

Sarah Wurzburg: ... afternoon or good morning, depending on where you're located. Thank you for joining today's Outcomes-Based Contracting for Reentry and Housing Support session. My name is Sarah Wurzburg. I'm a program director for the Behavioral Health Division at The Council of State Governments Justice Center. And I will be moderating this session. So, just a note on the Virtual Recording Notice, the session is hosted by The National Reentry Resource Center. The NRRC is operated by the American Institutes for Research, which allows for the recording of audio visuals, participants, and other information sent, verbalized, or utilized during business related meetings. By joining a meeting, you automatically consent to such recordings. Any participant who prefers to participate via audio only should disable their video camera so their audio will be captured. Video and/or audio recordings of any AIR session shall not be transmitted to an external third party without the permission of AIR.

So, to give you a little bit of background on my organization, this presentation was developed by The Council of State Governments Justice Center, which is a national nonpartisan, nonprofit that combines the power of a membership organization serving state officials in all three branches of government with policy and research expertise to develop strategies that increase public safety and strengthen communities. The CSG Justice Center is the Second Chance Act or SCA training and technical assistance provider for behavioral health, housing, and family supports. We are thrilled to be supporting the sessions on these topics as part of Second Chance month in partnership with The National Reentry Resource Center.

Today's presentation will begin with introductions of our panelists, followed by a brief background on outcomes-based contracting, and an overview of the session. We'll then move to a discussion with our panelists about outcomes-based contracting, and the process involved in successfully implementing them. Following the discussion, we will provide an opportunities for attendees of the webinar to ask questions of the panelists. Please place any questions you have at any time in the chat box, and we'll hold them until the question and answer time towards the end of the session. I'm really excited about the great panel we have today. I'm joined by my colleague, Alison Farringer, who is a Senior Policy Analyst of The Council State Governments Justice Center. She'll be assisting with monitoring and asking questions during the panel session. She also provides training and technical assistance to Department of Justice Outcomes-Based Contract Grantees.

Gloria Gong, who is the Executive Director of The Government Performance Lab or GPL at Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government, where she leads GPLS efforts to accelerate the pace of change on serious social problems by improving state and local government. Prior to becoming executive director, Gloria served as the managing director over GPLS Criminal Justice, Homelessness and Behavioral Health Practices. And previously, she served as the director of research and innovation. Gloria also [inaudible 00:03:50] GPL's Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Initiatives. Before joining GPL, Gloria worked on a

variety of state and national governments and legal programs, including serving as lead evaluator for the Connecticut judicial branch on an evaluation of its Mortgage Foreclosure Mediation Program in the Massachusetts department of early education and care on the agency's Early Education Initiative, and in China, at the Yale China Law Center on rule of law projects, including criminal justice and judicial reform.

Gloria received [inaudible 00:04:30] doctorate, or JD from Yale Law School, where she was public policy school at the Institute for Social Policy Studies. Thank you so much to Gloria for joining us. We also have Kelly Walsh, who is the principal policy associate at Urban Institute. She's the director of the Equitable Housing Demonstration, an initiative that supports reduced jail use through housing solutions for a cohort of MacArthur Safety and Justice Challenge Network. She is all also the principal investigator on an evaluation of housing and urban development and department of justice funded demonstration on Pay For Success and permanent supportive housing. Together with the CSG Justice Center, Dr. Walsh provides technical assistance to the Second Chance Act grantees focus on Pay For Success outcomes-based contracting. Previously, she provided leadership to two large scale TA initiatives for places exploring Pay For Success models.

She has a broad portfolio of work that includes research on technical assistance on outcomes-based financing, justice, and housing projects. Then as I mentioned, I'm Sarah Wurzburg, and I oversee training and technical assistance for the Second Chance Act behavioral health and housing at The Council State Governments Justice Center. This includes training and technical assistance to the Second Chance Act, Pay For Success initiative sites with support from Urban Institute. If you're not familiar with this grant, I encourage you to check it out as a new funding opportunity was just recently released.

So, thank you again for everyone who's attending. And we would really like to know a little bit more about you. In the chat, if you can put your name, title, and agency, that would be great. We look forward to you all participating in the discussion, and we encourage as you have questions, please feel free to answer them throughout the session, but first, tell us who you are. So now, I'm just going to provide a brief amount of background information on outcomes-based contracting and Pay For Success before we jump into the exciting part, which is the panel discussion with our subject matter experts. So, as you know, today's panel is focused on outcomes-based contracting for reentry and housing. Broadly speaking, outcomes-based contracting describes a type of performance based strategy involving contracts that link monetary payments to the attainment of specific outcomes.

It represents a way to incentivize the achievement of specific outcomes among vulnerable populations such as reducing recidivism. One well known approach to outcomes-based contracting is the Pay For Success model, which represents just one specific type of outcomes-based contracting. In true Pay For Success,

the upfront costs needed to launch or scale a program for outcomes-based contracting are provided by a new investor, sometimes private, or non-profit agencies, instead of a traditional funder, usually government, to improve outcomes for a specific population. Then, if an independent evaluation demonstrates the program achieved its goals and outcomes in the contract, the investment is repaid by the traditional funder. However, if the outcomes are not achieved, the investor then takes the loss.

And with that background in mind, today's session will really help to inform the ways in which justice partners can use outcomes or performance based contracts to support positive outcomes for people navigating reentry, and seeking housing. Examples will be shared on programs around the country who have successfully used contracts to drive performance. We will also be discussing how the strategy can be used to help define, measure, and track on existing reentry and housing needs as well as desired outcomes. This can also be broken down into focusing on the target population, outcomes for payment, and development of a contract. The session provides an opportunity to learn how people can educate government or other agencies to ensure staff or service providers have the tools and training needed to successfully implement key components for outcomes-based contracting. There will also be some tips shared on evaluation and partnering with researchers to be able to do this type of initiative.

So, with that overview, we are now, now going to turn to our panel discussion with Kelly and Gloria. Okay. So, I'm wondering if we can begin with each of you talking a little bit about outcomes-based contracting, including the difference between Pay For Success, and other approaches to outcomes-based contracting. Kelly, would you be willing to start for us?

Kelly Walsh:

Yes. Thanks Sarah. And thanks for having me here today. Really excited to join the panel in this conversation. So, I think if you ask that question to about five different people in the field, you might get five slightly different answers. But I think one of the things that's helpful to think about that it remains true with Pay For Success today, is that there's a couple core elements. When it really first evolved, especially back in around 2012, 2013, the full Pay For Success model involved outside investors, government and payers, philanthropy participating, service providers. It's a large model with lots of different partners, and a lot of different moving parts. Over the years, places have found ways to simplify the model a bit if they thought it better serve their needs and their ability to implement. But I think at its core, is this ability to link some sort of payment to outcomes, and especially if those outcomes are at the individual level of program participants.

I think one thing it's important to do is distinguish this between regular, say, performance based contracting, where in that model, providers may be paid, say, based on number of people served, or based on the activities that they're performing. But really, at its core with Pay For Success, and more broadly with

outcomes-based contracting, is that it's pushing beyond paying for activities, and making sure we're paying for outcomes. There's more we can say about the implications of doing that, especially for the ability of service providers to operate in that model. But I think coming away from this, to me, that's the core element of the model. Gloria, would you add to that?

Gloria Gong: Yes, I think that's exactly right. And I'll just add to kind of support what Kelly was saying here. From our perspective, we started in 2012, 2013 supporting primarily states, but also local governments that were experimenting with this new Pay For Success or social impact on contract model. And in those kind of... As Kelly said, in those original days, it was this kind of Cadillac model involving third party investors, contracts between the investors, often intermediaries, government partners, and providers. And again, I'll just share from my personal experience, what happened for us after we did kind of the first pioneering round of state based Pay For Success contracts, is a bunch of those state governments actually came back to us and said, "There were a bunch of things that we loved about this. It shifted us away from inputs, [inaudible 00:12:38] metrics to really trying to focus on what we were trying to achieve with these services. And that focus was incredibly powerful."

It set up the infrastructure for us to have real time data driven performance monitoring, which most of our programs don't have. And so, we were learning in real time, what was going wrong with our implementation, and that then drove these really rapid iterations around fixing those things. So we would find out that something wasn't working, and rather than learning that 12 or 24 months later when we didn't have a chance to fix it, we would learn it in close to real time when we actually had a chance to course correct. And so, a lot of governments are saying to [inaudible 00:13:12], "This is how we want to be running our social services. We want to be responsive, and agile, and focus on outcomes." And then another thing we heard from governments is they said there was something about the structure of this contract that kept the focus on implementation.

And so, often, what we see happening in governments is that there's this huge focus around kind of policy or initiation, and then the program gets handed off. Everyone's [inaudible 00:13:35] New York City and [inaudible 00:13:36]. The program is handed off to agency folks and all of the kind of support and attention pulls away. And a lot of the potential impact of those programs dies on the vine a little bit because they're starved of the consistent executive attention that they need to actually deliver. And a lot of these programs resulted in really thoughtful and exciting procurements where governments went out and actually listened to the communities more closely, they rethought the service array, and they redesigned services and contracts to be more responsive [inaudible 00:14:09] they were seeing. So, what we [inaudible 00:14:11] from governments after that kind of, what I think of as the 1.0 version of Pay For Success contracts, so governments back and saying, "What are the ways that we can keep all of these benefits without paying some of the pretty

heavy transaction costs of doing these very heavy lift with [inaudible 00:14:28] contracts?"

And so, I think this is what we're going to be talking about more over the course of the panel, but certainly what I've seen, as we've seen this evolving in the field, is governments looking for ways to keep those very impactful pieces of Pay For Success, and often leaving the more bespoke third party financing contracting things for pretty narrow circumstances, but really being inventive and broadening the ways in which they're thinking about using portions of this approach to apply sometimes across their entire service portfolio for an agency.

Sarah Wurzburg: Thanks so much. I think that's a really helpful overview in terms of where we have been, how Pay For Success started, and really, threading into where we're seeing a lot of sites going with this is really starting to think about how to expand this a bit in terms of how to really focus on outcomes in more contracting areas and scale up in a different way. So next, we actually want to discuss more about successfully implementing outcomes-based projects since we already have set the stage. So, do you have any recommendations for determining a good match or fit for outcomes-based contracting? And Kelly, we'll start with you.

Kelly Walsh: Sure. Thanks Gloria, or Sarah, excuse me. I think fit is so important along a lot of different elements of planning this type of work, because it's not just about fit for a program to the Pay For Success model, but fit for Pay For Success for like the local conditions on the ground. And what I mean by that is especially the local political landscape, right? I think places should really begin asking themselves a question of why am I exploring Pay For Success, right? It's a tool, not a model in and of itself. The goal is always to use that model to be able to support new programs that ultimately improve outcomes for people in your community. And so, I'd always encourage places not to start necessarily with how do we do Pay For Success, but if you need to do Pay For Success. And the answer maybe yes. This can be especially helpful if there's reluctance to just directly fund programs outright.

You can use the model... When you say to a policy maker, "Well, what if we were only paying for these outcomes, or paying for this service if we knew they were successful, if we were getting the outcomes we wanted out of this model, regardless of what it was." That's a pretty compelling point to be able to make, and we've seen it work to make places go from, "No, we're not doing this," to "Yes, let's test this out and see what happens." And so, I think when we're talking about fit, it's starting with the problem definition. What's the problem you're trying to solve on the ground? And then also being able to assess the strength of the program you're considering to solve that problem. So, what's the alignment between the problem and the program? What's the alignment between your potential pool of providers in that program? How strong can they possibly be to implement it?

But then, there's also the fit between the model, and your own both capital P and lowercase P political realities. Like, is this something that will help you move forward to expand something that exists, or to bring in something that's brand new? And if the answer is yes, it can be a really compelling reason to move forward with it. If the answer is no, I think that's fine. We've seen a number of places over the years that start to explore Pay For Success that ultimately make the decision that they don't need that financing model to make the programs they want a reality. And I'd encourage everyone listening to this today to still consider that a success, right? The goal here is not to launch PFS no matter what, the goal is to support new programs, or expand existing programs to improve outcomes for people. And if the planning process gets you to a decision point where you can do that through more traditional means, I'd encourage places to consider that a win as well. Gloria?

Gloria Gong:

I completely agree with everything that Kelly just said. And so, and I would differentiate here between kind of that Cadillac model original Pay For Success social impact bond approach with the third party investors, and the multi piece contracts versus a broader outcomes-based contracting, a result driven contracting approach. So, I would say for the first one, the needle that you have to thread is that you have to find something that is big enough, that it may potentially generate savings, that is sure enough that you actually can attract third party investors, but that is uncertain enough that it actually makes sense for the government to do that risk shifting. Because, the risk shifting comes at a cost. The investors are paid back a premium for lending the government it's money. So, if it's really, really clear that the intervention's going to work, you should not be borrowing money at the investor rate, government money is very inexpensive. You should just be paying for it.

But if it's uncertain enough, you actually can't attract investors. So, traditional Pay For Success has a very sweet spot in the Venn diagram of finding things that are big enough to generate returns, uncertain enough to make sense for government to borrow money, certain enough to return to investors. That's why they end up, I think being like a pretty niche tool. If you're talking more broadly about this broader outcomes-based contracting, I think there are a lot of programs that are really good candidates for this, because that means you're looking for a set of programs where you are concerned that you may currently be focused on inputs rather than important outputs or outcomes. You want work more collaboratively with your provider or your provider community to reshift a focus from compliance towards collaborative focus on outcomes.

And you potentially are getting ready to do a reinvestment or a reprocurement, and you want to use this as a foundation for essentially reexamining some of the ways that your current contracts are potentially structured and shifting more toward outcomes. And that could be a really, I think, broad set of initiatives or contracts that might be good candidates for that.

Sarah Wurzburg: Thanks so much. Just building on Gloria, are there any necessary or key elements to really getting started that you would want to elevate?

Gloria Gong: Yes. I actually think when we work with governments on this, one of the things we tell them too, is exactly what Kelly just laid out, which is actually start first with your strategic planning, don't have this as a hammer, and then go around looking for a nail, like don't say like, "Oh, I've learned about Pay For Success. I'm going to go find a Pay For Success project." Pull up in your strategic planning and ask what are the outcomes that my agency is tasked with delivering? And then what is the set of resources I'm deploying against that? [inaudible 00:21:22] my contracted services my directly provided services, and where might this kind of approach really increase the outcomes that we're delivering for the residents that we serve, and then use that to select some subset of programs that you may focus on. So, I think that's the first thing, is actually start from your strategic plan or your policy vision, not from a tool that's going to go hunting for a place to live.

And then the second thing I would say is, think really serious about target population. I think this is one of the mistakes that we see people making, is they actually start with that service, so they... And it's very easy to do, but they say, "We want to start with our home visiting service. We want to start with our vocational training," or something like that. And instead I think what you should be doing is actually asking what is the population whose outcomes we're really concerned with? What can we be doing to structure sort of services around the outcomes that we're trying to drive for that population? And one of the reasons that's important is that because I think one of the most powerful things that outcomes-based contracting, or Pay For Success can do, is hold both the government and the providers accountable to the full population that they were intending to serve, not just the easiest serve people who ended up showing up at the service providers store.

And you really have to push yourself to say there were 2,000 people coming out of... Moving on to probation, or being released from jail, and we're going to hold ourselves accountable for finding out how well we served all of them, not just for paying a provider for picking up people and getting them into a seat. And so, I think the second thing I would say in addition to starting from that strategic plan is then moving from that strategic focus that you have to a population that you're trying to serve and identifying them. Kelly, what else is on your mind as you're thinking about what jurisdiction should [inaudible 00:23:02]?

Kelly Walsh: So, when we think about getting started, it's never too early to start thinking about roles and responsibilities. I think one of the exciting things we've seen in this space is for places that have launched, they've done so with a blend of outcomes that crosses sectors. So, a single project, and a single program, might be defining their success through say, justice system outcomes, and housing stability outcomes, right? And so, what that does, is brings lots of people to the table. And I think it's important really early on to make decisions about how do

you decide where this will live? Like, collaboration is key, but it always needs a home base. And that's one of the things we've seen in our process evaluations for places that have explored this, is that where this lives, whether it's in a CJ system office, a housing office, early education office, does really affect the way it's implemented even if there's like cross sector outcomes included in the project itself.

The other thing I'd say, raise this up in the getting started category, which often doesn't appear right away, is to engage an evaluator. It doesn't have to be the evaluator, but just bring one, or maybe two, right? You want to bring some folks to the table because the decisions you're going to make really early on, especially to what Gloria just mentioned around population, right? The evaluator's going to ask you questions about, can you estimate the size? How many people are we talking about? How are they identified? What are your enrollment pathways? They'll help sort of crystallize all these questions because to the evaluator, they need to know that to plan in the evaluation. But what's so important in the PFS model, even on the variations on it, if payment is in any way tied to the ability to observe outcomes, you need to have, early on, at least estimates of things like that.

Because what you can pretty quickly identify is if you're talking about enough people, and the outcomes are happening quickly enough, say, three to five years, that makes them something more suitable for PFS. If you're talking about something that's this very small population, and where your outcomes are 10 years out, that's not suitable for this. That's not to say you shouldn't do the work, or the program shouldn't exist, but it's not right for linking any sort of payment to those observed outcomes. And we could talk a little bit more about why, but I'm big proponent of at least consulting with an evaluator early on to help drive those conversations.

Sarah Wurzburg: Really important points. And I think particularly on the target population piece, when you're talking about reentry generally, reentry is a process and it's not one thing. So really, trying to get at what are the key needs of people reentering the community from jail or prison, or who are on community supervision, depending on your population, because it could be housing, it could be substance use treatment, it could be employment, or many other things. So, really figuring out what the key needs are that you're trying to focus on, and thinking about outcomes from that perspective is really important. So, moving on a little bit more to some operational pieces, Kelly, what information do sites need to obtain to start this process?

Kelly Walsh: Great question. So, I think we've touched on a few already. Key information, just about the existing problem in your community. Again, going back to how many people would potentially be eligible? What are the outcome improvements you're looking for? But I think really early on, just going back to this idea of identifying and defining roles, and that could change. Define early on and then reassess with your local partners if you need to change leadership or change the

way places are engaging. But I think one of the things to explore locally, especially around the service providers, is their interest and ability in being able to operate within this model. Are you envisioning this as something that is going to exist and be applied to existing service providers in your community, or are you looking to bring in new providers? If it's existing providers, I think it's worth having conversation early on to say, "What would it take for you to be able to operate within a model like this?" How much capital can they wait for in terms of repayment?

And usually, the answer is not much, right? That's why the outside investor and Pay For Success is so important. But we've also seen places implement different structures like direct payments, but there's bonuses attached to outcomes. This doesn't need to be an all or nothing model. And I think early on, it's important to have these conversations about the reality of the model, and what it would mean in your community, with your partners, with your providers. Another thing I'll raise up in terms of what do programs need to obtain or determine, sometimes you can plan based on your existing data, but until you actually get into it, and test something out, it's hard to know how accurate your estimates are.

So, we've seen places that are able to launch pilots, even if they're small pilots with say 10, 15, 20 people, really learn a lot. It's an opportunity to test the assumptions they've made early on in the planning process, and then adjust and fix based on what they're observing before any investor dollars are at risk. So, I'd say don't ignore the importance or the ability of a pilot to help inform your planning in a path like this.

Gloria Gong:

I completely agree on the pilot front. Yeah, I think two of the things I think we see governments often overlooking until too late in the process, the first one is actually funding. Again, with the traditional Pay For Success model, there was a lot of times this perception that this is going to be free money because investors were putting it up and people weren't thinking about the fact that you have to pay them back, which actually means that from the beginning of the project, you knew [inaudible 00:29:06] identified for the outcome space payments were going to come from. I think that's still true in just a regular results driven contracting or outcomes-based contract model. Even if you're not borrowing from investors, is that a lot of times people get very focused on thinking about the policy implication. They do all of this work on thinking about target selection, and data, and all those kind of things. And then they hit some barrier where somebody is like, "Oh, we're not going to expand that program by \$10 million," or something like that.

And like at the end of the day, the heart of this is often the money that's going to be spent with a service provider in the community to either expand seats, or to reorient the contracts around us, [inaudible 00:29:44] to contain more outcomes focused. And so, somebody from the very beginning needs to have actually checked that those dollars are on the table, either that there's money

for expansion, or that the money that's currently being spent is available to reorient in this way. And I would say the second thing that we see often get left out is the capacity both on the provider side and the government side to actually engage in data driven performance management. I think this goes a little bit to some of the things that Kelly was just saying.

For me, the heart of this, the kind of Pay For Success model ended up being this really exciting and dynamic collaboration that we would see between government agencies and their service provider, where they were all of a sudden meeting in real time. Monthly, or biweekly, or something like that to say, "Do we have the number of people enrolled that we thought? If not, why?" "Oh, it's an issue with referrals." "What's the heart of that issue with referrals?" "Oh, it turns out it's a shared responsibility between the government and the provider." "Okay. Now, both of us are going to go fix something that we're doing to ensure better referrals." "Okay. Now we're having a problem with retention." "What's at the heart of that problem at retention?" I mean, that really dynamic problem solving together is incredibly powerful, and I think a kind of transformation that we're really eager to see going on, it takes significant staff capacity to be able to do that.

And often, again, the core of this is being able to look at data together. It's not very complicated data but it is things like how many people did we reach out to? How many of them are actually contacted, triaged, engaged? How are they flowing through our referral system? And then it was happening to them? And a lot of times, the providers and the agencies aren't actually set up to do that in real time. And so, I would think actually about like, do you have someone on your staff who can actually run this project, it takes more energy to run, then I kind of said it and forget it. Contract does, and same thing on the provider side. Are your providers completely over capacity, and they have no one who can produce data, or do input on their side? If so, that's going to be the first barrier that you hit and thinking about how you're going to address that by supplementing their capacity, or bringing an outside technical assistance, or something like that is really important.

And then it's going to go directly to what Kelly was just saying about that data then becoming kind of the heart of this ability to do this work.

Sarah Wurzburg: Yeah. Just getting further into the data piece, Gloria, what are some of the challenges that have really come up for sites that you've worked with in synthesizing the data, and being able to execute the results driven contracts?

Gloria Gong: Yeah. I'll just build forward on some of the things I was just saying. It is surprising for me. I mean, hopefully this is not the case for anyone who's on the call, but I'm surprised at how many times we get into one of these pieces of work, and it turns out that really neither the agency nor the provider is collecting data that's really closely connected to the outputs and outcomes that they were really wanting to achieve in certainly, a real time way, but even

sometimes overall. So, a lot of times there's actually some news, either data collection, or reporting that needs to be built in. And again, sometimes it's because folks are really, really [inaudible 00:32:44] for time, and this feels like an additional burden that you're imposing on them. So, there's actually important work that needs to be done in figuring out what you're going to take off of people's place.

Some of the work that we did on shelter work, we went through with the shelter providers and we said, "Can you show us all the metrics that you're being asked to report that you don't think has anything to do with getting people into stable housing?" And they're like, "Yes, we're being asked to report on things like number of showers administered," those kind of things. They'll be like, "Great. If we can take off all of that extraneous reporting that you don't think has really anything to do with connection to stable housing, can you start reporting out much and much higher validity, your connections and referrals to supportive housing, and then how often people are coming back?" So, I mean, that's the kind of improvement that often needs to be made. The other thing I'll say on this is I think sometimes we see folks getting tripped up where they think...

And we hear this all the time, "Oh, we are one and a half years into, or one and a half years away from building our super fancy new integrated data system, and this is going to become easier when we have the new shiny thing, da, da, da, da, da," and after having gone through this rodeo a couple times, I would say, "Don't wait for that." Like if that perfect integrated data system comes through at some point, then God bless you, that's fantastic. You should definitely use it. We have seen jurisdictions through this completely plausibly using Excel of spreadsheets and trackers that they build themselves. You can build them in two weeks, and you can start tracking things like, is it beautiful? No. Does it take more time? Yes. But it turns out it takes less time than waiting for that perfect data system that is always eight months over the horizon.

So, I would say like, don't let someone tell you like, "Oh, we need 10,000 fancy [inaudible 00:34:19] before we can get started." Like, Nope, even the provider can come up with something on your SharePoint, or like something that already exists, and you can start doing the work. And when you start doing the work, you'll discover a bunch of operational things that you needed that kind of pilot time that Kelly was talking about to iron out. And you'll be really glad you didn't keep pushing off and pushing off operational things because you thought that a big integrated data system was just around the corner.

Kelly Walsh: So, at the risk of having a lot of agreement on your panel, I'll just say yes to all of that, especially around don't wait for the integrated data system, which is fantastic to have, but is not necessary for this necessarily to exist, right? It might be necessary to do a lot of other amazing things. But I think one thing to examine early on is your existing data sharing agreements, if any exists at all, right? And knowing, especially, if you want to build this around outcomes in

multiple personal sectors, health, housing, education, justice, there's going to need to be some amount of data sharing that happens. And don't wait to have those conversations about what has to happen. And sometimes, it's the existence of a third party like GPL, or for intermediaries who work in this space, to sort of become a bit of a data broker where they'll pull together information. Maybe places won't share across each other, but they'll share with them, right? Or they'll share with the outside evaluator.

I think the evaluator can also be a helpful partner in bringing together and linking data that's useful for this. If along the way, the process to get there creates like an ongoing data sharing relationship that exists after the project's done and over, that's fantastic. But if it doesn't, there's those one time sharings and agreements, they can still get you there, especially if this is something new for your or community. Another thing I'd raise up too is just being aware of the data sharing challenges or barriers, legal barriers, that might exist for your colleagues in other sectors. Law enforcement's actually traditionally comparably pretty easy to share data with because they don't have a lot of laws prohibiting personal identifying information.

If you start talking about sharing with the education system, and the healthcare system, that gets a lot more complicated because of the legal protections in place. Doesn't mean it's not possible, it is possible. And there's examples out there online about places who've been able to do this. But just be aware that those barriers exist in other sectors. And don't hesitate having a conversation early on that they exist, and what can we do to link and share data in a way that makes this possible.

Sarah Wurzburg: I think some really good points and the database thing we do hear a lot about. And I think part of that is due to the information sharing trepidation that people have, so that seems to be the easy solution for some of those issues. I mean, Gloria, I know you touched on this a bit, but did anything else on information sharing you wanted to add? Because I think that's really the key building block here in terms of developing those agreements, data use agreements, or memorandums of understanding as well.

Gloria Gong: This is going to sound super down in the weeds, but I would say one of the number one things that we think be helpful on this is finding a problem solving lawyer in your administration that you can work with. Data sharing agreements, in my experience, can get completely hung up on whether you have what my boss calls, either a problem solving, or a problem creating lawyer. And so, I think finding someone who you can talk to about the vision for what it is that you're trying to achieve by creating a data sharing agreement with another agency, or a provider, and that person can then help you hammer out the details of how to put those in place is really helpful, and otherwise, you get hung up on. It turns into one of these [inaudible 00:38:19] the integrated data system, it turns into one of these things where you can be waiting for four years to work out a data sharing agreement.

One thing that we've seen a lot of jurisdictions use as a potential solution to that, it turns out a lot of times these are already in place. And so, if you can figure out like, ah, two of us have already agreed to share data with this third agency or something that's the state level or something like that, can we actually have some of this sit there, and have that person be the bridge or Kelly's I think great ideas about evaluators. Sometimes you already have some of those on contract and they have access to some of the data already and finding ways to expand those partnerships. So, [inaudible 00:38:53] I think, like kind of technical thing that we see about ways in which the actual data share agreements can get, can bog people down. And the other thing I'll say here is, I think sometimes when we talk about Pay For Success, there's this underlying a framework that the providers are like not delivering good services, and you use this as a tool to kind of discipline them into delivering good services.

And also say, personally, that's almost never been my experience. My experience has been that some system of incentives overall has pushed providers to a compliance mode, or mode where they're delivering a set of inputs. And almost all providers when you work with them are thrilled to be asked to refocus on the outcomes of their services and to work on that. I do think it's challenging for everyone to participate in evaluation just because we know that overall, so few interventions can really stand up to their rigor of an RCT and just there's so many things that we're doing we learn over time, aren't as effective as we thought. So, that can be very kind of psychologically challenging, but overall, providers are really excited to partner on some of these more outcome focus.

And so, that's my other thing I would say kind of to this, it's kind of related to this data sharing point is, you really going to need to be partnering with your providers and both of you are going to need to be kind of coming to this in a collaborative way. And I think setting that foundation, not only from your legal agreements, and your data systems, but actually, your relational approach to them is going to be like the third leg of that stool that you're going to have to invest in if you want this to work.

Sarah Wurzburg: Definitely some really important points there. And really making sure the service provider knows the parameters going into it so they can best partner with you. But this gives the opportunity to focus on specific outcomes that you've agreed upon with the provider, so it's mutually beneficial in that they also get to shift their focus to something that might be more interesting to them, or more focused on what they think is going to help people reentering the community, or seeking housing as well. So, I'm going to switch gears a little bit just to make sure we get to all of our topics here. So, I'm going to start with Kelly in how do sites determine outcomes for reimbursement?

Kelly Walsh: So, it's usually a collective decision making process. But I will say just a couple points of guidance on which ones are appropriate for reimbursement. I mean, one, you have to make sure that the outcomes are aligned with the activities

themselves. Like, does the theory of change line up? Right? You don't want to select outcomes that really aren't logically linked to the programs you're talking about. So, that's number one. Number two, they need to be observable in a reasonable timeframe, especially if there's a repayment to an investor in this model. We've usually say two to five years, or three to five years. Anything beyond that, and it gets really difficult unless the investor agrees to wait that long for repayment.

The other thing that does influence the outcomes that are selected for reimbursement for better or for worse are the priorities of the partners at the table, usually for better, not usually for worse. But for example, especially in places that are really exploring how this could leverage cost savings, healthcare systems often enter the conversation and become partners in this work. And so, we've seen in a couple sites where maybe you'll have multiple end payers, local government, and a healthcare system. And the healthcare system wants to pay on health outcomes, and the government wants to pay on some other family of outcomes, which makes sense. They want to pay for outcomes that are aligned with their own missions, and their own priorities. But I will caution that it can create quite a bit of complexity, and takes time to have those conversations and those negotiations. So the simpler... How should I say that?

I'd really start with this, what lines up with the theory of change, and trying to match it to those activities, as opposed to trying to give every partner at the table exactly what they want, because that can sometimes slow down the ability to launch at all. And the other thing too, is that they're observable. That the evaluation that you're setting up is capable of observing these things that the fields exist in your data systems, even if it's the columns in your Excel sheet to accurately be able to report out on these. And honestly, those are my top line recommendations around outcomes. I'm curious what Gloria might add to that.

Gloria Gong:

I think that's exactly right. The two things I just add. I mean, that list I think is exactly what you should be [inaudible 00:43:47]. The two things I would just add to it are one, I think it's really helpful if the outcomes are verifiable or observable, not only by the service provider, that, again, I don't think service providers are in general looking to go out and scan the system, but you put an enormous amount of weight and incentive on them, if you're asking them to report on a thing that they're going to get paid by. So it's really helpful if these are things that are reflected back in your own administrative data set or other things. Can you observe reduced contact with the shelter system, which is outside of your housing provider, or reduce contact with the criminal justice system, which the police will be reporting, not this provider or something like that.

I think it's not a good idea to have the same people reporting on things as the ones who are going to get paid for those things. And then, I think the only other thing I would say about this is most of the jurisdictions that we've worked with have discovered over time that you actually need a blend of inputs, outputs, and

outcomes, to do this. Like if you just say, 'Oh, we just want to see changes in reduced recidivism,' which is what we think reentry is about, it's a little too hard to observe or longer out. And it turns out it works... For most places, it works better if you say like, okay, well, the first piece of this is actually that we want you to engage maybe for the first time with this harder to serve population that's actually a really significant input for us. So we'll actually maybe pay you a little bit just on that. Like, can you successfully actually engage this harder group of people, and can you show that you're actually getting them to retain through the service in this amount some output that you really care about?

You've actually been able to treat them, and then maybe recidivism, or reduce criminal contact as the ultimate outcome that you're looking at. And often what we're seeing is a blend of inputs, outputs, and outcomes, as Kelly said, that really line up in a clear theory of change that point towards those ultimate outcomes, but not putting the complete weight on stuff that maybe is several years out, or that ignores these pretty significant operational lifts that folks might be doing in order to put these programmatic changes in place.

Sarah Wurzburg: Thanks so much. And just digging in a little bit more on the contract piece, Gloria, how do programs or sites successfully execute contracts? And can you provide an example of someone who's been able to do this?

Gloria Gong: Yeah. I'll use two different projects as an example, kind of that Cadillac full social impact on Pay For Success model, and then kind of the outcomes-based contracting versions that we've seen in the subsequent generations. So, for the first one, I think there's this fantastic project that was in Denver that I'm sure Kelly can probably talk about much more detail as well. We used to sit on the government side on, I think Urban was the evaluator that created permanent supportive housing units, and then created a referral mechanism that directed folks who were at high risk for cycling through either shelter, hospital use, or jail use, and then prioritize them for placement in these permanent supportive housing units. And that was a kind of classic Pay For Success contract structure, where there's actually a set of funders, and intermediary, these contracts that has outcomes-based payments that go back to the funders based on the results of the evaluation.

So, those kinds of contracts, I think in order to enter into them, like we really saw every party having its own lawyer or set of lawyers, some places were engaging pro bono firms to help represent them. These contract terms are both fairly complicated and bespoke. We supported governments with some of their initial kind of analytics and preparation for that, and the government then would also work with their general councils. And over time some folks develop these kind of template terms, but they're really a pretty significant list that just kind of sophisticated lawyers to work out. They weren't kind of an off the shelf thing that people found that their existing contracts departments were able to engage in. So, that's just this one example. I think it's a fantastic project, but

from the contracting standpoint, it's a bespoke set of contracts between multiple parties that are all interlocking with each other, and every party had its own lawyer or legal firm working on it, and they were kind of building it from scratch or using...

I think they actually pulled on some of the contracts that we've set up in some of the other jurisdictions for some of the core terms. But again, big bespoke list. On the other end of the scale, we supported Chicago's department of family and social services in kind of applying outcomes-based, or result in contracting lens to its full \$300 plus million service array. And that did not take a bunch of sophisticated outside law firms, because what we did is we sat with the procurement and contracting team, and with the social services teams, and we went through and essentially did this thing where you start from their strategy and what outcomes they're trying to drive for. And then we did a bunch of [inaudible 00:48:41] with them, and their service providers on what should these contracts actually really be focused on, and help them bake a bunch of that into the next time that they issue their contracts. And that, you can do with an agency's existing contracts, contract structure, contracting, and procurement team.

Again, in my experience, it takes like some outside support because a lot of this is new thinking for the procurement and contracting team. A lot of times people haven't pulled them into strategic policy meetings is that how can these contracts be tools that help us deliver better outcomes from these services? They've just been put in the place of kind of cutting and pasting for a long time. So it does take some work. But those contracts, what you're really doing is you're taking the existing set of social service contracts that might exist, and working really closely with folks in the agency to figure out what in here is actually serving the agency and the providers, and helping drive towards the things that they want, and what are kind of requirements that have accrued over time, and are just adding burden and getting the way of us actually being able to work with our provider community to deliver, and stripping a lot of that out.

And so, that's, I both think a lower... Quite a bit of a lower lift for agencies to take on. And they can do, I think, with some outside support, but really using their existing staff, whereas with the original Pay For Success contracts, I don't think we saw any jurisdictions other than like very huge sophisticated jurisdictions with like the New York Cities essentially who have like their own internal law firms who are really able to do that completely on their own. Everyone else was really pulling in quite a bit of additional legal support. Kelly, does this map with what your experience is as well, and what you would say to folks?

Kelly Walsh:

Yeah, I think that aligns with our experience as well. By design, the TA that I've been involved with has sort of always stopped when the executing contract conversations had begun. But I think one of the things that's so interesting

about your Chicago example is like, that's a way of approaching this, that changes it, not just for this one program, or this one special project, it's something that's changing it moving going forward. And I think one of the things we've seen, and this procurement, as it relates to the ability to create the contract, procurement comes up pretty often and early. And it's usually described as something to completely circumnavigate, or to work within. And I think one of the things we came across is that procurement offices and officials are usually really eager to be part of a solution to being able to launch this.

Now, I'm sure that varies from place to place, but I'd encourage everyone just as we're saying to like engage with evaluators early, engage with your procurement offices early just to see what precedent exists for anything like this before. Within your existing framework, how can you work with us, and work together to get this to a reality?

Sarah Wurzburg: So, moving forward a bit, Kelly, what's your advice on implementing a strong evaluation?

Kelly Walsh: So, I'd say my candid answer is at least one that exists, because so much of what we do, and what we spend, is never evaluated at all. So, I'll start there. And by saying that even being able to launch and support and evaluation is a step forward. Jumping to the other end of the spectrum, I think it's always important to at least start the conversation around is it possible for us to do a randomized controlled trial? Now the thing with RCTs, what's so interesting about them is that at the end of the day, it provides you as long as they have enough power, as long as there's that out correctly, it provides you with the strongest link between the activities you've done, and the outcomes you've observed. I will say though, very clearly, it's not necessarily always the right answer, but I'd encourage every place to start there.

And there's some examples, especially within the Denver example that Gloria brought up, about how they were able to make an RCT work for that project. So, I'd encourage anyone who's thinking of that to look at what's been written about that project in Denver as an example. The other thing though, is that there's lots of places. I'm thinking specifically about the sites we have in the jointly funded Pay For Success, permanent support of housing demonstration by HUD and DOJ. They're using a wider variety of evaluation methods to support their outcome space contract. They're using PFS for permanent supportive housing for justice involved folks. And at the end of the day, you need to bring your partners together to discuss what's possible, and how will it be funded.

An important thing I want to raise up is that the difference among all these evaluation methodologies is so often your point of comparison. It's like you're going to be able to observe outcomes, but you need to compare them to something. And the stronger that point of comparison is, the stronger the conclusions you're going to be able to make at the end of the day really are. So, if this is something that anyone on the call is exploring or struggling with, I'd

encourage you even just to search Pay For Success and evaluation, and you'll find a whole host of materials, some written by Urban, some likely written by GPL, and other partners in this field about places trying to provide really concrete and strategic advice about how evaluation fits in with this model. But I'd say though, how should I say? Don't let the idea that the evaluation has to exist make you shy away from the reality of an outcome space contract.

I think one of the things we've seen places do, which is really important and powerful, is include in their design, yes, there's going to be the outcomes that are linked to payment, and have some sort of financial consequence related to them. But then, there's other outcomes that are being observed that are part of learning agendas, that are just because places and providers want to have a better sense of what's going well and what's not. And I think to Gloria's point, the faster you can do that in say, an action research model, the easier it is to make adjustments to your model, and make sort of a continuous improvement process, as opposed to the final large report that comes out five years after the program's done, right?

So, to summarize, I'd say, go with the strongest point of comparison you can, and build it in... Work with the evaluator early on, and build it in a way so you're learning and adjusting along the way, as opposed to waiting for that four year, five year report to come out that'll have all of your results.

Sarah Wurzburg: Thanks so much. And in the interest of time, I'm going to ask one final question to you both, and then we'll go to the chat because we have a lot of people asking great questions. So, we'll start with Gloria. What advice you have for places exploring outcome space contracts?

Gloria Gong: That's such a great question. I think one of the main things I would say is this is a field where a lot of people got really excited about kind of creating this new model. And I think it's really easy to start dipping your toes into that, and then be really put off by what looks like a lot of sophisticated technical language, or a lot of jargon, or insiders speak, the core of this is not actually that complicated. It's about a government and service providers looking at their data, and figuring out what is working, and what's not working, and fixing it, and using contracts as a way to reinforce that by saying, "Hey, we actually want to focus on this. Like the services that you were providing, we think are supposed to be driving towards better reentry is measured this way," or something like that.

And so, I think my main advice would be if you're starting to dip your toes into looking at these things and thinking like, "Wow, these look really hard to do," like they're not actually that hard to do, and don't let people who really like got so excited about making them technical this with you from doing them.

Kelly Walsh: Yeah, that's great. I would add to that to find your sort of local coalition early, and find a way to identify your overall goals for doing this. And let's keep those goals at the top of every meeting agenda and have them be your North Star.

Because if those goals shift from actual improvements for families and communities into being able to say you launched to Pay For Success project, that there's a problem there. Because I think, again, the process of exploring this and planning for this may lead places down a path where they end up not needing this financial model, they find other ways to make it happen. And I'll just come back to that idea of that is also a success if it is supporting the expansion or implementation of really effective programs. But I'd say with the caveat of always looking at an eye towards, if you're not paying on success, you should at least be looking for it, measuring it. And if you don't see it, adjusting and changing your business as usual until you do.

Sarah Wurzburg: Thanks so much for really thoughtful discussion. We covered a lot of ground in a short amount of time. I'm going to turn it over to Alison who's going to help us explore some of the questions from the participants today.

Alison Farring...: Yes. Thank you everyone. I'm going to share some of the questions that we've had coming in from the chat. So, the first question I'll pose is, with three respect to Pay For Success, how does the site cover their static cost or expense if they are only paid for success? And happy to hear from either of our panelists. Kelly, if you'd like to start, I invite you.

Kelly Walsh: Sure. This question is really what drove what we call like the Cadillac or the big social impact bond Pay For Success model, because that's a key question. If government's withholding payment to the provider, how can the provider operate? In the full model, that's where the outside investor comes in. So, an outside investor comes and provides the upfront capital to pay the provider. So the provider's getting paid all along the way. And the success payments in that model are not going back to the provider, they're going back to the investor. So, the investor provides the upfront money and they're essentially taking on that risk. And when success payments would be made, those payments go from the end payer, which was usually government, to the independent investor, and perhaps there's a bonus structure built in for the provider along the way as well. So, that key question is what led to that multi-part model where there's so many different players involved.

There might be other ways though. We've seen places explore direct payment to providers, but then there's bonuses on top of it, or where the outcomes from one six month period end up dictating the funding for the second six month period. So, there's different ways to do it, but I'd say there's almost no place that can expect a provider to operate for six months to a year without payment and in any way be successful. So, that's a long way of saying that's where the other streams of money can come in to help.

Alison Farring...: Thank you so much. So, the next question we have is, can you say more about where the project lives, the sector impacts the evaluation, and if there's any examples that you have to go along with that? Gloria, would you like to take that question?

Gloria Gong: Yeah. Also, I might [inaudible 01:00:56] a version of it, but maybe it's the person who entered this, if they feel like their questions not being answered, feel free to put it in the chat. The outcomes that, this kind of gets to the question that we were talking about in terms of what outcomes you're looking for. I think the most difficult projects that we saw were ones that were targeting educational outcomes, or reduced use of special ed as kind of like a proxy for longer term educational outcomes, or I would say overall things were like the theory change was something around like economic mobility, or long term educational outcomes that were not observable within that window of time. And it really goes back to what Kelly was saying about what outcomes... Your ability to actually measure and observe the outcomes that you're of interest within a shorter window of time, like three to five years.

So, I think just from our experience, like the ones that projects that ran into difficulty, I don't think there's just specific to sectors, but like you kind of say this in education, are ones where people are saying like, "Well really, what we're going to see is that kids who get this intervention in kindergarten are going to be better off when they're 20," that's very difficult for an outcomes-based contract set up [inaudible 01:02:01] maybe like really true in terms of the ultimate impact that you want to have, but it's really hard to see or pay on or anything like that. The other thing I think, you can imagine is there are a lot of these interventions, we talk about this is one of the things that these contracts might be able to solve where there's this wrong pockets problem where the costs for the intervention are sitting in a different agency than the cost for the remediation.

So, one of the things that people often point out is that the pieces of the criminal legal system that kind of put people into jail, don't bear the cost of jail. And so, one of the things you need in the contract is to be able to connect that spending somehow so that you're being able to capture savings from something like reduced jail usage, or reduced shelter usage, and feed it back into an intervention that might be sitting farther upstream. I don't know, [inaudible 01:02:49] got the question at all. Someone to feel free to put it in the chat. Kelly, do you have any other thoughts on kind of the sector evaluation question?

Kelly Walsh: Sure. I can add to that. I think we've seen this as an example in this HUD DOJ demonstration I talked about before. So there's six sites in that demonstration. And again, all of them are doing PSH, all of them include justice and housing related outcomes and their success models. But I think if you want to do it, if anyone wants to do a deeper dive, I encourage you to take a look at our year three report. And Los Angeles county is an example where all of this lives in the office of diversion and reentry, and it's more sort of anchored... They have strong housing partners, but it's anchored in the reentry sector, and has a more direct connection to the criminal justice system. Whereas opposed to another demonstration partner in Lane County, Oregon, it's not. All those partners are

still at the table, but that's anchored and sort of the main leadership lives more in the housing space in that community.

And I'm not necessarily saying that one is better than the other. One of the things we've seen in the process evaluation is sort of where it lives does impact how it evolves, or what other partners are at the table. So, if anyone wants to get more into the weeds on that, I'd encourage you to take a look at that report, maybe just the executive summary. I know not all of us are diving into 150 page reports on Pay For Success. But I think that demonstration's a great place to look where everyone's working in the same grantee structure, but you can see the variations on how they've made it work for their individual communities.

Alison Farring...: Thank you. So, the next question that I'd like to pose to both of you is how can we mitigate cherry picking within payment for success contracts, noting that it's easier to achieve positive outcomes for some clients, versus more difficult to engage or service resistant clients? Gloria, would you like to start?

Gloria Gong: I'm happy to start. I actually think this is a huge risk because one of the things that you find when you start doing this is that there's a very natural... Some folks are easier to serve than others. And again, it doesn't even have to be malicious intent on the part of your providers if you're just trying to increase the number of people that you're serving or something like that. It's really easy to find the easiest to serve people. So, I actually think this is one of my favorite things about Pay For Success contracts is that I think one of the things that well done outcomes-based contracts, or Pay For Success contracts do is they define a target population coming in as their area of focus. And often, you can use it also to create that counterfactual that Kelly was talking about that's so important if you want to actually know if anything's working.

But this would be something like people who are identified that have had a certain number of jail bed stays and hospitalizations or shelter bed stays, or people exiting a system, right? And then what you say is like, okay, we're exiting on average 2,000 people out of incarcerations back into a reentry program system. That is our target population, and then you measure and observe those folks, not just the folks who then show up. And we've really seen this consistently as a powerful tool for pushing providers to really think about their engagement strategies. I think one of the examples of this, there's a separate question about the kind of RCT evidence around NFP as an intervention model. But I think in South Carolina, there was this nice Pay For Success program where part of the thing that the state did, it said we want to be targeting home visiting services to low income first time mother that's really important is to actually be reaching vulnerable families and not just filling up programs [inaudible 01:06:47] with people who have access to a lot of other services.

And so, they really push the provider in this case to demonstrate that they were reaching more difficult to serve populations, primarily looking at SES level by zip code. And one of the things that I heard from those providers is they said it was

an incredibly challenging and helpful thing for them to do because what they realized is that a lot of their outreach models kind of depended on self-referrals that wasn't going to allow them to actually reach the target population that the state was trying to reach. And they had to kind of dig really deep to think about alternative ways to reach the people that they were actually trying to reach and really revamp their model.

Now, I will say, one of the tricky things about this is it can often then make your outcomes look worse, because it's not apples to apples [inaudible 01:07:30] you used to be serving the easier to serve people and getting a certain set of outcomes. And so, it can actually make it look like it goes down. So you got to be really thoughtful about the way that you design this and hold people accountable. But I think pushing really hard to not cherry pick is one of the [inaudible 01:07:43] things about this contract. And I'll just note like a lot of current contracts were reward cherry picking. Because they're rewarding a bus and seats model, and that's inherently rewarding the people who are easy to recruit model. So, this is a great tool to be thinking about like, oh, did you actually want this service writer to be targeting a harder reach population? How are we going to set up a set of incentives to do that, and partner with them to give them the data that they need in the referrals and handoffs in order to do that well?

Kelly Walsh: Yeah, I'd add to that clearly defined target population. And if you can work with a partner to identify who's eligible outside of who's coming in your front door. So, I think this is something that Denver was able to do, and they were able to take, okay, people with this number of arrests, with this many shelter stays, I might have that metric wrong, but basically, two metrics that you were able to pull from your existing data to generate a list of names. And then you can provide that to the service provider and say, "This is your list. Find these folks." And that takes away some of the ability to cherry pick.

And I'd say that this problem isn't unique to Pay For Success. The financial aspect of it elevates it a bit, but there's also likely some really great strategies just in the evaluation literature about how to avoid it there, because this exists for basically for anyone being evaluated as well. But the closer you can get your point of comparison to look like the group that you're serving the... How should I say? The more protected you are against the motivations to cherry pick or cream.

Alison Farring...: Thank you so much. And thank you everyone for submitting your questions. Before we transition to the close, I'd like to invite our panelists just to provide any final or closing thoughts you have in this area. And Gloria, we could start with you.

Gloria Gong: Thanks. I mean, you're an amazing [inaudible 01:09:55] and the work that Kelly is doing in Urban. So, I think all the resources that have been named so far are really fantastic. And, I mean, I'll just say from our experience, partnering with a

bunch of state... A local government, I think that oftentimes, people are assuming that government can't do this on its own, or that needs like some enormous amount of help in order to be able to kind of reshift towards a focus on outcomes. And that hasn't been our experience, I think there's these incredibly talented people running a lot of these programs who, if they get like a little bit of structure or guidance on how to do this, can really make like very exciting things happen on the ground.

So it's kind of similar to the comment I made before. But for some reason, you're feeling dissuaded by people asking like shifting towards an outcome focus is some super technical thing that can't be done and say like, "No, look around in your staff, there's going to be someone who's eager and sharp and you can kind of rope them into testing a pilot on this." And like we see the same people would be able to do pretty incredible things.

Kelly Walsh:

Yeah. I'd add to that as well. If you're looking to dive in, I'd suggest really taking a close look at BJA's program in this space. Many of you go on this are probably already part of that grantee pool, but if you're not already, take a look because I think they've set up a structure that's really been informed by the field over the past 10 years. But to Gloria's point about just increasing your focus on outcomes, you can do this without creating a financial incentive related to those outcomes. So, think of this as a process. Examining your existing contracts, looking for ways to add more things in, examining your existing data sharing capabilities, and seeing how additional information on outcomes could be blended or polled from what you already have. There's been a lot of excitement around this model over the past 10 years, and it's been peaks and valleys. And I say there's been a lot written about it.

So, if you're wondering, I take about an element of this, whether it's evaluation, population programs, just searching, you're going to find a whole host of resources that have been written. And I'd say even if something is five or six years old, if this model is still new to your place and your community, I wouldn't consider that necessarily outdated. Feel free to pick it up and learn from that. Another thing I'd say too I want to flag is the potential role for local philanthropy can play in this space, especially if you're looking to fund a pilot, or to create some sort of like small bonus payment and incentive structure, that can often be a great place to start if the investment that you're looking for isn't that large. And you can leverage that [inaudible 01:12:45] success there, we'll say community foundations potentially looking at bigger philanthropic organizations to support your work in this space.

Sarah Wurzburg:

Thanks so much to our panelists. And just a reminder that today's session will be made available on The National Reentry Resource Center website. We encourage you to check out the resources that will be shared there along with the slide deck from Bureau of Justice Assistance, the Harvard Government Performance Lab, and Urban Institute. I want to thank everyone for participating in today's session. I encourage you to check out all the Second

Chance month events. We've got some great stuff up for you. An upcoming webinar that might be of interest is how to use participatory research in your reentry and evaluation program, and why you would want to. That's on Thursday, April 14th at 12:00 PM. Eastern.

Also, as mentioned in the chat, the department of justice has recently released a Pay For Success initiative solicitation. If you're interested in this topic, we really encourage you to read through that, see if it might be a fit for your partners. And there will be a solicitation webinar on May 4th from 3:00 to 4:00 PM Eastern, where you can learn more and ask the department of justice questions directly on that solicitation. Next slide please. And then for more information about Second Chance month activities, please visit The National Reentry Resource Center website listed here. We want to again, thank the panelists. Thank you, Kelly. Thank you, Gloria. Thank you, Alison. And we hope everyone enjoys the rest of your day. Be well.