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Using Evidence In Contracting

“This content was developed in consultation with the Pew Charitable Trusts’ Results First initiative.”
Challenges to traditional contracting practices

Focus on compliance rather than performance

Limited collaboration and capacity building

Lack of collection and use of meaningful data to improve outcomes

This content was developed in consultation with The Pew Charitable Trusts.
Opportunities to use research evidence to improve outcomes

Growing body of research on program effectiveness
Advances in technology
Emerging best practices
Steps to incorporate evidence into contracting

1. Use data to inform contract planning & development
2. Engage stakeholders to build capacity for delivering EBPs
3. Specify evidence requirements in RFPs

This content was developed in consultation with The Pew Charitable Trusts.
Use data to inform contract planning & development

- **Preliminary analysis**
  - Needs assessment
  - Program inventory
  - Clearinghouses & BCA
  - Stakeholder input

- **Writing – Define evidence criteria**
  - Levels of evidence
  - Info. on goals & objectives
  - Identifying & selecting EBPs
  - Trainings on a competitive proposal

- **Writing – Monitoring & evaluation**
  - Innovative, locally-developed, adapted programs
  - Implementation & outcome reporting requirements
  - Trainings/resources on delivering EBPs

This content was developed in consultation with The Pew Charitable Trusts.
Iowa’s Department of Corrections used a program inventory to consolidate and increase evidence-based programming implemented with fidelity.
Massachusetts Probation Services specified in RFP Moral Reconcilation Therapy (MRT) and invested in training all center staff in MRT to support contracted providers.

Source: The Pew Charitable Trusts

This content was developed in consultation with The Pew Charitable Trusts.
Engage stakeholders to build capacity

Educate providers on EBPs
Solicit provider input on RFP development
Provide training on creating a competitive proposal
Provide technical assistance on identifying and selecting EBPs
Identify training needs for delivering EBPs

This content was developed in consultation with The Pew Charitable Trusts.
Specify evidence requirements in RFPs

Provide key information on requested evidence-based services
Define evidence criteria and specify requirements
Clarify how programs will be assessed
Specify implementation and outcome reporting requirements

This content was developed in consultation with The Pew Charitable Trusts.
Specifying evidence requirements in RFPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Requirements</th>
<th>Flexible</th>
<th>Prescriptive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Give priority to EBPs in scoring proposals</td>
<td>Require some level of evidence</td>
<td>Require EBPs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Selection</th>
<th>Flexible</th>
<th>Prescriptive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providers choose any program that meets evidence requirements</td>
<td>Providers choose among pre-selected menu of programs</td>
<td>Providers must operate a specific model</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This content was developed in consultation with The Pew Charitable Trusts.
Resources

How to Use Evidence in the Contracting Process

EBP contracting examples

Using the Results First Clearinghouse Database Helps Users Access Information on Program Effectiveness

Where to Search for Evidence of Effective Programs

This content was developed in consultation with The Pew Charitable Trusts.
Active Contract Management
Steps to incorporate evidence into contracting

- Use data to inform contract planning & development
- Engage stakeholders to build capacity for delivering EBPs
- Specify evidence requirements in RFPs

This content was developed in consultation with The Pew Charitable Trusts.
Active Contract Management (ACM) is comprised of three main components:

1. High-frequency reviews of real time performance data.
2. Regular, collaborative meetings between service providers and agencies.
3. Forward looking performance management roadmaps.

This content was developed in consultation with The Pew Charitable Trusts.
Active Contract Management: Benefits & Risks

Benefits

- Reactive troubleshooting
- Incremental improvements
- Systems reengineering

Challenges

- Requires robust financial, personnel, and technical resources
- Data intensive
- Choosing outcomes

This content was developed in consultation with The Pew Charitable Trusts.
Using Evidence in Contracting: A Continuum

Figure 1. Continuum of Results-Driven Contracting Strategies and Other Procurement Best Practices

- **Stage 0**: Government procures goods and services without a strategy.
- **Stage 1**: Government defines desired outcomes and aligns procurement strategy with objectives.
- **Stage 2**: Government measures outcomes, impacts, cost-effectiveness.
- **Stage 3**: Government uses data to actively manage contracts.
- **Stage 4**: Government implements performance incentives for contractors (when appropriate).
- **Stage 5**: Government strategically manages its key procurements and applies results-driven contracting strategies and best practices widely.

The government adopts other procurement best practices, including:
- a) boosting competition and leveraging purchasing power
- b) strengthening capacity of staff to manage ongoing contracts
- c) enhancing accountability to residents about the goals and ultimate results of key procurements
- d) removing regulatory barriers and streamlining the procurement process.

This content was developed in consultation with The Pew Charitable Trusts.
• **Active Contract Management Brief** (Harvard Kennedy School)
  - Discusses the principles of active contract management, and provides examples of how other states have incorporated the model into their work.

• **Incentivizing Results: Contracting for Outcomes in Social Service Delivery** (Urban Institute)
  - Provides an overview of outcome-based contracting, challenges and benefits, and how to create a payment strategy.

• **The Hexagon Tool** (National Implementation Research Network)
  - The Hexagon Discussion and Analysis Tool helps organizations evaluate the fit and feasibility of implementing programs or practices in a given context.

NC DOT SPOT Program
Spot Safety Program

Mission Statement

To systematically and objectively administer the allocation of limited Spot Safety funds to those candidate safety projects across the State that provide the most benefit to the traveling public in terms of reducing fatalities, injuries, and motor vehicle crashes.

- Maximum Program commitment per project $400,000
- Program Funding $12,100,000 per year
Spot Safety Program Decision Support

Spot Safety Index Tool - prioritizing different projects across the state

Highway Safety Improvement Program – Identifying locations with needs

Comprehensive Safety Evaluations – Making sure what was implemented worked and feedback for future prioritization

Standardized Forms and Processes – Same starting point and process to keep from manipulating the process

Key Resources
Program Manager – Cindy Millikin monitors controls and documents to prevent chaos
Skilled Staff – Regional Traffic Engineers review and seal projects
Data and Information Driven

Network Screening tool using performance measures are used to identify potentially hazardous location.

The sites prioritized and investigated

Based upon specific patterns of crashes, and the actual locations, countermeasures are considered. Once selected, the project is developed and submitted for funding.

Funding decision is supported with the Spot Safety Index that is a combination of data (70%) and Subjective Ranking of local informed engineers (30%)
Spot Safety Program Decision Support Tools

Safety Index = S + Dg + Cd + Rs

S = Project Benefit Cost Ratio based on expected benefits divided by safety funds invested the projects as scaled 1-50 points, and the lowest receiving 1 point, B:C > 65 receive all 50 points, as the B:C lowers the points go down.

Dg = Does the project cover more than one department goal? (Scored 1-10 with 10 being the highest)

Cd = Projects that take longer to deliver get a lower score, quicker deliver higher score (Scored 1-10 with 10 being the quickest projects i.e. no ROW, Utilities, basic design)

Rs = Division and Regional Priority. The higher the priority the higher the score. Division and region may have different priorities for the list. There are not ties. Top project for each gets 15 points, the next gets 14 etc. If there are more than 15 projects 16 and up receive 1 point each.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>File Number</th>
<th>B/C</th>
<th>Reg Priority</th>
<th>Div Priority</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>Div</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Description of Location</th>
<th>Project Improvement Description</th>
<th>PE Cost</th>
<th>ROW, Utilis Cost</th>
<th>Con Cost</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
<th>Companion Funding Amount</th>
<th>Total Cost Estimate</th>
<th>Severity Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>04-20-61390</td>
<td>600.26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>Johnston/Wayne</td>
<td>US 70 at (1) SR 2556 (Dr. Donnie H. Jones, Jr. Blvd)/SR 2315 (New Barbour Road); (2) SR 2316 (Old Rock Quarry Road/Barden Street); (3) SR 2371 (Old Cornwallis Road); and (4) SR 1229 (Luby Smith Road).</td>
<td>Convert existing full-movement median crossovers to reduced conflict intersections by constructing 2' islands 1' off the travel lane in each crossover, with 2' pavement widening in the median. Install flexible delineators on top of each island.</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$292,000</td>
<td>$292,000</td>
<td>$300,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>06-20-61716</td>
<td>347.72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>Robeson</td>
<td>SR 1318 (McQueen Road/ Mary C Road) at SR 1752 (Rennert Road).</td>
<td>Convert to All-Way Stop.</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$26,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>09-20-1073</td>
<td>602.60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>Davidson</td>
<td>SR 1772 (Hasty School Road) at SR 1777 (Hasty Hill Road) in Thomasville.</td>
<td>Implement all way stop (AWS) traffic control. Construct channelization island in northeast quadrant radius (store [parking lot) to contain right shoulder-mounted stop sign.</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$17,000</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$27,000.00</td>
<td>13.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14-20-210</td>
<td>81.58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>US 23-74, 0.6 mile west of SR 1576, near Balsam.</td>
<td>Remove crossover.</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$101,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$111,000.00</td>
<td>38.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>02-20-61248</td>
<td>370.83</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>Pitt</td>
<td>SR 1700 (Old Tar Road) at SR 1713 (Laurie Ellis Road).</td>
<td>Install an all-way stop.</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$11,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10-19-218</td>
<td>785.12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Cabarrus</td>
<td>NC 200 and SR 1006 (Mount Pleasant Road) near Mount Pleasant.</td>
<td>Install an All-Way stop condition with upgraded flashers.</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$43,000.00</td>
<td>13.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All Way Stop
SR 2178 (Hardin Road) at Westview Street/Westwood Drive

• Before to After
### Crash Reductions (Using 5.67 Year Before and After Periods)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Reduction</th>
<th>Change in Crashes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Crashes:</td>
<td>70.2% Reduction</td>
<td>(From 57 crashes to 17 crashes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Crashes*:</td>
<td>81.8% Reduction</td>
<td>(From 55 crashes to 10 crashes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Injury Crashes:</td>
<td>81.1% Reduction</td>
<td>(From 37 crashes to 7 crashes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target PDO Crashes:</td>
<td>83.3% Reduction</td>
<td>(From 18 crashes to 3 crashes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AADT:</td>
<td>16.4% Increase</td>
<td>(From 5500 vehicles to 6400 vehicles)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Target Crashes include all Frontal Impact Crashes.
The Frontal Impact Crash types considered are as follows: Left Turn-Same Roadway; Left Turn-Different Roadways; Right Turn-Same Roadway; Right Turn-Different Roadways; Head On; and Angle.
Subdivision

Driveway

SR 1352 (Oakdale Rd)

SR 1144 (River Rd)

45 mph

Fixed Object
For More Information Contact:
Kevin Lacy, PE
jklacy1@ncdot.gov