State Targeted Violence Prevention KPIs: Output Measures

GOAL 1: DRAFT A COMPREHENSIVE STATE-WIDE TARGETED VIOLENCE PREVENTION (TVP) STRATEGY

Output 1: A list of regional subdivisions across the state (hereafter, "key regions") that share unique characteristics relevant to TVP (e.g., geography, social and/or economic context, nature of threat, demographic make up)

| Measures/Indicators of Performance | Scales/Scoring/Method |
|------------------------------------|--|
| A list of key regions exists | 1. Has the list of key regions been developed? □ Yes (1) □ No (0) □ In progress (0.5) |

Output 2: Region-specific, expert- and diversity-informed needs assessments

| Measures/Indicators of Performance | Scales/Scoring/Method |
|--|--|
| Needs assessments have been developed for all key regions in the state | 1. Have the needs assessments been developed for all key regions? Key Region 1: Yes (1), No (0), In progress (0.5) Key Region 2: Yes (1), No (0), In progress (0.5) Etc |
| The needs assessments were expert-informed | 1. Have the regional needs assessments been developed by or with the input from risk and vulnerability experts? An expert/experts developed the regional needs assessments (2) Regional needs assessments have been developed with input from experts (1) How many experts were consulted? What types of experts were consulted? Regional needs assessments were developed without the expert input (0) |

Output 2 Continued

| Measures/Indicators of Performance | Scales/Scoring/Method |
|---|---|
| The needs assessments were locally-informed | 1. How many representatives from key regions provided input on development of regional targeted violence risk profiles? a) Key region 1 b) Key region 2 c) Key region 3 |
| Local perspectives on regional risks were professionally diverse | 1. For each key region, what types of relevant expertise did the local consultants bring? a) Key region 1 Law enforcement (Number of consultants with LE expertise) Mental Health (Number of consultants with Mental Health expertise) Human Relations (Number of consultants with Human Relations expertise) Public safety (Number of consultants) K-12 Education (Number of consultants) Higher Education (Number of consultants) At-risk youth (Number of consultants) Suicide prevention (Number of consultants) Disengagement (Number of consultants) Re-entry services (Number of consultants) Religious clerics (Number of consultants) Community building (Number of consultants) Community violence prevention (Number of consultants) Civil/Human rights protections (Number of consultants) Other (Number of consultants) Other (Number of consultants) |
| Local perspectives on regional risks came from individuals from backgrounds reflective of the region's main groups (e.g., racial/ethnic groups, religious communities, groups vulnerable to victimization and/or recruitment) | For each of the regions, how many consultants of different backgrounds offered insights on the strategy? a) Key region 1:,, b) Key region 2:,, c) Key region 3:,, |

Output 3: An inventory of existing community resilience and violence prevention resources in the state and key regions

| Measures/Indicators of Performance | Scales/Scoring/Method |
|--|--|
| The inventory has been developed | 1. Has the inventory been developed? ☐ Yes (1) ☐ No (0) ☐ In progress (0.5) |
| The inventory incorporates community resilience resources statewide and in all key regions | 1. Have existing community resilience resources been identified statewide and in all key regions? a) State-wide Yes (1) No (0) In progress (0.5) b) Key region 1 Yes (1) No (0) In progress (0.5) C) Etc. |
| The inventory incorporates violence prevention resources statewide and in all key regions | 1. Have existing violence prevention resources been identified statewide and in all key regions? a) State-wide Yes (1) No (0) In progress (0.5) Key region 1 Yes (1) No (0) In progress (0.5) Etc. |

Output 4: Research- and best-practice driven, comprehensive TOC (or strategy)

| Measures/Indicators of Performance | Scales/Scoring/Method |
|--|--|
| The TOC/strategy has been developed | 1. Has the TOC/strategy been developed? □ Yes (1) □ No (0) □ In progress (0.5) |
| TOC/strategy incorporates insights from consultations with experts | 1. Does the TOC/strategy incorporate insights from expert consultations? Yes, to a large extent (1) Somewhat (0.5) No (0) |
| TOC/strategy incorporates insights from consultations with regional representatives | 1. Does the TOC/strategy incorporate local insights? Yes, to a large extent (1) Somewhat (0.5) No (0) |
| TOC/strategy reflects insights from representatives of principal demographic groups that live in the state | 1. Does the TOC reflect insights from representatives of principal demographic groups that live in the state? Yes, to a large extent (1) Somewhat (0.5) No (0) |
| TOC/strategy incorporates different levels of prevention | 1. Which levels of prevention does the TOC/strategy incorporate? a) Primordial: Yes (1), No (0) b) Primary: Yes (1), No (0) c) Secondary: Yes (1), No (0) d) Tertiary: Yes (1), No (0) |

Output 4 Continued

| Measures/Indicators of Performance | Scales/Scoring/Method |
|--|--|
| The TOC/Strategy was vetted by representatives from a diverse set of relevant professional domains | 1. Representatives of which domains vetted the developed TOC/Strategy? Check all that apply: Law enforcement (1) Human rights/Civic protections (1) Mental Health (1) Human Relations (1) Social Work (1) Social Work (1) Higher Education (1) At-risk youth (1) Suicide prevention (1) Disengagement (1) Re-entry services (1) Religious clerics (1) Community building (1) Civil/Human rights protections (1) Other |
| The TOC/strategy was vetted by representatives from a diverse set of demographic groups across the state | 1. Representatives of which demographic groups vetted the developed TOC/Strategy? Check all that apply: Group A (1) Group B (1) Group C (1) Group D (1) |

Output 5: A comprehensive list of performance and outcome metrics for strategy implementation

| Measures/Indicators of Performance | Scales/Scoring/Method |
|--|---|
| There is a list of performance metrics | 1. Has the list of performance metrics been developed? □ Yes (1) □ No (0) □ In progress (0.5) |
| Each task is associated with performance metrics | 1. Have performance metrics been developed for each task? □ Yes (1) □ No (0) □ In progress (0.5) |
| There is a list of outcome metrics | 1. Has the list of outcome metrics been developed? □ Yes (1) □ No (0) □ In progress (0.5) |
| Each goal within the TOC/strategy is associated with outcome metrics | 1. Have outcome metrics been developed for each goal? □ Yes (1) □ No (0) □ In progress (0.5) |

GOAL 2: BUILD A MULTI-DOMAIN, COORDINATED STAKEHOLDER NETWORK TO IMPLEMENT THE STRATEGY

Output 1: A diverse network of state agencies and non-governmental organizations as implementation partners

| Measures/Indicators of Performance | Scales/Scoring/Method | |
|--|---|------------------------------|
| The state agencies that joined the state strategy as implementation partners represent a set of diverse relevant domains for effective TVP efforts | 1. Which state agencies have joined as key strategy implementation partners? Check State Police | Health Health Services |
| The set of NGOs/Community organizations that joined the state strategy as implementation partners represent key domains for effective TVP | 1. NGOs/CBOs in which areas of practice have been joined as key strategy implement apply: Public safety Mental Health Substance use Human Relations/Community building K-12 Education Higher Education At-risk youth Suicide prevention Disengagement Nee-entry Vocational and employ Faith groups Immigrant supports Community violence p Civil/Human rights pro | revention |

Output 2: Coordination framework for the strategy implementation partners has been established

| Measures/Indicators of Performance | Scales/Scoring/Method |
|--|---|
| Each implementation partner has defined objectives/area of responsibility within the strategy | Have the objectives/areas of responsibility been defined for each of the following implementation partners? a) Implementation partner 1: Yes (1), No (0), In progress (0.5) b) Implementation partner 2: Yes (1), No (0), In progress (0.5) |
| The policies that guide collaboration, communication, and accountability among implementation partners have been clearly defined | 1. Has the policy document outlining processes and procedures for collaboration, communication, and accountability between implementation partners been developed? Yes (1) No (0) In progress (0.5) |
| There is a central coordinator/office | 1. Has a central coordinating body been established? Ves (1) No (1) In progress (0.5) |
| Approaches to cross-partner consultations (e.g., through all- partner meetings, working groups, etc.) have been outlined | 1. Have the approaches to cross-partner consultations been outlined? Yes (1) No (1) In progress (0.5) |

GOAL 3: SECURE A CONDUCIVE ENVIRONMENT FOR STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION

Objective 1: Ensure Political Will And Community Buy-In

Output 1: A comprehensive strategic communications plan

| Measures/Indicators of Performance | Scales/Scoring/Method |
|---|--|
| There is a strategic communication plan | 1. Has the strategic communications plan been developed? □ Yes (1) □ No (0) □ In progress (0.5) |
| The strategic communication plan is expert-informed | 1. Has the strategic communication plan been developed by or with the input from communication experts? Experts developed the strategic communication plan (2) Strategic communication plan was developed with input from the experts (1) Strategic communication plan was developed without the expert input (0) |
| The strategic communications plan targets the audiences identified as key for fostering and sustaining support for the state-wide TVP efforts | 1. Which audiences does the strategic communication plan target? Check all that apply [below is a list of general examples; substitute with state-specific relevant entities] State legislative bodies Local legislative bodies State executive offices Local executive offices General public Businesses Education sector Other |
| The strategic communications plan includes both immediate action and long-term action projection | 1. Does the strategic communications plan includes both immediate action and long-term action projection? Only immediate action (0.5) Only long-term action (0.5) Both (1) |

Output 2: An advocacy campaign to recruit political and community influencer support for the state TVP strategy

| Measures/Indicators of Performance | Scales/Scoring/Method |
|---|---|
| The advocacy campaign to recruit political support for the state TVP strategy took place | 1. Did a campaign to recruit political support for the state TVP strategy take place? Yes (1) No (0) In progress (0.5) 2. Number and type of activities conducted |
| The advocacy campaign is comprehensive | 1. What levels of government did the advocacy campaign target? State legislature (1) State executive offices (1) Local governments - executive (1) Local governments - legislative (1) Other (1) |
| The advocacy campaign to recruit community influencer support for the state TVP strategy took place | 1. Did a campaign to recruit community influencer support for the state TVP strategy take place? Yes (1) No (0) In progress (0.5) 2. Number and type of activities conducted |
| The advocacy campaign for community influencer support is comprehensive | 1. What community groups and influencers did the advocacy campaign target? Group A (1) Group B (1) Group C (1) Etc. |

Output 3: A wide-reaching and informative public awareness/messaging campaign

| Measures/Indicators of Performance | Scales/Scoring/Method |
|---|--|
| The public awareness/messaging campaign took place | 1. Has the public awareness/messaging campaign been conducted? Yes (1) No (0) In progress (0.5) 2. Number and type of activities conducted |
| The public awareness campaign targeted all key regions | 1. In which of the key regions did the public awareness campaign take place? a) Key region 1 (1) -Number and type of activities conducted b) Key region 2 (1) -Number and type of activities conducted c) Key region 3 (1) -Number and type of activities conducted |
| The public awareness campaign was conducted in the languages prevalent in the state | 1. What were the languages used in the public awareness campaign? Check all that apply English Language 2 Language 3 Language 4 2. How many of the languages prevalent in the state were used in the public awareness campaign? [Select All if English is the only prevalent language in the state] All (1) Some (0.5) None (0) |

Output 4: An up-to-date comprehensive multi-lingual hub for information on the state TVP efforts, strategy, and its implementation

| Measures/Indicators of Performance | Scales/Scoring/Method |
|--|---|
| The online information hub exists | 1. Has the online information hub been created? Ves (1) No (0) In Progress (0.5) |
| The information contained on the online hub is comprehensive | 1. Does the information hub contain information on the state approach (strategy) to TVP? Yes (1) No (0) In progress (0.5) 2. Does the information hub contain information on implementation partners? Yes (1) No (0) In progress (0.5) 3. Does the information hub contain information on participating service providers? Yes (1) No (0) In progress (0.5) 4. Does the information hub contain information on civil rights protections? Yes (1) No (0) In progress (0.5) |

Objective 1 - Output 4 Continued

| Measures/Indicators of Performance | Scales/Scoring/Method |
|---|--|
| The information on the online hub is available in all of the state's prevalent languages | 1. What languages are used to present the information in the hub? Check all that apply: English |
| The information contained on the online hub facilitates transparency of the state's TVP efforts | 1. What items facilitating transparency does the hub contain? Monthly/regular reporting of the number of referrals (1) Number of individuals who received different types of services (1) Number of active TAMTs (1) Policies and procedures guiding case collaborations between partners (1) Policies and procedures guiding referrals a to law enforcement (1) Policies and procedures guiding referrals across providers (1) Other (1) |

Objective 2: Ensure Implementation Transparency and Civil Rights Protections of Communities and Individuals Affected by TVP Programming Output: Strong information transparency, civil rights protections, and privacy protections policies and procedures

| Measures/Indicators of Performance | Scales/Scoring/Method |
|---|--|
| The public has open and easy access to the policies and procedures that guide the state-wide efforts and collaboration between the implementation partners and other stakeholders | 1. Have the policies and procedures that guide the state-wide efforts and collaboration between the implementation partners and other stakeholders been made available to public? -Yes (1) -No (0) -In progress (0.5) 2. Where can members of general public read policies and procedures that guide the state-wide efforts and collaboration between the implementation partners and other stakeholders? a) Source 1 b) Source 2 c) Source 3 |
| The state-facilitated TVP activities are detailed to the public (e.g., through frequent updates to the online information hub) | How much of the information about the state-supported TVP activities is currently available to the public? None of it (0)> All of it (5) Where can members of general public learn about the state-supported TVP activities? a) Source 1 b) Source 2 c) Source 3 |

Objective 2 - Output Continued

| Measures/Indicators of Performance | Scales/Scoring/Method |
|--|---|
| Civil rights monitoring procedures and processes have been developed | 1. Have the civil rights monitoring procedures and processes been developed? Yes (1) No (0) In Progress (0.5) |
| Privacy protections procedures and processes have been developed | 1. Have the privacy protections procedures and processes been developed? Yes (1) No (0) In Progress (0.5) |
| The anticipated number of trainings in the civil rights and privacy protections, cultural understanding and sensitivity, cross-cultural competence, and others have been conducted | 1. How many trainings on each of the planned topics have been conducted? a) Topic 1 b) Topic 2 c) Topic 3 2. How many organizations and individuals were trained in each topic? a) Topic 1: Individuals, Organizations b) Topic 2: Individuals, Organizations c) Topic 3: Individuals, Organizations c) Topic 3: Individuals, Organizations |

Objective 2 - Output Continued

| Measures/Indicators of Performance | Scales/Scoring/Method |
|---|--|
| Civil rights monitoring is active and ongoing | 1. Are the activities aimed at monitoring civil rights being implemented? a) Activity 1: Yes, implemented as planned (1), Partially (0.5), Not implemented (0) b) Activity 2: Yes, implemented as planned (1), Partially (0.5), Not implemented (0) c) Activity 3: Yes, implemented as planned (1), Partially (0.5), Not implemented (0) |
| | 2. How frequent are the monitoring activities? Ongoing Weekly Monthly Every 3 months Every 6 months Other Other 3. What organizations conduct monitoring? |
| Privacy protection monitoring is active and ongoing | 1. Are the activities aimed at monitoring privacy protections being implemented? d) Activity 1: Yes, implemented as planned (1), Partially (0.5), Not implemented (0) e) Activity 2: Yes, implemented as planned (1), Partially (0.5), Not implemented (0) f) Activity 3: Yes, implemented as planned (1), Partially (0.5), Not implemented (0) 2. How frequent are the monitoring activities? Ongoing Weekly Monthly Every 3 months Every 6 months Annually Other 3. What organizations conduct monitoring? |

GOAL 4: BUILD CAPACITY AMONG KEY STAKEHOLDERS AND AGENCIES (SEE PARTNERS & SECTORS)

Objective 1: Secure Funding to Provide Needed Support to Implementation Partners

Output 1: A comprehensive list of funding sources to support implementation and evaluation activities in different domains

| Measures/Indicators of Performance | Scales/Scoring/Method |
|---|--|
| There is a list of potential funding sources to support work in the key implementation domains | 1. Is there a list of funding sources to support the work in the key areas? Yes (1) No (0) In progress (0.5) |
| Potential funding sources have been identified for all key implementation domains | 1. For which of the implementation domains have the funding sources been identified? a) Implementation domain 1: Source 1, Source 2 b) Implementation domain 2: Source 1, Source 2 c) Implementation domain 3: Source 1, Source 2 d) Implementation domain 4: Source 1, Source 2 OR/AND 2. For how many of the implementation domains have the funding sources been identified? None (0) Some (0.5) All or most (1) |
| There is a list of potential funding sources to support evaluation activities in the key implementation domains | 1. Is there a list of funding sources to support the work in the key areas? Yes (1) No (0) In progress (0.5) |
| The funding sources are diverse | 1. From which sources have the funding streams been identified? □ Federal (1) □ State (1) □ Foundations (1) □ Private donors (1) |

Output 2: Designated state funds for TVP strategy implementation

| Measures/Indicators of Performance | Scales/Scoring/Method |
|---|--|
| \$\$\$X has been allocated toward the grant program to support TVP efforts | 1. How much \$\$\$ has been allocated toward the grant program to support TVP efforts in the state? |
| The state funds offer support to all or most areas of implementation in need of funding | 1. Which implementation domains in need of funding does the state grant program support? a) Implementation domain 1: Allocated \$\$\$ b) Implementation domain 2: Allocated \$\$\$ c) etc 2. What proportion of the implementation domains in need of funding are eligible to receive state funds? All or most (1) Few (less than half) (0.5) None (0) |
| The implementation partners pursue state funding relevant to their TVP efforts | How many implementation partners applied for state funding in the past year? How many implementation partners received state funding in the past year? |
| The state funds were sufficient to address the needs in each prioritized area of implementation | Were the state funds sufficient to address the needs in each prioritized area of implementation? Implementation domain 1: \$\$\$ needed \$\$\$ offered by the state \$\$\$ covered by other sources \$\$\$ uncovered Implementation domain 2: \$\$\$ needed \$\$\$ offered by the state \$\$\$ covered by other sources \$\$\$ uncovered \$\$\$ uncovered \$\$\$ exercises |
| \$\$\$X has been allocated toward independent evaluation of TVP programming in the state | 1. How much \$\$\$ has been allocated toward evaluation of TVP efforts in the state? |

Output 3: Implementation partners receive trainings in grant development and administration

| Measures/Indicators of Performance | Scales/Scoring/Method |
|---|---|
| The anticipated number of trainings on grant development/writing/administration have been conducted | How many trainings on grant development/writing/administration have been conducted? |
| All implementation partners received the training | 2. Which implementation partners received the grant development/writing/administration trainings? |

Objective 2: Facilitate TVP Programming Implementation and Evaluation Efforts

Output 1: A diverse set of program design and implementation supports for implementation partners

| Measures/Indicators of Performance | Scales/Scoring/Method |
|--|--|
| Program design and implementation supports* have been identified for each domain of implementation *Examples of implementation supports: 1. A program design and implementation handbook 2. A roster of program design and implementation consultants for different implementation domains 3. Trainings on program design and implementation | 1. Have the program design and implementation supports been identified for each of the areas of implementation? What type and how many? a) Implementation domain 1 (e.g., Mental health): Yes (1), No (0), In progress (0.5) 1) Type and number of supports 2) Type and number of supports b) Implementation domain 2: Yes (1), No (0), In progress (0.5) 1) Type and number of supports 2) Type and number of supports 2) Type and number of supports 2) Etc |
| Implementation partners use the program design and implementation supports available to them | 1. Have the planned program design and implementation supports been utilized by the implementation partners? a) Implementation domain 1 (e.g., Mental Health): Yes (1), No (0), In progress (0.5) 1) Type and number of supports used 2) Number of people/organizations who utilized the supports b) Implementation domain 2: : Yes (1), No (0), In progress (0.5) 1) Type and number of supports used 2) Number of people/organizations who utilized the supports c) Etc |

Output 2: Evaluation supports for implementation partners

| Measures/Indicators of Performance | Scales/Scoring/Method |
|--|--|
| Evaluation supports have been identified for each domain of implementation *Examples of evaluation supports: 1. An evaluation toolkit 2. A roster of evaluation consultants with relevant expertise 3. Trainings on program evaluation | 1. Have the evaluation supports been identified for each of the areas of implementation? What type and how many? a) Implementation domain 1 (e.g., Mental health): Yes (1), No (0), In progress (0.5) 1) Type and number of supports 2) Type and number of supports b) Implementation domain 2: Yes (1), No (0), In progress (0.5) 1) Type and number of supports 2) Type and number of supports c) Etc |
| Implementation partners use the evaluation supports available to them | Have the evaluation supports been utilized by the implementation partners? a) Implementation domain 1 (e.g., Mental Health): Yes (1), No (0), In progress (0.5) 1) Type and number of supports used 2) Number of people/organizations who utilized the supports b) Implementation domain 2: Yes (1), No (0), In progress (0.5) 1) Type and number of supports used 2) Number of people/organizations who utilized the supports c) Etc |

Objective 3: Equip Implementation Partners with Knowledge Relevant to Targeted Violence and Best Practices in Prevention and Intervention for Different Areas of Service Provision

Output: A strong set of comprehensive expert-informed TVP capacity-building supports

| Measures/Indicators of Performance | Scales/Scoring/Method |
|---|---|
| A diverse set of trainings have been conducted across the state's different regions. | 1. What trainings have been conducted across different regions? a) Key region 1: Type and number of trainings b) Key region 2: Type and number of trainings c) Etc |
| The trainings were well-attended by implementation partners from different domains and regions | 1. For each training, note: a) Number of participants b) Participants' implementation domain c) Participants' region of work |
| A permanent training hub where implementation partners can turn for consultation and regular trainings has been established Implementation partners utilize the training hub when needed | Has such a training hub been established? Yes (1), No (0), In progress (.5) Track usage statistics for interactions with the training hub. a) Who asked for support? b) Was the support provided? c) Was the support provided in a timely manner? |
| Partners have access to and participate in international and cross-state TVP forums and exchanges | 1. What international TVP forums or professional development exchanges (PDEs) did the implementation partners attend? a) PDE 1: (What, where, when) 1) Number of attendees from the state 2) Attendees' implementation domain b) PDE 2: (What, where, when) 1) Number of attendees from the state 2) Attendees' implementation domain c) Etc |

Objective 4: Implementation partners have access to and use a safe and comprehensive monitoring and reporting system

| Measures/Indicators of Performance | Scales/Scoring/Method |
|--|---|
| The monitoring and reporting (M&R) system where providers can track their activities has been created | 1. Has the M&R system been created? Yes (1) No (0) In progress (.5) |
| Data collection, storage, exchange, and safety procedures have been outlined | 1. Has the data collection, storage, exchange, and safety procedures been outlined? Yes (1) No (0) In progress (.5) |
| Privacy and personal identifiable information (PII) protection procedures have been outlined | 1. Have privacy/PII protection procedures been outlined? Yes (1) No (0) In progress (.5) |
| Secure systems for data sharing have been provided | 1. Has the secure data sharing system been provided? Yes (1) No (0) In progress (.5) |
| An expected number of relevant trainings have been offered to the implementation partners The trainings were well-attended by the providers | How many trainings have been offered? a) Training, number b) Training, number For each training, note: a) Number of attendees b) Attendees' implementation domain and organization |
| Providers use the M&R system | Assess by tracking M&R system use, number of reports submitted through the system, etc. |

GOAL 5: REDUCE AND MITIGATE COMMUNITY AND INDIVIDUAL RISK FACTORS

Objective 1: Support Development or Adaptation of Evidence-Based Efforts that Address Community-Level Risk Factors

Output: State-wide multi-domain timely programming addressing a variety of community risk factors is underway

| Measures/Indicators of Performance | Scales/Scoring/Method | |
|---|--|--|
| All or most planned programs/activities aimed at addressing community risk factors have been implemented | 1. Which of the planned programs/activities aimed at addressing the community risk factors have been implemented? a) Program 1: Yes (1), In preparation (0.5), No (0) Total number and type of activities b) Program 2: Yes (1), In preparation (0.5), No (0) Total number and type of activities Etc | |
| Programs/activities in each region reflect the specific risks outlined in the regional needs assessment | 1. For each region, what specific community risks do the programs/activities address? a) Key region 1: | |
| The timing of the programs/activities aimed at addressing community risk factors is well-aligned with the TVP strategy objectives | 1. For each program/activity, note the date when it was implemented 2. For each of the implementation domains, how well aligned was the timing of the risk-mitigating programming with the overall strategy objectives? a) Implementation domain 1: 1) Well-aligned (1) 2) Somewhat aligned (0.5) | |

Objective 2: Support Development or Adaptation of Evidence-Based Efforts that Address Individual-Level Risk Factors

Output: State-wide multi-domain timely programming addressing a variety of individual risk factors is underway

| Measures/Indicators of Performance | Scales/Scoring/Method |
|---|---|
| Programs/activities aimed at addressing individual risk factors are underway in all (or in a set of predetermined) key regions across the state | 1. In which regions have the efforts to address individual risk factors been implemented? |
| | a) Key region 1: Yes (1), In preparation (0.5), No (0) 1) Number and type of programs 2) Number and type of activities |
| | b) Key region 2: Yes (1), In preparation (0.5), No (0) 1) Number and type of programs 2) Number and type of activities |
| | c) Etc |
| All or most planned programs/activities aimed at addressing individual risk factors have been implemented | 1. Which of the planned programs/activities aimed at addressing the individual risk factors have been implemented? a) Program 1: Yes (1), In preparation (0.5), No (0) Total number and type of activities b) Program 2: Yes (1), In preparation (0.5), No (0) Total number and type of activities c) Etc |
| Programs/activities in each region reflect the specific individual risks outlined in the regional needs assessment | 1. For each region, what specific individual risks do the programs/activities address? a) Key region 1:,, b) Key region 2:, c) Etc 2. How much do the risks addressed through community-oriented programming in each region align with the risks specified in the needs assessment for that region? a) Key region 1: Not at all (1)> Very much (5) b) Key region 2: Not at all (1)> Very much (5) c) Etc |

Objective 2 Output Continued

| Measures/Indicators of Performance | Scales/Scoring/Method |
|--|--|
| The timing of the programs/activities aimed at addressing individual risk factors is well aligned with the TVP strategy objectives | 1. For each program/activity, note the date when it was implemented 2. For each of the implementation domains, how well aligned is the timing of the risk-mitigating programming with the overall strategy objectives? a) Implementation domain 1: Use Well-aligned (1) |
| | □ Poorly aligned (0) c) Etc |

GOAL 6: EDUCATE COMMUNITY ON WHAT TARGETED VIOLENCE IS AND PREVENTION APPROACHES

Output: [A pre-set percentage of the...] General public and members of professional communities across the state receive trainings on TVP-relevant topics

| Measures/Indicators of Performance | Scales/Scoring/Method |
|---|---|
| The number of the planned general population trainings took place across the state's different regions The trainings covered all of the planned target topics (e.g., suicide prevention, active bystandership) The trainings were accessible to the non-English-speaking populations that live in the region or state | 1. Note the following information a) Key region 1: 1) Training type/topic (e.g., training on active bystandership): i. Number or trainings ii. Training dates iii. Languages in which the trainings were conducted 2) Etc. b) Key region 2: 1) Training type/topic (e.g., training on active bystandership): i. Number or trainings ii. Training dates iii. Languages in which the trainings were conducted c) Etc. |
| The number of the planned trainings targeting predetermined professional communities took place across the state's different regions The trainings covered all of the planned topics | 1. Note the following information a) Key region 1: a. Target audience: (e.g., educators, healthcare) i. Training type/topic: ii. Number or trainings iii. Training dates iv. Languages in which the trainings were conducted b) Key Region 2: a. Target audience: i. Training type/topic: ii. Number or trainings iii. Training dates iv. Languages in which the trainings were conducted c) Etc. |

Goal 6 Output Continued

| Measures/Indicators of Performance | Scales/Scoring/Method |
|--|--|
| The trainings were well-attended by demographically and professionally diverse audiences The trainings were accessible to the professionals serving underprivileged communities | 1. To assess this measure, for each training note: a) Number of attendees b) Attendees' occupation c) Attendees' race/ethnicity d) Area where the attendees work e) For "professional communities" trainings only: What populations the attendees serve (offer a list of options for participants to choose from) f) Area where the attendees live g) Preferred spoken language h) Religious affiliation |
| The trainings aimed to address/mitigate stigmatization of different groups in the context of TVP | 1. Is there curriculum that addresses stigma and prejudice in the context of TVP? Yes (1) No (0) Under development (0.5) 2. Is the anti-stigma/anti-prejudice curriculum delivered to the public, either independently or as part of other trainings? Yes (1) No (0) |

GOAL 7: ENSURE THREAT ASSESSMENT AND MANAGEMENT TEAMS (TAMTS) OPERATE EFFECTIVELY THROUGHOUT THE STATE

Objective 1: Provide the Guidance and Supports Needed for Municipalities, Schools, Businesses, and All Other Interested Entities to Create and Operate TAMTs

Output: Comprehensive, evidence-based supports are available statewide to help set up and conduct TAMTs

| Measures/Indicators of Performance | Scales/Scoring/Method |
|---|---|
| | 1. What supports for setting up and conducting TAMTs have been made available? |
| Intended supports to facilitate the set up and conducting TAMTs have been made available | A compilation of guiding documents on establishing and conducting TAMTs (1) Risk/threat assessment tools (1) Templates for policies and procedures documents(1) |
| The supports offer guidance for a full spectrum of TAMT | ☐ Templates for legal documents and agreements (1) |
| functioning | □ Advisory council of subject-matter experts (1)□ Other (1) |
| | 1. What research and practical support do the included instruments and tools have? |
| | a) Risk assessment tool: |
| | 1) Validated in prior research: Yes, No, Do not know |
| The instruments and tools (e.g., risk assessment tool) provided to TAMT partners for guidance have been validated through research or identified as best practice | 2) Expertly identified is best practice: Yes, No, Do not know3) New instrument |
| | b) Bio/Psych/Social needs assessment: |
| | 1) Validated in prior research: Yes, No, Do not know |
| | 2) Expertly identified is best practice: Yes, No, Do not know |
| | 3) New instrument |

Objective 1 Output Continued

| Measures/Indicators of Performance | Scales/Scoring/Method |
|--|---|
| Expertise has been made available to TAMT partners in all key regions in a range of relevant domains | 1. What types of advisory expertise has been made available to TAMT partners in different regions? a) Key region 1: 1) Bio/Psych/Social needs assessment: Yes (1), No (0), In progress (0.5) 2) Risk assessment: Yes (1), No (0), In progress (0.5) 3) Risk mitigation: Yes (1), No (0), In progress (0.5) 4) Education: Yes (1), No (0), In progress (0.5) 5) Disengagement: Yes (1), No (0), In progress (0.5) 6) Evaluation: Yes (1), No (0), In progress (0.5) 7) Other: Yes (1), No (0), In progress (0.5) b) Key region 2: 1) Bio/Psych/Social needs assessment: Yes (1), No (0), In progress (0.5) 2) Risk assessment: Yes (1), No (0), In progress (0.5) 3) Risk mitigation: Yes (1), No (0), In progress (0.5) 4) Education: Yes (1), No (0), In progress (0.5) 5) Disengagement: Yes (1), No (0), In progress (0.5) 6) Evaluation: Yes (1), No (0), In progress (0.5) 7) Other: Yes (1), No (0), In progress (0.5) c) Etc. |

Objective 2: Ensure That All Key Regions of the State are Covered by TAMTs; For Areas that Are Not Covered, Establish Mobile TAMTs

Output: There is sufficient TAMT coverage in all key regions of the state

| Measures/Indicators of Performance | Scales/Scoring/Method |
|--|---|
| An anticipated number of TAMTs have been established statewide | 1. How many TAMTs have been established state-wide? |
| Each key region has an anticipated number of TAMTs | 1. How many TAMTs have been set up in each of the following regions? a) Key region 1: b) Key region 2: c) Etc. |
| The needed number of mobile TAMTs have been set up to cover regional gaps in TAMT coverage | 1. How many mobile TAMTs have been set up? |
| In each region, the anticipated number of TAMTs are present in a variety of domains | 1. How many TAMTs have been established in each of the professional domains? a) Key region 1: 1) K-12: 2) Postsecondary education: 3) Other: b) Etc. |

Objective 3: Ensure a Sufficient Locally-Rooted and Well-Resourced Aftercare Services in Support of TAMTs in All Key Regions

Output 1: Sufficient locally-rooted intervention services needed to support TAMTs in all key regions

| Measures/Indicators of Performance | Scales/Scoring/Method |
|--|--|
| The needed number and type of intervention services are available in all key regions | Under each domain, indicate the type and number of intervention services available in each region a) Key region 1: 1) Mental health: i. Type of service 1 (e.g., counseling): Number of providers/services ii. Type of service 2 (e.g., substance use): Number of providers/services 2) Housing: i. Type of service 1 (e.g., housing navigation): Number of providers/services ii. Type of service 2 (e.g., transitional housing): Number of providers/services 3) Etc. b) Etc. |
| The intervention service providers accept TAMT referrals | Track numbers of individuals referred to intervention services and the number of individuals who received intervention services. Sign agreements with intervention service providers to accept TAMT referrals |

Output 2: Implementation partners have the supports they need to provide necessary intervention and aftercare services

| Measures/Indicators of Performance | Scales/Scoring/Method |
|---|--|
| The anticipated \$\$\$ amount of funding was made available for capacity building of local services A range of trainings were made available across regions to | 1. What was the \$\$\$ amount of the funding allocated for capacity building of local services? 2. What type and how many trainings were conducted across key regions? a) Key region 1: 1) Type of training, number |
| support capacity building among service providers in different domains | 2) Type of training, number 3) Etc. b) Etc. |

Objective 4: TAMTs Are Willing to Conduct Their Work, Well-Equipped to Do So, Feel Confident In Their Ability to Do So, and Are Able to Collaborate Effectively

Output: TAMT members receive trainings and guidance on how to conduct TAMT work and collaborate effectively

| Measures/Indicators of Performance | Scales/Scoring/Method |
|---|--|
| Each TAMT partner's roles and responsibilities are clearly defined | 1. Is there a generic document that outlines key roles and responsibilities of TAMT partners? Ves (1) No (0) In progress (0.5) |
| An anticipated number of planned trainings were offered to TAMT partners across the state | 1. How many trainings of different types were offered to TAMT partners? a) Training A: b) Training B: c) Etc. |
| TAMT partners in all regions received key trainings | 1. How many of the TAMT partners received key trainings? a) Key region 1: All (100%) TAMT partners received all key trainings Majority (>61%) of TAMT partners received all key trainings Half (~40%-60%) of TAMT partners received all key trainings Few (~<40%) TAMT partners received all key trainings No (0) TAMT partners received all key trainings Etc. |

Objective 5: Establish a Comprehensive, User-Friendly, Safe Case Management System to Facilitate the TAMTs' Work

Output: A comprehensive, user-friendly, safe case management system capable of running anonymized reports to facilitate TAMTs' work

| Measures/Indicators of Performance | Scales/Scoring/Method |
|---|--|
| The case management system has been developed | 1. There is a case management system available to TAMT partners Solution System available to TAMT partners No (0) In Progress (0.5) |
| The case management system is comprehensive | 1. The case management system facilitates a wide variety of processes; select all that apply: Referrals (1) Intake assessments (1) Progress reports (1) Aftercare forms (1) Inter-provider referrals (1) Exit forms (1) TAMT meeting minutes (1) Other(1) |

Objective 5 Output Continued

| Measures/Indicators of Performance | Scales/Scoring/Method |
|---|---|
| The case management system is safe and secure | The case management system possesses the attributes/features of a secure and safe system: a) Attribute 1 (1-Fully Present; 0.5- Partially Developed; 0-Absent) b) Attribute 2 (1-Fully Present; 0.5- Partially Developed; 0-Absent) c) Attribute 3 (1-Fully Present; 0.5- Partially Developed; 0-Absent) d) Etc. 2. How many system security vulnerabilities were encountered in the last month? |
| The case management system is user-friendly | 1. [Answered by TAMT partners using the case management system]: a) How easy or difficult is it for you to navigate the [name of the case management system here]? (Very difficult (1)> Very easy (5)) b) How intuitive is the navigation of [name of the record-keeping system here]? (Very difficult (1)> Very easy (5)) c) c. How easy is it for you to locate the needed forms? (Very difficult (1)> Very easy (5)) |
| The case management system is capable of running anonymized reports | The case management system is capable of running anonymized reports Yes (1) No (0) In Progress (0.5) |

Objective 6: Establish a Secure Effective, and Diversified Referral System

Output: A secure, effective, and diversified referral system

| Measures/Indicators of Performance | Scales/Scoring/Method |
|---|--|
| There are multiple ways to refer an individual for an assessment through a TAMT | What are the different avenues for an individual to be referred for an assessment through a TAMT? a) Public referral system: Yes (1), No (0), In progress (0.5) b) Provider referral system: Yes (1), No (0), In progress (0.5) c) Education referral system: Yes (1), No (0), In progress (0.5) d) Law enforcement referral: Yes (1), No (0), In progress (0.5) e) Other |
| Public are able to refer individuals to TAMT through multiple outlets | 1. What are the outlets through which members of the public can refer individuals to TAMT? Phone line (1) Website (1) Mobile app (1) Other (1) |
| The public referral system is accessible to people with disabilities and those who speak languages other than English | 1. Is the public referral system ADA compliant? Yes (1) Somewhat (0.5) No (0) 2. In which languages spoken in the state is the public referral system available? English (1) Etc. |
| The public referral system is secure | 1. Does the central reporting line contain attributes of a secure system? Attribute 1 (1-Fully Present; 0.5- Partially Developed; 0-Absent) Attribute 2 (1-Fully Present; 0.5- Partially Developed; 0-Absent) Etc. |

Objective 7: Ensure That Public Knows About TAMTs and How to Refer Individuals Deemed at Risk

Output: A Public awareness campaign about TAMTs, the referral system, and how to use them is in place

| Measures/Indicators of Performance | Scales/Scoring/Method |
|---|---|
| The public awareness campaign about the TAMT is wide-spread | 1. Which regions across the state does the awareness campaign reach? a. Key region 1 (1) b. Key region 2 (1) c. Etc. |
| The public awareness campaign about the TAMTs is comprehensive | 1. The public awareness campaign incorporates: Information about the purpose of TAMT (1) Information about who TAMT partners (1) Information about how to refer individuals at risk: (1) Information about the TAMT assessment and follow up (1) Trust-building with the public (1) Other: (1) |
| The public awareness campaign about the TAMTs uses multiple media | 1. What media does the public awareness campaign use? Billboards (1) TV (1) Social media (1) Public transportation posters (1) State government websites (1) Other (1) |
| The public awareness campaign is available in different languages | 1. Have the TAMT monitoring timelines and procedures been established? Ves (1) No (0) In progress (0.5) |

Objective 8: TAMTS are Monitored and Evaluated for Performance Effectiveness

Output: Ongoing TAMT monitoring and evaluation

| Measures/Indicators of Performance | Scales/Scoring/Method |
|--|--|
| TAMT monitoring timelines and procedures have been established | 1. Have the TAMT monitoring timelines and procedures been established? Yes (1) No (0) In progress (0.5) |
| TAMT monitoring efforts are systematic | 1. Is there a preemptively developed set of milestones and metrics that TAMTs are expected to meet across the span of their work? Yes (1) |

Objective 8 Output Continued

| Measures/Indicators of Performance | Scales/Scoring/Method |
|---|--|
| TAMT monitoring efforts are regular and ongoing | 1. Has the monitoring timeline been established? Ves (1) No (0) In progress (0.5) |
| | 2. Is the monitoring timeline maintained: Ves (1) No (0) Somewhat (0.5) |
| | 3. How often do TAMTs provide progress reports? Monthly Bi-monthly Every 6 months Annually Other |
| The TAMT monitoring efforts are state-wide | 1. Do TAMTs in all key regions participate in monitoring? a) Key region 1: Yes (1), No (0), In progress (0.5) b) Key region 2: Yes (1), No (0), In progress (0.5) c) Etc. |
| The external evaluator has been contracted | 1. Has the external evaluator been contracted to evaluate TAMTs' work statewide? Yes (1) No (0) In progress (0.5) |

GOAL 8: FOSTER COMMUNITY RESILIENCE IN THE AFTERMATH OF A TARGETED VIOLENCE EVENT AND PREVENT CYCLES OF VIOLENCE

Output: Systems are in place to foster resilience and prevent cycles of violence in the aftermath of a targeted violence event

| Measures/Indicators of Performance | Scales/Scoring/Method |
|---|--|
| The plans for how the implementation partners can work together to foster community resilience and prevent cycles of violence are expert-informed and clear | 1. Have plans been developed for how implementing partners and associated providers can help foster community resilience? Yes (1) No (0) In progress (0.5) 2. Have plans been developed for how implementing partners and associated providers can help prevent cycles of violence? Yes (1) No (0) In progress (0.5) 3. Evaluate for each plan separately: Was this plan developed with the input from experts/expert literature? Yes (1) No (0) Somewhat (0.5) |
| The supports identified as needed to foster community resilience (to prevent cycles of violence) are available and sufficient in all key regions | Under each domain, indicate the type and number of supports/services available in each region a) Key region 1: |

| Measures/Indicators of Performance | Scales/Scoring/Method |
|---|--|
| Information about the supports is readily available to the public | 1. Information on how to reach a variety of services is clearly posted in multiple "logical" locations State government websites: Yes (1), No (0), Under development (0.5) Local governments' websites: Yes (1), No (0), Under development (0.5) Relevant organizations' websites: Yes (1), No (0), Under development (0.5) Social media: Yes (1), No (0), Under development (0.5) Billboards: Yes (1), No (0), Under development (0.5) Public transportation: Yes (1), No (0), Under development (0.5) Other: Yes (1), No (0), Under development (0.5) |

GOAL 9: FACILITATE REHABILITATION OF INDIVIDUALS WHO PREVIOUSLY ENGAGED IN TARGETED VIOLENCE AND/OR WHO BECAME AT-RISK FOR TARGETED VIOLENCE WHILE IN CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

Output 1: Incentives and funding for in- and out-of-prison Disengagement and re-entry programs for former targeted violence perpetrators

| Measures/Indicators of Performance | Scales/Scoring/Method |
|--|--|
| State funding has been earmarked for in-prison disengagement programs and efforts | 1.The \$\$\$ amount allocated to in-prison disengagement programs |
| State funding has been earmarked for in-prison re-entry preparation programs | 1. The \$\$\$ amount allocated to in-prison re-entry preparation programs |
| State funding has been earmarked for disengagement programs for individuals with or without recent history of justice system involvement | 1.The \$\$\$ amount allocated to disengagement programs |
| State funding has been earmarked for out-of-prison programs that facilitate successful re-entry (e.g., employment, psychological supports, social work, navigation services) | 1. The \$\$\$ amount allocated to post-incarceration re-entry preparation programs |

Output 2: Trainings and evidence-based guidance materials to build implementation partners' capacity to provide disengagement services and work with former targeted violence offenders and their families

| Measures/Indicators of Performance | Scales/Scoring/Method |
|--|---|
| The state-of-the-art approaches to disengagement and working with former targeted violence offenders and their families have been collected and summarized | 1. What guidance materials have been made available to support disengagement efforts with targeted violence offenders and their families? |
| An anticipated number of state-wide trainings are offered on disengagement and working with former targeted violence offenders and their families | 1. How many trainings have been offered on approaches to working with former targeted violence offenders and their families? a) Key region 1: b) Key region 2: c) Etc. 2. How many people attended the trainings? |

GOAL 10: SUSTAIN CONDUCIVE ENVIRONMENT

Objective 1: Sustain Political Will

Output: Continuous advocacy activities

| Measures/Indicators of Performance | Scales/Scoring/Method |
|--|--|
| Advocacy activities are comprehensive | 1. What levels of government does the advocacy campaign target? State legislature (1) |
| An anticipated ## of advocacy events (e.g., briefings, meetings, testimonies) took place | 1. How many of the advocacy events took place in [year]? Briefings Reports Meetings Testimonies Other |

Objective 2: Sustain Public Awareness And Support

Output: Continuous public awareness efforts

| Measures/Indicators of Performance | Scales/Scoring/Method |
|---|---|
| | 1. During which quarters of [year] was the public awareness campaign implemented in each of the regions (or statewide)? |
| The state-wide public awareness campaign about the overall state's TVP efforts is ongoing | a) Key region 1 □ Q1 (1) □ Q2 (1) □ Q3 (1) □ Q4 (1) b) Etc. |
| The public awareness campaign is comprehensive | 1. The public awareness campaign: a) Incorporates information about the state's general approach to TVP: Yes (1), No (0), Somewhat (0.5) b) Incorporates information about specific TVP-relevant activities and programs: Yes (1), No (0), Somewhat (0.5) c) Builds trust with the public: Yes (1), No (0), Somewhat (0.5) d) Is available in different languages: Yes (1), No (0), Somewhat (0.5) (OR: What languages does the public awareness campaign use?) |

Objective 2 Output Continued

| Measures/Indicators of Performance | Scales/Scoring/Method |
|---|--|
| The web hub is updated in accordance with the set schedule | 1. How frequently is the web hub updated? Daily Weekly Biweekly Bi-monthly Every 6 months Annually Other |
| An anticipated number of planned public events (e.g., relevant PSAs, visits to schools, media discussions) took place | 1. How many of the public awareness events took place in [year]? a) Public service announcement b) Press-conference c) Write-up in news media d) A segment on local TV e) Other |

Objective 3: Sustain Funding

Output: Sustained state TVP funding and related supports

| Measures/Indicators of Performance | Scales/Scoring/Method |
|--|---|
| The anticipated amount of state funds earmarked for TVP activities is available | 1. How much money has the State allocated toward the implementation of the TVP strategy in the last year? |
| State TVP funds are regularly updated and renew | 1. How frequently do state TVP funds become available? Annually Biennially Other frequency |
| The state allocates funds to support different areas of implementation | 1. Can the state funds be used for TVP efforts across different implementation domains? Yes (1) No (0) 2. How much of the state funds have been designated to different implementation domains? a) Implementation domain 1: \$\$\$ designated |
| The planned number of grant development trainings (e.g., on proposal writing, grant administration) have been provided | How many grant development trainings took place in the last year? |
| Organizations relevant to TVP implementation apply and receive state grants. | Collect the following data for both grant applicants and recipients: a) Organizational expertise b) Communities served c) Which key implementation area it supports d) Funds requested e) Funds granted |

GOAL 11: SUPPORT PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT, LEARNING, AND IMPROVEMENT

Objective 1: Provide the Implementation Partners with Available Up-To-Date Research Evidence and Best Practices for Effective TVP Efforts

Output: A regularly-updated research evidence and best practices hub

| Measures/Indicators of Performance | Scales/Scoring/Method |
|---|--|
| There is a research evidence/best practices online hub | 1. Has a recent-research/best-practices online hub been established? Yes (1) No (0) Under development (0.5) |
| The research evidence/best practices online hub is regularly updated | 1. How often is the information in the hub updated? a) Daily b) Weekly c) Monthly d) Other |
| Implementing partners use the research evidence/best practices online hub | 1. [Ask implementing partners] How often do you use the research/best practices hub? Never (1)> Very often (5) 2. Collect usage statistics (e.g., site traffic, number of downloads, number of reads) |

Objective 2: Support Professional Development of the Implementation Partners and Relevant Stakeholders

Output: Regular professional development activities

| Measures/Indicators of Performance | Scales/Scoring/Method |
|---|---|
| The professional development activities have been provided | 1.How many of the capacity building and professional development activities have been provided/facilitated in [period of time]? a) Research and best-practices review: b) Conferences: c) Lectures/seminars: d) Other: |
| The professional development activities are regular and ongoing | 1. Note the dates of all the relevant events |
| The professional development activities inform different implementation domains | 1. What and how many professional development activities contributed to capacity building in the following implementation domains? a) Mental health 1) Type of event, (e.g., conference), number 2) Type of event, (e.g., training), number 3) Etc. b) Law enforcement 1) Type of event, (e.g., conference), number 2) Type of event, (e.g., training), number 3) Etc. c) Etc. |
| Participants from different parts of the state and from diverse professional and demographic backgrounds attend the professional development events | For each event, note: a) Number of participants b) Participants' area of work c) Participants' demographic information |

Objective 3: Monitor The Strategy Implementation

Output: Continuous monitoring of the TVP strategy implementation

| Measures/Indicators of Performance | Scales/Scoring/Method |
|---|---|
| The anticipated number of monitoring activities take place | 1. How many of the anticipated monitoring activities took place in [period of time]? a) Progress reports b) Meetings c) Quarterly reports d) Other |
| Each implementation partner submits the agreed upon reports | 1. Did the implementation partner submit required reports? a) Implementation partner 1: 1) Report A: Yes, No, In progress 2) Report B: Yes, No, In progress b) Etc. |
| Monitoring efforts are coordinated | 1. Is there an office/individual charged with coordinating monitoring efforts across the state. Yes (1) No (0) Under development (0.5) |

Objective 4: Facilitate Ongoing Learning and Improvement Activities

Output: Ongoing learning and improvement activities

| Measures/Indicators of Performance | Scales/Scoring/Method |
|--|---|
| The anticipated ## of learning and improvement activities (e.g., partner conferences, workshops, tabletops) took place | 1. How many of the anticipated learning and improvement meetings took place in [period of time]? All partner meetings Strategy improvement workshop Thematic seminars Other |
| The learning and improvement activities are regular | 1. Note the dates of the learning/improvement activities and compare to the anticipated schedule |
| TVP efforts are being evaluated | 1. Have evaluations been conducted for all TVP efforts? a) Effort 1 Pes (1) No (0) In progress (0.5) b) Effort 2 Pes (1) No (0) In progress (0.5) C) Etc. |

Objective 4 Output continued

| Measures/Indicators of Performance | Scales/Scoring/Method |
|---|---|
| The learning and improvement activities produced actionable recommendations | 1. What actionable recommendations did the learning and improvement activities produce? a) Recommendation 1 b) Recommendation 2 c) Etc. |
| The strategy and/or relevant activities have been updated based on the learning/improvement recommendations | 1. Have the learning/improvement recommendations been implemented? a) Recommendation 1: Yes (1) No (0) In progress (0.5) b) Recommendation 2: Yes (1) No (0) In progress (0.5) C) Etc. |