U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Using Evidence with State and Local Fiscal Recovery Funds
For More Information on Treasury COVID-19 Economic Relief & Recovery Programs:

https://home.treasury.gov/policy-issues/coronavirus

To Request State & Local Fiscal Recovery Funds:
Please visit www.treasury.gov/SLFRP

For General Inquiries on State & Local Fiscal Recovery Funds:
Please email SLFRP@treasury.gov
The American Rescue Plan Act of 2021

The American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) is providing fast and direct economic assistance for American workers, families, small businesses, and industries and it:

- Continues programs started by the CARES Act in 2020 and Consolidated Appropriations Act in 2021.
- Adds new phases, allocations, and guidance to address issues related to the continuation of the COVID-19 pandemic.
- Creates new programs to address continuing pandemic-related crises, and fund recovery efforts as the United States begins to emerge from the COVID-19 pandemic.
- Was passed by Congress on March 10, 2021, and signed into law on March 11, 2021.
Coronavirus State and Local Fiscal Recovery Funds Overview

ARPA created the Coronavirus State and Local Fiscal Recovery Funds (SLFRF) program to deliver $350 billion for state, territories, municipalities, counties, and Tribal governments much needed aid.

The key objectives for SLFRF are to:

- Support the urgent COVID-19 response efforts to continue to decrease spread of the virus and bring the pandemic under control.
- Replace lost revenue for eligible recipients to strengthen support for vital public services and help retain jobs.
- Support an equitable recovery through immediate economic stabilization for households and businesses
- Address systemic public health and economic challenges that have contributed to the inequal impact of the pandemic on certain populations.
State and Local Fiscal Recovery: Reporting Guidance

The Reporting Guidance addresses priority areas to ensure a speedy and equitable recovery.

Equity Focused
Community Empowering
Worker-Centered
Results and evidence focused

Detailed information on reporting requirements and deadlines is available at: www.treasury.gov/SLFRP
Annual Recovery Plan: Evidenced-Based Interventions

Identify amount of project funds allocated to evidence-based interventions OR if undergoing rigorous program evaluation.

Applies to most Expenditure Categories in:
• Public Health (EC 1)
• Negative Economic Impacts (EC 2)
• Services to Disproportionately Impacted Communities (EC 3)

Encouraged to use Learning Agendas and relevant evidence Clearinghouses to assess the level of evidence for your interventions.

Evidence defined in Appendix 2
Building and Using Evidence
Building and Using Evidence

Diana Epstein
Evidence Team Lead
U.S. Office of Management and Budget
Federal Focus on Evidence

- **Foundations for Evidence-Based Policymaking Act of 2018 ("Evidence Act")**
  - New statutory framework for agencies to strategically plan and organize evidence-building, data management, and data access
  - Learning Agenda → Strategic evidence building plan that highlights priority questions and focuses attention on building the evidence needed to solve big problems

- **Presidential Memorandum on Restoring Trust in Government Through Scientific Integrity and Evidence-Based Policymaking (January 2021)**
  - “It is the policy of my Administration to make evidence-based decisions guided by the best available science and data.”

- **SLFRF** requires recipients to report if (and how much) they use funds for evidence-based interventions and/or rigorous program evaluations
  - Investing in data capacity and program evaluations are allowable uses of funds
What is an Evidence-Based Intervention?

• SLFRF requires that prior studies of the intervention have demonstrated it has a strong or moderate evidence base

• **Strong evidence:** can support causal conclusions for the specific program proposed with highest level of confidence
  • One or more well-designed and well-implemented experimental studies conducted on the proposed program with positive findings on one or more intended outcomes

• **Moderate evidence:** there is a reasonably developed evidence base that can support causal conclusions
  • One or more quasi-experimental studies with positive findings on one or more intended outcomes OR
  • Two or more nonexperimental studies with positive findings on one or more intended outcomes
Importance of Evaluation

• Evaluation is an assessment using systematic data collection and analysis intended to assess program/policy/organization’s effectiveness and efficiency.

• Certain questions can only be answered through evaluation:
  • What is the impact of a program, i.e. did the intervention itself cause the observed change?
  • Which version of a program causes better outcomes?

• Need to plan for evaluation at the outset to ensure necessary data are collected, comparison group formed, etc.

• Evaluation promotes learning and improvement; not simply a tool for accountability, and not an up or down vote on the program’s value.
Evidence and the SLFRF

• Investing SLFRF funds in evidence-based policies helps ensure that dollars are used efficiently and effectively
• Maximize value of investments by using data and evidence to inform budgetary and programmatic decision making
• Encourages state and local leaders to invest SLFRF funds in most effective programs and policies, leading to improved outcomes for communities served
• Opportunity to test new strategies, or test strategies in new conditions, and conduct rigorous program evaluations to build evidence on what works, for whom, and how
• Use this opportunity to build a culture of evidence-based policymaking and learning and improvement that can far outlast SLFRF funds
Using and Building Evidence to Improve Decisions

• My goal is to address educational disparities
  • I could use funds to invest in evidence-based educational services and practices (and track outcomes)
    And/or
  • I could conduct an evaluation of an evidence-based educational service or practice with a new population
    And/or
  • I could conduct an evaluation of an innovative educational service or practice designed with my community’s unique needs in mind

• Results can tell me if disparities are being addressed and how we might serve students even better
Resources

Evidence@omb.eop.gov

• OMB Evidence and Evaluation: https://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/information-for-agencies/evidence-and-evaluation/

• Evaluation.gov Website (*Forthcoming*)


Panel Discussion
The Why and What of Evaluation

Rohit Naimpally
Senior Research & Policy Manager
J-PAL North America
J-PAL’s mission is to ensure that policy is driven by evidence and research is translated into action.

Evaluations

J-PAL researchers conduct randomized evaluations to test and improve the effectiveness of programs and policies aimed at reducing poverty.

Capacity Building

Through training courses, evidence workshops, and research projects, J-PAL equips policymakers and practitioners with the expertise to carry out their own rigorous evaluations.

Policy Outreach

J-PAL affiliates and staff analyze and disseminate research results and build partnerships with policymakers to ensure policy is driven by evidence and effective programs are scaled up.

www.povertyactionlab.org
I. Why Evaluate?

II. What is Evaluation?

III. How to Evaluate?
6. Use of Evidence
The Recovery Plan should identify whether SLFRF funds are being used for evidence-based interventions\textsuperscript{20} and/or if projects are being evaluated through rigorous program evaluations that are designed to build evidence. Recipients must briefly describe the goals of the project, projects conducted by the recipient. In such cases where a recipient is conducting a program evaluation in lieu of reporting the amount of spending on evidence-based interventions, they must describe the evaluation design including whether it is a randomized or quasi-experimental design; the key research questions being evaluated; whether the study has sufficient statistical power to disaggregate outcomes by demographics; and the timeframe for the completion of the evaluation (including a link to completed evaluation if relevant).\textsuperscript{22} Once the evaluation has been completed, recipients must post the evaluation publicly and link to the completed evaluation in the Recovery Plan. Once an evaluation has been completed (or has
Problem ➔ Proposed solution

Problem: High rates of violence in some American cities

• Homicide and violent crime rates are far higher for youth being failed by the system, especially young men of color, than their peers.

Proposed solution: Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT)

• Becoming a Man (BAM) program encourages individuals to examine their automatic thought processes and responses
Clear, credible results

During the program year...

44% reduction in violent crime arrests
  – 18 arrests per 100 youth → 8 arrests per 100 youth

31% reduction in overall arrests
  – 52 arrests per 100 youth → 36 arrests per 100 youth

Why? Follow-up experiment suggests the program helps students to slow automatic responses
Policy attention

Chicago Mayor Rahm Emmanuel increased funding for BAM across the city after the first study.

Former President Barack Obama made federal funding available to expand BAM and mentioned BAM at the launch of the “My Brother’s Keeper” initiative.
I. Why Evaluate?

II. What is Evaluation?

III. How to Evaluate?
Program evaluation

What is the causal effect of the program on outcomes?
How to measure impact?

**Impact** is defined as a comparison between:

*What actually happened* and

*What would have happened*, had the program not been introduced (i.e., the “counterfactual”)

25
Selecting the comparison group

**Idea:** Select a group that is exactly like the group of participants in all ways except one—their exposure to the program being evaluated.

**Goal:** To be able to attribute differences in outcomes to the program (and not to other factors).
Methods as tools

- Pre-post
- Simple Difference
- Difference-in-Difference
- Regressions
- Randomized evaluation
Randomized Evaluation of Becoming a Man (BAM)

1. Identify eligible participants

   (2,740)

2. Random lottery

   Treatment (1,473)

   Control

3. Measure outcomes

   Intervention

   No Intervention
I. Why Evaluate?

II. What is Evaluation?

III. How to Evaluate?
Who?

• Internal evaluation groups:
  – E.g. Minnesota Management and Budget, The Lab @ DC

• Local universities:
  – E.g. California Policy Lab

• Evaluation firms:
  – E.g. MDRC, Mathematica
Evaluation Resources

Groups like J-PAL offer several resources:

• Trainings and workshops

• Toolkits and guides

• Technical assistance
Evidence Resources

Select topics to **Find What Works** based on the evidence

- Literacy
- Mathematics
- Science
- Behavior
- Children and Youth with Disabilities
- English Learners
- Teacher Excellence
- Charter Schools
- Early Childhood (Pre-K)
- Kindergarten to 12th Grade
- Path to Graduation
- Postsecondary

**STATE AND LOCAL POLICY AND RESEARCH PRIORITIES: A BLUEPRINT FOR FUTURE EVALUATIONS ON MOBILITY FROM POVERTY**
The Pew Charitable Trusts
Results First Initiative

Sara Dube, Project Director
sdube@pewtrusts.org

SLFRF Evidence Webinar
August 11, 2021
The Pew Results First Initiative created the Results First Clearinghouse Database to provide users with an easy way to access and understand the evidence base for programs in social policy areas such as behavioral health, criminal justice, education, and public health. More specifically, it allows users to see if there have been rigorous evaluations of a program and, if so, to review information on the program’s effectiveness.

The database compiles and displays key information from nine national clearinghouses, including the rating they assigned to each program and the program’s description, outcomes, setting, and target population (where available). It also contains a link back to the program’s original source page on the clearinghouse website so that users can obtain additional details. Clearinghouses develop this information by reviewing and summarizing rigorous evaluations of programs within their focus area. Then, they assign a rating to each program using their own methodology and terminology (such as top tier, effective, positive, and model).

The database applies color-coding to the clearinghouses’ distinct rating systems, creating a common language that allows users to quickly see where each program falls on a spectrum from negative impact to positive impact. This coding consists of five rating colors that correspond to different levels of impact as shown below.

- **Negative impact**
  - Negative effects
  - No effects
  - Mixed effects

- **Positive impact**
  - Second-highest rated
  - Highest rated

Legend:

- **Highest rated**
  The program had a positive impact based on the most rigorous evidence.

- **Second-highest rated**
  The program had a positive impact based on high-quality evidence.

- **Mixed effects**
  The program had inconsistent impacts based on high-quality evidence. That is, study findings showed a mix of positive impact, no impact, and/or negative impact.

- **No effects**
  The program had no impact based on high-quality evidence. That is, there was no difference in outcomes between program
Evidence-Based Policymaking Resource Center
A collection of resources and promising state and county examples organized by key components

- Program Assessment
- Budget Development
- Implementation Oversight
- Outcome Monitoring
- Targeted Evaluation
Incorporating evidence into state programs
A current example in Minnesota

LifeSkills Training:

• Delivering an evidence-based social-emotional learning program to 14,000 students

• Conducting fidelity monitoring

• Evaluating impact through an experimental design study
Using evidence when allocating resources

Include sections on evidence and evaluation in budget proposal forms

Highlight evidence-based items for decision-makers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Change Item and Description</th>
<th>2021-2023</th>
<th>2024-2025</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEED</td>
<td>Paid Family and Medical Leave. Establishes a paid family and medical leave program funded by a premium on wages. Paid family leave has been found to increase labor force participation and improve child health.</td>
<td>11,416</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHS</td>
<td>Extend MA Postpartum Coverage. Extends the duration of postpartum health care coverage. This has been found to increase use of postpartum outpatient care which in turn is associated with lower maternal morbidity and mortality.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHS</td>
<td>First Episode Psychosis (Funding allocated from federal mental health block grant). Supports specialty care teams in collaboratively developing personal treatment plans that may include psychotherapy, medication management, family education and support, skills training, and work or education support. This has been found to improve mental health outcomes.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHS</td>
<td>Integrated Community-based Housing Pilot. Provides support services to enable vulnerable populations to live independently. This has been found to reduce homelessness, health care costs, and crime.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLJ</td>
<td>Earned Sick and Safe Time. Provides employees with at least 1 hour of paid sick and safe time for every 30 hours worked. Paid sick leave laws have been found to reduce illness.</td>
<td>3,390</td>
<td>3,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOC</td>
<td>Alternatives to Incarceration Expansion. Expands access to community treatment options as an alternative to incarceration. This has been found to reduce recidivism.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFS</td>
<td>Body Worn Cameras. Supports purchase of body cameras for peace officers employed by the Bureau of Criminal Apprenticeship. Use of body worn cameras has been found to reduce officer use of force incidents.</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFS</td>
<td>Body Camera Grant Program. Supports purchase of body cameras by local law enforcement agencies. Use of body worn cameras has been found to reduce officer use of force incidents.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minnesota Management and Budget
May 7, 2021
Using evidence in new or existing grant programs

1. Legislature passes authorizing statute
2. Agency develops and publishes request for proposals (RFP)
3. Applicants submit proposals
4. Agency reviews proposals
5. Agency and applicants negotiate and sign contract
6. Grantees implement proposed activities
• “Evidence-based practices that could be supported with this funding include...”

• “Applications that employ licensed mental health professionals certified in any of the following early childhood evidenced-based practices will be given preference: Attachment Biobehavioral Catch-up (ABC) Child-Parent Psychotherapy (CPP) Parent-Child Interaction Therapy (PCIT).”

• “Responders must propose to use grant funds to cover staff time for mental health providers to attend training and become certified in Managing and Adapting Practice (MAP), Trauma-focused Cognitive Behavior Therapy (TF-CBT) and Cognitive Behavior Intervention for Trauma in Schools (CBITS).”
Effective Program Evaluations

August 2021

Grace Simrall
Office of Civic Innovation and Technology
Office of Performance Improvement
Louisville Metro Government
@Greendrv
@LouisvilleCIT
Our commitment:

Louisville Metro values evaluation as a tool for program improvement and accountability, and therefore seeks to evaluate programs wherever possible. Evaluations, whether conducted internally or externally, should adhere to the following standards.

Standards:
1. Continuous Improvement
2. Accuracy
3. Equity and Ethics
4. Transparency
Program Description:

F2ACT was created in July 2015 to meet a need for the Department of Corrections – there were inmates who would leave and often return to Corrections facilities. The program has evolved over time, but essentially assigns inmates who are considered at high risk for returning a case manager who helps plan their discharge through several avenues: ensuring they have housing, transportation, medication and insurance, bus tickets, an ID, and even a backpack with clothes and hygiene items.
Purpose of the Evaluation:

To determine whether the F2ACT Program is having the intended impact of reducing recidivism

Recidivism is defined as having a greater number of bookings after release from the F2ACT Program

Success is defined as having fewer or equal number of bookings after release from the F2ACT Program

Complete Success is defined as having zero bookings after release from the F2ACT Program.
# F2ACT
Engage stakeholders: Stakeholder Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Known questions/interest</th>
<th>Involvement in evaluation</th>
<th>When</th>
<th>Use of evaluation results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrections leadership</td>
<td>Is the program effective?</td>
<td>Setting questions, deadline</td>
<td>Initial stakeholder meeting 8/23; update with first draft of final evaluation</td>
<td>Present at a conference in April 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2ACT Program staff</td>
<td>How does the program affect subsequent bookings? What role does housing play? What role do other program components play?</td>
<td>Consulting throughout</td>
<td>Initial stakeholder meeting 8/23; ad-hoc as needed for data questions and feedback</td>
<td>Present at a conference in April 2020; use to make program changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrections data analyst</td>
<td>What data exists? Are there gaps?</td>
<td>Pulling data; assisting with analysis</td>
<td>Initial stakeholder meeting 8/23;</td>
<td>Understand for implementation of next evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2ACT participants</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>April 2020</td>
<td>Program improved to be more effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationally accredited correctional facilities</td>
<td>Interest in program and results</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>April 2020</td>
<td>Evaluation results will be presented nationally at a conference in April 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## F2ACT

**Describe program: Logic Model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| F2ACT program staff | Case management in the following areas:  
  - Housing  
  - Medication  
  - Insurance  
  - Transportation  
  - ID  
  - Bus tickets  
  - Backpack (clothes, hygiene, etc.)  
  - Guardianship | # released with housing  
# released with medication if needed  
# released with insurance  
# released with transportation to housing  
# released with IDs/backpack if needed | Participants have somewhere to go when they re-enter and their needs are met for 30 days post-release  
Stability allows participants to avoid crime and new arrests | Reduced costs to Corrections  
Reduced recidivism  
Better outcomes for inmates |
Our Data

**F²ACT program participant data**
Source: program data in an Excel file
Data was pulled from July 1, 2015 to August 31, 2017

**Booking records for the F²ACT participants**
Source: XJail database
Data was pulled from July 1, 2013 to August 31, 2019
Creating one dataset

- Get unique number of participants
- Join program data to booking data (two years before and after participation)
- Calculate new variables and run descriptive and inferential statistics
# Program Demographics

**One-time participants**
- 648 one-time participants
- Average age: 36.8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>71.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Repeat participants**
- 68 repeat participants
  - 60 participated 2 times
  - 8 participated 3 or more times
- Average age: 38.7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>77.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Program Services – Housing

One-time participants

Top 8 Housing Placements

Repeat participants

Top 7 Housing Placements

[Graphs showing data for one-time and repeat participants with different housing placements]
# Program Services – Other Services

## One-time participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Backpack</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medication</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification card</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus tickets</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Repeat participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medication</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backpack</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification card</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus tickets</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Complete success:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero Bookings since Release</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Success:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer Number of Bookings since Release</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Success:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Number of Bookings since Release</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recidivism:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Number of Bookings since Release</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Before:</th>
<th>After:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average days booked</td>
<td>177.98</td>
<td>121.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total days booked</td>
<td>127,437</td>
<td>87,012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40,425 fewer days

Savings of $2,906,961.75
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Q&A
For More Information on Treasury COVID-19 Economic Relief & Recovery Programs:
https://home.treasury.gov/policy-issues/coronavirus

To Request State & Local Fiscal Recovery Funds: Please visit www.treasury.gov/SLFRP

For General Inquiries on State & Local Fiscal Recovery Funds: Please email SLFRP@treasury.gov
Using Evidence with State and Local Fiscal Recovery Funds