



ACCELERATE POLICY AND RESEARCH FOR GREATER IMPACT

An Initiative hosted by the University of Washington's Center for Studies in Demography and Ecology (CSDE) and the Social Science Research Council (SSRC)

FINAL REPORT

Summer 2026



CENTER FOR STUDIES IN DEMOGRAPHY & ECOLOGY
UNIVERSITY of WASHINGTON



SOCIAL
SCIENCE
RESEARCH
COUNCIL

Table of Contents

- Part One: An Overview 3**
 - The Landscape: A Snapshot 3
 - This Initiative: Overview and Approach 3
 - Success and High-Level Take Aways 4
 - Team Acknowledgements and Factors for Success 5
- Part Two: Phase-by-Phase Insights 6**
 - Phase 1: Interested Organizations Submit Research Ideas 6
 - Phase 2: Promising Ideas Selected for Partnerships 7
 - Phase 3: Partner Organizations Connect (Virtually) 8
 - Phase 4: Researchers Selected and Invited to Reach Out to Partners 8
 - Phase 5: Day One In-Person, All Teams 8
 - Phase 6: Researchers Connect (Virtually) 9
 - Phase 7: Day Two In-Person, All Teams 10
- Part Three: From Project Proposal to Final Outcomes 12**
 - Walk About Yakima: Project Summary 12
 - Washington Attorney General’s Office: Project Summary 13
 - Sound Transit: Project Summary 14
 - Build 2 Lead: Project Summary 15
 - Leave & Care Programs, Washington Employment Security Department: Project Summary 16
 - Program Evaluation, Research, and Assessment, Washington Employment Security Department: Project Summary 18
 - Seattle City Light: Project Summary 19
 - Washington State Center for Court Research, Administrative Office of the Courts: Project Summary 20
- Appendix 22**
 - Visual Overview of Our Initiative 23
 - Participating Partners and Projects 24
 - Hosts, Designers, and Facilitators 28
 - The Potential and Pitfalls of Using Research: Our Views 29
 - In-Person Event #1 | Objectives and High-Level Agenda 30
 - In-Person Event #2 | Objectives and High-Level Agenda 31

Part One: An Overview

The Landscape: A Snapshot

Across the nation we've witnessed a heightened demand for evidence-based policy-making and program design. Public-serving organizations recognize the value of research for the success of their programs but are often constrained by limited budget, time, or staff capacity to design and implement that research. Many research funders are interested in supporting applied research that informs policy and practice, but receive too few aligned research proposals.

This Initiative: Overview and Approach

Accelerate Policy and Research for Greater Impact was a response to this landscape, led by the [University of Washington's Center for Studies in Demography and Ecology \(CSDE\)](#), with support and inspiration from the [Social Science Research Council's Public Innovations Program \(SSRC\)](#).

In brief, the Initiative centered leaders of Washington-based, public serving organizations who had ideas for research projects that would benefit from collaboration with UW scholars.

- The initiative began with CSDE's encouragement for public-serving organizations to submit their research project ideas.
- Through a carefully-designed process, CSDE connected researchers to these leaders, helped forge a new path for their research, and advanced the probability of "good fit" matches to potential funders.
- By the end, every selected organization walked away with the building blocks of a strong research project proposal.

We entered this work with the belief that partnerships between public-serving organizations and researchers make good sense for a number of reasons: 1) organizations can leverage their existing data for high-quality (low cost, high impact) research designs; 2) researchers can focus their skills and experience in ways that contribute directly to important policy and program decisions; and 3) funders can maximize the impact of their limited resources.

Throughout the process, we grounded ourselves, and everyone involved, in the following three key hallmarks of our approach:

1. We build partnerships from the very start;
2. Our partners make a mutual effort to understand + trust each other, and to seek co-benefit;
3. Public sector needs and curiosities serve as the starting point for research and guide it throughout.

Success and High-Level Take Aways

This was an incredibly successful initiative that surpassed expectations of participating partners as well as our UW/CSDE lead team! In their final initiative feedback, PSO leaders and research scholars indicated that we had, collectively, gone far in achieving every one of our initial goals for this collaborative effort, as outlined below:

- Enduring relationships built across the public sector and with UW
- Practical insights gained by the researchers and/or by the public-serving leaders
- Research strategies and research questions sharpened through the collaborative approach
- Public-serving organizations advanced in their development of potential research projects
- Teams gained a deeper understanding of the funding landscape

For future initiatives of this type, we offer Below are five cross-cutting take-aways from this initiative's methodology and approach:

- **Partnerships must be designed with flexibility and willingness to live with uncertainty.** Our experience confirmed that it's best to set a path and destination - but be prepared to change course in response to participants' needs.
- **Academic researchers are eager to conduct impactful research.** Most research partners we contacted warmly accepted our invitation with limited information. Their supportive response surpassed our high expectations. They generously shared their time and expertise – and willingly flexed as underlying research priorities of their community partners evolved.
- **Public-serving organizations benefit from networking with *each other* about research.** Participating organizations deeply appreciated getting to know each others' projects and were generous in their mutual support. Simple tools (e.g. our project team overview, in Appendix, and our pre/post meeting materials) and facilitated, cross-project feedback allowed participants to see each other as resources and inspired their collective efforts.
- **The basic components of a Letter of Intent (LoI) was a strong organizing framework for the teams' work together.** We (and they!) were pleasantly surprised at how much progress each team made in just two day-long meetings crafting the key components of an LoI and felt confident that these "building blocks" positioned them well as they took the steps needed for submissions to any funder. *It seems that one more in-person day (3 total) would have allowed them to walk away with a complete draft LoI and a more focused set of potential funders.*
- **Many public-serving organizations need research that is descriptive or predictive - not causal - in nature.** Yet, academic research partnerships and funding opportunities often "direct" them toward causal studies. This disconnect is one to be explored more deeply, in dialogue with potential funders.

Accelerate Policy and Research for Greater Impact is not an isolated initiative; it is part of a broader “movement” in which we are all learning how to fortify partnerships between public-serving organizations and research institutions. We see now, more than ever, the great potential of these initiatives to heighten the well-being of our institutions, organizations, and communities.

Team Acknowledgements and Factors for Success

Below are a few reflections on the composition of the team and how that contributed to the initiative. Most important, however, was every team member’s deep trust in each other and what they brought to the table.

1. UW/CSDE’s large community of research affiliates and strong connections with research funders was essential to the success of the work. This allowed our two team leaders to match practical research ideas from Washington-based, public-serving organizations with UW researchers who have related substantive and methodological expertise.
2. We engaged an expert facilitator to help shape the design of the entire initiative, and each component of it. The consultant’s “learning-centered approach” supported productive dialogue, self-directed progress, and relationship-building.
3. CSDE’s reliable administrative support allowed UW leads and the contracted facilitator to do what they do best.
4. Our SSRC funder served as a supportive thought-partner from the beginning, and offered extremely practical insights into the funding landscape at our final event.
5. UW’s Central Advancement team joined the final event and offered invaluable advice to all participants, while also providing specific advice to individual teams.
6. Participating organizational leaders and UW researchers were generous in

Core Team

Sara Curran, Director of the [Center for Studies in Demography and Ecology \(CSDE\)](#), UW; scurran@uw.edu

Heather D. Hill, Professor and PhD Program Director, Daniel J. Evans School of Public Policy & Governance, UW, CSDE Executive Committee member
hdhill@uw.edu

Maddie Farris, CSDE Program Coordinator, csde-prgm-coord@uw.edu

Valerie Uccellani, [Global Learning Partners](#), Designer and Facilitator, valerie@globallearningpartners.com

Lisa Marshall, Chief of Staff, [Social Science Research Council](#)

moving with us along an uncharted path. We thank them for their incredible wisdom, hard work, and caring hearts. See the Appendix for a list of all participants.

Part Two: Phase-by-Phase Insights

This part of our report presents some of the key ingredients that we believe contributed to each phase of the project. We'd be happy to share more about what didn't work as well but those things were so minor in the scheme of it. We thought it more helpful to you, the reader, to focus on all that went well and might be replicated. Thank you for your interest!

Phase 1: Interested Organizations Submit Research Ideas

At the very start, we...

- Established our core team, roles, and approach..
- Mapped out our entire journey (see Appendix) which allowed us to share and communicate a clear vision.
- Crafted a call for research ideas via a [public-facing page on the CSDE website](#).
 - The page conveyed high-level intentions and key hallmarks of the approach.
 - It demonstrated respect for busy professionals in public-serving organizations by avoiding academic language and simplifying the submission process.
 - Organizations were invited to submit up to 3 research ideas on any topic. (But, to attract projects we felt might be most fundable, we expressed special interest in research related to the criminal legal system, health, public finance, higher education & career pathways, and infrastructure (i.e., housing, transportation, and energy).
 - Applicants were invited to describe the resources they'd bring to the table, commit to dedicated time during the two in-person events, and prioritize what would be most important to them in a research partner. (In some cases, they also named UW researchers they would like to work with, which helped us craft our list of partners.)
- Leveraged our networks of contacts to conduct key informant interviews with stakeholders to see how best to approach outreach and programming. These same networks were tapped into for advertising the call widely through email and newsletters.

As applications started to come in, we...

- Held preliminary conversations with select partners to scope, shape, orient, and manage expectations of the public-serving organizations.
- Tapped into our network of existing relationships with academics who we believed would be a good fit for this work, even before knowing exactly which teams they might work with.

Within several weeks, we received 31 applications (20 government and 11 non-profit).

Phase 2: Promising Ideas Selected for Partnerships

After closing submissions, we...

- Assessed the fit of each research idea for this initiative by applying the following criteria and point system.
 - Relevant to Arnold Ventures' foci 0/1¹
 - Staff commitment to participate 0/1
 - Clear research proposal with connection to decisions about policy and/or practice at the organization 0/1/2
 - Good partner options at UW 0/1/2
 - Alignment with data, disparities, demography (0/1/2)²
- Selected 9 projects to move forward.³
- Communicated promptly in writing to those we determined to be a good fit, reiterating clear expectations for their participation (i.e., a committed team who could attend 1 virtual and 2 in-person events) and inviting their input or questions.
- Communicated promptly, in writing, to those who were not a good fit for this initiative. We explained why they weren't selected and suggested alternative pathways. For example, a number of submissions were better suited to UW student consulting projects and we directed them accordingly.⁴

Before convening the organizations, we...

- Finalized a decision to host the first event in Olympia, closer to state government agencies, and the second event, one month later, on the UW Seattle campus.
- Proactively reached out to our large network of UW scholars to inquire about their interest and fit for the selected projects, selecting candidates we know would welcome our approach to this organization-led partnership.
- Sought valuable input from our partner at the Social Science Research Council;
- Continued to connect with leaders of other, similar efforts so that we could build on their

¹ The support provided by SSRC was provided to seed ideas that could be submitted to Arnold Ventures. At the time of the call, Arnold Ventures' foci were causal (experimental or quasi-experimental) research in health, criminal justice, education and career pathways, public finance, evaluation and evidence, and infrastructure (e.g. housing).

² The support provided by CSDE through an NIH center grant was focused on supporting research that related to using innovative data to conduct demographic research related to disparities.

³ One organization withdrew from the initiative before the meetings because they were no longer going to operate..

⁴ The Daniel J. Evans School [Student Consulting Lab](#) is a program where a team of 3-5 Master of Public Administration (MPA) students work with public, nonprofit, and community-based organizations to tackle real-world policy and management challenges.

lessons learned.

Phase 3: Partner Organizations Connect (Virtually)

During our first convening with the 8 project teams from public-serving organizations, we...

- Signaled the sincerity of our intent to center their needs, motivations and wisdoms;
- Gathered insights into their projects so we could finalize the list of scholars with whom they would be matched;
- Structured opportunities for them to get to know each other's work, and to flag synergies across their projects;
- Generated a picture of the perceived potential and pitfalls of using research to direct their public-serving work. See Appendix for a summary of the Potential and Pitfalls of Using Research - which we presented back to the full group and probed more deeply in a later phase.

Phase 4: Researchers Selected and Invited to Reach Out to Partners

After meeting with organizations, we...

- Finalized the panel of scholars (through outreach into our CSDE community as well as all three UW campuses).
- Facilitated direct one-on-one introductory connections between the research partner and the organization (on their own time, in their own way).
- Asked these UW researchers to take a leap in order to build the relationships that could possibly lead to impactful work (noting the scant information about the projects and potential funding that they would have to work with at the outset).

Before the first in-person event, we...

- Shared a draft set of achievement-based objectives and agenda for our time together (see Appendix);
- Continued to communicate the hallmarks of our approach, to keep this philosophy alive throughout the initiative
- Decided to focus the teams' collaboration on development of key components for a "Letter of Intent" (LoI), and conveyed that intention to the group.
- Crafted practical resources, such as an LoI worksheet, to guide the teams' work during the in-person.
- Created a GitHub to organize resources and a safe online workspace for teams.

Phase 5: Day One In-Person, All Teams

During the event, we...

- Focused on relationship-building in 3 dimensions: Within the organization, between organizational and research partners, and across the organizations.
- Paced ourselves for ample engagement of everyone (over 50 people) and incorporated a mix of team break-outs and dialogue across teams throughout.
- Discouraged the use of screens/ laptops for the first part of the day at least- in order to maximize this rare opportunity to sit face-to-face and learn from each other.
- Maximized team work time - both in the main room and in private spaces to the extent possible.
- Used techniques such as paper covers on all the tables to inspire big picture thinking and visual communication.
- Designated time for project feedback in a very structured and affirming way.

After the event, we...

- Reflected on the feedback we gathered and reflected it back to the group (so they knew they were heard);
- Used the feedback to adjust the design of the rest of the journey and make other key decisions, such as switching our reliance on GitHub, to a less secure but more accessible online space for the teams.
- Planned a virtual session with researchers (which had not been an explicit part of our initial plan but which we knew would be helpful for them as well as for our core team).

Phase 6: Researchers Connect (Virtually)

During the event, we...

- Elicited straightforward input from the scholars on how they felt midway through this collaboration, and how we could make the next phase the most valuable for their team.
- Created an opportunity for the scholars to share concerns or ideas in a safe environment;
- Flagged any special attention that a particular team might need in order to progress well in the next, final phase of the initiative.

After the virtual event with scholars, we...

- Crafted a new set of resources for the public-serving organizations that would support their development of research questions and their focus on the most critical research priorities for their unique context;
- Built out a plan for researchers to “cross-fertilize” (i.e. provide other teams with insights based on their areas of expertise);
- Identified “learning topics” that would be highly relevant across teams (eg. use of administrative data);

- Guided reorganization of 2nd day towards time to work together, structured worksheets, drop-in resources for each group, peer feedback, funding discussions and coaching.
- Sought out the best set of potential guests for event #2 who could 1) offer expertise on topics of interest; and, 2) shed light on the funding landscape.
- Conversated with our invited guests to orient them, before their visit, to the people, projects, progress, and priorities they would encounter.

Phase 7: Day Two In-Person, All Teams

During the event, we...

- Made great use of one large, well-equipped room on the UW campus - as well as several break-out rooms where teams could go for quiet, focused work together.
- Welcomed a select group of guests who provided the group with valuable content and advice - and who demonstrated a strong understanding of the initiatives overarching intentions.
- Provided a short but practical learning opportunity focused on how to build a compelling “why” statement, a meaningful set of research questions, and a do-able methodology.
- Enjoyed a mid-day welcome from Dean Andrea Woody who is the UW’s institutional representative of the Social Science Research Council’s Colleges and Universities Fund.
- Carefully facilitated two cross-feedback sessions in which every team used a simple uniform framework to present the key components of their Lol. Core team leads and visiting guests offered general and tailored guidance not only on the research projects but on possible funding pursuits.

After the event, we...

- Reflected on the final participant feedback (provided via a survey at the close of the event while we still had somewhat of a ‘captive audience.’). Equal numbers of PSO and Researchers responded. The feedback underscored the following:
 - 75% of respondents reported that they had achieved every goal set out for the initiative;
 - All participants valued the protected time and space to gather, in person, for deep conversations and collective learning.

Select Guests

Lisa Marshall, Chief of Staff in the Office of the President, Social Science Research Council

Sumathi Raghavan, Director of Foundation Relations, Central Corporate and Foundation Relations, University of Washington

Jennifer Romich, Director West Coast Poverty Center & Associate Dean, School of Social Work

Andrea Woody, Divisional Dean of the Social Sciences, College of Arts & Sciences, University of Washington

- Some wanted less structure in our days together, but a majority found it very valuable.
- Many would have liked more insights into funding opportunities, but overall the group was grateful for what they learned about funding - from guests, leaders and each other.
- Took final steps to support ongoing work of the teams (85% of whom reported that, yes, they expected to continue to work together even after the formal end of this initiative!)

Part Three: From Project Proposal to Final Outcomes

The following project summaries share a snapshot about each initial project proposal and the final outcomes resulting from the Initiative.

Walk About Yakima: Project Summary

General Information

Initial Research Idea	<i>Develop a comprehensive and rigorous system for measuring impact of dialectical behavioral theory (DBT) instruction.</i>
Research Partners	<i>Walk about Yakima: Sam Decker (sam.decker@cpcocw.org), Alfredo Orozco, Carolyn Thruston University of Washington: Ali Rowhani-Rahbar, School of Public Health</i>

Drafted Letter of Intent Components

Why

Describe the significance of this research and why it matters to the work of the organization.

Youth and young adults are disproportionately affected by firearm violence in Yakima, particularly Latino/Hispanic and gang-involved populations. We want to expand the evidence base for the effectiveness of our program model in reducing the rate of firearm violence at the city level and individual level, both to expand the reach of our program and provide a treatment model that could be implemented by other regions experiencing similar firearm violence problems.

What

List the primary research questions this project aims to address.

- 1. Does the WAY treatment model lower the overall rate of firearm violence in Yakima?*
- 2. For individuals, does the WAY treatment model result in positive intermediate outcomes related to the theory of change?*

How

Describe the proposed methods, approaches, or strategies for addressing the research questions.

Group level analysis: synthetic control and interrupted time series approach. Obtain high level firearm violence data to compare across regions and time periods.

Individual level analysis: longitudinal analysis and theory-based contribution analysis. Look at individual change over time for firearm violence, legal system involvement, and intermediate outcomes.

Washington Attorney General's Office: Project Summary

General Information

Initial Research Idea	<i>Understand geographic access to sexual assault forensic exams.</i>
Research Partners	<i>Washington Attorney General's Office: Lauren Vlas (lauren.vlas@atg.wa.gov), Kyra Laughlin, & Katherine Thompson University of Washington: Avanti Adhia (School of Public Health), Alice Ellyson (School of Medicine), and Jessica Godwin (Center for Studies in Demography & Ecology)</i>

Drafted Letter of Intent Components

Why

Describe the significance of this research and why it matters to the work of the organization.

There are critical gaps in existing structures for forensic exams that are not meeting survivor needs (e.g., access, quality). There is no broad state-level compilation of information on access to and quality of forensic exams which is needed to ensure long-term viability of survivor services.

What

List the primary research questions this project aims to address.

- 1. Where are forensic exams available in Washington state?*
- 2. What are the wait and travel times for a survivor to receive a forensic exam?*

How

Describe the proposed methods, approaches, or strategies for addressing the research questions.

Primary data collection using surveys of primary points of contact for each forensic exam program across Washington state

Primary data collection from Crime Victim Compensation Program: Sexual Assault Exam Report / Domestic Violence Strangulation Report Forms (F800-098-000)

Descriptive, INTERACTIVE mapping and small area estimation of the availability of forensic exams, as well as exam and wait travel times, at multiple geographic scales, e.g. counties, jurisdictions, healthcare systems, across the state of Washington.

Sound Transit: Project Summary

General Information

Initial Research Idea	<i>Effects of uniformed fare staff on tapping and fare payment on LINK light rail.</i>
Research Partners	<i>Sound Transit: Juliana Borges (juliana.borges@soundtransit.org), Daniel Thiel, & Rebeca de Buen Kalman University of Washington: Cynthia Chen (College of Engineering) & Kyle Crowder (College of Arts & Sciences)</i>

Drafted Letter of Intent Components

Why

Describe the significance of this research and why it matters to the work of the organization.

Increasing fare compliance is crucial for assuring the financial stability of mass transit systems. There currently exists little scientific consensus on the strategies / interventions that are most effective in increasing fare compliance

What

List the primary research questions this project aims to address.

1. *What interventions are most effective in increasing fare compliance? (e.g., fare gates, fare ambassador personnel deployments)*
2. *What are the secondary impacts of these interventions on: Safety/security, and rider perceptions of safety, Passenger support (information, ADA, wayfinding, etc.), and accessibility?*
3. *What methods can accurately measure fare compliance? (e.g., trained CCTV that can estimate compliance)*

How

Describe the proposed methods, approaches, or strategies for addressing the research questions.

(Quasi-)experimental design to compare effectiveness of three interventions: Mobile pay stations, Fare gates (14 stations to be deployed with fare gates), and fare ambassadors. Measurement of fare compliance (a difficult issue): Using existing data sources: farebox revenue, APC data, and ORCA data; develop computer vision strategies to utilize existing CCTV footage. Validate this with data on ORCA taps for specific location? Ground truth using data on the number of riders and the number tapping cards collected by students?

Build 2 Lead: Project Summary

General Information

Initial Research Idea	<i>Evaluate youth-centered workforce pathways to behavioral health.</i>
Research Partners	<i>Build 2 Lead: Jimmy Brown (jbrown@build2lead.org), Dairyona Thompson, & Najmah Messiah University of Washington: Kristian Jones (School of Social Work) & LaTonya Trotter (School of Medicine)</i>

Drafted Letter of Intent Components

Why

Describe the significance of this research and why it matters to the work of the organization.

Lack of diverse representation in behavioral health careers leads to less culturally relevant & competent care. There are barriers to entry into these careers associated with cost & time, which disproportionately affect BIPOC & economically disadvantaged communities.

What

List the primary research questions this project aims to address.

- 1. Does exposure to health fields through Build2Lead programming change access and entry into health careers?*

How

Describe the proposed methods, approaches, or strategies for addressing the research questions.

*Examining current qualitative & quantitative data that Build 2 Lead already has.
Conducting a qualitative study w/ past participants centered on access & exposure impact in healthcare and behavioral health fields.
Providing surveys to community healthcare providers on biggest gaps in healthcare workforce.*

Leave & Care Programs, Washington Employment Security Department: Project Summary

General Information

Initial Research Idea	<i>Impact of paid caregiving leave on care recipients' and caregivers' health and wellbeing</i>
Research Partners	<i>Washington Employment Security Department: Rebecca Grady (rebecca.grady@esd.wa.gov), Selin Karabulut, & Katherine Geist University of Washington: Stipica Mudrazija (School of Public Health), Melissa Knox (College of Arts & Sciences), Tracy Mroz (School of Medicine), & Jing Li (School of Pharmacy)</i>

Drafted Letter of Intent Components

Why

Describe the significance of this research and why it matters to the work of the organization.

Goal: Demonstrate how a collaboration between researchers, health systems and state agency informs evidence based policy making. Case study: What is the value of WA PFML on the wellbeing of Washington youth outcomes?

What

List the primary research questions this project aims to address.

- 1. What are the demographic and health characteristics of families with a child with a serious medical condition based on Paid Leave program eligibility (e.g., 820 hours)?*
- 2. Among those who are eligible, who takes leave vs who doesn't?*
- 3. How does taking leave affect child wellbeing Including health (e.g., hospital readmission and ER visits) and educational outcomes (e.g., school attendance)?*
- 4. How would a decrease in the eligibility requirement (820 hours) change eligibility for caregivers?*

How

Describe the proposed methods, approaches, or strategies for addressing the research questions.

Partner with Kaiser Permanente WA (KPW) to KPW patient records and link to WA Paid Leave data to determine health qualifying event and program eligibility. Create statistical models that simulate possible Paid Leave expansion for families who are just under the threshold on WA youth outcomes.

Program Evaluation, Research, and Assessment, Washington Employment Security Department: Project Summary

General Information

Initial Research Idea	<i>Evaluation of workforce development programs for justice-impacted individuals.</i>
Research Partners	<i>Washington Employment Security Department: Olga Kondratjeva, Morgen Johansen, & Ying Liu University of Washington: Michael Shultz (Evans School of Public Policy and Governance), Rachel Erstad (College of Arts & Sciences), & Sofia Ayala (Center for Studies in Demography & Ecology)</i>

Drafted Letter of Intent Components

Why

Describe the significance of this research and why it matters to the work of the organization.

Workforce data and corrections data exist in different worlds. Some efforts to integrate the data but focus on wages and industry, or small surveys. Interested in the occupational destination of formerly incarcerated individuals. We need basic descriptive data to define problem: challenges of workforce outcomes. There is a lot of ambiguousness about how to prepare people for reentry, what training programs to direct them to, etc

What

List the primary research questions this project aims to address.

- 1. What are the occupational destinations and wages one year after release?*
- 2. How do these differ by type of offense and length of incarceration, and by race/ethnicity, education/training, type of employer (small/large) or self-employment?*

How

Describe the proposed methods, approaches, or strategies for addressing the research questions.

*Reach out to the Department of Corrections (DOC) research group and develop a partnership between DOC, ESD, and UW. Expand current data sharing agreements between ESD and DOC related to PROWD evaluation project. Small pilot grant to demonstrate feasibility
Deliverable: research briefs that demonstrate the value of the relationship, untap potential of what occupations.*

Seattle City Light: Project Summary

General Information

Initial Research Idea	<i>Understand both demand and supply side value of distributed renewable energy and design new rates and incentives to encourage adoption.</i>
Research Partners	<i>Seattle City Light: Traea Vaillancourt (traea.vaillancourt@seattle.gov), Alex Porteshawver, Tarney Sheldon University of Washington: Patrick Greiner (College of Arts & Sciences) & June Lukuyu (College of Engineering)</i>

Drafted Letter of Intent Components

Why

Describe the significance of this research and why it matters to the work of the organization.

Distributed renewable energy improves local climate and environmental outcomes and drives reductions in individuals' and business' financial energy burdens, but access to and adoption of renewable energy programs and technologies has been inequitably distributed and therefore constrained in the Seattle area. We want to understand the extent and drivers of inequitable adoption so that we can construct a flexible, context-specific policy analysis framework to inform more inclusive utility program and incentive design and decision-making.

What

List the primary research questions this project aims to address.

- 1. What role have various, existing rate setting and solar adoption incentive programs played in increasing the rate of solar uptake and/or generating disproportionate access to solar electricity production technologies?*

2. Which of the existing policy approaches and programs offer a meaningful way to advance the goal of solar adoption while maximizing access to these critical, emergent technologies?

How

Describe the proposed methods, approaches, or strategies for addressing the research questions.

We will conduct a spatio-temporal time series analysis of energy burden outcomes aggregated at the census tract level in 3 to 5 year increments. We will use socio economic, building stock, income and billing data from the SCL service territory and also zoom out across WA state.

Washington State Center for Court Research, Administrative Office of the Courts: Project Summary

General Information

Initial Research Idea	<i>Understand the representativeness of local jury source lists and how the process of jury recruitment affects that representativeness.</i>
Research Partners	<i>WA Center for Court Research: Patrizia Chirco (patrizia.chirco@courts.wa.gov), Karl Jones, Frank Thomas University of Washington: Karin Martin (Evans School of Public Policy & Governance) & Danieli Evans (School of Law)</i>

Drafted Letter of Intent Components

Why

Describe the significance of this research and why it matters to the work of the organization.

Representative juries are important to the legitimacy and fairness of jury verdicts. Jurors assess evidence in light of their own cultural experiences and biases, and when jurors are not representative of a party's community, that party is judged according to perceptions, understandings, norms, and values that may differ from their own community values and understandings. This undermines the legitimacy of the jury process—which depends on being judged by one's peers. Participating in jury service is also an important site of civic engagement and political participation. However, not everyone in Washington state has a

fair opportunity to participate on a jury, or to be judged by a jury that is representative of their own cultural and social community [or identity?]. Preliminary analyses suggest that there are demographic disparities between the population within a given jurisdiction/census tract/county/etc. and the population within the same jurisdiction that is mailed jury summonses. Preliminary analyses show that people who are White are overrepresented among those who are mailed summonses relative to their proportion within the population within that jurisdiction/census tract/county/etc. The purpose of this project is to understand whether and to what extent the process that courts use to mail summonses causes White people to be overrepresented in the population that is mailed a summons, relative to the local population.

What

List the primary research questions this project aims to address.

- 1. How representative of their county's population is the Master list that individual courts create based on the state's source list and use to create summonses lists?*
- 2. How representative of the local population are the summonses lists that counties use to generate jury pools?*

How

Describe the proposed methods, approaches, or strategies for addressing the research questions.

*Link Master file and summonses files with Census and other data held at NWFSRDC
Compare demographic data on master list with demographic data on summoning list. This will tell us if the summoning list is less racially diverse than the maser list. This would be an indicator of whether bias is being injected by the algorithm that creates the summoning list from the master list.
Because neither the master list nor summoning list include demographic data, to do this would require matching individuals on the master list and summoning list with individual level demographic information from Census/NWFSRDC/schools.*

Appendix

Visual Overview of Our Initiative

Accelerating Policy and Research for Greater Impact



An Initiative Hosted by the Center for Studies in Demography and Ecology (CSDE) at the University of Washington (UW)

Participating Partners and Projects

Public-Serving Organization	Team Members
<p>Washington State Center for Court Research, Administrative Office of the Courts</p> <p><i>Project Proposal: Understand geographic access to sexual assault forensic exams.</i></p>	<p><i>PSO Partners:</i></p> <p>Patrizia Chirco, patrizia.chirco@courts.wa.gov</p> <p>Karl Jones, karl.jones@courts.wa.gov</p> <p>Frank Thomas, frank.thomas@courts.wa.gov</p> <p><i>UW Partners:</i></p> <p>Karin Martin, kdmartin@uw.edu - Evans School of Public Affairs and Governance</p> <p>Danieli Evans, devans6@uw.edu - Law School</p>
<p>Washington Attorney General’s Office</p> <p><i>Project Proposal:</i></p>	<p><i>PSO Partners:</i></p> <p>Lauren Vlas, lauren.vlas@atg.wa.gov</p> <p><i>UW Partners:</i></p> <p>Avanti Adhia, aadhia@uw.edu - School of Public Health</p> <p>Alice Ellyson, aellyson@uw.edu - School of Public Health</p> <p>Jessica Godwin, jlg0003@uw.edu - Center for Studies in Demography & Ecology</p>

Public-Serving Organization	Team Members
<p>Program Evaluation, Research, and Assessment, Washington Employment Security Department</p> <p><i>Project proposal: Evaluation of workforce development programs for justice-impacted individuals.</i></p>	<p><i>PSO Partners:</i></p> <p>Olga Kondratjeva, olga.kondratjeva@esd.wa.gov</p> <p>Morgen Johansen, morgen.johansen@esd.wa.gov</p> <p>Ying Liu, ying.liu@esd.wa.gov</p> <p><i>UW Partners:</i></p> <p>Michael Schulz, msch22@uw.edu - Evans School of Public Policy & Governance</p> <p>Rachel Erstad, rerstad@uw.edu - Harry Bridges Center for Labor Studies</p> <p>Sofia Ayala, sgayala@uw.edu - Center for Studies in Demography & Ecology</p>
<p>Walk about Yakima, Community Peace Center of Central Washington</p> <p><i>Project proposal: Develop a comprehensive and rigorous system for measuring impact of dialectical behavioral theory (DBT) instruction.</i></p>	<p><i>PSO Partners:</i></p> <p>Sam Decker, sam.decker@cpcocw.org</p> <p>Alfredo Orozco, alfredo.orozco@cpcocw.org</p> <p>Carolyn Thurston, carolyn.thurston@cpcocw.org</p> <p><i>UW Partners:</i></p> <p>Ali Rowhani-Rahbar, rowhani@uw.edu - School of Public Health</p>

Public-Serving Organization	Team Members
<p>Build 2 Lead</p> <p><i>Project Proposal: Evaluate youth-centered workforce pathways to behavioral health.</i></p>	<p><i>PSO Partners:</i></p> <p>Jimmy Brown, jbrown@build2lead.org</p> <p>Dairyona Thompson, dthompson@build2lead.org</p> <p>Najmah Messiah, najmah.messiah900@commonspirit.org</p> <p><i>UW Partners:</i></p> <p>Kristian Jones, kjones21@uw.edu - School of Social Work</p> <p>LaTonya Trotter, ltrotter@uw.edu - School of Medicine</p>
<p>Leave and Care Programs, Washington Employment Security Department</p> <p><i>Project Proposal: Impact of paid caregiving leave on care recipients' and caregivers' health and wellbeing</i></p>	<p><i>PSO Partners:</i></p> <p>Rebecca Grady, rebecca.grady@esd.wa.gov</p> <p>Selin Karabulut, selin.karabulut@esd.wa.gov</p> <p>Katherine (Katie) Geist, katherine.geist@esd.wa.gov</p> <p><i>UW Partners:</i></p> <p>Stipica Mudrazija, smudrazi@uw.edu - School of Public Health</p> <p>Melissa Knox, knoxm@uw.edu - College of Arts & Sciences</p> <p>Tracy Mroz, tmroz@uw.edu - School of Medicine</p> <p>Jing Li, jli0321@uw.edu - School of Pharmacy</p>

Public-Serving Organization	Team Members
<p>Sound Transit</p> <p><i>Project Proposal: Effects of uniformed fare staff on tapping and fare payment on LINK light rail.</i></p>	<p><i>PSO Partners:</i></p> <p>Juliana Borges, juliana.borges@soundtransit.org</p> <p>Daniel Thiel, daniel.thiel@soundtransit.org</p> <p>Rebeca DeBuen, rebeca.debuen@soundtransit.org</p> <p><i>UW Partners:</i></p> <p>Cynthia Chen, gzchen@uw.edu - College of Engineering</p> <p>Kyle Crowder, kylecrow@uw.edu - College of Arts & Sciences</p>
<p>Seattle City Light</p>	<p><i>PSO Partners:</i></p> <p>Traea Vaillancourt, traea.vaillancourt@seattle.gov</p> <p>Alex Porteshawver, alex.porteshawver@seattle.gov</p> <p>Tarney Sheldon, tarney.sheldon@seattle.gov</p> <p><i>UW Partners:</i></p> <p>Patrick Greiner, ptgrein@uw.edu - College of Arts & Sciences</p> <p>June Lukuyu, jlukuyu@uw.edu - College of Engineering</p>

Hosts, Designers, and Facilitators

1. Sara Curran, Director of the [Center for Studies in Demography and Ecology \(CSDE\)](#) , UW; scurran@uw.edu
2. Heather D. Hill, Professor and PhD Program Director, Daniel J. Evans School of Public Policy & Governance, UW, hdhill@uw.edu
3. Maddie Farris, CSDE Program Coordinator, csde-prgm-coord@uw.edu
4. Valerie Uccellani, [Global Learning Partners](#), Designer and Facilitator, valerie@globallearningpartners

The Potential and Pitfalls of Using Research: Our Views

At our kick-off event in March 2026, we asked the project leaders: *What do you love and hate about using research to inform your work?* Your responses are organized below. In this project, we will work together to **maximize its potential** and **minimize the pitfalls**.

Potential

New and unexpected discoveries / Insights that you did not expect before

The people

The overall process of research

It gives us a foundation to build on

Opportunities to bridge types of knowledge / Galvanize community

Can provide communities with access and exposure to the power of research / Amplifying the voices of people who often don't get a voice in policy

How research opens up more questions/ Challenge our assumptions

The infinite variety

It can tell important stories / Research as a story-telling tool

Affirmation of the power and effectiveness of our work / Getting data that proves what we do is effective

Research focuses efforts on change / It can help us make good decisions that support people

Pitfalls

Political pushback

How conflicting it can be at times

When decision-makers don't understand research and treat it suspiciously

Sometimes slow pace / Time / The amount of time it takes to see real results - when funders want results immediately / Demand for quick answers

It takes so long for credible qualitative data to make it into the "evidence-based" publications

Difficult access to tools and resources / Data accessibility

Sometimes not meaningfully disaggregated

Different data sources

Logistics like data-sharing agreements / Navigating data sharing agreements and legal considerations

Inability for research to holistically address the problem, need, or solution

Disconnect between people and systems (distrust) - takes time and effort to build a collaboration

In-Person Event #1 | Objectives and High-Level Agenda

By the end of our day together, we will have:

- Built connections with other Washington-based leaders and researchers, all of whom are dedicated to collaboration for greater impact
- Advanced and sharpened the vision for your team's research project
- Gathered input to make the research project even stronger
- Narrowed in on the kind of research guidance/ support that would best serve your team and project
- Clarified and refined our path forward together

8:30 am | **PART ONE | Connections** [full group]

- Welcome, Coffee + Settle In
- Our Collective Force
- Leveraging the Potential of Research Partnerships

PART TWO | Our Projects [in teams]

- Begin with the End in Mind
- Digging into the Big Questions
- Gathering What You've Got

12:30-1:15 pm | LUNCH

PART THREE | Feedback and Insights [cross teams]

- What's really working here?
- What's unclear?
- What's essential?

PART FOUR | The Path Forward [in teams]

- Pursuing the Big Questions
- Deciding What's Next

4:00 pm

CLOSING [full group]

In-Person Event #2 | Objectives and High-Level Agenda

By the end of our May event, you will have:

- Deepened connections with other Washington-based leaders and researchers, all of whom are dedicated to collaboration for greater impact
- Refined answers to key questions about your research project
- Examined some trends and priorities among various potential funders
- Explored a research-related topic of interest to you
- Finalized your draft Letter of Intent (as time allows)

8:30 | Welcome, Coffee + Settle In

9:00 am | Opening [Full group]

- Inspiration from Lisa Marshall, Chief of Staff, [Social Science Research Council](#)
- The Funding Landscape - A Conversation
- Your Personalized Plan for the Today
- Resources and Guidance (in our [shared google folder](#) and in GitHub)
 - Guide to Research Question Development
 - Data Collection Table - Template + Example
 - Your Letter of Intent - Template + Example

9:45 | Jump In [Teams]

- Re-ground your Research Project
- Finalize your Research Questions
- [Begin the path toward your end-of-day presentation.]

10:45 ish | BREAK

11:00 | Consult and Synthesize [Full group / Teams]

- Merging + Using Admin. Data (Jennie)
- Northwest Federal Statistical Research Data Center (Sofia)
- Heather, Lisa or Sara - funding landscape, research design etc.
 - Many others!
 - [Capture your thinking in the Presentation Template.]

12:30 | Convene [Full group]

- Appreciation and encouragement from [Andrea Woody, Divisional Dean of Social Sciences, UW College of Arts and Sciences](#).
- Identify your team's after-lunch priorities

12:45-1:30 pm | LUNCH

1:30 - 3:30 | Present and Plan [Full group / Teams]

- Another Look at the Funding Landscape: [Sumathi Raghavan, Director of Foundation Relations, UW](#)).
- Rotating presentations with Input
 - Why: 2 compelling statements
 - What: Priority research questions
 - How: High-Level Plans for Research Approach

3:30-4:00 pm | Pull it Together [Teams]

- Your Letter of Intent
- Next Steps for Your Team

4:00-4:30 pm | Close [Full group]

- Your Feedback
- Thanks from UW

Closing Reflections and Celebration

