LEAA FORM 1331/8 (8-72)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Memorandum

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION

TO : Donald E. Santarelli
Administrator

DATE: March 1, 1974

FROM : John M. Greacen
Deputy Director, NILECJ

SUBJECT: Report of the LEAA Evaluation Policy Task Force

On behalf of the LEAA Evaluation Policy Task Force, I am pleased to present our final report and recommendations for LEAA evaluation goals and programs.

From its creation, the Task Force recognized the important role evaluation plays in LEAA programs and policies. With the new legislative mandate and the high priority assigned to evaluation by you and the Deputy Administrators, this role will continue to expand.

Your challenge to the Task Force required us to develop a program which could move ahead the state of the art in Federal program evaluation. In response to that challenge, the Task Force Report proposes a revolutionary approach which builds upon the experience of other Federal agencies, but surpasses existing efforts in two respects -- its two phase National Evaluation Program and its marriage of Federal, state and local evaluation interests and activities.

This Federal-state partnership was made possible by the broadly representative character of the Task Force and the ability of its members to surmount the parochial interests of individual organizational units to adopt a program designed to meet the entire agency's needs and objectives.

I will be glad to discuss the recommendations of the report with you when you have had an opportunity to review it, and to prepare for your consideration a set of specific decisions to implement it when you deem that step appropriate.

LEAA EVALUATION POLICY TASK FORCE

Chairman, John M. Greacen
Deputy Director
National Institute of Law Enforcement
and Criminal Justice
LEAA

Richard W. Velde (ex officio)
Deputy Administrator for Policy
Development, LEAA

Charles R. Work (ex officio)
Deputy Administrator for Administration, LEAA

James M. H. Gregg
Director
Office of Planning and Management
LEAA

George Hall
Acting Assistant Administrator
National Criminal Justice
Information and Statistics
Service, LEAA

Thomas J. Madden
General Counsel
LEAA

Robert F. Cole
Director, Evaluation Unit
Massachusetts Committee on Law
Enforcement and Administration
of Criminal Justice

Lee M. Thomas
Executive Director
South Carolina Law Enforcement
Assistance Program

Irving Slott
Office of National Priority
Programs, LEAA

Charles Rinkevich
Regional Administrator
LEAA Region III

Michael Farmer
Special Assistant to the
Administration, LEAA

Richard T. Barnes
National Institute of Law
Enforcement and Criminal
Justice, LEAA

Robert E. Crew, Jr.
Executive Director
Minnesota Governor's Commission
on Crime Prevention and Control

Keith M. Miles
Director, Division of Program
Support
Pennsylvania Governor's Justice
Commission

John Waller (Technical Advisor)
Urban Institute
Washington, D. C.

FORMER MEMBERS OF THE LEAA EVALUATION POLICY TASK FORCE

Dean Pohlenz
Formerly, Assistant Administrator
Public Information Office
LEAA

David Head
Regional Administrator
LEAA Region X

SUBCOMMITTEES OF THE LEAA EVALUATION POLICY TASK FORCE

Guidelines Subcommittee

Keith M. Miles, Chairman
Richard T. Barnes
William Sprecher
Robert F. Cole
John Waller
Robert E. Crew, Jr.

Resource Survey Subcommittee

Irving Slott, Chairman
George Hall
Robert F. Cole
Robert E. Crew, Jr.
Keith M. Miles
John Waller

Development Program Subcommittee

Michael Farmer, Chairman
Charles Rinkevich
William Sprecher (Office of National Priority Programs)
Wayne Holtzman (National Criminal Justice Information and Statistics Service)
Douglas Frisbie (Director, Evaluation Unit, Minnesota SPA)

Knowledge Program Subcommittee

Robert F. Cole, Chairman
John M. Greacen
Keith M. Miles
John Waller

Technical Support

Francine L. Tolson
Urban Institute
Washington, D. C.

Staff Support

National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Staff

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

PURPOSE AND BACKGROUND

LEAA Administrator Donald E. Santarelli established the LEAA Evaluation Policy Task Force in November 1973 and directed it to develop a comprehensive evaluation program for the agency.

Mr. Santarelli instructed the Task Force to build upon previous LEAA evaluation efforts and respond directly to the new requirements for evaluation mandated by the Crime Control Act of 1973. Ultimately, the comprehensive program developed by the Task Force would enable LEAA to identify valid, successful criminal justice programs and practices and would further the state of the art in evaluation of Federal social programs.

Specifically, the Administrator set these objectives for the Task Force:

a. To review the current level of evaluation activity carried out by all LEAA offices and the State Planning Agencies.

b. To develop a common understanding of what is meant by "evaluation," including both the form and the function of activities to be included (and excluded) under the term.

c. To develop evaluation goals and objectives for each part of the LEAA structure, including SPAs, that are mutually supporting and contribute to an overall agency evaluation goal.

d. To formulate by March 1, 1974 for the Administrator's review alternative program plans to implement the proposed goals, addressing:

   (1) Appropriate evaluation task statements for LEAA offices and the SPAs;

   (2) Appropriate SPA evaluation guidelines to be promulgated by the Administrator to supplant or supplement the existing guidelines;

(3) Appropriate funding mechanisms to implement the guidelines and program goals;

(4) Appropriate training and technical assistance programs to implement the guidelines and program goals.

e. To oversee the development of a series of alternative models for the SPAs to use in setting up their evaluation programs.

Members of the Evaluation Policy Task Force were appointed from all levels of LEAA, including the SPAs. This broad representation was designed both to enable input from all vital sources and to demonstrate LEAA's deep commitment to the Federal-state partnership fundamental to the New Federalism.

THE ISSUES FACED BY THE TASK FORCE

As the Task Force proceeded through the first phase of its work -- assessing the current state of evaluation activities within LEAA -- and, through its technical advisor, reviewed the history of evaluation in other Federal social programs, the full scope of the challenge set before it by the Administrator emerged. Its concern for the myriad different definitions of evaluation led to the general understandings set forth in Section II of this report. Its concerns about an evaluation program centered on seven general issues. An LEAA program would have to:

Reflect LEAA's commitment to the New Federalism. It must reflect the agency's goal of serving as a model for the New Federalism and represent a true partnership between LEAA and the states. The Federal government would provide resources and leadership. Decision-making authority would remain with state and local units. Only those activities for which a national focus provides decided benefits should be conducted at the national level; all others should take place at the state and local level. Even those best performed with a national focus might well be overseen by a joint Federal-state advisory board. An overriding objective of the program should be enabling state and local governments to enhance their own capacities for decision making and governing.

Allocate appropriate evaluation functions to each of LEAA's structural units. Within LEAA, evaluation activities must be allocated to national and regional units according to a consistent rationale. Those activities best handled at the regional level -- for which the needs of all states within a region are roughly similar, or are likely to be affected by regional factors, or for which the Regional Offices have uniquely qualified staff resources or expertise -- should be assigned to the Regional Offices. Those best conducted at the national level -- for which the needs of states differ greatly within regions or for which a very high degree of technical expertise is required -- should be assigned to a national office -- the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice in most cases.

Assure that the evaluation program addresses those criminal justice programs and projects:

a. which show maximum promise of reducing crime. LEAA's goal is to reduce crime and delinquency; its evaluation activities should retain the same emphasis.

b. which represent the expenditure of substantial amounts of LEAA's resources. The Congress is eager to know how effective the agency's program is. By studying in detail the programs for which substantial amounts of LEAA resources are ultimately allocated we can provide Congress the information needed.

c. which are of greatest interest to criminal justice practitioners. The evaluation program must recognize that LEAA serves state and local criminal justice decision makers, not itself or the research community. The subjects to be studied should therefore result from a process which involves input from state and local officials.

d. which involve the most significant assumptions and hypotheses of the criminal justice system. The evaluation program must also focus on those criminal justice programs which represent clear applications of the basic assumptions of current criminal justice practices. Together with a sophisticated research program, the evaluation program can serve not only to tell us where we are but where we should be going.

Assure that the results of the evaluation program will be usable and in fact used by decision makers in the criminal justice system and the public. One of the chief shortcomings of previous Federal government evaluation efforts has been their inability to influence program planning. Government decision makers have failed to communicate to evaluators the particularized information they want about a project, and evaluation

designs have typically failed to address the issues decision makers consider important for program decisions. Therefore, every evaluation in this program must be structured to answer real concerns which state and local decision makers have about the project being studied.

Assure both short-range and long-range evaluation products. Careful and rigorous evaluation requires several years of effort. Yet, LEAA management, the Congress and the criminal justice community also need to know right now whether particular types of programs or criminal justice activities are basically sound or unsound. The evaluation program must therefore produce rough short-range answers as well as definitive long-range conclusions.

Provide information on individual projects and on generic types of projects as well. SPAs and national LEAA offices need to know whether to continue particular projects from one year to the next. In a more fundamental sense, the agency and the criminal justice community need to know whether projects of a general type -- e.g., halfway houses -- work or don't work; this generalized information cannot be gained from independent studies of particular halfway houses, but requires a structured evaluation design covering a variety of projects in different operating environments. The latter type of study provides the basis for setting and updating criminal justice standards and goals. Both of these needs -- for individual project information and for assessment of general categories of projects -- must be met.

Recognize the limitations of our skills and resources. The program must tax our abilities, but set achievable goals and objectives. We must start modestly, and build to a more ambitious level of effort. The program must enlist the help of experienced outside researchers in the detailed formulation of our specific programs as well as in their execution.

THE WORK OF THE TASK FORCE

To meet these issues, the Task Force began formulating three general evaluation goals. They are set forth explicitly in Section III; in general terms they are:

a. to develop information on the effectiveness of criminal justice programs and practices -- a knowledge goal,

b. to have all LEAA program managers employ management practices which use evaluative information in the formulation and direction of their activities -- a management goal, and

c. to encourage all agencies in the criminal justice system to develop and utilize such evaluation capabilities--a development goal.

Once these three goals were chosen, programs were structured to achieve them. Funding mechanisms and model guidelines were drafted to implement them and the roles of each part of LEAA with respect to each program were analyzed

THE PROPOSED PROGRAM -- AN OVERVIEW

In summary, the three programs would operate as follows:

A. The Knowledge Program. The Knowledge Program has a strong national focus in its operation and utility. Basically, it recognizes that certain types of information can best be produced through a nationally coordinated evaluation. Yet it is designed to capitalize on the action grant program by building the evaluation designs around the operating projects. The results of the program are expected to be of use to a national audience of criminal justice system planners and decision makers and to meet the Congressional mandate to identify what has been learned about reducing crime through the LEAA program.

Annual Survey. The program, to be overseen by an Evaluation Coordinating Committee composed of broad representation from both Federal and state levels, begins with an annual survey of every SPA to identify candidate projects for evaluation. SPAs would be asked to identify their most expensive, their most crime effective, and their "best" projects. Other projects would be contributed by the Regional Offices and national LEAA offices and the results grouped into identifiable project types.

Phase I Study. The Coordinating Committee would recommend 20 of these project types for Phase I evaluation -- a 4-5 month survey of what is currently known about the operational effectiveness of this type of project, and an analysis of alternative strategies for a full scale evaluation. The state-of-the-art portion of the Phase I study would be used to guide short term decision making; the alternative evaluation strategies would serve as the basis for the Coordinating Committee to choose ten projects annually for long-term "Phase II" funding.

Phase II Study. The full scale evaluation would be designed in close coordination with the state and local authorities administering the particular projects chosen as the basis for the study, their SPAs and Regional Offices. A combination of Institute, DF and state block grant funds would be used to support evaluation, program modifications, and the pursuit of issues of importance to the state itself. The Phase II study report would consist of a full assessment of the utility of the project type under a variety of situations, and would also contain detailed standards for SPAs and operating agencies to use in assessing the effectiveness of similar programs which they fund or operate. The standards would set forth expected costs, level of effort, qualifications of personnel, program results, and likely effects of particular program variations.

Interim Program. The Institute will commence twelve Phase I studies this fiscal year, and move gradually into the full Phase I and Phase II programs during FY 1975. The Phase I results will become available for program planning and priority setting beginning in early FY 1975.

B. The Management Program. The program for the Management Goal is designed to insure that evaluation becomes an integral part of the management process for each administrative level of LEAA. In particular, detailed guidelines have been developed for SPAs to follow in developing their evaluation program and their annual comprehensive plan. However, similar requirements for performing and utilizing evaluation in the management of their activities are recommended for all LEAA offices as well. The Office of Planning and Management will be responsible for coordinating and assessing the effectiveness of this program.

Essentially, the Management Program will require each part of LEAA -- central, regional and SPA offices -- to utilize the management by objective techniques advocated by the President's Office of Management and Budget.

Objective Setting. Each office will be required to set forth its proposed annual activities in an evaluable form -- by setting forth measurable objectives. It will require each of its grantees to do likewise.

Monitoring and Evaluation. All granting activities of LEAA will include a careful monitoring system to assess the extent to which grantees are meeting their pre-established objectives. Each office and each grantee will be expected to internally assess the effectiveness of its

own program -- emphasizing the use of evaluation as a technique for managers to use to better their own programs rather than solely as a threat imposed from the outside. Each LEAA office will also be expected to plan for full-scale and sophisticated evaluations of those parts of its program which call for it.

C. The Development Program. The Development Program aims at building evaluation capabilities in LEAA and in the entire criminal justice system. The program incorporates and coordinates a variety of activities, including training, technical assistance, and supporting model evaluations at various levels of LEAA and the criminal justice system. All of the activities of the Knowledge and Management Programs are structured to be maximally useful to the criminal justice community. This Program includes two principal additional thrusts.

Training and technical assistance. In close cooperation with the National Conference of State Criminal Justice Planning Administrators, the Development Program will establish a nationally coordinated training and technical assistance effort. National workshop will be used sparingly. A nationally coordinated technical assistance unit will provide in-depth assistance to all levels of the criminal justice system, and facilitate periodic small workshops for SPA personnel centered around specific evaluation topics and concerns. A summer training institute will be developed to provide for training in evaluation methodology.

Model Program Development. The National Institute will sponsor the development of model evaluation units in SPAs selected as representative of the needs of the different states. Evaluation units will also be funded in operating criminal justice agencies recommended by SPAs and LEAA Regional Offices. A separate effort will be made to encourage evaluation of projects funded by the Regions with discretionary funds. The Institute will undertake a major program to develop sophisticated evaluation tools and methodologies -- a major state or national evaluation data system, prediction modeling techniques, useful criminal justice indicators and sophisticated criminal justice evaluation designs.

5. THE STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT

The Report which follows details these proposals. Section II sets forth a general understanding of the meaning and functions of evaluation. Section III describes the three proposed goals. The Knowledge, Management and Development Programs are explained in Section IV, followed by discussions of proposed funding and draft SPA evaluation

guidelines in Sections V and VI. The final section sets forth a rudimentary implementation process and summarizes the roles of each part of the agency. Appendices contain a discussion of current LEAA evaluation activities, the preliminary results of an evaluation resources survey and summaries of the Task Force's proceedings

CONCLUSION

The program suggested by this Report addresses the seven issues identified by the Task Force and fulfills the specific directions of the Task Force's charter.

Its proposals, if adopted, will provide LEAA with an evaluation program considerably more sophisticated and comprehensive than that of any other Federal agency -- one which will offer real promise for developing important information for the guidance of LEAA and its clients -- the criminal justice system and the public.

II. THE TASK FORCE'S VIEW OF EVALUATION IN LEAA

WHAT IS MEANT BY EVALUATION

During the last decade evaluation has become an integral part of most major public programs. Evaluation has been mandated by the Congress and state legislatures, required by the executive branches of government, and demanded by public interest groups and citizens. However, the more critical factor in the growth of evaluation is the realization by program managers that evaluation can help them to improve their programs.

The programs operated through LEAA are no exception to this general trend. In particular, specific provisions for evaluation were incorporated in the Crime Control Act of 1973. Justice Department officials and LEAA administrators have reiterated the importance of evaluation in recent policy statements. Many state legislatures and governors have asked that State Planning Agencies routinely provide evaluation information on the programs they plan and fund.

However, this rapid expansion of interest and activity in evaluation has been accompanied by some confusion as to what role various components of the agency should have in conducting and utilizing evaluation, and what, in fact, constitutes an "evaluation."

To resolve these problems, the Task Force's first activity was to review current LEAA evaluation activities. The results of this effort are contained in Appendix A. The process of assembling this information brought to the Task Force's attention the variety of different meanings associated with the term "evaluation" by different persons in LEAA and the criminal justice community. Some consider basic project monitoring to fall within the concept of evaluation; others limit the use of the term to those studies which measure the effects of criminal justice activities on changes in crime rates. In some states projects are grouped into "clusters" of similar efforts and evaluated as a program; in others, "evaluation" is limited to careful review of the progress of individual grants.

It is clear that some unified concept of evaluation is necessary to obtain any kind of common understanding of an agency-wide evaluation program.

Yet the Task Force did not attempt to resolve the issue of what is meant by evaluation by adopting an "official" one- or two-sentence definition of the term. This approach inevitably leads to semantic arguments that fail to clarify discussion. Similarly, the Task Force did not attempt to develop an "official" list for describing the variety of activities normally considered to be evaluations. There are plenty of

short definitions and classification schemes in the literature and in SPA comprehensive plans which one can adopt if such terminology is required. What the Task Force attempted to do was develop a common understanding of what the essential characteristics of evaluation are and what evaluation can do for LEAA.

EVALUATION CHARACTERISTICS

The essential characteristics of evaluation can be summarized in two words--comparison and measurement. For a program to be evaluated its activities must be compared to something: the specific activities proposed in the grant application; the general objectives which those activities were intended to achieve; or some other standard which a decision maker may be interested in, for example, the extent to which the activities actually reduce crime in the area in which they are implemented. And for the comparison to be evaluation it must be done in measurable terms. What is measured may be "soft" data--attitudes or subjective impressions of experts or participants--or "hard" data--numbers of clients, subsequent arrests, reported crimes of specific types, etc.

Fundamentally, then, evaluation is characterized by the Task Force as any activity which compares program objectives with results. Names for these activities include "monitoring", "program evaluation", "project evaluation", "input measures" and "output measures"--all activities which attempt to assess the extent to which a project has accomplished the goals it has set for itself, both those relating to its internal processing and those relating to its external effects.

The emphasis of the program proposed by the Task Force is on encouraging all parts of LEAA to carefully articulate the particular goals and objectives which they seek to meet by each of their projects, grants and in-house program activities. The first step is to assure that all our programs are "evaluable"--that is, that they have objectives set forth in measurable terms. The institution of a "management by objective" system will achieve this result.

Once the measurable objectives are established, an appropriate measurement technique is usually apparent. All activities should be monitored--did we get what was promised? Most should contain some method of verifying not only whether the promised activities were performed, but also whether the projected results of those activities materialized.

This report does not identify particular measurement processes as "real" evaluation and others as less than evaluation. All are evaluation; all are better than unexamined action. Each level of sophistication is appropriate in some but not all situations. It becomes most helpful

then to describe the particular uses to which particular forms of measurement of project activities and their results are likely to be useful.

WHAT CAN EVALUATION DO?

At every level of operations, from the smallest project being carried on by a criminal justice or related agency, to the Office of the Administrator of LEAA, an associated evaluation activity can provide information essential to rational decision making. Furthermore, evaluation results at any level can and should have impact on all other levels.

For example, by carefully comparing the activities and objectives set forth in a grant application with program progress. the grantee himself is provided with feedback which will help him on a day-to-day basis. At the same time, this information provides the granting agency with an assurance that the project is proceeding on schedule and performing as promised.

By beginning to learn what payoffs result from different types of projects and programs, a program manager can make better judgment in allocating his resources in the future.

An SPA can utilize evaluation results to assist local agencies in choosing the most effective strategies by comparing the activities of similar programs it has awarded and learning from these experiences. By making these comparisons, it also gets essential feedback for its own uses, especially planning for future years' funding. The SPA can also be the interface to provide information learned on a national level which in turn would assist potential grantees within its jurisdiction.

The Regional Office can use evaluation on the regional level in much the same way as the SPA can on the state level.

On a national level, careful evaluation of a range of similar types of programs in various parts of the country can provide information on the expected achievement of common types of activities.

It is a common misconception that evaluation is a weapon to be used to terminate programs which a manager does not favor. On the contrary, evaluation should provide managers at every level with enough information to enable a wide range of program responses. They should be able to

modify the direction of current activities. They should be able to increase the level of resources devoted to successful activities. And finally, they should be able to reduce the resources allocated to projects which show limited results.

These are only a sampling of Task Force perceptions as to how evaluation activities, and the information generated by them can be, if built into the planning - management cycle of operations, of tremendous value to program managers at all levels.

CONCLUSION

While a more detailed discussion of evaluation would identify additional uses for evaluation and present them more precisely, the above examples serve to demonstrate the view of evaluation adopted by the Task Force--namely, that evaluation is part of a management system aimed at learning from past and ongoing experiences to improve the future performance of LEAA's programs and criminal justice systems in general. Thus evaluation is something to be used as a tool of management and not to be treated as just another required activity to be turned over to a new professional group called "evaluators."

III. LEAA GOALS WITH RESPECT TO EVALUATION

LEAA's goals in the area of evaluation, just as its goals with respect to any other activity, should flow from its overall agency goal "in partnership with state and local governments to reduce crime and delinquency." It is, perhaps, difficult to see how evaluators' work will reduce crime; they do not reduce opportunities for crime, nor arrest suspects, nor reduce the likelihood that offenders will commit additional crimes. Yet, there can and should be clear relationships between the agency's goal and the evaluation activities which it undertakes and sponsors.

The essential and immediate purpose of evaluation is to provide guidance to managers in planning and implementing program decisions. To the extent that evaluation will encourage all parts of LEAA to articulate specific program and project goals and to justify their goals in terms of crime reduction, evaluation will make a contribution to the agency's overall goals.

It would, of course, be naive to assume that we have, except in very rare cases, reached a state of knowledge where this "justification" can be quantified with a high degree of confidence. Evaluators will almost never be able to state conclusively that any given project or program was both the necessary and sufficient mechanism which brought about an observed crime reduction. Too many other forces are at play whose actions we only dimly comprehend. Nevertheless, because of its overriding importance as the goal of the agency, all evaluation activities should, whenever it is at all reasonable to do so, include an attempt to measure probable (or even possible) crime reduction effects.

The Task Force recognizes that decision makers need answers to many other questions about their programs besides their effectiveness in reducing crime. The agency's evaluation goals and the programs deriving from them must take into account both these manifold information needs of management and the technical limitations on what is feasible within the present state of the art. As the program begins, it will serve primarily to lay the foundation for effective management of criminal justice programs; over time it will enable managers to maximize the impact of their programs on the reduction of crime.

Another aspect of the agency's goal is more directly realizble -- the agency's basic commitment to the New Federalism. It is directly reflected in the statement of goals and in the structure of the proposed evaluation program, which creates a true partnership between Federal, state and local governments.

The Task Force recommends, therefore, that the following formal goals be established for an LEAA evaluation program:

- °to obtain and disseminate information on the cost and effectiveness of various approaches to solving crime and criminal justice system problems--a knowledge goal;
- °to have performance information used at each LEAA administrative level in planning and decision making in order to assist program managers achieve established goals--a management goal; and
- °to assist state and local criminal justice system units to realize the benefits of utilizing evaluation as part of their management system--a development goal.

THE KNOWLEDGE GOAL

The "knowledge goal"--to obtain and disseminate information on the cost and effectiveness of various approaches to solving crime and criminal justice problems--is based on the assumption that useful information will influence decisions by criminal justice system administrators in a way that results in increased system performance and decreases in crime and delinquency. LEAA is not directly involved in most criminal justice decisions. Consequently, it must depend on indirect means for influencing state and local agencies' decision processes by providing an information base which contains reliable knowledge presented in a useable fashion. Both research and evaluation activities can be utilized in developing and maintaining the "knowledge" required for this type of function. The achievement of the goal can be measured by monitoring the production and utilization of the information base.

THE MANAGEMENT GOAL

The "management goal"--to have performance information used at each LEAA administrative level in planning and decision making in order to assist program managers achieve established goals--recognizes that LEAA is directly involved in many resource allocation decisions and assumes that LEAA program performance can be improved through time by utilizing a management system which identifies objectives and develops information to help assess when they are or are not being met. In particular, LEAA's primary activity is in providing action grants through a decentralized planning and allocation decision-making process. Evaluation serves as the crucial means by which to hold decision makers accountable for the effective use of their resources. With this tool, LEAA can learn from previous actions and incorporate the learning in future decisions to better aim the program toward achievement of its goals. It can serve

as a model for federal government managers in this regard.

THE DEVELOPMENT GOAL

The "development goal"--to help state and local criminal justice system units realize the benefits of utilizing evaluation as part of their management system--derives from the Task Force's view that LEAA's ultimate focus must be on enabling state and local criminal justice agencies to manage their own programs more effectively and, in turn, increase their impact on crime and delinquency. Just as evaluation is to be used to maximize the effectiveness of LEAA programs, it can be used by non-LEAA criminal justice agencies to achieve the same result. However, evaluation, or more specifically management systems using evaluation, is not common in the criminal justice field. This condition is due, in part, to a lack of experience with evaluation and a lack of evidence demonstrating its value. The elimination of this condition is a development goal of LEAA just as much as are the goals of programs aimed at eliminating identifiable hardware and crime fighting deficiencies.

Each of these three general goals has been developed into a full-fledged program specifying the types of activities to be carried out and the roles of the various LEAA offices in implementing it. These follow in the next chapter.

IV. RECOMMENDED EVALUATION PROGRAM

The Task Force recommends that LEAA pursue a single coordinated evaluation effort consisting of three interrelated programs to meet the knowledge, management and development goals. The programs are described in this chapter.

A. THE KNOWLEDGE PROGRAM

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

The Evaluation Policy Task Force identified the "production and dissemination of information on the cost and effectiveness of various approaches to solving crime and criminal justice problems," as one of LEAA's three major evaluation goals.

National policy makers and state and local decision makers need sound information concerning major criminal justice hypotheses, project results and nationally applicable standards. To meet these needs the Task Force recommends that LEAA undertake a National Evaluation Program to be conducted by the National Institute's Office of Evaluation (OE) in cooperation with the LEAA Regional Offices and SPAs. The Program would involve major research studies to evaluate various "project areas," selected through an annual survey of the Regional Offices and SPAs.

Specifically, the National Evaluation Program will help:

- To provide a timely, objective and reliable assessment to Congress and the public of the effectiveness of LEAA's programs.
- To extend our present knowledge and technical capability in all aspects of criminal justice.
- To test criminal justice standards and goals and, through critical research, refine and evaluate them.
- To provide criminal justice administrators with relevant information which they can use to administer their programs more effectively.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION AND IMPLEMENTATION

Evaluations will be implemented under the program by a process consisting of four distinguishable steps:

1. SELECTION OF PROBLEM AREAS FOR RESEARCH

The first step of the implementation will be an annual selection process to identify project areas for research.

In September and October of each year (March and April of FY 1974 only) OE will survey all SPAs, LEAA Regional and National offices responsible for discretionary grant projects. Field representatives (consultants) of OE and state representatives from Regional Offices will meet with SPA staffs to identify relevant projects and to determine the issues and concerns that might be most effectively addressed by means of evaluation. Projects will be identified according to guidelines such as the following.

°Expense -- The five or ten most expensive projects funded by the SPA.

°"Best " -- The five or ten "best" projects based on any SPA-developed criteria.

°Demonstrably Crime Reducing -- All projects which the SPA considers to contribute demonstrably to the reduction of crime.

The projects identified in the survey will then be clustered into "Project Areas," each of which will consist of comparable projects. There may be from 50 to 100 such "project areas" identified each year, with the assistance of the staff of the Office of Evaluation. An Evaluation Coordinating Committee will then review and select "Project Areas" to be recommended to the Deputy Administrator for Administration for Phase I evaluation. This Committee will have representation from LEAA central offices, Regional Administrators, SPAs, and experts in criminal justice research.

The survey and analysis described in this Phase will take an estimated two-to-three months. Since NILECJ must get substantial studies under way as soon as possible, OE will use a modified selection process this year. The survey schedule will produce a first set of project areas by mid-May, 1974. In order to move more rapidly, OE will undertake immediately the selection of at least six project areas identified a priori by the present Evaluation Task Force in consultation with NILECJ staff and other recognized experts. The goal is to have twelve Phase I evaluations by the end of June, 1974 -- part from a survey and part from the a priori selection process.

2. PHASE I EVALUATION

For each "project area" selected from the survey as a candidate for evaluation, a relatively short analysis (four to five months at most) will be conducted to determine what is currently known about the project type, what additional information could be provided through further evaluation of the project type, and what would be the cost and value of obtaining the additional information.

The products of this analysis, referred to as the Phase I evaluation, will be:

°A quick but usable evaluation of the project type based on available data and documentation;

°Alternative strategies and designs for further evaluation, with rough estimates of cost and expected results.

The Phase I evaluation will give LEAA a sound basis for determining if intensive evalaution is warranted. If further evaluation is unnecessary, LEAA will have an adequate evaluation of the area at a reasonable cost.

An initial evaluation can be conducted without extensive data collection and analysis efforts by reviewing completed evaluations on projects of the type being studied and by conducting a limited number of site visits. While available data may not permit a precise evaluation, it will generally support assessment of the potential effect of a type of project and permit an estimate of the confidence which can be placed in existing project cost and effectiveness information. Such information is often adequate for decision makers, and the cost of obtaining further precision or certainty would not be justified.

If the Phase I evaluator finds that further evaluation efforts may be justified, he will outline general strategies for obtaining additional information. In developing alternative long-term evaluation strategies and designs, he will start with five basic options arising out of LEAA's structure:

a. Use of on-going block or discretionary grant projects. Where existing LEAA projects are sufficiently consistent or show measurably different variations which fit an evaluation design, they can be used for a long-term evaluation program. However, both the SPA and the subgrantee for each program chosen must be willing to maintain a specific program structure for the duration of the data-gathering phase of the evaluation. Under this option, evaluation funds may be used to pay for data collection or other additional efforts required of the subgrantee.

b. Modification of existing or planned block grant or discretionary programs. Where existing or planned programs come close to meeting a rigorous evaluation design, discretionary funds may be used to pay for additional program elements. This option gives the subgrantee more incentive to participate in the evaluation effort and gives the evaluator more control over the actual operations of the projects being evaluated. It does not provide the most rigorous setting, however.

c. Replication of a specific project design in a number of locations. Discretionary funds can also be used to create new projects in the field, based on a specific, carefully structured model. This option provides the most rigorous research design and the most control over project operations. It is also the most expensive, and requires the most time before results can be obtained.

d. Imposition of data collection requirements on all LEAA-funded projects of selected types. The 1973 Crime Control Act authorizes the National Institute to require states to provide project data to help in evaluation of LEAA projects and programs. An evaluator could use this mechanism for collecting data on a specified type of project, or a more limited group of projects which follow a particular design, or an existing model. However, this alternative provides little assurance that projects conform to a set design or that standard data collection procedures are used.

e. Use of a research design not based on particular projects. Some types of projects might be assessed through analysis of general criminal justice data other than observation of particular projects. Such efforts would probably be transferred to the Institute's Office of Research Programs for execution; however, this technique should be considered as an option for each project evaluation design.

Whichever strategy is selected by the Phase I evaluator, rough estimates of the cost of implementation will be developed, along with a specification of the type of information to be produced and the anticipated uses for the information.

3. SELECTION OF PROJECTS FOR FULL-SCALE EVALUATION

The results of the Phase I Evaluations will be carefully reviewed by the Evaluation Coordinating Committee. From this set the Committee will select (1) those "project areas" which warrant further evaluation and (2) the particular evaluation design to be used from the alternative ones developed in Phase I. These will be forwarded to the Deputy Administrator for Administration for his approval.

4. PHASE II EVALUATION

The Office of Evaluation of the National Institute will have responsibility for selecting an evaluator to implement the design chosen and for monitoring its implementation. The evaluator will be selected through standard grant or contract awarding procedures; however, the design approved by the Evaluation Coordinating Committee will be the basis for the grant.

Therefore the potential evaluators must be aware of the design and their proposals must be assessed in relation to it. The Phase I evaluator who developed the design will not be given special consideration due to his Phase I experience nor are Phase II evaluations to be automatic extensions of Phase I grants.

In implementing the evaluation, OE and the evaluator will have to work closely with other components of LEAA to insure that the conditions of the design are met. Special attention will also have to be given to coordination and monitoring activities.

Coordination Among Involved Agencies. An immediate task of OE and the evaluator will be to develop an operational plan for implementing the design. Projects that will be involved in the evaluation need to be identified and plans for managing the projects within the contraints of the design established. Due to the block grant approach to the funding of most LEAA projects, the development and implementation will require the coordination and commitment of a variety of criminal justice agencies. Establishing this coordination is essential to the success of the evaluation.

To foster this cooperation and make the evaluation useful to the separate LEAA components involved, OE and the evaluator should:

- involve RO, SPA and local agency personnel in the finalization of the evaluation design to assure that their evaluation needs are met.

- where state and local decision making needs require short term products, provide for interim project reports in the evaluator's work plan. Where state and local decision making needs go well bevond the proposed design , provide an opportunity for the SPA to fund additional activities need to study the project's effectiveness with respect to additional criteria.

- establish federal-state-local monitoring teams to assist in implementing the designs and producing results of special interest to the involved agencies.

Special Grant Monitoring Provisions. Because of the complex interrelationships between subsidiary governmental units involved in these evaluations and because of the conceptual difficulty of relating general criminal justice problems to particular project designs, an especially intensive kind of grant monitoring will be required of OE. Much of this "monitoring" will be a continuation of the coordination function discussed above. However, OE will have to establish procedures for insuring that:

°projects funded through SPAs or ROs are operated as long as required for the purposes of the evaluation,

°projects are operated in conformity with the evaluation design, and

°promised data and documentation are provided.

Undoubtly, modifications will have to be made during the life of the evaluation. However, if the promised information is to be produced, changes in the design should be allowed only if they will not dilute the end product.

5. EVALUATION PRODUCTS

The results of both the Phase I and Phase II evaluations will contain the following information to the extent possible:

a complete analysis of the internal efficiencies of the projects studied, showing, for instance, the average staffing for such projects, staff qualifications and salaries, organization, operting budgets, and cost per client (or other appropriate standard for project output), and

a complete analysis of the external effectiveness of the projects studied, showing, for instance, the rate of recidivism for persons passing through the program, or rate of reported crime or average police response time.

In many cases, these findings will be meaningful only when broken down into identifiable sub-categories within the general type of project studies.

6. DISSEMINATION OF RESULTS

In order to achieve the payoff from the Phase I and Phase II evaluations the results of these efforts must be made available to and utilized by the criminal justice system. The purpose of the survey and Phase I design process is to conduct evaluations only when something can be learned and program managers and policy makers have a need for the knowledge to be produced. However, the evaluation process can spread over several years and OE will have to take active steps to see that potential users of the evaluations are kept informed of progress and provided with the results. Procedures for accomplishing this are given in the Management and Development Programs, which follows.

7. OTHER SOURCES OF EVALUATION KNOWLEDGE

The National Institute will pursue other avenues for the development of information about the operation of particular criminal justice projects and activities. In particular, it will:

Evaluate the replication activities sponsored by the Institute's Office of Technology Transfer. Under a new program, the Institute is encouraging the adoption of promising developments in criminal justice by combining training in new techniques and funding for their replication in selected cities as models for other cities to follow. These replications provide an ideal opportunity for careful evaluation of promising new approaches to criminal justice innovation.

Compile and publish useful evaluations conducted by SPAs or other criminal justice agencies. To the extent that LEAA is successful in creating evaluation capability throughout the criminal justice system, useful evaluation information will be generated in bits and pieces throughout the country. While these isolated results will in general be less significant that coordinated national studies, the Institute will be responsible for collecting, reviewing and assembling for publication all those which provide useful new information or suggest new evaluation designs techniques.

8. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EVALUATION AND RESEARCH

In order to distinguish between the functions of the National Institute's Office of Research Programs and its Office of Evaluation, the Task Force has developed a rough functional distinction between research and evaluation. In fact, there is little difference--evaluation must incorporate all the rigor of the best social science research techniques and research must include the development and testing of actual programs in a real world setting. But for LEAA's purposes evaluation will concentrate on the careful measurement of actual criminal justice projects and programs operating with some degree of frequency throughout the country--providing performance data on their internal efficiencies and external effectiveness.

It will be the function of research to approach criminal justice from the point of view of problem areas in need of solutions or fundamental hypotheses to be tested--doing basic research, developing new programmatic responses to existing problems, and testing them on a model basis. Once a program is instituted on a relatively broad basis, evaluation will begin the job of developing expected performance levels for that program.

B. THE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

The Task Force recognized evaluation as an essential tool in an effective management system. The evaluation program described below outlines necessary activities to achieve the management goal:

> to have performance information used at each LEAA Administrative level in planning and decision making in order to assist program managers in achieving established goals.

The program requires that all parts of LEAA describe their activities in evaluable terms by specifying measurable objectives for which they will strive, that they themselves assess their progress in meeting those objectives, and that they use outside evaluators to perform these assessments when they are too complex for internal staff to carry out. The Office of Planning and Management will be responsible for seeing that LEAA offices meet these requirements. The State Representatives will be responsible for seeing that SPAs comply with proposed SPA guidelines which incorporate the same requirements.

The objectives of the evaluation program to achieve the management goal are:

a. to provide well-defined measurable objectives for every LEAA component, program, and project.

b. to provide accurate and timely information to assess the results of activities carried out to achieve those objectives.

c. to insure the consideration of evaluative information in all planning and decision making.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Since management is a function basic to all levels of the LEAA program, all levels must participate in the evaluation program. The activities described below will be required of LEAA nad its various divisions (including NILECJ, NCJISS, etc.), the LEAA Regional Offices, and the SPAs.

Each component of the LEAA program will be required to take the following steps to ensure that its own activities and the activities of its grantees can be evaluated:

a. identify in measurable terms the problems to be addressed by its activities,

b. establish well-defined measurable objectives and relate these to its, and LEAA's, program goals,

c. clearly define the activities which are expected to achieve its objectives,

d. identify specific indicators and measures to be used to assess progress and problems in achieving its objectives and

e. collect appropriate data and information to measure the results of its activities.

Each component of the LEAA program will be required to internally assess the results of its own activities. Such an assessment shall include:

a. an analysis of the results and impact of its activities,

b. a comparison of the problem before and after its activities,

c. an analysis of the implementation and operation of its activities, and

d. modifications of its program activities based upon these evaluation findings.

Each component of the LEAA program will be required to monitor the implementation, operation, and results of the programs and projects it supports. Such monitoring must compare actual activities carried out and results achieved with the activities and results originally anticipated. It should include:

a. periodic site visits and interviews with project staff and clients,

b. an analysis of the objective and subjective results of the project,

c. an assessment of the progress and the problems of the project to date, and

d. effective reporting procedures documenting project performance.

Each component of the LEAA program will be expected to intensively evaluate, either with its own staff or contracted evaluators, selected

programs or activities according to its planning and management needs.

In those instances where more accurate or conclusive information is needed than systematic monitoring will supply, intensive evaluation should be conducted. Intensive evaluation should incorporate sound evaluation methodologies such as experimental designs developed prior to project implementation, control groups, independent data collection and analysis, and in-depth case studies.

Each component will be required to allocate responsibility and sufficient resources to adequately carry out the monitoring and evaluation responsibilities outlined above.

PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

The Office of Planning and Management of LEAA will implement and oversee the Program. It will be the responsibility of this Office to:

a. specify and interpret the above requirements for each component of the LEAA program, including the promulgation of SPA guidelines in this area (see proposed guidelines Section VI).

b. determine acceptable standards of compliance with requirements for each LEAA component,

c. monitor and assess the nature and extent of compliance by each component with the above requirements,

d. evaluate the effects and impact of the Program on the management and decision making of LEAA's components, and

e. report findings with respect to both compliance with program requirements and the effectiveness of the program to the Administrator.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE KNOWLEDGE AND MANAGEMENT GOAL PROGRAMS

The proposed National Evaluation Program will be producing large quantities of information on the performance of various types of criminal justice programs and projects. One of the responsibilities of the National Institute will be to disseminate the results of that program to all LEAA program managers whose activities could be affected by them. The Office of Planning and Management will have the ultimate responsibility for assessing the extent to which individual managers are utilizing the information in their program decisions and activities.

THE ROLE OF THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE IN THE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

In the past NILECJ has served in a role in LEAA comparable to that of an evaluation unit in an SPA, funding and monitoring the evaluation of major agency programs such as High Impact, Pilot Cities, the OLEA experience, and parts of its own research program. This is an appropriate function -- one which it should continue to perform as requested by the Administration or other LEAA offices. Its role should however, be limited to assessments of the effectiveness of agency-funded programs; evaluation of the performance of the various organizational units and managers in LEAA should remain the exclusive responsibility of the office of Planning and Management and the Administrators.

C. THE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Evaluation is an evolving activity in LEAA and the criminal justice system at large. Only recently has widespread attention been given to the area, and capabilities are quite uneven and limited. Therefore, the Task Force has recommended that LEAA adopt as a major goal the development of evaluation capability in the area of criminal justice. In particular, a Development Goal with respect to evaluation has been suggested:

> To assist state and local criminal justice system units to realize the benefits of utilizing evaluation as part of their management system.

The decentralized nature of the LEAA program requires that evaluation of most LEAA-funded programs be conducted at the state and local level. If SPAs and operating criminal justice agencies do not develop systems which are capable of implementing and utilizing evaluations, the management goal will not be realized and the achievements of the knowledge program will fall upon agencies incapable of realizing the potential of evaluation results. Achievement of the development goal is thus essential if the concept of evaluation is to become a permanent part of the criminal justice system.

The objectives of this program are to:

- Provide immediate assistance to LEAA components in implementing the Task Force recommendations and resolving their current evaluation problems.
- Provide means for a long-term, continuing increase in the capability of criminal justice agencies to conduct and utilize evaluations.
- Provide means for the sharing of evaluation expertise within LEAA - both between Federal and state levels and between separate units at each level.
- Provide leadership to criminal justice agencies in evaluation by providing training, technical assistance and by developing "model" evaluation efforts.

Because of the highly specialized nature of most evaluation training and technical assistance needs, these functions will be provided by centralized units at the national level, coordinated through the Regional Offices and the National Conference of State Criminal Justice Planning Administrators.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The development program contains five strategies for the achievement of the development goal. These strategies -- Evaluation Training, Technical Assistance, Guidelines, Evaluation Demonstration, and Information Dissemination -- can be viewed as interdependent parts of a continuing process by which state and local criminal justice systems are encouraged to incorporate evaluation as an integral part of their management systems.

1. EVALUATION TRAINING

Training needs relative to evaluation are as broad as past training attempts have been frustrating. Yet training is of primary importance both in assisting SPA and local criminal justice agency staff to realize the benefits of evaluation and in assisting them to develop evaluation systems. The training strategy can be broken into three components:

a. A national evaluation workshop. A national workshop -- open to SPA directors, directors of SPA evaluation programs and the planner/evaluators from the Regional Offices -- will be used to explain LEAA's evaluation program to those persons who will share much of the responsibility for administering and implementing it. The National Institute and the National Conference of State Criminal Justice Planning Administrators will be responsible for organizing the workshop.

b. Specialized evaluation workshop. Rather than large training conferences, the program will emphasize small topical workshops dealing with particular issues -- administrative and organizational problems, specific evaluation techniques, and the evaluation of specific types of projects. These workshops will be open to SPA and criminal justice agency staff responsible for conducting and monitoring evaluations. They will allow staffs to share their experiences and ideas as well as to learn specific techniques from experts both within and outside the criminal justice area.

The National Institute and the National Conference will be responsible for a) identifying needs and problems for discussion, b) developing criteria for the workshop structure, and c) identifying personnel to organize and implement the workshops. Participants must be selected carefully to avoid mismatching participants' skills and interests with workshop topics.

c. Summer institute on evaluation. The Institute will fund one or more universities or colleges to conduct, during the summer, a series of evaluation courses of from two to eight weeks in one or two sessions. These courses will be aimed at intensive and in-depth training in various aspects of evaluative research methodology, and would result in academic credit for the attendees.

2. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

This strategy recognizes that training programs by themselves are insufficient to fulfill the Development Goal. One-to-one assistance will be required in helping state and local criminal justice units incorporate evaluation into their management systems.

A Technical Assistance Team will be established with responsibility for all technical assistance in the area of evaluation. In order to provide concentrated assistance, members of the team will be available to SPAs for extended periods of time, e.g., for periods of up to three weeks. Technical assistance in the past has focused on one or two days visits in which the consultant spends most of his time learning about the agency and then takes an hour or so to give general advice available from any textbook on the subject.

In addition to providing direct technical assistance, the team will be able to draw on the assistance of experts both within and outside of LEAA. The team also will assist in the development of specialized evaluation workshops.

The team will work closely with the Planner/Evaluators of the Regional Offices -- providing technical assistance to them, and involving them in visits to SPAs whenever they are needed.

The Technical Assistance program will be the responsibility of the Office of Evaluation in the National Institute. It will oversee the identification of technical assistance teams, the development of evaluation technical assistance resources and coordination of all technical assistance in the area of evaluation.

3. GUIDELINES

LEAA guidelines play an essential role in encouraging SPA and criminal justice system evaluation development. The proposed SPA evaluation guidelines require:

that SPAs monitor and evaluate their subgrants;

that subgrantees assess their own performance; and

that SPAs use all available national-level evaluation information in planning their own activities.

4. EVALUATION DEMONSTRATION

The Task Force recognizes that one of the most effective means of increasing capabilities is by developing and demonstrating "model" activities in an operational environment. Therefore the Task Force has developed the following three-pronged evaluation demonstration strategy.

a. "Model" evaluations of discretionary fund grants. Projects and programs operated through DF grants provide a unique opportunity for demonstrating the conduct and use of evaluations. They tend to have a high degree of visibility and flexibility in their operation, facilitating careful design of the evaluation and wide dissemination of the results. Since they will be used as demonstrations, these evaluations should be designed not only to provide useful information on the program being evaluated, but also to develop and test methodologies that can have extensive applicability in the criminal justice system.

b. Model evaluation units in SPAs and criminal justice agencies. Many criminal justice agencies - and in particular SPAs - offer the opportunity to develop model evaluation units. The Task Force recommends that LEAA develop a program for the one-time funding of selected evaluation units to demonstrate evaluation. The agency selection would take into consideration such criteria as their current capability, their potential for improvement, the ability of other similar units to learn and benefit from the experience, and the resources available to the unit to better itself. SPA commitment to such efforts will be sought by the use of a fifty-fifty matching basis -- half of the funding would be national DF, the other half state block grant. Similarily , SPA block grant fund monies and LEAA DF monies should be provided to operating criminal justice agencies at the state and local level to enable them to build evaluation systems which can serve as models for other agencies.

c. Development of model methodologies. There is a major need for more sophisticated criminal justice evaluation tools and methodologies. The National Institute should use significant amounts of its funds to support the development of:

one or more major state evaluation data bases;

advanced prediction models for crime rates and recidivism;

useful criminal justice indicators which will provide a link between traditional project performance data and crime reduction; and

other advanced criminal justice evaluation designs and techniques which can be used as models by state and local evaluation units.

5. INFORMATION DISSEMINATION

An integral part of the Development Goal is the continual distribution of evaluation results and information on how to conduct and utilize evaluations. It is necessary, therefore, to insure that a national clearinghouse receives and disseminates evaluation materials appropriate to the needs of criminal justice agencies. Among these materials would be: documents on evaluation methodology, results of LEAA-funded evaluations - particularly those from the program for the knowledge goal, but also results of individual SPA evaluations, and information on the evaluation systems operated by various components of LEAA. The National Criminal Justice Reference Service could perform the material storage and dissemination function, with the National Institute and its technical assistance team working with the Service to insure that appropriate materials are made available and that the needs of criminal justice agencies are met.

V. FUNDING

The Task Force's projection of funding needs for the three programs covers the remainder of FY 1974, FY 1975, and FY 1976. It calls for a total federal contribution of over $4 million for this fiscal year, and a sustained level of $18 million in future years.

THE KNOWLEDGE PROGRAM

Under the Knowledge Program, major evaluation studies will be undertaken in two phases--a pre-analysis and design study (Phase I) and a full evaluation (Phase II). During the last part of FY 1974, $840,000 will be spent on 12 Phase I studies, with that amount increasing to $1,400,000 in FY 1975 and FY 1976 (20 grants averaging $70,000 each). No Phase II studies will be done this fiscal year, but ten will be commenced during each of the following years at $500,000 each, a total of $5 million each year.

To fund modification of existing programs and replication of model programs where necessary for a sophisticated research design, $6 million in DF funds will also be required for the Phase II program in each fiscal year beginning in FY 1975.

Additional funding will be used to evaluate programs replicated by the Institute's Office of Technology Transfer as part of its newly-created Demonstration and Replication Program. This will require $600,000 in FY 1974, $900,000 in FY 1975 and $1,200,000 in FY 1976.

THE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

The Management Program includes anticipated cooperation from the SPAs in the form of a substantial commitment of their planning and block grant monies in future years. The amount to be committed this fiscal year (under the existing 15% guideline) is uncertain, but in the next two years, this could reach substantial proportions.

SPA funding needs. The Task Force does not propose that DF monies be used as a general supplement to SPA budgets for evaluation purposes; this report proposes only limited DF assistance to SPAs in the form of grants for the creation of model SPA evaluation units and for the performance of unique evaluation projects and the development of designs. However, this decision rests on the Task Force's view of the appropriate role for the use of discretionary funds, and not on a view that the SPAs have sufficient resources to carry on the sort of evaluation program which this Report envisions. On the contrary, we consider the amount of funds available to the states to be inadequate.

Although the recent General Counsel's ruling increased the extent to which Part C monies may be used by the SPAs to fund evaluations carried on by outside contractors, and therefore increased the resources available to them for evaluation, this development by itself is not sufficient to meet SPA needs. Part C monies are subject to the pass-through requirement, which limits the amount available at the state level where most evaluation is carried out. They require match which is difficult to find for an evaluation program. And they are already committed to action programs in most states; to divert monies from action to evaluation is politically difficult. Even if these hurdles to the use of Part C monies are overcome, there is a need for adequate SPA staff to monitor and implement evaluation activities carried on by outside contractors. Existing Part B planning monies are insufficient to finance an adequate staff for these purposes.

The Task Force raises this issue as one for immediate concern by the Administration, and endorses the current plans to involve the SPAs in the formulation of LEAA's FY 1976 budget proposals. This will hopefully lead to fuller documentation of the need for action by the Department, the Office of Management and Budget and the Congress to meet it.

Goals for the agency's level of effort. The Task Force does propose that, in implementing this report, LEAA set some general goals for SPA and agency levels of effort for evaluation. The specific numbers included in the funding projection which follows are based on a commitment of 2% of SPA Part C and E monies in FY 1975 and 3% in 1976, and similar percentages for the LEAA discretionary program.

National Institute funding needs. The Management Program also calls for substantial commitment of National Institute resources to evaluate LEAA's national office programs. Specifically, in FY 1974, the Institute will spend $800,000 on evaluating the Impact Program, $309,000 on the Pilot Cities Program, and $100,000 on its own Equipment Systems Improvement Program. An additional $150,000 is earmarked for other studies to be identified this fiscal year. A slightly increased level of effort is projected for future years.

THE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

The activities proposed for the Development Program fall into two general categories--training and technical assistance and development of model programs.

Training and TA. National training workshops are projected for FY 1975 and FY 1976 at $100,000 each. The Summer Evaluation Institute would be held in both years, at roughly the same cost. A technical assistance team, and travel to support evaluation workshops focusing on the particularized needs of SPA and criminal justice staff persons, are projected to cost $60,000 in the current year and $500,000 in each succeeding year.

Model Program Development. The funding of model CJS and SPA evaluation programs would be on a 50-50 sharing basis--$300,000 of federal DF money in FY 1974, $1,000,000 in FY 1975, and $750,000 in FY 1976 would be matched by the same amount of state block monies for both programs. The Institute would fund a number of demonstration evaluations of Regional Office DF projects amounting to $120,000 (3-4 awards) this year, and $300,000 (6-10 awards) in future years. Finally, the Institute will need substantial funds to develop major evaluation data systems, statistical modeling techniques, criminal justice indicators and other sophisticated evaluation tools and methodologies--$1,400,000 in FY 1974 and $1,900,000 in FY 1975 and FY 1976.

	FY 74	FY 75	FY 76
KNOWLEDGE PROGRAM			
Major evaluation studies			
Phase I @ $70,000	$ 840,000 NI (12 studies)	$ 1,400,000 NI (20 studies)	$ 1,400,000 NI (20 studies)
Phase II @ $500,000	-	$ 5,000,000 NI (10 studies)	$ 5,000,000 NI (10 studies)
Action funds for creation or modification of programs to conform to evaluation design	-	$ 6,000,000 DF (5 studies)	$ 6,000,000 DF (5 studies)
Evaluation of OTT replications	$ 600,000 NI (2 replications)	$ 900,000 NI (3 replications)	$ 1,200,000 NI (4 replications)
MANAGEMENT PROGRAM			
Expected SPA evaluation effort (2% of BC&E funds in FY 75, 3% in FY 76)	?	$ 9,200,000 Parts BC&E	$13,800,000 Parts BC&E
Evaluation of national LEAA programs (2% of DF funds in FY 75, 3% in FY 76)	$ 1,230,000 NI	$ 1,500,000 NI $ 1,300,000 DF	$ 1,500,000 NI $ 2,700,000 DF
DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM			
Model CJS evaluation units	$ 300,000 DF $ 300,000 Parts C&E	$ 500,000 DF $ 500,000 Parts C&E	$ 250,000 DF $ 250,000 Parts C&E
Model SPA evaluation system	-	$ 500,000 DF $ 500,000 Parts C&E	$ 500,000 DF $ 500,000 Parts C&E
Innovative evaluation systems and development of advanced tools and methodologies	$1,400,000 NI	$ 1,900,000 NI	$ 1,900,000 NI
Model evaluations of regional DF programs	$ 270,000 NI (9 studies)	$ 300,000 NI (6-10 studies)	$ 300,000 NI (6-10 studies)
Training Workshops	-	$ 100,000 TN	$ 100,000 TN
Summer Evaluation Institute	-	$ 100,000 TN	$ 100,000 TN
Technical Assistance Team and travel for SPA coordination	$ 60,000 TA	$ 500,000 TA	$ 500,000 TA
TOTALS: NI	4,340,000	11,300,000	11,800,000
DF	300,000	7,000,000	6,750,000
BC&E	300,000	10,200,000	14,550,000
TN	-	200,000	200,000
TA	60,000	500,000	500,000
TOTAL	5,000,000	29,200,000	33,800,000

VI. PROPOSED SPA EVALUATION GUIDELINES

EVALUATION GOALS

Recognizing the importance of evaluation as an essential tool in planning to reduce crime and delinquency, LEAA has established three distinct but related goals with respect to evaluation. These goals call for the development of accurate information for management decisions, the generation of new knowledge to guide planning, and an increase in the evaluation capability of state and local criminal justice agencies. Specifically, LEAA goals with respect to evaluation are:

--Knowledge goal - to obtain and disseminate information on the cost and effectiveness of various approaches to solving crime and criminal justice system problems;

--Management goal - to have performance information utilized at each LEAA administrative level in planning and decision making in order to assist program managers achieve established goals;

--Development goal - to help state and local criminal justice system units realize the benefits of utilizing evaluation as part of their management systems.

PLAN REQUIREMENTS

In its Comprehensive Plan each state is required to describe its planned evaluation activities as they relate to these goals according to the guidelines and requirements listed below. These evaluation requirements are meant to encourage State Planning Agencies to give high priority to the evaluation function and to utilize evaluation results. More specifically, they attempt to insure that all projects funded by SPAs are capable of being evaluated, that project directors assess their own activities as part of their management responsibilities, and that the SPAs undertake an adequate level of evaluation and monitoring activity to meet their information needs. In essence, the requirements attempt to establish a foundation of evaluation activity upon which the SPAs and local criminal justice agencies can build.

a. REQUIREMENTS WITH RESPECT TO THE MANAGEMENT GOAL

Evaluation is a basic management and planning tool. An effective evaluation process will generate information to:

--determine the value and utility of different methods and approaches in solving particular criminal justice problems.

--gauge progress and problems in implementing particular programs or types of programs.

--determine whether, and in what form, present project and programs should be continued.

--determine the need for modifications of projects and programs and indicate the nature and extent of those modifications.

--assess the value and appropriateness of standards, goals, funding policies and objectives.

--provide a basis for developing or revising future plans.

--assess the planning and administrative functions of the SPA.

It is the responsibility of each component of LEAA to evaluate its activities and efforts to meet the needs above. This evaluation responsibility requires that each component of LEAA:

--establish measurable objectives related to its goals.

--define and carry out the activities which are expected to achieve its objectives.

--gather information and data to assess progress and identify problems experienced in achieving objectives.

--evaluate its success in achieving its objectives and fulfilling its goals.

--use evaluation results in refining objectives and planning future activities.

The SPA shall also undertake this evaluation responsibility. Specifically, in its plan the SPA shall develop a state evaluation strategy outlining a program for evaluating the results and impact of the activities it supports. This strategy shall describe how the SPA plans to fulfill the following minimum requirements with respect to evaluation.

1. The SPA is required to allocate sufficient resources to adequately carry out its evaluation and monitoring responsibilities.

(a) The SPA shall identify the resources available for its evaluation and monitoring program including:

--the amount and source of funds allocated in the 1975 Plan for evaluation and monitoring purposes (PART B, PART C, and PART E funds);

--the number and position of those persons responsible for planning, administering, and conducting evaluation and monitoring activities.

(b) The SPA shall describe the organization of the evaluation and monitoring functions and how they are structured within the SPA.

2. The subgrant application and the subgrant process must provide the prerequisites for an internal assessment of each project by the subgrantee as well as more intensive monitoring and evaluation activities as determined by the SPA.

These prerequisites include:

(a) the identification of the problem in measurable terms;

(b) well-defined objectives of the project stated in measurable terms;

(c) specific indicators and measures to be used to assess the results of the project;

(d) means of collecting data and information to assess the project's performance.

The SPA shall indicate who will be responsible for reviewing applications to assure that these prerequisites exist for each subgrant, and when this review takes place in the grant process.

3. The SPA must require all subgrantees to internally assess their own project results. (This does not preclude the SPA or its designated evaluator from conducting an independent evaluation of the project.)

Such an internal assessment shall include:

(a) an analysis of the results and impact of the project;

(b) a comparison of the problem before and after the project;

(c) a description of the implementation and operation of the project over time;

(d) modifications of program activities called for by the evaluation findings.

4. The SPA is required to monitor the implementation, operation, and results of the projects it supports. Such monitoring must compare actual activities carried out and results achieved with the activities and results originally specified in the grant application.

Such monitoring may include:

(a) periodic site visits and interviews with project staff and clients;

(b) an examination of objective and subjective results of the project;

(c) an assessment of the progress and the problems of the project to date;

(d) effective reporting procedures documenting project performance.

The purpose of the monitoring requirement is to insure that the SPA generates adequate information to carry out its management responsibilities.

The SPA shall describe its monitoring system including:

(a) what monitoring activities will be carried out;

(b) when monitoring activities will be carried out;

(c) who will be responsible for monitoring activities;

(d) what type of data and information will be collected through the monitoring process;

(e) how and when monitoring information will be used to modify the operations of projects and affect the planning and funding decisions of the SPA.

5. The SPA is expected to intensively evaluate, either with its own staff or contracted evaluators, selected projects or groups of projects according to its planning needs.

In many instances the SPA will need more accurate or conclusive information about selected projects than systematic monitoring will supply. This is especially true in those cases when the SPA's planning requires a better understanding of the relative effectiveness and costs of alternative approaches to particular crime-related problems. Although the National Evaluation Program conducted by NILECJ in cooperation with the states may meet many of these needs for more in-depth knowledge, it cannot address all policy or program issues which an SPA must address in a given year. Therefore, most states will find it necessary to supplement this national activity with their own intensive evaluation effort.

Such intensive evaluation should incorporate sound evaluation methodologies including experimental designs developed prior to project implementation, control groups, independent data collection and analysis, and in-depth case studies.

The SPA shall:

(a) indicate the projects or programs to be intensively evaluated, the criteria by which they were chosen, and the resources allocated to this level of evaluation;

(b) describe the process in which intensive evaluations are planned and implemented (including the way in which contracted evaluators are selected, if they are used);

(c) describe the relationship between intensive evaluation and planning including:

(1) procedures for reporting, corroborating, and utilizing evaluation findings in the planning and funding decisions of both the SPA staff and the supervisory board,

(2) measures taken to insure the independence of the evaluators from the project, the objectivity and accuracy of the evaluation, and the timely submission of evaluation reports;

(d) forward copies of all final reports of intensive evaluations to the LEAA Regional Office and NILECJ.

6. The SPA is required to take account of the results of the National Evaluation Program and its own evaluations in planning its future activities.

Each SPA is responsible for seeing that evaluation results are taken into account in its program decisions. When completed national evaluation studies are inapplicable to a particular SPA's circumstances, are contradicted by a local evaluation, or cannot be implemented for specific local reasons, an SPA is, of course, not bound to follow them, but will be expected to set forth the specific bases for its decision to disregard them.

The SPA shall:

(a) detail in each program area in its plan, the sources of evaluation data which it has consulted in developing the projects and programs proposed;*

(b) describe the ways in which the evaluation data consulted influenced the projects and programs included in the plan.

b. REQUIREMENTS WITH RESPECT TO THE KNOWLEDGE GOAL

It is the mandate of Congress that LEAA evaluate the cost and effectiveness of alternative approaches to solving selected criminal justice and law enforcement problems being tested in the LEAA Program. The results of these evaluations are to be applied nationally and are expected to contribute significant new knowledge concerning what works and what doesn't work.

Because of the resources, expertise, and overview required, NILECJ will be primarily responsible for initiating and coordinating research and evaluation efforts to fulfill this mandate. However, the SPA shall assist in this effort both through independent action and cooperation with NILECJ.

*All materials resulting from the National Evaluation Program will be contained in a continually updated index available through the National Criminal Justice Reference Service.

Specifically the SPAs will be required to cooperate in the National Evaluation Program by:

(1) identifying candidate projects and programs for evaluation in the National Evaluation Program;

(2) cooperating in developing and implementing the evaluation design;

(3) serving as liaison between NILECJ, its contracted evaluator, and the subgrantee;

(4) providing requested data; and

(5) monitoring the project and the evaluation.

In its Plan the SPA shall:

--indicate its willingness to cooperate in the National Evaluation Program to the extent outlined above;

--identify those projects or programs included in the most recent NILECJ survey as candidates for evaluation in the National Evaluation Program;

--specify which of the major SPA evaluation efforts planned for this year are expected to lead to significant new knowledge of interest to a national audience.

c. REQUIREMENTS WITH RESPECT TO THE DEVELOPMENT GOAL

It is the goal of LEAA to encourage state and local criminal justice agencies to build an evaluation capability and use evaluation results to guide their activities. The SPA should assume a major role in achieving this goal by identifying its own evaluation needs and the evaluation needs of local criminal justice agencies as well as the activities which should be undertaken to meet these needs.

Specifically, the SPA shall:

(1) Identify its own chief evaluation needs including:

--the need for evaluation training,

--the need for qualified evaluation specialists,

--funding for evaluation,

--authority to conduct evaluation,

(2) Describe the SPA's plans for meeting its own needs;

(3) Describe any evaluation assistance the SPA plans to offer local criminal justice agencies this year, including;

--training assistance (conferences, workshops, etc.),

--anticipated projects to develop research and evaluation units within local agencies,

--technical assistance, and

ways in which Federal-level assistance is needed for these activities;

(4) Indicate how the SPA disseminates evaluation results and findings to relevant local agencies.

VII. IMPLEMENTATION OF THIS REPORT

In order for this program to be put into effect, a number of actions must be taken during FY 1974 and 1975. The first section of this chapter identifies seven specific activities required, including the drafting by each LEAA office of its own implementation plan. The second section consists of a compilation of the roles for each of the various parts of LEAA, combining the activities proposed for each unit under the three separate evaluation programs.

IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITIES

1. Approval of all or part of the proposed programs. This Report should receive wide circulation throughout LEAA with the comments on it assembled for final decision by the Administrator. This action should be completed no later than April 1, 1974. Following final action on the report, a formal announcement of its adoption should be made jointly by the Administrators and the leadership of the National Conference of State Criminal Justice Planning Administrators (NCSCJPA).

2. Development of implementation plans by each part of LEAA. The announcement of approval of the report should be accompanied by a bulletin directing each office to develop task plans for implementing the proposed programs, to be delivered to the Office of Planning and Management for its review and approval.

3. Promulgation of new guidelines for the SPAs in the area of evaluation. The review and clearance process for the proposed SPA Guidelines should commence immediately in order for them to be included within the 1975 LEAA Planning Guidelines to be published by June 30, 1974.

4. Interim activities. A number of the proposed activities, especially those of the National Evaluation Program, are currently being implemented as part of the FY 1974 effort. In particular, the 1974 survey of SPA evaluation suggestions, twelve Phase I evaluation studies, and the funding of model evaluation programs should be commenced immediately.

5. Appointment of Evaluation Coordinating Committee. The members of a continuing coordinating committee should be appointed to oversee the development of the National Evaluation Program, continuing the Federal-state program development and management partnership begun with the Task Force.

6. Development of handbooks for SPA guidance. The final task given the Task Force was overseeing the preparation of handbooks to describe alternative models for the SPAs to use in structuring their evaluation programs. This effort should include a handbook on monitoring systems and the oversight responsibility should be transferred to the new Evaluation Coordinating Committee.

7. Setting of quantifiable long range objectives with respect to evaluation. The Office of Planning and Management, with the help of the Evaluation Coordinating Committee, should set quantifiable objectives for the agency's evaluation program. The Task Force has suggested a number of specific objectives with respect to the activities of each Federal LEAA office. An overall level of effort objective should be set as well -- that by 1976 at least 3% of all funds allocated to each part of the agency, and to the agency as a whole, be used for the purpose of evaluation. Additional quantifiable goals should also be set as we become more familiar with the operation of the system -- goals with respect to the use of evaluation results in SPA and LEAA planning and funding decisions.

ROLES OF LEAA FUNCTIONAL UNITS

The following roles are appropriate to each of the agency's parts in carrying out this evaluation program.

1. Office of the Administrator

The LEAA Administrator has ultimate responsibility for the program and will regularly be provided information on its operation and effectiveness with which he can evaluate its performance. The Deputy Administrators for Policy Development and for Administration will have responsibility for approval of policy and administrative requirements established to implement the program, such as SPA Evaluation Guidelines, and of the particular evaluation studies to be commissioned as part of the National Evaluation Program. The Administrator will be responsible for making management decisions in response to the findings of the National Evaluation Program, and to provide a national leadership role in publicizing and advocating the results of the program to state and local decision-makers.

2. Office of Planning and Management

Under the proposed program, OP&M will have a major role in meeting the Management Goal. In particular, OP&M will:

--Oversee implementation of the entire Task Force report.

--Share with the Evaluation Coordinating Committee responsibility for the development of handbooks to provide the SPAs with guidance in developing monitoring and evaluation programs.

--Develop and interpret requirements established for all components of LEAA under the management program, including the specification of Guidelines for SPAs.

--Determine what constitutes acceptable compliance with those requirements.

--Monitor and assess compliance with the requirements and report findings to the Administrator.

--Evaluate the effect of the program on management and decision-making by the various organizational units of LEAA.

3. Evaluation Coordinating Committee

This body, composed of representatives of appropriate national and regional offices and the SPAs, will:

--Oversee the conduct of the annual survey for evaluation suggestions.

--Screen the candidate project types for suitability for Phase I evaluations and make recommendations to the Administrators.

--Screen the alternative strategies suggested by Phase I evaluations and make recommendations to the Administrators for the conduct of Phase II efforts for each fiscal year.

--Serve as a focal point for coordinating Federal, state and local criminal justice evaluation activities.

4. National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice

The National Institute has a major role in the program relative to each of the three goals. In particular it will:

--Design the programs or operations it funds to insure that they are evaluable.

--Perform an internal assessment of its own activities.

--Monitor the projects and programs it operates or funds against pre-established objectives.

--Fund and monitor intensive evaluations of selected NILECJ and national and regional DF-funded projects and programs.

--With OP&M, oversee development of handbooks to aid SPAs in developing monitoring and evaluation programs and systems.

--Utilize the results of evaluation activities in its own program decisions.

Additionally, the National Institute will Implement the National Evaluation Program and:

--Arrange for the annual survey and analyze results.

--Perform staff work for the Evaluation Coordinating Committee in selecting Phase I and II evaluation projects.

--With the cooperation of the ROs and SPAs, fund and monitor Phase I and II evaluations.

--Disseminate evaluation results.

--With the cooperation of the ROs and the NCSCJPA, fund and monitor evaluation training activities.

--With the help of ROs and SPAs, choose and fund sites for model criminal justice system and SPA evaluation units, and monitor their activities.

--Fund and monitor a technical assistance team to aid ROs, SPAs and criminal justice system evaluation units.

--Fund and monitor model evaluations of programs and projects funded with regional discretionary funds.

--Fund and monitor the development of innovative evaluation systems, tools and methodologies.

--Disseminate information on evaluation methodologies.

--In cooperation with the ROs and NCSCJPA, coordinate evaluation training and TA activities.

5. Regional Offices

The Regional Offices will continue with the LEAA national offices to have the role of coordinating activities in their regions. In particular, they will:

--Interpret evaluation program requirements, including comprehensive plan guidelines, and enforce compliance with them.

--Participate in and facilitate the annual survey to be conducted.

--Assist in the collection of information for Phase I evaluations.

--Identify candidate sites for Phase II evaluations and assist in evaluation design and monitoring.

--Design the programs they fund to insure that they are evaluable.

--Perform an annual internal assessment of their own activities.

--Monitor the projects and programs they operate or fund and evaluate them against pre-established objectives.

--Fund and monitor intensive evaluations of selected projects and functions.

--Utilize the results of evaluation activities in their own program decisions.

--Participate in and help coordinate the training and technical assistance activities to be initiated by NILECJ.

--In conjunction with the NILECJ technical assistance team, provide training and technical assistance to SPAs with respect to subjects which can be handled on a regional basis.

--Conduct model or demonstration evaluations of programs and projects operated with their discretionary funds.

--Communicate evaluation training and TA needs to NILECJ technical assistance team.

--Assist in the identification of sites for model SPA and CJS evaluation units and in the monitoring of their activities.

6. State Planning Agencies

Since the SPAs manage the bulk of the program activity funded by LEAA, they play a critical role in the proposed evaluation program. They will:

--Develop model evaluation capabilities.

--Participate in the training programs to be operated by NILECJ.

--Assess training and TA needs of local CJS agencies and meet or arrange for the meeting of them.

--Insure that all their subgrants are evaluable.

--Insure that subgrantee program managers perform internal assessments of all subgrants funded by them.

--Monitor all subgrants against pre-established performance objectives.

--Perform intensive evaluations necessary to meet planning and decision needs unique to their state.

--Participate in the annual National Evaluation Program survey to identify their evaluation information needs and interests that can best be met through a nationally coordinated evaluation.

--Cooperate with Phase I evaluations by providing information and identifying projects that could be included in Phase II evaluations.

--Assist in funding and manage projects selected for inclusion in Phase II evaluations in conformity with agreed to design.

--See that, to the extent feasible, Phase II evaluation designs provide for as much of their unique information needs as possible.

--Utilize the results of evaluation activities in their own program decisions.

7. All Other LEAA Offices

--Design the programs they fund or operate to insure that they are evaluable.

--Perform internal assessments of their own activities.

--Monitor the projects and programs they operate or fund against pre-established objectives.

--Perform, or have NILECJ perform, intensive evaluations of selected major programs and projects.

--Utilize the results of evaluation activities in their own program decisions.

APPENDIX A: STATEMENT OF CURRENT STATUS OF EVALUATION ACTIVITY IN LEAA

During the initial set of meetings of the LEAA Evaluation Policy Task Force, a review of current evaluation activities was conducted by having Task Force members present reports on current evaluation activity as viewed from their perspective. Based on those reports and existing documentation, the following composite statement on the current status of evaluation in LEAA was developed. This is primarily a qualitative statement which serves to identify the major evaluation problems being encountered within LEAA at present. A more quantitative survey was conducted on a trial basis in Region III to determine the amount of resources being allocated to evaluation and to provide corroborating evidence to the qualitative review. Since the trial survey did support the results of the initial review and did not raise new issues, it was not extended further. As presented here, the statement is given in eight parts. Part 1 gives general characteristics concerning evaluation that were identified in the review. Parts 2 through 7 address evaluation at specific administrative levels of LEAA and Part 8 reports the results of the survey conducted in Region III.

1. GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS

Four general conditions that seem to characterize the current state of evaluation in LEAA are:

(1) Transition: LEAA is rapidly moving to a position where a significant amount of resources is being expended for evaluation and nearly every decision maker is expressing a need for evaluation.

(2) Capability Shortages: Due to the rapid growth in interest for evaluation, it has been difficult to secure adequate funds and staff to meet the requirements for evaluation that have developed. Recent modifications on the use of Part C funds for evaluation are expected to reduce these problems at the State Planning Agency (SPA) level.

(3) Variation: There is a considerable amount of variation among the components of LEAA relative to the quantity and quality of evaluations being used to develop an evaluation capability. At present, the best evaluation programs appear to exist in selected state planning agencies. However, at the SPA level evaluation activity varies from essentially no capability to maintaining a sizeable in-house evaluation staff.

(4) Limited Information: Comprehensive empirical information on the operation of the criminal justice system and techniques which affect crime is quite limited. The development of such information will require an orderly evolution of evaluation capability and results.

More specific statements on the state of evaluation activity within LEAA are given in the following sections which are organized according to levels of program or administrative activity.

2. ACTION GRANT LEVEL

There has been considerable resistance to evaluation at the operating project level for a variety of reasons. Two recurring reasons cited for the resistance are: the project managers view the evaluation as a threat to their continued existence and, in most cases, the cost of the evaluation is paid for from project funds which they would prefer to utilize for project operations. Several SPAs report this attitude to be changing, however, as the project operators discover that an evaluation can actually assist them in improving the operation of their project and in obtaining continued funding. In order to achieve this change, it has been necessary to design the evaluation to ensure that the project operators will receive useful management information from evaluations and that the results of the evaluation are used fairly.

In most cases, grantees do not voluntarily arrange for a sophisticated evaluation of their project. State planning agencies are using various techniques to ensure that evaluations are conducted at the project level. However, successes are limited and in only a few states do the SPA's attempt to review or affect evaluation plans for each proposed project.

3. STATE PLANNING AGENCY LEVEL

Several points were made concerning evaluation at this level.

(1) Interest in conducting and utilizing evaluations has grown dramatically. This state of affairs is partially the result of the introduction of the LEAA guideline requirement to conduct evaluation on a certain percent of a state's program. But, in many states, the interest has primarily derived from the SPA Director, state commission members, the governor's office or the state legislature. In nearly all states, support for evaluation has not been uniform and the LEAA guideline requirement has provided a useful rationale for establishing an evaluation program in the state.

(2) Information concerning the operation of the criminal justice system and its effect on crime is quite limited. Information that is available is primarily limited to descriptions of the organization of the CJS and the size of crime problems at various points in time. The development of comprehensive empirical evidence on the operation of the CJS and how it affects crime will require extensive experimentation and evaluation at the SPA project and program level. The information cannot be produced quickly, but will require an orderly evolution of evaluation capability and results.

(3) Evaluation in most states is equated to monitoring. In most states evaluation has been interpreted to mean the monitoring of a project to ensure that it operates within established laws and regulations and special conditions placed on the grant. Information is typically collected through site visits which are not structured to obtain data using techniques tested for reliability and validity. However, in several states, sophisticated evaluations are being conducted on selected projects and on groups of similar projects and this trend is increasing rapidly.

(4) There is diversity between states and in states about the organizational structure to be used for managing evaluation activities. In several states there are disagreements concerning whether evaluation activities should be directed by the SPA, the regional planning units or jointly by both. In many states there is an evaluation staff at the SPA level which effectively has total control over evaluation activities in the states, while in other states, control over the evaluation resources is essentially delegated to the RPUs or individual projects. Organizational arrangements that are being utilized to implement evaluations are:

- °require that each project have an evaluation component, but at the SPA level do not attempt to affect it.
- °require that each project have an evaluation component and, for a certain portion of the projects, attempt to affect the quality of the evaluation either by reviewing it and placing appropriate special conditions on the grant to modify it or by assuming responsibility for hiring the contractor to implement the evaluation component.
- °develop an evaluation design which the projects must agree to implement before receiving the grant.
- °employ contractors through the SPA to perform evaluations on a selected set of projects.
- °develop an in-house SPA capability to conduct evaluations of a selected set of projects.

(5) Many states are having difficulty building an adequate evaluation staff. The problem is not only one of quantity but of quality also. Most SPAs have identified specific staff persons as having responsibility for evaluation activities. However, not all states have been able to establish an identifiable evaluation unit and many SPAs have had difficulty establishing an identifiable evaluation staff. A tendency in some states has been to designate persons unfamiliar with evaluation as evaluators. This condition is in part due to a lack of understanding of the nature of evaluation and a lack of recognized qualification criteria.

(6) Technical assistance and training activities available to the SPA's have not been adequate. There have been several attempts at providing technical assistance and training for SPA personnel through state and regional conferences. However, the common opinion is that these conferences have not provided a basis on which participants can develop an increased evaluation capability. A specific criticism concerns the lack of materials which SPA personnel can utilize after attending a conference. In general, the conferences have not facilitated the transition of evaluation theory to evaluation practice and the utility of this approach is questionable.

(7) There is diversity of opinion concerning the use of evaluations. In most states the two primary uses of evaluation results appear to be: monitor the implementation of a grant and provide information for refunding decisions for individual grants. In a few states, attempts are being made to design evaluations to provide information on the performance of selected types of projects and develop an information base for future program activity. In a few instances, no specific use for the information has been identified, except to satisfy LEAA requirements.

(8) Utility of evaluation is being questioned. Several states have produced a sizeable amount of evaluation information on project activities. However, in many cases, the information has not been used, even when made available to decision makers or planners. As a result of this nonuse of information, both evaluators and decision makers in some SPAs have begun to question the utility of evaluation.

(9) There is a lack of coordination between evaluation activities and the other activities of individual SPAs. The problem is particularly evident between planning and evaluation. In many cases, projects are based on designs which essentially preclude any evaluations. In other cases, provision has not been made for the collection of necessary data. Problems also exist in feeding the results of an evaluation back into the planning activities for on-going SPA programs.

(10) There is little cooperation among the SPAs in performing evaluations or utilizing the results of evaluation. In several states similar types of projects are being evaluated and similar evaluations are being conducted. However, there are no mechanisms for coordinating these efforts

to avoid redundant activities or to strengthen the evaluation results by providing complementary or corroborating results.

In general, it is recognized that the SPAs still only have a limited evaluation capability. However, it is also recognized that many states have a greater evaluation capability than any other component of LEAA.

4. REGIONAL OFFICE LEVEL

Four activities which were used to describe the role of LEAA regional offices relative to evaluation are:

(1) Stimulate interest among all components of the criminal justice system for conducting and using evaluations.

(2) Provide technical assistance to SPAs.

(3) Review SPA and project evaluation efforts for quality control purposes.

(4) Ensure that the uses of discretionary funds are evaluated.

In general, the principal role of the regional office has been to monitor evaluation activities of the SPAs. Typically the regional offices are not evaluators. It is assumed that the person appointed to the recently created staff position of Regional Office Planner/Evaluator will provide technical assistance to SPAs and act as a liaison between individual SPAs and other components of the LEAA structure.

5. NATIONAL INSTITUTE LEVEL

The National Institute is in the process of increasing its role in evaluation significantly. In particular, expanded emphasis is being given to the testing of major hypotheses concerning techniques for affecting crime and the operation of the criminal justice system.

Conditions which characterize the current status of evaluation activity in the National Institute are:

(1) The National Institute has been less than successful in its efforts to evaluate its own programs. This is, in part, attributable to the nature of these programs and the fact that many of the research grants are indistinguishable from evaluations themselves. But it is also true that more thought and attention could have been addressed to carefully assessing progress made by grantees. However, as in other levels of the agency, efforts have been made to place more emphasis on evaluation. These include both a concept of team monitoring of major research grants and developing appropriate grant evaluation designs for implementation.

(2) Efforts on the part of the National Institute to assist with or carry out evaluations of non-Institute projects and programs have been limited to date. The most significant evaluation effort to date has been the LEAA Impact Program. The Institute's roles in this action-research program include (1) providing the necessary funds for planning and evaluation of each city's activities, (2) providing as much technical assistance and guidance as possible for city project evaluation design and implementation work, and (3) providing for a national level evaluation of the program. A National Institute-sponsored evaluation of the Pilot Cities Program has recently been implemented. Institute staff have participated in several evaluation training seminars sponsored by LEAA and in numerous discussions with SPA staffs regarding evaluation techniques and methodologies. Though benefits were probably realized from these activities, the lack of any focused and comprehensive effort in providing technical assistance and training has been a serious shortcoming.

(3) With the reorganization of the National Institute, an Office of Evaluation has been created to make it possible for the Institute to carry out its expanded responsibilities under the new legislation. At present, the development of a long-range plan of operations for this office is underway. This plan will incorporate the efforts required to rectify some of the Institute's previous limitations in evaluation and the strategies for most effectively satisfying its new mandates to provide evaluation results regarding the LEAA program. Activities currently under consideration for incorporation in the plan include:

- Testing of Major Criminal Justice System Hypotheses: The Institute is planning a series of in-depth evaluation studies aimed at testing major hypotheses concerning the operation of the criminal justice system and techniques for having an effect on crime. Several candidate hypotheses have been identified, and a commitment has been made to test the effect of New York's new drug laws.

- Coordinating "Planned Variation" Experiments: The Institute is exploring the feasibility of conducting evaluations in selected program areas by coordinating a "planned variation" of project activity in several states.

- Reviewing of Evaluation Studies: The Institute is proposing to review evaluation studies instituted by the various SPAs and determine uses for the findings and conclusions. This program would involve scanning SPA evaluations for findings of national significance and would provide a basis for structuring future policy.

°Providing Technical Assistance: The Institute proposes to supply as much assistance and support as possible to meet the technical requests of the SPAs as they continue their evaluation efforts.

°Developing an Information System: The National Institute is exploring the feasibility and the possible utility of an automated project evaluation data collection and analysis system. Such a system would be intended to make data generated through action projects readily available and be useful to a host of decision makers and criminal justice researchers. It would supplement the functions of LEAA's GMIS by capturing detailed project information.

As a related activity, the Office of Technology Transfer of the Institute is considering funding the replication of projects which have previously been implemented only on a limited scale but, on the basis of preliminary evaluation results, appear to be successful. The replications will serve the purpose of providing an opportunity for a more extensive evaluation of the projects and greater visibility to the projects through demonstrations of their operation. A "Family Crisis Intervention" project is being considered for near term implementation under this program.

6. NATIONAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE INFORMATION AND STATISTICS SERVICES PROGRAM LEVEL

The lack of baseline data for use by criminal justice system evaluators and planners has been a major problem since the inception of LEAA. In an attempt to reduce this information gap, the National Criminal Justice Information and Statistics Services (NCJISS) has established several programs to collect and assimilate baseline data. Examples of these programs include:

(1) The National Crime Survey Panel. This survey is producing independent data on the amount and socioeconomic impact of crime in selected large cities of the United States. The collected information will provide a basis for the overall analysis of the effectiveness of the High Impact Program and an assessment of the gross effectiveness of LEAA programs.

(2) The National Corrections Statistics Program. This includes consensus of conditions and personnel associated with jails, prisons and juvenile detention facilities. Data is also collected on the characteristics of criminal justice system employees and the expenditures of criminal justice systems.

It is recognized that not only is there a data gap at the national level, but that the capability of state and local governments to produce data for criminal justice system evaluation and planning efforts currently is quite limited. Efforts aimed at developing a state and local data capability are being concentrated in a Comprehensive Data Systems program, which includes the establishment of the following:

- Criminal Justice Statistical Analysis Centers which have the authority to collect and analyze data from all criminal justice agencies in a state.

- Offender Based Transaction Statistics Program which will provide data for evaluating recidivism rates.

The individual states assume the responsibility for the collection and quality control of the Uniform Crime Reports (UCR) data--data which are used in evaluations requiring crime data for small geographic areas.

The need to evaluate programs operated by NCJISS is recognized,and a major grant was recently given to the National Academy of Sciences to evaluate the National Crime Survey Panel.

7. NATIONAL OFFICE LEVEL

A Planning and Management Unit has been established at the National Office level of LEAA. This office will have responsibility for coordinating evaluation activities within LEAA and evaluating the performance of other components of LEAA.

Programs are also being developed at the National Office level to assist the states in developing, implementing and administering criminal justice system "standards and goals" appropriate to their situation. The work of the "National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals" provides a basis for this activity. As part of the continuing activity to identify appropriate standards and goals, effort will be expended on evaluating those that have been proposed or are already accepted. Once accepted, standards and goals provide a reference point for measuring program and project performance.

8. RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION RESOURCES SURVEY

a. Introduction

Individuals on the Evaluation Policy Task Force felt that a quantitative statement regarding the status of evaluation activity in SPAs was needed to supplement the general statement which it prepared. To this end the

Evaluation Resource Subcommittee consisting of six Task Force members[1] was appointed to develop a survey instrument focusing on SPA activities and responsibilities which would then be implemented by the Office of Planning and Management. Information obtained from the survey was utilized by the Task Force in the development of the comprehensive evaluation program and its funding, technical assistance, and training components as well as provide a more definitive statement on the staff resources and funds allocated to evaluation within SPAs.

Region III Office staff including LEAA State Representatives and a staff member of LEAA Central met in Philadelphia in early January 1974 to refine the draft of an instrument for data collection and to organize an initial pre-test effort within Region III, which was expected to last no more than one week. The six SPAs of Region II participated in the exercise.[2]

To assure a common understanding of terms so that the data collected would be comparable, four specific categories of "evaluation" activities were defined--project and program monitoring; follow-up project evaluation; on-going project evaluation; and program evaluation. These definitions, together with appropriate instructional material, were furnished to each of the participant SPAs.

b. Preliminary Results

Based on an initial set of computations, the following picture emerged:

(1) Block Grant Evaluation by Category of Activity

As evaluation efforts became more complex and intensive, the number of projects evaluated declined. In 1973 90 percent of all projects were monitored, 55 percent of all projects received some kind of follow-up review, and 20 percent received a controlled on-going evaluation. Additionally 30 percent of all identifiable programs were evaluated. Figures for 1972 followed the same general pattern.

(2) Resources Committed to Evaluation

In 1973, nearly 70 percent of SPA staff effort involving "evaluation" dealt with project monitoring. Program and project evaluation accounted

[1]Robert Cole, Robert Crew, George Hall, Keith Miles, Irving Slott, and John Waller.

[2]Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia, Virginia, West Virginia, and Pennsylvania.

for the remaining 30 percent. In terms of consultant assistance, the reverse was true, with the bulk of consultant effort lodged in program and project evaluation.

(3) Distribution of LEAA Funds Covering Evaluation

Five of the six states reported sizeable increases in Part "B" funding between 1972-1973. Part "C" funds allocated to consultants grew substantially during the same period. Still, most of the states expressed deep concern about the availability of funds.[3]

(4) Development and Utilization of Evaluation Plans

Five of the six states indicated that evaluation plans had been formulated; the remaining state noted that one was being developed. The SPA staff developed the plans in all instances, save one. Most of the SPAs in Region III had already established evaluation units, and these units used the results of evaluation studies to guide decisions on funds and programs.

c. General Observations

The survey, itself, revealed a number of problems that will have to be resolved before a nation-wide effort is attempted. The following are among the more critical issues requiring attention:

(1) Data Reliability and Validity

More could be done to ensure the development of reliable and valid statistics, since internal inconsistencies were noted in several of the completed surveys. There were instances where the number of professionals assigned to evaluation activities (questions three and four of the survey) differed substantially from that recorded under the appropriate heading of the matrix sheet. There were examples of double-counting, where "level of effort" figures applied to both project and program categories. Finally, differences between SPA staff cost allocation figures and manpower distribution statistics were noted for several of the surveys.

The following steps are suggested to facilitate the data collection effort and improve the quality of the data collected. LEAA's state representatives could work closely with the SPAs in an effort to establish

[3]This issue was discussed during the deliberations of the Task Force. SPA concern about the availability of funds is based on the legal restrictions attached to Part C monies, the pass-through requirement and the hard match requirement. Both restrict the SPA in the way in which they utilize Part C funds to fund evaluations of subgrantee projects, and therefore limits the evaluations capability of the SPA.

the veracity of the data. SPAs could be required to document the figures provided; at the very least, state agencies could indicate the basis on which undocumented figures were developed. The survey instrument could be revised to incorporate the suggestions offered by the respondents. It is also suggested that technical expertise in this area be consulted before the survey questionnaire is prepared for nation-wide distribution.

(2) Administrative Matters

Delays were noted in the transmission of the information--material sent to the Regional Office by the SPAs was not always forwarded to LEAA Central; one or two of the SPAs passed the deadline set for the survey; and "follow-up" questions were not always handled expeditiously. In developing plans for a nation-wide survey, serious attention should be given to the establishment of an ad hoc coordinating unit. Furthermore, the role of the state representatives should be clearly defined. It would be appropriate to hold them accountable for the preparation and prompt transmittal of reliable and accurate information. Finally, the survey should be coordinated with the SPAs' National Conference.

d. Conclusions

Although only preliminary, the results corroborate what has been said earlier in terms of the amount and type of SPA evaluation activity. The results also should contribute to the further development of sound and realistic nation-wide evaluation programs. However, having met the Task Force's purposes, it was decided that there was no need to extend the survey nation-wide.

*U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE:1974 545-413/573 1-3