This report is part of the RAND Corporation research report series. RAND reports present research findings and objective analysis that address the challenges facing the public and private sectors. All RAND reports undergo rigorous peer review to ensure high standards for research quality and objectivity.

Safety and Justice Program

An Assessment of Program Sustainability in Three Bureau of Justice Assistance Criminal Justice Domains

Eyal Aharoni, Lila Rabinovich, Joshua Mallett, Andrew R. Morral

The research described in this report was sponsored by the Bureau of Justice Assistance and was conducted in the Safety and Justice Program within RAND Justice, Infrastructure, and Environment.

This project was supported by Grant No. 2010-DB-BX-K075 awarded by the Bureau of Justice Assistance to the RAND Corporation. The Bureau of Justice Assistance is a component of the Office of Justice Programs, which also includes the Bureau of Justice Statistics, the National Institute of Justice, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, the Office for Victims of Crime, and the SMART Office. Points of view or opinions in this document are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

RAND OFFICES

SANTA MONICA, CA • WASHINGTON, DC

PITTSBURGH, PA • NEW ORLEANS, LA • JACKSON, MS • BOSTON, MA

CAMBRIDGE, UK • BRUSSELS, BE

www.rand.org

Preface

This document was prepared by the RAND Corporation to address a growing interest on the part of the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) to better understand what factors facilitate program sustainment over time. The objectives of the document are therefore to evaluate program sustainment status in a sample of former BJA programs, to examine the characteristics theorized to underlie longevity, and to make recommendations for improving BJA's assessment of program sustainability.

BJA is a component of the Office of Justice Programs of the U.S. Department of Justice. Its mission is to provide leadership and services in grant administration and criminal justice policy development to support local, state, and tribal justice strategies to achieve safer communities.

This document is intended for use by BJA program officials. The insights presented may also be applicable to other service program stakeholders, such as project directors and other government and private sponsors.

RAND is a nonprofit institution that helps improve policy and decisionmaking through research and analysis. Recent RAND projects germane to the present study include the evaluation of mental health risk needs of probationers affected by California's Realignment Act; evaluation of an alcohol monitoring program for South Dakota probationers; evaluation of community policing and violence prevention in Oakland, California; and creation of a leadership training and research institute in cooperation with the Dallas Police Department. These projects align with BJA's efforts the fields of criminal justice, public health and safety, and mental health care.

The RAND Safety and Justice Program

The research reported here was conducted in the RAND Safety and Justice Program, which addresses all aspects of public safety and the criminal justice system, including violence, policing, corrections, courts and criminal law, substance abuse, occupational safety, and public integrity. Program research is supported by government agencies, foundations, and the private sector.

This program is part of RAND Justice, Infrastructure, and Environment, a division of the RAND Corporation dedicated to improving policy and decisionmaking in a wide range of policy domains, including civil and criminal justice, infrastructure protection and homeland security, transportation and energy policy, and environmental and natural resource policy.

Questions or comments about this report should be sent to the project leader, Eyal Aharoni (Eyal_Aharoni@rand.org). For more information about the Safety and Justice Program, see http://www.rand.org/safety-justice or contact the director at sj@rand.org.

Contents

Tables

Summary

The Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) aims to improve community safety through effective programming throughout the United States. To maximize the impact of its investments, BJA has an interest in supporting programs that will be sustained beyond initial federal funding. This notion of program sustainability is becoming increasingly important as programs have been challenged to operate with increasingly scarce resources.

The present study aimed to better understand the characteristics and environments of programs that are likely to persist beyond federal seed funding and to delineate strategies that will enable BJA to assist programs that it funds in their efforts to sustain themselves. Using archival documentation and survey methods, we assessed 231 BJA grantee programs spanning three BJA funding domains—drug courts, human trafficking, and mental health—to identify characteristics associated with sustainability. Via the survey in mid-2013, administered at least ten months following the end of the grants, we successfully confirmed the sustainment status of 61 percent of these BJA grantees, a majority of which demonstrated evidence of program sustainment. Seventy-nine percent of these were successful in procuring supplemental support, particularly state-level funding (43 percent) and internal matching funds (83 percent).

Hypotheses about factors that predict program sustainment were generated from previous literature in program sustainability and from the results of qualitative expert interviews. Specifically, we hypothesized that sustainment would be most strongly associated with programs showing evidence of increased funding stability, increased modifiability, increased political support, stronger partnerships, greater organizational capacity, program evaluation, greater public impact, and strategic planning. Evidence in support of these hypotheses was limited to measures of funding stability and program modifiability. In post hoc tests, sustainment was also significantly predicted by the existence of well-connected project leaders. Explanations for these observations are discussed.

We discuss several recommendations for improving BJA's assessment of program sustainability. Most notably, we recommend that BJA develop a comprehensive, quantitative measurement and data-collection plan, permitting the systematic tracking and analysis of performance and outcome measures of program sustainment. The measurement plan should include longitudinal assessment of grantee performance beyond the award period. We also recommend the development of a procedure for educating grantees early about strategies for program sustainment that are grounded in existing literature. Finally, although it is not yet known whether a single standardized evaluation

process for all BJA grantees would be feasible or valuable for fostering program sustainment, we recommend support for further research to investigate this possibility.

Acknowledgments

We thank the project research assistants (Kevin Jiang, David Stebbins, Samuel Berkowitz, Robert Stewart, and Semira Yousefsadeh) for their contributions to data collection and coding, Fabiola Lopez for editorial comments, and the RAND Survey Research Group, especially Megan Zander Cotugno, for their assistance in survey preparation, administration, and data collection. We thank Robert Davis and our peer reviewers, Mary Ann Scheirer of Scheirer Consulting and Sarah Hunter of the RAND Corporation, for invaluable comments on this report.

This publication was made possible by award 2010-DB-BX-K075 from the Bureau of Justice Assistance in the U.S. Department of Justice Office of Justice Programs. The opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this publication are ours and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Justice.

Abbreviations

BJA	Bureau of Justice Assistance
DC	drug court
HT	human trafficking
MH	mental health

Chapter One. Introduction

The Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) seeks to improve community safety by supporting the dissemination of effective criminal justice strategies. One way it pursues its mission is to fund innovative criminal justice programs. Thus, each year, BJA makes hundreds of awards to state, local, tribal, and nonprofit criminal justice programs to help them develop or expand their services. In many cases, these investments are seed funds designed to help establish a new service that will continue to provide benefits for years to come, and long after the BJA funds have been spent. For these programs, BJA shares the interest of many grant-making organizations across multiple disciplines to fund programs likely to continue to provide benefits beyond the period of BJA support.

BJA and comparable grant makers in public health, education, social services, and other fields seek to carefully vet potential grantees in order to identify those most likely to not just meet their initial service goals but also procure additional funding sources and become self-sustaining. Of course, sustainability is not a primary concern in all grant making. Some programs may be designed to meet a time-limited need or to provide a one-time infusion of resources. However, BJA provides many organizations with seed money designed to launch programs that will thrive over time. To achieve its mission, BJA needs to understand the characteristics of programs likely to be sustained, as well as their larger organizational and environmental contexts.

Grant makers providing seed funding face two key questions: What factors contribute to a program's long-term sustainability, and how can grant-making organizations best support funded programs to encourage their longevity and success? Although the literature on program sustainability is growing in the fields of public health and international development, few studies have examined program sustainability in the criminal justice field.

In this report, we describe a study of program sustainability examining the sustainment status of 231 BJA grantee programs from BJA's drug court (DC), human trafficking (HT), and mental health (MH) areas. To ground this task in a theoretical context, we started with a literature review outlining definitions of sustainment and the factors associated with sustained programs. These themes were further explored in primary data collection from interviews with seven key informants in the criminal justice field. Specifically, we asked about program characteristics and other factors associated with program sustainment beyond cessation of BJA funding. We then reviewed archival records on each program, including information contained within their grant applications, progress reports, BJA assessments, and other documents to select relevant characteristics and examined their association with program sustainment beyond seed funding. To assess

program sustainment, we report results of a survey of 136 of the 231 funded grantees followed by an analysis of factors predictive of program sustainment.

The present study did not focus on program effectiveness—that is, the extent to which programs accomplish their goals and objectives (for instance, a reduction in recidivism or abstinence from substance abuse)—or on whether programs succeed in replicating in new sites or expanding to new beneficiaries. Although such variables are likely to be important correlates of sustainability, they were not evaluated in the present study.

In Chapter Two, we discuss the factors theorized in the literature to predict program sustainability. To expand on these themes, Chapter Three summarizes the results of primary interviews with seven executive directors of organizations with track records of launching criminal justice programs that have become self-sustaining. Their insights and the empirical literature on program sustainability are used to inform our analysis of the 231 BJA programs, which we present in Chapter Four. In Chapter Five, we summarize key findings from this work and recommend strategies that BJA or other grant makers might consider when attempting to identify grantees whose programs will likely continue to be implemented beyond initial grant funding.

Chapter Two. Insights on Program Sustainability from the Empirical Literature

The empirical literature on program sustainability has grown significantly in the past two decades, providing useful insights to researchers, funders, and implementation agencies across different fields of social policy into what might help a program continue to be implemented after the conclusion of initial funding. Nevertheless, research on this topic is fragmented and "has not yet coalesced into a single research paradigm, a shared set of statistical methods, or even a common terminology" (Scheirer, 2005, p. 321; see also Schell et al., 2013).

A majority of research into sustainability has occurred in the fields of public health and international development. There is, of course, recognition of the challenges to sustainability faced by criminal justice demonstration programs. For example, the U.S. Department of Justice Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention funded the development of a toolkit in 2002, *Building Sustainability*, aimed for demonstration projects for children, youth, and families (Institute for Educational Leadership, undated). Yet, empirical studies of program sustainability in criminal justice are less prevalent. One possible reason for this is the traditional focus on program outcomes and relative neglect of issues of implementation that has characterized criminal justice research since the early 1990s (Mihalic and Irwin, 2003). During this period, studies of treatment and prevention of crime and violence have not paid as much attention to the process of implementing such programs and, concomitantly, the question of what can make a program sustainable.

Within public health, studies of the sustainability of health promotion and substance abuse prevention interventions, as well as of school-based health and substance abuse treatment (Blasinsky, Goldman, and Unützer, 2006), tend to echo the findings of the more general research on program sustainability; that is, that a variety of factors "facilitate program sustainability, including positive outcomes, funding, organizational support, the presence of a program champion, integration within existing programs and services, and trained staff" (p. 719). In the rest of this chapter, we describe our review of the empirical literature, which involved an expanding, iterative process by which relevant search terms identified in initial source material were used to structure our subsequent literature searches, emphasizing works published within the past 15 years. Citation indexes included Thomson-Reuters' Web of Science, Google Scholar, and EBSCOhost databases, such as Criminal Justice Abstracts.

Defining Program Sustainability

Several terms are commonly used to refer to program sustainability and guided our review of the literature, including program "survival," "continuation," "maintenance," "institutionalization," "incorporation," "integration," "routinization," and "local or community ownership." All of these terms refer to aspects of a program's continuation beyond the initial funding, demonstration, or pilot stage (Shediac-Rizkallah and Bone, 1998, p. 91; Savaya, Spiro, and Elran-Barak, 2008). Sustainability is just one component a program life cycle that includes program development, implementation, and end state (sustained or discontinued). The time frame that a program must be operational to be deemed sustainable varies widely across this literature, with many papers providing no time frame at all (Savaya, Spiro, and Elran-Barak, 2008).

One typical definition of program sustainability is the "continued use of an innovation in practice" (Aarons, Hurlburt, and Horwitz, 2011). At least one paper defines sustainability as program continuation *from the moment of first implementation* (with implementation and sustainability as concomitant processes) (Pluye, Potvin, Denis, Pelletier, and Mannoni, 2005). Another definition further specifies that "program sustainability exists when elements essential to a program's effectiveness continue to operate over time, within a stable organization, at stable or increased organizational and service capacity" (Cassidy, Leviton, and Hunter, 2006, p. 150).

Scholars have also distinguished between "sustainability" as a prospective state of continuity that can be achieved by a program depending on its particular characteristics and "sustainment" as a more general, often retrospective description of whether a program continued or not regardless of whether this can be attributed to any particular program characteristics (see Aarons, Hurlburt, and Horwitz, 2011). In the present paper, we use both terms as appropriate, acknowledging the high overlap between them and lack of agreement in the field.

A key element of program sustainability is institutionalization or routinization—i.e., the process by which programs are incorporated into routine organizational processes and systems (Yin, 1981; Scheirer, 2005; Pluye, Potvin, Denis, and Pelletier, 2004; Pluye, Potvin, and Denis, 2004). When new programs are "routinized," as was the case, for instance, with Yin's study of police computer systems or the addition of a paramedic service to fire departments, they may no longer be distinguishable as distinct programs and are instead part of the organization's standard practice (Yin, 1981). Yin developed a specified framework determining whether programs have been "routinized" based on budget (e.g., program support changes from soft to hard money), personnel (e.g., program activities become part of job descriptions), supply and maintenance (e.g., supply and maintenance provided by parent agency), training (e.g., skills become part of professional standards), and organizational governance (e.g., program recognized in manuals,

procedures, and regulations). Using these criteria, he distinguished marginal, moderate, and high degrees of routinization.

Pluye, Potvin, Denis, Pelletier, and Mannoni (2005), writing specifically about health promotion initiatives, suggest that routinization may be supported primarily by eight events: resource stabilization, risk-taking in support of program activities, incentives for personnel, adaptation of activities to their context or environment, the fit of objectives to the values of the organization and its staff, transparent communication between stakeholders, sharing cultural artifacts (such as myths or metaphors that express the program and organization's values and objectives), and integration of program rules into the organization's rules. Their empirical work, a qualitative analysis of a heart health promotion program in five community health centers, suggest that at least some aspects of routinization can begin with initial program implementation (Pluye, Potvin, Denis, Pelletier, and Mannoni, 2005).

Another conceptualization views sustainability as a matter of degree or levels of institutionalization. Chovav and Weinstein (1997, cited in Savaya, Spiro, and Elran-Barak, 2008), for instance, propose different levels of sustainability: full continuation of the program, partial continuation, and implementation of the program in a modified form or in another locale. LaPelle, Zapka, and Ockene (2006) propose a similar framework in an examination of the sustainability of tobacco use cessation programs after the conclusion of initial funding, identifying high, moderate, low, and no sustainability as possible sustainability status outcomes. Pluye, Potvin, Denis, and Pelletier (2004) distinguish between the absence of sustainability, precarious sustainability (when the future of a program remains uncertain), weak sustainability (when a program's activities are weakly maintained and not routinized), and sustainability through routinization. Similarly, in their analysis of six social programs in Israel, three of which were discontinued and three of which were sustained after the period of initial funding, Savaya, Spiro, and Elran-Barak (2008) found that, even if programs cease, they may leave a "legacy" in the form of skilled personnel absorbed into similar organizations. Illustrating the ways in which program sustainability is a matter of degree, they found that, of the continuing programs, one was downsized, one was sustained on a small scale, and one was institutionalized and disseminated.[1]

Program sustainability has also been defined with reference to a set of characteristics of sustainable programs and interventions. Writing specifically about sustainability of health interventions, Shediac-Rizkallah and Bone (1998) propose that these categories include continued beneficial outcomes from an original program, the degree of "institutionalization" of the program within an organization, and the development of a

[1] The latter program, called Art Therapy, was found to have become a stable part of the services of some 60 percent of Israeli institutions for children at risk (Savaya, Spiro, and Elran-Barak, 2008).

community's capacity to maintain a coalition that continues to deliver the original program's beneficial outcomes. Similarly, Scheirer, Hartling, and Hagerman (2008) and Scheirer and Dearing (2011) argue that, according to prior literature on sustainability of health programs, *sustainability* can refer to four or more major types of outcomes: continuing program activities within the funded organization; sustaining benefits for intended clients; maintaining the capacity of a collaborative structure, such as a coalition; and maintaining attention to the issues addressed by the program.

Factors Affecting Program Sustainability

The empirical research on factors that reliably predict or affect program sustainability comprises a nascent, developing field. Studies of sustainability have been predominantly qualitative, using such methods as case study analysis, reviews of program documents and materials, and interviews with current and previous staff, funders, and other stakeholders (e.g., Baum et al., 2006; Savaya, Spiro, and Elran-Barak, 2008; Pluye, Potvin, Denis, Pelletier, and Mannoni, 2005; Blasinsky, Goldman, and Unützer, 2006; Porowski, Burgdorf, and Herrell, 2004). Although it provides important insights, this research does not adequately address the question of the relative importance of different factors on sustainability, nor of the strength of the association between particular factors and program continuation.

More recently, the field has seen a push toward evidence-based research to identify predictors of program sustainability (Damschroder and Hagedorn, 2011). In one of the most rigorous studies of the determinants of sustainability, Scheirer (2005) reviewed and synthesized 19 empirical studies that used quantitative methods to examine the sustainability of U.S. and Canadian health-related programs. She found that an average of about 60 percent of the multiple programs in each study reported that they sustained at least one program component. Her analysis consistently identified five factors promoting sustainability: (1) programs that could be modified over time, (2) a "champion" is present who pushes hard for institutionalization, (3) the program is a good fit with its organization's mission and procedures, (4) the program provides clear benefits to staff members or clients, and (5) stakeholders in other organizations provide support.

Similarly, in an assessment of 189 community-based heart health intervention programs, O'Loughlin and colleagues (1998) observed that 44 percent were reportedly "very permanent," 35 percent "somewhat permanent," and 22 percent not permanent. Reported sustainment was correlated with use of volunteer staff, modification during program implementation, fit between local provider and the intervention, and the presence of a program champion.

In their model of program sustainment, Aarons and colleagues (Aarons, Hurlburt, and Horwitz, 2011) distinguish between factors arising from the inner, organizational context and the outer, sociopolitical context. Inner-context factors are those related to the quality

of leadership, a critical mass of expertise, fidelity monitoring and organizational support, and validated staff selection procedures, among other things. The outer context includes external leaders who develop initiatives and set agendas, policies that support such initiatives, ongoing funding streams, and public-academic collaboration.

Shediac-Rizkallah and Bone (1998) suggest that four broad classes of factors affect a program's prospects for sustainability: (1) factors related to program design and implementation (such as financing or duration of the program and effectiveness), (2) factors associated with the organizational setting (e.g., institutional strength, managerial structures and processes), (3) integration with existing programs or services (e.g., whether they are stand-alone or integrated programs, the presence of program champions), and (4) the characteristics of the broader community environment (community participation and socioeconomic and political considerations). As we found in extensive reviews of the literature, similar models have been proposed by other scholars (e.g., Gruen et al., 2008; Stirman et al., 2012).

With regard to organizational factors, several other observations have been made. Savaya and colleagues observe that program sustainment is facilitated by the degree of involvement by the grantee organization and the sponsor and by the diversity of funding sources garnered to support the project (Savaya, Spiro, and Elran-Barak, 2008; Savaya and Spiro, 2012). In their systematic review of literature on the diffusion of service innovations in the health care sector, Greenhalgh and colleagues (2004) argue that beneficial organizational factors include a flexible organizational structure, as well as a capacity for project adaptation and reinvention. The authors, however, note a potential ambiguity in the notion of sustainability, claiming that "the longer an innovation is sustained, the less likely the organization will be open to additional innovations" (p. 582).

According to a review of the empirical literature by Savaya, Spiro, and Elran-Barak (2008), others have observed activities as varied as the development of fund-raising strategies, the presence of internal monitoring, program evaluation, and the maintenance of strategic partnerships within and outside the organization as key processes affecting the chances of program sustainment. Blasinsky, Goldman, and Unützer (2006), for example, examine the factors facilitating or hindering the sustainability of a program to address depression in older adults in primary care settings. The qualitative study highlighted four key determinants of program sustainability: demonstration of positive clinical outcomes, institutional support, trained staff, and continued funding sources. In another example, a study by Baum et al. (2006) of a health promotion program in Austria identified nine factors that the authors associate with the program's ability to operate continuously, including a strong vision for the program, a model adaptable to local conditions, strong community involvement, and a transition from "program" to "an approach and a way of working" (p. 259). In another paper, examining behavioral health interventions, Hogue and colleagues echo this message, arguing that sustainability is

achieved by "solidifying the funding and regulatory resources, agency and supervision infrastructures, model modifications, and clinical oversight procedures required" to maintain an independent and sustaining intervention (Hogue et al., 2013, p. 61). Hogue adds that achieving program sustainability is predicated on "relative success in the preparation, training and implementation, and assessment phases of a program" (Hogue et al., 2013, p. 61).

A different conceptual approach has been used to categorize factors affecting organizational and program sustainability and capacity. In one paper, downstream, midstream, and upstream factors are identified (Cassidy, Leviton, and Hunter, 2006). Downstream factors are those affecting program implementation, such as staffing, resources, and local demand; upstream factors concern funding; and midstream factors are the characteristics of the organizations that implement programs. In their empirical analysis of tobacco use cessation programs, LaPelle, Zapka, and Ockene (2006) develop a framework for understanding factors affecting sustainability based on "layers," whereby the sustainability of services is affected by increasingly detailed groupings of organizational strategies. In that framework, at the broadest level, organizations plan for sustainability by redefining the scope of services in advance of initial funding withdrawal, and engage in creative use of resources. In the next layer of strategies, the scope of services is redefined to better align with organizational goals and to ensure that services are affordable. The creative use of resources includes finding funding, adjusting staff patterns, and creating a demand for the services. The most detailed layer is the one in which particular organizations implement strategies specific to their programs. In the case of smoking cessation, this involved, for instance, targeting specific subpopulations of smokers and dovetailing with cessation research at the program's site.

A more recent review of 85 empirical studies of public health programs, and the results of a concept mapping exercise, identified nine core domains that may affect a program's capacity for sustainability: political support; funding stability; partnerships between the program and the community; organizational capacity; program evaluation; program adaptation; communications with stakeholders, decisionmakers, and the public; public impact; and strategic planning (Schell et al., 2013; see Table 2.1). Although the predictive power of these particular factors in this framework has not yet been validated empirically, they are fairly representative of what has been reported in the public health literature and so provided a useful framework by which to structure our analysis of BJA programs in Chapter Four.

Table 2.1: Factors Affecting Program Capacity for Sustainability in Public Health

Factor	Definition
Funding stability	Making long-term plans given a stable funding environment
Political support	Internal and external political environments that influence program funding, initiatives, and acceptance
Partnerships	The connections between program and community
Organizational capacity	The skills and resources needed to effectively manage the program and its activities
Program adaptability	The ability to adapt and improve in order to ensure effectiveness
Program evaluation	Monitoring and evaluation of process and outcome data associated with program activities
Communications	The strategic dissemination of program outcomes and activities with stakeholders, decisionmakers, and the public
Public impacts	The program's effect on attitudes, perceptions, and behaviors in the area it serves
Strategic planning	The process that defines program direction, goals, and strategies

SOURCE: Adapted from Schell et al., 2013.

In the international development field, the literature also identifies a range of factors associated with program sustainability. Although the context, type of program, and implementing agencies in international development differ significantly from those working in public health in the developed world, many of the protective or predictive factors linked to program sustainability are similar in the two fields. Studies of agriculture, health, economic, and social development programs have listed the presence of committed leaders (Datta, 2007; Okeibunor et al., 2012), incentives for staff (Datta, 2007), community ownership or participation (Amazigo et al., 2007; Edwards and Roelofs, 2006; Okeibunor et al., 2012; Pade-Khene, Mallinson, and Sewry, 2011), the integration of programs with existing structures (Amazigo et al., 2007; Edwards and Roelofs, 2006), and forward planning (Amazigo et al., 2007; Edwards and Roelofs, 2006; Okeibunor et al., 2012) as some of the key factors in ensuring program sustainability.

As previously mentioned, the research on program sustainability in the crime treatment and prevention literature is still limited and has focused primarily on program service outcomes. Nevertheless, some research, mostly qualitative, has emerged that offers insight into justice program sustainability and implementation. In one report sponsored by BJA, planning for long-term sustainability is highlighted as an essential element of an effective mental health court (Thompson, Osher, and Tomasini-Joshi, 2007). Achieving sustainable mental health courts, the authors argue, depends on systematic data gathering, formalization of court policies and procedures, identification of long-term funding sources, and outreach to the community and key stakeholders.

In another study, conducted by the Center for Court Innovation in partnership with BJA, the primary factors reported to "make or break" a program's success were

comprehensive planning, stakeholder support, responsiveness to emerging challenges, and valuation of strong leadership (Cissner and Farole, 2009). In a recent survey by the same organizations, investigators assessed an array of criminal justice professionals, including correctional officials, lawyers, police chiefs, judges, and court administrators (Labriola, Gold, and Kohn, 2013). They found, among other things, that programs engaging in greater innovation are both more likely to report implementation failures and more able to mitigate those failures by modifying the program.

According to Mihalic and Irwin (2003), studies addressing implementation indicate factors that influence the success of a program, including the presence of program champions, community involvement, staff training, and integration of activities into the organization—factors that overlap those cited in the public health literature. However, in their own quantitative analysis of factors affecting the ability of violence prevention programs implemented in 42 sites to sustain for 30 months—six months after initial grants ended—Mihalic and Irwin find no significant effects for staffing characteristics, the presence of champions, community support, agency characteristics, availability of time to implement a program, and number of training visits, even though the qualitative literature identifies these as key issues in program implementation. The authors conclude that "[t]hese variables may indirectly influence success (i.e., they may influence other variables, which then influence success)" (p. 324). The authors do find that program sustainability in particular, as an indicator of program success, is significantly influenced by program characteristics (a measure that considers how much of an asset or a barrier the quality of materials, the flexibility, the time required, complexity, and the cost of the program are during implementation).

Given these mixed results, it is important to note that many of these factors may be necessary but insufficient conditions for program sustainability. In their qualitative analysis of six social programs in Israel, Savaya, Spiro, and Elran-Barak (2008) find that program sustainment does not differ in terms of program evaluation, program effectiveness, having a theory of change, the stability of the host organization, or the duration and adequacy of initial funding. These were all present across all six of the programs. Similarly, it is possible that a program appears to fulfill most of the conditions for sustainability and yet be destabilized by a single challenge. For instance, one of the programs that did not survive in their analysis—group treatment for male perpetrators of domestic violence—had all the features of the three programs that were sustained but eventually terminated because of factors outside its control. After the establishment of this program, three separate bodies with more resources and greater clout developed similar initiatives, prompting its leadership to shut down the program and "let stronger organizations, with greater resources, do the job" (p. 490).

Summative Remarks

The existing literature provides important insights into what constitutes program sustainability and what factors might help achieve it. This matters because programs in criminal justice, public health, and other areas of social policy are more likely to produce long-lasting, positive outcomes when they are sustainable. Still, the field suffers from some weaknesses. First, as mentioned previously, there remains a lack of consensus on definitions and on significant factors driving sustainability (although a few factors, such as community involvement, adequate planning, and data gathering or evaluation on outcomes, have been suggested with some consistency). As a result, individual studies typically present their own definitions of sustainability, their own set of variables to include in the analysis, and their own methods for data collection and analysis (Scheirer and Dearing, 2011), and the resulting knowledge is not cumulative (Schell et al., 2013). Second, much of the research on sustainability has been qualitative and therefore cannot address the relative importance of different factors for sustainability, the strength of their association with sustainability outcomes, and other important questions. Third, as one paper notes, many authors see sustainability "as both a set of processes and an outcome at a given moment in time, and thus do not distinguish clearly between dependent and independent variables in evaluative research about sustainability" (Scheirer, Hartling, and Hagerman, 2008; also Schell et al., 2013).

Given the heterogeneous nature of the sustainability literature, we developed a broad research strategy, which we describe in Chapter Three. The comprehensive framework published by Schell and colleagues (2013) provides a useful scheme within which to organize the factors theorized to be associated with program sustainability.

Chapter Three. Insights on Program Sustainability from Successful Program Directors

To expand on the limited empirical literature on criminal justice program sustainability and to obtain personal narrative insights about program sustainability from those with extensive experience, we conducted in-depth interviews with experts on demonstration programs.

The interviewed experts were drawn from organizations dedicated to creating criminal justice demonstration programs, nourishing them, and finding ways to institutionalize them either as independent agencies or within existing criminal justice organizations. The Vera Institute of Justice and the Center for Court Innovation both have strong records in establishing criminal justice reform efforts that thrive over time. For example, Vera created the nation's first pretrial release and first victim/witness demonstration programs circa 1970. Both of these programs thrive today with stable annual funding that dwarfs the original investment by Vera. Similarly, in 1993, the Center for Court Innovation established one of the nation's first and most successful courts for combating quality-of-life offenses by way of community service sentencing and providing treatment services. The Midtown Community Court in Manhattan has been replicated internationally and continues to thrive today.

Seven in-depth, semistructured interviews were conducted in person with current and past Vera and Center for Court Innovation executive directors and directors of some of their demonstration programs. Interviewees were selected based on existing relationships with RAND project leaders. Interviews included prompts encouraging interviewees to discuss factors identified through the literature review as important for sustainability. A note taker recorded responses into detailed field notes. No incentives for participation were provided. All procedures were approved by the RAND Human Subjects Protection Committee (2011-0321).

Several common themes emerged across the interviews, which we highlight in the rest of this chapter.

Diversified Funding

The most widely mentioned factor affecting program sustainability was diversified funding. Most interviewees discussed the importance of securing funding from multiple sources rather than relying exclusively on one source. One interviewee told of a community court program that had initially secured funding from an office of court administration but then obtained core funding from the state and city. Another community court received stimulus funds to cover start-up costs and then additional

funding from the state and city. This interviewee explained the principle behind the organization's fundraising strategy: "Leveraging government funds is a persuasive argument to fund programs." In addition, this person explained, "using a range of funding sources spreads risk" for the implementing agency.

Another interviewee described an agency that was able to obtain federal grant funding to cover costs for the first year of a stand-alone court program and expected the grant to be renewed after the first year. When that did not happen, the agency raised funds from the city, foundations, and the probation department. The interviewee stated that the lesson from this experience was that "youth court funding needs to be obtained through multiple sources as part of larger suites of programs." In another example, a community mediation center was funded solely by the city at a time of turmoil in the community, turmoil that eventually led to withdrawal of the funding. The interviewee noted that "the toughest programs [to sustain] are those funded by a single grant that has a sunset clause." A third interviewee echoed this: "Programs that diversify funding sources tend to survive. Therefore, local match is critical to start-ups." In this speaker's experience, tapping into permanent funding streams and robust fundraising (when possible, with support from board members) are key approaches.

Building Partnerships and Obtaining Stakeholder Support

The importance of developing good relationships with various stakeholders, including judges, district attorneys, and other court staff, was highlighted by most interviewees. The director of a DC program, for instance, stated that, when the program was initially set up, there was animosity among judges and court staff who "were jealous of the money that went into" the DC and who were skeptical of the approach. The speaker discussed the importance of face-to-face interaction in building trust, indicating that informal lunch meetings with court personnel were "key to gaining their support." Equally, building rapport with the chief clerk and advocating four-day work weeks for court officers were other examples offered to explain why "attitudes began to turn around."

A second interviewee discussed actively involving court staff in the programs. The speaker said, "It is important to get local folks to take credit for the program. Some judges find the work very rewarding. Stakeholders are thrilled; [district attorneys] brag about [the programs]."

Interviewees discussed the boost that programs received from the support of particular individuals, such as public officials (e.g., city mayors and judges). One interviewee, who directed a treatment court, highlighted the role of a state's chief judge, who was "a big supporter" and "very engaged" with the program. Another interviewee spoke more generally: "A strong government backer interested in reform is essential" to a program's success and sustainability. A third interviewee described the central role of an incoming mayor with an interest in community courts. Yet another interviewee said that,

along with federal funding, the commitment of the state's chief judge to implement DC programs throughout the state was key to securing state and local funding.

Other interviewees stated that actively seeking the support of key stakeholders is an important strategy. One interviewee looked for support specifically from state administrative judges and local district attorneys, although this did not always pay off; the experience in some locales was better than in others. In one city, for example, "the administrative judge didn't like the idea and doesn't send cases to the court."

Empirical Research

Empirical research that showed the effectiveness of a particular type of program was also frequently cited as important to program sustainability. In one case, an interviewee commented on the influence of "well-designed research" on a treatment court. It yielded positive outcomes and may have contributed to the state providing funding for court staff. Another interviewee explained that "research was important to make the case for the program" and helped bring the city's criminal justice officials "on board" to a victim/witness assistance program. Conversely, an interviewee told us about a program that had been "federally funded for three years but not picked up by locals" for further support, possibly "due to little research evidence showing effectiveness."

Another interviewee highlighted the importance of research on program feasibility. This interviewee discussed a feasibility study in the community prior to the establishment of a community court in which this speaker had been involved. The speaker explained that this feasibility study included community meetings and focus groups with offenders, which helped the implementing agency "learn the political landscape" and eventually gain approval from the court system for the initiative. In a similar vein, another interviewee working on the implementation of domestic violence courts discussed attempts "to understand the local legal culture, to address [its] specific concerns." Toward this aim, the speaker "surveyed state court judges," which proved "important to start off the program."

Other Themes

In addition to these frequently cited factors influencing a program's chances to thrive, other themes were also mentioned, albeit less consistently. **Project leadership expertise** was one such theme. An interviewee with experience managing DC programs argued that "programs need visionary, charismatic leaders" to succeed. This sentiment complements our survey respondents' reports of strong project leadership. The **timing of program implementation** was also discussed, typically as a factor over which implementing agencies have little control. One interviewee, discussing the establishment of a community court in New York City, said, "Timing was great: [Rudy] Giuliani had just been elected, and the Times Square [Alliance] and Grand Central Partnership had been

formed," providing funding and momentum to the initiative. Others also cited the effect timing had on the program's sustainment, discussing the impact of "turmoil in the community" or cuts to funding "when times get tough" and with the advent of the financial crisis. Finally, one interviewee commented that "**focusing on failures** is important for learning lessons that produce success," thus emphasizing the need to assess progress and evaluate outcomes for learning and improvement.

Summative Remarks

Several of the themes identified by our informants comport with the observations of research evaluators in previous interviews concerning criminal justice program implementation noted in Chapter Two. Examples include comprehensive planning, stakeholder support, responsiveness to emerging challenges, and valuation of strong leadership (Cissner and Farole, 2009), as well as the ability to mitigate and recover from failures (Labriola, Gold, and Kohn, 2013). Our interviewees also highlighted the importance of empirical research to track the impact of program strategies on sustainment outcomes, thereby validating similar arguments in the treatment literature (Damschroder and Hagedorn, 2011). One theme to which our informants gave disproportionate attention was funding diversity, echoing the finding by Savaya and Spiro (2012) and suggesting that securing multiple types of funding sources could buffer against unanticipated financial obstacles. Thus, funding diversity could enhance funding stability, as described by Schell and colleagues (2013). As a whole, these themes, reported in the empirical literature and validated by and elaborated on in our primary interviews, provided the conceptual framework for the task of exploring the factors associated with sustainment in new data from criminal justice program domains.

Chapter Four. Factors Affecting the Sustainment of Bureau of Justice Assistance–Supported Programs

To evaluate factors associated with the sustainment of recent BJA-supported programs, we first analyzed archival information on each program, coding each for the presence or absence of factors previously suggested to be related to sustainability. Subsequently, we conducted surveys with principals from each grantee program that we could locate. These surveys were designed to gain additional information on program characteristics, information on how long beyond the end of BJA grant funding the programs continued, and details on the factors that contributed to the decision to end programs, when applicable. In this chapter, we describe the programs, their sustainment status, and the association between program characteristics and sustainment.

The Bureau of Justice Assistance Programs

Program sustainment was assessed in three program domains of interest to BJA: DC, HT, and MH programs. As detailed in this section, 26 programs were found to be ineligible for the sustainment analysis (our inferential hypothesis tests) because they indicated in their survey responses that their original BJA grants were still open at that time. Nonetheless, these programs were retained for our broader descriptive analyses (N = 231) so as to provide BJA with the most comprehensive characterization of the data possible.

The Drug Court Discretionary Grant Program provided financial and technical assistance to states, state courts, local courts, units of local government, and Indian tribal governments to develop and implement treatment drug courts that effectively integrate substance abuse treatment, mandatory drug testing, sanctions and incentives, and transitional services in a judicially supervised court setting with jurisdiction over nonviolent, substance-abusing offenders. Eighty-seven programs were funded between 2002 and 2015 (final start date was 2012). Six of them had not finished spending the initial BJA funds by the survey assessment date, leaving 81 programs eligible for survey analysis that finished BJA spending no less than ten months before our August 2013 survey assessment.

In the antitrafficking area, BJA supported Anti–Human Trafficking Task Forces, which address trafficking of both foreign nationals and U.S. citizens. These task forces are composed of state and local law enforcement but also include investigators, victim service providers, and other key stakeholders. The task force members work in partnership to identify, investigate, and prosecute human trafficking cases and provide

comprehensive victim services to identified victims. Fifty-seven programs were funded between 2004 and 2012 (final start date was 2011). All of them ceased BJA spending no less than 18 months before survey assessment.

Finally, between 2003 and 2014 (final start date was 2011), BJA allocated grant funding to 87 city and county court-based programs to increase access to mental health and other treatment services for individuals with mental illnesses or co-occurring mental health and substance abuse disorders. Grant funds were to be used for the development and expansion of a range of services, including services for affected individuals, training programs for criminal justice and mental health and substance abuse treatment personnel, and mental health courts, court-based programs and pretrial services among others. Sixty-seven of the programs were eligible for survey analysis on the basis of a ten-month downtime between BJA spending and survey assessment.

BJA provided RAND access to all retained program records on grantees from these three programs. In total, we reviewed 7,436 electronic documents relevant to the funded programs. Documents included grant application data, such as program descriptions, applicant qualifications, letters of support, memoranda of understanding, and budget reports; progress report data, such as fulfillment of numerical goals and indications of efforts to locate new funding; and miscellaneous information, such as evaluation reports.

Encountering incomplete data was frequent when working with the files and presented a significant challenge for our analytic approach. Instead of excluding all grantees from the study that had any incomplete data, we retained different numbers of grantees for each statistical test according to what maximized the number of observations for each of those tests. Even so, many variables suffered from too few observations, a limitation that we address in Chapter Five.

To the extent possible, given the nature of the archival data, we sought to code indicators of factors previously shown or suspected to be associated with sustainability. Five research assistants were trained to identify, evaluate, and code relevant variables into spreadsheets for each research domain. Response types included "yes/no" judgments to represent presence or absence of an attribute, "weak/moderate/strong" judgments to represent the quality of an attribute, and numeric scores provided by BJA. Research assistants were provided with examples of weak, moderate, and strong attributes (such as project descriptions) as determined by the expertise of the principal investigators, which they used to guide their judgments. As a part of training, a reliability test was conducted on nine files from an extensive but otherwise arbitrarily selected grantee record. Discrepancies were resolved through qualitative discussion and by constructing explicit coding conventions that protect against potential interrater variability. For instance, research assistants were instructed that, in case of a missing final report, a variable of interest should be queried from the nearest-term progress report. Further elaboration of the coding scheme was developed for particular variables during coding as needed and, in

such cases, previously coded records were updated according to the revised scheme (see Appendix A for a complete list of archival variables and their coding schemes).

Table 4.1 summarizes the factors we were able to code from the archival data and their incidence among the 231 grantees. Of note, grant applications were evenly split in regard to inclusion of a sustainability plan. Similarly, an even split was observed within progress reports for indications of efforts to locate new funding.

Table 4.1. Archival Results

Question	N	Response Type	DC	HT	MH	Pooled Total[a]
Source: Project description in grant application						
Project description clearly presented and convincing?	153	Weak	4.8	0.0	2.4	2.0
		Moderate	4.8	53.1	61.5	51.0
		Strong	90.5	46.9	36.1	47.1
Is statement of need supported by statistical data?	160	N	24.2	4.6	2.4	7.5
		Y	75.8	95.5	97.6	92.5
How well-defined are intended program operations?	172	Weak	3.1	5.3	1.2	2.9
		Moderate	34.4	61.4	34.9	43.6
		Strong	62.5	33.3	63.9	53.5
Does project description include immediate numerical targets?	169	N	57.1	54.4	42.9	49.1
		Y	42.9	45.6	57.1	50.9
Does project description include long-term (post–BJA funding) outcomes?	173	N	58.1	47.4	21.2	36.4
		Y	41.9	52.6	78.8	63.6
Does application include description of self-evaluation?	173	N	6.5	22.8	3.5	10.4
		Y	93.6	77.2	96.5	89.6
Strength of self-evaluation design?	155	Weak	59.3	13.0	11.0	20.0
		Moderate	37.0	54.4	45.1	46.5
		Strong	3.7	32.6	43.9	33.6
Evaluator experience?	75	Weak	0.0	3.5	4.8	4.0
		Moderate	50.0	86.2	26.2	50.7
		Strong	50.0	10.3	69.1	45.3
Plan presented for administrative oversight (e.g., some type of formal arrangement or steering committee)?	164	N	40.0	17.9	24.4	25.0
		Y	60.0	82.1	75.6	75.0
Sustainability plan presented?	147	N	27.6	46.5	60.0	49.7
		Y	72.4	53.5	40.0	50.3

Question	N	Response Type	DC	HT	MH	Pooled Total[a]
Source: Curriculum vitae and biographical sketches						
Does the project application include applicant curriculum vitae or resumes?	229	N	29.4	59.7	63.2	49.8
		Y	2.4	40.4	20.7	18.8
Experience managing large federal programs?	59	Weak	23.1	45.5	4.2	23.7
		Moderate	0.0	40.9	37.5	30.5
		Strong	76.9	13.6	58.3	45.8
Project director experience managing similar programs (any prior experience, including on this project)?	231	Weak	0.0	12.3	2.3	3.9
		Moderate	1.2	22.8	11.5	10.4
		Strong	20.7	5.3	19.5	16.5
Source: Memos and letters						
Memorandum of Understanding with partners or collaborators?	231	N	0.0	0.0	3.5	1.3
		Y	3.5	84.2	29.9	33.3
Letters of support?	165	0	16.7	86.0	18.0	41.2
		1–5	23.3	14.0	33.3	24.9
		6 or more	60.0	0.0	48.7	33.9
Source: Progress reports and evaluation reports						
Indications of problems meeting numerical goals?	164	N	86.4	98.3	76.5	85.4
		Y	13.6	1.8	23.5	14.6
On track to complete program?	175	N	12.7	0.0	15.2	11.4
		Y	87.3	100.0	84.8	88.6
Indications of efforts to locate new funding?	92	N	50.0	93.6	19.5	51.1
		Y	50.0	6.5	80.5	48.9
Evaluation reports included in package?	94	N	0.0	91.1	51.6	71.3
		Y	100.0	8.9	48.4	28.7
BJA monitoring priority?	54	Low	70.4	—	77.8	74.1
		Med	29.6	—	22.2	25.9
BJA priority assessment score	54	Mean (SD)	14.1 (6.0)	—	12.3 (5.3)	13.2 (5.7)

NOTE: Numbers represent percentages unless otherwise specified. Percentages may not add up to 100 in cases involving incomplete data. Reported numbers (N) vary due to incomplete archival data. SD = standard deviation.

[a] Pooled totals are percentages from all observations without regard to program type.

Table 4.2 reports budgetary statistics for each program domain derived from the application files for the total of 231 BJA programs, as well as the subset of 136 that responded to the survey. Of note, the standard deviations reveal wide variability in award amounts. Given this variability, the survey sample means appear to be generally comparable to the larger selection of project means. We also note that the grantees as a whole appeared to be fairly successful at procuring substantial internal matching funds, in

the range of 45 to 50 percent of the total award amount. Indeed, four programs' internal fund amounts exceeded that of the BJA award.

Table 4.2. Budgetary Results from Archive for Total and Survey Sample

		All			Survey Sample		
Result		**Mean**	**SD**	**N**	**Mean**	**SD**	**N**
Total award amount	DC	$254,679.89	$104,665.77	28	$251,571.94	$114,265.52	16
	HT	$281,475.68	$156,298.93	28	$172,727.13	$56,428.76	8
	MH	$181,529.40	$66,728.39	42	$185,477.38	$68,682.16	26
	Pooled total[a]	$230,985.62	$116,996.89	98	$204,587.60	$89,100.48	50
Personnel amount	DC	$142,572.54	$87,965.66	28	$130,363.19	$97,065.61	16
	HT	$163,573.71	$98,764.18	28	$122,703.88	$103,627.72	8
	MH	$76,236.98	$65,126.23	42	$79,916.23	$60,413.96	26
	Pooled total[a]	$120,143.35	$90,477.36	98	$102,905.28	$82,891.97	50
Contract or consultant amount	DC	$84,660.75	$74,007.51	28	$100,565.63	$80,963.34	16
	HT	$109,462.89	$109,140.88	28	$69,439.75	$67,977.61	8
	MH	$90,384.68	$77,242.96	42	$77,825.38	$67,102.22	26
	Pooled total[a]	$94,200.19	$86,382.41	98	$83,760.56	$71,473.62	50
Matching funds	DC	52.57%	62.41%	28	51.88%	57.56%	16
	HT	40.50%	31.28%	28	44.00%	33.08%	8
	MH	44.64%	83.61%	42	51.77%	106.19%	26
	Pooled total[a]	45.72%	65.83%	98	50.56%	83.26%	50

NOTE: Number of observations (N) are included to illustrate the limited number of budgetary data points found in the archival records.
[a] Pooled totals are percentages from all observations without regard to program type.

Follow-Up Survey of Program Representatives

Using email, phone, and address data available for individuals listed as program directors in the BJA archive, we attempted to survey program representatives from each of the 231 BJA grantees using a structured 24-item survey. The survey was initially sent by email. Trained members of the RAND Survey Research Group followed up with nonrespondents, as well as respondents who preferred to provide oral answers, by telephone. If the listed contact person could not be reached, the program manager or financial administrator was solicited. Three or more unrequited calls were made for each contact number before disqualifying. Once contact was established, up to three follow-up calls were made for confirmation and reminder purposes. No incentives were provided.

The survey was designed to elicit information on the program's history and current status, as well as additional factors potentially associated with program sustainment. For example, was the program in operation after BJA funding ended? Did resource availability change over the course of the program? To assess the validity of their responses, respondents were also asked (1) to confirm their award identification numbers, (2) whether they had access to program documentation to inform their answers, and (3) how confident they were in the accuracy of their responses. (See Appendix B for a complete list of survey questions and response options.)

Dependent Measures

To best capture the heterogeneous nature of program sustainment in the literature, sustainment was defined both in terms of "sustained operations" and "sustained funding" beyond cessation of BJA funding. This distinction between operations and funding permits the possibility that a program with prospects for sustainability could potentially excel in one more than the other, although, in practice, the two often may be positively correlated. Certainly, evidence of both forms of sustainment presents a stronger case for sustainability and can be useful for validation purposes. Unfortunately, a continuous measure of survival (e.g., sustainment days) was not available because of a low item response regarding program start and end dates. Thus, *sustained operations* was defined as the self-reported presence or absence of continued program operations following cessation of BJA funding (survey Q9). Likewise, sustained funding was considered to be achieved when the program reportedly received (versus did not receive) supplemental funding and continued to operate following cessation of BJA funding (positive response to both survey Q9 *and* Q10, on the assumption that programs that continued to operate were able to do so because of their supplemental funding). Both variables were dichotomous. A Pearson correlation revealed that the dependent measures were highly intercorrelated, as expected, $r = 0.62$, $p < 0.001$, N = 99. Although the time between the cessation of BJA funding and survey data collection varied by project, none of the respondents in our inferential analyses reported a follow-up period of less than six months.

Summary Statistics

Table 4.3 reports descriptive summary statistics for the survey sample. As shown, we achieved a 61-percent response rate for the survey. Ninety-three percent of those responded using the electronic survey; the remainder opted to deliver their responses by phone. Approximately 79 percent of the surveyed grantees (excluding nonresponders) reported continuation of program operations following cessation of BJA funding. Sixty-nine percent of grantees procured supplemental funding at some point in the program cycle (Q10). Of these supplemental funding sources, the most frequent funding type

reported was state funding (42.6 percent), followed by local funding (21.3 percent) and other federal sources (13.2 percent). Sixty-one percent of grantees reportedly procured supplemental funding following cessation of BJA funding (survey Q9 and Q10).

Table 4.3. Summary Statistics for the Survey Sample

Measure	DC	HT	MH	Pooled Total[a]
Number of invitees	87	57	87	231
Survey response rate (% of invitees)	82.5	35.1	58.8	61.3
Number of respondents with sufficiently complete archival and survey data	55	20	48	123
Program duration (months)	15 to 36	12 to 36	12 to 36	12 to 36
Program date range	September 2001 to September 2015	November 2004 to February 2012	March 2003 to September 2014	May 2002 to September 2015
Average elapsed time between start date and survey (years)	5.6	3.4	4.2	5.4
Percentage of respondents with sustained operations (Q9)	82.2	61.5	80.7	78.7
Percentage of respondents with supplemental funding (Q10)	68.3	55.0	75.5	68.9
Percentage of respondents with sustained funding (Q9 plus Q10)	57.1	46.2	70.3	60.6

[a] Pooled totals are percentages from all observations without regard to program type.

Table 4.4 reports a summary of the survey response data for each program domain. A few items are particularly noteworthy. First, approximately 92 percent of all surveyed grantees reported that local stakeholders were involved in the start-up process. Eighty-nine percent reported that the program was modifiable to meet local needs. Of the 42 grantees who reported that their initial project leaders left the programs, 95 percent reported that these leaders were able to pass on their responsibilities to other people. Ninety percent of surveyed grantees reported that their project leaders were well-connected with funding sources. The vast majority of the projects had at least one other funding source (from 84 percent for DC to 96 percent for MH). Although these high frequency scores lend optimism to the prospect of program sustainment, they also allow for the possibility of range restriction in our subsequent hypothesis tests, meaning that the smallness of the number of grantees reporting low scores on these dimensions could compromise our ability to detect true effects of these factors on our sustainment measures.

Other measures exhibited greater variability, such as whether an evaluation of the program was conducted (55 percent reported yes) and whether the program experienced changes in resource availability over time (50 percent reported yes). It is also noteworthy that approximately 38 percent of respondents reported that they did not have access to program documentation records to answer the survey questions and instead had to rely on memory alone; yet, as a whole, grantees reported high confidence in the accuracy of their responses, $M = 8.9$ out of ten (SD = 1.2).

Table 4.4. Survey Response Data

Survey Question	Valid N	DC	HT	MH	Pooled Total[a]
Mean number of supplemental funding sources at any time (SD)	132	1.0 (0.9)	0.7 (0.73)	1.2 (0.8)	1.0 (0.9)
Percentage of programs reporting having one or more supplemental funding sources	132	84.1	92.0	95.5	71.7
Program still in operation	89	78.8	73.7	85.7	80.6
Reason program ended, if not sustained	134				
Successful completion of program		9.7	5.3	20.6	12.2
End of funding opportunity		11.3	42.1	11.8	16.5
Lack of internal resources		1.6	0.0	0.0	0.9
Other		6.5	0.0	5.9	5.2
Not applicable		71.0	52.6	61.8	65.2
In operation before BJA funding	129	44.3	15.0	22.9	31.8
Local stakeholders involved in the start-up	130	88.5	94.7	94.0	91.5
Evaluation conducted	121	75.0	47.1	50.0	55.4
Modifiable to meet local needs	131	89.1	77.8	91.8	88.5
Champion	121	81.4	68.4	79.1	78.5
If change in leadership, successfully passed on responsibilities	44	92.3	100.0	100.0	95.5
Well-connected in the community and with funding sources	82	97.5	83.3	83.3	90.2
Organizational capacity to carry out program prior to funding	96	27.1	23.1	34.3	29.2
External economic or political factors affect program sustainability	123	35.6	55.6	45.7	42.3
Legislation	124	23.0	42.1	29.5	28.2
Availability of funding or other resources change	129	57.1	60.0	37.0	50.4
Access to documentation	136	60.6	60.0	66.0	62.5
How confident that responses are correct: mean (SD) on 1–10 scale	129	8.9 (1.4)	8.7 (1.2)	9.1 (1.0)	8.9 (1.2)

NOTE: Values represent percentage of valid N endorsed.
[a] Pooled totals are percentages from all observations without regard to program type.

Factors Associated with Bureau of Justice Assistance Program Sustainment

In accordance with previous literature, we hypothesized that our two dependent measures of program sustainment (sustained operations and sustained funding) would be associated with several factors, including evidence of funding stability, political support, research and community partnerships, strong organizational capacity, adaptability, program evaluation, communications, public impact, and strategic planning. Because of small sample sizes, it was not possible to statistically test differences between the three program domains, but we refer the reader to Tables 4.1 through 4.4 for various descriptive comparisons between these domains.

The selection of these factors was based loosely on a theoretical framework proposed by Schell et al. (2013) because this framework is broadly representative of the empirical research on program sustainability. We tested the effect of each of the factors independently using separate logistic regression models. For factors composed of more than one variable, all such variables were entered into the model simultaneously, permitting us to test their combined effect using the chi-square omnibus test. In these multifactor models, main effects of the individual predictors were evaluated using the Wald statistic. Statistical weights were not assigned. Discretion was used to determine which specific variables were selected and paired to represent higher-order factors, depending on their theoretical relevance and on the available data (shown in Tables 4.1, 4.2, and 4.4; archival variable codes and survey response categories are shown in Appendixes A and B, respectively). These selections were defined as follows:

- Funding stability was defined as the combination of the grantee organization's percentage match contribution[2] (archival variable) (on the assumption that programs with more internal funding would be more sustainable over time) and whether the availability of funding or other resources reportedly changed over the course of the program (survey Q20). (A positive integer represented the presence of funding changes; we made no theoretical predictions about the direction of the effect of funding changes on sustainment.)
- Political support was defined as the combination of whether the program was reportedly affected by external socioeconomic or political factors (Q18) and by current or pending legislation (Q19). (Because the directionality of the effect—positive or negative—was not specified by these questions, we made no predictions about the direction of the effect of political support on sustainment.)
- Partnerships were defined as the combination of the percentage of the total budget that the grantee subcontracted to a third-party partner or consultant (archival variable) (on the assumption that grantees that provide more support to their

[2] Note that the percentage match variable can exceed 100 percent of the BJA award amount if the grantee raised more than that amount.

partners would tend to benefit more strongly from those relationships) and whether the respondent reported the presence of support by local stakeholders (Q11).[3]

- Organizational capacity was defined by whether the grantee organization reportedly had the capacity to conduct the program prior to BJA funding (Q17) (on the assumption that organizations with prior capacity would demonstrate greater sustainment than those without).
- Adaptability was defined by whether the program was reportedly modifiable to meet local needs (Q13) (on the assumption that more-adaptable or modifiable programs would exhibit greater sustainment).
- Evaluation was defined as the combination of whether the proposal specified numeric goals (archival variable) and whether the program was reported by BJA evaluation as "on track" toward successful completion (archival variable) (on the assumption that programs specifying numeric goals and evaluated to be on track would exhibit greater sustainment than those without these attributes).
- Public impact was defined as the indication of support or lack thereof by officials from the criminal justice community (archival variable) (on the assumption that programs with greater support would demonstrate greater sustainment).
- Strategic planning was defined as the combination of whether the program proposal included a "sustainment plan" (archival variable) and whether it identified long-term outcomes and a plan for measuring and attaining them (archival variable) (on the assumption that grantees that provided a well-defined plan and goals for measuring and achieving long-term sustainment would be better equipped to meet this objective than other grantees).

In addition to testing these a priori statistical models, we tested eight post hoc models (four for each measure of sustainment) that were of interest to us but did not conform neatly to our a priori categories. These were whether the project leader was well-connected in the community and with funding sources (Q16), number of letters of support included in the grant application (archival variable), whether the project description was clear and convincing (archival variable), whether the project description had well-defined operations (archival variable), and whether the project description included specific numeric target goals (archival variable). Of course, there are innumerable other ways of defining these constructs that are worthy of investigation. (See Appendixes A and B for coding categories.)

Table 4.5 summarizes the results of the 16 a priori analyses of the association between predictors of sustainability and actual sustainment (eight for each dependent measure). Two of these results are noteworthy. First, consistent with predictions is the result that programs reported to be modifiable to meet local needs were more likely to have procured subsequent funding than less modifiable programs. However, this effect

[3] Number of letters of support was not considered an indicator of partnerships because such letters are often written by political figures not directly involved in the project.

was not observed when sustainability was defined as the continuation of program operations following cessation of initial BJA funding, reinforcing the notion that our "sustained funding" and "sustained operations" are indexing different constructs.

Second, our measure of funding stability showed a marginal tendency to predict continuation of program operations (Table 4.5). The individual predictors making up the funding stability construct were not independently significant, as shown by their respective Wald statistics in Appendix C, suggesting that it is their combined influence that may be driving the effect. This pattern was not observed when sustainment was defined as the procurement of subsequent funding, suggesting that program operations by financially stable organizations may have been sustained even without reports of additional funding. None of our other a priori models yielded significant effects. (Further statistical details are reported in Appendix C.)

Table 4.5. Summary of 16 A Priori Logistic Regressions

Predictor	Dependent Variable	Statistical Significance
Funding stability	Sustained operations	$p < 0.10$
	Sustained funding	None
Political support	Sustained operations	None
	Sustained funding	None
Partnerships	Sustained operations	None
	Sustained funding	None
Organizational capacity	Sustained operations	None
	Sustained funding	None
Adaptability	Sustained operations	None
	Sustained funding	$p < 0.05$
Evaluation	Sustained operations	None
	Sustained funding	None
Public impact	Sustained operations	None
	Sustained funding	None
Strategic planning	Sustained operations	None
	Sustained funding	None

NOTE: Sustained operations = Q9. Sustained funding = Q9 + Q10.

In addition to testing the 16 a priori models, we tested eight other models (four for each measure of sustainment) based on the available data (see Table 4.6 for a summary of results). One significant and one marginally significant effect were observed. Consistently with predictions, project leaders reported to be well-connected in the community significantly predicted continuation of program operations following BJA

funding. However, this effect was not replicated using our funding-based definition of sustainment. We also observed a marginally significant tendency of the number of letters of support: Programs whose applications contained more letters tended to be more likely to procure subsequent funding. However, this effect was not observed when sustainment was defined by continuation of program operations. (Further statistical details are reported in Appendix D.)

Table 4.6. Summary of Eight Post Hoc Logistic Regressions

Predictor	Dependent Variable	Statistical Significance
Well-connected leader	Sustained operations	$p < 0.01$
	Sustained funding	None
Number of letters of support	Sustained operations	None
	Sustained funding	$p < 0.10$
Project description	Sustained operations	None
	Sustained funding	None
Numerical targets	Sustained operations	None
	Sustained funding	None

NOTE: For models containing multiple predictors, those predictors were entered into the model simultaneously.

Finally, we explored whether factors theoretically associated with sustainability predicted program sustainment better if we assumed that all programs lost to follow-up had failed to be sustained. This assumption did not result in more than one additional significant effect among the 20 we tested, so we judged that it did not improve the predictive performance of the sustainment models.

Chapter Five. Conclusions and Recommendations

The purpose of this study was to assess the sustainment status of BJA programs across three domains and to examine possible factors predicting program sustainment. The majority of BJA programs with which we were able to follow up reported evidence of program sustainment, which is consistent with Scheirer's (2005) finding that about 60 percent of health programs studied in prior research about sustainability reported sustainment of at least one program component. Moreover, most of the BJA programs that responded to the survey were successful in procuring supplemental support, particularly state-level funding and internal matching funds. They also demonstrated high levels of consistency in reports of involving local stakeholders in the start-up process.

Despite these trends, substantial variation was observed in the context of archival variables, such as award amounts, number of letters of support, presence and strength of a program evaluation, and the inclusion of a sustainability plan in the program proposal, and survey variables, such as reported changes in resource availability throughout the life of the program. However, few of these differences could explain which programs would be most likely to be sustained.

That said, we did find a small number of significant or marginally significant predictors of program sustainment, including funding stability, program adaptability and modifiability, the existence of well-connected project leaders, and the number of letters of support. However, the majority of our hypotheses that were derived from previous literature were not confirmed, including effects of political support, research and community partnerships, organizational capacity, program evaluation, public impact, and strategic planning.

The relatively small number of factors found to be related to sustainment is consistent with some prior studies that have also found few empirical predictors of sustainment (e.g., Mihalic and Irwin, 2003; Peterson et al., 2013; Savaya, Spiro, and Elran-Barak, 2008). For example, Peterson and colleagues (2013) examined the ability of a host of different program characteristics to predict sustainment in 49 mental health care programs, but the majority of factors were not found to be significant. However, the small proportion of significant predictors was inconsistent with the larger body of literature (e.g., Molfenter, Ford, and Bhattacharya, 2011; Scheirer, 2005).

Several considerations may help to explain the inconsistency in findings. First, it is possible that the theories of sustainability, developed primarily in the fields of public health and international development, may not accurately describe the reasons for sustainment success and failure in criminal justice domains. In such a case, we might find, for instance, that other factors in the justice program environment that were not

recorded might play a larger role, such as competition for resources from other similar programs (see Savaya, Spiro, and Elran-Barak, 2008).

Another reason for our null pattern of results could be how our variables were specifically operationalized. If our specific measures did not accurately capture the larger construct of interest, this could explain the lack of consistency with previous literature. For example, our measure of sustained funding was a composite of two different survey items (whether the program received other sources of funding and whether it continued to operate after BJA funding ended). However, the existence of continued operations following supplemental funding is not direct evidence that the funding itself was sustained, so future studies should seek out more direct evidence from financial records that funding was in fact granted or spent after the BJA end date.

Finally, if these measures were not sufficiently sensitive because of, for example, range restriction or, relatedly, if we lacked enough observations to detect small but true effects, either of these could also explain the dearth of predictive effects. Indeed, the available BJA file data, consisting primarily of application materials, progress reports, and evaluation and monitoring reports, were generally not sufficient to make detailed judgments about the presence of many factors theorized as predictive of sustainability. For example, BJA records contain a variable representing whether the applicant presented a "sustainability plan." However, out of our 231 cases, only 11 could be coded as "no," whereas 196 were not found, rendering this variable unusable for inferential analysis. In addition, 29 programs had end dates that could not be found in their files. It is not known whether these missing data points were never reported by the applicant or reported but not coded into the BJA archive.

Moreover, even the small number of significant associations we observed may be suspect because of the large number of statistical tests we performed. In general, we would expect about 5 percent of all statistical tests to find significant effects, even if none existed. As such, our finding of four significant effects among 24 tests is only a little above the one or two we might expect by chance.

Another important caveat of our results concerns the survey response rate. About 40 percent of the programs did not complete follow-up surveys. If, as we suspect, nonrespondents disproportionately reflected programs that were discontinued (i.e., if sustaining programs were more likely to respond), then a selection bias could have resulted such that the true rate of programs with sustained funding could be substantially below the observed 60 percent (but above 34 percent, which would be the observed sustainment rate if every program that did not respond were included and coded as unsustained).

Among the submitted surveys, the *item* response rate was also modest, perhaps because these data were not available to respondents. For this reason, time-series analyses, such as survival analysis on the length of funding, were not possible. Future

studies should consider methods other than self-report to collect the information required to evaluate program duration and its predictors.

Another potential limitation involved the method of data collection for the expert interviews. Interviewees were selected based on existing relationships with the project team, responses were recorded manually by a note taker rather than an audio recorder, and thematic content was coded by a single analyst. Future efforts to extend this work should consider random sampling techniques, audio recording, and dual ratings accompanied by appropriate reliability testing.

There were many theoretical frameworks, potential predictors, and ways of operationalizing them that are reviewed above but were not examined in the present analysis. For example, the data set did not contain a measure of the degree to which programs were affected by the presence of other competing programs, as noted by Savaya, Spiro, and Elran-Barak (2008). It would also be valuable to test hypotheses related to funding period length, such as whether length of the funding award or the length of time since program support ended predicts later sustainability. In the same vein, temporal measures could help examine whether early recorded variables, such as grant application materials, are better or worse at predicting sustainment than later measures, such as final report materials. Extensions of this research should explore such hypotheses systematically.

In the present study, the vast majority of survey respondents chose to respond via an electronic structured survey mode. This method permitted them to respond on their own schedules, a fact that allows the respondent time to locate files needed for reporting. However, other modes, such as telephone interviews, may be preferred to elicit greater detail and nuance from grantees. Future studies of program sustainment might consider pairing both of these modalities in sequence for maximal fidelity.

Finally, examining other criminal justice program domains (e.g., policing, domestic violence, gun and gang violence, gun trafficking) was beyond the scope of this project but would equally benefit from a systematic analysis of program sustainability and its factors.

Recommendations for Improving the Sustainability of Bureau of Justice Assistance Grantee Projects

In the absence of strong empirical evidence from the BJA programs, the best models for identifying and promoting sustainable programs are those articulated in the literature outside the criminal justice field, such as Scheirer's (2005) model for public health programs:

- Fund programs within existing agencies that have the capacity to support them, and provide expertise needed to reach sustainability.

- Fund programs that have local resources invested to build a sense of local ownership.
- Identify and work with local champions.
- Allow the program to adapt to fit local needs.
- Allow time and resources for the program to fully develop.
- Encourage planning for sustainability early in a program's life cycle.
- Fund evaluation studies to provide insight into program successes and challenges.

The Scheirer and Dearing (2011) agenda for sustainability research makes at least two broad recommendations about the capacities and responsibilities of funding agencies. First, they advise sponsors to develop a comprehensive *measurement and data-collection plan*, permitting the systematic tracking and analysis of both performance and outcome measures of program sustainment. Second, they recommend that the funding agency take steps to communicate the value and characteristics of sustainable practices by *educating prospective grantees*.

A robust measurement and education plan can be developed using feedback from current and former clients and third-party evaluators to clarify and standardize performance criteria for program capacity, sustainment, adaptations, and related constructs. These can provide the basis of a standardized procedure for assessment of both current program implementation and later sustainment. Longitudinal surveys of grantees and data archives for preserving their responses make up invaluable strategies toward this end. Such surveys should solicit structured feedback from multiple levels, from project leaders to front-line staff, at several time points, from initial submission to postaward follow-up. They should contain mechanisms for coding qualitative statements from application materials into quantitative scores. The agency archives should include more-detailed financial information to support more-sophisticated hypothesis tests regarding both the allocation and use of funds. They should also include procedures for tracking grantee contact information over time. Moreover, assessment of program sustainability can be informed by third-party sources, such as funding reports from external sponsors supporting the program.

These recommendations are consistent with the advice we collected from successful developers of criminal justice programs. Specifically, and consistently with previous research, our interviewees emphasized the role of funding availability and stability (e.g., Blasinsky, Goldman, and Unützer, 2006; Schell et al., 2013); support from key stakeholders, including those in public office (e.g., Scheirer, 2005; Schell et al., 2013); and the establishment of robust partnerships with particular stakeholders (e.g., Savaya, Spiro, and Elran-Barak, 2008), as well as more widely with the community (e.g., Amazigo et al., 2007; Baum et al., 2006; Edwards and Roelofs, 2006; Mihalic and Irwin, 2003; Okeibunor et al., 2012; Pade-Khene, Mallinson, and Sewry, 2011; Schell et al., 2013). Our interviewees also broadly agreed on the importance of empirical research,

either in the form of evidence for program effectiveness or as input into program development and implementation, and this theme is further supported in the literature (e.g., Damschroder and Hagedorn, 2011).

BJA should consider supporting further research to assess the value and feasibility of developing a standardized evaluation process for grant applications on par with program effectiveness. Such a process could potentially begin by assessing program sustainment (in a retrospective sense) similarly for all programs and then use those results to determine the extent to which the programs carry prospects for long-term sustainability (in the prospective sense). Such efforts will require development of an evidence-based, standard procedure for measuring sustainment and its predictors and outcomes coupled with a well-defined strategy for educating current and prospective grantees about performance criteria and best practices. These techniques could benefit from investment into longitudinal data collection and more-structured reporting requirements that lend themselves to quantitative analysis. Supporting effective programs that will continue beyond the cessation of BJA grant funding will ensure that federal dollars are leveraged to achieve the greatest possible improvements to public safety.

At a time of scarce federal resources, understanding the elements of program sustainability is critical to fostering effective and enduring program outcomes. This need is especially important in the field of criminal justice, wherein the safety of communities is at stake. The present report represents an early effort to organize, expand, and apply strategies for assessing sustainability to criminal justice program domains. It is through the culmination of such efforts that positive, longer-term social change can be realized.

Appendix A: Variables Collected from Bureau of Justice Assistance Reports

Table A.1. Variables Collected and Their Coding Schemes

Variable	Coding Scheme
General	
Start date of BJA funding	MM/DD/YYYY, n/a, unknown, TBD
End date of BJA funding	MM/DD/YYYY, n/a, unknown, TBD
Project description	
Is project description clearly presented and convincing?	Strong, moderate, weak, NF
Is statement of need supported by statistical data?	Y, N, NF
Is program new or existing?	New, existing, NF
If existing, how was program originally funded?	Local, federal, other, NF, n/a
How well-defined are program operations?	Strong, moderate, weak
Does statement include immediate numerical targets?	Y, N
Does it include long-term (post–BJA funding) outcomes?	Y, N
Does application include description of self-evaluation?	Y, N, n/a
Strength of self-evaluation design?	Strong, moderate, weak, NF
Evaluator experience?	Strong, moderate, weak, NF
Plan presented for administrative oversight (e.g., some type of formal arrangement or steering committee)?	Y, N, NF
Sustainability plan presented?	Specific, vague, NF
Applicant qualifications	
Does the program description include applicant curriculum vitae or resumes?	Y, N
Experience managing large federal programs?	Strong, moderate, weak, NF
Program director experience managing similar programs (any prior experience, including on this program)?	Strong, moderate, weak, NF
Collaborative arrangements	
Collaborators: Does it include a memorandum of understanding?	Y, N, NF
Number of letters of support submitted with application	Integer
Budget narrative	
Personnel amount (federal funding amount in dollars)	###,###
Contract or consultant amount (federal funding amounts)	###,###
Total amount in dollars	###,###
Quality of budget narrative	Strong, moderate, weak, NF
Dollar amount local match: *required*	0–xxx,xxx, NF

Variable	Coding Scheme
Percentage local match: *required*	0–100, NF
Dollar amount local match: *match achieved*	0–xxx,xxx, NF
Percentage local match: *made*	0–100, NF
Description of match	Vague, specific, NF
Progress reports	
Indications of problems meeting numerical goals	Y, N, n/a
On track to complete program	Y, N, n/a, NF
Indication of support or lack of support for program by criminal justice system officials	High, low, n/a, NF
Indications of program efforts to locate new funding	Y, N, n/a, NF
Explain any problems noted	Text
Outside evaluation reports	
Evaluation reports included in package	Y, N, NF
Quality of evaluation design	Strong, moderate, weak, n/a, NF
Report favorable to program	Favorable, mixed, unfavorable, n/a, NF
BJA staff evaluations	
Monitoring priority	Low, medium, high, n/a, NF
Monitoring priority assessment rating	Number, n/a, NF
Concerns from prior desk reviews or monitoring visits	Number, NF
Implementation issues	Text, NF

NOTE: Some of the variables listed were not analyzed because of an insufficient number of observations. n/a = not applicable. TBD = to be determined. NF = not found.

Appendix B. Survey Questions

Bureau of Justice Assistance

Survey on Program Outcomes

Instructions: Please open any documentation (final reports, financial reports, etc.) you might have describing your BJA-funded project. Then complete the questions below. You can type text and select your responses directly in the form using Adobe Reader. Refer to the bottom of Page 4 for instructions on submitting your responses to us.

No identifying information will be shared with BJA or anyone else beyond the RAND staff assigned to this project.

1. What is your BJA Project Award Number? (e.g., 2010-CA-BX-0099) _____

2. What was the year of your initial BJA Program Funding? __ __ __ __

3. Is your program still in operation?
   - ○ Yes
   - ○ No
   - ○ Unknown
   - ○ Not applicable

4. How many participants/clients did the program have when it was originally funded?

   Number: _____

5. How many participants/clients were seen by the funding end date?

   Number: _____

6. What were the program's original funding sources? (Select all that apply)
   - ☐ Federal funding
   - ☐ State funding
   - ☐ Local funding
   - ☐ Private foundation
   - ☐ Internally funded
   - ☐ Other. Please specify: _____
   - ☐ None
   - ☐ Unknown
   - ☐ Not applicable

7. What do you think is the primary reason that the project ended?
   - ○ Successful completion of project
   - ○ End of funding opportunity
   - ○ Loss of director/principal investigator
   - ○ Change of organization's priorities
   - ○ Lack of internal resources
   - ○ Other. Please specify: _____
   - ○ Not applicable

8. Was the program in operation *before* BJA funding?
   - ○ Yes → What was the program's initial *start* date? __ __ / __ __ / __ __ __ __
   - ○ No (Month / Day / Year)
   - ○ Unknown

9. Was the program in operation *after* BJA funding?
   - ○ Yes → What was (is) the program's final (or projected) *end* date? __ __ / __ __ / __ __ __ __
   - ○ No (Month / Day / Year)
   - ○ Unknown

10. Does/Did the program receive other sources of funding besides BJA? (Select all that apply)
   - ☐ Federal funding
   - ☐ State funding
   - ☐ Local funding
   - ☐ Private foundation
   - ☐ Internally funded
   - ☐ Other. Please specify: _____
   - ☐ None
   - ☐ Unknown
   - ☐ Not applicable

11. Were local stakeholders involved in the start-up process of the program?
   - ○ Yes. Please specify who: _____
   - ○ No
   - ○ Unknown

12. Was any evaluation ever done to document the effectiveness of the program?
   - ○ Yes, and I can share the evaluation results.
     Who should RAND contact to receive the evaluation results? Name and Contact Information:

     _____

     _____
   - ○ Yes, but I cannot share the evaluation results.
   - ○ No
   - ○ Unknown

13. Was the program modifiable to meet local needs?
- ○ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Unknown

14. Was there a person who originally thought up the project idea and championed the program from start to finish?
- ○ Yes. Name and Contact Information:

  _____

  _____
- ○ No → **Go to question 18.**
- ○ Unknown → **Go to question 18.**

15. Was this person (listed in question 15) able to pass on their responsibilities to another person when/if they left?
- ○ Yes. Name and Contact Information for new person:

  _____

  _____
- ○ No
- ○ Unknown
- ○ Not Applicable

16. Was this person (listed in question 15) well connected in the community and with funding sources?
- ○ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Unknown

17. Did your organization already have capacity to do the program prior to funding?
- ○ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Unknown

18. Did any external socio-economic/political factors affect the program's sustainability?
- ○ Yes. Please describe: _____
- ○ No _____
- ○ Unknown

19. Was the program directly affected by any (pending, current, or previous) legislation?
- ○ Yes. Please describe: _____
- ○ No _____
- ○ Unknown

20. Did availability of funding or other resources change over the course of the program?
- ○ Yes. Please describe: _____
- ○ No _____
- ○ Unknown

21. Did you access documentation records to provide answers to any of the questions above?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No (I had to rely on my memory only)

22. How confident are you that this information is current and accurate? (Select one number)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Not confident Very confident

23. May we contact you if you have additional questions in the coming weeks or months?

- ○ Yes. Contact information:

_____

_____

- ○ No

24. Additional comments:

_____

_____

Thank you for your time!

We will call you soon to record your answers to our questions.
Alternatively, you can return this questionnaire in one of the following ways:

1. ***Click the "Submit Form" button in the upper right hand corner***
2. ***Save your responses and email the completed form to mzander@rand.org***
3. ***Complete by phone: 310-393-0411 x7653***
4. ***Print and fax it to: 310-451-6921, Attn: Megan Zander***
5. ***Print and mail it to the following address:***

Megan Zander
RAND Corporation
PO Box 2138
Santa Monica, CA 90407-2138

Appendix C. Results of A Priori Logistic Regressions

Table C.1. Results of A Priori Logistic Regressions

Predictor	Dependent Variable	df, n	Chi-Square (*p*)	–2 Log Likelihood	Wald	*B* (SE)
Funding stability	Sustained operations	2, 44	5.1[m]	44.4	1.1[a] 2.1[b]	0.0 (0.0)[a] 1.3 (0.9)[b]
	Sustained funding	2, 43	3.1	52.5	1.2[a] 0.2[b]	0.0 (0.0)[a] 0.3 (0.7)[b]
Political support	Sustained operations	2, 77	0.12	81.18	0.1[c] 0.0[d]	–0.2 (0.6)[c] 0.0 (0.6)[d]
	Sustained funding	2, 76	0.1	81.2	0.8[c] 0.3[d]	–0.5 (0.5)[c] 0.3 (0.6)[d]
Partnerships	Sustained operations	2, 49	0.60	48.99	0.3[e] 0.3[f]	0.0 (0.0)[e] 0.5 (0.9)[f]
	Sustained funding	2, 49	0.9	101.6	0.0[e] 3.2[f]	0.0 (0.0)[e] 1.6 (0.9)[f]
Organizational capacity[g]	Sustained operations	1, 64	0.35	64.25	0.3	0.4 (0.7)
	Sustained funding	1, 64	0.6	48.1	0.0	0.0 (0.7)
Adaptability[h]	Sustained operations	1, 85	1.5	83.6	1.6	1.0 (0.8)
	Sustained funding	1, 84	5.3*	105.3	4.5*	1.8 (0.9)
Evaluation	Sustained operations	2, 42	2.1	48.2	2.1[l] 0.0[j]	–1.9 (0.8)[i] 0.1 (1.3)[j]
	Sustained funding	2, 41	1.1	51.6	1.1[i] 0.0[j]	–0.9 (0.8)[i] –0.2 (1.3)[j]
Public impact[k]	Sustained operations	(n < 40)				
	Sustained funding	(n < 40)				
Strategic planning	Sustained operations	2, 41	1.1	46.6	1.0[l] 0.2[m]	0.7 (0.7)[l] 0.3 (0.7)[m]
	Sustained funding	2, 40	0.4	50.1	0.1[l] 0.3[m]	–0.2 (0.7)[l] 0.4 (0.7)[m]

NOTE: df = degrees of freedom. SE = standard error. *m* = $p < 0.10$. * = $p < 0.05$.
[a] Percentage match.
[b] Funding change (Q20).
[c] Political (Q18).
[d] Legislation (Q19).
[e] Contract percentage.

Predictor	Dependent Variable	df, n	Chi-Square (*p*)	–2 Log Likelihood	Wald	*B* (SE)

[f] Stakeholder support (Q11).
[g] Q17.
[h] Q13.
[i] Numeric goals.
[j] On track.
[k] Criminal justice system support.
[l] Sustainment plan.
[m] Long-term outcomes.

Appendix D. Results of Post Hoc Logistic Regressions

Table D.1. Results of Post Hoc Logistic Regressions

Predictor	Dependent Variable	df, n	Chi-Square (*p*)	–2 Log Likelihood	Wald	*B* (SE)
Well-connected leader	Sustained operations	1, 56	8.2**	52.5	6.2*	2.9 (1.2)
	Sustained funding	1, 55	2.2	71.9	1.9	1.6 (1.2)
Number of letters of support	Sustained operations	1, 47	0.4	55.1	0.4	0.04 (0.1)
	Sustained funding	1, 46	3.2*m*	58.4	2.6	0.1 (0.1)
Strong project description	Sustained operations	1, 43	0.1	48.8	0.1 0.1	0.2 (0.7) –0.2 (0.7)
	Sustained funding	1, 42	1.0	50.9	0.1 1.0	–0.2 (0.8) 0.7 (0.7)
Numerical targets	Sustained operations	1, 49	0.0	58.6	0.0	0.1 (0.6)
	Sustained funding	1, 48	0.2	62.2	0.2	0.3 (0.6)

NOTE: ** = $p < 0.01$. * = $p < 0.05$. *m* = $p < 0.10$.

References

Aarons, Gregory A., Michael Hurlburt, and Sarah McCue Horwitz, "Advancing a Conceptual Model of Evidence-Based Practice Implementation in Public Service Sectors," *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research*, Vol. 38, No. 1, January 2011, pp. 4–23.

Amazigo, Uche, Joseph Okeibunor, Victoria Matovu, Honorat Zouré, Jesse Bump, and Azodaga Seketeli, "Performance of Predictors: Evaluating Sustainability in Community-Directed Treatment Projects of the African Programme for Onchocerciasis Control," *Social Science and Medicine*, Vol. 64, 2007, pp. 2070–2082.

Baum, Fran, G. Jolley, R. Hicks, Kate Saint, and Steve Parker, "What Makes for Sustainable Healthy Cities Initiatives? A Review of Evidence from Noarlunga, Australia After 18 Years," *Health Promotion International*, Vol. 21, No. 4, December 2006, pp. 259–265.

Blasinsky, Margaret, Howard H. Goldman, and Jürgen Unützer, "Project IMPACT: A Report on Barriers and Facilitators to Sustainability," *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research*, Vol. 33, No. 6, November 2006, pp. 718–729.

Cassidy, Elaine F., Laura C. Leviton, and David E. K. Hunter, "The Relationships of Program and Organizational Capacity to Program Sustainability: What Helps Programs Survive?" *Evaluation and Program Planning*, Vol. 29, No. 2, February 2006, pp. 149–152.

Chovav, H., and T. Weinstein, *Continuation or Cessation? A Follow-Up Study of Projects in Neighborhoods Where Project Renewal Has Ended*, Jerusalem: Ministry of Housing, Department of Neighborhood Social Rehabilitation, 1997. In Hebrew.

Cissner, Amanda, and Donald J. Farole, Jr., "Avoiding Failures of Implementation: Lessons from Process Evaluations," U.S. Department of Justice Bureau of Justice Assistance, June 2009. As of March 20, 2014: http://www.courtinnovation.org/sites/default/files/Failure%20Final.pdf

Damschroder, Laura J., and Hildi J. Hagedorn, "A Guiding Framework and Approach for Implementation Research in Substance Use Disorders Treatment," *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*, Vol. 25, No. 2, June 2011, pp. 194–205.

Datta, Dipankar, "Sustainability of Community-Based Organizations of the Rural Poor: Learning from Concern's Rural Development Programs, Bangladesh," *Community Development Journal*, Vol. 42, No. 1, January 2007, pp. 47–62.

Dupont, William D., *Statistical Modeling for Biomedical Researchers: A Simple Introduction to the Analysis of Complex Data*, 2nd ed., Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Edwards, Nancy C., and Susan M. Roelofs, "Sustainability: The Elusive Dimension of International Health Projects," *Canadian Journal of Public Health*, Vol. 97, No. 1, January–February 2006, pp. 45–49.

Greenhalgh, Trisha, Glenn Robert, Fraser Macfarlane, Paul Bate, and Olivia Kyriakidou, "Diffusion of Innovations in Service Organizations: Systematic Review and Recommendations," *Milbank Quarterly*, Vol. 82, No. 4, 2004, pp. 581–629.

Gruen, Russell L., Julian H. Elliott, Monica L. Nolan, Paul D. Lawton, Anne Parkhill, Cameron J. McLaren, and John N. Lavis, "Sustainability Science: An Integrated Approach for Health-Programme Planning," *Lancet*, Vol. 372, No. 9649, November 1, 2008, pp. 1579–1589.

Hogue, Aaron, Timothy J. Ozechowski, Michael S. Robbins, and Holly Barrett Waldron, "Making Fidelity an Intramural Game: Localizing Quality Assurance Procedures to Promote Sustainability of Evidence-Based Practices in Usual Care," *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice*," Vol. 20, No. 1, March 2013, pp. 60–77.

Institute for Educational Leadership, *Building Sustainability in Demonstration Projects for Children, Youth, and Families*, U.S. Department of Justice Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Systems Improvement Training and Technical Assistance Project Toolkit 2, undated. As of March 20, 2014: http://www.iel.org/pubs/sittap/toolkit_02.pdf

Jana, Smarajit, Ishika Basu, Mary Jane Rotheram-Borus, and Peter A. Newman, "The Sonagachi Project: A Sustainable Community Intervention Program," *AIDS Education and Prevention*, Vol. 16, No. 5, 2004, pp. 405–414.

Labriola, Melissa, with Emily Gold and Julia Kohn, *Innovation in the Criminal Justice System: A National Survey of Criminal Justice Leaders*, U.S. Department of Justice Bureau of Justice Assistance, May 2013. As of March 20, 2014: https://www.bja.gov/Publications/CCI-InnovationSurveyReport.pdf

LaPelle, Nancy R., Jane Zapka, and Judith K. Ockene, "Sustainability of Public Health Programs: The Example of Tobacco Treatment Services in Massachusetts," *American Journal of Public Health*, Vol. 96, No. 8, August 2006, pp. 1363–1369.

Mihalic, Sharon F., and Katherine Irwin, "Blueprints for Violence Prevention: From Research to Real-World Settings—Factors Influencing the Successful Replication of Model Programs," *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, Vol. 1, No. 1, January 2003, pp. 307–329.

Molfenter, Todd, James H. Ford II, and Abhik Bhattacharya, "The Development and Use of a Model to Predict Sustainability of Change in Healthcare Settings," *International Journal of Information Systems and Change Management*, Vol. 5, No. 1, March 2011, pp. 22–35.

Okeibunor, Joseph, Jesse Bump, Honorat G. Zouré, Azodoga Sékétéli, Christine Godin, and Uche V. Amazigo, "A Model for Evaluating the Sustainability of Community-Directed Treatment with Ivermectin in the African Program for Onchocerciasis Control," *International Journal of Health Planning and Management*, Vol. 27, No. 3, July–September 2012, pp. 257–271.

O'Loughlin, Jennifer, Lise Renaud, Lucie Richard, Luis Sanchez Gomez, and Gilles Paradis, "Correlates of the Sustainability of Community-Based Heart Health Promotion Interventions," *Preventive Medicine*, Vol. 27, No. 5, September 1998, pp. 702–712.

Pade-Khene, C., B. Mallinson, and D. Sewry, "Sustainable Rural ICT Project Management Practice for Developing Countries: Investigating the Dwesa and RUMEP Projects," *Information Technology for Development*, Vol. 17, No. 3, 2011, pp. 187–212.

Paulhus, Delroy L., "Two-Component Models of Socially Desirable Responding," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 46, No. 3, March 1984, pp. 598–609.

Peterson, Alison E., Gary R. Bond, Robert E. Drake, Gregory J. McHugo, Amanda M. Jones, and Jessica R.Williams, "Predicting the Long-Term Sustainability of Evidence-Based Practices in Mental Health Care: An 8-Year Longitudinal Analysis," *Journal of Behavioral Health Services and Research*, 2013, pp. 1–10.

Pluye, Pierre, Louise Potvin, and Jean-Louis Denis, "Making Public Health Programs Last: Conceptualizing Sustainability," *Evaluation and Program Planning*, Vol. 27, No. 2, May 2004, pp. 121–133.

Pluye, Pierre, Louise Potvin, Jean-Luis Denis, and Jocelyne Pelletier, "Program Sustainability: Focus on Organizational Routines," *Health Promotion International*, Vol. 19, No. 4, December 2004, pp. 489–500.

Pluye, Pierre, Louise Potvin, Jean-Luis Denis, Jocelyne Pelletier, and Chantal Mannoni, "Program Sustainability Begins with the First Events," *Evaluation and Program Planning*, Vol. 28, No. 2, May 2005, pp. 123–137.

Porowski, Allan W., Kenneth Burgdorf, and James M. Herrell, "Effectiveness and Sustainability of Residential Substance Abuse Treatment Programs for Pregnant and Parenting Women," *Evaluation and Program Planning*, Vol. 27, No. 2, May 2004, pp. 191–198.

Rosenberg, Alana, K. Hartwig, and M. Merson, "Government-NGO Collaboration and Sustainability of Orphans and Vulnerable Children Projects in Southern Africa," *Evaluation and Program Planning*, Vol. 31, No. 1, February 2008, pp. 51–60.

Savaya, Riki, and Shimon E. Spiro, "Predictors of Sustainability of Social Programs," *American Journal of Evaluation*, Vol. 33, No. 1, March 2012, pp. 26–43.

Savaya, Riki, Shimon Spiro, and Roni Elran-Barak, "Sustainability of Social Programs: A Comparative Case Study Analysis," *American Journal of Evaluation*, Vol. 29, No. 4, December 2008, pp. 478–493.

Scheirer, Mary Ann, "Is Sustainability Possible? A Review and Commentary on Empirical Studies of Program Sustainability," *American Journal of Evaluation*, Vol. 26, No. 3, September 2005, pp. 320–347.

Scheirer, Mary Ann, and James W. Dearing, "An Agenda for Research on the Sustainability of Public Health Programs," *American Journal of Public Health*, Vol. 101, No. 11, November 2011, pp. 2059–2067.

Scheirer, Mary Ann, Gretchen Hartling, and Diane Hagerman, "Defining Sustainability Outcomes of Health Programs: Illustrations from an On-Line Survey," *Evaluation and Program Planning*, Vol. 31, No. 4, November 2008, pp. 335–346.

Schell, Sarah F., Douglas A. Luke, Michael W. Schooley, Michael B. Elliott, Stephanie H. Herbers, Nancy B. Mueller, and Alicia C. Bunger, "Public Health Program Capacity for Sustainability: A New Framework," *Implementation Science*, Vol. 8, No. 15, 2013.

Shediac-Rizkallah, Mona C., and Lee R. Bone, "Planning for the Sustainability of Community-Based Health Programs: Conceptual Frameworks and Future Directions for Research, Practice and Policy," *Health Education Research*, Vol. 13, No. 1, March 1998, pp. 87–108.

Stirman, Shannon Wiltsey, John Kimberly, Natasha Cook, Amber Calloway, Frank Castro, and Martin Charns, "The Sustainability of New Programs and Innovations: A Review of the Empirical Literature and Recommendations for Future Research," *Implementation Science*, Vol. 7, March 2012, p. 17.

Thompson, Michael, Fred Osher, and Denise Tomasini-Joshi, *Improving Responses to People with Mental Illnesses: The Essential Elements of a Mental Health Court*, U.S. Department of Justice Bureau of Justice Assistance, 2007. As of March 20, 2014: https://www.bja.gov/Publications/MHC_Essential_Elements.pdf

Weiss, Heather, Julia Coffman, and Marielle Bohan-Baker, *Evaluation's Role in Supporting Initiative Sustainability*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Graduate School of Education, December 2002. As of March 20, 2014: http://www.hks.harvard.edu/urbanpoverty/Urban%20Seminars/December2002/Weiss.pdf

Yin, Robert K., "Life Histories of Innovations: How New Practices Become Routinized," *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 41, No. 1, January–February 1981, pp. 21–28.