Process Evaluation
#1 Defining a program and what works
  - Program theory
  - Effective approaches

#2 Risk, Needs, Responsivity, Target Population
  - Risk-needs-responsivity model
  - Identifying the target population

#3 Problem Statement, Goal, Outcomes
  - Using data to identify problems
  - Defining “SMART” Outcomes

#4 Activities, Program Fidelity, Outputs
  - Activities measured by outputs
  - Fidelity contributes to success
  - Ties directly to process evaluation
For Successful Program

1. Plan
   ✓ Right program
   ✓ Right youth
   ✓ Right dosage

2. Implement

3. Evaluate
   ➢ Planning and implementation → process evaluation
   ➢ Success in achieving outcomes → outcome evaluation
Frequent Check-In

Inputs
↓
Activities
↓
Outputs
## Logic Model Template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Problem Statement:</strong> Issue to be addressed.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Goal:</strong> Plan to achieve.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| **Target Population:** Who in program. | **Resources:** What is required. | **Activities:** Planned tasks. | **Outputs:** Measure of activities. | **Outcomes:** Measure of goal achievement. |

**Date Created/Modified:**
Process Evaluation

• Why
• Plan
• Data Collection
• Results/review
• How to use
• Write-up/dissemination
Process Evaluation

• Examines implementation
  1. Service utilization (target population)
  2. Program organization (should=actual?)

• Includes ongoing program check-in (monitoring)

• Adjunct to outcome evaluation
Why Worry?

– Short-Term
  • What’s working well, what’s not
  • Show early successes

– Long-Term
  • Help explain outcome results
  • Help when repeat the program
Juvenile Drug Court Study

- Goals
  - Reduce recidivism? (outcome)
  - Using evidence-based approaches? (process)

- Methods
  - Outcomes drug court vs. traditional probation
  - Evidence-based Correctional Program Checklist

- Results
  - No significant impact on outcomes

# Juvenile Drug Court Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Court</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Effective → ↓ Recidivism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td>Highly Effective → ↓ Recidivism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Effective → ↓ Recidivism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Benefits

• Evaluates fidelity to the program design

• Provides understanding of
  – what is done correctly
  – what activities and/or components are difficult to implement and why
  – potential problems to address early
  – why the program was successful or not as part of the outcome evaluation
What’s the Question?

1) How many youth are receiving services?
2) Are those receiving services the intended targets?
3) Are they receiving the correct type, dosage, and quality of services?
4) Is staffing sufficient? Competent?
5) Are resources, facilities, funding adequate?
6) Is program in compliance with any requirements?
7) If >1 site, are some sites better than others?
8) Are participants satisfied with the services?

Process Evaluation Plan

1) Fidelity (quality)
2) Dose delivered (completeness)
3) Dose received (exposure, satisfaction)
4) Reach (participation rate)
5) Recruitment (staff, youth, family)
6) Context (organizational, other factors)

From Saunders, Evans, & Joshi (2005).
**Problem Statement:** Youth on probation supervision have a violent re-offense rate of 30% demonstrating a need for a cognitive behavioral intervention program that addresses youth who experience difficulties with interpersonal relationships and prosocial behavior.

**Goal:** To reduce recidivism by modifying the anti-social behavior of chronically aggressive youth through skill streaming, anger control and moral reasoning training.

**Target Population:**
- Ages 12-17
- Youth on probation
- Identified as chronically aggressive through relevant assessments
- Identified as accepting of anti-social behavior through relevant assessments

**Resources:**
- ART-trained group facilitators
- Assessment personnel (e.g. trained probation officers or case managers)
- Program materials
- Space for groups of 8-12 youth to meet
- Evaluation checklist
- Budget

**Activities:**
- 30 one-hour program sessions delivered 3 times per week over 10 weeks (1 hr. per component)
- 10 one-hour sessions, delivered 1 time per week over 10 weeks on Structured Learning Training:
  - Modeling
  - Role playing
  - Performance feedback
  - Transfer training
- 10 one-hour sessions, delivered 1 time per week over 10 weeks on Anger Control Training:
  - Identifying triggers/cues
  - Using reminders/reducers
  - Self-evaluation
- 10 one-hour sessions, delivered 1 time per week over 10 weeks on Moral Reasoning:
  - Moral dilemma exposure

**Outputs:**
- Participants will attend at least # of the 30 program sessions
- # of Structured Learning Trainings given and attendance rate
- # of Anger Control Trainings given and attendance rate
- # of Moral Reasoning sessions given and attendance rate

**Outcomes:**
- At least XX% of participants will abstain from recidivating within 18 months of the date of program completion
- At least XX% of participants will have significant improvements in parent- and teacher-reported scores on the Social Skills Rating System (SSRS)
- At least XX% of participants will have significant improvements on parent-reported scores on the Child and Adolescent Disruptive Behavior Inventory 2.3 (CADBI)
- At least XX% of participants will report significant improvement on the HIT instrument

**Date Created/Modified:**
**Problem Statement:** Youth on probation supervision have a violent re-offense rate of 30% demonstrating a need for a cognitive behavioral intervention program that addresses youth who experience difficulties with interpersonal relationships and prosocial behavior.

**Goal:** To reduce recidivism by modifying the anti-social behavior of chronically aggressive youth through skill streaming, anger control and moral reasoning training.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Target Population:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Resources:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Activities:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Outputs:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Outcomes:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ages 12-17</td>
<td>ART-trained group facilitators</td>
<td>30 one-hour program sessions delivered 3 times per week over 10 weeks (1 hr. per component)</td>
<td>Participants will attend at least # of the 30 program sessions</td>
<td>At least XX% of participants will abstain from recidivating within 18 months of the date of program completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth on probation</td>
<td>Assessment personnel (e.g. trained probation officers or case managers)</td>
<td>10 one-hour sessions, delivered 1 time per week over 10 weeks on Structured Learning Training: o Modeling o Role playing o Performance feedback o Transfer training</td>
<td># of Structured Learning Trainings given and attendance rate</td>
<td>At least XX% of participants will have significant improvements in parent- and teacher-reported scores on the Social Skills Rating System (SSRS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified as chronically aggressive through relevant assessments</td>
<td>Program materials</td>
<td>10 one-hour sessions, delivered 1 time per week over 10 weeks on Anger Control Training: o Identifying triggers/cues o Using reminders/reducers o Self-evaluation</td>
<td># of Anger Control Trainings given and attendance rate</td>
<td>At least XX% of participants will have significant improvements on parent-reported scores on the Child and Adolescent Disruptive Behavior Inventory 2.3 (CADBI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified as accepting of anti-social behavior through relevant assessments</td>
<td>Space for groups of 8-12 youth to meet</td>
<td>10 one-hour sessions, delivered 1 time per week over 10 weeks on Moral Reasoning: o Moral dilemma exposure</td>
<td># of Moral Reasoning sessions given and attendance rate</td>
<td>At least XX% of participants will report significant improvement on the HIT instrument</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Resources:**
- ART-trained group facilitators
- Assessment personnel (e.g. trained probation officers or case managers)
- Program materials
- Space for groups of 8-12 youth to meet
- Evaluation checklist
- Budget

**Activities:**
- 30 one-hour program sessions delivered 3 times per week over 10 weeks (1 hr. per component)
- 10 one-hour sessions, delivered 1 time per week over 10 weeks on Structured Learning Training:
  - Modeling
  - Role playing
  - Performance feedback
  - Transfer training
- 10 one-hour sessions, delivered 1 time per week over 10 weeks on Anger Control Training:
  - Identifying triggers/cues
  - Using reminders/reducers
  - Self-evaluation
- 10 one-hour sessions, delivered 1 time per week over 10 weeks on Moral Reasoning:
  - Moral dilemma exposure

**Outputs:**
- Participants will attend at least # of the 30 program sessions
- # of Structured Learning Trainings given and attendance rate
- # of Anger Control Trainings given and attendance rate
- # of Moral Reasoning sessions given and attendance rate

**Outcomes:**
- At least XX% of participants will abstain from recidivating within 18 months of the date of program completion
- At least XX% of participants will have significant improvements in parent- and teacher-reported scores on the Social Skills Rating System (SSRS)
- At least XX% of participants will have significant improvements on parent-reported scores on the Child and Adolescent Disruptive Behavior Inventory 2.3 (CADBI)
- At least XX% of participants will report significant improvement on the HIT instrument

Date Created/Modified:
What's the Criteria?

- Program manual
- Generic program type
- Standards (legal, ethical, professional)
- Policies or procedures
- Comparable programs or groups
- Prior measurement
- Past experience
- Professional judgement
## Process Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Tools</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Reporting</th>
<th>Check-In</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fidelity</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dose delivered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dose received</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Saunders, Evans, & Joshi (2005).
Data Collection

—What, where, when, who
  • Program Records
  • Program Participants
  • Evaluator Observation

—Examples
  • Case Management System/JCMS
  • Excel
Excel is Your Friend

• Readily accessible
• Large amounts of data
• Different types of data
• Reliability/consistency
• Graphs or other visual presentation
• Statistics/calculations
• Flexible
• Training available
• Design yourself
Data Collection

Question

• 1) Activities implemented
• 2) Sessions offered
• 3) Sessions attended
• 4) Population served
• 5) Staff perception
• Participant satisfaction

Criteria

• 1) Logic model (fidelity)
• 2) Planned
• 3) Expect (dosage)
• 4) Target population
• 5) Satisfied

Data

• 1) Activities, characteristics
• 2) Class schedule
• 3) Attendance
• 4) Age, offense, risk, needs
• 5) Individual responses

How

• 1) Checklist, spreadsheet
• 2) Spreadsheet, attendance
• 3) Attendance record
• 4) CMS, assessments
• 5) Debriefing, survey, focus group, interview
## Attendance Tracker

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Name</th>
<th>Behavioral Skills Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>List of Students</td>
<td>4/4/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4/11/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4/18/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4/25/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Attended</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Attendance Options
- Attended
- Excused Absence
- Unexcused Absence
- Class Cancelled (approved)
- Class Cancelled (unapproved)
# Process Matrix

## ART Activities

- 30 sessions 3X per week over 10 weeks
- 3 components, each 1X per week

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Tools</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Reporting</th>
<th>Check-In</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dose received</td>
<td>To what extent did youth attend sessions for the three components?</td>
<td>ART facilitator;</td>
<td>Attendance checklist;</td>
<td>ART facilitators report weekly;</td>
<td>Calculate score based on % of sessions provided</td>
<td>Summarized by component type</td>
<td>Reviewed every two weeks by department staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Department staff</td>
<td>Observation with checklist</td>
<td>Two observations per facilitator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Who Will Do What?

• Who is going to develop the tools?
• Where do data go after collected?
• Who enters data?
• What is the protocol for data entry?
• Who analyzes the data?
• How long will analysis take?
• Who will generate the summary reports?
• When will summary reports be generated?
• Who receives summary reports?
• When are the reports needed?
Program Chrono

- Key dates
- Standard Activity or Challenge
- Description
- Concerns
- Resolution
# Program Chrono

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Standard Activity or Challenge</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Concerns</th>
<th>Resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/4/2017</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>First class begins (20 youth)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/1/2017</td>
<td>Challenge</td>
<td>2 youth arrested out of class--they are no longer attending class.</td>
<td>Annual goal is 50 youth completing. Decision on whether to add new youth.</td>
<td>Determine too hard to have new youth come in &quot;midstream.&quot; Leadership group decides that if 10 youth drop out during 1 fiscal year, they will meet with funders to determine if target adjustments have to be made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/12/2017</td>
<td>Challenge</td>
<td>Program subcontractor informs leadership that they are losing money and may have to pull out at the end of the contract cycle.</td>
<td>Subcontractor provides service that we are required to provide via the contract.</td>
<td>The leadership group appoints Carolina to investigate alternative subcontractors. The leadership group informs the funders of the issue.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Program Chrono

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Standard Activity or Challenge</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Concerns</th>
<th>Resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/17/2017</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Select youth for class 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/1/2017</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>First class graduates (18 youth)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/10/2017</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Second class begins (19 youth)</td>
<td>1 youth not enrolled due to work schedule conflict.</td>
<td>Youth will enroll in next class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1/2017</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>New Fiscal Year starts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/9/2017</td>
<td>Challenge</td>
<td>New Program Idea</td>
<td>Chara has found research on a new program. The leadership group needs to decide if they should replace the current program with a new one.</td>
<td>The leadership group meets to assess the pros and cons of the new program vs. the current program. The group decides the pros outweigh the cons. One concern is that the group is contracted to use the current program. The group assigns Lory the task of meeting with the funders to see if they would be willing to change the program either during this contract or the next contract cycle.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Collection

GET ALL THE INFORMATION YOU CAN, WE'LL THINK OF A USE FOR IT LATER.
Analyze Data

• Quantitative
  – Frequency - # trainings attended
  – Average – average attendance
  – Percentage - % attendance

• Qualitative
  – Descriptive
  – Content analysis
% Output = Actual/Anticipated*100

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Name</th>
<th>Behavioral Skills Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>List of Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duck, Donald</td>
<td>Unexcused Absence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runner, Road</td>
<td>Attended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Snow</td>
<td>Attended</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Classes held $\frac{3}{5} \times 100 = 60\%$
- Donald Duck $\frac{1}{3} \times 100 = 33\%$
## Results/Review

### Planning Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Key Planning Activities</th>
<th>Scheduled Completion</th>
<th>Actual Completion</th>
<th>On Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Target Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Group</th>
<th>Anticipated Number</th>
<th>Actual Number</th>
<th>Reach (%)</th>
<th>Recruitment</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Outputs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Implemented as Planned</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Progress, Problems, Lessons Learned
# Results/Review

## Planning Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Key Planning Activities</th>
<th>Scheduled Completion</th>
<th>Actual Completion</th>
<th>On Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ART Program Sessions</td>
<td>Identify ART facilitators</td>
<td>2/15/2017</td>
<td>2/1/2017</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify 1st group of youth</td>
<td>3/15/2017</td>
<td>3/1/2017</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weekly class 4/4-6/13/2017</td>
<td>6/13/2017</td>
<td>7/1/2017</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

## Progress, Problems, Lessons Learned

Two classes cancelled by facilitator which required adding additional weeks to program.
## Results/Review

### Target Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Group</th>
<th>Anticipated Number</th>
<th>Actual Number</th>
<th>Reach (%)</th>
<th>Recruitment</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Group</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Program discussed with youth and families.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Group</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Progress, Problems, Lessons Learned

One youth not enrolled due to work schedule conflict.
## Results/Review

### Outputs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Imp. as Planned</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structured Learning</td>
<td>7/1/2017</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Trainings Given</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Attendance Rate</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger Control</td>
<td>7/1/2017</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Trainings Given</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Attendance Rate</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Progress, Problems, Lessons Learned

Anger control sessions held 5-6 p.m. which resulted in transportation issues.
Quality Matters

• Need both
  ✓ Appropriate program and program theory
  ✓ High quality implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 1) High quality</td>
<td>• 1) Positive</td>
<td>• 1) Appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 2) High quality</td>
<td>• 2) Negative</td>
<td>• 2) Inappropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 3) Poor quality</td>
<td>• 3) Negative</td>
<td>• 3) ?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Population Matters

• Did target the intended population?
  ✔ Risk level
  ✔ Offense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Re Offend in One Year</th>
<th>1 yr Re-Offense Rate</th>
<th>Average # of Prior Referrals</th>
<th>Prior Violent/Assaultive Referral</th>
<th>Prior VOP</th>
<th>Majority Offense Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ART</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>Misd. Assaultive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dosage Matters

• How much did youth receive?

Attendance
• 1) Very high
• 2) Very low
• 3) Very low

Outcomes
• 1) Negative
• 2) Negative
• 3) Positive

Program
• 1) Right program?
• 2) Not enough
• 3) Change not due to program
Program Improvement

• Document
  – Implemented with fidelity?
  – What worked well or didn’t?
  – Modifications along the way?

• Ask
  – Reach intended participants?
  – Successful for subgroup of participants?
  – Resources available to make changes?
Write-Up

• What
  1) Program description
  2) Logic model

• How
  3) Process matrix
  4) Results

• Why it matters
  5) Conclusions & interpretation
  6) Recommendations
Practical Suggestions

• Document program requirements
• Develop department friendly templates
• Start collecting data early
• Make program check-ins doable
• Schedule & budget evaluation
  – Time
  – $$
Questions?
Contact Information:

Chara Heskett
Research Specialist
512-490-7941
Chara.Heskett@tjjd.texas.gov

Carolina Corpus-Ybarra
Research Specialist
512-490-7258
Carolina.Corpus-Ybarra@tjjd.texas.gov

Lory Alexander
Program Supervisor
512-490-7058
Lory.Alexander@tjjd.texas.gov
Evaluation Resources

• Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol (SPEP)
  – Provider services compared to effective programs
  – Characteristics (service type, dosage, quality, risk)
  – http://www.episcenter.psu.edu/juvenile/spep

• Evidence-Based Correctional Program Checklist
  – Capacity (leadership, staff, quality assurance)
  – Content (risk, need, responsivity, treatment principles)
  – https://www.uc.edu/corrections/services/program_evaluation.html
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