Phase II. Outcome Evaluation Plan for the Community Crisis Intervention Program

Submitted to:

Managing Director's Office
City of Philadelphia

Tumar Alexander, Managing Director

Erica Atwood, Senior Director
Office of Policy and Strategic Initiatives for
Criminal Justice and Public Safety

Shondell Revell, Director
Office of Violence Prevention

AUGUST 2022

Submitted by:

American Institutes for Research

Patricia Campie, Ph.D.
Principal Researcher

AIR®
Advancing Evidence.
Improving Lives.

Table of Contents

Exhibits

Project Background

The City of Philadelphia selected the American Institutes for Research (AIR) to conduct a two-phase evaluation of the Community Crisis Intervention Program (CCIP). Phase I took place over a 12-month period, where AIR completed 1) an evaluability assessment of CCIP to determine which outcome/impact evaluation model may be best suited for the program, and 2) a process evaluation to explore how the program operates. Results from the evaluability assessment and process evaluation generated the following recommendations.

Recommendation 1: Implement a retrospective outcome evaluation that examines outcomes from CCIP's last 12 months of individual referrals, from June 1, 2021, through May 30, 2022. The outcome evaluation would assess the quality and expediency of the referral process itself, the recipient's experience with the referral process and how it has impacted their well-being (including norms of violence or actual engagement in violence), and the extent to which different parts of the city or different populations experience differential outcomes due to cultural, linguistic, or other barriers to service.

Recommendation 2: Use results from the outcome evaluation to fine-tune the CCIP theory of change and develop a staff training, implementation, and continuous quality improvement process that truly reflects this theory of change. Once this theory of change and implementation process is in place, an impact study can be reconsidered.

Recommendation 3: Produce a community crisis needs gap and cost analysis that allows PAAN and OVP to determine the nature, scope, and dollar amount of resources/services requested and provided through referrals to individuals over the 12-month period, and how well the resources provided match the level of need in referral requests.

Recommendation 4: Strengthen CCIP capacity to use the large amount of data it collects by identifying ways to streamline, coordinate, and automate the process for documenting, tracking, analyzing, and reporting on CCIP program processes and outcomes, including referrals to other PAAN programs and departments. These improvements will lead to more useful and accurate reports to OVP and outward-facing stakeholders, while producing digestible information internally at shift meetings and other meetings to acknowledge the work staff do, identify areas of innovation, and opportunities for learning and improvement.

Recommendation 5: Consider a structural change to how CCIP is organized, by identifying a person to serve as program director, and making that role responsible for 1) staff hiring, training, development, and retention, 2) implementation quality, and 3) using data and

information to report out on CCIP operations and what outcomes CCIP is producing. PAAN not having autonomy as its own 501(c)(3) potentially limits the ability to create this type of sustainable management structure for CCIP, so a broader organizational assessment might be needed to determine the best way to proceed on this front.

This document presents a draft plan and related cost estimate for Phase II of the project: 1) conducting an outcome evaluation of CCIP; 2) using results to create an updated theory of change and continuous quality improvement tool to guide implementation; 3) producing a community crisis needs and gaps cost analysis; 4) identifying ways to streamline, coordinate, and automate the process to document, track, analyze, and report on CCIP program processes and outcomes, including referrals to other PAAN programs and departments; and 5) preparing CCIP and PAAN for an impact evaluation of long-term program outcomes.

A. Outcome Evaluation Plan

A retrospective outcome evaluation design will be used to examine outcomes from CCIP's last 12 months of individual referrals, from June 1, 2021, through May 30, 2022. The outcome evaluation will:

1. Assess the quality and expediency of the referral process itself—according to referral service type and location (in contrast to where gun violence was occurring)

2. Examine each recipient's experience with the referral process and the extent to which their needs were met in a safe, timely, and complete manner

3. Measure the way referrals affected self-reported physical, social, and emotional well-being, including norms of violence or actual engagement in violence

4. Determine the extent to which different parts of the city or populations experienced different outcomes due to physical, social, cultural, or linguistic barriers to service.

Methods

Sample Selection: The evaluation team will work closely with PAAN to identify the referral sample. Inclusion in the sample will require that the following conditions be met:

1. Referral was made within the 12-month period from June 1, 2021, through May 31, 2022;

2. PAAN's referral documentation includes all key information for the referral, including individual contact information, the date and nature of the referral, and the outcome or status of the referral—from PAAN's perspective; and,

3. Evaluators have access to the person(s) for the purpose of consent and enrollment in the study. This means that individuals who are hospitalized, incarcerated, living out of state, or deceased when the sample is formed will not be eligible to participate.

If a participant is under the age of 18 at the time of the study, parental consent will be sought. No individuals will be enrolled in the study until the AIR Institutional Review Board (IRB) approves all study protocols and individuals provide consent to be in the study. While the evaluators will have the names of individuals for the purpose of contact and consent, the data collected from individuals will not include their name and no names will be used in the analysis or reporting of results. A unique identifier will be used to match the study results back to the PAAN records, so that researchers can connect study data with referral data without relying on personal names to make that connection. We will attempt to enroll up to 500 individuals in the study, each of whom represents a unique referral to PAAN through CCIP. Since CCIP serves a broad range of neighborhoods and police districts in Philadelphia, it will be important to take as inclusive an approach as possible when constructing the sample for the study, so that we can see how the referral process and the outcomes it produces are felt across different populations and neighborhoods.

Interviews: Interview questions will focus specifically on the aims of the evaluation. The interview will be designed to take no more than 15 minutes to complete, to reduce burden on participants. At the start of the interview the evaluator will reference a specific referral request and date to provide the participant with a memory clue that elicits more accurate recall of their experience. Questions will ask about CCIP/PAAN experiences as well as those with external service providers with whom CCIP/PAAN might be working to deliver services. We will ask demographic questions to identify race; ethnicity; gender; age; and language preferences; as well as housing; employment; health; and education status; and prior experience with police, with violence, and as victims, bystanders, or producers. CCIP/PAAN-specific questions could include the following (Exhibit 1):

Exhibit 1. Sample Interview Questions Aligned With Evaluation Aims

Evaluation Aims	Example Questions (not exhaustive)
Assess the quality and expediency of the referral process itself—according to referral service type and location (in contrast to where gun violence was occurring)	What type of help were you hoping to receive through CCIP/PAAN? What type of help did you receive through CCIP/PAAN?
Examine the recipient's experience with the referral process and the extent to which their needs were met in a safe, timely, and complete manner	What did CCIP/PAAN staff do to help you feel safe when working with you? How quickly did CCIP/PAAN contact you to provide help after you requested this referral?

Evaluation Aims	Example Questions (not exhaustive)
Measure the manner in which referrals affected self-reported physical, social, and emotional well-being, including norms of violence or actual engagement in violence	How well were your needs met by CCIP/PAAN? Are you better off now after working with CCIP/PAAN than you were before you met them?
Determine the extent to which different parts of the city or different populations experienced differential outcomes due to physical, social, cultural, or linguistic barriers to service	Did you have any challenges trying to access the services that CCIP/PAAN tried to provide? To what extent were your culture, gender, race, or other individual characteristics respected by those who provided help to you through CCIP/PAAN?

During the study enrollment process participants will be given three different options to complete an interview for the evaluation, so each person can choose a method that works best for their circumstances and preferences. The interview tool will be available for PAAN to use after the study is over, should PAAN wish to use the tool on an ongoing basis to track and improve performance.

- **In-person interview**: This option will involve the evaluator working with the participant to identify a public location to meet for the interview. If PAAN is willing to share its space for the purpose of these interviews, we will offer that location as an option to participants. The evaluator will use a tablet device to read the interview questions and record responses. Interview questions will be designed like survey items, using short, direct questions with different answer options, including open-ended comment opportunities. Gift card incentives will be distributed immediately after the interview ends.

- **Telephone interview**: This option will involve the evaluator calling the participant at a specific date and time (using a number than can also receive text messages) to provide a reminder of the session. The evaluator will use a tablet device to read the interview questions and record responses. Interview questions will be designed like survey items, using short, direct questions with different answer options, including commentary. Gift card incentives will either be distributed in electronic format and sent to the participant's phone or email address immediately following the interview, or a physical card will be mailed to the participant using an address of their choosing within a week of the interview.

- **Online interview**: This option will involve the evaluator sending the participant a link to an online survey-style interview tool that is identical to the in-person and telephone interview tools, using a unique access code provided by the evaluator to link the responses to information collected from the referral paperwork at PAAN. Participants will need to provide either a working email address or mobile telephone number that can receive text messages in order to select the online survey option. Gift card incentives will either be

distributed in electronic format and sent to the participant's phone or email address immediately following the interview, or a physical card will be mailed to the participant using an address of their choosing within a week of the interview.

Each participant who completes an interview will receive a $25 Visa gift card to use at their discretion. We will budget up to 500 $25 gift cards to ensure no one is denied compensation for their participation. Regardless of incentive type, all incentives will be logged in the gift card tracking spreadsheet maintained by the evaluator for accounting purposes.

Document Review: The evaluator will work with PAAN to identify and collect all CCIP-generated referrals created during the study period of June 1, 2021, through May 31, 2022. These documents will be analyzed for key data points to crosswalk with interview results, such as date of referral, type of referral requested, external referral partners, follow-up contact with participants, any challenges that arose, and referral outcomes. The result of this analysis will be an electronic workbook that contains data from every referral included in the study. The workbook will then be merged with the interview data files, so that interview responses are matched to the correct referral. Once matching occurs, the combined data set will be transferred to statistical software for analysis to answer the evaluation questions. The electronic referral workbook with interview data matched to referral case will remain with PAAN as a tool they can use to automate their referral tracking process.

Analysis and Reporting

The four evaluation questions will be answered through an analysis of the matched interview and referral documentation data. In addition to answering each evaluation question, the evaluator will produce a summary of the referral and interview data using descriptive statistics of each quantitative item (e.g., counts, percentages) and thematic analysis of qualitative/open-ended items. For example:

- Number of referrals for employment services
- Percentage of referrals made for employment services
- Participant commentary on the process or outcomes associated with employment referrals

The referral and interview data will also be analyzed according to demographic characteristics, including past experiences with violence, such as:

- Number of referrals for employment services among those victimized by violence
- Percentage of referrals made for employment services among Blacks, Latinos, Asians, and Whites

- Participant commentary on the process or outcomes associated with employment referrals based on location where individuals lived at the time of the referral.

Preliminary results will be shared with CCIP/PAAN before delivering to OVP to ensure that the evaluators have not misunderstood or misrepresented any of the referral documentation used in the analysis. Once CCIP/PAAN offers feedback, the study results will be finalized and reported to OVP in whatever format(s) are requested (e.g., executive summary, full report, PowerPoint, infographic).

B. Theory of Change Update and Continuous Quality Improvement Plan

Once we have the results from the retrospective outcome evaluation and understand the positive outcomes that are most likely to result from CCIP referrals, we will use the information to guide CCIP and PAAN leadership through a process to update the CCIP theory of change as it relates to the outreach and referral component of the program, which is the most frequently used aspect of the CCIP model. In the process, we will work with CCIP/PAAN to develop a continuous quality improvement (CQI) plan that supports consistent implementation of outreach and referral activities, both within CCIP and outside of CCIP within the other PAAN departments that receive referrals from CCIP. Where possible, we will include implementation supports that enhance the quality and consistency of referral practices that fall outside of PAAN, with external agencies and individuals, since their performance may ultimately impact evaluation outcomes attributed to CCIP/PAAN. The CQI plan will include a logic model that describes the core program activities that must be implemented to achieve the results in the theory of change, as well as the indicators to monitor on a continual basis to understand the extent to which outcomes are being met.

The CQI plan will be developed largely by CCIP/PAAN with consultation support from the evaluator, who will provide a process (toolkit) for CCIP/PAAN to use. It is important that CCIP/PAAN take a strong leadership role, across all levels of staff, to develop the CQI plan, or it will not be useful or integrated within day-to-day practice of CCIP or the broader organization. The process the evaluator will use will include:

- An all-staff learning session on evidence-based practices to reduce community-based violence

- An all-staff learning session on theories of change, implementation quality, and flexible fidelity for producing consistent outcomes aligned with a program's theory of change

- An all-staff learning session reviewing the outcomes of the outcome evaluation in the context of the current theory of change to identify areas to add, remove, expand, or reduce

- Development of a Learning and Improvement Leadership (LIL) team, composed of 6–8 staff representing all levels of the program and organization, who will develop the CQI plan

  - A LIL team learning session on CQI best practices

  - A LIL team learning session to review the toolkit they will use to develop the CQI plan

  - A LIL team series of workshopping sessions to operationalize the theory of change within the CQI plan

- Other learning/workshop sessions that may add value (TBD)

C. Community Crisis Needs and Gaps Cost Analysis

The outcome evaluation will also produce information that will allow us to determine the nature, scope, and dollar amount of resources/services requested and provided through referrals to individuals over the 12-month period, and how well these provided resources match the needs within the referral requests. To calculate the cost of services provided, we will request financial information from PAAN and any external agencies that may have provided services in response to a referral from CCIP. Where this information is not available or the request is refused, we will use publicly available sources and prior research to create a reliable estimate of the costs. In documenting the costs, we will attempt to identify the intermediate costs of providing the service as well as the source of funding that bears the cost of the service in question. For example, if there were a referral related to relocation services after a shooting, we would aim to capture costs of the relocation itself (e.g., new housing, moving service) that may be made possible through local, state, federal, or private funding resources, as well as costs borne by those fulfilling the referral (e.g., district attorney's office) and funding sources (type) supporting this work. The overall product from this analysis will be a needs and gaps map that visualizes the amount of need represented in the referrals against the amount of service delivered within the context of available dollars and funding sources. This information can be used by PAAN, OVP, and other stakeholders to explore strategies that close the service and funding gaps, so that the universe of community need in relation to community violence addressed by CCIP/PAAN can be better met.

D. Streamline, Coordinate, and Automate Paper-Driven Reporting Processes

CCIP and PAAN staff collect and report on a large amount of data. However, most of this information is paper based, which is time consuming for staff to produce, limits the ability to easily share the information internally or with external stakeholders, and makes it difficult to identify trends or insights that can be used to track project outcomes, recognize staff accomplishments, identify areas of innovation, and seize opportunities for learning and improvement. To help CCIP make the most of the information it collects, the evaluator will work with PAAN to create an inventory of each paper-based or virtual reporting/data collection tool (including the Survey123 app). The inventory will identify the name of the tool, its purpose, who must use the tool, how often the tool is used, what is done with information from the tool, whether or not the tool is required through funding or other requirements, and any other relevant facts about the tool. Once the inventory is in hand, the evaluator will convene a working session with staff who use the tools in question to present the inventory and explore ways to streamline, coordinate, and automate practices. The evaluator will prepare a summary memo of the inventory, staff feedback on suggested improvements, and recommendations for action, and present this information to PAAN leadership and the LIL team to determine how to proceed. The evaluator will be ready to work with PAAN and CCIP to implement the recommended changes, within the resources available in the evaluation budget. If costs exceed what the evaluator can provide through the current contract or what PAAN or OVP can provide to the effort, the evaluator will identify external funding or donated resources to consider.

E. Prepare CCIP for Impact Evaluation

The three factors keeping CCIP from being ready for an impact evaluation are 1) needing an updated theory of change that aligns with actual program practices, 2) showing consistency in the way the program model is implemented, and 3) having a programmatic infrastructure that supports evidence-based practice. Factors 1 and 2 will be addressed through the activities described in this plan. To address the third factor, PAAN as an organization will need to reflect on and assess its own readiness to restructure itself and the CCIP program in the process. To some extent, the data infrastructure that will be needed to support an impact study will be partially developed through the data collection inventory, streamlining, and coordination process just described. However, if automated tools do not result from that process, whereby specific activities are tracked in relation to specific people in the community, an impact study

will be more difficult to execute and could produce unreliable results. The Survey123 app is a potential doorway into some of this automation, but the process evaluation indicated that the tool is not used in a consistent manner among the subset of staff who use the tool.

Some of the other evidence-based-practice infrastructure changes do not require a large shift in practice or structure, such as creating a CCIP program director to be the glue that holds the various pieces of CCIP in place and can ensure that staff are supported, trained, and held accountable to the purpose and process of the program. But this position will come at a cost that may not be feasible in the current CCIP budget without cutting costs in another area of the program. The evaluator will be ready to work with PAAN to explore the creation of this position, what resources are required, and how to integrate it within the existing CCIP structure, so that the director is set up for success from the start. It is also likely that the outcome evaluation results will indicate the need for a case management function within CCIP, to serve as the connective tissue between the referral process and resolution of the needs that CCIP staff are trying to address through the referral process. Right now, some advocates work informally as case managers to follow up with community members, but there is no formal process, structure, training, or compensation within CCIP to ensure that case management is done in a manner consistent with best practices and in a way that is more likely to result in successful outcomes. If a case management function is needed, the evaluator will be poised to help PAAN and CCIP strategize on how best to restructure the program to benefit from this new function, and what resources will be needed to support and sustain the position.

Finally, the organizational status of PAAN being dependent on another organization (UAC) to manage core organizational functions such as finance, contracts, and human resources severely limits PAAN's ability to grow and develop in ways that will support the growth and development of CCIP as an evidence-based program. If staff hiring, compensation, development, and performance reviews cannot be conducted by PAAN because the HR function exists outside of PAAN, CCIP will continue to suffer from complaints that the "wrong" staff are being hired, compensation is too low, there is little attention paid to staff development or training, and there is no accountability for poor performance—all of which then affects the morale of those performing at a high level, and can lead to staff turnover. If PAAN wants to explore a change in organizational status, the evaluator is willing to help PAAN work with its board to explore the issue and determine the feasibility of becoming independent.

CCIP Outcome Evaluation Plan

F. Timeline Estimate

The time to complete activities A through E is planned with a minimum–maximum approach, where the minimum time assumes no substantial barriers are slowing down the work (e.g., contract delays, access to people or information), and the maximum time accounts for overcoming any substantial challenges that might arise. Most activities are sequential, one building off the other beginning with the outcome evaluation, but activity D could be a standalone activity occurring at any point in the project timeline.

Exhibit 2. Timeline for Executing Outcome Evaluation Plan Activities

15 to 24 months

A. Retrospective Outcome Evaluation	B. TOC Update and CQI Plan	C. Community Crisis Needs and Gaps Analysis	D. Streamline, Coordinate, and Automate Reporting	E. Prepare PAAN/CCIP for Impact Evaluation
9 to 12 months to complete all activities and produce draft report, once adequate funding is in place.	**3 to 6 months** to complete all activities once the outcome evaluation is done.	**2 to 4 months** to complete all activities once the outcome evaluation is done.	**1 to 2 months** to complete all activities, independent of the outcome evaluation.	**TBD** depending on what infrastructure changes PAAN decides to make.

.

About the American Institutes for Research

Established in 1946, with headquarters in Arlington, Virginia, the American Institutes for Research® (AIR®) is a nonpartisan, not-for-profit organization that conducts behavioral and social science research and delivers technical assistance to solve some of the most urgent challenges in the U.S. and around the world. We advance evidence in the areas of education, health, the workforce, human services, and international development to create a better, more equitable world. The AIR family of organizations now includes IMPAQ, Maher & Maher, and Kimetrica. For more information, visit AIR.ORG.

AIR® Headquarters
1400 Crystal Drive, 10th Floor
Arlington, VA 22202-3289
+1.202.403.5000 | **AIR.ORG**