

Preliminary LA DOOR Local Evaluation Plan

Proposition 47 Grant Program

The RAND Corporation, KH Consulting Group

Preliminary LA DOOR Local Evaluation Plan

Preface

LA DOOR is a comprehensive, health-focused approach to drug intervention that emphasizes field-based services, pre-booking diversion, community engagement, and financial leveraging to address substance dependence for historically under-resourced South Los Angeles populations with a history of mental health issues or substance use disorders who have previously been arrested, charged with, or convicted of a criminal offense. Through the implementation of three components: mobile service team; pre-booking diversion and an advisory committee, LA DOOR intends to increase participants' utilization of community-based supports, reduce entry into the criminal justice system and create sustainable community social safety nets in targeted locations.

This preliminary local evaluation was drafted upon award to fulfill the BSCC grant requirements and help guide development of the evaluation. At this time, the project has yet to be reviewed by RAND's Human Subjects Protection Committee (Internal Review Board). As the project evolves, there may be changes made to the evaluation which will be documented and reflected upon in the final evaluation document.

The work described in this report was funded by the Los Angeles City Attorney's Office and will be of interest primarily to the LA City Attorney's Office, LA DOOR program partners, and the California Board of State and Community Corrections. Results could potentially benefit other prosecutor offices across the country who are looking for innovative ways to deal with low-level offenders in lieu of jail or court involvement.

This project is part of RAND Justice, Infrastructure, and Environment, a division of the RAND Corporation dedicated to improving policy-and decision making in a wide range of policy domains, including civil and criminal justice, infrastructure protection and homeland security, transportation and energy policy, and environmental and natural resource policy.

Questions or comments about this report should be sent to the project leaders, Melissa Labriola (Labriola@rand.org) and Rosanna Smart (rsmart@rand.org).

Preliminary LA DOOR Local Evaluation Plan

Project Background

LA DOOR is a comprehensive, health-focused approach to drug intervention that emphasizes field-based services, pre-booking diversion, community engagement, and financial leveraging to address substance dependence for historically under-resourced South Los Angeles populations with a history of mental health issues or substance use disorders who have previously been arrested, charged with, or convicted of a criminal offense. LA DOOR intends to increase participants' utilization of community-based supports, reduce entry into the criminal justice system and create sustainable community social safety nets in targeted locations, aims which will be supported and evaluated by RAND and its subcontractor, KH Consulting Group (KH) – referred to as RAND/KH.

Proposition 47, passed in 2014, reduces certain drug possession felonies to misdemeanors and requires misdemeanor sentencing for certain charges, including petty theft, receiving stolen property and forging/writing bad checks. LA DOOR captures Prop 47's guiding principles through the implementation of three components:

1. **Mobile service team.** A diversely staffed mobile service team delivering culturally competent, trauma-informed, harm reductive, and peer navigator-led social services
2. **Pre-booking diversion.** A pre-booking diversion pathway to treatment featuring a 24/7 hotline for use by law enforcement and social contact referrals
3. **Advisory Committee.** A robust Advisory Committee fostering collaborative partnerships to inform and adapt interventions to specific local needs to restore the harm inflicted by substance use.

Project Performance Measurement

Project performance will be measured in relation to LA DOOR's three goals and their objectives. The following table displays each goal, its objective, and the associated performance metrics.

Table 1: Overview of Goal, Objectives, and Performance Metrics

| LA DOOR Goal | Goal Objective | Performance Metrics |
|---|---|---|
| Goal 1: Increase participants' utilization of community-based supports | Expand participant access to and engagement with a broad range of social support services, including services for substance use disorder treatment, mental health treatment, healthcare, housing, employment, and legal assistance. | Primary <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Changes in service access• Changes in service uptake• Fidelity to evidence-based practices• Cultural competence of service delivery Secondary <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Use of wraparound services• Engagement and satisfaction with service delivery• Changes in substance use, mental and physical health, |

Preliminary LA DOOR Local Evaluation Plan

| LA DOOR Goal | Goal Objective | Performance Metrics |
|--|--|---|
| <p>Goal 2: Reduce entry into the revolving door criminal justice system.</p> | <p>Prevent new bookings, case filings, and convictions for pre-booking diversion participants by intercepting individuals arrested on a Proposition 47 drug offense in the Program Area (Southwest, Southeast, and 77th LAPD Divisions), and redirecting those arrestees to pre-booking diversion to reduce criminal court case filings, and engaging individuals in LA DOOR’s peer case management services.</p> | <p>employment, legal outcomes, and housing stability</p> <p>Primary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of pre-booking diversion referrals • Number (and percent) of completed pre-booking diversion participants • Change in the number of new bookings, case filings, and convictions for the target population eligible for pre-booking diversion <p>Secondary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Differences in recidivism • Changes in community-level crime rates (by crime type) • Differential costs of pre-booking diversion relative to booking, filing, & prosecuting Proposition 47 drug possession offenses. |
| <p>Goal 3: Create sustainable community social safety nets in targeted locations.</p> | <p>Expand the availability and utilization of new community-based housing and social supports through efforts by the Housing Partner and Capacity Building Partner. This will entail the City Attorney’s Office issuing a RFP for supplemental local housing support and a RFP for capacity building support for local providers to deliver enhanced services.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of LA DOOR participants served through new housing and capacity building services |

Monitoring Activities

Tracking project performance for LA DOOR will include:

- Monitoring the data collection process
- Monitoring data accuracy

Preliminary LA DOOR Local Evaluation Plan

- Tracking program progress and performance
- Ensuring that Program Partners are in compliance with research procedures.

Throughout the course of the evaluation, several activities will be employed to ensure fidelity to the LA DOOR model, contractual obligations, and program goals. This work effort will be done in collaboration with RAND/KH.

Site Visits. Site visits by the evaluation team to Program Partner, which can serve multiple purposes, will be a key aspect of this monitoring process. In part, these site visits will help the evaluation team build relationships and rapport with Program Partner agency staff, and gain a better understanding of partners' services and the unique contexts in which they are working. In addition, these site visits will be an opportunity to provide training and/or technical assistance in research procedures, and to collect qualitative data such as interviews or focus groups with program staff and with clients to assess project implementation and impact. RAND/KH will make at least one site visit per Program Partner during the project period, most likely during months 9-32. The specific purpose, duration, and timing of these visits is being determined in collaboration with the LA City Attorney's Office staff, Program Partners, and clients, as appropriate. In addition, RAND/KH has developed site visit protocols through prior experiences that will allow for the systematic collection of information at these visits to determine whether programs are being implemented with fidelity across sites.

Regular Meetings. In addition to site visits, RAND/KH will be meeting with the LA City Attorney's Office and Program Partners as part of regularly scheduled LA DOOR meetings, and will be submitting quarterly progress reports to the LA City Attorney's Office. These activities will allow the project team to maintain regular communication with all project stakeholders. In turn, the meetings will provide a forum to help service providers troubleshoot any challenges, share best practices, and obtain guidance from Program Partners, the LA City Attorney's Office, and Advisory Committee.

Progress Reports. Ideally, all active Program Partners will enter information on each client into an online LA DOOR Assessment Tool to track the key performance metrics. In this way, RAND/KH can consolidate the metrics into quarterly progress reports. The performance metrics will include data related to program implementation to date (e.g., number of clients served; amount and types of services provided), as well as challenges experienced by service providers within the past month and solutions that have been attempted.

As the evaluation progresses and clients begin to access services and complete pre-booking diversion, the progress reports will also include outcome data (e.g., number of clients obtaining employment, rates of recidivism). These progress reports will form the foundation for any feedback and discussion that takes place during the meetings with the LA City Attorney's Office and Program Partners. Reviewing performance data regularly will also offer an opportunity to quickly identify any challenges or issues with data collection feasibility, quality, and accuracy, and can offer some preliminary insights on performance metrics relevant for service access and uptake, the types of services being offered and used, overall case flow, and program capacity.

Evaluation Reports. Two evaluation reports will provide a detailed overview of LA DOOR's project performance as required by the California Board of State and Community Corrections ("BSCC"):

1. A *Two-Year Preliminary Evaluation Report* to be produced at the conclusion of LA DOOR's second year
2. A *Final Local Evaluation Report* to be produced 32 months after LA DOOR implementation

Preliminary LA DOOR Local Evaluation Plan

The reports will describe the results of the evaluation to date regarding:

- **Process Evaluation.** These reports will address themes such as: number of individuals who have been contacted by each Program Partner; types of services provided; fidelity and cultural competence of service delivery; and client feedback on service delivery and satisfaction with the program.
- **Outcome Evaluation.** These reports will provide information on short-term and longer-term outcomes as possible (e.g., client reports of program effectiveness; access and retention in housing). To the extent available, it will also report on recidivism for program participants.

As these results are presented, the reports will specifically address the progress that LA DOOR is making toward the goals and objectives envisioned by the City Attorney's Office and Program Partners (i.e., increased utilization of support services, reduced entry into the criminal justice system, enhancing the social safety net).

Data Management

Data Sources

The process evaluation will leverage multiple quantitative and qualitative data sources to:

1. Triangulate process data¹
2. Increase the likelihood of obtaining all necessary measures
3. Better understand LA DOOR's implementation in the existing context.

The outcome evaluation will rely largely on the quantitative data required to be collected by LA DOOR's partner agencies. It will be supplemented with additional quantitative measures and qualitative information provided by program participants, as well as quantitative measures of environmental context collected through publicly available data sources.

The data sources to be used for the process and outcome evaluations are described below. As discussed later under "Data Collection Activities," RAND/KH will be developing an online LA DOOR Assessment Tool for SSG Project 180, the LA City Attorney's Office, and the Housing Partner to use for compiling data. This approach is cost-effective, ensures better consistency in data collection, and enables real-time compilation of data for efficient production of monthly, quarterly, semi-annual, or annual reports.

Administrative and Programmatic Data Sources. Table 2 provides an overview of the key administrative and programmatic data sources that will be used for the program evaluation, noting whether the data source relates to the mobile outreach prong, 24/7 hotline prong, or both. Administrative and programmatic data are owned by each specific Program Partner.

- **SSG Project 180** will collect and manage most programmatic data related to mobile field team operations and the 24/7 hotline, including information on contacts/referrals; case management; LA DOOR participants' characteristics; and social service referrals or utilization. Data will include quantitative measures, complemented by qualitative information from case notes. To support evaluating differential effects of engaging with LA DOOR through mobile outreach compared to pre-booking diversion, SSG Project 180 will flag individual records with source

¹ Silverman, Myrna, Edmund M. Ricci, and Margaret J. Gunter. "Strategies for increasing the rigor of qualitative methods in evaluation of health care programs." *Evaluation Review* 14, no. 1 (1990): 57-74.

Preliminary LA DOOR Local Evaluation Plan

information. The RAND/KH team will maintain confidentiality of the individual LA DOOR participants by only reporting aggregated data and trend patterns.

- **Los Angeles City Attorney’s Office** will house information on pre-booking diversion caseload information; referrals to Homeless Engagement and Response Team (HEART) legal services; outcomes of HEART services; and recidivism information. The City Attorney’s Office will work with Public Defender partners to track LA DOOR participants referred to the Public Defender’s Office for conviction relief.
- The **Los Angeles Police Department’s (LAPD)** Open Data Portal includes arrest data that is updated weekly and includes administrative data on arrest information relevant to the LA DOOR Program Area, as well as the larger city of Los Angeles. In addition, the LAPD and **City Attorney’s Office** will have data available relevant to individuals referred through the 24/7 hotline who are eligible for pre-booking diversion.
- Once procured, **LA DOOR’s Housing Partner** will collect and manage aggregate data on housing capacity made available to LA DOOR participants, as well as client-level data on housing placement, retention, additional on-site services, and length of stay for LA DOOR participants.
- Once procured, **LA DOOR’s Capacity Building Partner** will collect and manage aggregate data on the quantity and type of services made available to South LA communities through the capacity-building project, the number of LA DOOR participants served through the new expanded services, and other relevant measures as decided prior to the release of the RFP.

Table 2. Administrative or Programmatic Data Sources and Measures

| Data Source (Data Type) | Sample of Measures to be Collected | Location Collected | Mobile Outreach | 24/7 Hotline |
|-------------------------------------|---|-----------------------|--------------------|-----------------|
| <i>SOG Project 180</i> | | | | |
| Mobile team deployment | # times deployed; location of deployment; time spent at deployment site; staff deployed | On-site, in-field | X | |
| Field contact information | # new contacts; # repeat contacts; # contacts with individual not LA DOOR clients; contact demographic info | On-site, in-field | X | |
| Service referral information | # screens completed (by type); # (by type) of referral; where individual referred | On-site, in-field | X | X |
| Case management information | # of case management participants, # case management participants closed (successful/ unsuccessful), # of active case management participants | On-site, in-field | X | X |
| Social service information | # who access substance use disorder, mental health, medical, housing, legal, employment, and transportation services | On-site, in-field | X | X |

Preliminary LA DOOR Local Evaluation Plan

| Data Source (Data Type) | Sample of Measures to be Collected | Location Collected | Mobile Outreach | 24/7 Hotline |
|--|---|-----------------------|--------------------|-----------------|
| Pre-booking diversion referrals | # referrals to LA DOOR; % of referrals enrolled in LA DOOR | On-site, in-field | | X |
| Social contact referrals | # social contact cards distributed; # calls to 24/7 hotline by non-pre-booking; # (%) calls that led to service referral | On-site | | X |
| Characteristics of LA DOOR participants | Demographic info; Risk-Need Responsivity (RNR) assessments for those with open case management; case planning and service delivery | On-site, in-field | X | X |
| <i>LA City Attorney's Office</i> | | | | |
| HEART Linkage information | # referred to HEART, tickets eligible for dismissal, community/social service hours for ticket dismissal, # tickets dismissed, value of fines/fees forgiven | On-site | X | X |
| Pre-booking caseload data | Charges avoided, case filings avoided, bookings avoided, cases filed, court outcomes for cases filed; demographics | On-site | | X |
| Characteristics of LA DOOR participants | Demographic information | On-site | | X |
| Arrest and recidivism for pre-booking diversion | # arrests eligible for pre-booking diversion; # LA DOOR participants with conviction of a new felony or misdemeanor (within 6, 12, 24, and 36 months) | On-site | | X |
| <i>LAPD</i> | | | | |
| Criminal justice data | Calls for service, arrests in LA DOOR Program Area and other areas of City of LA | Open Data | | X |
| <i>LA DOOR Housing Partner</i> | | | | |
| Housing services | #/type of housing made available through housing RFP; LA DOOR participant housing placements and length of stay; # early exits from housing and reason for exit; any additional services provided | On-site | X | X |
| <i>LA DOOR Capacity Partner</i> | | | | |

Preliminary LA DOOR Local Evaluation Plan

| Data Source (Data Type) | Sample of Measures to be Collected | Location Collected | Mobile Outreach | 24/7 Hotline |
|-----------------------------------|--|-----------------------|--------------------|-----------------|
| Capacity-building services | #/type additional services made available; # LA DOOR participants served through capacity partner | On-site | X | X |

Document Review. To better understand the history and context of the LA DOOR program, RAND/KH will review documents provided by the LA City Attorney’s Office and any information from Program Partners that informs the history of program development, decisions made in the program design, activities during the pilot phase of LA DOOR, etc. RAND/KH will also collect printed documentation of policies, procedures, budgets, and activities that are relevant to the process evaluation and can be provided by Program Partners. Finally, throughout the project’s implementation, RAND/KH will review local news sources to gain any relevant insights on additional policies or issues relevant to the target population served by LA DOOR, public opinion regarding LA DOOR, or other context regarding the communities serviced by LA DOOR or the Program Partners.

Interviews with LA DOOR Program Partners. Semi-structured interviews with Program Partners will be conducted in person when possible or by phone. In-person interviews provide an effective means of getting detailed information about program activities from a variety of perspectives. Some interviews will be group interviews and others will be individual interviews. An advantage to group interviews over individual interviews is that they sometime stimulate discussions that would not occur otherwise, and provide quality controls by allowing participants to identify false or extreme views.

Focus Groups with LA DOOR Participants. Focus groups with LA DOOR participants will be conducted. These focus groups will provide an effective means of getting detailed information about program activities from a variety of perspectives.

Observations. RAND/KH will collect observational data to assess LA DOOR’s performance and functionality, involvement of the Advisory Committee, interactions between Program Partners and with other key stakeholders, and interactions with program participants. These observational data will be used to provide evidence on the three LA DOOR’S goals:

Goal 1: Processes and activities regarding in-the-field interactions between the mobile team members from SSG Project 180 and LA DOOR participants

Goal 2: Interactions between SSG Project 180 team members, LAPD officers, and pre-booking diversion participants

Goal 3: Functioning and interactions between key stakeholders involved with the LA DOOR Advisory Committee

Publicly Available Secondary Data Sources. Additional publicly-available secondary data sources will be collected by RAND/KH to provide contextual information on the communities serviced by LA DOOR (e.g., socio-economic and demographic factors) and historical and contemporary information on relevant outcomes in these communities (e.g., crime, calls for service, and arrests from open-source LAPD data). If feasible, such data may be useful in constructing an appropriate comparison group to bolster the outcome evaluation methods.

Preliminary LA DOOR Local Evaluation Plan

Data Collection Tools

Working with RAND, KH will take the lead in the data management endeavor in the development and implementation of the online *LA Door Assessment Tool* and the *LA DOOR Process Evaluation Plan*.

Administrative and Programmatic Data Sources – Online LA DOOR Assessment Tool. RAND/KH is responsible for data management, which includes the tracking and monitoring of activities as described in the previous section with respect to all data sources. KH will develop the online LA DOOR Assessment Tool for SSG Project 180 and housing provider staff to use for collecting and reporting data on individual encounters. The online tool will:

- Enable the gathering of data pertaining to the LA DOOR participants, which KH can then readily aggregate
- Facilitate greater consistency of the collected data for later analytics
- Entail branching of questions based on the type of initial contact (e.g., mobile unit, pre-booking, social contact referral)
- Include a field for intake or baseline data, such as the SAQ index used at SSG Project 180
- Include space for qualitative case study notes, by category, for further analysis by RAND/KH

The foundation of the online tool is a commercially and cost-effective service that the City of Los Angeles could readily adopt upon our completion of the 32-month evaluation study. Using this platform, data entry could take place in the field or at the SSG Project 180 office.

To preserve confidentiality, KH will work with RAND, City Attorney, SSG Project 180, and Housing Partner leadership to identify an acceptable method for coding the LA DOOR participants' identities (e.g., individual-level identifiers). This will ensure that the outcomes over the 32-month period on a client-level basis can be assessed and overall change patterns can be monitored. These identifiers are also important to ensure that counts are not duplicated.

Document Review. RAND/KH will compile documents relevant to LA DOOR history, context, and processes as shared by the LA City Attorney's Office or Program Partners. In reviewing these materials, RAND/KH will extract details particularly relevant for ensuring an in-depth understanding of the range of activities and approaches being used to accomplish the overall program goals. Relevant quantitative measures will be coded into analytic files.

Interviews with LA DOOR Program Partners. Interview data from LA DOOR Program Partners will be collected using a semi-structured interview protocol, focusing on the implementation components and implementation processes, including service planning and decision-making, service selection, development and maintenance of partnerships, communication among partners, and program-monitoring efforts. The interview protocol will also include questions on barriers and facilitators to implementation, organizational changes, program management, and perspectives on service delivery and system capacity. All interviews will be voluntary and conducted in accordance with the requirements of the RAND Human Subjects Protection Committee. Information gained from interviews will be aggregated (not attributed to specific individuals).

Focus Groups with LA DOOR participants. RAND/KH will leverage a tool developed by KH called **Q²**, which provides both **Q**uantitative and **Q**ualitative input during the focus groups. In this way, KH can overcome some of the challenges with the subjectivity of focus groups:

Preliminary LA DOOR Local Evaluation Plan

- **Quantitative input.** Focus groups will begin by collecting the participants' individual ratings on a quantitative survey, which lists issues, programs, services, etc. The participants will be asked to rate the effectiveness and importance of each listed item from their individual perspectives.
- **Qualitative input.** KH then facilitates the qualitative component of the focus group, building on the quantitative input, and soliciting additional feedback from the group. KH will document the focus group's qualitative input, reporting salient participants' quotations and group consensus statements. Toward the end of the discussions, KH will explore if participants' initial viewpoints had changed as a result of the discussions.

The quantitative ratings are then integrated with the qualitative statements.

Observations. Observations will be conducted and recorded through field notes, particularly documenting the involvement of the Advisory Committee, interactions between Program Partners and with other key stakeholders, and interactions with program participants.

Publicly Available Secondary Data Sources will be downloaded and compiled into a comprehensive analytic file. Depending on the geocoded identifiers available in the data source, data will be merged and linked to the other data sources at various levels of geographic fineness.

Data Collection Timeline

Collection of qualitative, observational, and contextual data to inform the process and outcome evaluations is currently underway. Upon approval of this Preliminary Local Evaluation Plan, steps toward collection of quantitative and further qualitative information will begin. The expected timeline for data collection is described below.

Administrative and Programmatic Data Sources. The collection of most administrative and programmatic data sources will begin concurrent with the implementation of the relevant LA DOOR program prongs.

It is anticipated for the Mobile Outreach prong, the first mobile team deployments will begin in mid-February 2018. Thus, collection of all SSG Project 180 data for mobile team activities, field contacts, service referrals, case management, and LA DOOR participant data will begin at that time; as well as collection of LA DOOR participant referrals to legal services through the LA City Attorney's Office. Once started, data collection will occur in near real time or on a daily basis.

It is anticipated for the 24/7 hotline prong that data collection will begin in mid- or late-March 2018. Once started, data collection will occur in near real time or on a daily basis.

The RFP for the Housing Partner has been released, and we anticipate that the Housing Partner will be procured in mid-March 2018 and can begin data collection once housing services become available. Once started, we anticipate that data collection will occur daily.

The RFP for the Capacity Building Partner has not yet been released (expected date for the RFP release is Spring-Summer 2018), but once the capacity building partner has been procured, decisions on optimal data collection tools and performance measures will be made quickly to ensure that data collection can occur as soon as possible. Once started, data collection will occur daily or weekly.

Document Review. RAND/KH began collection of documents relevant to LA DOOR in mid-January 2018. Data collection for the document review will occur as needed throughout the life of the project.

Interviews with LA DOOR Program Partners. RAND/KH will conduct interviews with LA DOOR Program Partners throughout the life of the project. During the first year of the project, interviews will be

Preliminary LA DOOR Local Evaluation Plan

heavily focused on identifying issues and challenges that will be presented in the evaluation reports. RAND/KH will also interview and conduct site visits prior to the completion of the *Two-Year Preliminary Evaluation Report* and the *Final Local Evaluation Report*.

Focus Groups. RAND/KH will conduct focus groups with LA DOOR participants at key project milestones: toward the end of Year 1, Year 2, and project end. To have a large number of LA DOOR participant input, at each milestone RAND/KH plans to facilitate 3-4 focus groups with 8-10 participants in each focus group. In this way, RAND/KH will have input from 24 to 40 LA DOOR participants.

Observations. RAND/KH began observing activities relevant to LA DOOR in early February 2018. Observations and subsequent data collection includes observing meetings with program partners, the advisory committee, information sessions, and conducting ride-a-longs. Observations will not occur on a regular schedule, but will occur as needed throughout the life of the project.

Publicly Available Secondary Data Sources. Collection of additional secondary data sources will occur after the relevant data sources have been identified. In collaboration with the LA City Attorney's Office, RAND/KH has already begun the process of identifying these sources. We anticipate collection of these sources to occur quarterly, semi-annually, or annually depending on the nature of the dataset.

Methodology for Analyzing Data

Quantitative data. Most quantitative data will be provided in analytic files (e.g., Excel, ASCII).

For the administrative and programmatic data, each record will represent an individual (stripped of identifying information), which SSG Project 180 and Housing Partner staff will enter into the LA DOOR Assessment Tool, creating a centralized database. The online LA DOOR Assessment Tool data will automatically compile the data with graphic tables; the data can also be readily downloaded as Excel files. The LA DOOR Assessment Tool can also track other information for analyzing trends, such as patterns in different geographic areas.

Regarding secondary data sources, we plan to link this information using geographic identifiers to establish contextual information around the locations serviced by the mobile team and the LAPD divisions in South LA where the LA DOOR Target Population is being identified. This will allow for robust analysis at the aggregate LA DOOR program level (e.g., through descriptive statistics and trend analysis), at aggregate subgroup levels (e.g., comparing outcomes across mobile deployment area, or comparing outcomes for 24/7 pre-booking participants and mobile team field contacts separately), as well as at the individual level.

For any quantitative process evaluation measures obtained through the document reviews that are not provided in analytic files (e.g., budget data may only be available in PDF files), the data will be transferred to an analytic file prior to any analysis and considered in combination with the other process measures.

Qualitative and observational data. Qualitative data may be entered through a centralized, data entry system (observational forms) and/or summarized into a key point summary (focus groups, interviews). Key point summaries tend to provide major points and salient respondents' viewpoints from interviews and focus groups. This method can be used to provide individual key point summaries for each Program Partner and summaries across all participants, and/or key point summaries for each group of LA DOOR participants (i.e., mobile team referrals and pre-booking diversion referrals); how the data should be aggregated will be determined during the course of the project. Depending on the ability of Program Partners to provide data, qualitative software (e.g. ATLAS.ti) will be used to code key point summaries

Preliminary LA DOOR Local Evaluation Plan

from Program Partners and LA DOOR program participants, as well as to analyze interviews and focus group data for emergent themes. The analysis of aggregate data will focus primarily on strengths and barriers of different intervention components, and overarching themes regarding program perceptions and feedback that arise through focus groups and surveys with LA DOOR program participants.

Data Sharing Agreements

The City Attorney’s Office and SSG Project 180 are currently drafting data agreements to share specific data with RAND/KH as needed for the robust evaluation of LA DOOR. In addition, the Housing Partner and Capacity Building Partner are expressly required as part of their contract with the City Attorney’s Office to share requisite data with RAND/KH to conduct the evaluation. If necessary, once the partner has been procured, RAND/KH will immediately begin the process of establishing data agreements with each partner.

Other contextual data to be used in the evaluation will be obtained by compiling information from publicly available secondary datasets, which does not require data sharing agreements.

Process Evaluation Research Design

Measures

The process evaluation will aim to develop knowledge about the operational status of LA DOOR program activities and assess whether program activities are implemented with fidelity. The process evaluation is also important for interpreting results of the outcome evaluation (i.e., if no effect of the program is found, it may be due to issues implementing the program with fidelity). Table 3 briefly describes the types of questions to be assessed and data collection methods to be used in the process evaluation.

Table 3: Process Evaluation Measures

| Measures | Output | Questions | Data Collection |
|--|--------------------------|--|--|
| Program description | Fidelity | How was the project developed? How will the project be implemented? Changes? Obstacles? Who was involved? How were decisions made? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program partner interviews • Document review |
| | Training | How many staff members are trained? What is the quality of the training? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program partner interviews • Document review • Observations |
| Utilization of community-based support services | Expanding service access | How many mobile team deployments? How many hours of services are provided, or how many of contacts are made? How does the enrollment rate of | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program partner interviews • Document review • Observations • Participant interviews • Administrative data |

Preliminary LA DOOR Local Evaluation Plan

| Measures | Output | Questions | Data Collection |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>participants change over time? What are trends in the number of hours of service delivered or number of contacts/referrals made? What are recruitment strategies?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Publicly available data |
| | <p>Participant engagement</p> | <p>Are program participants satisfied with providers and services? What do program participants perceive as strengths of each service? How many individuals accept LA DOOR services? How many participants are enrolled in case management? How many RNR assessments are administered? How many participants access services for substance use disorders, mental health, legal assistance, employment, health and wellness, and housing? How many and what percentage of participants remain active for 6 months or more?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program partner interviews • Document review • Observations • Participant interviews or focus groups • Administrative data |
| <p>Pre-booking diversion</p> | <p>Alternatives to traditional criminal justice system processes</p> | <p>How many calls (pre-booking, social contact) and what percentage of eligible arrests are referred to the hotline? How many calls are referred to LA DOOR services? How many and what percentage accept pre-booking diversion? How many and what percentage complete pre-booking diversion?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program partner interviews • Document review • Observations • Participant interviews • Administrative data • Publicly available data |

Preliminary LA DOOR Local Evaluation Plan

| Measures | Output | Questions | Data Collection |
|---|--|---|---|
| | | <p>What types of services are being offered to (and accepted/completed by) active pre-booking diversion participants, and does this vary by LAPD Division? What are trends in the number of social contact referral calls? What are recruitment strategies?</p> | |
| | <p>Ensuring rapid access to pre-booking diversion services</p> | <p>What is the length of time between arrest and referral to pre-booking diversion? Are pre-booking and social contact referral participants satisfied with service delivery, cultural competency, and service effectiveness?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Program partner interviews ● Document review ● Observations ● Participant interviews ● Administrative data ● Publicly available data |
| <p>Ability to provide wrap-around services</p> | <p>Community partnerships and collaboration</p> | <p>To what extent are program partners across sites in communication and/or collaboration with each other? How many LA DOOR participants are receiving multiple services?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Program partner interviews ● Document review ● Observations ● Participant interviews ● Administrative data |
| | <p>Capacity building</p> | <p>To what extent have additional services been made available through the capacity building project? What are trends in housing access for LA DOOR participants?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Program partner interviews ● Document review ● Participant interviews ● Administrative data ● Publicly available data |
| | <p>Cultural competence</p> | <p>Are staff members aware of the impact of cultural and racial factors on service delivery? Is there diversity among staff and participants? Does the</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Program partner interviews ● Observations ● Participant interviews ● Administrative data |

Preliminary LA DOOR Local Evaluation Plan

| Measures | Output | Questions | Data Collection |
|----------|-------------------------|---|--|
| | | diversity of staff reflect the diversity of participants? | |
| | Focus on the individual | How do service providers aim to reduce barriers to care (e.g., transportation)? Is feedback collected from LA DOOR participants? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Program partner interviews ● Observations ● Participant interviews |

Data Collection Activities and Timeline

The process evaluation research design entails a combination of site observations, interviews, focus groups, and ride-a-longs. KH will take the lead in implementing the process evaluation with specific assessments at project milestones: Month 12, Month 24 (two-year), and Month 32 (project end). During the course of the process evaluation, KH’s focus will be on identifying issues and working with the involved parties to take corrective actions during the course of the project.

Thoughtful process evaluation requires multiple perspectives, including input from both the LA DOOR partners and participants. Table 4 displays the types of process evaluations proposed.

Table 4: Process Evaluations

| LA DOOR Partners and Participants | Process Evaluation | Frequency |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| SSG Project 180 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Develop data collection metrics ● Site visits ● Ride-a-longs ● 1:1 interviews with staff ● Discussions of identified issues and potential intervention options | 3 reviews: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● By Month 12 ● By Month 24 ● By Month 32 |
| LA City Attorney’s Office | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Develop data collection metrics ● Site visits ● 1:1 interviews with staff ● Discussions of identified issues and potential intervention options | 3 reviews: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● By Month 12 ● By Month 24 ● By Month 32 |
| Housing Provider (TBD) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Develop data collection metrics ● Site visits ● 1:1 interviews with staff ● Discussions of identified issues and potential intervention options | 3 reviews: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● By Month 12 ● By Month 24 ● By Month 32 |

Preliminary LA DOOR Local Evaluation Plan

| LA DOOR Partners and Participants | Process Evaluation | Frequency |
|---|---|--|
| LA DOOR Participants | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finalize approach for soliciting feedback from LA DOOR participants (e.g., ongoing site surveys, intake forms, focus groups) • Identify and purchase best incentives for LA DOOR focus group participants (e.g., food vouchers, cash, etc.) • Facilitate Q² Focus Groups | Annually: 3-4 focus groups per year with 8-10 participants in each focus group <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By Month 12 • By Month 24 • By Month 32 |
| Advisory Group | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attend all quarterly meetings • Collect observational data for at least 2 meetings • If needed, provide feedback on how to strengthen future meetings | 2 reviews: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By Month 12 • By Month 24 |
| Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LAPD ride-a-longs • Observe LAPD information sessions for LA DOOR • Facilitate a Q² Focus Group with a sample of LAPD officers involved in LA DOOR | 1 LAPD information session observation by Month 12 2 Q ² Focus Groups <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By Month 24 • By Month 32 |
| Capacity Building Group (TBD) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review capacity building group work plan • Develop metrics • Observations | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By Month 24 • By Month 32 |

Outcome Evaluation Research Design

The outcome evaluation will serve to examine the effect of program participation on anticipated outcomes, including reduced criminal justice involvement, improved legal outcomes, and improved access to services. In this way, the purpose of the outcome evaluation is to determine whether the program is achieving its intended effects.

Program Interventions/Independent Variables

LA DOOR program participants are identified through three mechanisms:

1. **Mobile outreach** to hotspot locations, defined as areas with a high density of misdemeanor drug arrests and homelessness
2. **Pre-booking diversion**, by which LAPD officers who arrest an individual for a qualifying misdemeanor drug-related offense can contact SSG Project 180 via 24/7 hotline to offer services in lieu of booking
3. **Social contact referrals**, by which LAPD officers and other sources (e.g., local businesses) can contact SSG Project 180 using the hotline to connect individuals with services

Preliminary LA DOOR Local Evaluation Plan

In turn, those who enroll in LA DOOR are eligible to receive a host of services. These services include:

- **Cognitive behavioral therapy (CBT)**, a structured psychotherapy directed toward solving current problems and teaching clients skills to modify dysfunctional thinking and behavior. CBT can be applied to issues ranging from mental health concerns (e.g., anxiety, depression) to criminogenic thinking patterns.
- **Mental health services**, including interventions implemented by social workers, marriage and family therapists, and psychiatrists that focus on improving wellbeing, reducing mental health symptoms, and improving daily functioning.
- **Substance use disorder treatment**, including individual and/or group services. This includes harm reduction interventions, relapse prevention, and abstinence maintenance. Depending on the severity of symptoms, treatment may be outpatient, residential, or detoxification.
- **Health and wellness checks**, including checking vital signs, administering medications, providing nursing care, and discussing health-related concerns;
- **Legal services**, including citation relief and applications for charge reduction
- **Housing services**, which follow a Housing First model (i.e., provide housing quickly, then provide services on an as-needed basis).
- **Peer Case Management Services**, including an individually assigned Peer Case Manager with relevant lived experience to help guide LA DOOR participants through accessing and using services, and to provide transportation support.

In addition, services provided by SSG Project 180 are consistent with the Risk-Need Responsivity (RNR) model, the leading evidence-based treatment model for justice-involved populations. RNR emphasizes addressing an individual's criminogenic needs (e.g., substance use, criminal thinking patterns) in an effort to reduce the risk of recidivism. Care is also trauma-informed, in that service providers are sensitive to the vulnerabilities of trauma survivors, as there are high rates of trauma among homeless and justice-involved populations.

LA DOOR estimates that approximately 100 participants (across all sources) will be enrolled during the first year of implementation, with 200 participants enrolled during the second year. The specific number of individuals receiving mental health, substance use, health and wellness, and legal services will depend in part on the needs of individual clients. However, with respect to housing services, it is expected that 13 beds will be available through the housing service provider during the first 6 months of services (10 beds for men, 3 for women), and will increase to 29 beds in the second year of implementation (24 for men, 5 for women).

Method

The outcome evaluation will use quasi-experimental techniques to examine changes within the study population over time, and to determine whether the individuals and/or communities served by LA DOOR experience improvements on the target outcomes.

To the extent possible, RAND will collect baseline data on the outcome measures of interest. This will allow us to make pre/post-LA DOOR comparisons within the sample of participants who are served by the program. As possible, RAND will explore the factors that contribute to program outcomes – for example, whether those who receive more services or a greater intensity of services have better outcomes, or whether matching intensity of services to risk (per RNR) results in better outcomes.

Preliminary LA DOOR Local Evaluation Plan

In addition, RAND is exploring options for a comparison group. In some cases, different comparison groups may be appropriate for examining the effect of different aspects of LA DOOR. For example, it may be possible to use data from the LAPD and City Attorney's Office to track cases originating in South Los Angeles that were processed through traditional court processes, and compare outcomes to individuals enrolled in LA DOOR through the pre-booking diversion program to determine if those in LA DOOR had better outcomes (e.g., with respect to repeat arrests).

For other participants (e.g., those enrolled via the mobile outreach component), it may be more challenging to track intermediate outcomes or identify an appropriate comparison group. For these cases, rather than identify a specific comparison group, RAND will likely focus on tracking change over time from baseline data on the outcomes of interest, as well as potentially examining changes at the community level. For example, RAND will explore the availability of historical data on service utilization, calls for service, and/or crime or arrests in the same "hotspot" areas or the same LAPD divisions to determine whether it is possible to examine changes from pre-LA DOOR to post-LA DOOR (e.g., do the target districts experience an overall decrease in crime relative to similar areas of the city?). These types of measures have certain weaknesses, as it will not be possible to determine whether reductions in criminal activity were due specifically to LA DOOR. However, RAND will explore overall trends in criminal activity in Los Angeles, particularly in areas with similar characteristics (e.g., demographic characteristics, baseline crime rates) in an effort to account for other factors that may affect justice system involvement.

Outcome Measurements

As part the outcome evaluation, RAND will track:

- Short-term outcomes (those occurring within the first six months to one year of program participation)
- Intermediate outcomes (those occurring 1-2 years following participation)
- Project-end outcomes (those occurring by Month 32)

These outcomes measurements are described in more detail below.

Short-Term Outcomes

Access to services. A key aspect of the process evaluation will be to determine how many clients are served by LA DOOR. A related outcome is access to services. RAND will examine whether participation in LA DOOR increases access to services on the individual level. By assessing service access at the baseline level, RAND can measure changes in service access during involvement in LA DOOR. This outcome will be analyzed by service type (e.g., mental health, substance use, legal), and by service provider (i.e., whether services are provided via LA DOOR or via referral to another organization or provider).

Reduced substance use. LA DOOR is designed to serve individuals who have substance use and/or mental health disorders. Therefore, a key outcome will be whether participants experience reductions in substance use. Because LA DOOR uses a harm reduction model, the focus will be on measuring reductions in substance use rather than abstinence. Data will be collected via self-report and/or instruments used (e.g., online LA DOOR Assessment tool) by SSG Project 180.

Reduced mental health symptoms. As noted, individuals who have mental health disorders are within the Target Population for LA DOOR. RAND will examine whether participants experience reductions in

Preliminary LA DOOR Local Evaluation Plan

mental health symptoms, based on self-report and/or instruments used (e.g., online LA DOOR Assessment tool) by SSG Project 180.

Reduced criminogenic thinking. Services provided by SSG Project 180 aim in part to reduce criminal thinking patterns, which will be measured using the Criminal Thinking Scales (Knight, Garner, Simpson, Morey, & Flynn, 2006).

Reduced barriers to employment. SSG Project 180 collects data related to reductions in criminogenic needs, including employment. RAND will collaborate with SSG Project 180 to identify the best way to assess reductions in barriers to employment experienced by program participants. These data may also be collected via focus groups and the online LA DOOR Assessment tool.

Reduced legal barriers. Outcomes will include: (a) obtaining citation relief and money saved on citations, tracked via data from the HEART program; (b) obtaining charge reduction pursuant to Proposition 47; and (c) resolution of case obligations.

Improved housing outcomes. The short-term outcomes related to housing will be access to housing, based on data from the housing partner and/or SSG Project 180 (e.g., online LA DOOR Assessment tool). RAND will also measure length of stay in housing.

Perceived service effectiveness. In addition to the measures of service effectiveness described above, participant perceptions of service effectiveness will be measured.

Intermediate Outcomes

Reduced substance use. In addition to measuring reductions in substance use in the short-term, RAND will also explore whether these reductions are sustained in the intermediate term for program participants. Data will be collected via self-report and/or instruments (e.g., online LA DOOR Assessment tool) used by SSG Project 180.

Reduced mental health symptoms. As with substance use, RAND will examine whether reductions in mental health symptoms are sustained in the intermediate term. Data will be collected via self-report and/or instruments (e.g., online LA DOOR Assessment tool) used by SSG Project 180.

Improved housing outcomes. The intermediate outcome related to housing will be retention in housing, measured using data from the Housing Partner/SSG Project 180.

Increased employment. RAND will assess increased employment among program participants using data from SSG Project 180. To the extent possible, other labor outcomes will be assessed as part of the outcome evaluation (e.g., wages, hours worked).

Reduced severity of medical problems. Using data collected via self-report and/or instruments used (e.g., online LA DOOR Assessment tool) by SSG Project 180 during their interaction with clients, RAND will measure need and service referral for medical issues in the short-term. RAND will also attempt to determine whether the severity of these medical problems is reduced in the intermediate term for program participants. Data will be collected via self-report and/or instruments used (e.g., online LA DOOR Assessment tool) by SSG Project 180 and if possible, outside referral agencies.

Reduced criminal justice system involvement. It may be challenging to measure involvement in the criminal justice system among LA DOOR participants who are not referred via the pre-booking diversion component. However, RAND is exploring options for measuring reductions in justice-system involvement, such as using publicly-available crime data for the LA DOOR Program Area (Southwest,

Preliminary LA DOOR Local Evaluation Plan

Southeast, and 77th LAPD Divisions) to determine if there is a reduction in criminal activity after LA DOOR implementation. RAND will consider the use of such measures as calls for service and arrests.

Reduced recidivism. RAND will measure recidivism among the subset of LA DOOR participants who were enrolled via pre-booking diversion. Given data available through the LAPD and the City Attorney's Office, RAND will collect repeat arrest data at a minimum, and are exploring options to obtain other recidivism data (e.g. reconviction).

Project Outcomes

The final report will build on the short and intermediate outcomes. The recommendations will focus on findings, challenges, and strategies for sustaining improved outcomes.

Logic Model

The Logic Model is a visual representation of the project that depicts the logical relationships between the input/resources, activities, outputs, outcomes and impacts of the project.