

Evaluation 101

with illustrations from OCJS evaluation studies

Structure of Training

- Introduction
- Planning and Process evaluations
- **BREAK**
- Outcome and Cost/Benefit evaluations

Training Will Cover

- Evaluation 101 document
- Illustrations from
 - Ohio Mental Health Court evaluation
 - Ohio Drug Court evaluation
 - OCJS project performance reporting program

What we hope to achieve

- Provide training in program evaluation
- Illustrate points through research we have conducted
- Provide you information and findings from that research

What do you wish to achieve?

- Your name
- Agency
- Position
- Have you conducted an evaluation?
- What you hope to learn about program evaluation?

Genesis of the Evaluation 101 Document

- Justice Stratton's Advisory Committee on
Mentally Ill in the Courts

What is “evaluation”?

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

Why Evaluate?

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

Types of Evaluations

- Planning evaluation
- Process evaluation
- Outcome evaluation
- Cost-benefit evaluation

Overview of Ohio Mental Health Court Evaluation

- Kent State
 - ODMH funded study
 - OCJS funded study
- OCJS

Planning and Process Evaluation Goals

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

Akron Mental Health Court

- Specialized docket within Municipal Court
- Operates on drug court model
- Two-year program
- Appropriate services available for dual diagnosis clients

Who are the MHC Clients?

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

How to Collect Data for a Process Evaluation

- Interviews
- Focus groups
- Observation
- Questionnaires/Surveys
- Analysis of existing documents

Types of Data to Collect for a Process Evaluation

- Quantitative
- Qualitative
- Which is more useful?

Planning Evaluation--Topics

- Why is the program needed?
 - Identify target population
- Who needs to be involved in the planning?
 - Identify key players/agencies
- What are the goals of the program?
 - Identify goals from perspective of various key players/agencies

Planning Evaluation (continued)

- What resources are necessary?
 - Identify financial resources
 - Identify non-financial resources
- What is the timeline?
 - Determine timeline to program implementation

Process Evaluation--Topics

- Clients served
 - Is program hitting its identified target population?
- Collaboration
 - How is collaboration achieved? Where are weaknesses in collaboration/communication? How to improve upon collaboration?
- Services/Gaps in service
 - What services are being provided? Are they adequate?

Process Evaluation (continued)

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

Who was Interviewed

- The court
 - MHC judge
 - Probation officer/program manager
 - Defense attorney
 - Other municipal court judges

Who was Interviewed (cont.)

- The ADM board
- The treatment providers
 - Treatment manager and treatment supervisor
 - Court liaison
 - Caseworkers
 - Vocational specialists
 - Treatment psychiatrist
 - Jail screening psychiatrist
 - Clinical therapist
 - Substance abuse counselors

Types of Data to Collect For Outcome Evaluations

- The essence of outcome evaluation is comparison
 - Control group (experimental)
 - Comparison group (quasi-experimental)
 - Pre- and post- (time series)

Short-term vs. Long-term Outcomes

- Many funding agencies want long-term outcomes
- Some – especially the Princeton Group – argue there are too many intervening variables for most long-term outcomes
- The key is to pick the type of outcomes that best answer the goal of the evaluation

Short-term vs. Long-term Outcomes

- NIJ Guidelines for Byrne Formula Grant program use three-part distinction:
 - Implementation (i.e., “process”)
 - Results (i.e., “short-term”)
 - Outcomes or impacts (i.e., “long-term”)
- OCJS has used this model for its project performance reporting program

OCJS Project Performance Reports

- Implementation: monitoring of required elements
- Results information: collected through semi-annual performance reports
- Long-term outcomes: assessed through formal, usually independent, evaluations

Illustrations From Multi-Jurisdictional Law Enforcement Task Forces

- Implementation:
 - Control group formed and meeting regularly
 - MOUs on criminal asset forfeitures
- Results:
 - Number of investigations
 - Number of arrests
 - Amount of drugs seized
 - Amount of criminal assets seized and forfeited
- Outcomes (long-term):
 - Are communities with task forces better able to control drug trafficking?

Ohio Drug Court Evaluation

- Illustration of long-term outcome evaluation
 - Impact on recidivism
 - Cost-benefit analysis
- Illustrates how process, short-term, and long-term evaluations can work together
- Illustrates use of outside evaluators

Genesis of the Drug Court Evaluation

- Governor's Office
- Growing presence of specialty courts

University of Cincinnati

- Quasi-experimental design
- Quantitative assessment of impact on recidivism
- Data collection methodology

Findings: UC Experimental and Control Groups

- 4 Courts of Common Pleas: 788 drug court participants, 429 comparison offenders
- 3 Municipal Courts: 556 drug court participants, 228 comparison offenders
- 3 Juvenile Courts: 310 drug court participants, 134 comparison offenders

Findings: Types of Other Services (UC)

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

www.uc.edu/criminaljustice/researchreports.html

Findings: Program Retention (UC, OSU, and OCJS)

- 70% of drug court participants complete Phase I of treatment
- However, low graduation rates (those in the program counted as not graduated)
- Graduation rates improve over time

Findings: Recidivism (UC, OSU, and OCJS)

- Common Pleas: lowered the probability of re-arrest by 19%
- Municipal: lowered the probability of re-arrest by 9%
- Juvenile: lowered the probability of re-arrest by 16%
- The longer the drug court is in existence the greater the lowering of recidivism

Findings: Factors Predicting Lower Recidivism (UC)

- Drug court participation was predictive for all three types of courts
- Predictive factors varied by type of drug court
 - Common Pleas: employed, complete High School, no prior record
 - Municipal: employed, complete High School, caucasian, time at risk
 - Juvenile: complete High School, no prior record, caucasian, time at risk, female

Cost-Benefit: Dr. Matthew Hiller, University of Kentucky

For every \$1 spent on drug courts, there were savings to other systems of:

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

Cost-Benefit: Northwest Professional Consortium

- Drug courts cost the court more than traditional court procedures
- Drug courts produce substantial benefits to the courts and – even more so – to related service systems
- <http://npcresearch.com/>

Where do we go from here?

- UC cost-benefit study

Closing

- Any questions, comments, or problems?