

## 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**

1. The individual stakeholders listed below are <i>philosophically</i> committed to using empirical research					
to guide decision making in their respective roles/areas of practice 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 <i>philosophically</i> committed to collaborating to ensure that empirical research guides decision making <i>across all areas</i> of the local criminal justice system.						
Law enforcement	YES	UNCLEAR	Пno			
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			
routine participation) on an existing or planned/proposed local criminal justice policy team.  Law enforcement TYES TUNCLEAR 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			
<ul> <li>4. For Question 3, indicate whether the team is  Existing or  Planned/proposed.</li> <li>5. How confident are you that your jurisdiction will be successful in engaging all key stakeholder</li> </ul>						
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 A	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).				
	YES NOT YET, BUT STEPS H STEPS HAVE NOT YET E				
7.	7. The stakeholders have dev	veloped a systemwide visior	n and an agreement on a cor	mmon set of goals	
	YES NO				
8.		estion 7, are stakeholders co de vision and common goals	ommitted to discussing and i	reaching	
	YES NO N	N/A			
Co	COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT	<b>E</b> FFORTS			
9.	representatives of various	•	y to educate the local commitizens at large) about relevance findings locally.		
	YES NO				
10.	.0. The stakeholders have beg	gun to implement this comn	nunity education strategy.		
	YES NO				
11.	11. The stakeholders have ide strategic planning efforts.	ntified methods to actively	engage community represer	ntatives in their	
	YES NO				
Εv	EVIDENCE-BASED KNOWLED	GE			
12.	based (e.g., how to condu	cting training and skill build ct a validated risk/needs ass	agency leadership and staff ving events on practices that sessment and use the inform a concrete problem solving s	are evidence- nation in decision	
	aw enforcement	YES	UNCLEAR	□ NO	
	Pretrial services	∐ YES	UNCLEAR	∐ NO	
VIC	/ictim advocates	YES	UNCLEAR	NO	

Prosecution	YES	☐ UNCLEA	R NO		
Defense	YES	UNCLEA	R NO		
Jails	YES	UNCLEA	R NO		
Court administrators	YES	UNCLEA	R NO		
Judges	YES	UNCLEA	R NO		
Community corrections/probation	YES	UNCLEA	R NO		
City/county executives/administrators	YES	UNCLEA	R NO		
Legislators	YES	UNCLEA	R NO		
Community representatives/public	YES	UNCLEA	R NO		
Other:	YES	UNCLEA	R NO		
<ul> <li>13. Validated assessment instruments (e.g., LSI-R, COMPAS) are used to inform decisions for (select only one):</li> <li>All/most types of cases</li> <li>Only certain types of cases (e.g., drug-related, sex offenses, other violent crimes)</li> <li>N/A—none used</li> <li>14. Stakeholders (e.g., judges, prosecutors, defenders) have adopted mechanisms to acquire and use</li> </ul>					
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 Cite vs. detain decision Pretrial release decision Diversion decision Plea negotiation decision Sentencing decision Jail programming decision Community supervision-level de Community programming decision Violation decision Early termination decision		YES	NO         NO		
15. Stakeholder agencies agree that mo offenders.	re intensive	interventions are best re	eserved for higher risk		
<ul><li>All agree</li><li>Most agree</li><li>Few agree</li><li>None agree</li></ul>					

16. Stakeholder agencies deliver services and interventions to offenders based on assessed criminogenic needs.				
All deliver  Most deliver  Few deliver  None deliver				
CONTINUOUS QUALITY IMPROVEMENT AND PERFO	DRMANCE <b>M</b> EASURE	MENT		
17. The stakeholders have agreed on a "scorecard" to	measure systemwid	e performance		
YES NO				
18. If you answered no to Question 17, are stakehold agreement on a "scorecard" to measure systemw		cussing and rea	aching	
YES NO N/A				
19. The following are in place to ensure evidence-bas at the <a href="mailto:system">system</a> level:	ed practices are inco	rporated into d	lecision making	
System-level logic model Quality assurance mechanisms that assess fidelity of implementation Key benchmarks, performance measures Strategies to collaboratively assess benchmarks and performance measures and address identified performance issues	☐ YES ☐ YES ☐ YES ☐ YES	<ul><li>NO</li><li>NO</li><li>NO</li><li>NO</li></ul>		
20. If you answered no to Question 19, are stakeholders committed to developing and instituting these mechanisms and indicators?				
YES NO N/A				
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 HIGH full range of necessary stakeholders	MODERATE	Low	☐ NO NEED	
22. Establishing a shared vision for HIGH the team	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	HIGH	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	HIGH	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	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW	☐ NO NEED