] Grantee
- [ ] Granting agency

[Other (please specify)]

[ ]
### Training/Technical Assistance Needs

#### 35. On which of the following topics would YOU like to receive training or technical assistance? Select all that apply.

- [ ] Collecting and interpreting research on evidence-based programs
- [ ] Establishing baseline data
- [ ] Developing a database
- [ ] Developing performance measures
- [ ] Incorporating performance measures into a Request for Proposals/Statement of Work
- [ ] Implementing evidence-based programs
- [ ] Preparing for an evaluation/conducting an evaluability assessment
- [ ] Conducting an evaluation
- [ ] Cost-benefit analysis
- [ ] Survey design and methodology
- [ ] Privacy concerns for human subjects
- [ ] How to use evaluation results
- [ ] Sustaining evidence-based programs and practices
- [ ] None
- [ ] Other (please specify)

#### 36. On which of the following topics would you like to see GRANTEES/DIRECT SERVICE PROVIDERS/THOSE WORKING IN THE JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM receive training or technical assistance? Select all that apply.

- [ ] Collecting and interpreting research on evidence-based programs
- [ ] Establishing baseline data
- [ ] Developing a database
- [ ] Developing performance measures
- [ ] Incorporating performance measures into a Request for Proposals/Statement of Work
- [ ] Implementing evidence-based programs
- [ ] Preparing for an evaluation/conducting an evaluability assessment
- [ ] Conducting an evaluation
- [ ] Cost-benefit analysis
- [ ] Survey design and methodology
- [ ] Privacy concerns for human subjects
- [ ] How to use evaluation results
- [ ] Sustaining evidence-based programs and practices
- [ ] None
- [ ] Other (please specify)
### Training/Technical Assistance Needs

37. On a scale from 1 to 5, how would you rate YOUR need for evaluation training/technical assistance?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Need</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Great Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Little Need</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38. On a scale from 1 to 5, how would you rate your GRANTEES' need for evaluation training/technical assistance?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Need</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Great Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Little Need</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training/Technical Assistance Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>39. What are the most substantial issues or challenges currently with regard to evaluation and evidence-based programs and practices in your agency/organization?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Blank space for answer" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>40. Conversely, what evidence-based or evaluation-related policies or practices are working well in your agency/organization?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Blank space for answer" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
41. Would you be willing to participate in a focus group over the phone to discuss innovative ways for training and technical assistance providers to share evaluation information?

- Yes, I would like to participate.
- No, I would not like to participate.

42. Would you like to receive the National Juvenile Justice Evaluation Center (NJJEC)'s electronic newsletter?

- Yes
- No

43. Do you have any additional comments?
**Background**

*44. In which state do you work?*

- [ ] Other (please specify)

45. Which of the following best describes where you work?

- [ ] State government agency
- [ ] Local government agency
- [ ] Non-governmental agency or organization
- [ ] Other (please specify)

46. What is your job title?

47. Does your position require you to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deliver direct services to youths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collect performance measurement data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit performance measure data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report on program performance/outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oversee/manage program operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write grant proposals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write solicitation/RFP requests for proposals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make project funding decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Background

48. Are you a member of a Governor-appointed State Advisory Group (SAG) for juvenile justice?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No

49. Does your SAG have an evaluation subcommittee?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No

50. In your state, what groups/agencies/organizations are most involved with evaluation in juvenile justice?
   ○ State Advisory Group (SAG)
   ○ Governor's office
   ○ Other (please specify)
### Evaluation and Performance Measurement Policies/Practices

**51. In the past year or so, have you or others at your agency/organization participated in any of the following activities? (Check all that apply)**

- [ ] Read articles or books on evaluation
- [ ] Read OJJDP materials on evaluation
- [ ] Referenced OJJDP’s Model Programs Guide
- [ ] Received training or technical assistance on evaluation or evidence-based programs/practices
- [ ] Read research articles/reports on juvenile justice programs/practices
- [ ] Helped create a program logic model
- [ ] Incorporated an evaluation plan or findings into a funding proposal
- [ ] Implemented an evidence-based program/practice
- [ ] Developed performance measures
- [ ] Conducted or helped with an evaluation
- [ ] Had an evaluation by an evaluator contracted by your agency or other source
- [ ] Used findings from an evaluation to improve program function
- [ ] Provided information, training, or technical assistance on evidence-based programs/practices to others
- [ ] Recommended an evidence-based program/practice for implementation/ funding
- [ ] Made/assisted in funding decisions on evidence-based programs/practices
- [ ] None

**Other (please specify)**

![Other (please specify) field]

---

**52. Does your agency/organization have an individual or group of individuals who is/are responsible for conducting program evaluations?**

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
Evaluation and Performance Measurement Policies/Practices

53. What is the best description for the individual or group who conducts program evaluation?

- [ ] A position, subcommittee, or office within my agency.
- [ ] A position, subcommittee, or office in another government agency.
- [ ] A private agency, nonprofit organization, university, or other external entity.

54. Has this individual/group participated in any of the following activities in the past year or so? Check all that apply.

- [ ] Made a policy recommendation.
- [ ] Conducted a program evaluation.
- [ ] Made a recommendation to change or improve a program.
- [ ] Produced a report with program evaluation/analysis results.
- [ ] Analyzed performance measurement data.
- [ ] None
- [ ] Conducted a cost-benefit analysis.
- [ ] Other (please specify)
### Training/Technical Assistance Needs

55. Have you worked with OJJDP's Performance Measures Program and Data Reporting System (DCTAT)?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

56. Does your agency or organization collect performance measures beyond those required for DCTAT?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Don't Know
57. Why does your agency collect additional performance measure beyond those required by DCTAT?

58. Who develops the additional performance measures? (Check all that apply.)

- [ ] Grantee
- [ ] Granting agency
- Other (please specify):
### Training/Technical Assistance Needs

**59. On which of the following topics would YOU OR OTHERS IN YOUR AGENCY like to receive training or technical assistance? Select all that apply.**

- [ ] Collecting and interpreting research on evidence-based programs
- [ ] Establishing baseline data
- [ ] Developing a database
- [ ] Developing performance measures
- [ ] Incorporating performance measures into a Request for Proposal/Assistance
- [ ] Implementing evidence-based programs
- [ ] Preparing for an evaluation/conducting an evaluability assessment
- [ ] Other (please specify):

**60. On which of the following topics would you like to see GRANTEES/DIRECT SERVICE PROVIDERS/THOSE WORKING IN THE JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM in your state receive training or technical assistance? Select all that apply.**

- [ ] Collecting and interpreting research on evidence-based programs
- [ ] Establishing baseline data
- [ ] Developing a database
- [ ] Developing performance measures
- [ ] Incorporating performance measures into a Request for Proposal/Assistance
- [ ] Implementing evidence-based programs
- [ ] Preparing for an evaluation/conducting an evaluability assessment
- [ ] Other (please specify):
### Training/Technical Assistance Needs

61. Have you ever evaluated your program(s) or worked with others to have them evaluated?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

62. On a scale from 1 to 5, how would you rate YOUR need for evaluation training/technical assistance?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Need</th>
<th>Little Need</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Great Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

63. On a scale from 1 to 5, how would you rate the need of OTHERS IN YOUR AGENCY for evaluation training/technical assistance?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Need</th>
<th>Little Need</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Great Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

64. On a scale from 1 to 5, how would you rate your GRANTEES' need for evaluation training/technical assistance?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Need</th>
<th>Little Need</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Great Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training/Technical Assistance Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**65.** What are the most substantial issues or challenges currently with regard to evaluation and evidence-based programs and practices in your agency/organization?

| |

**66.** Conversely, what evidence-based or evaluation-related policies or practices are working well in your agency/organization?

| |
67. Would you be willing to participate in a focus group over the phone to discuss innovative ways for training and technical assistance providers to share evaluation information?

- Yes, I would like to participate.
- No, I would not like to participate.

68. Would you like to receive the National Juvenile Justice Evaluation Center (NJJEC)'s electronic newsletter?

- Yes
- No

69. Do you have any additional comments?
Appendix B
Tribal Needs Assessment
Introduction

In order to conduct a needs assessment for its National Juvenile Justice Evaluation Center (NJVEC) project, the Justice Research and Statistics Association (JRSA) is contacting tribal recipients of Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) awards to answer a series of questions regarding evaluation activities occurring in tribal agencies and organizations. The needs assessment will be used to learn more about tribal juvenile justice practices, and identify the type of training and technical assistance that would increase juvenile justice evaluation capacity for OJJDP tribal grantees and subcontractors. The assessment is an extension of OJJDP’s 2010 National Needs Assessment of Juvenile Justice Professionals, and expands upon questions related to evaluation capacity and evidence-based programs and practices. There are no anticipated risks associated with participating in data collection.

Your participation in this research is voluntary, and you may stop at any time by exiting the web site. We will not identify individuals or their tribes when we summarize the findings from questions, but we may follow up with you to clarify a response. It should take approximately 20 minutes to answer the questions. By entering your e-mail address on the next page, you acknowledge that you have read and understand these conditions and agree to participate in data collection. Thank you for your participation.

Here are definitions for two key terms used in the questions.

**PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT:**
- Measures inputs, outputs, and outcomes over time
- Concerned with collecting information to determine whether a program is achieving its objectives

**EVALUATION:**
- Like performance measurement, assesses the effectiveness of a program in achieving its objectives
- Distinguishes a program’s effects from those of other factors
- Aims at program improvement through a modification of current operations
1. Please confirm your e-mail address.

2. Indicate what your agency/organization/group does (check all that apply):
   - **RECEIVES GRANT AWARDS OR SUBCONTRACTS** to provide direct services to tribal youth and/or operate one or more components of the tribal youth justice system
   - **MAKES GRANT AWARDS OR SUBCONTRACTS** to others to provide direct services to tribal youth and/or operate one or more components of the tribal youth justice system
   - **BOTH MAKES AND RECEIVES GRANT AWARDS OR SUBCONTRACTS** to provide direct services to tribal youth and/or operate one or more components of the tribal youth justice system
   - Neither of those applies to my agency/organization/group (For example, my agency/organization/group is an OJJDP training or technical assistance provider or a university/other organization with a research grant)
## Background

### 3. Which of the following best describes where you work?

- [ ] Tribal council or other governing entity
- [ ] Tribal law enforcement agency or tribal court
- [ ] Tribal advisory group or community organization not listed above
- [ ] Direct service provider for tribal youth
- [ ] Other (please specify)

### 4. What is your job title?

[ ]

### 5. Does your agency or organization:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deliver direct services to tribal youth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collect performance measurement data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit performance measure data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report on program performance/outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oversee/manage program operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write grant proposals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write solicitation of RFPs/RFIs for proposals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make project funding decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Evaluation and Performance Measurement Policies/Practices

6. In the past year or so, have you or others at your agency/organization participated in any of the following activities? (Check all that apply)

- [ ] Read articles or books on evaluation
- [ ] Read OJJDP materials on evaluation
- [ ] Referenced OJJDP’s Model Programs Guide
- [ ] Received training or technical assistance on evaluation or evidence-based program/practices
- [ ] Read research articles/reports on juvenile justice program/practices
- [ ] Helped create a program logic model
- [ ] Incorporated an evaluation plan or findings into a funding proposal
- [ ] Implemented an evidence-based program/practice
- [ ] Developed performance measure(s)
- [ ] Conducted or helped with an evaluation
- [ ] Had an evaluation by an evaluator contracted by your agency or other source
- [ ] Used findings from an evaluation to improve program function
- [ ] Provided information, training, or technical assistance on evidence-based program/practices to others
- [ ] Recommended an evidence-based program/practice be implemented/funded
- [ ] Made a case in funding decision on evidence-based program/practices
- [ ] None

**Other (please specify):**

[ ]

---
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Evaluation and Performance Measurement Policies/Practices

7. Have you worked with OJJDP’s Performance Measures Program and Data Reporting System (DCTAT)?
   - Yes
   - No

8. Does your tribe, agency or organization collect performance measures beyond those required for DCTAT?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Don’t Know
Evaluation and Performance Measurement Policies/Practices

9. Why does your tribe/agency/organization collect additional performance measures beyond those required by DCTAT?


10. Who develops the additional performance measures? (Check all that apply.)

☐ Grantee
☐ Granting agency
☐ Other (please specify)
11. On which of the following topics would you or your agency like to receive training or technical assistance? Select all that apply.

- Collecting and interpreting research on evidence-based programs
- Establishing baseline data
- Developing a database
- Developing performance measures
- Incorporating performance measures into a Request for Proposals/Request for Grant
- Implementing evidence-based programs
- Preparing for an evaluation/conducting an evaluability assessment
- Conducting an evaluation
- Cost-benefit analysis
- Survey design and methodology
- Privacy concerns for human subjects
- How to use evaluation results
- Sustaining evidence-based programs and practices
- None

12. Have you ever evaluated your program(s) or worked with others to have them evaluated?

- Yes
- No
13. On a scale from 1 to 5, how would you rate your tribe’s need for evaluation training/technical assistance?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Need</th>
<th>Little Need</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Great Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. What are the most substantial issues or challenges for your tribe with regard to evaluation and evidence-based programs and practices?

15. On the other hand, what evidence-based or evaluation-related policies or practices are working well for your tribe?
16. What impact, if any, do you expect the Tribal Law and Order Act of 2010 to have on evaluation or evidence-based practices for tribal youth?

17. Would you be willing to participate in a focus group over the phone to discuss innovative ways for training and technical assistance providers to share evaluation information?

- Yes, I would like to participate.
- No, I would not like to participate.

18. Would you like to receive the National Juvenile Justice Evaluation Center (NJJEC)'s electronic newsletter?

- Yes
- No

19. Do you have any additional comments?
20. Which of the following best describes where you work?

- Tribal council or other governing entity
- Tribal law enforcement agency or tribal court
- Tribal advisory group or community organization not listed above
- Direct service provider for tribal youth
- Other (please specify)

21. What is your job title?

[Blank]

22. Does your position require you to (check all that apply):

- Deliver direct services to tribal youth: Yes ☐ No ☐
- Collect performance measurement data: Yes ☐ No ☐
- Submit performance measurement data: Yes ☐ No ☐
- Report on program performance/outcomes: Yes ☐ No ☐
- Oversee/manage program operations: Yes ☐ No ☐
- Write grant proposals: Yes ☐ No ☐
- Write solicitations/RFPs/other calls for proposals: Yes ☐ No ☐
- Make project funding decisions: Yes ☐ No ☐
Background

23. In your tribe, what groups or organizations are most involved with evaluation in juvenile justice?
Evaluation and Performance Measurement Policies/Practices

24. In the past year or so, have you or others at your agency/organization participated in any of the following activities? (Check all that apply)

- Read articles or books on evaluation
- Read OJJDP materials on evaluation
- Reviewed OJJDP's Model Programs Guide
- Received training or technical assistance on evaluation or evidence-based program/practice
- Read research articles/reports on juvenile justice program/practices
- Helped create a program logic model
- Incorporated an evaluation plan or findings into a funding proposal
- Implemented an evidence-based program/practice
- Developed performance measures
- Conducted or helped with an evaluation
- Had an evaluation by an evaluator contracted by your agency or other source
- Used findings from an evaluation to improve program function
- Provided information, training, or technical assistance on evidence-based program/practices to others
- Recommended an evidence-based program/practice be implemented/funded
- Made/assisted in funding decisions on evidence-based program/practices
- None

Other (please specify)

25. Does your agency/organization have an individual or group of individuals who is/are responsible for conducting program evaluations?

- Yes
- No
Evaluation and Performance Measurement Policies/Practices

26. What is the best description for the individual or group who conducts program evaluation?
   - A position, subcommittee, or office within my agency.
   - A position, subcommittee, or office in another tribal agency.
   - A private agency, nonprofit organization, university, or other external entity.

27. Has this individual/group participated in any of the following activities in the past year or so? Check all that apply.
   - Made a policy recommendation.
   - Conducted a program evaluation.
   - Made a recommendation to change or improve a program.
   - Conducted an analysis of program evaluation results.
   - Analyzed performance measurement data.
   - Produced a report with program evaluation/analysis results.
   - Conducted a cost-benefit analysis.
   - None

Other (please specify)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training/Technical Assistance Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

28. Have you worked with OJJDP's Performance Measures Program and Data Reporting System (DCTAT)?

- [ ] Yes
- [x] No

29. Does your tribe, agency or organization collect performance measures beyond those required for DCTAT?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Don't Know
### Training/Technical Assistance Needs

**30. Why does your tribe/agency/organization collect additional performance measures beyond those required by DCTAT?**

*Reasons to collect additional performance measures could include monitoring progress, improving services, or meeting specific goals.*

**31. Who develops the additional performance measures? (Check all that apply.)**

- [ ] Grantee
- [ ] Granting agency
- [ ] Other (please specify)
32. On which of the following topics would YOU like to receive training or technical assistance? Select all that apply.

- Collecting and interpreting research on evidence-based programs
- Establishing baseline data
- Developing a database
- Developing performance measures
- Incorporating performance measures into a Request for Proposals/Acquisition
- Implementing evidence-based programs
- Preparing for an evaluation/conducting an evaluability assessment
- [Other (please specify) ]

33. On which of the following topics would you like to see GRANTEES/ SUBCONTRACTORS/DIRECT SERVICE PROVIDERS/ THOSE WORKING IN THE TRIBAL YOUTH JUSTICE SYSTEM receive training or technical assistance? Select all that apply.

- Conducting an evaluation
- Cost-benefit analysis
- Survey design and methodology
- Privacy concerns for human subjects
- How to use evaluation results
- Sustaining evidence-based programs and practices
- None

[Other (please specify) ]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training/Technical Assistance Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>34. On a scale from 1 to 5, how would you rate YOUR need for evaluation training/technical assistance?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of Need</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>35. On a scale from 1 to 5, how would you rate your GRANTEES'/ SUBCONTRACTORS' need for evaluation training/technical assistance?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of Need</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training/Technical Assistance Needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. What are the most substantial issues or challenges for your tribe with regard to evaluation and evidence-based programs and practices in your agency/organization?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. On the other hand, what evidence-based or evaluation-related policies or practices are working well for your tribe?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
38. What impact, if any, do you expect the Tribal Law and Order Act of 2010 to have on evaluation or evidence-based practices for tribal youth?

39. Would you be willing to participate in a focus group over the phone to discuss innovative ways for training and technical assistance providers to share evaluation information?
   - Yes, I would like to participate.
   - No, I would not like to participate.

40. Would you like to receive the National Juvenile Justice Evaluation Center (NJJEC)'s electronic newsletter?
   - Yes
   - No

41. Do you have any additional comments?