135813

SURVEY OF STATE PLANNING
AGENCY FORMULA GRANTS PROGRAM
EVALUATION CAPABILITIES

135813

135813

NCJRS

MAR   1992

ACQUISITIONS

SURVEY OF STATE PLANNING AGENCY FORMULA GRANTS PROGRAM EVALUATION CAPABILITIES

Prepared for

The Office of Juvenile Justice and
Delinquency Prevention

by

Community Research Associates, Inc.
115 North Neil, Suite 302
Champaign, Illinois 61820

The Assistant Attorney General, Office of Justice Programs, coordinates the criminal and juvenile justice activities of the following program Offices and Bureaus: National Institute of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, Bureau of Justice Assistance, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, and Office for Victims of Crime.

September 1988

PREFACE

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention's State Relations and Assistance Division has created an Evaluation Plan Task Team comprised of OJJDP staff, evaluation experts, State Planning Agency staff, and technical assistance providers. The goal of the task team is to develop a plan designed to assist state planners interested in improving their capability to evaluate programs funded using Formula Grants Program monies. This report, <u>Survey of State Planning Agency Formula Grants Program Evaluation Capabilities</u>, is the first product of the team. Eventually, it is anticipated that an evaluation training curriculum for state planners will be developed along with an evaluation monograph. A long-range goal is to improve efforts to identify exemplary programs and to share them with other jurisdictions through an SRAD marketing network.

The task team is headed by Deborah Wysinger of the State Relations and Assistance Division. She is supported by Joseph Thome and James Coldren, who both wrote sections of this report, and by Barbara Seljan, Anne Schneider, and Ruth Williams, who collaborated to design the survey and help edit this report.

The information in the report was compiled through a lengthy survey of State Planning Agencies. The task team would like to acknowledge the effort that respondents took to complete the survey and thank them all for their assistance. Much work was necessary to complete the questionnaire accurately. Their help is sincerely appreciated.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

In 1987, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention's (OJJDP) State Relations and Assistance Division (SRAD--the division charged with the responsibility of administering the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act's Formula Grants Program) conducted a review of internal policies and procedures. The goal of the audit was to determine whether the Office's mission of working with local and state governments to assist them in planning, establishing, operating, coordinating, and evaluating juvenile justice programs was functioning effectively.

It was already known that a certain amount of disparity exists in the levels of success states have made towards the goals of the deinstitutionalization of status offenders, separation of adults from juveniles in adult facilities, removal of juveniles from adult jails and lockups {Section 223(a)(12)(13)(14) and (15) of the JJDP Act}. Several, in fact, have been quite successful in developing and implementing jail removal, separation, and DSO technologies. However, the audit revealed that the application of those technologies in other states has been slow. It quickly became apparent that there was a great need to evaluate and replicate exemplary programs to assist states in their juvenile justice and delinquency prevention efforts. Congress recognized the need when enacting the JJDP Act by establishing that OJJDP coordinate an increased "capacity of state and local governments and public and private agencies to conduct effective juvenile justice and delinquency prevention rehabilitation programs and to provide research, evaluation and training services in the field of juvenile delinquency prevention" {Section 102(a)(b)}. Consistent with Section 102 of the Act, and the needs of the states and SRAD, a recommendation was proposed in the final audit report:

> "Participating states should be urged to evaluate promising approaches to the mandates of the Act, and to disseminate the results to other communities who face similar problems nationwide. SRAD should provide the technical assistance and develop standardized subgrant categories to aid in ongoing assessment of program impact and fund allocation which allows for comparative analysis."

Towards this goal, SRAD has formed an Evaluation and Marketing Package Task Group. Its objective is to increase the evaluation capability of State Juvenile Justice Specialists and State Advisory Groups by: (a) developing an assessment of state capabilities for evaluation; and (b) preparing a prescriptive package

on evaluation for State Juvenile Justice Specialists, State Advisory Groups, and local project monitors. This report concentrates specifically on objective A--the assessment of state capabilities for evaluation.

Many of the current State Planning Agencies (SPAs) are descendants of similar agencies formed in the mid-seventies and charged with the responsibility of administering Law Enforcement and Assistance Administration (LEAA) funds for local action projects. LEAA required SPAs to establish specific parameters regarding program design which could form the basis for assessing success or failure. One charge of the task group was to determine whether any of those evaluation capabilities still existed.

As a condition of participating in the Act and receiving Formula Grants funds, each state must submit an annual Performance Report to OJJDP "which shall describe the progress in implementing programs, the effectiveness of the programs and activities" (JJDP Act: Formula Grants Program--Performance Report Instruction). These instructions allow for the development of a rather sophisticated evaluation design by requiring outcome measures which identify changes in the client or community including increases in recidivism or other follow-up measures. Yet despite instructions that encourage extensive evaluation capabilities of program activities at the state level, neither the Formula Grants Program Audit nor a simple review of Performance Reports could precisely describe the extent or level of such research.

It became clear to the task group that their primary step was to measure state evaluation capabilities. Once accomplished, the results could be used to develop a prescriptive evaluation package for application by system professionals. Such a package would be relevant to the management, design, and utilization of evaluation.

In order to determine those capabilities, a survey of the states involved in the Act's Formula Grants Program was conducted. The purpose of the survey was to identify:

- ► the extent of evaluation in the states;
- ► the types of evaluations conducted;
- ► the requirements of local project grantees regarding evaluation;
- ► attitudes and opinions towards evaluation;
- ► perceived barriers to conducting evaluations;
- ► perceptions of OJJDP's evaluation plans; and
- ► the level of satisfaction with current evaluation processes.

SURVEY DESIGN

The survey was designed according to the premise that there are four evaluation types (in general) that can be applied to juvenile justice and delinquency prevention programs. They are summarized by the following model.

DATA RESOURCES

		PROGRAM ONLY	COMPARISON GROUP
TIME FRAME	PROGRAM ONLY	TYPE A	TYPE B
	BEYOND PROGRAM	TYPE C	TYPE D

Type A evaluations represent the simplest method (save pre-evaluation program monitoring), using client-based data from the target program, and only for the time the client is actually in the program; there is no follow-up. Type A evaluations are called "Short-Term Program Performance Evaluations." Their benefits include, generally, the provision of valuable program management data, such as:

- caseloads,
- client profiles,
- schedule, and service timing data,
- closure, program completion data,
- risk analysis,
- ability to compare program components,
- time series data,
- ability to conduct in-program recidivism analyses,
- detail data concerning program tasks and activities, and
- fiscal data.

Type B evaluations rare also called "Short-Term Program Performance Evaluations," though they are an improvement over Type A programs because they include comparison data. With program and comparison data (from other similar programs), Type B evaluations provide:

- better measures of short-term effectiveness,
- capability to conduct policy analyses, providing more alternatives for program managers,
- benchmark data for future program evaluation, and
- generally, more confidence that your evaluation findings (positive or negative) can be attributed to the program under evaluation, and better means of identifying other influences on program effectiveness.

Type C evaluations, called "Long-Term Program Evaluations," do not consider data from comparison groups but do consider client-based data following their release from a program. Type C evaluations can be considered to be of comparable utility to Type B evaluations, but they have a different perspective. They are "in-program" evaluations in that they collect data on program clients/targets only, but they collect data on those individuals after service delivery has stopped. The benefits of Type C evaluations include:

- ► tracking beyond the program, supporting recidivism analyses, and measures of rehabilitation,
- ► better risk analyses,
- ► better cost analyses, and
- ► more complete analyses and comparisons of program components.

Generally, these evaluations provide more confidence in findings about program performance than Type A evaluations provide, because follow-up has been conducted.

Type D evaluations are the highest level evaluations considered in the prescriptive package. They are true, comprehensive impact evaluations because they include program, client-based, comparison, and follow-up data, supporting a broad variety of evaluation activities. Type D evaluations are called "Long-Term Program Performance Evaluations," and offer the following benefits:

- ► comparing program impact over time and for different programs,
- ► comparing the impact of different program components, across time or programs,
- ► increased ability to isolate program effects on targets,
- ► provides program managers with even more policy options and information for decision-making, and
- ► even more confidence in the probability that your findings are not due to chance, that real outcomes have been identified.

Each of these evaluation types can, of course, vary internally in terms of sophistication. Depending upon resources (staff and money), random assignment of control and target populations can be applied for example. Yet this model does serve to sufficiently describe the type of evaluations which can occur while assessing the effectiveness of Formula Grants Programs.

Therefore, a State Planning Agency Evaluation Capacity (SPAEC) Survey, was developed to identify the evaluation processes (if any) applied to the client-based programs that received Formula Grants funds during the past two calendar years (1986-1987). It was used to collect data describing the elements and attitudes about evaluation described in the introduction above.

In an attempt to collect relevant information and determine which evaluation type is most prevalent, the SPAEC Survey questionnaire was necessarily extensive. To ensure accuracy, a decision was made to solicit the information from the Juvenile Justice Specialist (JJS) within each state's planning agency. The JJS is that person who administers the Formula Grants Program within the state. By job description, the specialist should be the state staff person with the most intimate knowledge of evaluation activities under the Formula Grants Program.

Each Juvenile Justice Specialist was mailed a copy of the SPAEC survey instrument (see appendix) with a request that he or she review relevant files and prepare the answers for a telephone interview. The goal of this design was to obtain the most accurate information possible in the most expeditious manner. The combination of mailing the survey instruments to prepare respondents and then following up with telephone data collection was deemed most appropriate.

The questionnaires were sent to the District of Columbia and to forty-six states currently participating in the Formula Grants Program. Nonparticipating states do not receive Formula Grants funds and have no State Planning Agencies as described in the Act. For these reasons their responses were not solicited. (Wyoming, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Hawaii do not participate.)

Forty-four of the forty-seven jurisdictions were able to respond to the survey. Although it appears that every state will eventually be prepared to provide the task team with the information necessary to determine the extent of state evaluation programs, a decision was made to proceed with analysis and interpretation of the data rather than to wait for missing responses. Since the primary task of the project team is essentially the examination of national trends in terms of evaluation skills, programs, and policies, the forty-two jurisdictions included in the database examined here provide sufficient information to offer necessary insights. The aggregate statistics that appear in the Findings section that follows are based on responses only from those forty-two jurisdictions. All responses are combined into an aggregate database with respondent anonymity a guarantee of the interview.

FINDINGS

Programs Funded and Evaluations Conducted

The number of programs funded by surveyed State Planning Agencies and State Advisory Groups during 1986 and 1987 ranged from zero to more than 100. Table 1 shows there was a distinct preference to fund client-based programs over other project types. The forty-two state specialists interviewed indicated that their juvenile commissions funded client-based programs at a ratio of about three and one-half to one over other types of programs. In fact, the average per state for client-based programs was nearly thirty-five, compared to about ten for other programs.

The preference toward funding programs which emphasize service delivery is a reflection of general priorities by the State Advisory Groups. Many respondents claimed that given a choice between funding a service-oriented program which is aimed directly at helping youths, versus other administrative, monitoring or evaluation tasks, the SAGs lead toward service delivery. There is a perception that the Formula Grants Program dollars are limited, and SAG councils are anxious to focus the monies directly in youth programs. As a result, supporting activities, suffer through a lack of adequate resources.

The preference for programs which emphasize service delivery to juveniles means that a significant proportion of all state-funded initiatives are viable candidates for evaluation and eventual replication. The SPAEC Survey has shown that evaluation types vary by state and program.

Examination of the characteristics of the data generated in client-based programs suggests that they can be highly informative. For example, of the forty-two states responding to the survey, five indicated that more than forty of their client-based Formula Grants Programs funded during the past two years were designed in a manner which resulted in the collection of data on each youth served (see Table 2A) and represented 69 percent of all funded activities. Only five states claimed that they collect or require no such data. Table 2 also provides evidence that, not surprisingly, there is essentially a negative relationship between sophistication of the data collection task and the number of states attempting the activities. For example, although states indicated that 69 percent of their programs collected data on each client, more sophisticated

TABLE 1

NUMBER OF PROGRAMS FUNDED PER STATE
1986-1987

NUMBER OF PROGRAMS	NUMBER OF STATES	
	Client-Based	Nonclient-Based
0	1	1
1-9	5	26
10-19	6	8
20-29	17	6
30-39	5	0
40 plus	8	0
Unknown	0	1
Average per state	34.5	9.5

Source: Survey Items 1.A. and 1.B.

studies such as those involving client tracking Type D were less apt to be incorporated into the program design. Only 31 percent of the funded client-based programs actually tracked cases after the client left the program to assess effectiveness, and only 25 percent collected follow-up offense, rearrest, or court contact information. Conversely, nearly 80 percent of all client-based programs were designed to collect data at the time of case closure to indicate whether a client successfully completed the program. Unfortunately, the SPAEC Survey instrument was not designed to determine how program success was gauged when this task was not a requirement of subgrantees.

The rarest of program designs were those which involved the collection of the data on control or comparison groups. Only 9.1 percent of all client-based Formula Grants programs involved data collection at this level (Table 2F). Only fifteen states in the past two years have even funded such sophisticated projects.

The SPAEC Survey also found that there were merely ten programs established with Formula Grants over the past two years which involved random selection of clients in the treatment and control groups. The forty-two surveyed states funded more than 1,400 programs in 1986 and 1987, yet just a handful were designed with random selection in mind. Evaluation of program success does occur as demonstrated by Table 2D, but there is apparently an emphasis toward Type A rather than Type D designs.

The program types funded using comparison or control groups were diverse. Despite a December, 1988 deadline for removal of juveniles from adult jails and lockups for states participating in the JJDP Act, there is no real concentration of jail removal/detention alternative programs at this level. Although some detention and alternatives were cited by respondents, program types with control groups varied as follows:

- law related education,
- detention and alternatives to detention,
- delinquency prevention,
- wilderness programs,
- alcohol and drug abuse,
- aftercare programs,
- alternatives for chronic status offenders,
- restitution, and
- outreach.

TABLE 2

AGGREGATE CHARACTERISTICS OF CLIENT-BASED DATA

CHARACTERISTICS   NUMBER OF PROGRAMS

							Percent
	0	1-9	10-19	20-29	30-39	40 +	of all
A. Data collected on each client served (no. of states)	5	3	13	10	2	5	68.8
B. Cases tracked after client leaves	8	11	6	1	1	2	30.8
C. Follow-up offense data collected	9	14	4	1	0	2	24.9
D. Data collected showing program success	1	9	10	7	1	5	78.9
E. Data collected showing whether client offended during program	5	10	7	5	0	4	60.2
F. Data collected on control or comparison groups	20	12	3	0	0	0	9.1
G. Outcome data from control and treatment groups	4	9	3	0	0	0	--

The collection of descriptive project data (to act as performance indicators) is not a requirement of all surveyed planning agencies (see Table 3). Furthermore, use and maintenance of automated information systems is not a uniform practice nor are the use of statewide data systems with client-based information (see Tables 4 and 5). It might therefore be expected that most client-based programs would at least prepare qualitative descriptive narratives of the programs, including treatment types and design rationale. Surprisingly, seven states claimed that such reports were not received from any local project directors. In only twenty-three of the states do all local programs prepare qualitative reports regarding programs (see Table 6). On average, only 68 percent of all client-based projects prepare reports for the state.

Site visits to each client-based project within a state is apparently not a feasible option. Presumably a lack of resources and staff time interfere. Four Juvenile Justice Specialists claimed that their states visited no programs during the year and no state was able to visit each project. While the number of client-based programs averaged approximately thirty-five per state, the average number of site visits for monitoring or evaluation purposes was about nineteen (see Table 7).

To summarize, the SPAEC Survey has found that the forty-two states combined to fund 1,416 client-based projects and 1,807 total projects. This represents an average of about seventeen client-based programs and five additional programs funded per year for each state with Formula Grants monies. Yet despite a propensity to fund client-based programs, only 68.8 of the 1,416 programs provided data on each youth and an identical percentage developed descriptive summaries for the State Planning Agencies. Only ten projects (0.7 percent of all those funded) involved random selection into treatment and control groups. The SAGs have generally elected to concentrate on Type A evaluations in order to reserve resources to emphasize service delivery.

Most respondents did outline a general evaluation process used for, among other purposes, identifying model programs for replication. The following section outlines that process and details some differences between states.

TABLE 3

CHARACTERISTICS OF LOCAL DATA FORWARDED TO

STATE PLANNING AGENCIES

	FREQUENCY OF RESPONSES	
	Number	Percentage
Individual level only	2	4.8
Aggregate data only	14	33.3
None reported	3	7.1
Varies substantially	17	40.5
Unknown	6	14.3

Source: SPAEC Survey Item 1.L

TABLE 4

STATEWIDE COMPUTERIZED DATA SYSTEMS

	FREQUENCY OF RESPONSES	
	Number	Percentage
Yes	8	19.0
No	30	71.4
Yes Not Complete	4	9.5

Source: SPAEC Survey Item 2.

TABLE 5

LOCAL PROJECTS WITH COMPUTER SYSTEMS

	FREQUENCY OF RESPONSES	
Number of Projects	Number	Percentage
0	9	21.4
1 - 9	15	35.7
10 or more	6	14.3
unknown	12	28.6

TABLE 6

CLIENT-BASED PROGRAMS PROVIDING DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION

	Frequency	
Number Per State	Number	Percentage
0	7	16.7
1 - 9	5	11.9
10 - 19	6	14.3
20 - 29	12	28.6
30 or more	8	19.0
unknown	4	9.5

Source: SPAEC Survey Item 2.B.

Client-Based Evaluation Process

The findings above suggest that while there have been many Formula Grants Programs funded in the past twenty-four months and that Juvenile Justice Specialists claimed that approximately seven out of every ten are evaluated, the sophistication, extent, design, and goals of those evaluations is varied.

The SPAEC Survey was conducted to establish the numbers and characteristics of client-based programs that are evaluated and to identify the process for conducting evaluations. SPAEC Survey interviewers asked respondents to generally describe how evaluations were conducted, as well as to reveal their attitudes about the process and its adequacies. Although each state described a different model, there was enough uniformity among them to both describe a generic "evaluation model" as well as to draw some conclusions about JJS' perceptions regarding the goals and uses of evaluations.

All respondents claimed that their agency essentially requires some type of performance indicators-- local project directors are usually mandated to submit quantitative or qualitative evidence that client-based programs funded using Formula Grants resources are meeting stated pre-application goals and objectives. The performance indicator requirements are routinely written into the request for proposals that announce the disbursal of JJDP Act Formula Grants. The extent to which this requirement is enforced is unclear however. Recall from Tables 2A and 6 that some states did not receive either program information or data from any projects. Yet most claimed during the description of the process that such indicators are required.

To encourage project directors and RFP respondents to improve or expand their evaluation components, some state agencies will attempt to encourage evaluations. About one-third of the respondents claimed that a variety of techniques are used in an attempt to motivate local jurisdictions to participate in evaluation. The following strategies were all cited:

- making technical assistance available;
- making funding contingent upon a strong "evaluation" component within the program description;
- creating an exemplary program award initiative in which those grantees with the highest success rates and most efficient use of Formula Grants resources are recognized by the state;
- requiring that state juvenile justice staff be involved in project design; and
- making second year funding contingent upon some amount of success measured during the first year.

TABLE 7

CLIENT-BASED PROJECTS VISITED FOR MONITORING

OR EVALUATION PURPOSES

	FREQUENCY	
Projects Per State	Number	Percentage
0	4	9.5
1 - 91	3	30.9
10 - 19	11	26.2
20 or more	11	26.2
Unknown	2	4.8
Average Number Visited	19	--

Source: SPAEC Survey Item 2.C.

In addition, 73.8 percent of the respondents claimed that their State Planning Agency attempts to increase evaluation capacity by assisting local project directors and staff toward this goal. The following techniques were listed, many of which employed more than one state (source is SPAEC Survey item 6.B):

- ► Technical assistance (eighteen states).
- ► Distribution of manuals and other written materials on evaluation (ten states).
- ► Making computer hardware available (one state).
- ► Conducting pre-application workshops for potential grantees around the state (five states).
- ► Conducting additional training workshops (eleven states).
- ► Setting aside extra funding for evaluations under certain conditions (two states).
- ► Providing data services for local projects (one state).
- ► Asking the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention for assistance in regard to evaluation (two states).

Technical assistance was mentioned by respondents as the most common aspect of their efforts to increase local evaluation capacity. However, the TA process was admittedly quite informal and often merely included providing project directors with lists of evaluation consultants, providing materials mentioned in the list above, or offering advice by telephone. On-site technical assistance was apparently not the norm.

The process for submission of the performance indicators to the State Planning Agency is routinely accomplished through quarterly reports. Most Juvenile Justice Specialists indicated that these reports are characterized substantially as narrative or qualitative descriptions of progress toward stated goals and objectives. The reports often contain data describing the numbers and types of juveniles served in the program as a primary means of gauging progress or failure. While the quarterly reports are commonly prepared by local project directors or their staff, there are instances when outside consultants are contracted to fulfill the SPA reporting requirement.

Perhaps the main reason that the submission of performance indicators in quarterly reports was mentioned as the major tool in efforts to evaluate program success is that many state requirements regarding evaluation methodologies are left to the discretion of project directors. Table 8 shows that of those specialists interviewed, twenty-eight claimed that requests for proposals regarding client-based Formula Grants programs must include an evaluation methodology. Half required a specific set of data elements for all such programs while the remainder allowed local project directors to pursue their own methodology for reporting. The quarterly report and their narrative descriptions of performance seemed to suffice for the SPA's purposes.

After submission of quarterly reports, the information is normally reviewed for progress toward stated goals and objectives by the state Juvenile Justice Specialist or other staff within the State Planning Agencies who have specific skills in the area of monitoring and evaluation (see Table 9). Forty-nine percent of the Formula Grants Programs funded in 1986 and 1987 resulted in development of an evaluation report that included an analysis and interpretation of the data. There were ten states, however, that obtained no such reports from any of their projects (23 percent). Again, this is more evidence as to the informality of aggregate performance expectations.

In most states, the SPA staff person charged with the responsibility of reviewing the "evaluation report" information will routinely check the performance indicators upon submission to ensure that steady progress is maintained. In the event that stated goals and objectives are not being met, a decision may be made to conduct an on-site visit to ascertain where problems exist. Some state planners will visit a project site only if there is a problem, while others will inspect as part of a routine monitoring visit to the program. There were four states, however, where respondents indicated that no project receiving Formula Grants Program monies in the past two years was visited again (see Table 7).

A final step, according to most respondents, is usually to prepare a summary of the project quarterly reports (or other submitted information) for presentation to the State Advisory Group or the SAG's relevant subcommittees. The information culled from the evaluation/quarterly reports in client-based programs are used in a variety of ways. Respondents indicated that one or more of the following are major applications for evaluation information:

- ▶   Deciding whether to fund programs or continue funding (21 states)
- ▶   Determine program impact on Act mandates (6)
- ▶   Setting/changing SAG priorities (8)
- ▶   General planning purposes (4)
- ▶   Developing OJJDP Performance Report (6)
- ▶   Technology transfer and marketing (7)
- ▶   Information resource for legislation (4)
- ▶   Define program design (3)
- ▶   Identify better models (2)
- ▶   Assure project focus has not changed (1)
- ▶   Identify need localities (2)

TABLE 8

STATE REQUIREMENTS REGARDING EVALUATION

NUMBER (AND PERCENTAGE) OF STATES

	Yes	No	Depends
A. Requests for proposals mandate evaluations	28 (66.7)	10 (23.8)	4 (9.5)
B. The state requires a specific set of data elements of all client programs	19 (45.2)	19 (45.2)	4 (9.5)
C. The state requires projects to set aside funds for evaluation	1 (2.4)	40 (95.2)	1 (2.4)
D. The state requires the evaluation be conducted by outside evaluators	2 (4.8)	37 (88.1)	3 (7.1)

Source: SPAEC Survey Item 5A-D.

TABLE 9

WHO CONDUCTS CLIENT-BASED EVALUATION

	Number of States	Average per State
Juvenile Justice Specialist	13	5
SPA Staff Evaluation Specialist	11	7
Outside Evaluators (per SPA)	7	1
Local Program Staff	22	14
Local Staff Evaluation Specialist	2	6
Outside Evaluators (per program staff)	12	1

Source: SPAEC Item 3.A.

- ►   Develop workshops (2)
- ►   Cost effectiveness (2)
- ►   Assess program impact on statewide problems (1)

In general, the information is primarily used by SAGs to make decisions about continuation funding and the measurement of progress toward stated goals and objectives. The information can theoretically be used to assess whether the state program plan is addressing needs identified by the SAG.

The evaluation processes described by the respondents varied from state to state, but it is apparent that there is a "general model" common among most planning agencies. That process, as described above, can be summarized as follows:

(1)   A requirement of performance indicators is written into the request for proposals.

(2)   The performance indicators are submitted as part of a quarterly report by each project director.

(3)   The quarterly reports and performance indicators are reviewed for progress toward stated goals and objectives by state Juvenile Justice Specialists and staff.

(4)   Some on-site verification of the data submitted in the quarterly reports is conducted.

(5)   A summary of the quarterly reports is provided either in written or oral format for the State Advisory Group.

(6)   The State Advisory Groups use the summaries of the quarterly reports to make a variety of decisions, including whether certain programs should be refunded, and to assist in refining state policy in juvenile justice matters.

In the strictest sense, this process most closely resembles Type A evaluation. State planners are primarily interested in determining whether a program is accomplishing stated pre-application goals and objectives. Additional outcomes were often considering secondary benefits. The processes described by respondents indicate that Type A evaluations, concentrating specifically upon the target population (no comparison group) and within the context and time frame of the project period.

Many of the survey respondents admitted that the process they were describing was not designed as evaluation per se, but was instead a routine aspect of their quarterly monitoring efforts. The following quote is representative:

"We don't actually do evaluation. We just review data received as part of our quarterly report, and in that sense we are evaluating program success."

TABLE 10

LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH EVALUATION DESIGN

	REGARDING OBJECTIVITY AND ACCURACY OF INFORMATION	USEFULNESS OF INFORMATION
Very satisfied	9 (21.4)	7 (17.9)
Somewhat satisfied	19 (45.2)	18 (46.2)
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	3 (7.1)	4 (12.8)
Somewhat dissatisfied	6 (14.3)	8 (20.5)
Very dissatisfied	0 (0)	1 (2.6)

In the aggregate, state planners are essentially satisfied with the objectivity and accuracy of this process as well as the usefulness of the information (see Table 10). Their evaluation techniques apparently fulfill many planner expectations and requirements. Two-thirds of all specialists interviewed (66.6 percent) claim that the evaluation information they received was satisfactory in terms of objectivity and accuracy. There were six states, however, which did indicate that evaluation design was neither satisfactorily objective or accurate (Table 10).

Regarding the usefulness of the evaluation information, the respondents were also essentially satisfied --at a rate of 64.1 percent (see Table 10). However, despite a fairly high rate of satisfaction with the accuracy and objectivity of the evaluation, there was slightly more dissatisfaction with the usefulness of the information. Nine respondents were either dissatisfied or very dissatisfied in this regard. Satisfaction with the usefulness of such information is obviously tied to the goals which State Planning Agencies and advisory groups have for program derived data. Because these organizations tend to use data primarily for setting policy direction and gauging the progress of funded programs, rather than for research purposes, most evaluation programs are considered by them to be sufficient.

The level of satisfaction with evaluations could conceivably improve with a mandatory requirement by SPAs to use outside consultant services rather than staff for implementation. All of the Juvenile Justice Specialists were asked the number of evaluations that are conducted by outside, independent evaluators during the course of their tenure within the State Planning Agency. Seventeen states reported that no such evaluations were conducted, and an additional eighteen reported less than ten. Three state officials were unsure about the number of such evaluations that were conducted. However, when comparing evaluations conducted by independent organizations versus those done by staff, an overwhelming majority of respondents (61.9 percent) were more satisfied with the results of the evaluations performed by outside groups. Four reported no difference (about 19 percent) and another four were more satisfied with those conducted by staff (Table 11).

TABLE 11

SATISFACTION WITH OUTSIDE EVALUATIONS

	FREQUENCY	
Level of Satisfaction	Number	Percentage
More with Outside Evaluation	13	52.0
More with Staff Evaluations	4	16.0
Both About the Same	4	16.0
Unsure	4	16.0

Source: SPAEC Survey Item 7.A.

Many reasons were cited for the higher level of satisfaction with outside evaluators. These include:

- ▶   objectivity (18 of 25 respondents--72 percent)
- ▶   the expertise they bring (9 respondents--36 percent)
- ▶   lack of time staff have for evaluations (9 respondents--36 percent)

Using outside evaluators is still problematic, however. Weaknesses cited by respondents included:

- ▶   no understanding of system mechanics (6 respondents--29 percent)
- ▶   the increased cost (7 respondents--28 percent)
- ▶   lack of credibility with staff (3 respondents--12 percent)

The objectivity that independent consultants can bring to an evaluation was repeatedly noted. Yet, the cost associated with contracting for the service is a concern. One respondent noted that it was more expensive to fully evaluate a program than to run it. With limited monies available, sophisticated applications of evaluative research are considered a luxury.

Barriers other than costs impede the development of in-depth evaluation programs as well. Both a lack of time and limited staff expertise were identified in this regard by more than half of the respondents (Table 12). These obstacles can be overcome through the use of an independent consultant, but contracting for these services is expensive.

There are some negative attitudes prevalent in the states toward evaluation, but only about 28 percent of the respondents claimed this as a barrier. On the whole, most felt that there was more support than concern about the benefits which evaluation can provide.

Respondents were, in fact, queried about the perceived support of the following groups toward evaluation--local project directors, the respondents themselves, the State Advisory Group, and OJJDP. The respondent group identified themselves as the most supportive group--more than three-quarters were classified as "very supportive" (on a five point scale), followed by SAGs (54.8 percent), OJJDP (31.7 percent), and local directors (19.0 percent--see Table 13).

Local directors were also most often considered to be opposed (four states). Reasons listed for the lack of total support by this group are extensive, but focus on cost concerns, lack of time, a concern about being audited, and a perception that they are simply intimidated by the entire process of evaluation. (Note: Comments regarding perceived support are numerous and therefore summarized for presentation in the

TABLE 12

PERCEIVED BARRIERS TO EFFECTIVE EVALUATION

	FREQUENCY	
Barrier	Number	Percentage
Lack of money or resources	38	90.5
Lack of time	34	81.0
Lack of staff expertise	33	78.6
Lack of understanding	22	47.6
Negative attitudes	12	28.6
Bad experiences	9	21.4

Source: SPAEC Survey Item 8.1.

TABLE 13

SUPPORT OF EVALUATION

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE

	Local Project Directors	Respondents	SAG	OJJDP
Very Supportive	8 (19.0)	33 (78.6)	23 (54.8)	13 (31.7)
Somewhat Supportive	23 (54.8)	7 (16.7)	13 (31.0)	15 (36.6)
Neither Supportive or Opposed	7 (16.7)	2 (4.8)	5 (11.9)	12 (29.3)
Somewhat Opposed	4 (9.5)	0 (--)	1 (2.4)	1 (2.4)

Source: SPAEC Survey Items 8A, C, E, G.

Appendix). There is a basic fear of evaluations by local project directors because of perceptions that the process will reveal problems resulting in negative conclusions regarding program effectiveness and an eventual loss of funds. It is interesting to note that the very reason an SAG would support evaluation is identical to the perceptions of why project directors oppose them.

It was assumed the State Advisory Groups that support evaluations do so because they are considered important for funding decisions, to assess the cost effectiveness programs, and because of a desire to obtain objective information on programs. Yet those SAGs that were considered neutral or opposed primarily developed their posture because of a concern that the limited funds go directly into service delivery (see Appendix). Evidence of this concern is repeatedly being found throughout the survey findings.

Interest in OJJDP's Evaluation Assistance Proposals

Despite the perception of barriers to evaluation, attitudes that evaluative research is a secondary concern, that it is an expensive luxury, and that Performance Report requirements are not stringent and that many states are already at least somewhat satisfied with existing procedures, respondents showed a high degree of interest in OJJDP plans to assist in improving evaluation design. In fact, 88.1 percent endorsed these plans (Table 14).

Of greatest interest to the respondents was the development of a training program. Slightly more than half perceive this as a major benefit to the states' abilities to enhance evaluation capabilities. Only three felt that this would be of no benefit. There was concern voiced by respondents, however, that a training program of four to five days is excessive and their participation could not be guaranteed (Table 15).

The development of an evaluation handbook or a guide to evaluation, such as the monograph currently proposed by the task group, is perceived as a benefit to more than 90 percent of the respondents. However, many respondents volunteered that such an activity could only be valuable in concert with a training program. Without accompanying training, the contents of an evaluation handbook, it was suggested, could not be adequately utilized. It was for that reason that this activity was designated as a major benefit by 33.3

TABLE 14

SUPPORT FOR AN OJJDP EVALUATION
ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

	FREQUENCY	
	Number	Percentage
Very Supportive	31	73.8
Somewhat Supportive	6	14.3
Neutral	4	9.5
Somewhat Opposed	1	2.4

Source: SPAEC Survey Item 8.J.

percent and only a moderate benefit to 59.5 percent of the respondents. Its major value comes as a reference once the training program is complete.

The inclusion of evaluation topics in regional or national SAG Conferences is also considered a major benefit by a quarter of the respondents (26.8 percent) primarily because it was seen as an opportunity to reinforce the value and importance of evaluation to the SAGs. Currently, the only persons (in the aggregate) advocating evaluation research using Formula Grants Program funds are the State Planning Agencies. Since the SAGs essentially propose (or outline) the administrative directions of SPAs, examples of how to use evaluations, an expression of support by OJJDP, and other topics for SAG Conference would be an important contributor to improving the number of evaluations conducted.

Encouraging states to use funds for evaluation would be of slightly less benefit in the opinion of the respondents. Only three assumed it would be a major help while seven actually felt that it would produce no benefit at all. There was a general perception that encouragement alone would not be beneficial without the development of support services such as training or a handbook. Project directors and SAGs have to be shown the utility of evaluations as well as low cost methods for conducting them. The JJS staff already attempt to encourage their application.

There was a disparate perception as to the benefits produced if states were required to set aside a certain portion of their funds for evaluation. Forty-three percent indicated that they assumed there would be a major benefit associated with such a requirement. Conversely, this idea also met with the most resistance in that 20 percent (n = 8) actually felt it would be of no benefit. There is simply not enough money available through the Formula Grants Program to mark a major percentage of funds for evaluation. This could better be handled, according to some respondents, through the use of discretionary funds.

Respondents were also able to provide a number of suggestions to encourage and improve evaluations at the local level in the states. Many respondents reiterated the findings regarding perceived benefits of specific program ideas by OJJDP. For example, twenty of forty-one respondents felt that training was the most critical component for encouraging evaluation. The development of an evaluation guide or design was cited as the next most prevalent aid (36.6 percent). Other ideas include the provision of technical assistance

TABLE 15

PERCEIVED BENEFITS OF SPECIFIC

PROGRAM IDEAS

BENEFIT

(NUMBER AND PERCENT)

	Major	Moderate	Small	None
Guide to Evaluation	14 (33.3)	25 (59.5)	2 (4.8)	1 (2.4)
Training Program	22 (52.4)	14 (33.3)	3 (7.1)	3 (7.1)
Evaluation Topics in SAG Conferences	11 (26.8)	19 (46.3)	11 (26.8)	0 (0)
Encourage Use of Funds	3 (7.3)	20 (48.8)	11 (26.8)	7 (17.1)
Require Use of Funds	17 (42.5)	9 (22.5)	5 (12.5)	8 (20.)

Source: SPAEC Survey Item 8.K.funds.

resources and the demonstration of commitment to evaluation by the Office. Apparently training in this area cannot be overemphasized (Table 16).

Respondents also provided numerous suggestions for the focus of that training and subsequent technical assistance. The Juvenile Justice Specialists were seeking for help with overall evaluation design including methods, procedures and efficiency, as well as the more intimidating aspect of evaluation research-- data gathering techniques (see Table 17). Beyond the design and mechanics of evaluative research, the respondents were also interested in assistance in methods for application of the findings. It is recognized that evaluation will produce a number of statistics and tables regarding program successes and failures. Yet it is also recognized that beyond this, it would be extremely helpful if techniques for improving or modifying program design based on the findings could be provided. Other suggested training topics include goal setting and the establishment of objectives, the types of evaluations which can be conducted, methods for conducting evaluations with limited resources (and an overview of the importance and purpose of evaluation which can be passed on to State Advisory Groups and local project directors).

Although limited in the number of staff responsible for the administration and management of the Formula Grants funds (47 percent indicated that they have no other full-time staff and 43 percent indicated they have no other part-time staff), the fact that 12 percent of the respondents were only part-time juvenile justice specialists and only about half (eighteen) of the states have other staff available for supervising evaluative research, the respondents certainly have the background necessary to grasp and apply evaluation techniques. All are college graduates (50 percent with master's degrees) and most have a degree background, which probably required some course work in evaluation theory (see Appendix for Respondent Demographics). Interestingly, respondents also had about sixteen hours on average of college level methodology or statistics courses. A training program would be able to focus on the specifics of training with only a slight need to provide basic methodological or statistical training.

TABLE 16

SUGGESTIONS FOR OJJDP TO ENCOURAGE AND IMPROVE

EVALUATION IN THE STATES

(Two or more responses)

	FREQUENCY (n = 41)	
	Number	Percentage
Require states set aside percentage of formula grant funds	3	7.3
Develop evaluation guide/design	15	36.6
Training	20	48.8
Use discretionary/other funds	10	24.4
Encourage in guidelines for formula grants	10	24.4
Provide resources	3	7.3
Provide technical assistance	9	21.9
Use SAG conferences for workshops	8	19.5
Simply require it	7	17.1
Demonstrate a commitment to it	3	7.3

TABLE 17

SUGGESTED TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TOPICS

(Two or more states responding)

	FREQUENCY (n = 37)	
	Number	Percentage
Overall evaluation design - including methods, procedure efficiency	12	32.4
Data gathering techniques - including survey instruments	9	24.3
How to identify appropriate performance indicators	6	16.2
How to apply findings - including improving/modifying program design	7	18.9
Setting goals/objectives	5	13.5
Types of evaluations	7	18.9
How to conduct with limited resources	4	10.8
Importance/purpose	6	16.2
How to examine flow of process	3	8.1
Data analysis	2	5.4
Sharing of existing evaluation systems	2	5.4
Designing and RFP	2	5.4
Identifying appropriate programs	2	5.4
Stressing project individuality	2	5.4

IMPLICATIONS OF FINDINGS

The survey of State Planning Agency Evaluation Capabilities is packed with detail and has provided many interesting findings. Of greatest interest to the task team is the fact that the evaluation processes portrayed by respondents is most often a Type A technique. Most SPAs and SAGs were concerned with whether their Formula Grants Program funds were being appropriately spent by local project directors. It was felt that this task could be accomplished through simple monitoring by SPA staff. The costs and time associated with full-scale, Type D, random assignment evaluative research make such projects burdensome and a secondary concern. Given the choice, service delivery (to focus on the mandates of the Act) remains a state priority.

This is not to imply that higher-level (overtime, post-project period, or random assignment) evaluations will always be shunned by decision-makers. Quite to the contrary, the survey respondents felt that in the aggregate, SAGs might be willing to increase evaluation capabilities if direct service delivery was not slowed or interrupted.

In this regard, there are some recommendations that are appropriate and should be considered by the task group. They are summarized below.

- ► The development of an Evaluation Design Monograph will facilitate the application of this research technique. OJJDP developed a similar guide in 1978, but Evaluation Issues is too general to be of any assistance in actual program development. The range of topics to be addressed in an new evaluation guideline is diverse and the updated monograph should be designed with the intent of application, rather than merely information sharing regarding theory. The following general topics should be considered for incorporation into the monograph:

  -- The types of evaluations which can be conducted by State Planning Agencies.

      It would be useful not only to describe the difference between process and impact evaluations, but also to offer examples of program types to which an evaluation design can be applied (e.g., briefly how one might evaluate the effectiveness of a truancy program or a jail removal project).

  -- How program evaluation differs from project monitoring in terms of goals and objectives, mechanics, timelines, product, and costs.

  -- How to establish goals and objectives for an evaluation effort.

SPAs and SAGs must be advised as to how evaluations can contribute to overall state planning efforts if they are to be designed and applied. This task is tied directly to formation of goals and objectives.

-- Why findings are valuable and how they should be applied (for local, State, and national JJDP goals).

It is one matter to design and conduct an evaluation project. It is another to interpret the results accurately and apply the findings in a manner which will result in system-wide improvements. Respondents are seeking assistance in the application of the findings.

-- Low-cost methods for conducting evaluations (determining when meeting stated goals and objectives cannot be accomplished in a cost effective manner).

A major concern of respondents was the costs associated with evaluation. There is certainly a point when costs dominate benefits and conducting an evaluation is no longer economically feasible. Understanding the tradeoff between costs and the impact of simplistic design would be helpful.

-- Identification of national technical assistance and information resources.

Without assistance, state evaluation capabilities will quite simply not improve. As with any program, running into obstacles during an evaluation reduces enthusiasm when help cannot be obtained.

-- Descriptions of evaluation processes.

SPAs and SAGs are interested in design, not theory. As such, generic step-by-step instructions detailing evaluation should be included in the monograph. The instructions should focus on the technical aspects of evaluation including sample size determination, survey instruments, appropriate performance indices, etc. The instructions should comprise the core of the monograph.

-- Methods for overcoming obstacles.

The survey findings highlighted several barriers (resource oriented and attitudinal) that impede evaluation research in the field. Practical suggestions for eliminating the obstacles would be valuable.

► A training program must be developed to support the Evaluation Monograph. Respondents indicated that a monograph would be helpful, but not without an accompanying training program. The technical nature of evaluations and the type of assistance which SPA staff are seeking essentially dictates that training be supported by OJJDP.

The annual regional monitoring workshops would be appropriate settings for conducting the training. In such a forum the training could be used not only to relate techniques and issues regarding program design to SPA staff, but it could also be used to impress attending SAG members of OJJDP's interest in assisting the them with evaluation.

The training should ideally be incorporated directly into the State Relations and Assistance Division's existing training program. SRAD currently is developing training aimed at Staff, SAGs, SPAs, and compliance monitoring contractors. Curriculums have been developed in a variety of areas of concern regarding the implementation of the Act, and oversight and coordination of the evaluation training should also be supervised as part of the same continuing task. Because of the complexity and timelines associated with development of a training program, supervision of the training by SRAD's training unit probably could not commence until 1989.

► The Performance Report instructions should be modified to clarify the Office's expectation regarding evaluation. As the instructions are currently written, evaluation is not clearly stressed as a tool for measuring impact. Incorporation of the monograph within the instructions could be a valuable method for impressing state planners as to the usefulness of this research technique.

It would also be valuable to standardize performance reports so that some measure of national progress in selected grant areas could be made. It is important to note here that the SPAEC Survey was designed to examine evaluation as strictly defined. It might not be possible to develop as national evaluation design for JJDP programs, as each state, jurisdiction, and project is quite unique. However, at minimum, it might be possible to develop standard performance indicators applicable to each subgrant category. When reported to OJJDP, these indicators would provide a summary of progress which could be quickly synthesized for Congress, OJJDP, or the states.

The task team will have to proceed with great care if the evaluations which are designed as a result of the monograph are to be of any use. Recent research by Lab and Whitehead (1988) purports that many findings regarding juvenile treatment program effectiveness are based upon subjective designs. The design outline proposed by the team should account for any methodological flaws since it is intended to become a standard for many years.

The issue of generating enthusiasm for evaluations at the local level must also be dealt with. One SPA staffer noted that local project directors are more concerned with program implementation than evaluation. The process is intimidating, and tying future funding to findings by external investigators serves as a serious disincentive. In short, program managers do not apply for monies from sources that mandate technical evaluations. To require them would supposedly reduce the number of JJDP programs in the state. The evaluation assistance model developed by the task team must necessarily be easy to administer, quick, and nonthreatening.

In general, much enthusiasm was shown towards efforts to improve state evaluation capabilities. Respondents to the SPAEC Survey stressed a simple lack of resources and cost inefficiencies as major

obstacles. It is the goal of the task team to provide a cost-effective method for incorporating evaluations into state Formula Grants Programs to insure that technologies for juvenile justice and delinquency prevention are increasingly identified and shared.

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

PROGRAM EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Let me begin with some questions about the client-based programs that received formula grant funds during the past two years--between January, 1986 and January, 1988. *[NOTE: THIS REFERS TO DIRECT SERVICE DELIVERY PROGRAMS TO JUVENILES OR THEIR FAMILIES. ALSO, THIS REFERS TO PROGRAMS FUNDED LAST YEAR; THAT HAVE BEEN OPERATING FOR ABOUT A YEAR OR MORE]*

A. First, how many different client-based programs have been funded in the two-year period beginning January, 1986 and ending January 1988?

___ ___ ___

B. How many other programs have been funded during this same time period?

___ ___ ___

C. In approximately how many of the client-based programs are data collected on EACH CLIENT served, such as intake data, service delivery information, case closure information? *[NOTE; DATA COLLECTED BY OUTSIDE EVALUATORS IS COUNTED AS IF THE PROGRAM WERE COLLECTING IT]*

___ ___ ___ *[RECORD ACTUAL NUMBER, NOT PERCENTAGE]*

[IF NONE, SKIP TO QUESTION 2, Page 3]

D. In how many of the programs, if any, are cases tracked after they leave the program to determine the effects of treatment or services on individual clients over a longer period of time?
___ ___ ___ *[RECORD NUMBER]*

E. In how many programs, if any, are follow-up offense data collected on each case, such as arrests or re-referrals to court?
___ ___ ___ *[RECORD NUM3ER]*

F. In how many of the programs are data collected at the time the case is closed, to show whether the client completed the program successfully?

___ ___ ___ *[RECORD NUMBER]*

G. In how many programs are data collected at case closure showing whether the client committed any offenses while in the program?

___ ___ ___ *[RECORD NUMBER]*

H.   In how many programs, if any, are data collected on control or comparison groups of persons who either are untreated or who are in a different treatment program or treatment component?

      — — —

I.   *IF THERE WERE ANY:* In how many of these are the clients randomly selected into the treatment and control groups, and in how many were other selection procedures used?

        — — Random
        — — Other

J.   In how many of these are outcome data, such as recidivism data, being collected from both the treatment and control groups?

      — —

K.   What type of program(s) are being evaluated using comparison or control groups and who is doing these evaluations? [LIST NAMES OF PROGRAMS AND NAMES OF PERSONS AND THEIR ORGANIZATIONS WHO ARE DOING THE EVALUATION]

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

L.   This next question shifts to the data that your office receives from each of the client-based programs on a regular basis. Does the state receive the individual-level data from the projects, or does the state receive tallies (aggregated data), or does the state not receive any data from them?

        1. Individual level
        2. Aggregated data (tables, etc.)
        3. No data reported to the state; they maintain
           it locally
        4. Varies (explain:_____

        5. Other (explain: _____

        9. Don't Know

2. Do you have a state-wide computerized information system through which client-based individual-level data are collected at the local level and sent to the state?

        1. Yes
        2. No

A.   How many of the local projects, if any, have their own individual-level computerized information system?

      — — —

B.   From how many of the client-based programs does the state receive qualitative, descriptive information, including types of treatment provided and the logic or rationale of their approaches?

___ ___ ___

C.   How many of the client-based projects are visited each year as part of a monitoring or evaluation process?

___ ___ ___

3. We are interested in knowing who does the client-based evaluations in your state and what kinds of requirements you have about evaluation. We are defining evaluation to include both process evaluations and impact evaluations--that is, evaluations that range from very simple ones to very sophisticated ones. Please provide a brief description of how evaluations are handled in your state. *[RECORD INFORMATION BELOW]*

A.   We would like to know how many client-based evaluations were done by each of the following:

    __ __   The state Juvenile justice specialist

    __ __   State juvenile justice staff whose esponsibilities are primarily evaluation/monitoring rather than project management or administration

    __ __   Outside (contract/grant) evaluators? selected by state staff

    __ __   Local service delivery staff or project directors (in-house)

    __ __   Local program staff whose responsibilities are primarily evaluation/monitoring rather than service delivery

    __ __   Outside evaluators selected by local program staff

    __ __   Other: specify

B.   From how many of the client-based projects have you received at least one evaluation report that included an analysis and interpretation of the data?

    __ __ __

C.   From how many of these reports could you ascertain the short-term or longer term effects of the project?

    __ __ __

D.   On the whole, how satisfied were you with the objectivity and accuracy of the evaluation information? Were you ...[READ RESPONSES]

    1. Very satisfied
    2. Somewhat satisfied
    3. Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
    4. Somewhat dissatisfied
    5. Very dissatisfied

E.   What are the major ways in which you use the evaluation information received from the client-based programs?   [RECORD RESPONSES]

F. On the whole, how satisfied were you with the usefulness of the evaluation information? Were you [READ RESPONSES]

    1. Very satisfied
    2. Somewhat satisfied
    3. Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
    4. Somewhat dissatisfied
    5. Very dissatisfied

4. Lets turn now to the other programs funded with formula grants--the ones that are NOT client-based programs. How many of these have some type of evaluation component?

— — —

A. For how many of these did you receive an evaluation report?

— — —

B. For how many of these did the evaluation report contain an analysis of data from which you could ascertain the effectiveness of the program?

— — —

C. On the whole, how satisfied were you with the objectivity and accuracy of the evaluation information? Were you ...[READ RESPONSES]

    1. Very satisfied
    2. Somewhat satisfied
    3. Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
    4. Somewhat dissatisfied
    5. Very dissatisfied

D. What are the major uses of the evaluation information?

E. On the whole, how satisfied were you with the usefulness of the evaluation information? Were you [READ RESPONSES]

    1. Very satisfied
    2. Somewhat satisfied
    3. Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
    4. Somewhat dissatisfied
    5. Very dissatisfied

F.   Do you evaluate how well the state, as a whole, meets state-level juvenile justice goals, and do you attempt to assess the contribution of different programs to the overall success of the plan?

      1. Yes   2. Maybe, somewhat   3. No

     IF YES, or MAYBE: Please describe how this is done:

5. We are interested in knowing what kinds of requirements, if any, the state places on local programs regarding evaluation.

A.   Do the requests for proposals state that applicants must include an evaluation?

      1. Yes 2. No 3. Depends *(explain:*

B.   Does the state require a specific set of data elements that all client-based programs must collect?

      1. Yes 2. No 3. Depends *(explain:*

C.   Does the state require that projects set aside a specific percentage of their project funds for evaluation?

      1. Yes 2. No 3. Depends *(explain:*

D.   Does the state require that the evaluation be conducted by outside evaluators?

      1. Yes 2. No 3. Depends (explain:

E.   Does the state require persons to participate in state- funded evaluations?

      1. Yes 2. No 3. Depends *(explain:*

F.   Are there (any) other requirements? *[RECORD RESPONSES]*

6. Are there any ways in which projects are encouraged to carry out evaluations, or are given some kinds of extra motivation to participate in evaluation?

      1. Yes *(explain below)* 2. No
      IF YES: What kinds of incentives are there?

A. Are there any practices or policies in your state that you believe act as a negative incentive to evaluation? If so, what are these?

      1. Yes *(explain below)*
      2. No
         IF YES: Explain:

B. Are there any ways in which the state office attempts to increase the evaluation capacity of the local projects, such as with training programs, technical assistance, written materials, and so forth?

      1. Yes *(explain below)*
      2. No
         IF YES: What are these?

C. The states use several different methods to fund evaluations. How are evaluations funded in your state?   *[RECORD RESPONSES]*

D. Are there any OJJDP policies or practices that you believe actually discourage evaluation in your state?
      1. Yes *(explain below)*
      2. No
         IF YES: What are these?

7. We have some questions now that pertain to the entire time you have been with the juvenile justice office in your state. During this time, approximately how many evaluations have been done by outside organizations or outside consultants?

— — —

(IF NONE, SKIP TO QUESTION 7.C)

A. IF SOME: We would like for you to compare the evaluations done by outside organizations with those done by staff. On the whole, were you more satisfied with the evaluations done by outside evaluators, or with those done by staff?

      1. More satisifed with outsiders
      2. No difference
      3. More satisifed with staff

B.   What do you see as the strengths and weaknesses of outside evaluators and of staff evaluators?
Strengths/Weaknesses of Outside Evaluators:

Strengths/Weaknesses of Staff Evaluators:

C.   During the time you have been with the juvenile justice office in your state, approximately how many evaluations have been done on OJJDP formula grant programs that involved comparison or control groups and that attempted to assess program effectiveness, such as analysis of recidivism rates?   __ __

(IF NONE, SKIP TO QUESTION 7.E)

D.   IF SOME: On the whole, were you more satisfied with the evalutions that had comparison or control groups, or with those that contained only data on project clients?

1. More satisfied with those that had comparison/control
         groups
2. No difference
3. More satisfied with those that did not have
         comparison/control groups

E.   What do you see as the major strengths and weaknesses of including comparison/control groups in the evaluation?

F.   During the time you have been with the juvenile justice office in your state, have any evaluations been done on OJJDP funded formula grant programs that involved random assignment between treatment and control groups?
         1. Yes
         2. No *(IF NO SKIP TO QUESTION 7.H)*

IF YES: Who conducted that evaluation? _____

_____
         What program was evaluated? _____

_____

G.   On the whole, how satisifed were you with the evaluation that included random assignement, compared with other evaluations of client-based programs?

         1. More satisfied with random assignment evaluations
         2. No difference
         3. More satisfied with other evaluations

H.   What are the major strengths and weaknesses, from your perspective, of the random assignment evaluations?

8. We are interested in attitudes toward evaluation.

A. First, how supportive are local project directors toward evaluation? Are they...

     1. Very supportive
     2. Somewhat supportive
     3. Neither supportive nor opposed
     4. Somewhat opposed
     5. Very opposed

B. Why do you think they feel that way?

C.   How supportive are YOU toward evaluation?

     1. Very supportive
     2. Somewhat supportive
     3. Neither supportive nor opposed
     4. Somewhat opposed
     5. Very opposed

D.   Why do you feel that way?

E.   How supportive are members of the State Advisory Group?

     1. Very supportive
     2. Somewhat supportive
     3. Neither supportive nor opposed
     4. Somewhat opposed
     5. Very opposed

F.   Why do you think they feel that way?

G.   How supportive do you believe OJJDP is toward evaluation? Would you say that they are:

     1. Very supportive
     2. Somewhat supportive
     3. Neither supportive nor opposed
     4. Somewhat opposed
     5. Very opposed

H.   Why do you think that?

I.   We would like your thoughts about the major barriers to effective evaluation of local projects in your state-- especially client-based programs. What do you see as the major barriers to evaluation in your state and how could these be overcome? *[CIRCLE AS MANY AS RESPONDENT MENTIONS, RECORD OTHERS IN THE SPACE PROVIDED]*

     01. Lack of money or resources
     02. Lack of time
     03. Lack of staff expertise
     04. Lack of understanding about what evaluations are for or how they can be used
     05. Negative attitudes toward evalaution
     06. Bad experiences with evaluations in the past

     Others:

J.   OJJDP is considering the development of a program designed to assist state agencies in evaluating local programs? Are you

     1. Very supportive
     2. Somewhat supportive
     3. Neutral
     4. Somewhat opposed
     5. Very opposed

K.   If OJJDP goes ahead with a program, there are several things they might do. As I read each one, tell me how effective you think it would be in your state.

     1. Develop an evaluation handbook or Guide to evaluation. Would that have a
        a. Major effect
        b. Moderate effect
        c. Small effect
        d. No effect - a waste of money

     2. Develop a 4-5 day training program on evaluation for juvenile justice specialists. Would that have a
        a. Major effect
        b. Moderate effect
        c. Small effect
        d. No effect - a waste of money

3. Include evaluation topics at regional or national SAG conferences. Would that have a
   a. Major effect
   b. Moderate effect
   c. Small effect
   d. No effect - a waste of money

4. Encourage states to use funds for evaluation. Would that have a
   a. Major effect
   b. Moderate effect
   c. Small effect
   d. No effect - a waste of money

5. Require states to use a certain portion of their funds for evaluation. Would that have a
   a. Major effect
   b. Moderate effect
   c. Small effect
   d. No effect - a waste of money

L.   What do you think OJJDP should do to encourage and improve evaluation in your state?

M.   What topics do you believe are most important to cover in the training and technical assistance program?

8. I have just a final few questions:

A.   How long have you been the juvenile justice specialist in your state?
      __ __ years

B.   Are you fulltime or parttime?
      __ Fulltime
      __ Parttime

C.   How many other staff have some responsibility for administration or management of OJJDP formula grant funds?
      __ __ Fulltime
      __ __ Parttime

D. What is the highest educational degree you received?

1. High school graduate
2. Associate (junior or community college degree, two-year degree)
3. Bachelor's degree
4. Master's degree
5. Law degree
6. Ph.D.

E. What was your major field of study?_____

F. How many hours of college-level quantitative methods, statistics, or similar courses have you had?

___ ___

G. In what category is your annual salary:

1. Under 15,000
2. 15,000 to 19,999
3. 20,000 to 24,999
4. 25,000 to 29,999
5. 30,000 to 34,999
6. 35,000 to 39,999
7. over 40,000

H. In your office, who does the evaluations, you or someone else, or both?

1. JJ specialist
2. Someone else
3. Both

IF SOMEONE ELSE DOES EVALUATIONS, ASK THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ABOUT THAT PERSON

I. What is the highest educational degree that person has received?

1. High school graduate
2. Associate (junior or community college degree, two-year degree)
3. Bachelor's degree
4. Master's degree
5. Law degree
6. Ph.D.

J. What was his or her major field of study? _____

K. Approximately how many hours of college-level quantitative methods, statistics, or similar courses do you think that person has had?

___ ___

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR PARTICIPATING. WOULD YOU LIKE TO SEE A COPY OF THE RESULTS OF THE SURVEY?
___ YES ___ NO

APPENDIX B

COMMENTS REGARDING SUPPORT OF EVALUATION

WHY DO RESPONDENTS FEEL AS THEY DO?--8.D

STATE
ID NUMBER 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47

COMMENT	TOTAL
FEEL NEED FOR EVAL	3
THINK EVAL IMPORTANT	4
PROOF, JUSTIFICATION	11
ACCOUNTABILITY	5
ALLOWS TRACKING	1
TO USE RESOURCES WISELY	5
COST	3
TIME	1
TAKES FROM DIRECT SERVICES	2
REQUIRES ENERGY, RESOURCES	1
AT TIMES RESULTS NOT USEFUL	3
PERSONAL INTEREST, BACKGROUND	2
OBJECTIVE INFO WHAT WORKS&WHY	9
FOR PLANNING PURPOSES	4
FOR ADMINISTRATIVE PURPOSES	1
TO AID IN FUNDING DECISIONS	4
USE INFO TO IMPROVE,BENEFIT PRGM	2
USE AS DIAGNOSTIC TOOL	1
FEEL RESPONSIBILITY TO PROVIDE	1
UNSURE EVAL'S IMPACT,USE	2
EVAL-BEST MANAGEMENT TOOL	1
TO REPLICATE SUCCESSFUL PRGMS	1
ASSESS PROGRAM IMPACT	3
KEEP EVAL SIMPLE, LIMITED	2
PRATICAL APPLICATION OF EVAL	1
TOO OVERBURDENED TO EVAL	1
PROVIDE SAG FEEDBACK	1
SCALE RESPONSE	

SCALE RESPONSE: 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 1 1 1 1 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1   1 3 1 1 1 3 1 1 1 1 2 1 1 2 2 1 1 1 1   1 1 1 1   1

STATE
ID NUMBER
COMMENT

WHY DOES SAG FEEL AS IT DOES?--8.F

STATE
ID NUMBER 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47   TOTAL
COMMENTS

COMMENTS	TOTAL
TOO ASSESS WORTH OF COSTS	9
EXPERIENCED SAG NEUTRAL,NEG	1
NEW, INEXPERIENCED SAG	3
DO NOT USE EVAL	1
USES EVAL INFO	1
IMPT FOR FUNDING DECISIONS	10
STATUS & IMPACT INFO	4
RELIABILITY	1
EVAL.OR ON COUNCIL HELPS	1
SAG SUPPORTS & ENCOURAGES EVAL	1
SAG TALKS BUT NOT FUNDS	1
IMPACT EVAL GIVES DIRECTION	1
SAME AS RESPONDENT	7
SUPPORTS THE FUNDING SYSTEM	1
LACK OF KNOWLEDGE	1
SERVICES-EVAL TRADE-OFF	6
UNDERSTAND WHAT WORKS & WHY	2
ESSENTIAL FOR ADMINISTRATION	1
ACCOUNTABILITY	3
CHAIR REQUEST REVIEW & REVISION	1
IF TIME AND MONEY AVAIL	1
TO ASSESS PROGRAM QUALITY	3
NOT DISCUSSED, NOT DONE YET	2
NOT A PRIORITY	2
QUESTION OF MONEY	1
CURRENTLY DEVELOPING PROGRAM	1
NEED OBJECTIVE INFO, STATISTICS	4
WANT TO KNOW EVAL WHYS & USES	1
EVAL GIVEN LOW PRIORITY	1
TO DEV NEW & BETTER STRATEGIES	1
OPEN TO ANY HELPFUL INFO	1

SCALE RESPONSE 1 3 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 1 4 1 1 2 1 2 1 1   2 3 1 1 3 3 1 1 1 2 2 2 2 1 2 2 2 1 1   1 1 3 1   2

STATE

ID NUMBER COMMENTS	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	TOTAL
WOULD LIKE TO, BUT NOT FUND	1									1																																						2
NO EMPHASIS, NOT ISSUE		1							1	1												1					1				1	1							1									8
LITTLE FUNDING EMPHASIS				1											1																																	2
EVAL DOES NOT AFFECT FUNDS	1																																															1
EVAL HAS NO IMPACT													1																																			1
GOOD COMMUNICATION ON EVAL			1																						1								1															3
DISCRETIONARY FUNDING OF EVAL			1																																			1										2
LACK FEEDBACK & SUGGESTIONS				1																																												1
MANDATE SOME INFORMATION					1																									1																		2
HEARD NOTHING, NOT TALKED							1														1																			1								3
NOW IS THE TIME TO									1																										1													2
GATHERING INFO, THIS SURVEY											1	1															1	1					1															5
STAFF SUPPORTIVE OF EVAL														1									1								1																	3
TIME MONEY STAFF ETC LIMITS																1																																1
WOULD PROVIDE TA IF "VERY"																	1																															1
ASSUMED THRU PERSONAL CONTACTS																		1			1																											2
ENCOURAGING TOWARD SITE VISIT																			1																													1
NO RESPONSE																				1																												1
LIKE BETTER DATA FOR CONGRESS																					1																											1
TO KNOW IMPACT, PRODUCTIVITY																						1																1										2
NEED TO GIVE GUIDELINES, TOOLS																										1					1																	2
NEED SIMPLE, ORDINARY APPROACH																													1																			1
OJJDP NOT HELPING DIRECTLY																					1																											1
NEED A NATIONAL STATEMENT																									1																							1
HAD EVALUATION WORKSHOP																												1																				1
TOO NEW TO OFFICE TO COMMENT																																			1													1
DEMONSTRATION & RESEARCH																																										1						1
GIVES NO INFORMATION																																												1				1
MONEY FOR PROJECTS NOT EVAL																																															1	1
SCALE RESPONSE	1	3	1	1	3	2	3	3	2	1	2	3	1	2	3	2	2	1	1		2	2	1	1	3	3	1	2	3	3	1	2	2	3	2	1		1	2		2	1	4	3		2		

STATE

ID NUMBER
COMMENTS
WOULD LIKE TO, BUT NOT FUND
NO EMPHASIS, NOT ISSUE
LITTLE FUNDING EMPHASIS
EVAL DOES NOT AFFECT FUNDS
EVAL HAS NO IMPACT
GOOD COMMUNICATION ON EVAL
DISCRETIONARY FUNDING OF EVAL
LACK FEEDBACK & SUGGESTIONS
MANDATE SOME INFORMATION
HEARD NOTHING, NOT TALKED
NOW IS THE TIME TO
GATHERING INFO, THIS SURVEY
STAFF SUPPORTIVE OF EVAL
TIME MONEY STAFF ETC LIMITS
WOULD PROVIDE TA IF "VERY"
ASSUMED THRU PERSONAL CONTACTS
ENCOURAGING TOWARD SITE VISIT
NO RESPONSE
LIKE BETTER DATA FOR CONGRESS
TO KNOW IMPACT, PRODUCTIVITY
NEED TO GIVE GUIDELINES, TOOLS
NEED SIMPLE, ORDINARY APPROACH
OJJDP NOT HELPING DIRECTLY
NEED A NATIONAL STATEMENT
HAD EVALUATION WORKSHOP
TOO NEW TO OFFICE TO COMMENT
DEMONSTRATION & RESEARCH
GIVES NO INFORMATION
MONEY FOR PROJECTS NOT EVAL
SCALE RESPONSE

WHY BELIEVE PROJECT DIRECTORS FEEL AS THEY DO?--B.B

STATE
ID NUMBER 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47

COMMENT	TOTAL
NO REQUESTS, NO FEEDBACK	2
DID REQUEST TA	3
FEAR NEGATIVE EVAL	2
INTIMIDATED BY EVALUATION	5
HASSLE	4
FEAR LOSS OF FUNDS	2
COST CONCERNS	8
OBJECTIVE CRITERIA AVAIL	1
MORE ACCURACY	1
MORE ACCEPTABLE	1
FUNDING REQUIREMENT	3
JUSTIFIES FUNDING, PROOF	2
COOPERATIVE	1
VALUE THE TERMINOLOGY	1
UNCERTAIN HOW EVAL USED	2
LACK EXPERTISE	2
FEAR AMOUNT OF WORK	1
EXTRA PAPER WORK	2
LACK TIME	7
LACK STAFF	3
NO COERCION TO EVAL	2
INTEREST IN PERF, QUALITY	4
INTEREST IN IMPACT, SUCCESS	3
RATHER DO DIRECT SERVICE	3
USE EVAL TO IMPROVE	4
DISLIKE OUTSIDERS COMING IN	3
BAD EXPERIENCE WITH EVAL	1
NO EXPERIENCE WITH EVAL	1
USE EVAL TO SUPPORT OPINIONS	1
NOT MOTIVATED TO EVAL	1
BELIEVE EXPERIENCE SUFFICIENT	1

SCALE RESPONSE 2 4 1 1 2 2 2 1 2 2 2 2 3 2 3 2 2 4 1 3 2 3 2 2 4 3 2 1 2 3 2 2 2 2 2 1 2 1 3 2 2 4 2 1

STATE
ID NUMBER
COMMENT
NO REQUESTS, NO FEEDBACK
DID REQUEST TA
FEAR NEGATIVE EVAL
INTIMIDATED BY EVALUATION
HASSLE
FEAR LOSS OF FUNDS
COST CONCERNS
OBJECTIVE CRITERIA AVAIL
MORE ACCURACY
MORE ACCEPTABLE
FUNDING REQUIREMENT
JUSTIFIES FUNDING, PROOF
COOPERATIVE
VALUE THE TERMINOLOGY
UNCERTAIN HOW EVAL USED
LACK EXPERTISE
FEAR AMOUNT OF WORK
EXTRA PAPER WORK
LACK TIME
LACK STAFF
NO COERCION TO EVAL
INTEREST IN PERF, QUALITY
INTEREST IN IMPACT, SUCCESS
RATHER DO DIRECT SERVICE
USE EVAL TO IMPROVE
DISLIKE OUTSIDERS COMING IN
BAD EXPERIENCE WITH EVAL
NO EXPERIENCE WITH EVAL
USE EVAL TO SUPPORT OPINIONS
NOT MOTIVATED TO EVAL
BELIEVE EXPERIENCE SUFFICIENT
SCALE RESPONSE

APPENDIX C

RESPONDENT DEMOGRAPHICS

APPENDIX C

RESPONDENT DEMOGRAPHICS

HIGHEST EDUCATIONAL DEGREE

Degree	Number	Percent
Bachelors	19	45.2
Masters	21	50.0
Law	2	4.8

Source: SPAEC Survey Item 9.D.

RESPONDENT DEMOGRAPHICS

MAJOR FIELD OF STUDY

Field	Number	Percent
Sociology-Anthropology	4	9.5
Political Science	5	11.9
Social Work	5	11.9
Criminal Justice-Corrections	3	7.1
Education	5	11.9
Psychology	7	16.7
Accounting	1	2.4
Planning	2	4.8
English	1	2.4
Community Services	1	2.4
Economics	1	2.4
Law	2	4.8
Business Administration	2	4.8
Child Development	1	2.4
Guidance	2	4.8

Source: SPAEC Survey Item 9.E

CLASS HOURS OF COLLEGE LEVEL

QUANTITATIVE METHODS OR STATISTICS

Hours	Number	Percent
No Hours	1	2.4
1 to 10 Hours	17	41.5
11 to 20 Hours	16	39.0
21 or More Hours	7	17.1

MEAN equals 16.293
MEDIAN equals 12.0

NOTE: Certain respondents could only estimate total classes,
    not total hours. In these cases, the figure for total
    classes was multiplied by 3 to arrive at total hours.
    As such, the figures above may be an underestimate of
    total hours.

SOURCE: SPAEC Survey Item 9.F

ANNUAL SALARY

Annual Salary	Number	Percent
15,000 to 19,999 Dollars	1	2.4
20,000 to 24,999 Dollars	9	22.0
25,000 to 25,999 Dollars	6	14.6
30,000 to 34,999 Dollars	9	22.0
35,000 to 39,999 Dollars	10	24.4
40,000 Dollars or More	6	14.6

SOURCE: SPAEC Survey Item 9.G.

NUMBER OF YEARS AS JUVENILE JUSTICE SPECIALIST

Years	Number	Percent
One	10	23.8
Two	5	11.9
Three	7	16.7
Four	2	4.8
Five	2	4.8
Six	6	14.3
Seven	2	4.8
Eight	3	7.1
Nine	2	4.8
Ten or more	3	7.1

MEAN equals 4.5 Years

MEDIAN equals 3 Years

SOURCE: SPAEC Survey Item 9.A

APPENDIX D

REFERENCES

Arthur D. Little, Inc. (1978). Evaluation Issues. Washington, DC (US Government Printing Office).

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (undated). JJDP Act: Formula Grant Program Performance Report Instruction.

Lab, S. P. and J. T. Whitehead (1988). "An Analysis of Juvenile Correctional Treatment." Crime and Delinquency. 34(1):60-83.