EDJIE
Overview of Evaluation Metrics & Tools

Disclosure

EDJIE Metrics Framework

The Statewide Equity thru Data, Justice, Inclusion, and Education (EDJIE) Initiative seeks to create standardized, relevant metrics and collection tools as part of its larger effort to increase racial justice, equity, and inclusion in the 23 state-funded restorative justice agencies. The initiative also seeks to help tell the story of what the agencies do and their impact.

An evaluation approach, called the Performance Logic Model or Results-Based Accountability Metrics, fits well with the desire of policy makers, justice system practitioners, program staff, and other community stakeholders to: (1) understand the effort, that is, who is served, what strategies were used, and whether process goals were met; (2) understand the effect, that is, whether participants were satisfied with services and whether they are better off as a result of participating in the program; and (3) produce usable information to practice continuous improvement.

The other important component to this evaluation approach is to anchor to a theory-based logic model. By anchoring to the theory behind core strategies, like building youth developmental assets or Restorative Justice principles like taking responsibility for the harm that was caused, as well as organizing the evaluation system around a logic model, stakeholders can easily understand what the program set out to accomplish. A Performance Logic Model At-A-Glance can be used to help funders, policy makers, and program staff easily see how things unfolded.

Normally the development of Logic models can require a significant amount of training, time and attention from program staff. However, the EDJIE consulting is recommending the use of a model that we have developed for Vermont's restorative justice programs. With the use of a mobile device and/or online program, use of this model will accelerate the learning curve, allow program staff to reduce the amount of double-entry of information and increase the response rate from participants. Of course, this predicated on the funders agreeing to some basic definitions of data as well as the type of data. Additional funding will be needed to support the change-over in RJCs.

This following short paper describes the model and the survey data to be collected. While one can always aim for a perfect system that fits every case and program, we believe that using this model will assure that important equity data is collected on participants, their satisfaction with as participants and how well the program achieved its goals.

Sample Performance Accountability Model

This first chart shows the information that can be produced from use of the model. The first section contains basic program information, demographic information about participants, the strategies used and the outputs and process goals. The latter part of the model shows the statistics for participant satisfaction and how the participants rated the program itself.

Perfor-mance Account-ability Model	Logic Model	PROGRAM AT-A-GLANCE				
Effort [*How Much Did we Do?*] RBA: How much and how well? How well did you do in implementing it?	Inputs: How much was spent on services?	Grant funds allocated	Funds from other sources	Total Program Funds	Grant funds as percentage of total program budget	In-Kind Contributions
		$300,000	$150,000	$450,000	67%	$45,000
	participants: Who was served?	Total Unduplicated participants	Female	Male	Non-Binary	Transgender
		100	40%	40%	10%	10%
		10-14 years	15-17 years	18-25 years	25-35 years	36+ years
		8%	22%	30%	30%	10%
		Asian Pacific Islander	African American/ Black	Latino	Native American/ Alaskan Native	White
		5%	10%	15%	7%	55%
		Multi-Racial	Other	Referring Offense Property	Referring Offense Misdemeanor	Referring Offense Felony
		4%	6%	20%	75%	5%
	Strategies: What strategies were used?	Restorative Classes or Skills Development	Intake Assessment	Restorative Circle	Referral to Mental Health Support	Referral to Job Training/ Academic Support

		60%	100%	80%	20%	15%
		Substance Use Treatment	**Restitution Payment**	**Community Service**	**Case Management**	**Other Referral to Support**
		45%	60%	80%	90%	60%
	Outputs and Process Goals: **What was produced by the program and did we reach process goals?**	**# Intake Assessments**	**# Contracts Developed**	**# Restorative Circles**	**# Letters of Apologies**	**Amount of Restitution Collected**
		100	98	90	50	$1
		# Community Service Hours	**# Victims Involved**	**# Community Volunteers Involved**	**% Successful Program Completion**	**Ave. #f Days from Intake to Restorative Circle**
		400	25	40	88%	45
Effect [Are they better off?]	**Participant Satisfaction:** **Were Participants satisfied with services?** **Scale = 0 to 100**	**Youth Participant Satisfaction Rating**	**Adult Participant Satisfaction Rating**	**Parent of Youth Participant Satisfaction Rating**	**Victim Participant Satisfaction Rating**	**Community Member Participant Satisfaction Rating**
		85%	90%	90%	60%	80%
	Service Productivity - Statewide: **Were services effective in producing change for the better on Statewide metrics?** **Scale = -100 to 100**	**Rating on: Understanding of how behavior affected others.**	**Rating on: Understanding that harm resulted from a choice that could have been made differently.**	**Rating on: Ability to accept responsibility for the harm that was caused.**	**Rating on: Ability to express remorse for actions.**	**Rating on: Ability to repair the harm that was caused.**
		80%	80%	90%	60%	70%
	Service Productivity - Program Specific: **Were services effective in producing change for the better on program-specific metrics?**	**Rating on: Ability to connect with adults in the community.**	**Rating on: Ability to avoid high-risk behaviors.**	**Rating on: Ability to recognize negative peer pressure.**	**Rating on: Knowledge of how to communicate effectively.**	**Rating on: Ability to ask for help when needed.**
		80%	70%	60%	60%	90%

	Scale = -100 to 100					

Program and Demographic Information

The data about basic program information, the strategies used and the outputs and process goals would be filled out by the appropriate program staff. Depending on the final decisions, this information would be reviewed and/or entered on a regular quarterly or other routine basis.

The demographic information is obtained from the participants who would enter the information in an online tool. The tool will provide automatic updates on the predetermined regular basis.

participant satisfaction and service productivity data comes from surveys that participants would also enter as when the RJ process has been completed. Again, this will be an online tool.

Participant Satisfaction

Youth participant, adult participant, parent of youth participant, and victim participant satisfaction reflects whether participants were content with services. Stakeholders and providers alike need to understand whether participants were satisfied so they can begin determining if services were effective. Generally, satisfied participants are more likely to experience and undergo desired changes. Four standard questions are used to understand satisfaction with services. Participants are asked to rate the following:
- I think the program I participated in was…(rated poor to great)
- I feel I benefited from this program…(not at all, some, a lot)
- I thought the people who ran the program were…(very helpful, somewhat helpful, not helpful)
- Would you tell a friend or schoolmate to come to this program if they needed it? (yes, maybe, no)

Service Productivity

Service productivity measures whether participants are better off as a result of participating in the program. Service productivity is assessed by designing questions that allow the participant to reflect on whether certain changes occurred due to the services. The response choices allow the respondent to indicate whether services made the better off, worse off, or no change.

In the proposed evaluation system, service productivity affords stakeholders insight into where a program is in its pursuit of targeted changes -- for statewide measures, as well as program-specific measures. Service productivity does indicate how much change occurred in a participant.

SAMPLE SURVEY TOOL

Participant Satisfaction Reflecting back on your time in the program, circle the response to the right that best matches how you feel about the following…				
I think the program I participated in was:	**Great**	**Good**	**Poor**	**Does Not Apply**
I feel I benefited from this program:	**A Lot**	**Some**	**None at All**	**Does Not Apply**
I thought the people who ran the program were:	**Very Helpful**	**Some-what Helpful**	**Not Helpful**	**Does Not Apply**
Would you tell a friend or schoolmate to come to this program if they needed it?	**Yes**	**Maybe**	**No**	**Does Not Apply**
Service Productivity Reflecting back on your time in the program, circle the response to the right that best matches how you feel.				
Because of this program, my understanding of how my behavior affected others is:	**Better**	**Worse**	**The Same**	**Does Not Apply**
Because of this program, my understanding of the harm that resulted from a choice that I made is:	**Better**	**Worse**	**The Same**	**Does Not Apply**
Because of this program, my ability to accept responsibility for the harm that I caused is:	**Better**	**Worse**	**The Same**	**Does Not Apply**
Because of this program, my ability to express remorse for my actions is:	**Better**	**Worse**	**The Same**	**Does Not Apply**
Because of this program, my ability to repair the harm that I caused is:	**Better**	**Worse**	**The Same**	**Does Not Apply**
Because of this program, my ability to connect with adults in the community is:	**Better**	**Worse**	**The Same**	**Does Not Apply**
Because of this program, my ability to avoid high-risk behaviors is:	**Better**	**Worse**	**The Same**	**Does Not Apply**
Because of this program, my ability to recognize negative peer pressure is:	**Better**	**Worse**	**The Same**	**Does Not Apply**
Because of this program, my knowledge of how to	**Better**	**Worse**	**The Same**	**Does Not**

				Apply
communicate effectively is:				
Because of this program, my ability to ask for help is:	**Better**	**Worse**	**The Same**	**Does Not Apply**

Scoring Service Productivity

Finally, the data from the surveys is automatically downloaded to the Service Productivity form. This form tabulates the responses and provides a percentage productivity rate. Service productivity ratings range from -100% to +100%. A -100% rating would mean that everyone got worse on a particular measure. A +100% means that all participants got better on a particular measure. A rating of zero means that all participants experienced no change.

Service Productivity **Reflecting back on your time in the program, circle the response to the right that best matches how you feel.**					Respondent indicates that she is better off on ALL measures.	Respondent indicates that she is better off on SOME measures.	Respondent indicates that she is worse off on ALL measures.
Because of this program, my understanding of how my behavior affected others is:	**Better**	**Worse**	**The Same**	**Does Not Apply**	1	1	-1
Because of this program, my understanding of the harm that resulted from a choice that I made is:	**Better**	**Worse**	**The Same**	**Does Not Apply**	1	1	-1

	Better	Worse	The Same	Does Not Apply			
Because of this program, my ability to accept responsibility for the harm that I caused is:	**Better**	Worse	The Same	**Does Not Apply**	1	1	-1
Because of this program, my ability to express remorse for my actions is:	Better	Worse	**The Same**	**Does Not Apply**	1	0	-1
Because of this program, ability to repair the harm that I caused is:	**Better**	Worse	The Same	**Does Not Apply**	1	1	-1
Because of this program, ability to connect with adults in the community is:	Better	Worse	The Same	**Does Not Apply**	1	0	-1
Because of this program, my ability to avoid high-risk behaviors is:	Better	Worse	**The Same**	Does Not Apply	1	0	-1
Because of this program, my ability to recognize negative peer pressure is:	**Better**	Worse	The Same	Does Not Apply	1	1	-1

Because of this program, my knowledge of how to communicate effectively is:	**Better**	**Worse**	**The Same**	**Does Not Apply**	1	-1	-1
Because of this program, my ability to ask for help is:	**Better**	**Worse**	**The Same**	**Does Not Apply**	1	-1	-1
					SUM = 10	SUM = 3	SUM = -10
					SUM/ TOTAL # QUESTIONS (*100) = +100	SUM/TOTAL # QUESTIONS (*100) = +30	SUM/TOTAL # QUESTIONS (*100) = -100