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The Institute for Municipal and Regional Policy (IMRP) is a non-partisan, University-based organization dedicated to enriching the quality of local, state and national public policy. The IMRP tackles critical and often under addressed urban issues with the intent of ensuring the most positive outcomes for affected individuals and entities. In doing so, the IMRP bridges the divide between academia, policymakers, practitioners and the community.

Working for fair, effective and just public policy through applied research and community engagement, the IMRP utilizes the resources of CCSU students, staff and faculty to develop, shape and improve public policy on issues of municipal and regional concern. The IMRP accomplishes this through a variety of targeted approaches such as: public education and dialogue; published reports, articles and policy papers; pilot program design, implementation and oversight; and the facilitation of collaborations between the University, government, private organizations and the general community.

The IMRP aspires to be a respected and visible presence throughout the State of Connecticut, known for its ability to promote, develop and implement just, effective public policy. The IMRP adheres to non-partisan, evidence-based practices and conducts and disseminates its scientific research in accordance with strict, ethical standards.

The IMRP is responsive to social and community concerns by initiating projects addressing specific needs and interests of the general public and policymakers, as well as sponsoring conferences, forums, and professional trainings. Access to state-of-the-art technology and multi-media enhances the IMRP’s ability to advance best practices to improve the quality of public policy in the State of Connecticut and nationwide.
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Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative

BACKGROUND

The Project Origins

The Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative (Results First), a project of the Pew Charitable Trusts and the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, works with states to implement an innovative cost-benefit analysis approach that helps them invest in policies and programs that are proven to work in order to make policy decisions based on probable outcomes and return on investment. Results First uses a sophisticated econometric model to analyze the costs and benefits of evidence-based programs across a variety of social policy areas. It is intended to help states identify opportunities to effectively invest limited resources to produce better outcomes and substantial long-term savings.

Connecticut’s Results First model is based on the cost-benefit tool originally developed by the Washington State Institute for Public Policy (WSIPP) and implemented with the assistance of the Results First team. The model identifies the best available national research studies of effective programs, uses state-specific data to predict program impact in a participating state, and calculates the long-term return on investment for multiple programs for use as a planning and budgeting tool. Results First currently offers technical assistance to 14 states and three California counties to help them customize and implement jurisdiction-specific versions of the model and use its results in policy and budget deliberations. This report was developed with assistance from the Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative.

In March 2011, Governor Dannel Malloy, Senate President Pro Tempore Donald Williams, Jr., and House Speaker Christopher Donovan submitted formal letters of invitation to Results First (Appendix A). The letters highlighted Connecticut’s interest in participating in a public policy initiative using the cost-benefit model to identify and support cost-effective interventions in the criminal justice arena that would address crime prevention and budget savings. The state leaders emphasized their commitment to results based accountability and data-driven decision making, while reserving the right of prior approval of any public policy recommendations for changes to Connecticut’s criminal justice system. They promised to establish an implementation team and a policy work group, which laid the foundation for the policy oversight committee.
Authorizing Legislation

In 2013, the General Assembly included funding for Results First in Connecticut in the budget act. An Act Concerning Expenditures and Revenue for the Biennium Ending June 30, 2015 (PA 13-184, Section 42) appropriated up to $150,000 of the appropriation for FYs 14 and 15 for the Board of Regents for Higher Education for the Connecticut State University for a grant to the Institute for Municipal and Regional Policy (IMRP) to assist in the “development of the Connecticut specific model within the Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative.”

The budget “implementer,” An Act Implementing Provisions of the State Budget for the Biennium Ending June 30, 2015 Concerning General Government (PA 13-247, Section 42) (see Appendix B) established a Results First Policy Oversight Committee to provide advice on the development and implementation of the Pew-MacArthur Results First cost-benefit analysis model. The committee’s overall goal is to promote cost effective state policies and programs.

The committee must at least consist of the following 14 members (see Appendix C):

1. four legislators (the House speaker, Senate president pro tempore, and House and Senate minority leaders appoint one each);
2. the chief court administrator, or his or her designee;
3. the comptroller, or his designee;
4. the directors of the non-partisan offices of Legislative Research, Fiscal Analysis, and Program Review and Investigations;
5. the director of Central Connecticut State University’s Institute for Municipal and Regional Policy;
6. the Commission on Children’s executive director;
7. a private higher education representative, whom Connecticut Conference of Independent Colleges appoints; and
8. two Connecticut business community members, whom the majority leaders of the House and Senate appoint.

The act allows the committee to add members. Members serve without compensation but may receive necessary expenses for performing their duties. Appointing authorities had to make their initial appointments by July 19, 2013. The chairperson, whom the House speaker and Senate president jointly select, had to schedule the committee’s first meeting for no later than August 18, 2013. By October 1, 2013, and annually thereafter, the committee must report to the governor and the Appropriations Committee with recommended measures for implementing the Pew-MacArthur Results First cost-benefit analysis model.
RESULTS FIRST AND RELATED EVIDENCE-BASED INITIATIVES

Results First and Results Based Accountability

Connecticut has enhanced its budgeting process several times over the years. From line-item budgets to program budgets to performance-based budgets, various improvements have been implemented. Policy makers continue to seek even better ways to arrive at making budget decisions.

Most recently, Results Based Accountability (RBA) has been used by some state agencies as an additional way to measure program performance in order to analyze their budgets. RBA and Results First are different but related. The following clarifies the distinctions between the two.

RBA enables policymakers, funders, and providers to identify programs' desired outcomes and use performance measures to assess progress towards achieving those outcomes. This approach seeks to answer the question "what are current programs accomplishing?" For example, under public safety, RBA measures the Department of Correction's progress towards goals by tracking recidivism – the return of released inmates and probationers to the criminal justice system.

Results First provides policymakers with investment advice to help guide funding choices to an optimal mix of evidence-based programs in a variety of social policy areas such as adult criminal and juvenile justice, child welfare, pre-K-12 education, substance abuse, and mental health. The Results First approach seeks to answer the question "what programs would be the most cost-effective way to achieve state goals?" For example, in adult criminal justice, participating states can use the Results First model to identify and allocate resources to programs that are most effective at reducing recidivism.

RBA and Results First are complementary efforts in that RBA sets the broader performance outcome goals and Results First helps to select cost-effective programs aimed at achieving those goals. Results First informs the budgetary process and can focus investments in evidence-based programs across multiple policy areas, while RBA focuses stakeholders on setting goals and establishing the means for reaching them.

Results First builds upon the foundation of RBA by assigning a dollar value to the benefits states hope to achieve by funding programs for their citizens, moving from a critical information gathering and organizational tool to an investment model. Additionally, Results First provides information about cost effective options that may be applied to achieving goals set through the RBA process.
To sum up, the two processes are complementary. Results First adds the cost-benefit calculation into the process.

For a list of the eight standard RBA questions for all programs, see Appendix D.

**Results First and Justice Reinvestment**

Justice Reinvestment is a project of the Council of State Governments (CSG) Justice Center and is supported by federal, state, local, and private funds, including the Pew Charitable Trusts and the U.S. Department of Justice. It provides non-partisan policy recommendations and strategies on criminal justice issues to all levels of government.

Like Results First, the project uses a data-driven approach to policymaking tailored to the unique public safety needs of a particular jurisdiction. Justice Reinvestment policy recommendations based on state-specific data are intended to reduce spending on corrections, producing savings that can be reinvested to enhance public safety. Justice Reinvestment requires monitoring new practices to assure achievement of outcomes. Eighteen states, including Connecticut, participate.

Results First is both broader and more specific than Justice Reinvestment. Results First helps guide funding choices across multiple areas of social policy, not only in public safety. In the area of criminal justice, the Results First model can be used to allocate resources to programs that are most effective at reducing recidivism, but is not designed to address sentencing policies and practices. Results First informs the budgetary process and increases investment in evidence-based programs across a variety of policy areas, while Justice Reinvestment generates policy recommendations to promote system-wide reform in criminal justice.

Both Results First and Justice Reinvestment:

- address adult criminal justice issues,
- provide technical assistance to participating states,
- base policy decisions on state-specific data,
- focus on reducing costs and improving results, and
- monitor and analyze program outcomes.

The Policy Oversight Committee’s subcommittee on Adult Criminal Justice will look into how Results First can collaborate with Justice Reinvestment efforts in the state to avoid any duplication and promote common goals.
Results First and the Federal Office of Management and Budget

Interestingly, the federal government has endorsed the use of evidence-based budgeting for many years. For example, a May 18, 2012 memorandum from the acting director of the Office of Management and Budget in the Office of the President (Appendix E) to the heads and executives of federal departments and agencies promotes their use of evidence in their FYF 2014 budget submissions. The memo describes the incentives agencies would have to incorporate evidence and evaluation tools. The memo cites Results First as a useful tool to rank programs based on evidence of their return on investment for improved resource allocation.

RESULTS FIRST CRIME MODEL

Connecticut Program Inventory

The Results First model is based on the cost-benefit tool that WSIPP has developed over the past 15 years. It uses the best national research to identify evidence-based programs that work. Participating states apply those findings to their own state-specific population data to estimate the fiscal and policy impact of potential investments in their own programs that are similar to those in the WSIPP evaluation studies.

The original work group collected data on programs from Connecticut’s departments of Correction (DOC) and Mental Health and Addiction Services (DMHAS) and the Court Support Services Division (CSSD) of the Judicial Branch. The work group catalogued all state-funded programs in Connecticut that are intended to reduce recidivism. The work group requested from each agency lists of every program offered to adult or juvenile clients served as a result of a conviction or with charges facing trial court adjudication. The program inventory documents the program name and a brief description of the program, a description of the target participant population, the cost per participant, the annual capacity or annual total number of slots available for participants, and the annual amount appropriated or budgeted statewide for each program. The work group matched evidence-based programs in Connecticut with those in the Results First model to determine the cost-benefit ratio of each program.

The analysis is presented in a Consumer Reports-style format showing each program along with its costs, total benefits (as a dollar amount in net present value), the breakdown between benefits to taxpayers and non-taxpayers, the net benefit, and the benefit to cost ratio. The results can help states achieve a higher return on investment (ROI) by shifting resource allocations from programs with a low ROI to those programs that realize greater returns.

Connecticut has the option with the benefit-cost analysis tool to compare the costs and benefits of programs that are not used in the state with currently funded programs. The tool also allows for Connecticut to add new programs that have not
been reviewed by WSIPP and are not included in the model. High-quality research studies can be added to the meta-analysis as long as they meet evaluation and design standards.

**Marginal Costs of the Criminal Justice System**

Benefits from each program are estimated in present value by calculating the monetary value of taxpayer-funded juvenile and criminal justice system resources that are affected by recidivism. Each major sector of the criminal justice system has a unit cost adjusted by sentencing outcomes for a criminal conviction or delinquent adjudication. The sectors include law enforcement agencies, trial courts, juvenile justice services, and adult corrections. Additionally, the benefits include the estimated monetary value of victim injury and property damage from crime.

The unit value of juvenile and criminal justice system costs is represented by the marginal cost. Marginal costs represent the change in expenses associated with a single unit increase or decrease in activity or service provision. In DOC, for example, the marginal cost represents the incremental change in operating cost caused by a change in the average daily prison population.

In addition to the cost of crime to taxpayers, the Results First benefit-cost analysis includes the costs borne by victims of crime. Victims can suffer direct, out-of-pocket losses or long-term psychological consequences. The model relies on scholarly research that estimates crime victims’ costs from (1) tangible expenses such as medical care, property damage, and loss of earnings and (2) intangible costs that place a dollar value on victims’ pain and suffering (estimated from jury awards).

The Results First model users can focus solely on the taxpayer perspective, turning "off," as it were, the victim cost. The Process Subcommittee of the Policy Oversight Committee will determine whether to use this element in Connecticut’s application.

**Victim Costs**

The total monetary estimates of a particular policy option or program include the costs and benefits that accrue to (1) program participants; (2) taxpayers; and (3) other people in society, e.g., crime victims. Thus, in addition to the cost to taxpayers that the Results First model uses for criminal justice programs in calculating their cost-benefit ratio, it includes the cost borne by victims. Victims can suffer direct, out-of-pocket losses or psychological consequences. The WSIPP model relies on recent research that estimates crime victim costs:

- *The Cost of Crime to Society*, by K.E. McCollister, M.T. French, and H Fang (2010) and
• *Victim Costs and Consequences*, by T. R. Miller, M.A. Cohen, and B.
  Wiersema published by the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice
  Programs, National Institute of Justice (1996).

These studies divide crime victim costs into two types:

1. tangible victim costs such as health care expenses, property damage
   and loss, and loss of crime victims’ earnings and

2. intangible victim costs that place a dollar value on victims’ pain and
   suffering (in part based on jury awards).

**Recidivism and Sentencing Outcome Measures**

Results First measures the magnitude of a program’s cost effectiveness by its
effect on recidivism of defendants sanctioned in Connecticut. The work group
estimated recidivism over seven years of Connecticut’s prisoners, probationers, and
juveniles committed to the Connecticut Juvenile Training School and probation.
Results First defines recidivism as any offense committed after release to the
community, or after initial placement in the community, that results in a conviction
from an adult or juvenile court. In Connecticut, the Office of Criminal Justice Policy
and Planning Division compiles an annual recidivism report that includes four
recidivism measures: rearrest, reconviction, return to jail or prison, and
reincarceration. The Judicial Branch’s CSSD uses reconviction as the primary
indicator, but it can report using any of the measures reported by OPM.

The various sentencing outcomes associated with convictions for different
 crimes affect the cost of crime to taxpayers. The Results First model includes seven
crime categories: Murder, Sex Offenses, Robbery, Aggravated Assault, Property,
Drug and Other Felonies, and Misdemeanors. The work group gathered data from
the court system and the DOC on the likelihood of prison or community sanctions
for different crime types. The work group also estimated the length of sentences for
the different court-ordered sanctions.

**Risk Analysis**

The degree of certainty in the results is a key concern for benefit-cost
analysis. The Results First model has many assumptions and inputs that, if varied,
tend to produce different results. The Results First model uses a Monte Carlo
simulation to test the uncertainty of inputs. Employing this method, users run the
benefit-cost analysis for each program hundreds of times, each time randomly
varying the inputs. The result of each trial is recorded to summarize the percentage
of time that the net present value of benefits will be greater than zero.

A “discount rate” and the “deadweight cost of taxation” are two key economic
variables included in the risk analysis. The discount rate in the model ranges from 2
to 5 percent. The deadweight cost of taxation reflects the economic value of consumer dollars lost per tax dollar raised to pay for program costs. The value of this input ranges from 0 to 1 in the Results First model, though users can enter different range inputs, if desired.

**Fidelity in Program Delivery**

It is essential for states to develop the capacity to monitor whether evidence-based programs are being implemented with fidelity, that is, the degree to which programs are implemented as intended by the program developers. Experience has shown that proven programs, when implemented poorly, will not achieve predicted outcomes and in some cases can actually be harmful (i.e., increasing rather than reducing recidivism). Several states are creating valuable tools for monitoring program fidelity, including one-time program reviews and on-going evaluations. The level of resources necessary to carry out quality assurance will not be insignificant.

**Relationship with Providers**

When the Results First approach is adopted and incorporated into Connecticut’s budget and policy decision-making processes, private providers of government services may be affected. The model uses performance indicators and evidence to evaluate and, if needed, transform policy. It monetizes outcomes in a clear and concrete way. Because Results First focuses on program outcomes, providers can assist by establishing the infrastructure for accurate data collection and analysis. Providers that include and provide assessment tools will partner with the state’s Results First efforts in creating savings and efficiencies. Collectively, providers and state agencies can cooperate to achieve critical policy goals in the most cost-effective ways. The Connecticut Results First team welcomes and encourages providers that understand and can help facilitate the application of the initiative.

**CONNECTICUT ACTIVITY**

**Staff Work Group**

After initial planning and organization efforts, stakeholders launched the Connecticut Results First project in December 2011. Representative Toni Walker, House chair of the Appropriations Committee, and Mike Lawlor, Office of Policy and Management undersecretary for criminal justice policy and planning, supervised the first phase of the project. In 2012, the IMRP staff recruited a work group to begin the application of WSIPP’s meta-analysis of criminal justice programs to Connecticut programs. The staff work group included analysts from legislative and executive branch offices involved in criminal justice programs. The group reviewed reports and identified evidenced-based criminal justice programs provided in Connecticut. Coordinating with staff from the Judicial Branch and the departments of Correction
and Children and Families, the group matched state programs with the WSIPP model. They solicited input and evaluation data related to those programs.

In December 2012, the staff work group completed its initial model implementation and generated preliminary results for selected adult criminal and juvenile justice programs. Since then, the group has (1) finalized population of the crime model to use in policy decision making in the 2014 legislative session, (2) begun to meet with relevant agency staff to ensure model inputs are properly vetted, (3) briefed stakeholders such as the Connecticut Sentencing Commission and legislators interested in Results First, and (4) supported enactment of 2013 legislation that created an oversight committee and provided funding for the IMRP to support Results First in Connecticut.

**Policy Oversight Committee**

Since its creation pursuant to PA 13-247, the Results First Policy Oversight Committee (RFPOC) has met twice. At the RFPOC’s initial meeting on September 19, 2013, members of the Results First work group described the group’s activity since 2011. Presentations included (1) an overview of the Results First approach and its application to Connecticut’s criminal justice and juvenile justice programs and (2) anticipated assessments of domestic violence programs offered by CSSD and DOC.

On November 12, 2013, the RFPOC met again when the Results First technical assistance team (Sara Dube, project manager, and Steve Lize, technical consultant) described the Results First national initiative and the work group presented a summary of the work completed to date in Connecticut (see Appendix F). The Committee created subcommittees to work on (1) adult criminal justice, (2) juvenile justice, and (3) process. The subcommittees plan to meet to develop initial recommendations beginning in January 2014.

The Adult Criminal Justice subcommittee is headed by Senator Catherine Osten. That group will provide an ongoing review of that component of the cost-benefit model. It will work with project staff to develop action steps, draft reports, and offer recommendations to the full committee. The Juvenile Justice subcommittee, under the direction of Representative Toni Walker, will do the same with respect to juvenile justice programs.

The Process Subcommittee, chaired by Elaine Zimmerman, will function as a steering committee for the RFPOC to oversee and ensure that Results First activities in Connecticut align with other statewide performance based policy initiatives and to make recommendations regarding the application of the Connecticut Results First model to additional policy areas, such as education, child welfare, and mental health.
CRIMINAL JUSTICE PROGRAMS AND RESULTS FIRST

Program Summaries

Dr. Ashley Provencher, a member of the Connecticut Results First work group, submitted a report in August 2012 summarizing evidence-based juvenile and adult criminal justice programs used in Connecticut that are evaluated in the WSIPP meta-analysis of the Results First project. (See “A Guide to the Meta-Analytical Process Used in the Results First Model,” September 2012.)

In December 2013, Results First released comprehensive summaries of each of the adult criminal and juvenile justice programs in the cost-benefit model. The first half of each summary contains key WSIPP information, including their description of the program and program outcome data (e.g., number of studies, effect size, etc.). The second half contains new information Results First compiled by reviewing the studies WSIPP used in the meta-analysis of each program. Specifically, it consists of a description of the program (i.e., a summary of the main elements of the intervention based on the commonalities across studies) and the providers, as well as detailed information on the type of people who participated in the intervention and the amount and length of the “treatment” they received.

There are Program Summaries for adult criminal justice and juvenile justice, but Results First plans to prepare them for the other components of the model in the future. The Program Summaries provide additional program information to help users match state programs to those in the WSIPP model. The degree of similarity determines whether programs in the WSIPP model can be used for a state’s cost-benefit analysis.

Adult Criminal Justice Inputs

The staff work group has determined the marginal costs of the adult criminal justice system in Connecticut, summarized in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criminal Justice Sector</th>
<th>Unit Measure</th>
<th>Marginal Cost</th>
<th>Year of Estimate</th>
<th>Percent Paid by State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>Arrest</td>
<td>$815</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>21 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courts &amp; Prosecutors</td>
<td>Conviction</td>
<td>7,553</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jail &amp; State Prison</td>
<td>Average Daily Population</td>
<td>20,447</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Supervision</td>
<td>Average Daily Population</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Prison Supervision</td>
<td>Average Daily Population</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The staff work group endeavors to refine the criminal justice sector marginal costs. In particular, costs per arrest and conviction should be estimated by crime type, given the different magnitude of resources used for crimes ranging from murder to misdemeanor.

The group has identified evidence-based criminal justice programs in Connecticut to which the Results First model can be applied. Those include:

- Cognitive behavioral therapy
- Correctional education
- Correction industries
- Domestic violence perpetrator treatment programs
- Drug treatment in the community
- Drug treatment in prison
- Electronic monitoring
- Employment training and job assistance in the community
- Mental health courts
- Vocational education in prison
- Work release.

For the most part, sufficient data on these programs are available from the CSSD, DOC, and DMHAS.

The group drafted its analysis, as shown in the chart below.

**DRAFT Adult Program Benefit-Cost Analysis (2011 dollars)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Total Benefits</th>
<th>Taxpayer</th>
<th>Non-Taxpayer</th>
<th>Net Benefits</th>
<th>Benefit to Cost Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROBATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (high risk)</td>
<td>(512)</td>
<td>5,983</td>
<td>3,497</td>
<td>2,486</td>
<td>5,471</td>
<td>11.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Monitoring (high risk)</td>
<td>(829)</td>
<td>11,029</td>
<td>6,439</td>
<td>4,590</td>
<td>10,203</td>
<td>13.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentally Ill Jail Diversion</td>
<td>(1,151)</td>
<td>5,512</td>
<td>4,324</td>
<td>1,188</td>
<td>4,361</td>
<td>4.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRISON</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional Industries</td>
<td>(1,216)</td>
<td>4,422</td>
<td>1,978</td>
<td>2,444</td>
<td>3,206</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Violence Perpetrator Treatment (Duluth)</td>
<td>(1,400)</td>
<td>(4,977)</td>
<td>(2,755)</td>
<td>(2,222)</td>
<td>(6,377)</td>
<td>(3.58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>(2,386)</td>
<td>13,831</td>
<td>7,643</td>
<td>6,188</td>
<td>11,446</td>
<td>5.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Education</td>
<td>(2,385)</td>
<td>13,114</td>
<td>7,247</td>
<td>5,867</td>
<td>10,729</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With respect to the domestic violence perpetrator treatment programs, state-specific data has been collected. However, the effect data, which is inferred from the meta-analysis, may not accurately estimate the effectiveness of Connecticut domestic violence programs. Programs evaluated in the meta-analysis rely on a different model (the Duluth model) than what is delivered in Connecticut. Because Connecticut programs do not rely on that model, they cannot be compared to it with confidence. However, without knowing with certainty how well Connecticut’s domestic violence perpetrator treatment programs are delivered, the example above serves to show the potential risk in delivering programs that are shown to be ineffective.

The meta-analysis based on the Duluth model suggests that domestic violence programs are not cost-effective. Since Connecticut programs are different and may, in fact, be cost-effective, the legislature has required CSSD and DOC to provide estimates of the effectiveness of their programs. The Results First model could then be updated to reflect the Connecticut-specific estimates of program effectiveness, and more accurately estimate the cost-effectiveness of Connecticut domestic violence programs. CSSD and DOC are expected to submit their program evaluation plans by May 31, 2014 and issue reports by June 30, 2014.

**Juvenile Justice Inputs**

The staff work group has estimated the marginal costs of the juvenile justice system in Connecticut, summarized in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Juvenile Justice Sector</th>
<th>Unit Measure</th>
<th>Marginal Cost</th>
<th>Year of Estimate</th>
<th>Percent Paid by State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detention</td>
<td>Average Daily Population</td>
<td>$ 231,981</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSSD Supervision</td>
<td>Average Daily Population</td>
<td>3,076</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training School</td>
<td>Average Daily Population</td>
<td>267,707</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCF Supervision</td>
<td>Average Daily Population</td>
<td>3,076</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that the staff work group continues to work with DCF to refine the juvenile justice sector marginal costs.

With respect to juvenile justice programs in Connecticut, including probation, detention, and the juvenile training school, the staff work group identified the following evidence-based programs:
• Aggression replacement training
• Family integrated transitions
• Functional family therapy
• Multisystemic therapy
• Multidimensional treatment foster care.

Data on these programs comes from CSSD and DCF.

The group drafted its cost-benefit analysis, as shown in the chart below.

**DRAFT Juvenile Program Benefit-Cost Analysis (2011 dollars)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Total Benefits</th>
<th>Taxpayer</th>
<th>Non-Taxpayer</th>
<th>Net Benefits</th>
<th>Benefit to Cost Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggression Replacement Training</td>
<td>($2,858)</td>
<td>$24,945</td>
<td>$11,827</td>
<td>$8,956</td>
<td>$22,087</td>
<td>$8.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Probation High Risk)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Integrated Transitions</td>
<td>($8,903)</td>
<td>$39,940</td>
<td>$12,374</td>
<td>$24,829</td>
<td>$31,037</td>
<td>$4.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Training School)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Family Therapy</td>
<td>($3,894)</td>
<td>$32,846</td>
<td>$12,758</td>
<td>$15,301</td>
<td>$28,951</td>
<td>$8.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Probation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multisystemic Therapy</td>
<td>($8,240)</td>
<td>$16,412</td>
<td>$7,781</td>
<td>$5,891</td>
<td>$8,172</td>
<td>$1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Probation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interpreting the Results**

Several factors should be considered when interpreting these findings. The predicted costs, benefits, and return on investment ratios for each program are calculated as accurately as possible but are, like all projections, subject to some level of uncertainty. Accordingly, it is more important to focus on the relative ranking of programs than small differences between them; some programs are predicted to produce large net benefits and may represent “best buys” for the state while others are predicted to generate small or even negative net benefits and may represent neutral or poor investment opportunities.

It is important to recognize that program fidelity – how well programs are implemented – is critically important to achieving the predicted outcomes. Connecticut Results First assesses evidence-based programs that are designed to follow specific treatment models, and failure to operate these programs as
prescribed can dramatically reduce their outcomes. Thus, safeguarding the state’s investment in evidence-based programs requires ongoing efforts to assess program delivery and, when necessary, taking corrective actions to hold program managers and providers accountable for program outcomes.

These findings represent the preliminary findings from Connecticut Results First and will be discussed and refined in subcommittee meetings. Going forward, the RFPOC may want to consider recommending how to:

- move funding away from programs that are not evidence-based or generate a low return on investment;
- move funding toward programs with a high projected return on investment as appropriate for the population’s demonstrated programming needs;
- require program providers to demonstrate that they are achieving crime/recidivism reduction outcomes, and compare these outcomes to those predicted for these programs by the Connecticut Results First model;
- monitor program fidelity, including ensuring that program participants are appropriately matched by criminogenic risk and needs factors and programs are implemented as designed;
- invest in rigorous evaluations of programs that do not yet have a robust research base to help inform future decision making; and
- incorporate findings in executive branch policies and practices.

RESULTS FIRST COMMUNITY OF PRACTICE

Regional and National Convening

Results First’s 2012 Northeast Regional State Convening was held at the Old State House in Hartford, December 6 and 7, 2012. The series of workshops provided an opportunity to collaborate with other Results First participating states and discuss technical and policy issues associated with implementation. Representatives from the northeast Results First states attended.

Future regional conferences for Results First participating states are expected. Such a conference allows Results First staff to efficiently update state teams. Meetings also allow Results First colleagues from different states to share their experiences, discuss solutions to problems, and show how they use the Results First model to affect policy and budgets.

See Appendix G for a copy of the conference agenda.
Connecticut staff also participated in the Results First Initiative Third Annual State Convening in Denver on July 25-26, 2013. That meeting brought together elected officials and staff from 13 of the participating states as well as staff from Results First and WSIPP. The meeting provided opportunities to share state experiences, discuss future plans, and emphasize implementation strategies. Future expansion applies to (1) an increase in the number of state and local jurisdictions that elect to participate and (2) additions to the number of policy areas and programs included in the model.

**Results First Minigroup**

During the Results First Third Annual State Convening in July in Denver, states expressed strong interest in developing enhanced mechanisms for communicating and sharing information with one another. In response to that feedback and in line with our goal of building a community of practice, Results First launched the Results First Minigroup web platform in October 2013. Minigroup is a secure, private listserv on which Results First state and county partners can share information, pose questions, and learn from the experiences of other participating jurisdictions. Information is organized in a format in which participants see posts, comments, and events in a similar fashion as a Facebook activity feed. The Results First Minigroup has already helped states connect with and learn from one another. For example, when the Idaho project manager asked the group for advice regarding program data, the Iowa Results First lead responded with an explanation of her state’s approach and ideas for ways to handle the issue.

Staff are participating in webinars offered on the minigroup site on use of the model and the introduction of the modified 2014 model.

**OUTREACH IN CONNECTICUT**

**The Municipal Opportunities & Regional Efficiencies (M.O.R.E.) Commission**

Since 2010, the Connecticut General Assembly’s M.O.R.E. Commission has investigated ways to realize local government function efficiencies and cost savings through regional collaboration. Its membership includes legislators and executive agency officials and representatives of (1) municipal governments, (2) business and labor organizations, and (3) education and municipal interest groups. The commission identifies obstacles to achieving operating efficiencies, considers establishing regional entities that could carry out municipal functions, and develops ways to evaluate these efforts.

After meeting with M.O.R.E. Commission members on November 19, 2013, to discuss the potential application of Results First to the commission’s work, the RFPOC co-chair and staff will consider an effort to collaborate and explore how Results First can be used to evaluate special education programs that a M.O.R.E. Commission subcommittee is studying. While the Results First model has not yet
assessed the costs and benefits of special education programs for rating purposes, staff will investigate sources of data on special education programs in Connecticut.

**Future Outreach**

On January 14, 2014, the Institute for Municipal and Regional Policy sponsored a Statewide Conference on the Justice Reinvestment Initiative and Results First. The conference included a panel discussion of the Reinvestment Initiative, the link between Results First and the business community’s interest in addressing the costs of corrections in the state, and a presentation on the Results First approach and state updates from around the country.
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
Sec. 42. (NEW) (Effective from passage) (a) There is established a Results First Policy Oversight Committee. The committee shall advise on the development and implementation of the Pew-MacArthur Results First cost-benefit analysis model, with the overall goal of promoting cost effective policies and programming by the state.
(b) The committee shall consist of the following members:

(1) Four members of the General Assembly, one of whom shall be appointed by the speaker of the House of Representatives, one of whom shall be appointed by the president pro tempore of the Senate, one of whom shall be appointed by the minority leader of the House of Representatives, and one of who shall be appointed by the minority leader of the Senate;
(2) The Chief Court Administrator, or the Chief Court Administrator's designee;
(3) The Comptroller, or the Comptroller's designee;
(4) The director of the Office of Fiscal Analysis;
(5) The director of the Office of Program Review and Investigations;
(6) The director of the Office of Legislative Research;
(7) The director of the Institute for Municipal and Regional Policy at Central Connecticut State University;
(8) The executive director of the Commission on Children;
(9) A representative of private higher education, appointed by the Connecticut Conference of Independent Colleges;

(c) All appointments to the committee under subdivisions (1) to (11), inclusive, of subsection (b) of this section shall be made not later than thirty days after the effective date of this section. Any vacancy shall be filled by the appointing authority.

(d) A member of the General Assembly selected jointly by the speaker of the House of Representatives and the president pro tempore of the Senate shall be the chairperson of the committee. Such chairperson shall schedule the first meeting of the committee, which shall be held not later than sixty days after the effective date of this section.

(e) Members of the committee shall serve without compensation, except for necessary expenses incurred in the performance of their duties.

(f) Not later than October 1, 2013, and annually thereafter, the committee shall submit a report to the Governor and the joint standing committee of the General Assembly having cognizance of matters relating to appropriations and the budgets of state agencies, in accordance with section 11-4a of the general statutes, recommending measures to implement the Pew-MacArthur Results First cost-benefit analysis model.
# APPENDIX C

## Members of the Results First Policy Oversight Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Appointed By or Ex-Officio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representative Toni Walker</td>
<td>House Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator Catherine Osten</td>
<td>Senate President pro Tem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative Cecilia Buck-Taylor</td>
<td>House Minority Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator Robert Kane</td>
<td>Senate Minority Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chip Flanagan</td>
<td>House Majority Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen Durnin</td>
<td>Senate Majority Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Graham</td>
<td>Chief Court Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Clark</td>
<td>State Comptroller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Calandro</td>
<td>Director, Office of Fiscal Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrie Vibert</td>
<td>Director, Office of Program Review and Investigations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Norman-Eady</td>
<td>Director, Office of Legislative Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Clark</td>
<td>Director, Institute for Municipal and Regional Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine Zimmerman</td>
<td>Executive Director, Commission on Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy Greiman</td>
<td>Connecticut Conference of Independent Colleges</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

Appropriations Committee Budget Hearings
Eight Standard RBA Questions for All Programs

1. What is the quality of life result to which the program makes the most important contribution?

This question relates to the broader mission or vision of the program. Programs are the means to an end. They are created in order to help the state achieve a certain vision or mission for improving the quality of life for people in the state (a population). For example, a job training program contributes to the result, “All Connecticut workers earn a living wage.” A waste water treatment program contributes to the result, “A clean environment for Connecticut.” There is no official list of Connecticut result statements. A result statement in its basic form can be stated as a desired result in the following sentence structure: "All (name a population) in (name a geographic location) are (statement of the quality of life condition to be achieved), e.g. “All children in Connecticut are born healthy and are developmentally on target from Birth to 3” or “All Connecticut citizens are secure and free from crime.” There may be instances where a program contributes to more than one quality of life result. Generally, you should indicate the most important of these results. If more than one result is equally important, then you may indicate the additional results as well.

2. How does the program contribute to the result?

Programs are not responsible for population results; however, they are expected to contribute to achieving one or more results. The program’s statutory purpose or the purpose of the activities funded (we do these things in order to…) should be connected to the result. A program’s purpose is usually narrower than the quality of life to which the program contributes. For example, the purpose of the Clean Water Fund is to encourage municipalities to treat waste water and to segregate it from storm water run-off. This program is only one element that contributes to the population result of a clean Long Island Sound. If the statutory purpose no longer seems consistent with the quality of life result you think the legislature now expects, you should explain the discrepancy.

3. Who are the program’s major customers?

Customers are those served by the program. They are the direct beneficiaries of the program, the individuals, groups, or entities that receive the services, funds or other benefits of the program. For example, the customers of a preschool program are the children who attend the school and their families. Being clear about customers is essential for identifying the appropriate performance measures. The direct beneficiaries of the Clean Water Fund are the municipalities that apply for funding. The residents of the municipalities might be seen as the ultimate beneficiaries, but they are not the direct customers.

4. What measures do you use to tell if the program is delivering its services well?

---

1 This document and all other RBA resource materials for state agencies are available on the Appropriations Committee’s RBA web page: http://www.cga.ct.gov/app/rba
How are you doing on the most important of those measures?

“How well” measures relate to the manner in which program activities are carried out. These measures are often referred to as process measures. Is information collected accurately? Timely? Are services delivered courteously? Efficiently? What percent of the eligible population participates in the services? Completes them? What are staff qualifications? What do customers think of the service delivery? For example, “How well” measures for the unemployment compensation program include percent of payments made within 7 days of application (timeliness) and percent of payments made without error (accuracy). “How well” measures are often related to best practices or evidence-based practices. So, if mentoring is part of an evidenced-based practice model, the percent of youth linked to a mentor could be a “how well” measure.

For the “How well” measures you consider most important, what is the current level of performance? If you have a baseline, that is data for the last 3-5 years, provide it, along with where you think performance will be in the next 2-3 years if you keep doing what you are doing. What is the “Story behind the Baseline”? Is this baseline going in the right direction? Is it going there fast enough? What is causing the baseline to go in this direction? What are the external circumstances affecting the direction? What interactions among people or personal characteristics are affecting the direction?

If you don’t have any baseline data, what are your plans for collecting the necessary data? Use the Data Development Agenda to document your plans.

5. What measures do you use to tell if the program’s customers are better off?

How are you doing on the most important of those measures?

No matter how well you are delivering your services, how do you know if your customers are benefitting? For example, a job training program may have excellent attendance at its workshops, its instructors may all be highly qualified, and it may use a nationally recognized, evidence-based curriculum. However, we would still want to know the outcomes achieved by its customers: Did they get a job, keep that job for 6 months or a year, and earn a living wage at that job?

For the “Better off” measures you consider most important, what is the current level of performance? If you have a baseline, that is data for the last 3-5 years, provide it, along with where you think performance will be in the next 2-3 years if you keep doing what you are doing. What is the “Story behind the Baseline”? Is this baseline going in the right direction? Is it going there fast enough? What is causing the baseline to go in this direction? What are the internal and external forces affecting this performance? If you don’t have baseline data, what are your plans for collecting the necessary data? Use the Data Development Agenda to document your plans.

6. Who are the partners with a major role to play in doing better?

Government agencies alone can rarely achieve all of the outcomes that their customers desire. Partners contribute to the success of programs by making contributions to critical strategies. For example, for a program to reduce teen pregnancy, parents, teachers, doctors, clergy, and peers are all important partners. Effective strategies should include the engagement of major partners and be clear about their role.
7. What works, what could work, to do better, or to do the least harm in a difficult financial climate?

What are the actions that you know from the research, best practices, and your own experience are effective to “turn the curve” on the critical performance measures, that is to move performance in the right direction or prevent it from getting worse. These are the strategies that respond to the causes and forces behind the current level of performance.

8. What specific actions do you propose to take over the next two years? Focus on 1) no-cost and low-cost actions, 2) actions to reduce the harm of budget reductions, and 3) reallocation of existing resources to obtain best results.

To obtain the best results in this economic climate and to ensure that any budget reductions produce the least harm, what do you propose to do over the next two years? In the absence of financial resources, we need to do our best and most creative thinking, based on the analyses of the “how well” and “better off” measures, to identify no-cost or low-cost ideas, including moving funding from activities or programs that are less essential or that work less well. Be specific and concrete; focus on new actions that you will take, not what you are already doing. Remember, if you keep doing what you have been doing, you will keep getting what you have been getting.
MEMORANDUM TO THE HEADS OF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

FROM: Jeffrey D. Zient
Acting Director

SUBJECT: Use of Evidence and Evaluation in the 2014 Budget

Since taking office, the President has emphasized the need to use evidence and rigorous evaluation in budget, management, and policy decisions to make government work effectively. This need has only grown in the current fiscal environment. Where evidence is strong, we should act on it. Where evidence is suggestive, we should consider it. Where evidence is weak, we should build the knowledge to support better decisions in the future.

Agencies should demonstrate the use of evidence throughout their Fiscal Year (FY) 2014 budget submissions. Budget submissions also should include a separate section on agencies’ most innovative uses of evidence and evaluation, addressing some or all of the issues below. Many potential strategies have little immediate cost, and the Budget is more likely to fund requests that demonstrate a commitment to developing and using evidence. The Budget also will allocate limited resources for initiatives to expand the use of evidence, including but not limited to approaches outlined below. Agencies may include these initiatives in their submission at the guidance level or with proposed addbacks.

1. **Proposing new evaluations.** As in 2011 and 2012, OMB invites agencies to propose new evaluations. Areas of potential focus may include the following:

   - Low-cost evaluations using administrative data or new technology: As explained in the Coalition for Evidence-Based Policy’s recent brief—agencies can often use administrative data (such as data on wages, employment, emergency room visits or school attendance) to conduct rigorous evaluations, including evaluations that rely on random assignment, at low cost. Similarly, the private sector has used new software and online
tools to dramatically reduce the time and cost of experimentation. Agencies should consider whether they can use such data or technology to support rigorous evaluations of their existing programs or new initiatives.

- **Evaluations linked to waivers and performance partnerships:** One of the best ways to learn about a program is to test variations and subject them to evaluation, using some element of random assignment or a scientifically controlled design. OMB invites agencies to explain how they will use existing waiver authorities to evaluate different approaches to improving outcomes. Agencies should also consider seeking authority from Congress, through the FY 2014 budget process, to allow new waivers linked to evaluation or to establish cross-agency "performance partnerships" that enable blending of multiple funding streams to test better ways to align services and improve outcomes. Several agencies are seeking such authority in 2013 for initiatives supporting distressed communities and disconnected youth.

- **Expansion of evaluation efforts within existing programs:** In addition to specifying evaluations to be performed with dedicated funding, agencies can also add a general policy and requirements favoring evaluation into existing grants, contracts, or waivers. These measures may require new legislation. For example, Congress recently approved the Department of Labor's request for a small cross-agency set-aside for evaluation activities.

- **Systemic measurement of costs and cost per outcome:** Agencies are encouraged to include measurement of costs and costs per outcome as part of the routine reporting of funded programs to allow for useful comparison of cost-effectiveness across programs.

Agencies should release evaluations promptly through either their agency websites or alternative means. OMB particularly welcomes agency proposals to improve public access to, and understanding of, evidence about what works and what does not.

2. **Using comparative cost-effectiveness data to allocate resources.** Through the Pew Charitable Trust's Results First initiative, a dozen States are currently adopting a model developed by the Washington State Institute for Public Policy (WSIPP) that ranks programs based on the evidence of their return on investment. Once evidence-based programs have been identified, such an analysis can improve agency resource allocation and inform public understanding. For example, the Environmental Protection Agency and the U.S. Department of Agriculture are working together to incorporate evidence about the cost-effectiveness of different pollution control strategies in the Chesapeake Bay restoration effort.

OMB invites agencies to identify areas where research provides strong evidence regarding the comparative cost-effectiveness of agency investments. The research may pertain to the allocation of funding across agency programs (e.g., research
showing that some funding streams have higher returns on investments) or within programs (e.g., research showing that some types of grantees or programmatic approaches have higher returns). Agencies should describe the body of research and then apply its results to support a proposed resource re-allocation. OMB is more likely to support an existing resource allocation or a request for new resources supported in this way, and may feature the agency's reasoning in the 2014 Budget.

3. **Infusing evidence into grant-making.** Grant-making agencies should demonstrate that, between FY 2013 and FY 2014, they are increasing the use of evidence in formula and competitive programs. Agencies should consider the following approaches, among others:

- **Encouraging use of evidence in formula grants:** OMB invites agencies to propose ways to increase the use of evidence-based practices within formula grant programs. For example, formula funds can be conditioned on the adoption of evidence based practices, and high quality technical assistance can be used to share and support implementation of evidence based practices. Competitive programs can assign points to applicants based on their integration of such practices into formula streams.

- **Evidence-based grants:** Several agencies—ranging from the Department of Education to the U.S. Agency for International Development—have implemented evidence based grant programs that apply a tiered framework to assess the evidence supporting a proposed project and to determine appropriate funding levels. Under this approach, programs supported by stronger evidence, as established in a rigorous agency process, are eligible for more funding. All programs are expected to evaluate their results. Examples of evidence programs include the Department of Education's Investing in Innovation program and the Department of Health and Human Services’ Teen Pregnancy Prevention and Home Visiting programs. Even without creating tiers, agencies can provide points or significant competitive preference to programs that the agency determines are backed by strong evidence, and can build the evidence base by embedding evaluation into programs. Because running evidence based programs requires more resources, agencies may wish to combine multiple smaller programs into larger, evidence based efforts.

- **Pay for Success:** Taking the principle of acting on evidence one step further, the Departments of Justice and Labor will be inviting grant applicants to use a "pay for success" approach, under which philanthropic or private entities (the "investors") pay providers upfront and are only repaid by the government if certain outcomes are met. Payment amounts are based, in part, on the amount that the Federal, State, or local government saves. A pay for success approach is appropriate where: (i) improved prevention or
other upfront services can produce better outcomes that lead to cost savings at the Federal, State, or local level; and (ii) foundations or others are willing to invest.

To date, the Administration has focused its Pay for Success planning on programs financed with discretionary appropriations. OMB invites agencies to apply a pay-for-success model for programs funded by either discretionary or mandatory appropriations. Agencies should also consider using the new authority under the America COMPETES legislation to support incentive prizes of up to $50 million. Like Pay for Success, well-designed prizes and challenges can yield a very high return on the taxpayer dollar.

4. Using evidence to inform enforcement. Rigorous evaluation of strategies for enforcing criminal, environmental, and workplace safety laws often reveals that some approaches are significantly better than others at securing legal compliance. OMB encourages agencies to indicate how their allocation or reallocation of resources among enforcement strategies is informed by such evidence.

5. Strengthening agency evaluation capacity. Agencies should have a high-level official who is responsible for program evaluation and can:
   • Develop and manage the agency's research agenda;
   • Conduct or oversee rigorous and objective studies;
   • Provide independent input to agency policymakers on resource allocation and to program leaders on program management;
   • Attract and retain talented staff and researchers, including through flexible hiring authorities such as the Intergovernmental Personnel Act; and
   • Refine program performance measures, in collaboration with program managers and the Performance Improvement Officer.

These goals can be accomplished by different kinds of leaders, ranging from a chief evaluation officer who reports to the Secretary or Deputy Secretary to the head of an independent institute in the agency. An existing official could play the role, or a forceful new position could replace several less empowered ones. OMB invites agencies to propose in their budget submissions ways to strengthen the agency's evaluation capacity, within tight resource constraints.

Support for Evidence-Based Initiatives

OMB invites your agency to participate in a number of forums to improve use of evidence:

- OMB and the Council of Economic Advisers will organize a series of topical discussions with senior policy officials and research experts in the agencies. The meeting agendas will focus on administrative and policy levers for driving an increasing share of Federal investments into evidence-based
practices. We will plan summer meetings in order to help inform agencies' evaluation plans and budget submissions, and will also have follow-up meetings in the fall.

- OMB will reinvigorate the interagency evaluation working group established in 2010 with a series of meetings focused on issues commonly affecting evaluators, such as procurement rules, the Paperwork Reduction Act, and the integration of evidence in agencies' decision-making process.

- The Performance Improvement Council will convene research, performance management, and program officials to develop ways to improve performance measures, validate their correlation with outcome data from program impact evaluations, and use data analytics to support more cost-effective decision-making.

- The Office of Science and Technology Policy has created a "community of practice" for agency personnel involved in designing and managing incentive prizes and has organized a Science of Science Policy working group that is developing tools aimed at establishing a more scientific, empirical evidence basis for science and technology policymaking.

To discuss which ideas in this memo make most sense at your agency, please contact your agency's OMB contact. For more general support on evidence-based policy and evaluation, you also may contact Dan Rosenbaum (Dan T. Rosenbaum@omb.eop.gov).
APPENDIX F

CT Results First Policy Oversight Committee

AGENDA

Tuesday, November 12, 2013 Meeting
1:00 – 2:30pm
Room 2D, Legislative Office Building
Hartford, CT

I. Welcome and Introduction

II. Discussion: the Pew MacArthur Results First national initiative
   a. Pew project staff will be present to answer questions and discuss state work

III. Presentation: detailed accounting of Results First model work in CT to date
   a. The Criminal Justice component
      i. Marginal Costs
      ii. Programming
      iii. Recidivism Cohort/Resource Use
   b. Discussion

IV. Next steps:
   a. Committee meetings and structure
      i. Working groups:
         1. Adult Criminal Justice
         2. Juvenile Justice
         3. Process
   b. Oct. 1 Report (update)

V. General Discussion

VI. Adjourn
APPENDIX G

Results First Northeast Regional State Convening
December 6th – 7th, 2012
Connecticut’s Old State House
800 Main Street
Hartford, CT
Thursday, December 6th
[Staff teams]
12:00-1:00pm Working Lunch
Opening Remarks and Presentation: Unlocking the Power of Results First
Gary VanLandingham, Director, Results First
The Results First model does much more than calculate the return on investment of different programs; it can also identify the ‘cost of doing nothing,’ analyze sentencing changes, and help states move towards evidence-based policymaking. This session will discuss the ways that Washington State, New Mexico, and Iowa are realizing the full potential of Results First to inform policy and budget choices in their executive and legislative branches.

1:00-2:30pm Model Implementation – Key Issues and Strategies
Steve Lize and Mike Wilson, Technical Consultants, Results First
This session will address (through a brief presentation and facilitated discussion) key technical issues states encounter in implementing the Results First model - identifying marginal costs, conducting cohort analyses, matching state programs to those in the model, and quality assurance and documentation.

2:30-3:00pm The Model of the Future – Help Chart Its Course
Gary VanLandingham and Mike Wilson
Results First will begin a software development process in 2013 to build a new platform for the cost-benefit model. This session will seek your input into the features and functionalities we should build into the new, improved version.

3:00-3:15pm Break

3:15-4:30pm Linking Your Work to State Policymakers
Small group discussions by state
State teams will use this time to begin to address key challenges of linking your model’s results to your state’s policy and budget deliberations. Teams should arrive prepared to discuss: (1) plans for reporting your model’s results; (2) strategies for reaching out to and engaging policymakers; (3) additional resources you would like to receive from Results First; (4) opportunities and challenges that you have encountered; and (5) what successful implementation of Results First in your state would look like in five years.

5:30 p.m. Meet in Marriott Hotel lobby for transportation to dinner
6:00-8:00pm Offsite Networking Dinner Connecticut State Capitol, Hall of Flags
   Staff teams and policymakers

**Friday, December 7th**
[Staff teams and policymakers]

8:30-9:00am Breakfast

9:00-10:15am Panel: Developing and Executing a Policy Strategy for Results First
   Moderator: Gary VanLandingham, Director, Results First
   Panelists: Mike Coelho, Assistant Secretary of Policy and Planning, Massachusetts Executive Office of Public Safety and Security
   Terry Salo, Senior Advisor to the Deputy Secretary for Public Safety, and Deputy Commissioner, Office of Justice Research and Performance, New York Division of Criminal Justice Services
   Representative Toni Walker, Chair, House Appropriations, Connecticut General Assembly
   Mike Lawlor, Under Secretary for Criminal Justice Policy and Planning, Connecticut Office of Policy and Management
   Arielle Reich, Director of Intergovernmental Affairs, Office of Governor Dannel P. Malloy

   The panelists will discuss: (1) key policy questions their states are addressing with Results First; (2) their states’ policy and budgeting framework for Results First; (3) how this work fits within their states’ political landscape and public discourse; and (4) the ideal long-term placement of their Results First models.

10:15-10:30am Break

10:30-12:00pm Developing State Plans
   Small group discussions by state
   State teams will use this time develop/refine their plans for using the model’s results to move from research to policy, as well as begin to consider ways in which northeast states may continue to learn from each other.

12:00-1:00pm Working Lunch: State Reports and Next Steps
   State reports/large group discussion
   States will present highlights from their state plans and engage in a participant-wide conversation of next steps.