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Delinquency Prevention Initiatives and Goals

Multi-Agency Steering Committee
(Justice, Welfare, Education, Health)

Intermediary and State-level Prevention Support System

Support to Community Prevention Coalitions
Support Evidence-based Prevention & Intervention Programs
Improve Quality of Local Innovative Programs and Practices

Broad-scale Dissemination
High Quality Implementation
Valid Impact Assessment
Long-term Sustainability
PCCD Funds New Providers to implement EBPs

EPISCENTER Supports Providers to use Standard Process and Outcomes Measures During Implementation

Providers Submit Aggregate Reports to PCCD via Egrants and Create Final Outcome Report at end of Funding

EPISCENTER Aggregates Data Across Providers by Program and Across Programs Using Common Indicators

Providers Aggregate and Analyze Data using EPISCENTER Excel Tool or Inspire

Aggregate Reports Used to Inform Policy Makers, Funders, Program Developers, and Providers

Annual Survey of Evidence-based Programs Assesses Overall Health of EBP Scale Up

Providers Submit Aggregate Reports to PCCD via Egrants and Create Final Outcome Report at end of Funding

Learning Communities Provide Qualitative Feedback

EPISCENTER Processes Monitored Via Technical Assistance Data Base

Exit Interviews Conducted When Funding Ends
EPISC Center TA tracking

• Collected based on 5 categories
  • Strategic Planning and Outreach
  • Resources development
  • Training
  • Networking & Learning Communities
  • Tailored TA
    • Data collection support
    • Site consultations
    • Program Implementation Plans
    • Implementation barriers

* Currently collected in local Access database
EPISCenter’s Impact: Increasing EBP sustainability and embedding data driven program monitoring

- Over one third of EPISCenter’s work has focused on data collection support.
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EPISC Center’s Impact: Increasing EBP sustainability and embedding data driven program monitoring

- Over one third of EPISC Center’s work has focused on data collection support.

![Pie chart showing the distribution of EPISC Center’s work from 2014-2015]

- Data Collection: 35%
- Tailored TA: 34%
- Resources: 24%
- Networking: 2%
- Fiscal Issues: 2%
- Other: 3%
EBP Data Collection Tools

- Also know as Performance Measure Reporting Tools
- Custom built Excel spreadsheets
- Allow providers to track and get data feedback onsite
- Process and Outcome measures
- Are uploaded quarterly PCCD via Egrants reporting system
EBP Data Collection Tools

- Aggression Replacement Training (ART)
- Big Brother Big Sisters (BBBS)
- Incredible Years (IYS)
- LifeSkills Training (LST)
- Olweus Bullying Prevention Program (OBPP)
- Project Towards No Drug Abuse (TND)
- Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies (PATHS)
- Positive Parenting Program (TripleP)
- Strengthening Families Program 10-14 (SFP 10-14)
- Strong African American Families (SAAF)
- Trauma-Focused Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (TF-CBT)
Excel Tools and INSPIRE empower providers to aggregate and analyze their own data quickly

• In the last fiscal year, 77 providers generated 317 quarterly reports which allowed them to immediately analyze data regarding their impact and quality

• With 99% of providers utilizing standard process and outcome measures, the EPISC can aggregate data across providers and programs
Standard process measures demonstrate **reach** in Pennsylvania.

### Number of Parents Served

- 2011-2012: 551
- 2012-2013: 827
- 2013-2014: 876
- 2014-2015: 963

### Number of Youth Served

- 2011-2012: 12,167
- 2012-2013: 19,520
- 2013-2014: 11,086
- 2014-2015: 6,014

### Number of Participants Served

- Total Served: 6,977
- Youth Served: 6,014
- Adults Served: 963
Standard process measures demonstrate **quality** in Pennsylvania.
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**Percent of Pre-Post Data Collected**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BBBS (192)</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART (324)</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFP (608)</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IYS BASIC (332)</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IYS Advance (10)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IYS Small Group (160)</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IYS Classroom (116)</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATHS (132)</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LST (1402)</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TND (867)</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBPP (310)</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average: 73%

**Percent of Participants Completing Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BBBS (391)</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART (294)</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFP (609)</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IYS BASIC (337)</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IYS Advance (10)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IYS Small Group (169)</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IYS Classroom (85)</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATHS (0)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LST (1525)</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TND (944)</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average: 72%
Simple outcome measures serve as signposts that change of participant change Pre to Post program delivery

**Improved Parental Discipline (SFP 10-14, IY)**

- 2011-2012: 50%
- 2012-2013: 50%
- 2013-2014: 50%
- 2014-2015: 50%

**Improved Knowledge of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Other Drugs**

- 2011-2012: 25%
- 2012-2013: 50%
- 2013-2014: 75%
- 2014-2015: 100%

**Peer Pressure Resistance (LST, SFP 10-14)**

- 2011-2012: 25%
- 2012-2013: 25%
- 2013-2014: 25%
- 2014-2015: 25%

**Improved Academic Performance and/or Related Behaviors**

- 2011-2012: 25%
- 2012-2013: 50%
- 2013-2014: 75%
- 2014-2015: 100%
INSPIRE stands for INtegrated System for Program Implementation and Real-time Evaluation. In simple terms, it is a web-based data-collection and reporting system that allows evidence-based programs to easily collect, store, analyze, and communicate data.

Examples:
- Quarterly Report
- Three Year Report
Grantee Exit Survey

- Program Operation
  - Current operation level
  - Funding sources

- Evaluation
  - Data collection tools
  - Outcomes Report
  - Quality Assurance process

- Networking
  - Process and value

- Overall satisfaction with TA provided by EPISCenter
  - Website, resources, social media

- Program success
Annual Survey of Evidence-based Programs (ASEP)

• Measures the implementation of evidence-based programs (EBP) in the context of a real-world, statewide roll-out of programs.

• Empirically examine grantees’ experiences through the grant funding period and beyond in order to gain an understanding of the process from adoption to maintenance of a program under natural conditions.

• Covers six broad areas:
  • Training, Local Evaluation, Fidelity, Implementation, Sustainability, and Community Coalition Involvement.
Monitoring Impact of TA and Sustainability of EBPs

• Exit Interviews
  • 90% of grantees at the conclusion of their grant indicated that they would continue their programs post funding.
  • 74% (n=98) of grantees report an intention to continue evaluation activities after PCCD seed funding ends.

• Annual Survey of Evidence-based Programs
  • 83% of providers presented or planed to present outcome data to community stakeholders as part of a sustainability plan.
Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol (SPEP)

- Track process data in Excel workbooks
  - Who, where, and how many
  - SPEP service groups and service types
  - Community vs Residential based
- SPEP scores are also tracked in Excel
  - Aggregate report of scores is shared
  - Specific scores and Performance Improvement Plan shared with local stakeholders
SPEP Data Examples

Number of Services Reviewed by Service Type

- TBD: 2
- SOCIAL SKILLS TRAINING: 4
- RESTITUTION; COMMUNITY SERVICE: 1
- REMEDIAL ACADEMIC PROGRAM: 6
- N/A: 3
- MIXED COUNSELING: 2
- MENTORING: 8
- MEDIATION: 2
- JOB RELATED TRAINING: 3
- INDIVIDUAL COUNSELING: 10
- GROUP COUNSELING: 12
- FAMILY CRISIS: 1
- FAMILY COUNSELING: 10
- COGNITIVE-BEHAVIORAL THERAPY: 16
- CHALLENGE PROGRAMS: 7
- BEHAVIORAL CONTRACTING; CONTINGENCY: N/A
SPEP Data Examples

Number and Percent of Services Scoring 50 or more

- 16, 30%
- 37, 70%

Quality of Service Delivery

- Count of Services
- Low: 4
- Med: 17
- High: 32

Count of Services by % of Youth Receiving Recommended Duration

- 0-19%: 12
- 20-39%: 16
- 40-59%: 9
- 60-79%: 11
- 80-99%: 2
- 99-100%: 3

Count of Services by % of Youth Receiving Recommended Dosage

- 0-19%: 16
- 20-39%: 11
- 40-59%: 8
- 60-79%: 5
- 80-99%: 8
- 99-100%: 5

% of Youth Receiving Recommended Targets

Svcs >= 50
Svcs < 50
CTC Data Collection

• Communities That Care
  • CTC Performance Measures Reporting Tool
    • Tracks process and community board membership
  • Milestones and Benchmarks Tool
    • Developed by Social Development Research Group (SDRG)
    • Used to guide coalitions through 5 phase process
• Monthly Phone Contact Survey
  • Online survey completed monthly by coalitions
  • Drive discussion during monthly phone consultations

* Tools being used by 21 newly funded CTCs
CTC Data: Board Sector Representation

PCCD Grant funded CTCs Reported Sectors as of December 2015

- Schools (147)
  - Primary: 143
  - Secondary: 4
- Youth-serving orgs. (111)
  - Primary: 88
  - Secondary: 23
- Other Orgs. Involved in Social Services (97)
  - Primary: 83
  - Secondary: 14
- State & Local Social Service Agencies (95)
  - Primary: 89
  - Secondary: 6
- Civic & Volunteer Groups (71)
  - Primary: 40
  - Secondary: 31
- Parents (65)
  - Primary: 42
  - Secondary: 23
- Religious & fraternal Orgs. (51)
  - Primary: 44
  - Secondary: 7
- Law Enforcement (49)
  - Primary: 49
- Businesses (37)
  - Primary: 31
  - Secondary: 6
- Healthcare Professionals (33)
  - Primary: 31
  - Secondary: 2
- Youth (25)
  - Primary: 21
  - Secondary: 4
- Media (8)
  - Primary: 8
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CTC Data: Implementation Progress

CTC Milestones & Benchmarks Progress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Qtr1</th>
<th>Qtr2</th>
<th>Qtr3</th>
<th>Qtr4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planners</strong></td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementers</strong></td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALL</strong></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Connecting Data to Stakeholders

- **Evidence-based Programs**
  - Outcomes Report
  - Community/Coalition Report

- **Community Coalitions**
  - PAYS workbook
  - PAYS Guide

- **Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol**
  - Utilized by stakeholders within the county
A conservative estimate shows the return on PCCD’s investment is over **$38 million** across seven programs in FY 2014-15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>PCCD Cost per Participant</th>
<th>Benefit per Participant</th>
<th>Benefit Minus Cost</th>
<th>Participants Served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggression Replacement Training</td>
<td>$1,145</td>
<td>$16,137</td>
<td>$14,992</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Brothers Big Sisters</td>
<td>$2,050</td>
<td>$12,048</td>
<td>$9,998</td>
<td>1,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LifeSkills Training</td>
<td>$328</td>
<td>$1,298</td>
<td>$970</td>
<td>4,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Towards No Drug Abuse</td>
<td>$77</td>
<td>$496</td>
<td>$419</td>
<td>2,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies</td>
<td>$233</td>
<td>$5,543</td>
<td>$5,310</td>
<td>2,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening Families Program: For Parents &amp; Youth 10-14***</td>
<td>$1,902</td>
<td>$4,008</td>
<td>$2,106</td>
<td>1,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Incredible Years (parent only)***</td>
<td>$5,552</td>
<td>$1,639</td>
<td>($3,913)</td>
<td>666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,613</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>12,344</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* PCCD costs based on actual grantee budget expenditures for two-year grants awarded in FYs 2010, 2011, 2012
** Benefits estimates are drawn from the Washington State Institute of Public Policy (WSIPP)
*** WSIPP cost-benefit based on Parent Program for IYS and youth served for SFP
What’s Next?

• New database will link EPISCenter’s technical assistance process data with community level indicators and data from EBP implementations

• Why?
  • Build additional Evidence of Public Health Impact
  • Determine what kind of technical assistance has the greatest impact
  • Increase the efficiency of the EPISCenter and inform the translational science knowledge base
THANK YOU!

The EPISCenter is a collaborative partnership between the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency (PCCD), the Pennsylvania Department of Human Services (DHS), and the Bennett Pierce Prevention Research Center, College of Health and Human Development, Penn State University. The EPISCenter is funded by DHS and PCCD. This resource was developed by the EPISCenter through PCCD grant VP-ST-24368.
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