Collecting, Analyzing, and Sharing Data

When jurisdictions hold policy discussions and make decisions based on data, they are able to develop systems that yield better outcomes. Data might relate to case processing (e.g., numbers and types of cases in the system, flow of cases), the client population (e.g., demographics, offense types, criminal histories), and harm reduction (e.g., changes in attitudes and behaviors, changes in risk/needs assessment scores, satisfaction of people on supervision and of victims with their justice system experiences).

Jurisdictions often develop performance measures, which are benchmarks or objective indicators, to help them evaluate:

EFFECTIVENESS

To what extent
are intended outcomes
being achieved?

EFFICIENCY

Are maximum
outcomes being achieved
at minimum cost?

SATISFACTION AND QUALITY

Are the right processes
being used? To what degree
is there satisfaction
with them?

TIMELINESS

To what extent are
activities or processes taking
place within predetermined
time frames?

Steps for Developing Performance Measures

1. **Form a data workgroup** comprising key stakeholders, including leadership, line staff, and information technology and data analysis experts. Partner with a local university or hire an outside consultant/researcher if beneficial.

2. **Identify the data** you want to collect and the data parameters (e.g., time period for which you want to collect data, population on whom you want to collect data). The data should relate to the agency's goals (long-term) and objectives (short-term).

3. **Identify performance measures** that can be used to assess processes and outcomes.

4. **Determine whether data exists** or if there is capacity to capture it.

5. **Collect the data,** and perform needed quantitative analyses, converting the data into ratios, percentages, percent change, averages, or more complex calculations if needed.

6. **Share the information** with stakeholders and others in a clear and easily understood manner, for example, using graphs, charts, and/or tables.

7. **Identify change targets** and prioritize them.

8. **Develop improvement plans** and set targets for each performance measure.

9. **Continue to track** performance measures to ensure improvements are made.

To be as valuable as possible, performance measures should be:

Related to goals and objectives

Quantifiable and measurable

Defined with specific performance targets

Shared with stakeholders and others

Monitored regularly

PPCJI

Pennsylvania Partnership
for Criminal Justice
Improvement

Sample Performance Measures

The following are examples of performance measures for areas in which continuous quality improvement might be conducted:[1]

CQI AREAS AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

RISK/NEEDS ASSESSMENTS

- # and % of staff who pass interrater reliability assessment testing
- % of assessments where risk level is overridden (and reasons for override)

CASE PLANNING

- % of reviewed case plans developed with input of the person on supervision
- % of reviewed case plans completed in the designated time frame
- % of reviewed case plans addressing the three most influential criminogenic needs, including the driver
- % of reviewed case plans that reflect the person's responsivity factors, strengths, triggers, and stabilization needs
- % of reviewed case plans with simple, clear goals and SMART action steps

ONE-ON-ONE INTERVENTIONS

- % of staff who use motivational interviewing skills
- % of appointments during which staff teach a concrete skill related to a criminogenic need
- % of appointments during which staff conduct a practice session (role-play) to help build a skill related to a criminogenic need
- % of one-on-one appointments that are 20 minutes or longer

BEHAVIOR MANAGEMENT

- # (and average by person) of positive behaviors reported
- # (and average by person) of rewards provided
- Time lapse between prosocial behaviors and rewards
- # of noncompliant behaviors reported
- Time lapse between noncompliance and responses
- % of cases where rewards outnumber responses to noncompliance by a ratio of at least 4 to 1

COMMUNITY-BASED SERVICES

- # and % of community-based services that underwent a fidelity assessment
- % improvement on the fidelity assessment score

EXPERIENCES OF PEOPLE WHO ARE JUSTICE-IMPACTED

- Average decrease in risk/needs assessment scores
- % of people who indicate on a survey that interventions helped them make better choices
- % increase in the level of satisfaction with the justice system experienced by people on supervision
- % increase in the level of satisfaction with the justice system experienced by victims

---

[1] For more information on continuous quality improvement, see the EBP brief *Continuous Quality Improvement*.