



City of Seattle

Office of City Auditor

March 22, 2013

TO: City Councilmember Bruce Harrell, Chair, Public Safety, Civil Rights, and Technology Committee
City Councilmember Mike O'Brien, Vice Chair, Public Safety, Civil Rights, and Technology Committee
City Councilmember Nick Licata, Member, Public Safety, Civil Rights, and Technology Committee
City Councilmember Sally Bagshaw, Alternate, Public Safety, Civil Rights, and Technology Committee

CC: City Council President Sally J. Clark, City Councilmember Tim Burgess, City Councilmember Richard Conlin, City Councilmember Jean Godden, City Councilmember Tom Rasmussen
Donnie Grabowski, Mariko Lockhart, Sid Sidorowicz, Holly Miller, Department of Neighborhoods
Carl Marquardt, Mayor's Office
Karl Stickel, City Budget Office

FROM: David G. Jones, City Auditor *David G. Jones*

RE: Update of our Review of the Seattle Youth Violence Prevention Initiative (SYVPI) Logic Model

As you requested, this memo serves as an update of our review of the latest version (i.e., March 14) of the Seattle Youth Violence Prevention Initiative's (SYVPI) logic model. It also communicates our request to the City Council that it approve the implementation of the SYVPI evaluation strategy, which we proposed in our January 31, 2013 memo to the City Council.

Since receiving the newest version of the SYVPI logic model, our office has had useful discussions with SYVPI officials and with Dr. Todd Herrenkohl from the School of Social Work at the University of Washington, who has been providing volunteer consulting to SYVPI. After holding these discussions and reviewing the new logic model, we believe that the questions and issues that we raised in our January 31 memo about the SYVPI logic model still remain to be answered. For example, we have questions about whether there is a clear linkage between the seven SYVPI strategies and its two long-term outcomes measures (i.e., 50% reductions in referrals to Juvenile Court and middle school suspensions and expulsions). However, our discussions with SYVPI officials and Dr. Herrenkohl led us to the following agreements:

- **“Phase One” of the Evaluation:** The evaluation “readiness review” proposed in our January 31, 2013 memo to the City Council represents the first steps that a skilled evaluator would take in conducting an evaluation. We all agreed that it will be important to proceed with these steps, including responding to the 13 questions raised in our memo, and to check-in with the City Council about the implications of the readiness review. We recognized that the use of the term readiness review may have created some confusion. Therefore, to help clear up any confusion, we agreed that these first steps could be called “Phase One” of the evaluation.
- **Logic Model:** We presented a logic model in our January 31 memo, and subsequently SYVPI has been developing a logic model using an alternative format. SYVPI presented a version of their logic model at the March 6, 2013 meeting of the Council’s Public Safety, Civil Rights, and Technology Committee. Subsequently, they revised this logic model, and we discussed it during our March 14 meeting. We all agreed that this logic model could be used as a starting point for “Phase One” of the evaluation, which will include an examination of the 13 questions raised in our memo.

We hope that this clears up any questions about the SYVPI logic model and our proposed evaluation strategy. We are looking for your approval to begin work on “Phase One” of the evaluation and the evaluations of the Street Outreach and School Emphasis Officer components. We anticipate that selecting evaluators could take approximately three months, and we could begin the evaluation work at that time.