NIC
National Institute of Corrections

C E P P
Center for
Effective
Public Policy

EBDM

EVIDENCE-BASED DECISION MAKING IN STATE AND LOCAL JURISDICTIONS: INITIATIVE REVIEW

RESULTS OF EVIDENCE-BASED DECISION MAKING SURVEY

JULY 2021

Center for Effective Public Policy

TABLE OF CONTENTS

BACKGROUND

In March 2021, the National Institute of Corrections (NIC) partnered with the Center for Effective Public Policy (CEPP) to conduct a survey of those who had received support from NIC's Evidence-Based Decision Making (EBDM) initiative. The goal was to gather their perspectives on the project's approach, technical assistance and other activities, tools, and other strategies that were most and least helpful to them and their jurisdiction in order to inform future NIC investments in this work.

More than 150 responses were gathered through Survey Monkey, including many from people who had moved on from past positions but who welcomed the opportunity to reflect on their involvement in EBDM.

The following is a summary of the survey results.

1. SURVEY RESPONDENTS

On March 9, 2021, the survey was sent to 471 stakeholders who had participated in at least one phase of EBDM. One hundred fifty-five survey responses were received—approximately a 33% return rate.

EBDM

The EBDM initiative was established to harness the knowledge from a growing body of evidence that can inform justice system agencies' decisions, leading to improved performance and effectiveness. It was also designed to increase system collaboration around a common set of principles and expected outcomes.

The EBDM Framework can be applied at the local level, state level, or both.

For more information, read the EBDM Framework and the EBDM Primer.

2. EBDM TEAMS

The following chart depicts the percentage and number of survey respondents from each EBDM team.

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Colorado, Mesa County	3.87%	6
Indiana, State Team	6.45%	10
Indiana, Bartholomew County	3.87%	6
Indiana, Grant County	3.23%	5
Indiana, Hamilton County	1.94%	3
Indiana, Hendricks County	2.58%	4
Indiana, Jefferson County	2.58%	4
Indiana, Porter County	3.87%	6
Indiana, Tipton County	2.58%	4
Minnesota, Ramsey County	1.94%	3
Oregon, Yamhill County	2.58%	4
Virginia, State Team	4.52%	7
Virginia, City of Charlottesville/County of Albemarle	6.45%	10
Virginia, Chesterfield County	3.23%	5
Virginia, Norfolk County	3.87%	6
Virginia, City of Petersburg	1.29%	2
Virginia, Prince William County	5.81%	9
Virginia, City of Richmond	0.00%	0
Virginia, Staunton County	1.29%	2
Wisconsin, State Team	5.81%	9
Wisconsin, Chippewa County	5.16%	8
Wisconsin, Eau Claire County	3.23%	5
Wisconsin, La Crosse County	4.52%	7
Wisconsin, Marathon County	3.23%	5
Wisconsin, Milwaukee County	8.39%	13
Wisconsin, Outagamie County	3.87%	6
Wisconsin, Rock County	4.52%	7
Wisconsin, Waukesha County	5.16%	8
Answered		**155**

3. STAKEHOLDER GROUP ON THE EBDM POLICY TEAM

Survey respondents were asked to select the stakeholder group that they represent/ represented on the EBDM policy team. The following chart summarizes the results. Those who replied "Other" held a variety of positions, including clerk of court, county justice system manager, Criminal Justice Coordinating Council director, district court administrator, human services director, and representative from pre- and post-charge diversion.

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Community advocacy	0.65%	1
Defense	11.61%	18
Judge/courts	18.06%	28
Law enforcement/police/sheriff	7.10%	11
Local/state institutional corrections	1.94%	3
Pretrial	4.52%	7
Probation/parole	19.35%	30
Prosecution	11.61%	18
State/county administration	6.45%	10
State/county legislator	1.29%	2
Victim advocacy/service provider	1.94%	3
Other	15.48%	24
Answered		155

4. ROLE ON THE EBDM POLICY TEAM

Those surveyed were asked to indicate their role on the EBDM policy team. The chart below summarizes those roles.

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
I was a chair or co-chair of our EBDM policy team.	12.90%	20
I was the coordinator of our EBDM policy team.	17.42%	27
I was a member of our EBDM policy team.	71.61%	111
I participated in EBDM activities but was not a member of our EBDM policy team.	12.26%	19
Answered		155

5. MEMBERSHIP ON THE EBDM POLICY TEAM AT THE TIME OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Respondents were asked whether they were a member of the EBDM policy team when technical assistance (TA) was actively provided. The chart below shows the percentage and number of respondents who were a member of the policy team at the time of TA and the percentage and number of respondents who joined after TA ended.

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	85.16%	132
No	14.84%	23
Answered		155

Helpfulness of Technical Assistance Activities

Participants were asked to rate the degree of helpfulness of six TA activities. The chart below summarizes the results, and shows that the most helpful activity was having an outside facilitator help plan meetings and facilitate discussions/activities/exercises.

	VERY HELPFUL		SOMEWHAT HELPFUL		NOT HELPFUL		DON'T REMEMBER OR N/A		TOTAL
Receiving the EBDM Framework as a guiding document for EBDM policy teams	84.38%	108	14.06%	18	0.00%	0	1.56%	2	128
Receiving support and guidance in forming EBDM policy teams (e.g., identifying members, establishing ground rules, identifying roles and responsibilities, etc.)	78.13%	100	17.97%	23	0.00%	0	3.91%	5	128
Having an outside facilitator help plan meetings and facilitate discussions/ activities/exercises	88.28%	113	9.38%	12	2.34%	3	0.00%	0	128
Receiving guidance documents and examples related to the Phase II Roadmap's steps (e.g., system maps, logic models, performance measures)	78.91%	101	17.97%	23	1.56%	2	1.56%	2	128
Participating in a national, multisite initiative with external technical assistance providers	65.63%	84	21.88%	28	0.00%	0	12.50%	16	128
Receiving guidance separating the initiative in phases, each with distinct timelines and activities	67.19%	86	31.25%	40	0.00%	0	1.56%	2	128
Answered									128

6. EBDM AS A COMPETITIVE PROCESS

Respondents were asked how helpful it was that EBDM was structured as a competitive process for the initial and many of the subsequent phases. As the chart below shows, the majority of people found the competitive process either somewhat or very helpful. They felt that it increased their team's focus and energy and helped them prepare for next steps. Those who felt the competitive process was not helpful indicated that it added delays to the process, lessened opportunities for collaboration, and increased stress.

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Very helpful	26.00%	39
Somewhat helpful	37.33%	56
Not helpful	14.00%	21
Don't remember or N/A	22.67%	34
Answered		150

COMPETITION COMMENTS

"I think this helped bring urgency to the conversation and a healthy push forward."

"It brought out our competitive spirit; we wanted to be part of the winning team."

"It would have been nice to work in collaboration with the other sites as opposed to being in competition with them."

"I believe that EBDM should be available to any community that wants to participate."

"Having a competitive process helped determine commitment to the process and to achieving our goals, but it was also a stressful time for our team."

7. PARTICIPATION IN PHASE II

Participants were asked whether they participated in Phase II of the EBDM initiative—the pilot sites' planning phase—from June 2010 to May 2011. The following chart summarizes participants' responses.

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	32.89%	49
No	67.11%	100
Answered		149

PHASE II

Goal: Test the assumptions of the EBDM Framework and prepare pilot sites for implementation of the Framework

Participating Sites: Mesa County, CO; Grant County, IN; Ramsey County, MN; Yamhill County, OR; City of Charlottesville and Albemarle County, VA; Eau Claire County, WI; Milwaukee County, WI

Primary Roadmap Activities During This Phase: Form a local EBDM policy team; develop vision, mission, and values statements; conduct an EBDM policy team collaboration survey; participate in webinars on various topics; develop "One Less" individual statements and a team document that reflects these statements; conduct system mapping; assess how well current policies and practices align with research-informed practices; identify change targets; create a scorecard; develop a Phase III application

Helpfulness of Phase II Activities

Survey participants were asked how helpful a series of Phase II activities were. As the chart below shows, the majority of participants found the activities somewhat or very helpful, with the most helpful being identifying change targets.

	VERY HELPFUL		SOMEWHAT HELPFUL		NOT HELPFUL		DON'T REMEMBER OR N/A		TOTAL
Developed a policy team charter that defined the team's vision, mission, goals, members, roles, responsibilities, and ground rules	78.26%	36	15.22%	7	0.00%	0	6.52%	3	46
Conducted a collaboration survey	50.00%	23	34.78%	16	0.00%	0	15.22%	7	46
Participated in a series of webinars on various topics (e.g., EBDM in Pretrial Justice; EBDM in Prosecution; Evidence-Based Policing; Introduction to Logic Models)	58.70%	27	30.43%	14	0.00%	0	10.87%	5	46
Participated in monthly webinars among local site coordinators (for local coordinators only)	23.91%	11	17.39%	8	0.00%	0	58.70%	27	46
Completed one or more "mini-assessments" to determine how well policies and practices aligned with best practices	54.35%	25	21.74%	10	0.00%	0	23.91%	11	46
Identified change targets	78.26%	36	19.57%	9	0.00%	0	2.17%	1	46
Prepared an application to NIC for Phase III participation	63.04%	29	21.74%	10	2.17%	1	13.04%	6	46
Received other specialized technical assistance (please describe in question 11 if these activities were particularly helpful or not helpful)	67.39%	31	8.70%	4	0.00%	0	23.91%	11	46
Answered									**46**

Usefulness of Phase II Publications/Resources

Survey participants were asked about the usefulness of a series of publications/resources produced during Phase II. As the chart below shows, the majority of participants found the resources somewhat or very helpful, with the most helpful being the EBDM Framework.

	VERY HELPFUL		SOMEWHAT HELPFUL		NOT HELPFUL		DON'T REMEMBER OR N/A		TOTAL
EBDM Framework	89.13%	41	2.17%	1	0.00%	0	8.70%	4	46
EBDM "Starter Kit"	65.22%	30	23.91%	11	0.00%	0	10.87%	5	46
EBDM User's Guides for pretrial executives and prosecutors	65.22%	30	19.57%	9	0.00%	0	15.22%	7	46
"Fact sheet" describing public opinion survey results from Phase I	52.17%	24	26.09%	12	2.17%	1	19.57%	9	46
Answered									**46**

Additional Phase II Feedback

Participants were invited to comment on Phase II activities that were particularly helpful or not helpful. They discussed the "top notch" technical assistance; the usefulness of the resources developed during this phase; the development of a violations matrix; action plans which, according to one participant, "tended to be fairly laborious and did not provide much for us locally in the long term"; and system mapping, which was seen as essential to sites' success.

PHASE II COMMENTS

"'Ugh; not system mapping!' was my initial thought, but after working through the process, we realized it was a critical step, and we have repeated it to stay up to date."

"It was an incredible, informative experience—worth the challenge."

"The quality of the facilitation was excellent. We could not have done it ourselves."

"All of these resources helped push things forward instead of the group spinning around and around, and thinking it was forward motion."

"The EBDM Framework was and is my Bible to the system approach."

8. PARTICIPATION IN PHASE III

Participants were asked whether they participated in Phase III of the EBDM initiative—implementation of the Framework—from August 2012 to December 2013. The following chart summarizes participants' responses.

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	33.10%	48
No	66.90%	97
Answered		145

Helpfulness of Phase III Activities

Survey participants were asked how helpful a series of Phase III activities were. As the chart below shows, the majority of participants found the activities somewhat or very helpful, with the most helpful being implementing one or more change targets.

PHASE III

Goal: Implement change strategies identified by the EBDM policy teams in Phase II

Participating Sites: Mesa County, CO; Grant County, IN; Ramsey County, MN; Yamhill County, OR; City of Charlottesville and Albemarle County, VA; Eau Claire County, WI; Milwaukee County, WI

Primary Roadmap Activities During This Phase: Prepare a logic model; administer knowledge surveys; receive EBP training; develop key communications messages and a communications plan; begin implementing change strategies; repeat the collaboration survey; create a data dashboard; identify a next set of change targets

	VERY HELPFUL		SOMEWHAT HELPFUL		NOT HELPFUL		DON'T REMEMBER OR N/A		TOTAL
Completed a logic model	51.06%	24	31.91%	15	4.26%	2	12.77%	6	47
Participated in a workshop with Potomac Communications Group to learn how to develop communication goals and message triangles	38.30%	18	25.53%	12	0.00%	0	36.17%	17	47
Developed a message triangle to communicate effectively with internal and external stakeholders about EBDM	38.30%	18	34.04%	16	2.13%	1	25.53%	12	47
Completed a collaboration survey	40.43%	19	34.04%	16	0.00%	0	25.53%	12	47
Received a "Principle Two" assessment	38.30%	18	14.89%	7	0.00%	0	46.81%	22	47
Implemented one or more change targets	74.47%	35	14.89%	7	2.13%	1	8.51%	4	47
Built a data dashboard	61.70%	29	23.40%	11	2.13%	1	12.77%	6	47
Prepared an application to NIC for Phase IV participation	61.70%	29	10.64%	5	0.00%	0	27.66%	13	47
Received other specialized technical assistance	63.83%	30	6.38%	3	0.00%	0	29.79%	14	47
Answered									47

Additional Phase III Feedback

Participants were invited to provide additional comments on Phase III activities that were particularly helpful or not helpful and to describe additional specialized technical assistance they received. Several participants commented on the challenge of creating logic models and developing data dashboards. Many participants commented on the value of the technical assistance in helping them move forward. One person noted that their site received specialized assistance redesigning their approach to working with people with mental illness; another site was connected to experts on conditions of pretrial release, which eventually led to the development of a pretrial assessment tool.

PHASE III COMMENTS

"We developed a local data dashboard that we still use to look at jail, court, and probation data."

"Developing a logic model was too complicated for team members."

"Somewhere along the way, we became more and more self-sufficient, and there was significant intrinsic motivation for our jurisdiction to press forward."

"As we encountered impediments, we brainstormed ways to overcome or circumvent them."

"Without the support of a TA provider to lead and push our team forward, I doubt that we would have succeeded in our efforts to implement our initiatives."

9. PARTICIPATION IN PHASE IV

Participants were asked whether they participated in Phase IV of the EBDM initiative—expansion to a statewide structure—from December 2013 to March 2015. The following chart summarizes participants' responses.

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	50.69%	73
No	49.31%	71
Answered		144

PHASE IV

Goal: **Prepare to expand EBDM at the state level and to additional local sites**

Participating Sites: **Colorado, Indiana, Oregon, Virginia, Wisconsin**

Primary Roadmap Activities During This Phase: **Form a statewide EBDM project planning team; participate in an EBDM Statewide Summit (Wisconsin only); analyze stakeholder engagement, data capacity, criminal justice policy, and communications; select team members to participate in a weeklong EBDM capacity-building training in Aurora, CO, to help local policy teams plan for and implement EBDM; develop a Phase V application**

Helpfulness of Phase IV Activities

Survey participants were asked how helpful a series of Phase IV activities were. As the chart below shows, the majority of participants found the activities somewhat or very helpful, with the most helpful being analyzing stakeholder engagement, data capacity, criminal justice policy, and communications to determine EBDM-related needs in these areas.

	VERY HELPFUL		SOMEWHAT HELPFUL		NOT HELPFUL		DON'T REMEMBER OR N/A		TOTAL
Formed a statewide EBDM project planning team	62.50%	45	20.83%	15	2.78%	2	13.89%	10	72
Participated in an EBDM Statewide Summit (Wisconsin respondents only)	41.67%	30	12.50%	9	0.00%	0	45.83%	33	72
Analyzed stakeholder engagement, data capacity, criminal justice policy, and communications to determine EBDM-related needs in these areas	66.67%	48	23.61%	17	0.00%	0	9.72%	7	72
Participated in a weeklong EBDM capacity-building training in Aurora, Colorado, to help local policy teams plan for and implement EBDM	30.56%	22	9.72%	7	0.00%	0	59.72%	43	72
Engaged with local partners to share information about EBDM; gauged interest in pursuing EBDM along with state partners	62.50%	45	26.39%	19	1.39%	1	9.72%	7	72
Prepared an application to NIC for Phase V participation	43.06%	31	23.61%	17	0.00%	0	33.33%	24	72
Received other specialized technical assistance	31.94%	23	5.56%	4	0.00%	0	62.50%	45	72
Answered									**72**

Additional Phase IV Feedback

Participants were invited to provide additional comments on Phase IV activities that were particularly helpful or not helpful and to describe additional specialized technical assistance they received. Several participants commented on the challenges of establishing true collaboration between local and state teams and on the importance of outside technical assistance to keep the group on track. One participant noted the need for more technical assistance to bring additional counties that expressed interest in EBDM on board. Another commented on the importance of TA providers learning the "local vocabulary."

PHASE IV COMMENTS

"The collaboration between the state and local sites was never codified in any meaningful way."

"What was disappointing was the lack of commitment, ultimately, at the state level, where the initiative died on the vine."

"Virginia hosted an EBDM Summit. It was one of our highlights and we had great attendance. I would rate the experience as very helpful."

"Technical assistance with everything regarding data was particularly helpful."

10. PARTICIPATION IN PHASE V

Participants were asked whether they participated in Phase V of the EBDM initiative—building EBDM capacity at the individual, agency, and system levels—from September 2014 to February 2017. The following chart summarizes participants' responses.

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	62.86%	88
No	37.14%	52
Answered		140

PHASE V

Goal: Address statewide barriers to achieving harm reduction goals and support the expansion of EBDM to additional local sites

Participating Sites: Indiana, Virginia, Wisconsin

Primary Roadmap Activities During This Phase: Participate in a Phase V kickoff workshop; form an EBDM policy team; develop a charter that includes mission and vision statements, as well as information on membership, roles, and decision making processes; identify in-state capacity builders to support local teams; complete a collaboration survey; conduct system mapping; identify change targets; determine data collection needs; develop logic models; create a plan for baseline data collection and performance measurement; create scorecards

Helpfulness of Phase V Activities

Survey participants were asked how helpful a series of Phase V activities were. As the chart below shows, the majority of participants found the activities somewhat or very helpful, with the most helpful being identifying change targets based on decision points identified in the system mapping process.

	VERY HELPFUL		SOMEWHAT HELPFUL		NOT HELPFUL		DON'T REMEMBER OR N/A		TOTAL
Participated in a Phase V kickoff workshop with other in-state teams	52.94%	45	23.53%	20	2.35%	2	21.18%	18	85
Developed a policy team charter that defined the team's vision, mission, goals, members, roles, responsibilities, and ground rules	68.24%	58	16.47%	14	2.35%	2	12.94%	11	85
Utilized in-state capacity builders to support newly formed EBDM teams	40.00%	34	31.76%	27	3.53%	3	24.71%	21	85
Completed a data collection template to determine data collection needs	50.59%	43	28.24%	24	1.18%	1	20.00%	17	85
Created a plan for baseline data, performance measurement, and system scorecards	54.12%	46	29.41%	25	2.35%	2	14.12%	12	85
Completed a collaboration survey	36.47%	31	34.12%	29	3.53%	3	25.88%	22	85
Conducted system mapping	70.59%	60	17.65%	15	3.53%	3	8.24%	7	85

	VERY HELPFUL		SOMEWHAT HELPFUL		NOT HELPFUL		DON'T REMEMBER OR N/A		TOTAL
Identified change targets based on decision points identified in the system mapping process	78.82%	67	15.29%	13	1.18%	1	4.71%	4	85
Prepared an application to NIC for Phase VI participation	44.71%	38	21.18%	18	2.35%	2	31.76%	27	85
Received other specialized technical assistance	41.18%	35	4.71%	4	1.18%	1	52.94%	45	85
Answered									**85**

Usefulness of Phase V Webinars

Survey participants were asked how helpful a series of Phase V webinars were in assisting sites as they developed implementation plans and identified baseline data and performance measures. As the chart below shows, a large proportion of survey respondents did not remember or participate in the webinars; however, among those who did, the majority found the webinars somewhat or very helpful, with the most helpful being the webinar on pretrial.

	VERY HELPFUL		SOMEWHAT HELPFUL		NOT HELPFUL		DON'T REMEMBER OR N/A		TOTAL
Risk Reduction Strategies Across the Decision Points	30.59%	26	14.12%	12	0.00%	0	55.29%	47	85
Court Processing	21.18%	18	12.94%	11	2.35%	2	63.53%	54	85
Public Education/Communications	18.82%	16	17.65%	15	2.35%	2	61.18%	52	85
Professional Development	21.18%	18	18.82%	16	1.18%	1	58.82%	50	85
Universal Risk Assessment	24.71%	21	18.82%	16	0.00%	0	56.47%	48	85
Responses to Prosocial and Noncompliant Behavior	25.88%	22	17.65%	15	1.18%	1	55.29%	47	85
Pretrial	37.65%	32	15.29%	13	0.00%	0	47.06%	40	85
Behavioral Change Interventions	29.41%	25	12.94%	11	0.00%	0	57.65%	49	85
Efforts to Reduce Unintended Costs Imposed on Victims, Offender Success, and Public Resources	21.18%	18	14.12%	12	1.18%	1	63.53%	54	85
Law Enforcement	18.82%	16	12.94%	11	1.18%	1	67.06%	57	85
Answered									**85**

Additional Phase V Feedback

Participants were invited to provide additional comments on Phase V activities that were particularly helpful or not helpful and to describe additional specialized technical assistance they received. As in Phase II, several participants commented on the difficulty but importance of logic modeling and system mapping. One respondent noted that prioritizing change targets was the most helpful task after system mapping.

Collaboration between state and local teams remained a challenge. Some participants from local teams expressed that state teams were "slow" or "lacked firm commitment," and that key stakeholders, such as legislators and judges, were not part of their state team, which hindered the scope of work. On the other hand, a respondent from one state team explained that there seemed to be an expectation on the part of the local team that the state team would solve local problems, yet the state team was working to develop its own change targets and implementation plans. This created capacity issues and stress.

Technical assistance continued to be crucial to teams' implementation of their initiatives, with several respondents commenting on the "big difference" that having a TA provider on site, facilitating policy team meetings, and offering "expert guidance" made to their success and to the advancement of EBDM in their jurisdiction.

PHASE V COMMENTS

"We were a more cohesive group after participating in the Phase V activities."

"Developing agreed-upon goals helped motivate us to hold each other accountable to our responsibilities and tasks."

"Our TA provider was able to quickly learn where team members stood regarding important issues. She was able to engage them and facilitate meaningful discussions that led to significant decisions."

"The work really did help us create a shared vision on how we wanted our justice system to operate. Of course, we did not accomplish it all, but there was significant progress which continues today."

11. PARTICIPATION IN PHASE VI

Participants were asked whether they participated in Phase VI of the EBDM initiative—implementation of the Framework by state and local partners—from February 2017 to March 2018. The following chart summarizes participants' responses.

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	50.36%	69
No	49.64%	68
Answered		**137**

PHASE VI

Goal: Implement change strategies identified in Phase V

Participating Sites: Indiana, Virginia, Wisconsin

Primary Roadmap Activities During This Phase: Implement change targets; review and refine the logic model and change targets; create baseline measures and a dashboard; develop the next set of change targets; complete a collaboration survey; develop communications messages and a communications plan

Helpfulness of Phase VI Activities

Survey participants were asked how helpful a series of Phase VI activities were. As the chart below shows, the majority of participants found the activities somewhat or very helpful, with the most helpful being implementing one or more change targets.

	VERY HELPFUL		SOMEWHAT HELPFUL		NOT HELPFUL		DON'T REMEMBER OR N/A		TOTAL
Implemented one or more change targets	73.91%	51	21.74%	15	0.00%	0	4.35%	3	69
Participated in cross-jurisdictional meetings to coordinate work associated with common change targets	65.22%	45	17.39%	12	1.45%	1	15.94%	11	69
Collected/analyzed performance measurement data	62.32%	43	21.74%	15	1.45%	1	14.49%	10	69
Developed communications messages and a communications plan	42.03%	29	37.68%	26	8.70%	6	11.59%	8	69
Received other specialized technical assistance (please describe in question 25 if these activities were particularly helpful or not helpful)	31.88%	22	26.09%	18	0.00%	0	42.03%	29	69
Answered									**69**

Usefulness of Phase VI Publications

Survey participants were asked about the usefulness of a series of publications/resources produced during Phase VI. As the chart below shows, a significant percentage of respondents do not remember or did not read the resources; however, the majority of those who did found them somewhat or very helpful, with the most helpful being the EBDM User's Guides.

	VERY HELPFUL		SOMEWHAT HELPFUL		NOT HELPFUL		DON'T REMEMBER OR N/A		TOTAL
EBDM User's Guides for defense attorneys, judges, and victim service providers	39.13%	27	24.64%	17	0.00%	0	36.23%	25	69
EBDM Case Studies: Highlights from the Original Seven Pilot Sites	28.99%	20	34.78%	24	4.35%	3	31.88%	22	69
EBDM Stakeholder Briefs for defense attorneys, judges, law enforcement, pretrial executives, probation, prosecutors, state and county legislators and administrators, and victim service providers	33.33%	23	26.09%	18	2.90%	2	37.68%	26	69
Answered									**69**

Additional Phase VI Feedback

Participants were invited to provide additional comments on Phase VI activities that were particularly helpful or not helpful and to describe additional specialized technical assistance they received. During this phase, many efforts were focused on pretrial justice, with one participant noting their jurisdiction's work on a Treatment Alternatives and Diversion program. Several participants commented on the TA provider's continued interaction with their team as the "most helpful part of the process." Two participants commented that they would have benefited from more support around external communication and public education. In terms of the resources developed during this phase, participants expressed that they were useful but were long and required a "huge investment of time," so many people did not read them.

PHASE VI COMMENTS

"Phase VI didn't go as quickly as anticipated, but we are still in the process of implementing things identified and are on our way to fulfilling our EBDM objectives."

"External communication was a struggle."

"Meetings with other EBDM sites were extremely helpful to share strategies that work."

"Our TA provider always followed through with providing requested information and was always available if we had questions. She was able to help the team make the connection between the printed EBDM literature and actual practice. She was respected by all of our team, and she gained everyone's trust, which greatly helped our team navigate change."

12. CURRENT EBDM TEAM

Respondents were asked whether their policy team continues to meet. The chart below shows the percentage and number of "yes" and "no" responses.

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	78.10%	107
No	21.90%	30
Answered		137

Description of Current Policy Team

Participants were asked how they would describe their policy team today. The chart below summarizes the responses.

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Highly effective in our efforts to continue to advance evidence-based decision making	39.09%	43
Partially effective in our efforts to continue to advance evidence-based decision making	55.45%	61
Not very effective in our efforts to continue to advance evidence-based decision making	5.45%	6
Answered		110

Reason Why Work Has Not Continued

Participants whose policy team no longer meets were asked to describe as best as they could why the work did not continue. COVID-19, internal change, conflicting priorities, loss of interest, departing team members, lack of a meeting coordinator, lack of leadership, and lack of NIC support were cited as reasons. One participant stated "the EBDM process moved us too fast"; "key members didn't understand why the process mattered"; "we struggled with how to collaborate across branches of government"; and "there were lots of trust issues." One participant explained that their policy team still meets to discuss the status of past initiatives, but no new ideas are being suggested, making meetings "pointless." Still other participants noted that they have incorporated their work into other initiatives such as their Criminal Justice Coordinating Council, Community Criminal Justice Board, or Justice Reinvestment Advisory Council. In still other cases, the full EBDM policy team no longer meets but some subgroups do, or the state team no longer meets but the local team does.

COMMENTS REGARDING A LACK OF CONTINUATION OF THE WORK

"Our change targets are still in place but movement has stalled."

"The buy-in by some team members was difficult at best."

"The EBDM approach was too much too soon."

"We had a core group that was dedicated and understood the role and potential for change but never enjoyed a tipping point to expand beyond the core."

"Despite the lack of sustainability for our team, the experience was positive and we continue to use the skills of mapping, logic modeling, and the concept of interagency collaboration to create change."

13. POSSIBLE PARTICIPATION IN A FOCUS GROUP

Respondents were asked if they would be interested in participating in a virtual focus group to discuss ways in which EBDM could be most impactful in future efforts. Responses are summarized in the chart below.

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	64.23%	88
No	35.77%	49
Answered		137

EBDM