A CT Results First
Project Update:
Juvenile Justice Perspective
Overview of Results First Initiative

History of CT Results First
  - Model components – cost estimates; programs; recidivism cohorts

Juvenile Parole Recidivism Study Process
  - Populations; Data management; Definitions and Measures
  - Next Steps

Juvenile Justice Reinvestment in CT?
Overview of Results First Initiative
March 10, 2011

Mr. Gary VanLandingham, Director, Results First
Pew Center on the States
The Pew Charitable Trusts
901 E. Street NW, 10th Fl.
Washington, D.C. 20004

Dear Mr. VanLandingham:

The State of Connecticut is pleased to become a beta testing site for the Results First Initiative. Our state is committed to research-based prevention practices that can help ensure safety and quality of life for our citizenry. We seek to reduce the number of offenders, both adult and youth, through proven and targeted intervention practices. We expect this to save both dollars and dignity.

Connecticut has a strong policy commitment to results based accountability. Our full manner of operations, at this point, entails data-driven decision making and financing.

We are in the process of setting up both a policy oversight committee and an implementation team. We will get back to you promptly on possible dates for your next visit and technical assistance.

We retain the right of approval on any public policy recommendations about changes to the Connecticut criminal justice system. We will work with you prior to any publication or release.

Thank you for extending this wonderful opportunity to the State of Connecticut

Sincerely,

Governor Dannel P. Malloy

Senate President Pro Tempore Donald E. Williams

House Speaker Christopher G. Donovan
Results First Approach

1. Use the best national research to identify what works

2. Predict impact in your state

3. Calculate long-term costs and benefits
Recidivism Among Adjudicated Youth
- Recidivism Among Adjudicated Youth On Parole In Connecticut (July 2017)

Benefit-Cost Analyses
- Adult criminal and juvenile justice evidence-based programs (November 2016)
- Adult criminal and juvenile justice evidence-based programs (March 2016)

Annual Report
- Annual report (October 2017)
- Annual report (October 2016)
- Annual report (October 2015)
- Annual report (October 2014)

Case Study: Court Support Services Division
- Data collection, use, and benefit of evidence-based programs (2016)

Program Inventory
- Program inventory (October 2014)
Criminal Justice System
Cost Estimates
TAXPAYER COSTS

Police
Courts
Adult jail (county)
Adult probation
Adult prison (security, health care, etc.)
Adult parole
Youth probation/detention
Youth secure facility commitment
Per Unit Costs

Focusing on the costs related to incremental change in average daily population

**Marginal Cost** is the change in the total cost as the number of individuals served increases by one; typically referred to as “the cost to produce one more unit”

Looking at *additional* cost of change in units served within existing system
The Connecticut Dept. of Correction reports its average daily cost of incarceration per inmate, is approximately $95.16 per inmate, which is $34,733 annually (~2011).

The Office of Legislative Research reported the average annual cost of incarceration per inmate is $44,165 in 2006.

The Vera Institute reported the average annual cost per inmate to be $50,262 in 2012.
## Annual Criminal Justice System Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police (per arrest)</td>
<td>$ 815</td>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>Federal Justice Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courts (per conviction)</td>
<td>$ 7,553</td>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>Judicial Court Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Prison &amp; Jail</td>
<td>$ 20,447</td>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>Department of Correction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Probation</td>
<td>$ 666</td>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>Judicial Branch, CSSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Parole</td>
<td>$ 926</td>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>Department of Correction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Probation</td>
<td>$ 3,076</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Judicial Branch, CSSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Detention</td>
<td>$ 231,981</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Judicial Branch, CSSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Training School</td>
<td>$ 267,707</td>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>Department of Children &amp; Families</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Connecticut Criminal Justice Programs
Develop full list of all programs
Determine annual cost per participant for each program and total funding for program
Calculate percentage of funded programs that are evidence-based
Inform Policymakers

What programs are funded?
How much has been appropriated?
Do they work?
Are they evidence based?
Do they meet the need?
Are they cost effective?
IDENTIFY “EVIDENCE-BASED” PROGRAMS

• Program description
• Primary participant population
  Cohorts for recidivism baseline
• Duration
  Months or years
• Average age of participant
  Crucial for juvenile programs
• Cost per participant
  Marginal or average
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Intended Outcomes</th>
<th>Average Duration</th>
<th>Number of Participants Served</th>
<th>Eligible but Not Served</th>
<th>Annual Capacity</th>
<th>Program Budget</th>
<th>Annual Cost per Participant/Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adolescent-Community Reinforcement Approach &amp; Assertive Continuing Care - Outpatient</td>
<td>Reduce substance use, improve social and family functioning, reduce recidivism</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>$289,356</td>
<td>$4,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescent-Community Reinforcement Approach &amp; Assertive Continuing Care – Residential</td>
<td>Reduce substance use, improve social and family functioning, reduce recidivism</td>
<td>Residential: 60 days; aftercare in community: 4 months</td>
<td>DCF: undetermined</td>
<td>DCF: undetermined</td>
<td>12 beds (11 CSSD, 1 DCF)</td>
<td>$673,000 (CSSD portion/OFA with DCF)</td>
<td>DCF: undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate Residential</td>
<td>Reduction in substance use and improved family relationship. Reduce recidivism.</td>
<td>4 months</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Clients tracked at admission</td>
<td>42 (14 beds)</td>
<td>$2,723,947, State: $2,696,094 PI: $27,853</td>
<td>$55,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Sex Offender Services</td>
<td>Reduce recidivism</td>
<td>Up to 1 year</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>36 slot capacity</td>
<td>$392,401</td>
<td>$5,375 Marginal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multidimensional Family Therapy (Contracted)</td>
<td>Reduce recidivism, improve family relationships</td>
<td>60 days</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>Clients tracked at admission</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>$1,287,171, State: $1,107,218 PI: $179,953</td>
<td>$11,809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multidimensional Family Therapy (With DCF)</td>
<td>Reduce recidivism, improve family relationships</td>
<td>5 months</td>
<td>DCF: undetermined</td>
<td>DCF: undetermined</td>
<td>DCF: undetermined</td>
<td>$629,186</td>
<td>DCF: undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multidimensional Treatment Foster Care</td>
<td>Reduce recidivism, family reunification</td>
<td>6-9 months</td>
<td>DCF: undetermined</td>
<td>DCF: undetermined</td>
<td>DCF: undetermined</td>
<td>$378,679</td>
<td>DCF: undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multisystemic Therapy</td>
<td>Reduce recidivism, improve family relationships, prevent out-of-home placement</td>
<td>5 months</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>Clients tracked at admission</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>$4,843,940, State: $4,344,821 PI: $499,119</td>
<td>$10,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Mentoring</td>
<td>Pro-social connection</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>179 admitted</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>$539,389</td>
<td>$4,086</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Connecticut Recidivism
Cohorts and Resource Use
Cohort Analysis

20 Offender Populations derived from 2004 criminal and juvenile justice records

Prison: 13,649
Parole/Community Supervision: 3,982
Adult Probation: 28,505
Juvenile Probation: 3,135
Juvenile Confinement: 273

Populations disaggregated by Risk and Offense Type, where available
Cohort Analysis

Offenders tracked for seven years (2004-2011)
All convictions over the seven year period were analyzed
First study of CT offender populations to track recidivism for seven years
Datasets may provide the foundation for future studies
CONTRIBUTING AGENCIES

Department of Correction
Department of Emergency Management and Public Protection
Department of Children and Families
Judicial Branch
Final Result: Cost-Benefit Analysis for Connecticut CJ and JJ Programs
# Connecticut Results First: Benefit-Cost Comparisons

## Benefit-Cost Analyses for Selected Programs for Preventing Crime Recidivism Using Marginal Costs

(2015 Dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Name/Program Name/Appropriated Program Name and SID #</th>
<th>Total Benefits</th>
<th>Benefits to Participants</th>
<th>Taxpayer Benefits</th>
<th>Non-Taxpayer Benefits</th>
<th>Other Indirect Benefits</th>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Benefits minus Costs (net present value)</th>
<th>Benefits to Cost Ratio</th>
<th>Odds of a positive net present value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adult Crime</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Branch – Court Support Services Division (JB-CSSD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (Moderate and High Risk)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Offender Treatment in the Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Sex Offender Treatment Services - 12043</td>
<td>$31,203</td>
<td>$5,958</td>
<td>$22,330</td>
<td>$2,953</td>
<td>$(77)</td>
<td>$31,126</td>
<td>$405.23</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Juvenile Justice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Branch – Court Support Services Division (JB-CSSD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Crime (Aggression Replacement Training)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children, Youth and Family Support Service Centers – 12105, 12128, &amp; 12375</td>
<td>$15,081</td>
<td>$1,572</td>
<td>$5,811</td>
<td>$5,313</td>
<td>$2,540</td>
<td>$(313)</td>
<td>$14,768</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IMRP Study Process
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Raise the Age</th>
<th>Post-Raise the Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjudicated youth under 16</td>
<td>Adjudicated youth under 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 through 2009</td>
<td>2010 through 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-year-old youth convicted as adults</td>
<td>16-year-old youth adjudicated as juveniles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 through 2009</td>
<td>2010 through 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-year-old youth convicted as adults</td>
<td>17-year-old youth adjudicated as juveniles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 through June 2012</td>
<td>July 2012 through 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Sources of Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Type</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Data Definition</th>
<th>Time Series</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committed Juvenile Data</td>
<td>DCF</td>
<td>Population with at least one DCF commitment</td>
<td>2000-2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile &amp; Adult Court Data</td>
<td>JB-CSSD</td>
<td>All 16- and 17-year-olds with at least one arrest Criminal history for juveniles and adults</td>
<td>2000-2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Incarceration Data</td>
<td>DOC</td>
<td>Discharges and early releases from prison</td>
<td>2007-2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IMRP Data Management

• Exhaustive process to collect, merge and “clean” data
  • Time consuming, but necessary

• Extensive recoding of data for research purposes
  • Data collected for case management purposes, not research
  • Recoding necessary to create new variables and to make existing variables useful for research

• Collaborate with agencies to interpret data and resolve data issues
  • Develop “dictionaries” for data
  • Identify improvements for data collection and management
Measures of Recidivism

- Recidivism in CT is measured by:
  - Rearrest
  - Re-adjudication (reconviction)
  - Re-commitment and re-incarceration

- For the purposes of Results First, recidivism is primarily measured as reconviction:
  - Primary purpose of Results First is to measure cost vs. benefit
  - Reconviction requires a significant use of tangible and intangible state resources
IMRP Study Recidivism Definition

- Rate at which adjudicated juvenile offenders re-engaged in criminal behavior after commitment to DCF
- Phase I analysis focused on tracking re-arrest baseline rate at 24 months
- Phase II analysis for Results First model
  - Track baseline rate of recovation
  - Inventory of DCF parole programs
  - Analyze impact on recidivism
**Other Outcomes Included in the Study**

- Type and duration of any sanctions imposed for reconvictions
- Identify any predictors of recidivism
- Strength of risk assessment in predicting recidivism
- Impact of Raise the Age law on juvenile offenders
RISK ASSESSMENT

- JB-CSSD utilizes Juvenile Assessment Generic (JAG)
  - Validated for CT juvenile offender population
  - Utilized consistently during study period
  - JAG scores available for 70 percent of youth in DCF sample
  - JAG scores used as proxy measure for study

- DCF utilizes several different assessment tools
  - Not validated for CT juvenile offender population
  - Assessment tools changed during study period
  - Assessment score data not available for many youth in DCF sample
Risk Assessment

- JB-CSSD utilizes Juvenile Assessment Generic (JAG)
  - Validated for CT juvenile offender population
  - Utilized consistently during study period
  - JAG scores available for 70 percent of youth in DCF sample
  - JAG scores used as proxy measure for study

- DCF utilizes several different assessment tools
  - Not validated for CT juvenile offender population
  - Assessment tools changed during study period
  - Assessment score data not available for many youth in DCF sample
JAG Risk Assessment Score Level for DCF-Committed Youth

![Graph showing number of DCF commitments by year and risk level from 2002 to 2014. The graph includes bars for Very High, High, Medium, and Low risk levels, with specific years marked for 16 YO RTA and 17 YO RTA.]
Rearrest Rate by JAG Risk Level

Connecticut Rearrest Rates by Risk Level, 2002-2014

- Rearrest Rate After 6 Months
- Rearrest Rate After 12 Months
- Rearrest Rate After 18 Months
- Rearrest Rate After 24 Months
- Rearrest Rate After 36 Months
- Rearrest Rate After 48 Months

Year:
- Low
- Medium
- High
- Very High
Next Steps
Phase II: Outcomes

- Cost-effectiveness of DCF juvenile parole programs
- Better understanding of high-risk and high-need juvenile offender population
  - US Census data project
- Identify predictive factors for reoffending
- Assist JJPOC to develop recidivism reduction strategies
CONTINUE ASSESSMENT OF IMPACT OF RTA LAW

• Complete impact analysis on 16- and 17-year-olds
  • 2015 through 2017 data necessary to have sufficient time to track recidivism rate

• Use education and labor data to better understand impact of RTA legislation on older adolescents
  • Lessons learned may be applied to current proposal to raise the age to 21
CT Juvenile Justice Reinvestment???

- CT was first state to do Adult JRI in 2003
- Only a few states have used the framework for the JJ System
- CT well situated to apply JRI to its JJ system – JJPOC, Results First, etc.
- Beneficial to aligning goals with metrics, including outcomes
QUESTIONS?