

Appendix A: Qualitative Data Methods and Analysis

The JohnJayREC team utilized a mixed-methods approach for this evaluation. The team drew upon a wide variety of sources to understand what BOGAP is and the outcomes of BOGAP participants. As part of this, the team conducted interviews with program participants, staff, participants' loved ones, and the Bronx District Attorney's Office. Only BOGAP participants and their loved ones received an incentive payment for taking part in an interview. Researchers also observed court and program proceedings.

Interviews with BOGAP Staff Members

The team attempted to interview current BOGAP staff at three points in the project – Fall 2023, Fall 2024, and Summer 2025. The first wave of interviews focused on describing the program, interactions with participants, and program facilitation. Staff described BOGAP's strengths, the program's challenges, and their recommendations. The second wave of interviews in Fall 2024 builds on themes from the first wave, with more in-depth discussions of recurring topics such as participant engagement. Staff also reflected on program changes since BOGAP's launch and shared additional insights from their evolving experiences. The third wave asked staff to reflect on BOGAP and the curricula they used. The faculty specialists conducted the interviews via Zoom video.

Osborne helped the research team identify the current roster of BOGAP staff for each interview wave. The research team extended the interview opportunity to all staff at each wave, emphasizing that participation was voluntary. Osborne did not require staff to take part in the 45-minute interviews.

Interviews with BOGAP Participants

The research team conducted a set of interviews with active BOGAP participants in the Summer and Fall of 2025. Participants were recruited as a convenience sample by BOGAP staff from the most advanced cohorts available at the time. These interviews focused on participants' experiences with BOGAP and complement the surveys offered to all participants. Participants had an opportunity to speak about their time in the program, the program's impact on the larger community, employment, and their recommendations for BOGAP.

The research team conducted these interviews in person at the Osborne offices during BOGAP program hours in a private area away from other participants and staff. Participants were paid \$35 to take part in approximately 30-minute interviews and were eligible to complete only one. Osborne did not require participants to take part in interviews.

Interviews with Loved Ones of BOGAP Participants

The research team hoped to speak with other individuals who were close to BOGAP participants and would likely be invested in their success. Interviewees could be parents or other family members, romantic partners, or anyone the participant felt met the interview criteria.

Researchers hoped to gain insight into how those around participants might perceive program effects, and to hear what they thought made BOGAP effective.

The research team shared information about the interview opportunity with BOGAP participants in person and through the evaluation survey. Participants were invited to share the opportunity with their loved ones. The team also intended to conduct focus groups with loved ones, but due to low interest, the study included only individual interviews. Ultimately, only two individuals scheduled interviews.

Interviews with Bronx District Attorney Staff

Researchers conducted a series of interviews with staff from the Bronx District Attorney's office, focusing on those most directly involved with BOGAP. The team sought to understand how BOGAP was conceptualized, the criteria for BOGAP referral, staff reactions to BOGAP, and the program's future direction. The team asked the Bronx DA research team to help identify potential interview participants, who were then invited directly. The research team conducted single and double interviews via Zoom, as preferred by the staff.

Court Observations

Researchers attended public court sessions to observe BOGAP participants in their monthly court hearings. In coordination with the BOGAP program coordinator and the court liaison, the team prioritized observing participants' final hearings when their charges could be dismissed. Other hearings were observed as feasible, including routine hearings while individuals were at various stages in the program. The team also attended one BOGAP program session during a site visit by staff from the federal Bureau of Justice Assistance, during which program staff facilitated a group discussion. The purpose of each observation was to see BOGAP in action and provide context for other data collection.

Analysis of Qualitative Data

The research team systematically reviewed all interview transcripts to identify key themes related to BOGAP's development and implementation, its strengths and challenges, and opportunities for improvement. Using a structured approach, researchers organized responses into categories aligned with each interview topic and noted any new ideas that emerged during the conversation. Multiple members of the research team confirmed the topics and summarized the findings at the aggregate and de-identified level to protect interviewee confidentiality.

Qualitative interviews provided rich insight into program operations, participant engagement, and implementation. Preliminary analysis and data collection occurred concurrently, allowing the team to share interim observations from staff interviews with Osborne and to inform future program decisions before the end of the evaluation.

Illustrative quotes were identified during analysis and included in the report to illustrate key points and provide additional insight into the program. Quotations were not attributed to individual speakers to reduce the risk of identification. Any quotations appearing in the final report were edited for clarity and brevity while preserving the individuals' original meaning. The results reflect the perspectives and experiences of individuals connected with BGOAP rather than supporting causal or generalizable claims about gun-diversion or other ATI programs.