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A 2-pronged approach...

- Promoting Evidence-based Programs
  - Theoretically-based
  - Demonstrated effects (confidence)
  - Sponsored lists
    - E.g., Blueprints
  - Funding requirements

- Developing Practice-based Evidence
  - Not an EBP for every community need/context
  - Many programs/services already in widespread use
  - Some of those may be effective
  - Local expertise/fit
What is a Logic Model?

- Visual way (road map) to present how you believe the activities in your program will bring about change
What is a Logic Model?

- Describes program activities
- Links activities to the risk and protective factors you are targeting
- Maps out the short and long term outcomes you expect
The Purpose of Logic Models

- Provides stakeholders with a road map of your plan to achieve intended outcomes
- Communicates the purpose of your program
- Explains why your program is important
- Describes the anticipated outcomes
- Provides a reference point as the program is delivered
Essential Features of a Program Logic Model

Program/Process Components
- Lessons
- Group Activities
- Homework
- Projects
- Social Skill Practice
- Therapy

Risk Factors:
- Poor family relationships
- Attitudes toward substance use
- Poor social skills

Protective Factors:
- Attachment to school
- Prosocial activities
- Positive relationships
- Norms knowledge

Targets

Short Term (Proximal) Outcomes
- Increased knowledge
- Increased social skills
- Improved attitudes
- Better communication

Long Term (Distal) Outcomes
- Increased school success
- Better relationships
- Decreased substance use
- Better mental health
- Decreased problem behaviors in community

Risk Factors:
- Poor family relationships
- Attitudes toward substance use
- Poor social skills

Protective Factors:
- Attachment to school
- Prosocial activities
- Positive relationships
- Norms knowledge

Influence
The Purpose of Logic Models

- A Logic Model allows you to apply what you know through:
  - Prior research
  - Outcomes you have already documented
  - Outcomes others have documented
The Purpose of Logic Models

- Better position programs for success because you are able to plan for:
  - Implementation Activities
  - Program Evaluation
  - Sustainability
Building a Logic Model

- There is no right or wrong way to do a logic model
- Logic models take time to build
- Logic models are best built as a team effort
  - Key stakeholders
  - Organizational Leaders
  - Program staff
Building a Logic Model

- Logic models can be:
  - Organization Specific
  - Program specific
**Program Components**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skillstreaming</th>
<th>Anger Control Training</th>
<th>Moral Reasoning Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal: To teach youth a broad curriculum of prosocial behavior (50-skill curriculum of prosocial behaviors)</td>
<td>Goal: To teach youth self-control of anger</td>
<td>Goal: To raise youth’s level of fairness, justice, and concern with the needs and rights of others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Program Modalities**
Specific strategies, methods, and techniques are used to accomplish the program goals.

**Targeted Risk and Protective Factors**

- **Risk Factors:**
  - Aggressive behavior
  - Impulsive behavior
  - Poor problem solving skills
  - Poor social skills
  - Early initiation and persistent antisocial behavior
  - Favorable attitudes towards antisocial behavior

- **Protective Factors:**
  - Social skills (beginning and advanced)
  - Emotional awareness and understanding
  - Emotional regulation
  - Planning Skills
  - Problem solving
  - Identify triggers and cues of anger
  - Use reminders and reducers
  - Using self-evaluation
  - Heightened moral reasoning

**Proximal Outcomes**
Targeted outcomes that the program is designed to impact immediately following program completion.

**Distal Outcomes**
Outcomes impacted by the program months/years following program completion that have been demonstrated through research.

**Decrease in Conduct Problem Behavior:**
- Improve relationships with teacher
- Decrease in frequency and intensity in daily acting out behavior incidents
- Decrease in impulsiveness
- Help youth feel more responsible

**Improved Pro-Social Behavior:**
- Increased knowledge of social skills
- More likely to express a complaint appropriately
- More likely to express a complaint appropriately

**Improved Anger Control:**
- More likely to respond to anger appropriately
- Less likely to initiate a fight

**Enhanced Levels of Moral Reasoning:**
- More likely to respond to group pressure appropriately

**Decrease Levels of Thinking Errors:**
- See improvements in assuming the worst

**Reduced Criminal Behavior and Recidivism Rate:**
- Less likely to be arrested again
- Less likely to commit a felony again
- Decrease in conduct problem behavior

**Improvement in In-Community Functioning:**
- More likely to be rated higher in domains of home and family, peer, legal, and overall adjustment

**Reduction in aggressive and delinquent behavior**
’I think you should be more explicit here in step two,’
Your Organization/Agency

- Group Counseling
- Victim-Offender Mediation
- Family Group Decision Making
Things to think about:

- Your logic model should be focused on what is being done with the person receiving the services.
- Your program targets are a way to describe how you are getting to your outcomes. The direction is not the same as the destination!
- Your short-term outcomes should be things you are measuring (or plan to measure).
- Long-term outcomes are your “desired outcomes for the future” and should be based in research, experience, and (if possible) actual data from your program.
**My Victim-Offender Mediation Program**

**Program/Process Components**

- Preparatory meeting for victim and offender (1x, 2 hrs)
- Facilitated meeting(s) between victim and offender (1x 2 hrs)
- Creation of a Restitution agreement

**Short Term (Proximal) Outcomes**

- Creation of signed restitution agreement (document)
- Increased empathy for victim (Pre-Post)
- Increased accountability for actions (pre-post)
- Reduced favorable attitudes toward antisocial behavior (pre-post)

**Long Term (Distal) Outcomes**

- Completion of restitution by offender (probation report)
- Decreased recidivism for offender (archival data)
- Improved pro-social behaviors (probation report)

**Risk Factors:**
- Lack of understanding of crime impact
- Favorable attitudes toward antisocial behavior

**Protective Factors:**
- Empathy
- Accountability for actions
- Communication/listening skills

**Targets (attitudes, values, beliefs)**

- Offender/victim learn communication skills
- Offender hears how crime impacted victim
- Offender can offer apologies to victim
- Victim may offer forgiveness to offender
- Agreement is drawn up that satisfies victim

**Training**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Type</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written Program Protocol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Trained in the Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Associated Protocol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring the Quality of Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Procedures for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responding to Departures from the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protocol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restorative Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill Building Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Primary and Supplemental Service Types**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Type</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary Service Type for Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being Rated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1 services (5 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2 services (10 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3 services (15 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4 services (25 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 5 services (30 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental Service Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifying supplemental service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>used: Yes (5 points) No (0 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Quality of Service Delivery**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of services delivered:</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low (5 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium (10 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (20 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Amount of Service**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of youth who received at least</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the target weeks of service:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% (0 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% (2 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40% (4 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of youth with medium or high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>risk scores (greater than low):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% (0 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30% (2 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% (5 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of youth with high risk scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(greater than medium):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% (0 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30% (2 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% (5 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Provider’s Total SPEP Score**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider’s Total SPEP Score</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 (Insert Score)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Targets for Duration and Dosage are dependent on Service Type**

The Commonwealth has adopted the “Youth Level of Service”, or YLS, as its measure of youth risk level. Scores are based on the proportion of moderate to high-risk youth participating in your services.
### My Victim-Offender Mediation Program

#### Program/Process Components

- **Preparatory meeting for victim and offender** (1x, 2 hrs)
- **Facilitated meeting(s) between victim and offender** (1x, 2 hrs)
- **Creation of a Restitution agreement**

#### Program/Process Modality

- Offenders/ victims learn communication skills
- Offender hears how crime impacted victim
- Offender can offer apologies to victim
- Victim may offer forgiveness to offender
- Agreement is drawn up that satisfies victim

#### Target (attitudes, values, beliefs)

- **Risk Factors:**
  - Lack of understanding of crime impact
  - Favorable attitudes toward antisocial behavior

- **Protective Factors:**
  - Empathy
  - Accountability for actions
  - Communication/listening skills

#### Short Term (Proximal) Outcomes

- Creation of signed restitution agreement (document)
- Increased empathy for victim (Pre-Post)
- Increased accountability for actions (pre-post)
- Reduced favorable attitudes toward antisocial behavior (pre-post)

#### Long Term (Distal) Outcomes

- Completion of restitution by offender (probation report)
- Decreased recidivism for offender (archival data)
- Improved pro-social behaviors (probation report)

#### Risk Factors:

- Lack of understanding of crime impact
- Favorable attitudes toward antisocial behavior

#### Protective Factors:

- Empathy
- Accountability for actions
- Communication/listening skills

#### Training

- Offenders/hears how crime impacted victim
- Offender can offer apologies to victim
- Victim may offer forgiveness to offender
- Agreement is drawn up that satisfies victim
Q&A
Thank You!

Evidence-based Prevention and Intervention Support Center
Prevention Research Center, Penn State University
206 Towers Bldg.
University Park, PA 16802
(814) 863-2568
episcenter@psu.edu
www.episcenter.psu.edu

The EPISCenter is a project of the Prevention Research Center, College of Health and Human Development, Penn State University, and is funded by the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency and the Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare as a component of the Resource Center for Evidence-Based Prevention and Intervention Programs and Practices.
Thank You!

- Save the Date:
  - February 21, 2014 at 11 am
    SPEP Overview and Review with an open forum
    Questions and Answer session to follow

- Evaluation of this webinar
  - Available in Web Links panel, lower left corner of the screen

The EPISCenter is listed here:
http://www.episcenter.psu.edu/juvenile
EPIS Center Staff

- Mary Ann Demi- MDemi@episcenter.org
- Sebrina Doyle-Sdoyle@episcenter.org
- Phyllis Law-Plaw@episcenter.org
- Heather Perry- HPerry@episcenter.org
Additional Resources

- More information on building a logic model

- More information on risk and protective factors
  - [https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/ojjdp/193409.pdf](https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/ojjdp/193409.pdf)
  - [http://www.episcenter.psu.edu/sites/default/files/ctc/Risk_Factor_Chart-Definitions_and_Behaviors.pdf](http://www.episcenter.psu.edu/sites/default/files/ctc/Risk_Factor_Chart-Definitions_and_Behaviors.pdf)
  - [http://www.episcenter.psu.edu/sites/default/files/ctc/Protective_Factor_Chart-Definitions_and_SDS.pdf](http://www.episcenter.psu.edu/sites/default/files/ctc/Protective_Factor_Chart-Definitions_and_SDS.pdf)
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Other things to consider:

- **What training is needed** to facilitate this service?
- **Who benefits** most from this service or component?
- **How often** do the activities need to happen to be effective? (Dosage)
- What is the **average time needed** at each session or with each component? (Duration)
- As you are putting together the information from this logic model, consider writing it down if you haven’t already to **create a manual or guide** that states the expectations for this service or component of your service.
Thank You!

Evidence-based Prevention and Intervention Support Center
Prevention Research Center, Penn State University
206 Towers Bldg.
University Park, PA 16802
(814) 863-2568
episcenter@psu.edu
www.episcenter.psu.edu