



## A Framework for Evidence-Based Decision Making in Local Criminal Justice Systems

*An initiative funded by the National Institute of Corrections  
with support from the Office of Justice Programs*

Technical assistance provided by:  
Center for Effective Public Policy, Pretrial Justice Institute,  
The Justice Management Institute, and The Carey Group

### Starter Kit

#### 1a: Conducting an EBDM Readiness Checklist

#### Appendix 2: Template for Summarizing Checklist Results

### SHORT-TERM TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO JURISDICTIONS INTERESTED IN ADVANCING EVIDENCE-BASED DECISION MAKING IN THEIR LOCAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM

*Readiness Checklist Results Summary*

N = \_\_

#### POLICY-LEVEL COLLABORATION

- 1. The individual stakeholders listed below are committed philosophically to using empirical research to guide decision making in their respective roles/areas of practice in the local criminal justice system.**

	YES	UNCLEAR	NO	Count
Law enforcement				
Pretrial services				
Victim advocates				
Prosecution				
Defense				
Jails				
Court administrators				
Judges				
Community corrections/probation				
City/county executives/administrators				
Legislators				
Community representatives/public				
Other ( <i>list here</i> )				

- 2. The individual stakeholders listed below are philosophically committed to collaborating to ensure that empirical research guides decision making across all areas of the local criminal justice system.**

	YES	UNCLEAR	NO	Count
Law enforcement				
Pretrial services				
Victim advocates				
Prosecution				
Defense				
Jails				
Court administrators				
Judges				
Community corrections/probation				

City/county executives/administrators				
Legislators				
Community representatives/public				
Other ( <i>list here</i> )				

**3. The individual stakeholders listed below are represented (as measured by formal inclusion and routine participation) on an existing or planned/proposed local criminal justice policy team.**

	YES	UNCLEAR	NO	Count
Law enforcement				
Pretrial services				
Victim advocates				
Prosecution				
Defense				
Jails				
Court administrators				
Judges				
Community corrections/probation				
City/county executives/administrators				
Legislators				
Community representatives/public				
Other ( <i>list here</i> )				

**4. For Question 3, indicate whether the team is:**

	Count
Existing	
Planned/proposed	

**5. How confident are you that your jurisdiction will be successful in engaging all key stakeholder agencies (see list of stakeholders in Question 3) in your jurisdiction in this Framework initiative and sustaining their involvement over the long term?**

	Percent	Count
Very		
Somewhat		
Not at all		

**6. A forum for collaborative work has been formally established to take on this evidence-based decision making initiative (e.g., there is a mechanism for meeting on a regular basis, work to be accomplished has been defined, operating norms/ground rules have been established).**

	Percent	Count
Yes		
Not yet, but steps have been taken		
Steps have not yet been taken		

**7. The stakeholders have developed a systemwide vision and agreement on a common set of goals.**

	Percent	Count
Yes		
No		

**8. If you answered no to Question 7, are stakeholders committed to discussing and reaching agreement on a systemwide vision and common goals?**

	Percent	Count
Yes		
No		
Don't know		
N/A (Question 7 marked "yes")		

## COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT EFFORTS

**9. The stakeholders have developed a deliberate strategy to educate the local community (e.g., representatives of various interest groups as well as citizens at large) about relevant crime and risk reduction research and efforts underway to apply these findings locally.**

	Percent	Count
Yes		
No		

**10. The stakeholders have begun to implement this community education strategy.**

	Percent	Count
Yes		
No		

**11. The stakeholders have identified methods to actively engage community representatives in their strategic planning efforts.**

	Percent	Count
Yes		
No		

## EVIDENCE-BASED KNOWLEDGE

**12. Stakeholder agencies have equipped their individual agency leadership and staff with EBP knowledge/skills by conducting both training and skill building events on practices that are evidence-based.**

	YES	UNCLEAR	NO	Count
Law enforcement				
Pretrial services				
Victim advocates				
Prosecution				
Defense				
Jails				
Court administrators				
Judges				
Community corrections/probation				
City/county executives/administrators				
Legislators				
Community representatives/public				
Other				

## IMPLEMENTATION OF EVIDENCE-BASED PRACTICES

**13. Validated assessment instruments are used to inform decisions for (select only one):**

	Percent	Count
All/most types of cases		
Only certain types of cases (e.g., drug-related, sex offenses, other violent crimes)		
N/A—none used		

**14. Stakeholders (e.g., judges, prosecutors, defenders) have adopted mechanisms to acquire and use consistent assessment information (e.g., offender risk/needs information, knowledge regarding evidence-based programming) to inform individual case dispositions in the following ways:**

	Yes	No	Count
Arrest decision			
Cite vs. detain decision			
Pretrial release decision			
Diversion decision			
Plea negotiation decision			
Sentencing decision			
Jail programming decision			
Community supervision-level decision			
Community programming decision			
Violation decision			
Early termination decision			

**15. Stakeholder agencies agree that more intensive interventions are best reserved for higher risk offenders.**

	Percent	Count
All agree		
Most agree		
Few agree		
None agree		

**16. Stakeholder agencies deliver services and interventions to offenders based on assessed criminogenic needs.**

	Percent	Count
All deliver		
Most deliver		
Few deliver		
None deliver		

## CONTINUOUS QUALITY IMPROVEMENT AND PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT

**17. The stakeholders have agreed on a “scorecard” to measure systemwide performance.**

	Percent	Count
Yes		
No		

**18. If you answered no to Question 17, are stakeholders committed to discussing and reaching agreement on a “scorecard” to measure systemwide performance?**

	Percent	Count
Yes		
No		
Don't know		

**19. The following are in place to ensure evidence-based practices are incorporated into decision making at the system level:**

	Yes	No	Count
System-level logic model			
Quality assurance mechanisms that assess fidelity of implementation			
Key benchmarks, performance measures			
Strategies to collaboratively assess benchmarks and performance measures and address identified performance issues			

**20. If you answered no to Question 19, are stakeholders committed to developing and instituting these mechanisms and indicators?**

	Percent	Count
Yes		
No		
Don't know		

## EXTERNAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE NEEDS

Indicate the amount/level of assistance that your team needs in the following areas (high need for assistance, moderate need, etc.):

	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW	NO NEED	Count
21. Initially identifying/engaging the full range of necessary stakeholders					
22. Establishing a shared vision for the team					
23. Clarifying the roles and responsibilities of team members					
24. Establishing a results-driven structure for the team's operation					
25. Developing mechanisms to promote long-term engagement of team members					

26. Establishing benchmarks, performance indicators, and outcome measures				
27. Equipping leadership across the system with knowledge about evidence-based principles/practices				
28. Equipping practitioners across the system with knowledge about evidence-based principles/practices				
29. Equipping practitioners across the system with evidence-based skills/competencies				
30. Raising awareness and engaging the public in the initiative				