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We need better accountability information...now

- Our governments face incredible fiscal pressures
  - Trillion-dollar federal deficits
  - States have faced over $500 billion in shortfalls since Great Recession
  - Local governments face ongoing property value reductions
- There is a critical need for better ways to triage spending
Results First

• Uses cost-benefit analysis to identify and compare the return on investment programs generate for citizens

• Enables states to identify policy choices that can maximize outcomes AND reduce costs

• Can assess individual programs as well as portfolios of related policies
Approach in a nutshell

1. Aggregate best national research to identify evidence-based programs that are effective

2. Estimate these programs’ impact if implemented in a state, based on the state’s population characteristics

3. Use the state’s fiscal data to predict total costs and benefits for each program

Result: Predicted state-specific return on investment for each program
### Example: Functional Family Therapy
*(Washington State 2010 dollars)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits Per Family</th>
<th>Main Source of Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduced crime</td>
<td>Lower state &amp; victim costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced health care costs</td>
<td>Lower public costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased high school graduation</td>
<td>Increased earnings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Benefits Per Family</strong></td>
<td><strong>$37,739</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost Per Family</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,190</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Present Value</strong></td>
<td><strong>$34,549</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benefits Per Dollar of Cost</strong></td>
<td><strong>$11.86</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Addendum (distribution of benefits)**

$3,599 = Benefits to participant
$8,336 = Benefits to taxpayers
$21,636 = Benefits to others (crime victims)
$4,167 = Other benefits

Source: Washington State Institute for Public Policy
Model can rank programs in “Consumer Reports” lists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy/Program</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Net Long-term Benefits</th>
<th>Cost/Benefit Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative drug sentencing</td>
<td>$1,511</td>
<td>$26,502</td>
<td>$18.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional education in prison</td>
<td>$1,102</td>
<td>$18,821</td>
<td>$18.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational education in prison</td>
<td>$1,537</td>
<td>$17,547</td>
<td>$12.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community drug treatment</td>
<td>$2,102</td>
<td>$13,317</td>
<td>$7.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental health court</td>
<td>$2,878</td>
<td>$11,352</td>
<td>$4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive behavioral therapy</td>
<td>$217</td>
<td>$10,524</td>
<td>$49.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work release</td>
<td>$649</td>
<td>$5,817</td>
<td>$9.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JUVENILE PROGRAMS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression replacement training</td>
<td>$1,473</td>
<td>$66,481</td>
<td>$45.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug court</td>
<td>$3,024</td>
<td>$9,713</td>
<td>$4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination of services</td>
<td>$386</td>
<td>$4,884</td>
<td>$13.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scared Straight</td>
<td>$63</td>
<td>-$6,095</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Washington State Institute for Public Policy
Long-term success in Washington State

- Developed by Washington State Institute for Public Policy
- Washington has used model for many years to help achieve better outcomes at lower costs in many policy areas
  - Example – criminal justice: Washington State has avoided $1.3 billion per biennium AND achieved a lower crime rate
Keeping track of results: juvenile arrest rates

Change since 1990 in the United States and in Washington State

In 2000, Washington begins evidence-based juvenile justice programs.

In 2003, Washington begins full fidelity implementation.

Washington State 67% lower

United States 49% lower

Source: Washington State Institute for Public Policy
Policy areas in current model

- Child Welfare
- Criminal Justice
- Housing
- Mental Health

- Pre-K-12 Education
- Prevention
- Public Health
- Substance Abuse
Results First services to states

• Provide model
• Train staff in the approach and provide ongoing technical assistance
• Help interpret results for policy makers
• Compile and share lessons learned among participating states
• Continue to expand and update model
• Provide all services free to participating states
Two key implementation goals

• Gather and analyze the data needed to operate the model and produce reports

• Link the results to the state’s budget and policy process so legislators can consider them during the legislative session
Two teams needed for implementation

• Policy team
  • Key policy makers and their staff
  • Guides implementation and helps link results to policy and budget process

• Staff team
  • Includes designated project manager and analysts
  • Collects and analyzes data and operates model
States are using different approaches

- Key requirements for staff teams
  - Viewed as an honest broker
  - Access to data/technical skills
  - Access to policy makers

- Placement for current states
  - Legislative: Fiscal / Program Evaluation / Research Office (NM, TX, VT)
  - Hybrids / other entities: interagency groups (CT, IL); good government nonprofit (FL)
  - Executive: Office of Public Safety (MA, NY, OR); Department of Corrections (IA, ID, KS)
State examples

- New Mexico
  - Legislative Finance Committee, Department of Corrections, and NM Sentencing Commission staff
  - Reducing Recidivism, Cutting Costs and Improving Public Safety in the Incarceration and Supervision of Adult Offenders (June 2012)

- Iowa
  - Public Safety Advisory Board and Department of Corrections
  - Iowa Results First: Return on Investment for Corrections Programs – 2012 (May 2012)
Informing policy

- New Mexico
  - Identifying gaps in reporting for community-based programs
  - Identifying programs that should receive priority funding
- Iowa
  - DOC budget request
  - Modeling mandatory minimum sentencing changes for drug offenses
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