

A Framework for Evidence-Based Decision Making in Local Criminal Justice Systems

An initiative funded by the National Institute of Corrections with support from the Office of Justice Programs

Technical assistance provided by: Center for Effective Public Policy, Pretrial Justice Institute, The Justice Management Institute, and The Carey Group

Starter Kit 1a: Conducting an EBDM Readiness Checklist

Appendix 1: EBDM Readiness Checklist

Conducting a constructive self-assessment of your work as a local criminal justice policy team is important for creating a change-promoting climate and/or determining how best to advance policy and practice. The items on this checklist are designed to assist you with exploring a range of team-, policy-, and practice-related elements in your system. It can be valuable for providing a preliminary assessment of your jurisdiction's readiness to build capacity for implementing the EBDM Framework and can be used as a foundation for the planning process. Please complete this checklist as a group.

POLICY LEVEL COLLABORATION

 The individual stakeholders listed below are <u>philosophically</u> committed to using empirical research to guide decision making <u>in their respective roles/areas of practice</u> in the local criminal justice system.

Law enforcement	YES	UNCLEAR	🗌 NO
Pretrial services	YES	UNCLEAR	🗌 NO
Victim advocates	YES	UNCLEAR	🗌 NO
Prosecution	YES	UNCLEAR	🗌 NO
Defense	YES	UNCLEAR	🗌 NO
Jails	YES	UNCLEAR	🗌 NO
Court administrators	YES	UNCLEAR	🗌 NO
Judges	YES	UNCLEAR	🗌 NO
Community corrections/probation	YES	UNCLEAR	🗌 NO
City/county executives/administrators	YES	UNCLEAR	🗌 NO
Legislators	YES	UNCLEAR	🗌 NO
Community representatives/public	YES	UNCLEAR	🗌 NO
Other:	YES	UNCLEAR	□ NO

2. The individual stakeholders listed below are *philosophically* committed to collaborating to ensure that empirical research guides decision making *across all areas* of the local criminal justice system.

Law enforcement	YES	UNCLEAR	□ NO
Pretrial services	YES	UNCLEAR	🗌 NO
Victim advocates	YES	UNCLEAR	🗌 NO
Prosecution	YES	UNCLEAR	🗌 NO
Defense	YES	UNCLEAR	🗌 NO
Jails	YES	UNCLEAR	🗌 NO
Court administrators	YES	UNCLEAR	🗌 NO
Judges	YES	UNCLEAR	🗌 NO
Community corrections/probation	YES	UNCLEAR	🗌 NO
City/county executives/administrators	YES	UNCLEAR	🗌 NO
Legislators	YES	UNCLEAR	🗌 NO
Community representatives/public	YES	UNCLEAR	🗌 NO
Other:	YES	UNCLEAR	🗌 NO

3. The individual stakeholders listed below are represented (as measured by formal inclusion and routine participation) on an existing or planned/proposed local criminal justice policy team.

Law enforcement	YES	UNCLEAR	🗌 NO
Pretrial services	YES	UNCLEAR	🗌 NO
Victim advocates	YES	UNCLEAR	🗌 NO
Prosecution	YES	UNCLEAR	🗌 NO
Defense	YES	UNCLEAR	🗌 NO
Jails	YES	UNCLEAR	🗌 NO
Court administrators	YES	UNCLEAR	🗌 NO
Judges	YES	UNCLEAR	🗌 NO
Community corrections/probation	YES	UNCLEAR	🗌 NO
City/county executives/administrators	YES	UNCLEAR	🗌 NO
Legislators	YES	UNCLEAR	🗌 NO
Community representatives/public	YES	UNCLEAR	🗌 NO
Other:	YES		🗌 NO

- 4. For Question 3, indicate whether the team is Existing *or* Planned/proposed.
- 5. How confident are you that your jurisdiction will be successful in engaging all key stakeholder agencies (see list of stakeholders in Question 3) in your jurisdiction in this Framework initiative and sustaining their involvement over the long-term?

VERY SOMEWHAT NOT AT ALL

6. A forum for collaborative work has been formally established to take on this evidence-based decision making initiative (e.g., there is a mechanism for meeting on a regular basis, work to be accomplished has been defined, operating norms/ground rules have been established).



NOT YET, BUT STEPS HAVE BEEN TAKEN STEPS HAVE NOT YET BEEN TAKEN

7. The stakeholders have developed a systemwide vision and an agreement on a common set of goals.



8. If you answered no to Question 7, are stakeholders committed to discussing and reaching agreement on a systemwide vision and common goals?

YES	🗌 NO	🗌 N/A

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT EFFORTS

9. The stakeholders have developed a deliberate strategy to educate the local community (e.g., representatives of various interest groups as well as citizens at large) about relevant crime and risk reduction research and efforts underway to apply these findings locally.



10. The stakeholders have begun to implement this community education strategy.

YES NO

11. The stakeholders have identified methods to actively engage community representatives in their strategic planning efforts.



EVIDENCE-BASED KNOWLEDGE

12. Stakeholder agencies have equipped their individual agency leadership and staff with EBP knowledge/skills by conducting training and skill building events on practices that are evidence-based (e.g., how to conduct a validated risk/needs assessment and use the information in decision making; motivational interviewing skills; how to teach concrete problem solving skills):

Law enforcement	YES	UNCLEAR	NO NO
Pretrial services	YES	UNCLEAR	NO
Victim advocates	YES	UNCLEAR	NO

Prosecution	YES		🗌 NO
Defense	YES	UNCLEAR	🗌 NO
Jails	YES	UNCLEAR	NO NO
Court administrators	YES	UNCLEAR	NO NO
Judges	YES	UNCLEAR	NO NO
Community corrections/probation	YES	UNCLEAR	NO NO
City/county executives/administrators	YES	UNCLEAR	NO NO
Legislators	YES	UNCLEAR	NO NO
Community representatives/public	YES	UNCLEAR	NO NO
Other:	YES		🗌 NO

IMPLEMENTATION OF EVIDENCE-BASED PRACTICES

13. Validated assessment instruments (e.g., LSI-R, COMPAS) are used to inform decisions for (select only one):

All/most types of cases
 Only certain types of cases (e.g., drug-related, sex offenses, other violent crimes)
 N/A—none used

14. Stakeholders (e.g., judges, prosecutors, defenders) have adopted mechanisms to acquire and use consistent assessment information (e.g., offender risk/needs information, knowledge regarding evidence-based programming) to inform individual case dispositions in the following ways:

Arrest decision	YES	🗌 NO
Cite vs. detain decision	YES	🗌 NO
Pretrial release decision	YES	🗌 NO
Diversion decision	YES	🗌 NO
Plea negotiation decision	YES	🗌 NO
Sentencing decision	YES	🗌 NO
Jail programming decision	YES	🗌 NO
Community supervision-level decision	YES	🗌 NO
Community programming decision	YES	🗌 NO
Violation decision	YES	🗌 NO
Early termination decision	YES	NO NO

15. Stakeholder agencies agree that more intensive interventions are best reserved for higher risk offenders.

All agree
Most agree
Few agree
None agree

16. Stakeholder agencies deliver services and interventions to offenders based on assessed criminogenic needs.



CONTINUOUS QUALITY IMPROVEMENT AND PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT

17. The stakeholders have agreed on a "scorecard" to measure systemwide performance.



18. If you answered no to Question 17, are stakeholders committed to discussing and reaching agreement on a "scorecard" to measure systemwide performance?



19. The following are in place to ensure evidence-based practices are incorporated into decision making at the <u>system</u> level:

System-level logic model	YES	🗌 NO
Quality assurance mechanisms that assess	YES	
fidelity of implementation		
Key benchmarks, performance measures	YES	🗌 NO
Strategies to collaboratively assess		
benchmarks and performance measures and	YES	🗌 NO
address identified performance issues		

20. If you answered no to Question 19, are stakeholders committed to developing and instituting these mechanisms and indicators?



EXTERNAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE NEEDS

Indicate the amount/level of assistance that your team needs in the following areas (i.e., high need for assistance, moderate need, etc.):

21.	Initially identifying/engaging the full range of necessary stakeholders	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW	NO NEED
22.	Establishing a shared vision for the team	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW	NO NEED

23.	Clarifying the roles and responsibilities of team members	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW	NO NEED
24.	Establishing a results-driven structure for the team's operation	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW	NO NEED
25.	Developing mechanisms to promote long-term engagement of team members	НІGН	MODERATE	LOW	NO NEED
26.	Establishing benchmarks, performance indicators, and outcome measures	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW	NO NEED
27.	Equipping leadership across the system with knowledge about evidence-based principles/practices	🗌 нібн	MODERATE	LOW	🗌 NO NEED
28.	Equipping practitioners across the system with knowledge about evidence-based principles/practices	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW	🗌 NO NEED
29.	Equipping practitioners across the system with evidence-based skills/competencies	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW	NO NEED
30.	Raising awareness and engaging the public in the initiative	🗌 нібн	MODERATE		NO NEED