EFFECTIVE EVALUATION METHODS AND STRATEGIES: HOW TO DO IT RIGHT
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DEFINITION OF EVALUATION

- 5 key elements
  - Systematic assessment
    - formality and rigor required
  - Operations
    - fidelity and implementation of program
  - Outcomes
    - effects of program on intended beneficiaries
  - Standards for comparison
    - assess merit versus expectations
  - Contribution to improvement of program and policy
    - use results to take informed action
LIST OF SOME KEY TERMS IN EVALS

- **Fidelity** - quality of implementation of program
- **Outcomes** - measures that define success for program
- **Process** - steps the organizations goes through for implementation
- **Objectives** - small observable and measurable actions or points taken toward overall goals
- **Goals** - overarching purpose that guides and informs process and programmatic direction
- **Evidence-based** - approaches that allow practitioner to critically assess research data, clinical guidelines, and other information resources in order to
  1. correctly identify the problem,
  2. apply the most high quality intervention, and
  3. reevaluate the outcome for future improvement
Program evaluation - investigation that seeks to assess the quality of the daily processes and delivery of services of the program to the targeted population.

Outcome evaluation - investigation that seeks to determine and measure efficacy and efficiency of program goals after the services have been delivered to the targeted population.

- Outcome evals may look at either short- or long-term effects on participants or recipients.

Cost benefit evaluation/analysis - Quantifies the value of program services and/or outcomes to give a monetary estimate of benefit to participants as well as related domains (e.g., social service costs, criminal justice-related processing costs, employment earnings, savings to municipalities).
Project with the Baltimore County Local Management Board and Baltimore County area schools

Combines structured components shown effective in other settings:

- Structured tutoring
- All Stars prevention curriculum
- Positive reinforcement of attendance

Rigorously tests effects on academic outcomes and related student behaviors

Funded by the Institute of Education Sciences (IES) of the U.S. Department of Education
EXEMPLARY 1: PROGRAM EVALUATION

- Excerpts from The Baltimore County Middle School After School Collaboration Project
- 30 weeks of programming consisting of 9 hours per week (3 days per week, 3 hours per day) during the 2006-2007 school year
- 5 schools in Baltimore County will participate
- 500 students (approximately 100 from each site) will be randomly assigned to either the enhanced After School Program (ASP) or no program
GOALS AND EXPECTATIONS OF ASP’S

- Improve student academic performance
- Improve related student behaviors
  - School attendance
  - Substance use (-)
  - School conduct
  - Social skills
  - Attitudes unfavorable to substance use
  - Educational plans and aspirations
  - Commitment to academics/Studying behavior
- Provide supervision during after school hours
RESEARCH PARTNERS

- University of Maryland, Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice (UMD) – conducts the research
- Baltimore County Local Management Board (LMB) – facilitates entry in Baltimore County Public Schools, oversees program implementation
- Baltimore County Department of Recreation and Parks (BCRP) – day-to-day operation in 5 sites
- Baltimore County Public Schools (BCPS) – hosts sites, provides students and staff, cooperates with data collection, coordinates with all partners
- Bonham Associates – provides local data collection
This is an example of flow chart of partners involved.

Data collected at all levels to observe program process outcomes.
“Paired Tutoring” methods developed by Keith Topping (Topping, 2001; Topping and Bamford, 1998)

- 1.5 hours of one-on-one tutoring per week, for each student
- Diagnostic test identifies deficiencies
- Tutoring provided in reading, math, or both
- Tutors from local high schools and the community
- Group leader at each site supervises
- Tutor coordinator oversees
OUTCOMES TARGETED BY STRUCTURED TUTORING

- Educational plans and aspirations
- School grades
- Promotion to the next grade
- Standardized test scores
Students will be randomized into either the enhanced ASP program (treatment group) or to a group receiving only minimal recreational services once per month (control) (see diagram for randomization).

- Control youths will be treated and measured in the same way as treatment youths.
- The schools involved in the study do not currently have ASP's.
- High demand for programs results in higher numbers of interested families than can be served.
- Randomization is a fair way to distribute scarce resources.
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WHAT IS BEING MEASURED?

- The amount and quality of ASP programming received (process data, observations and youth surveys)
- Summary of after school time expenditure (youth surveys)
- Intermediate outcomes
- Academic and behavioral outcomes
## RESEARCH DESIGN

### MEASURES AND OUTCOMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Records</td>
<td>Attendance, grades, promotion, achievement test scores, discipline records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Rating Form</td>
<td>Social competency, effectence motivation, expectancy of success, academic competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Registration Form</td>
<td>Basic demographic information and tracking information for those who withdraw from school; family demographic information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Survey</td>
<td>Demographics, classroom behavior, aggression, delinquent behavior, victimization, substance use, drug attitudes, drug resistance, impulsiveness, normative beliefs about violence, peer influence, self-reported grades, attachment to school, belief in conventional rules, commitment to education, studying behavior, goal setting, decision making skills, parental monitoring, after school time expenditure, ASP liking, friendship networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Experiences Survey (YES)</td>
<td>Youth activities and experiences during the after school hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Information System (MIS)</td>
<td>Student information, staff information, staff attendance, tutor information, school attendance, ASP attendance, tutoring session checklist, daily activity log, lesson plan codes, All Stars program contents, All Stars session checklist, attendance incentive points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>Number of youths and adults present, variety of activities offered, numbers of minutes spent on each activity, level of youth engagement in each activity, fidelity of the peer tutoring and social skills components, level of youth reinforcement for deviant behavior</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Youth Experiences Survey (YES) Version 2.0

**Instructions:** Based on your *current* or *recent* involvement, please rate whether you have had the following experiences in the *activity that you circled on the first page.*

Your experiences in: ________________________________

For each answer, please fill in marks like this:  ●  not like this:  ❌  ○  ✅

This survey measured youth experiences with ASP across range of domains and constructs—identity, initiative, skills, relationships, teamwork, networks, and negative experiences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IDENTITY EXPERIENCES</th>
<th>Yes, Definitely</th>
<th>Quite a Bit</th>
<th>A Little</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identity Exploration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Tried doing new things</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Tried a new way of acting around people</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I do things here I don’t get to do anywhere else</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NOTE: Pre-test/post-test design*
### Example of Measurement: Youth Experiences Survey

**Likert 4-point scale from yes definitely to not at all also used here**

#### Goal Setting

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I set goals for myself in this activity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Learned to find ways to achieve my goals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Learned to consider possible obstacles when making plans</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Effort

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I put all my energy into this activity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Learned to push myself</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Learned to focus my attention</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXAMPLE OF MEASUREMENT: YOUTH EXPERIENCES SURVEY

BASIC SKILLS

Emotional Regulation

19. Learned about controlling my temper
   0 0 0 0

20. Became better at dealing with fear and anxiety
   0 0 0 0

21. Became better at handling stress
   0 0 0 0

22. Learned that my emotions affect how I perform
   0 0 0 0

©2003  University of Illinois Youth Development Research Project
EXAMPLE 2: OUTCOME EVALUATION

- Judge Roberto Canas, Dallas County Court 10 requested independent evaluation by Dr. Boots in early 2010 of misdemeanor domestic violence court outcomes for all defendants who went through court in 2007 and were adjudicated.

- Wanted to know if new policies and Batterer Intervention and Prevention Program treatment reduced offender recidivism and future acts of family violence for defendants processed through County Court 10.
  - Critical assessment of the efficacy of domestic violence batterer treatment versus all other potential outcomes in the court.
    - Compared to jail time, probation only, conditional dismissals, etc.
    - NOT a program assessment but a comparison of justice-involved outcomes for persons who went through BIPP versus all other types of sentencing in County Court 10.
  - Not concerned with an individual offender but looking at a summary of all offenders in each group.
  - This study is about to go to peer-review and is not available for distribution yet.
  - If interested in more info, contact Dr. Boots summer 2014.
RESEARCH QUESTIONS

“Does treatment have a positive effect in reducing recidivism in DV offenders over time?”

- H1: Treatment will reduce all recidivism arrests in the 12-month period following the last date of involvement in the criminal justice system for the original DV-related arrest.
- H2: Treatment will reduce DV recidivism arrests in the 12-month period following the last date of involvement in the criminal justice system for the original DV-related arrest.
- H3: Offenders who received conditional dismissals will have less recidivism arrest(s) than offenders who plead guilty to DV and went through BIPP treatment.

Notice definitive time period for evaluation
Data and Methods

Note important decisions about exclusion of cases, collapsing data, missing data, looking across different data sources to get complete record, and rigor of data collection to have large sample sizes.

- Data were collected between **February-September 2010**
  - Cases were officially disposed in 1st year of judge being on bench
  - Transitory time and he inherited cases in process
  - Cases files disposed between January 1st and December 31st, 2007
  - Final sample included a grand total of 2,815 original cases, of which 421 were 2nd to 5th repeat arrests for same offender already in process in County Court 10 – excluded these cases

- Collected information first on **total population of all dismissed cases (N = 2,394)**

- **Representative sample** drawn from original 12 groups into 9 groups
  - 50 of each of 9 groups- except entire 16 trial group included \( n = 415 \) (one offender in 5-year dismissal group could not be replaced and 4 files were not able to be located)
  - Sampling strategy allowed for **weighting of data** in analyses to reflect the original distribution of group cases
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Final Group #</th>
<th>Original Group #</th>
<th>Group Name</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>BIPP Conditional Dismissals</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Other Conditional Dismissals</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Regular Dismissals</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5-year Dismissals</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Plea- Completed BIPP</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Plea- Did Not Complete BIPP</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Plea- Uncertain BIPP Outcome</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Plea- Deferred Adjudication</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Plea- Fine Only</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Plea- Jail</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>excluded</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Trial—All Sentences</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1: Residential Locations for DV in Dallas County by gender across census tracts.

*In 2008, this county accounted for 8 percent of DV-related casualties in Texas*
FIGURE 2: CONCENTRATION OF DV ARREST BY ZIP CODE ACROSS DALLAS COUNTY.

Distribution of Residential Locations for Domestic Violence Unique Offenders for 2007 in County within Zip Code Boundaries (n=2,240)
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FIGURE 3: CONCENTRATION OF DV ARREST BY ZIP CODE ACROSS DALLAS COUNTY.

Residential Locations for Domestic Violence Unique Offenders for 2007 within Zip Boundaries by Gender (n=2,240)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Final Group #</th>
<th>Original Group #</th>
<th>Group Name</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Concentrated Disadvantage</th>
<th>Residential Mobility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>BIPP Conditional Dismissals</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Other Conditional Dismissals</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Regular Dismissals</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5-year Dismissals</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Plea- Completed BIPP</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Plea- Did Not Complete BIPP</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Plea- Uncertain BIPP Outcome</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Plea- Deferred Adjudication</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Plea- Fine Only</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Plea- Jail</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>excluded</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Trial—All Sentences</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEASURES

- **Dependent Variables**
  - Recidivism arrests w/in 12-month follow-up period
  - Recidivism DV arrests w/in 12-month follow-up period
  - Measured 1 year from last date of involvement in court system for DV offense
  - Used NCIC/state database arrest data

- **Independent Variables**
  - Socio-demographics: race (White, Non-White), gender, DOB
  - Age of first arrest, DV arrest statute and charge, case disposition, number of prior arrests/charges/DV charges, number of post-recidivism arrests/charges/DV charges, address, victim’s gender, cohabitation, substance abuse, alcohol involvement (Y/N)
### Table 4: H1--DV Court Group Disposition for Treatment by Recidivism Arrests for Weighted Sample (N = 2,365).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group:</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>1,038 (52.5%)</td>
<td>74 (22.2%)</td>
<td>29 (51.8%)</td>
<td>1,141 (48.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Treatment</td>
<td>508 (25.7%)</td>
<td>82 (24.6%)</td>
<td>2 (3.6%)</td>
<td>592 (25.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jail</td>
<td>430 (21.8%)</td>
<td>177 (53.2%)</td>
<td>25 (44.6%)</td>
<td>632 (26.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*χ² [4, n = 2,365] = 177.077, p < 0.001. Trial cases were excluded from the sample for analyses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1+</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Statistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-White</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>149 (12.2%)</td>
<td><strong>32 (26.4%)</strong></td>
<td>181 (13.5%)</td>
<td>$\chi^2[1, \ n = 1,340] = 19.060, \ p &lt; 0.001$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1,070 (87.8%)</td>
<td>89 (73.6%)</td>
<td>1,159 (86.5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,219 (100.0%)</td>
<td>121 (100.0%)</td>
<td>1,340 (100.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>138 (13.8%)</td>
<td><strong>0 (0.0%)</strong></td>
<td>138 (13.3%)</td>
<td>$\chi^2[1, \ n = 1,041] = 6.855, \ p = 0.009$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>860 (86.2%)</td>
<td>43 (100.0%)</td>
<td>903 (86.7%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>998 (100.0%)</td>
<td>43 (100.0%)</td>
<td>1,041 (100.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 6: H3—RECIDIVISM ARRESTS BY GROUP DISPOSITION (N = 2,364).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Number:</th>
<th>Number of Recidivism Arrests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>386 (19.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Conditional Dismissals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>331 (16.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Regular Dismissals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>652 (33.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Plea to BIPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>176 (8.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Plea Deferred Adjudication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>430 (21.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Jail Plea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1,975 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \chi^2 [8, n = 2,364] = 181.982, p < 0.001 \). Trial cases were excluded from the sample for analyses.
Overall, offenders who participated in BIPP treatment programs have more favorable outcomes (arrests, charges and FV incidents) 12 months after the date of last involvement in the DV court, compared to jail and dismissal regular, but not plea deferred or dismissal conditional cases.

- Suggests perhaps a labeling issue

- In the 12-month follow-up period, number of recidivism arrests ranged from 0 (with 90.5% having no arrests) to 3 times.

- Race, gender, and age were significant predictors.

- DV offense characteristics, specifically gender of victim, NON-cohabitation, and drug/alcohol use, were also predictors of recidivism.

- When controlling for the effect of other measures, prior arrests only mattered for predicting future DV charges, and this was in the opposite direction than the literature would suggest.
THESE FINDINGS LED TO POLICY AND PARTNER-RELATED CHANGES IN THE COURT BY THE JUDGE

- FINDINGS PRESENTED TO POLICE CHIEFS, BIPP PROVIDERS, PROSECUTORS, ATTORNEYS, ACADEMICS, OTHER TREATMENT-RELATED PRACTITIONERS
- BEGS THE QUESTIONS

1) IS BIPP EFFECTIVE COMPARED TO OTHER OUTCOMES?
2) HOW CAN WE GET PARTNERS TO COMMUNICATE INFORMATION MORE EFFECTIVELY TO FACILITATE BETTER OUTCOMES IN THE SYSTEM?
3) WHAT POLICIES NEED TO CHANGE IN DALLAS COUNTY TO BETTER USE RESOURCES OF COURT AND THE CJ SYSTEM OVERALL?
4) SOME OF FINDINGS ARE CONTROVERSIAL AND DESERVE FUTURE INVESTIGATION– RACIAL DISPARITIES, ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL PROCESS OUTCOMES ACROSS GROUPS, CALLS FOR SERVICE?, OTHER DATA QUESTIONS
CONSIDERATIONS FOR DRUG COURT EVALUATIONS

- Identify your critical partners in the community, system, and social service organizations that help deliver your program goals
- Define and outline your program organization, flow chart of key personnel, and definitions of program goals and objectives clearly and concisely
- Consider and investigate funding opportunities in your community
  - Invaluable to have a grant writer on staff
  - Partnerships with competent and experienced academic evaluators who have expertise in your type of services
    - Independent, not affiliated or related to your organization, without conflict of interest
    - Seek publication in peer-reviewed and respected journals within the discipline that you practice as a goal of your evaluation to raise the level of objectivity
      - This is how evidence-based practice is replicated, validated, and accepted across the disciplines and in the field
Things to consider when hiring an evaluator

- Are evaluations expensive?
  - In a word, yes! You get what you pay for. The best evaluators have rigor, time, effort, and evidence-based standards that they employ and will NOT dilute, regardless of the price tag
  - The reputation of a strong academic is worth the price you pay for a sound evaluation
  - Top-notch evaluators will publish your evaluation and take steps to protect the identity of the program and location if possible
  - Quality evaluators will help you find areas of improvement for your program overall
    - This is something you should discuss in advance if you worry about shortcomings being publicized or fear changes
    - Good evaluators are sensitive to the political, economic, social, and agency-related issues that come with rigorous evaluation and introspection
    - Done right, a good evaluation should give you objective, sound, and research-based alternatives and suggestions that are practical and based on applied evidence to help your program grow, modify, and evolve toward solutions that promote efficacy

EVALUATION PROJECTS MANY TIMES ARE THE BEGINNING OF A NEW CHAPTER FOR YOUR ORGANIZATION WITH NEW IDEAS & EXCITEMENT ABOUT CHANGE AND GROWTH- BE OPEN TO THIS IDEA!
CONTACT INFORMATION

Denise Paquette Boots, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Criminology
deniseboots@utdallas.edu

Nadine M. Connell, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Criminology
Nadine.connell@utdallas.edu