

The New Mexico Results First Model



Charles Sallee
Deputy Director
New Mexico Legislative Finance Committee

National Conference of State Legislatures
August 2012

LFC Background and Overview

- Established in 1957
- Performance audit function brought to LFC in 1991 (previously at Office of the State Auditor)
- Only 10 other legislatures have some degree of “joint responsibility” with the executive for budget development; only one of these states also conducts program evaluations as part of its budget office’s main duties.

Program Evaluation of the New Mexico Corrections Department

- Program Evaluation
 - In June the LFC issued a report dealing with ways to reduce recidivism, cut costs and improve public safety in the incarceration and supervision of adult offenders.
 - The New Mexico Results First Model was implemented in conjunction with this program evaluation with assistance from Results First, a project of the Pew Center on the States and the MacArthur Foundation.
- Key Finding Related to the New Mexico Results First Model
 - Evidence based programs in New Mexico have been cut while non-evidence based programs have been expanded.
 - **Through the New Mexico Results First model, the LFC was able to put a price tag on cuts to evidence-based programs and estimate potential savings in recidivism reduction.**
 - Reducing recidivism by 10 percent in one year could save \$8.3 million in prison costs alone and could reduce victimization costs by an estimated \$40 million.

Process for Data Collection and TA

- LFC staff held meetings with agencies responsible for providing data.
- Received guidance on potential timelines for milestone accomplishments and data collection from Results First TA along with assistance with data requests and analysis.
- Data requests to agencies were made early on in the project.

Model Implementation

- Two LFC staff worked on model implementation.
- Data for a seven year cohort from the corrections department was used in the model to examine six evidence based programs.
- Data from five state agencies and other sources were broken out across seven crime types for the following categories.
 - Marginal operating and capital costs for police, courts, prosecutors, supervision, jail and prison.
 - Probability of resource use (e.g. prison, supervision, jail, etc).
- The New Mexico Results First model was implemented in approximately 8 months.

Results

- Six evidence-based programs currently existing in New Mexico were entered into the model.
- The model assumes all programs are delivered with fidelity which is not always the case (example Therapeutic Communities).
- All programs show a positive benefit to cost ratio with differing returns on investment.

Monetary Benefits and Costs of Evidence-Based Public Policies in New Mexico (Per Participant)

Program	Taxpayer Benefits	Total Benefits (Taxpayer + Victims)	Costs	Benefits Minus Costs (net present value)	Benefit to Cost Ratio	Rate of Return on Investment	Measure of Risk (odds of a positive net present value)
Adult Education	\$3,043	\$18,952	\$627	\$18,325	\$30.22	421%	99%
Cognitive Behavioral Programs	\$1,571	\$10,033	\$523	\$9,510	\$19.20	278%	99%
Corrections Industries	\$1,090	\$7,080	\$0	\$7,080	\$7,080	N/A	99%
2nd Judicial District Drug Court (Adult)	\$3,285	\$20,336	\$3,205	\$17,131	\$6.35	103%	99%
Drug Treatment In Prison (Therapeutic Communities)	\$2,319	\$15,371	\$3,233	\$12,138	\$4.77	79%	99%
Vocational Education in Prison	\$2,881	\$18,525	\$1,171	\$17,354	\$15.89	234%	99%

Next Steps

- LFC staff will be meeting with agency leadership and members of the executive policy team to further discuss model results and utility.
- The LFC will be holding a meeting with the agency responsible for child welfare and juvenile justice to request data for the next iteration of the model.
- Focus on promoting expansion of what works (evidence-based programming) supporting the LFC mission of improved performance and effective allocation of resources.

Lessons Learned

- Some of the data needed for the model had quality issues or was unavailable.
 - Making data requests early on is important to allow for time to conduct analysis and request follow-up data pulls.
- We cannot let the perfect be the enemy of the good.
 - Workarounds are likely inevitable depending on the data availability and Pew Center on the States TA is valuable in assisting.
- New tools are often accompanied with skepticism.
 - Continued clear communication is key.

Contact Information



Charles Sallee, Deputy Director
(505) 986-4528
charles.sallee@nmlegis.gov

Jon Courtney, Program Evaluator III
(505) 986-4539
jon.courtney@nmlegis.gov

Reports: <http://www.nmlegis.gov/lcs/lfc/lfcprogevalall.aspx>