

Developing a Framework Document (Goal 2)

For this activity McCain has partnered with the Institute for Strategic Dialogue to develop six practice guides that will eventually be combined into one overall framework document. The practice guides are a combination of the read ahead materials that McCain produced for the workshops and symposiums. The plan is to have three practice guides developed from the nine workshops and another three from the symposiums. The ultimate goal for this product is to combine all six practice guides into one framework and promote this framework throughout the US with the help of Strong Cities Network. McCain had originally stated they would be gathering data on use of the framework from practitioners during technical assistance (TA) calls with sites. Although McCain staff informed RTI that a limited number of these calls are occurring, currently there is no system in place to track these calls. McCain is tracking the number of downloads of their read ahead materials and will be tracking framework download from their website. This component is developing a resource and not implementing an intervention or collecting any data that would measure change. As such, RTI will conduct a process evaluation of this component.

Creating the Prevention Practitioner's Network Directory (Goal 3)

The final activity of McCain's TVTP program is creating a network directory. This directory will be housed on McCain's website, but the project staff has also collaborated with One World Strong Foundation to create an app to host it. They are partnering with Parents for Peace and DEEP in New York to help design the app and test it to ensure usability. The network directory recruitment has not been initiated yet, but plans are in place for moving it forward. Part of the recruitment will come from the workshop/symposium follow-up survey that is under IRB review. Progress on this task will be measured through the numbers of practitioners joining the directory and website and app analytics on the number of people who access the directory. An outcome evaluation is not suitable for a network development, so a process evaluation about the creation of such a directory and the procedure of obtaining acquiescence would be most appropriate.

2.5.2 Evaluation Design

RTI will be conducting a process evaluation of all four components in the McCain Institute TVTP project. For the PPN, RTI will review the list of steering committee members, the network membership criteria, the charter, and all other documents the network and its committees create. RTI will plan to observe at least one committee meeting and monitor and document recruitment activities once recruitment is initiated. RTI will review the PPN directory and website analytics once this portion of the project is complete.

As part of a process evaluation of the workshops, RTI will review all the read-ahead materials and watch available recordings of the workshops (two workshops were not recorded due to sensitive nature of the content). We will also review participation and pre-/posttest data that McCain has sent us from their workshops. For the symposiums, RTI attended select plenary sessions during the first virtual symposium and plans to attend the remaining ones.. RTI will also request and review the data collected from the follow-up surveys once that has been approved by IRB and implemented.

For the framework development, RTI plans to review the six practice guides created from the workshop materials, as well as review the comprehensive framework design once it has been fully developed. RTI will also review the list of practitioners who say they are interested in joining the public directory.

2.6 Life After Hate

This section of the report will document our evaluability assessment with Life After Hate (LAH). The evaluability assessment ran from November 2021 to February 2022, during which time we engaged in telephone calls, reviewed available program materials, and completed a survey with LAH.

In October 2021, LAH went through a leadership change that resulted in a reorganization of service delivery and other activities that affected the original program implementation plan. The restructure included changes to internal policies and procedures, updates and expansion of policies around mandated reporting, and procedures for responding to suicide, homicide, and violence risk. In addition, forms were updated or created including consent to services, a comprehensive biopsychosocial intake, suicide risk assessment, and homicide risk assessment. Safety plans and a series of internal staff trainings were also held. ExitUSA client services were updated to address client needs and staffing availability. Furthermore, ExitUSA was experiencing a significant staff shortage.

RTI experienced several challenges initiating our work with the grantee. Initial review of the IMP revealed a lack of clear organization across goals, objectives, inputs, outputs, and outcomes. The new grant point of contact was new to the organization and was not familiar with the IMP. RTI's work in November and December was focused on engaging with LAH staff to understand their project goals and objectives, though that effort was sometimes hindered by the disconnect between the new point of contact, remaining staff, and the intentions of the IMP. The new project lead was upfront about not knowing what the intentions of the IMP author were or how they intended to complete all that was listed in the IMP. The new lead had to meet with others to answer our questions about their project, leaving us waiting to take our next steps. This is a good example of why IMPs need to be clear, linear, and specific. The new point of contact was happy to continue communications with RTI as she identified IMP intentions and reconciled them with project activities. This allowed the evaluation team to better understand how the grantee planned to proceed with each goal as well as outputs, measures, and data available. Although these discussions provided RTI a better understanding of the project, we still believe that a revision of the LAH IMP to simplify it and reflect the current implementation plan would be beneficial.

In this section, we will explain how we concluded the type of evaluation that is best suited for this grantee by first describing the LAH grant project. Second, we will describe how we conducted our evaluability assessment and provide our findings. Finally, we will describe our evaluation plans moving forward.

2.6.1 Project Summary

The LAH's project objectives and activities are designed around three main goals outlined in the IMP: 1) provide support to individuals with risk factors for violent white supremacist extremism (WSE) targeted violence and terrorism through ExitUSA services; 2) enhance outreach to build awareness of the violent WSE exit process among the public and ExitUSA client-base; and 3) develop and implement local prevention framework trainings to enhance the ability of direct service professionals, particularly those in law enforcement and mental health fields. Here we will describe the work surrounding each of these goals in greater detail.

ExitUSA services to support exiting white supremacy extremists (Goal 1)

ExitUSA provides direct support to individuals that may be questioning their belonging to the violent far-right movement (VFRE) with a goal of facilitating their disengagement, exit, and re-integration. The program also works with families and friends who are concerned about their loved one's engagement

with the ideology. Since the leadership change in October 2021, new self-referred clients have undergone comprehensive biopsychosocial intake and risk assessments conducted by a social worker. This had not been done consistently prior to new leadership. The social worker's job is to identify goals and needs, provide referrals to community resources, and referrals to peer Exit Specialists who work with individuals on involvement in VFRE ideology, behavior, and social networks. Clients who are friends and/or family of individuals who are involved in WSE undergo comprehensive biopsychosocial intakes, with brief case management services focused primarily on relevant safety issues. Other activities under this goal include refining screening tools used by the staff, expanding internal and external referral services, and increasing engagement in the ExitUSA Community Forum, which is an online peer community.

Progress on activities is measured by number of individuals and families engaged, rates of internal and external referrals accepted, number of resources developed, number of new referral sources, and rates of engagement in the Community Forum. Though historical records of ExitUSA clients have been inconsistent, a new case management system (CMS) is being implemented in the summer of 2022 for better tracking.

As of February 2022, LAH is in the process of implementing a new case management system. All records from October 2021 up to the time the new CMS launches will need to be manually reviewed and entered to extract any data. It is anticipated that the only reliable data prior to the new CMS implementation would be length of communication between the client and their case worker and/or Exit Specialist. Once this new system is fully implemented, LAH plans to collect more robust data. The CMS implementation timeline is estimated to take between 3-6 months.

RTI has determined that the data collection systems currently in place prohibit an outcome evaluation; therefore, we will conduct a process evaluation of Goal 1. However, RTI will revisit this evaluation recommendation once LAH has more information and is able to communicate how they will utilize their new CMS system, what data will be collected, and confirm the quality of collected data. Also worth noting is that even with flawless implementation and no delays, the new CMS would only provide data for the last few months of the project at most and will likely yield a small sample size.

Outreach to build awareness of exit process and ExitUSA services (Goal 2)

LAH plans to increase outreach to build awareness of the violent WSE exit process and ExitUSA intervention services by updating LAH and ExitUSA-specific website content, conducting an online messaging campaign with a subcontractor (Moonshot CVE), and developing five WSE counter narrative videos targeting their client-base as well as the general community.

Progress on these activities is measured through their website and Google analytics to capture a number of unique page views on the ExitUSA web page, number and type of online campaigns conducted, number of campaign searches matched to LAH's ExitUSA program, number of counter narratives developed, and engagement analytics on Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, and YouTube (i.e., number of clicks, comments, shares, likes, etc.) This component addresses outreach and awareness and does not provide an intervention. As such, RTI will conduct a process evaluation of Goal 2.

Development and implementation of training for professionals (Goal 3)

The third goal of the project is to enhance the ability of local prevention networks to identify and work with individuals at risk of mobilizing to violence through a series of trainings and creating an online Co-Responder Community Forum targeting those who complete these trainings for continuous support and network building. This Co-Responder Community Forum is not connected with or related-to the

Community Forum for ExitUSA clients. There are two series of trainings planned: 1) Mental Health Professional Co-Responder Development (MHPCD) training targeting mental health professionals and 2) ExitUSA Motivational Interviewing (MI), Trauma-Informed Care (TIC) and VFRE 101 training geared towards law enforcement professionals. Curriculum for the law enforcement training is currently under development while MHPCD curriculum is being updated to fit the new and shorter format.

Progress on these activities is tracked by measuring the number of trainings delivered, number of participants attending each session, and number of training participants engaging in the Community Forum post-training. In order to conduct an outcome evaluation of these trainings, RTI worked with LAH to develop and implement pre-/posttests to measure knowledge gained from these training sessions, and a follow-up survey to measure knowledge retention over time.

As previously mentioned, the first round of the MHPCD training that took place in January 2022 had its difficulties, including the fact that none of the pre-test surveys and only one posttest survey was collected, despite disseminating the pre-test to participants two days prior to the training session and allowing time at the beginning of the class to complete the pre-test. This resulted in a revision of the training curriculum and presentation. Ahead of the second MHPCD training session, the pre-/posttest was revised to align with updated curriculum and LAH and RTI collaborated on strategies to increase pre-/posttest data collection response rates. During the session, training facilitators implemented several of these measures, including allowing 10 minutes at the very beginning of the training for pre-test completion. They reminded participants to complete the survey multiple times via Zoom chat during those 10 minutes, requesting that participants indicate completion of the survey via raising their virtual hand or thumbs-up. They also allowed time for posttest completion between the curriculum presentation and Q&A session and disseminated the posttest link via email after the webinar. As a result of implementing these strategies, 22 pre-tests surveys and 17 posttest surveys were collected. LAH staff are currently working on deidentifying data and linking pre-tests to posttests before sharing data with RTI. Additional training sessions employing the same format are planned for May and April 2022. LAH also agreed to deploy follow-up surveys three months after training, with RTI's development assistance.

2.6.2 Outcome Evaluability Assessment

Our evaluability assessment began by reviewing LAH's IMP. Since then, we have had regular, ongoing calls with our LAH points of contact to get project updates and confirm availability of the data collected by the program. RTI continued the evaluability assessment by reviewing the quarterly reports provided to CP3.

RTI also reviewed data collection instruments and materials that were already available and supported the grantee in the development of new ones. LAH shared their biopsychosocial form and RTI was able to review slides developed for the VFRE 101 component of the MHPCD training. Materials for the MI component of the training were requested by LAH from their external training consultant, but as of now, RTI has not received them. After reviewing available materials, RTI helped LAH develop an informed consent and pre-/posttests to collect outcome data in the MHPCD trainings.

RTI completed an Outcome Evaluation Assessment Checklist for each of the three LAH goals as described above to determine if an outcome evaluation or a process evaluation would be the most feasible and appropriate. Based on these findings, RTI has determined that we will conduct an outcome evaluation of the professionals training component and a process evaluation of the outreach component. RTI anticipates a process evaluation would be the most feasible for the ExitUSA services

component, but we will be monitoring the implementation progress of the new CMS to determine if an outcome evaluation would be possible with those data.

Development and implementation of training for professionals (Goal 3)

Is the project designed in such a way that measurable outcomes are realistic to expect?

The project's mission and goals are coherent. The objective is not clear or well defined. Obj. 3.1 is stated as *Build local capacity to enhance ability to identify and respond to individuals at risk of mobilizing to violence*, but a definition of 'building local capacity to enhance ability' is lacking. Additionally, the IMP is not set up logically. Outcomes are not assigned to specific objectives/outputs and one activity related to MHPCD training is listed under Goal 1. However, the component theory of change is plausible, targets identified for each training in the IMP are expected to be achieved and the project is expected to be completed on time.

As designed, the performance measures are all retrospective and are not intended for an outcome evaluation. However, RTI has worked with LAH to implement additional measures that include pre-, post-, and follow-up tests that will allow RTI to measure change and retention of knowledge as well as participants' ability to identify and respond to individuals at risk of mobilizing to violence.

Are the results of the TVTP program verifiable based on the planned collection systems?

Yes, with the revised data collection plan results are verifiable. While LAH set up reliable systems to collect data related to development of training curricula, participation in training sessions, and post-training online forum engagement in their IMP, these performance measures do not measure the objective. Their original measures document progress related to the implementation process, but they do not provide outcomes. Once this was discovered, RTI began working with LAH to develop pre-/posttests to use in remaining trainings which should result in outcome data.

If an outcome evaluation were completed, would it be useful and meaningful?

If LAH moves forward with collecting pre-/posttest data, the outcome evaluation of this project component will be feasible and useful. Based on our knowledge of this project and taking into consideration that LAH will engage in additional data collection activities per RTI's recommendation, we believe that an outcome evaluation would be the best type of evaluation for Goal 3. RTI also recommends that the IMP be updated to align with the revised data collection plan.

2.6.3 Evaluation Design

RTI will proceed with an outcome evaluation of the LAH project component related to development and implementation of trainings for mental health professionals and law enforcement. Using the pre-/posttest evaluation design with three data collection time points (pre-test, posttest, and follow-up survey), an outcome evaluation will allow researchers to measure change in knowledge of VFRE in training participants after the training and retention of knowledge over time.

First, RTI will collaborate closely with LAH on the follow-up survey data collection. To strengthen the proposed outcome evaluation approach, RTI will plan to help identify comparison groups for the mental health and the law enforcement professionals and invite them to complete the same follow-up survey at the same time as the trainees (3 months after training).

In addition, RTI will review resources posted on the Community Forums, the updated curriculum for the MHPCD training, and the new curriculum for the ExitUSA MI, TIC, and VFRE 101 training. RTI will observe training sessions and request data related to training participation and engagement in the online

Community Forums facilitated by LAH post training. Additionally, RTI will continue to have calls with LAH to obtain updates and resolve challenges that may arise around survey data collection.

RTI will conduct a process evaluation of the LAH TVTP project component related to outreach to build awareness of the violent WSE exit process and ExitUSA intervention services. . RTI will monitor progress related to updating the ExitUSA-specific website content and development of five WSE counter narrative videos facilitated by Moonshot, as well as their final report from their targeted online campaign. We will request LAH share their website and Google Analytics metrics to track the number of unique views of the updated website content, average time spent on the ExitUSA page, and engagement analytics on Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, YouTube (i.e., number of clicks, comments, shares, likes).

Regarding the ExitUSA services, RTI determined that it is too soon to decide whether an outcome evaluation is feasible. We will continue our systematic information gathering through monthly calls with LAH to document progress on the new CMS implementation and overall progress in direct service provision. This preparatory work will allow RTI to pursue the process evaluation if an outcome evaluation is deemed not to be possible. RTI will include a review of the biopsychosocial intake form utilized by the program since October 2021 as well as review a list of data and measures that will be collected and documented in the new CMS.

3 Conclusion

3.1 Outcome Evaluation Context and Challenges

RTI encountered a number of challenging conditions that apply to many or all of the FY20 TVTP grant programs. These were either challenges to conducting an evaluability assessment or challenges related to conducting outcome evaluations. Though we discussed site-specific program obstacles to undergoing a potential outcome evaluation in each grantee section, here we will describe challenges affecting multiple sites.

Program type. One of the main reasons we found that grantees are unsuitable for outcome evaluations is that their programs are not engaged in interventions. Rather, they are focused on downstream activities to reduce vulnerabilities to radicalization by engaging professionals, providing technical assistance and referrals, organizing networking opportunities, and creating an assortment of tools and resources for prevention professionals. These sorts of programs are generally not suitable for outcome evaluations as they are unlikely to result in meaningful information. Instead, process evaluations are valuable to track and document program accomplishments related to outputs to ensure that the programs are engaged in the activities they set forth to accomplish.

Program design. Many programs struggle with project design due to lack of specificity or unrealistic causal connections between program activities and desired outcomes. Terrorism prevention is an emerging complex area in which there is limited theory on specific causal understanding identifying ‘the cause(s)’ of terrorism. The complexity of terrorism mobilization and activation creates uncertainty for program actors that can result in program designs that do not clearly connect program purposes, goals, and objectives in realistic ways to achieve measurable reductions in terrorism activities.

Our evaluability assessments worked with program staff and partners to determine if there were clear relationships delineated between program resources, activities, and expected outcomes. RTI observed that program delivery of numerous FY20 TVTP grants often was not designed in a way conducive to measure outcomes because they do not identify suitable comparison groups (or historic benchmarks). Even in these grantee’s training programs, pre-tests are often excluded so posttests rely on self-

reported knowledge or skill attainment, which we discuss further below. The use of pre-/posttests to measure learning began in the education field and migrated to adult learning in the 1950's and 60's, so these are well-established methods (Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick 2006). In fact, the Kirkpatrick four-level model of training evaluation is still discussed and adapted in the literature today (see Alsalamah & Callinan 2021; Muqorobin et.al. 2022). Unfortunately, self-reported data are not reliable enough for an outcome evaluation. More information specific to each site's IMPs can be found in RTI's IMP Recommendations Report submitted to DHS in February 2022.

Data collected from protected populations. Two of the grantees are conducting trainings or interventions with protected populations. Bay Area Project 2 is training students (under 18) to be student ambassadors and CEP is conducting an intervention with inmates in prisons. Usually for program evaluation projects like these RTI receives a "not human subjects research" determination by our IRB, in which the inclusion of protected populations is allowed. RTI received direction from DHS that this study needed to be considered "exempt human subjects research" which results in limited oversight by our IRB and subjects us to the Common Rule. Within the Common Rule there are subparts declaring that human subjects research with an exempt status does not apply to research with minors or inmates. Some government agencies (e.g., DOJ) opted-out of those subparts but DHS did not and so that rule applies to this work. RTI is currently precluded from collecting or receiving any data gathered from students or inmates. RTI is in the process of working with these two sites (Bay Area Project 2; CEP) to examine the possibility of having their IRB oversee RTI's work with these populations for an outcome evaluation, or even a more robust process evaluation. As of March 2022, these sites, RTI, and DHS have all been in communication with the IRB and this request is under review.

Training evaluations. As mentioned above, numerous grantees are conducting trainings as a primary component of their program. Although training programs are not an ideal fit for outcome evaluations, it is still possible to conduct an outcome evaluation if done properly. Through the evaluability assessments, RTI identified Bay Area (Project 1 & 4) and LAH (mental health and law enforcement trainings) where an outcome evaluation of their training program was feasible, though they are not without their challenges.

One aspect of measuring outcomes that is often lacking with grantees conducting trainings is the ability to identify a reliable baseline and post-training assessment to measure changes in knowledge transfer. The use of pre-/posttests to evaluate trainings is a well-established and common practice in education where training is prevalent. Many grantees have the capacity to track reaction performance measures after trainings such as attendance, feedback on the training, and self-reported knowledge gain. Although these data are helpful for tracking outputs and improving future trainings, these self-report data do not provide reliable information on the effectiveness of the training (Athanasou 2005). Empirical outcome measures of the trainings – in other words, pre-/posttests evidencing learning or how the trainees apply their new knowledge – are needed to observe objective change yet are not captured by the grantees in their IMPs. This approach involves time and resources these grants do not currently cover or anticipate. A structured pre-/posttest would involve questions on topics covered in the training being asked prior to training. The same questions would be asked after training to determine if there were positive shifts in test scores.

It is also a best practice in training evaluation to conduct a follow-up test some months after the training to determine if the newly acquired skills, network, or knowledge have been retained and applied to the target population. This type of measurement plan is also beyond the reach of most of the current grantees due to resources and time constraints (i.e., grantees do not have an extra 6 months [for

example] in their period of performance to later conduct a follow-up assessment or do not have resources for such data collection). Assuming they are far enough along in their process, a No Cost Extension (NCE) could alleviate this concern for some grantees, though it may not be helpful if the grantee needs that time to complete their project as planned.

RTI has held discussions with Bay Area (Projects 1 & 4 and 2), LAH, and CRC to determine the possibility of inserting the necessary data collection tools to conduct an outcome evaluation of these training programs. Thus far, RTI has worked with Bay Area UASI Projects 1 & 4 and LAH to develop true pre-/posttests for an outcome evaluation, and CP3 is working with CRC. More detail is provided in their specific assessments above. We are continuing to work with these sites to develop a follow-up plan to conduct a full outcome evaluation of the trainings that have not yet occurred. It is too soon to say whether this will be possible for the Counter Extremism Project (CEP) grantee as they are still working to get their project up and running, but if they can implement their intervention as described in their IMP, we expect to at least have pre-/posttest results with which to conduct an outcome evaluation.

Originally, Bay Area Project 2 and CRC declined to interject pre-/posttests into their trainings for a host of reasons. Specifically, they were concerned that 1) returning to the IRB at this point in their grant might disrupt their timeline because of the need to wait for another approval; 2) they do not have the time and staff resources to develop the materials needed to return to their IRB; 3) adapting data collection was not possible because all or most of these trainings were already complete; and 4) the amount of time that trainers have with participants is limited and therefore time used to collect data might take away from the time allocated for the training itself (see 2.1 Bay Area UASI Project 2 and 2.2 CRC for more information). However, after conversations with CP3 and expected changes to the IRB process due to RTI's need for coverage mentioned above, both of these sites plan to add pre-/posttests to their remaining trainings.

Staff turnover. A final challenge that RTI identified across multiple grantees is the issue of staff turnover. Half of the grantees have experienced significant staff turnover just since RTI's involvement began mere months ago. Through a myriad of circumstances, the NGA, CEP, and LAH have all had at least 2 project leads in the past 6 months (see 2.3 CEP, 2.4 NGA, and 2.6 LAH for more details). For better or worse, these changes have implications beyond the time it takes for new staff to acclimate to a new role. Some new grant leads have been unable to answer our questions about their program and IMP because program documents were not sufficiently clear. Now that they developed and articulated a slightly altered project plan it does not align completely with the IMP which is the road map evaluators tend to follow (see 2.6 LAH). Another new program lead provided different timelines and expectations surrounding their project than what RTI had been told by previous program leads (see 2.3 NGA). These transitions alter our understanding of a project and thus inhibit our ability to plan for next steps and undertake a valid outcome evaluation.

3.2 Summary

The evaluability assessment for the FY20 TVTP Grantees resulted in a mix of process and outcome evaluations. RTI has determined that five project components are eligible for an outcome evaluation because 1) they are realistically able to achieve outcomes based on their design, 2) these outcomes will be verifiable based on data collection systems, and 3) they will provide useful information to the TVTP field. These components are:

1. Bay Area UASI's Project 1&4 trainings

2. Bay Area UASI's Project 2 SSA trainings*⁴
3. CEP's Alternative Pathways in-person trainings*⁵
4. LAH's MHPCD/LE trainings
5. CRC's 101/201 trainings

These outcome evaluations are contingent upon a variety of factors, as detailed in each site-specific section. RTI will conduct a process evaluation for all other project components. As the grantees continue to make changes and develop their projects, the determinations in this document may also change.

Some projects have made substantial changes that we recommend be reflected in a revised IMP as the IMPs are the core guide to our evaluation. RTI will continue working with grantees who are trying to assist us in IRB approval and adding data collection methods to conduct an outcome evaluation. In the future, RTI would recommend all grantees conducting trainings to include a pre-/posttest plan at a minimum, and ideally a more robust plan to follow-up after trainings to determine knowledge retention and application of skills. Kirkpatrick and Kirkpatrick (2006), for example, have a book on the four levels of training evaluation including case studies. We also recommend future grantees automatically collecting baseline data prior to beginning any type of program, intervention, treatment, or information sharing. Having baseline data would greatly augment future evaluations and provide more opportunities for outcome measures.

⁴ Outcome evaluation is still pending IRB approval for RTI and program implementation.

⁵ Outcome evaluation is still pending IRB approval for RTI and stipend availability.

References

- Alsalamah, A., & Callinan, C. (2021). Adaptation of Kirkpatrick's Four-Level Model of Training Criteria to Evaluate Training Programmes for Head Teachers. *Education Sciences*, 11(3), 116. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci11030116>
- Athanasou, J. (n.d.). Self-evaluations in adult education and training. *Australian Journal of Adult Learning*.
- Davies, R. (2013). *Planning Evaluability Assessments*. Department for International Development.
- Davies, R., & Payne, L. (2015). Evaluability Assessments: Reflections on a review of the literature. *Evaluation*, 21(2), 216–231. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1356389015577465>
- Dunn, K. (2008). *Planning for Cost Effective Evaluation with Evaluability Assessment* (No. 6). USAID. https://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PNADN200.pdf
- Earl, Sarah, Fred Carden, & Terry Smutylo. (2001) *Outcome Mapping*. International Development Research Centre; Ottawa.
- International Labor Organization. (2018). *Diagnostic Instrument to Assess Evaluability of DWCPs in the context of SDGs*.
- International Labor Organization. (2020). *Procedure and Tools for Evaluability*.
- Kaufman-Levy, Debra, Poulin, M., & Orchowsky, S. (2003). *Evaluability Assessment: Examining the Readiness of a Program for Evaluation*. Juvenile Justice Evaluation Center.
- Kirkpatrick, D. L., & Kirkpatrick, J. D. (2006). *Evaluating Training Programs: The Four Levels (3rd ed.)*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc..
- Muqorobin, Komarudin, Badrujaman, A., Arthur, R., & Prayogi, S. (2022). CIPP vs Kirkpatrick in the evaluation of physics teacher competency development programs: Literature study. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 2165(1), 012039. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/2165/1/012039>
- Sniukaite, Inga. (2009). *Guidance Note Carrying out an Evaluability Assessment*. UNIFEM.
- Trevisan, M.S., Walser, T. (2014). *Evaluability Assessment: Improving Evaluation Quality and Use*. Sage Publications, Inc.
- United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. (2017). *Evaluation Handbook*.

APPENDIX A

RTI Outcome Evaluability Assessment Checklist: [ENTER SITE AND COMPONENT]

Use this checklist as a guide to help determine if an **outcome evaluation** is feasible for each site component.

Evaluability Question	Response
Does the quality of the project design and theory of change allow for an outcome evaluation?	
Is the program's mission clear?	
Is it clear who is the target population is?	
Is it likely to be completed on time?	
Are the project purpose, goals, and objectives clear to and commonly understood by the stakeholders?	
Are the objectives specific	
Are the objectives measurable	
Are the objectives attainable	
Are the objectives relevant	
Are the objectives time-bound (time for outcomes)	
Does the IMP show the project's inputs, outputs, outcomes, and objectives in a logical and linear relationship?	
Is the change process presumed in the program theory plausible? In other word, is it plausible that the program activities would achieve the intended effects?	
Are the constituent inputs, activities, and outputs of the program well defined and sufficient?	
Are resources allocated to the program and its various activities adequate?	
Are the results of the TVTP program verifiable based on the planned collection systems?	
Do performance indicators/measures exist to adequately measure the project objectives?	
Are baseline data available to compare change?	
Are performance monitoring data being collected regularly to assess performance indicators?	
Do current program activities lend themselves to an outcome evaluation?	
Does the program have the capacity to provide data for an evaluation?	
Do data collection instruments, protocols and processes, measure development?	
Or, if not, does the program have the capacity to develop these things?	

If an outcome evaluation were completed, would it be useful and meaningful?	
Is it useful to targeted violence and terrorism prevention studies to conduct an evaluation of this program?	
Is this program replicable?	
Have the elements of the program, if any, been evaluated before?	
How are external factors (e.g., political, climatic) likely to hamper an outcome evaluation?	
Are key stakeholders and partners available to participate in an outcome evaluation?	
Are the program activities being implemented as designed?	

APPENDIX B

Grantee Goals and Objectives

Bay Area UASI

Component 1: Combined Community Awareness Briefings, Behavioral Assessment Trainings, and Prevention Strategies

Goal 1 (Project 1): Enhanced community-based terrorism prevention capabilities through awareness, partnerships, and training for schools and houses of faith in the Bay Area

- Objective 1.1: Build partnerships with leaders and stakeholders representing 55 schools and 100 faith-based organizations, establish regional multi-disciplinary team practitioner working groups, deliver 10 culturally competent CAB training to 55 schools and 100 faith-based organizations by 4Q 2021.
- Objective 1.2: Build cadre of Targeted Violence Prevention trainers for 55 schools and 100 faith-based organizations, deliver 8 train-the-trainer courses to extend and sustain CABs across the Bay Area, and evaluate the project by 3Q 2022.

Goal 1 (Project 4): Increase the Bay Area's resilience to targeted violence and terrorism through awareness, training, and a public health approach to preventing targeted violence and terrorism (Project 4)

- Objective 1.1: Enhance the ability of individuals to recognize the behavioral characteristics of someone about to perpetrate targeted violence and understand the public health approach to preventing violence by delivering 8 culturally competent Behavioral Analysis and Prevention Strategies training to 55 schools and 100 faith-based organizations by 3Q 2022 and establishing practitioner workgroups.
- Objective 1.2: Build cadre of Targeted Violence Prevention trainers for 55 schools and 100 faith-based organizations, deliver 8 train-the-trainer courses to extend and sustain Behavioral Analysis and Prevention Strategies across the Bay Area, and evaluate the project by 3Q 2022.

Component 2: Safe Schools Ambassadors Programming

Goal 1: Reduce bullying in five schools across the Bay Area

- Objective 1.1: Five schools in the Bay Area will be selected and confirmed to implement the Safe School Ambassadors (SSA) Program by Q4 2021.
- Objective 1.2: Up to 40 students and five faculty per school (230 total) in five schools implementing and evaluating SSA training in Year 1.

Goal 2: Empower schools to implement anti-bullying training in five Bay Area schools

- Objective 2.1: Five individuals are identified and confirmed to participate in the Training-of-Trainers (TOT) by Q1 2022.
- Objective 2.2: Five individuals attend two SSA training sessions by Q3 2022.
- Objective 2.3: Five individuals complete the TOT sessions by Q3 2022.
- Objective 2.4: Five individuals each lead one SSA training session at 5 schools by Q3 2022.

Goal 3: Expand, sustain, and evaluate anti-bullying protective efforts in five schools in the Bay Area.

- Objective 3.1: Up to 40 new students and six new adults at 5 schools identified to participate in the SSA Program by Q4, 2022.
- Objective 3.2: SSA training is completed for an additional 230 students and faculty by Q4, 2022.
- Objective 3.3: Implementation, and sustainment provided to new SSA trainers and ambassadors through bi-annual meetings and family group facilitators in Q3 and Q4 2022
- Objective 3.4: Complete Program evaluation and impact assessment by Q4 2022

Component 3: NTAC Dashboard

Goal 1: Build regional prevention practitioner partnerships and identify gaps in School Threat Assessment Teams across the Bay Area

- Objective 1.1: Conduct multi-discipline, multi-jurisdiction partner outreach meetings and socialize the TVTP program
- Objective 1.2: Establish an implementation toolkit that includes Threat Assessment and Management Team resources and prevention frameworks.

Goal 2: Build and strengthen intelligence and information sharing capability of Bay Area School Threat Assessment Teams

- Objective 2.1: Develop, Publish and Share Sample Level 1 School Threat Assessment and Management Protocols, threat prevention and awareness resources, and Technology capabilities by Q4 2021
- Objective 2.2: Develop new informal partnerships, identify school risk factors and data sources for use by three (3) Bay Area County Offices of Education Threat Assessment Teams by Q2 2022.
- Objective 2.3: Select best technology solution for assessing local and regional risk factors in support of COE Threat Assessment Teams by Q1 2022(Re-Scoped)

Goal 3: Harness the power of Data Zone to support School Threat Assessment and Management teams in three (3) Bay Area Counties serving 290,000 students.

- Objective 3.1: Build an updated data model on an industry standard platform.
- Objective 3.2: Onboard current districts to the updated data model

Goal 4: Empower three Bay Area County Offices of Education Threat Assessment and Management Teams with awareness of aggregate risk factors and other data that will drive protective effort strategies

- Objective 4.1: Identify Minimum Viable Product (MVP) Metrics for Summary, Attendance, Behavior, Enrollment, and Programs Dashboards
- Objective 4.2: Build Out MVP County Level Dashboards
- Objective 4.3: Build out County -level data filtering
- Objective 4.4: Conduct Quality Assurance

Goal 5: Deploy County Level Dashboards for use by School Threat Assessment Teams in 3 Bay Area Counties and Evaluate short term impact

- Objective 5.1: Develop implementation plan for COEs by Q3 2022
- Objective 5.2: Refine/update DSAs as needed
- Objective 5.3: Move dashboards to Production by Q4 2022
- Objective 5.4: Release self-service training and support by Q4 2022.ounties and evaluate short term impact

CEP

Component 1: Alternative Pathways (in-person)

Goal 1: Develop curriculum and protocol

- Objective 1.1: A 10-week counter-extremism course appropriate for replication in institutions around the country is developed with national accessibility.

Goal 2: Deliver curriculum in-prison to reduce risks of in-prison radicalization

- Objective 2.1: At least 72 inmates' awareness of radicalization risk factors, underlying causes, and evidence-based counter-radicalization and self-care practices increases.
- Objective 2.2: At least 72 inmates made aware of Alternative Pathways program and other post-release support.

Component 2: Alternative Pathway (mail course)

Goal 3: Deliver the curriculum as a written correspondence course to incarcerated terrorism-related offenders or those with known affiliations to extremism movements and ideologies.

- Objective 3.1: At least 300 terrorism-related offenders or those with known affiliation to violent extremism movements made aware of the Alternative Pathways program.
- Objective 3.2: At least 20 at-risk offenders supported by AP program with anonymized data (case studies) to inform identification of best-practices and research and training material.

Component 3: Info sharing/webinars

Goal 4: Research Component and Delivery of Training to Stakeholders

- Objective 4.1: Knowledge of extremism and best practices in re-entry and reintegration amongst those tasked with post-release supervision of inmates with known affiliations to violent extremism movements increase.

McCain Institute

Component 1: Prevention Practitioner's Network

Goal 1: Enhance efficacy of local prevention and intervention programs by facilitating learning across the sector.

- Objective 1.1: Prevention and intervention practitioners join the practitioners' network

Component 2: Workshops & Symposiums

Goal 1: Enhance efficacy of local prevention and intervention programs by facilitating learning across the sector.

- Objective 1.2: Increase knowledge and collaboration among network members

Component 3: Framework Development

Goal 2: More localities develop initiatives to respond to individuals at risk of mobilizing to violence

- Objective 2.1: Framework simplifies design stages for new prevention and intervention initiatives

Component 4: Prevention Practitioner's Public Directory

Goal 3: Increase in referrals that connect individuals with risk factors to intervention capability

- Objective 3.1: Increase number of mental and behavioral health professionals able and willing to receive referrals
- Objective 3.2: Government officials locate relevant programs in their regions for referrals

LAH

Component 1: Exit USA

Goal 1: More extremists disengage from violent WSE, de-radicalize, and contribute to society without violence

- Objective 1.1: Provide ExitUSA services to facilitate exit from violent WSE Objective 1.2: Provide ExitUSA aftercare services to build individual resilience
- Objective 1.3: Enhance outreach to build awareness of the violent WSE exit process and ExitUSA intervention services

Component 2: Exit USA outreach

Goal 2: Build favorable community attitudes toward those exiting violent WSE & formers

- Objective 2.1: Enhance outreach to build awareness of the violent WSE exit process and ExitUSA intervention services

Component 3: MHPCD/LE Training

Goal 3: Enhanced ability of local prevention networks to identify and work with individuals at risk of mobilizing to violence

- Objective 3.1: Build local capacity to enhance their ability to identify and respond to individuals at risk of mobilizing to violence

NGA

Component 1: Policy Academy

Goal 1: Four to five states and territories establish prevention strategies and frameworks that enable them to identify and prevent individuals from mobilizing to violence.

- Objective 1.1: Four selected states establish and implement policy and program changes through prevention strategies and frameworks that enable unity of effort between all layers of government and community partners.
- Objective 1.2: Four selected states leverage threat assessments and management services to improve prevention frameworks.
- Objective 1.3: Four selected states establish a platform to communicate and share best practices and enhance peer-to-peer learning between states.

Goal 2: Four states effectively allocate program resources to support prevention efforts across all levels of government.

- Objective 2.1: Increase the ability of the four state participants to develop and implement targeted, evidence-based programming to govern prevention activities
- Objective 2.2: Enhance the four state participants' ability to use data to inform policymakers' decision-making across all levels of government.

Goal 3: Governors from four to five states and territories, through community partnerships and engagements, gain public support for prevention activities that enhance resilience to violence and extremist narratives.

- Objective 3.1: Four state participants strengthen relationships between government, private, and nonprofit partners.
- Objective 3.2: Four state participants improve messaging to the general public about prevention programming

CRC

Component 1: 101/201 Trainings

Goal 1: Build awareness for prevention and intervention of targeted violence within communities across Colorado

- Objective 1.1: During grant period, facilitate access to targeted violence prevention training and resources for at least 800 professionals and 50 organizations to build the capacity of communities to prevent and address targeted violence.
- Objective 1.2: During grant period, provide in-depth educational materials to 200 professionals and 20 organizations about the nature of targeted violence and how to use behavioral indicators to assess threats and manage cases.

Component 2: Consultation, Triage, & Community Events

Goal 2: Strengthen local networks and collaboration for the prevention and intervention of targeted violence

- Objective 2.1: During grant period, triage at least 75 cases with relevant resources and referrals and deliver in depth consultation services to at least 50 cases utilizing the CRC's consultation approach for addressing risks for and threat behaviors related to targeted violence.
- Objective 2.2: By end of Year 2 of grant, facilitate consultation meeting online to disseminate learnings from applying the in practice to at least 400 professionals and 30 organizations, and 10 community agencies engaged in prevention and intervention work.
- Objective 2.3: During grant period, host 4 virtual events for collaboration and knowledge-sharing for professionals and organizations who are engaged in prevention and intervention work

Component 3: Resource Library

Goal 3: Create sustainable approaches for the prevention and intervention of domestic targeted violence

- Objective 3.1: By the end of year 1, develop and launch an online resource library of training and technical assistance materials for the prevention and intervention of targeted violence
- Objective 3.2: By the end of year 2, reach at least 1000 persons with training and technical assistance materials via the online resource library.