

## **Arizona – NCJRP Phase III Data Infrastructure Template**

### **1. Introduction**

The purpose of this document is present the data infrastructure and integration plan to support the planning, implementation, and evaluation efforts related to the Lewis Second Chance Center (hereafter, LSCC or “the center”). The plan was developed by the Arizona Criminal Justice Commission (ACJC) and the Center for Correctional Solutions (CCS) at Arizona State University (ASU). Andrew LeFevre of the Arizona Criminal Justice Commission is the point of contact.

### **2. Evaluation Data Requirements**

#### **a. Policy Questions to be Addressed**

The primary goal of the formative evaluation was to examine the extent to which the anticipated procedures of the center were being implemented as intended. Adopting a formative evaluation approach allowed us to begin to examine the overarching effectiveness of the center and by first exploring the extent to which any heterogeneity can be linked to variation in the fidelity, delivery, and experience of services, as well as whether the intended population is being reached.

#### **b. Evaluation Criteria**

The evaluation plan for this project is broken down into two components:

1. A gap analysis of the existing data collection and structure
2. A comparison of the characteristics of LSCC participants with those who do not participate in the center

**The gap analysis** included “taking stock” of what data were currently being collected by the Arizona Department of Corrections Rehabilitation and Reentry (ADCRR) and Department of Economic Security (DES) about center participants and comparing that to what additional data and information would need to be collected to fully understand the experience and impact of the center on successful reentry outcomes. This will include, for example, what data are currently being collected on the classes and programs offered within the center and what additional data could be collected to better understand how the classes and programs are performing.

**A comparison of participant and non-participant characteristics** examined the risk scores of those who participated in the center, those who were offered participation in the center but declined, and those who were not eligible for the center. By examining the risk scores, we were better able to determine if the centers are providing services to those who are most at risk for recidivism, as they were intended.

#### **c. Data Categories for Analysis**

The research team began by first performing a gap analysis of the data that was currently collected by the ADCRR and DES. This included reviewing all data points that are routinely collected by both organizations and determining whether this adequately captures key points of variation in the center experience.

Our state also analyzed administrative participant and non-participant characteristics provided by the ADCRR to determine whether those that are entering the center appropriately fit the eligibility and selection criteria.

### 3. Governance and Policies

#### a. Decision Making Body

The Arizona Criminal Justice Commission (ACJC) served as the primary decision-making body established to ensure stakeholder involvement, support, and resource allocation.

#### b. Key Partners

The Arizona Department of Corrections Rehabilitation and Reentry, as the state agency responsible for running the center, provided data as outlined. The Department of Economic Security, as a partner with ADCRR in the center, provided additional information as needed about center activities and operations. This largely included information on the activity cycle required of center participants. The Center for Correctional Solutions (CCS) at ASU will be responsible reviewing and analyzing all the data provided by the research partners. To that end, The CCS will house and organize all data provided by the research partners and stakeholders.

#### c. Capabilities and Competencies

The Arizona Criminal Justice Commission serves as one of the lead agencies on the Arizona NCJRP team and includes **Andrew LeFevre**, Executive Director, who serves as co-chair of the Arizona NCJRP team, **Joshua Cutler**, who is responsible for coordinating team meetings and information gathering to further the project objectives. Additionally, Statistical Analysis Center Director, **Jillian Ware**, and Director of Research, **Dr. Jaimie Jeffords**, will be available to assist with the activities of ASU as needed.

The Arizona Department of Corrections Rehabilitation and Reentry is responsible for providing data to all relevant parties and providing access to the facilities once evaluation activities can begin in-person. The ADCRR team includes **Karen Helman**, Assistant Director for Inmate Programs and Reentry, who serves as the co-chair of the Arizona NCJRP team and as the primary point of contact with the Department. In addition, **Dr. Michael Dolny**, from the Department’s research unit will provide data as required to complete the evaluation.

The Department of Economic Security is responsible for providing employment data for individuals who attended the center. The DES representative is **Tim Tucker**, who is the Deputy Administrator for the Workforce Development Administration within DES.

The Center for Correctional Solutions will perform both original data collection and secondary data analysis of the data currently collected. The center has extensive research experience in the correctional system, with a heavy focus on how the delivery

of programs and policies can be improved for both inmates and staff. The center staff includes **Dr. Wright**, who has collaborated with state agencies on a number of projects, including as Principal Investigator of a project examining the impact of restrictive housing on the mental health of officers and people who are incarcerated, as well as other projects relating to programming for security group threat members and motivational interviewing training for correctional officers. **Dr. Young** has served as a co-investigator on two government-funded grants related to prison: “The Prison Inmates Networks Study (PINS)” and “Network Mechanisms in a Prison-Based Therapeutic Community,” and is an expert in rigorous research methodologies and advanced statistics.

**d. Data Infrastructure Challenges and Potential Solutions**

*i. COVID-19*

Due to COVID-19, admissions to ADCRR by volunteers was suspended and the center closed in early May 2020. Given the absence of the programming partner and participants, as well as the nature of the pandemic, it has been challenging to anticipate all necessary procedures for the formative and outcome evaluation. To this end, key participants have maintained frequent contact with one another and plan to discuss project plans.

**4. Data Sharing Architecture**

**a. Process to be Used to Provide Data**

The formative evaluation primary included the analysis of secondary data provided by ADCRR and DES.

*i. Methods of Generation, Transport Means, Data Structure and Transformation*

The information required for the gap analysis was gathered by the CCS through brief interviews ADCRR and DES staff. The data required for the comparison of participant versus non-participant and will be provided by Dr. Dolny at ADCRR via email. This data will be provided in Stata (i.e., .dta) format.

**5. Data Management Environment**

**a. Methods of Organization and Management**

As data were received, the CCS will store both raw and cleaned files in a secured Dropbox folder. This folder is only accessible to members to the research team. Subfolders will contain the data syntax that was used to transform the raw data files into clean data files, as well as any analyses performed. Brief descriptions of each data syntax file will also be included.

**6. Data Curation**

**a. Methods of Organization, Management, and Normalization**

*ii. Data Quality Analysis*

All data will be thoroughly cleaned (e.g., check and remove duplicates) by members of the research team at the CCS.

*iii. Data Consolidation*

All additional quantitative analyses were then be performed in Stata.

*iv. Merging Data Across Sources*

No merging across participant-level data was conducted for this project.

**7. Data Analysis**

**a. Anticipated Analysis Process**

Dr. Kevin Wright and Dr. Jacob Young at the CCS were primarily responsible for data analysis, with assistance from the ACJC’s Jillian Ware and Dr. Jaimie Jeffords as needed.

The gap analysis consisted of meeting with and determining, in collaboration with ADCRR and DES staff, whether the data currently collected is sufficient for conducting an outcome evaluation. This included determining whether all the necessary data points are in place and if not, what solutions can be implemented to integrate their collection into routine center procedures.

The quantitative data analysis included a comparison of center participants versus non-participants. This analysis is primarily concerned with whether center participants have a higher risk for recidivism as compared to those who were not offered or were offered but declined participation in the center.