From: Letavish, George
To: Irving, Toni
Subject: NRI
Date: Friday, July 27, 2012 12:50:00 PM
Attachments: NRI Questions.docx

Toni,

I reviewed several online sources regarding NRI as well as numerous documents from Jason Boltz (DPH General Counsel); however, nothing I've come across thus far provides the necessary data or information required for measuring the impact of NRI's programs.

Please let me know whenever you schedule a time to meet with the Director of Programs. In preparation for that meeting, I brainstormed a number of questions I believe would be useful in order to obtain the information required to adequately compare the programs. Some of them refer to individual program-specific characteristics, and others are necessary to compare providers and programs across communities or the component programs by category.

Although the amount of money invested into each program and the benefit or outcome are the most important pieces of information needed, I think there are four additional areas to consider since we cannot control for a variety of different factors that may influence the results.

1) Variance in community or participant characteristics
    a. Ex. If one group's starting benchmarks were much lower, incremental improvement may be a better indicator
2) Delivery and execution of programs based on IVPA criteria (effectiveness of implementation)
    a. Ex. When comparing categories of component programs it may be worthwhile to throw out poorly executed programs
3) Outliers or inconsistent trends that may have distorted the overall outcome
    a. Ex. A program may have started strong and then fallen apart but still look good overall
    b. Any particularly positive or negative events or factors outside of program/provider control
4) Reliability and accuracy of data
    a. Data sources and reporting methods
    b. Ex. Any inclusion/exclusion of participants into outcome categories that is questionable and affects the overall results in a significant manner

Pew CBA reference:
http://cbkb.org/2012/04/guest-blog-13-states-get-on-board-for-cutting-edge-cost-benefit-analysis/, April 2012

"To meet this need, Connecticut, Florida, Idaho, **Illinois**, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Massachusetts, New Mexico, New York, Oregon, Texas, and Vermont, with assistance from Pew's Results First initiative, are adapting a proven research and analysis model developed and implemented over 15 years by the Washington State Institute for Public Policy (WSIPP)."

Please let me know if you have any additional information regarding what steps we're taking towards adapting Results First recommendations or WSIPP's model and who is doing this work.

Also, I put the list of public safety/abuse hotlines and your advised note on Andy's desk the other day, but I haven't heard back or received any further instructions.

George