

STATE OF CONNECTICUT  
Results First  
Policy Oversight Committee  
Annual Report  
2016



INSTITUTE FOR MUNICIPAL AND  
REGIONAL POLICY



Central Connecticut State University



October 1, 2016

In 2013, the General Assembly created the Results First Policy Oversight Committee to oversee and guide the Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative in Connecticut. This project started in March 2011 to apply cost-benefit analysis to state policy and budget decisions. The project staff of the Institute for Municipal and Regional Policy (IMRP) at Central Connecticut State University have been working with the Judicial Branch's Court Support Services Division and the departments of Correction, Mental Health and Addiction Services, and Children and Families to implement Results First in Connecticut.

This report, as required by Section 2-111(f) of the Connecticut General Statutes, describes the Connecticut Results First project and its implementation activity in 2015-2016. This year, for the first time, the adult criminal and juvenile justice agencies listed above produced program inventories and IMRP issued its benefit-cost analyses report using the Results First model and the "results" proved to be useful!

We acknowledge and thank the technical support team from Results First and the state agency staff who have assisted and advanced this effort.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Toni Walker", enclosed in a thin black rectangular border.

Representative Toni Walker  
Chair

**PREPARED BY:**

**INSTITUTE FOR MUNICIPAL AND REGIONAL  
POLICY**

**Central Connecticut State University**

*Andrew J. Clark, Director*

*Mary Janicki, University Assistant*

*John Noonan, University Assistant*

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 Central Connecticut State University 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.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**.....2

**PART I: BACKGROUND**

    The Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative Origins.....3

    Results First In Connecticut.....3

**PART II: CONNECTICUT ACTIVITY IN 2015-2016**

    Results First Policy Oversight Committee .....4

    Collaboration with Juvenile Justice Policy Oversight Committee.....4

    Collaboration with the Connecticut Sentencing Commission.....5

**PART III: CONNECTICUT RESULTS FIRST INITIATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN 2015-2016**

    Connecticut Results First 2015-2016 Strategic Plan Status Update.....5

    Status of 2014 Juvenile Parole Recidivism Study.....10

    Connecticut Evidence-Based Program Inventories and Benefit-Cost Analyses Report..... 10

    Outreach and Communications.....12

**PART IV: 2016 CONNECTICUT LEGISLATION**.....13

**PART V: PEW-MACARTHUR RESULTS FIRST INITIATIVE SUPPORT**

    General Technical Support and Products.....13

    Site Visit: January 11, 2016.....14

    Regional Convening.....14

**PART VI: RECOMMENDATIONS**.....15

**PART VII: APPENDICIES**

    Relevant Section of Public Act 13-247.....16

    Members of the Connecticut Results First Policy Oversight Committee.....17

    Connecticut Sentencing Commission Resolution No. 2015-01.....18

    Relevant Sections of Public Act 15-5, June Special Session.....20

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- Since October 1, 2015, adult criminal and juvenile justice agencies (Judicial Branch's Court Support Services Division [CSSD] and the departments of Correction [DOC], Children and Families [DCF], and Mental Health and Addiction Services [DMHAS]) submitted the first, and are working on the second, set of program inventories listing agency programs that are evidence-based, research-based, and promising along with program descriptions and data on cost, participants, capacity, and staff. These inventories were distributed to the Office of Policy and Management (OPM), the Office of Fiscal Analysis (OFA), and to the Institute for Municipal and Regional Policy (IMRP), which used them as the basis for its “Results First Benefit-Cost Analyses of Adult Criminal and Juvenile Justice Evidence-Based Programs” report.
- IMRP conducted meetings with OPM, OFA, and agency staff on how to use the inventories and the report to make informed policy and budget decisions, of particular importance in a year when the state faced significant budget reductions.
- The goals and objectives of the 2015 Results First strategic plan have largely been accomplished, including progress on the juvenile justice parole recidivism study.
- The IMRP Results First staff participated in the Juvenile Justice Policy Oversight Committee’s ongoing efforts to increase diversion and reduce incarceration and recidivism among juveniles, resulting in the enactment of major reform legislation (PA 16-147).
- The Connecticut Sentencing Commission formally approved a partnership with the Results First Initiative in order to utilize the Results First approach when evaluating sentencing policies, practices, and programs.
- Outreach by the Results First Initiative in Connecticut was enhanced with the publication of a monthly newsletter and updated information on its website.

## **PART I: BACKGROUND**

### **Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative Origins**

The Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative (Results First)<sup>1</sup> works with jurisdictions to implement an innovative evidence-based policymaking approach and cost-benefit analysis model 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. It is intended to help states and selected counties identify opportunities to effectively invest limited resources to produce better outcomes and substantial long-term savings.

Results First employs a sophisticated econometric model to analyze the costs and benefits of evidence-based programs across a variety of social policy areas. The model, originally developed by the Washington State Institute for Public Policy (WSIPP), applies the best available national, rigorous research on program effectiveness to predict the programmatic and fiscal outcomes of evidence-based programs in Connecticut, based on our unique population characteristics and the costs to provide these programs in the state. By calculating the long-term return on investment for multiple programs through the same lens, it produces results that policymakers can use in planning and budgeting decisions.

Results First currently offers technical assistance to 22 states and seven California counties (an increase of four states and three counties since the last annual report) to help them (1) customize and implement jurisdiction-specific versions of the model and related tools and (2) use the results to help inform policy and budget deliberations.

### **Results First in Connecticut**

Connecticut became an early participant in the Results First Initiative in March 2011 when Governor Dannel Malloy and legislative leaders submitted formal letters of support to Results First.

The 2013 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, codified at CGS Sec. 2-111) (see Appendix A), established a Results First Policy Oversight Committee (RFPOC) to provide advice on the development and implementation of the Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative cost-benefit analysis model. The committee's overall goal is to promote cost-effective state policies and programs.

Public Act 15-5, June Special Session put in place the framework for ongoing implementation of the principles of Results First: program inventories from specified agencies; program identification as evidence-based, research-based, and promising; collection of program data on participants and cost for each; and a benefit-cost analysis for policy and budget decision-

---

<sup>1</sup> The Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative, 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. Results First has also received support from the Annie E. Casey Foundation.

makers. In compliance with that law, the adult criminal and juvenile justice agencies submitted program inventories in January 2016 and IMRP issued its “Results First Benefit-Cost Analyses of Adult Criminal and Juvenile Justice Evidence-Based Programs” on March 1, 2016. The law requires subsequent program inventories to be submitted on October 1, 2016 and the next benefit-cost report to be published by November 1, in time for consideration by the Office of Policy and Management and Office of Fiscal Analysis for development of the FY 2018-19 biennial budget.

Public Act 16-2, May Special Session, An Act Adjusting the State Budget for the Biennium Ending June 30, 2017, appropriates \$94,250 for FY 17 for the Results First project.

## **PART II: CONNECTICUT ACTIVITY IN 2015-2016**

### **Results First Policy Oversight Committee**

The Connecticut Results First Policy Oversight Committee and its three subcommittees were inactive during this period.

### **Collaboration with the Juvenile Justice Policy Oversight Committee**

Legislation enacted in 2014 established the Juvenile Justice Policy Oversight Committee (JJPOC) to evaluate and report on policies related to the juvenile justice system and the expansion of juvenile jurisdiction to include persons sixteen and seventeen years of age (the so-called “Raise the Age” initiative). The Tow Youth Justice Institute at the University of New Haven was designated the staff and implementation team to research, evaluate, and report on the policies and programs identified in the legislation. Its reports were to include short-, medium-, and long-term goals. In addition, the law charged the JJPOC to “work in collaboration with any Results First initiative” (PA 14-217, Sec. 79 (h)). In 2015, the committee’s authorizing legislation was amended (PA 15-183) to require it to implement a strategic plan integrating goals it set.

Once the JJPOC adopted its one-year strategic plan on June 18, 2015, Tow Institute and IMRP Results First staff met to discuss the development of a program inventory of evidence-based programs associated with the diversion, incarceration, and recidivism rates for juveniles. This effort will provide data for estimating the monetary cost-benefit analysis of programs associated with the adopted goals of increasing diversion and reducing incarceration and recidivism. The intent is to provide, along with recommendations in the Tow evaluations, specific information on (1) projected cost savings to the state and (2) the level of potential reinvestment.

Work groups began developing strategies and action steps to implement the target goals of increasing the diversion rate by 20% and reducing the incarceration rate by 20% and the recidivism rate by 10% over the next three years. On January 21, 2016, the work groups submitted recommendations to achieve the strategic goals pertaining to diversion, incarceration, and recidivism. The work group recommendations were ostensibly incorporated in House Bill 5642 and became the basis for legislation that made several changes affecting juvenile detention,

school discipline, and other juvenile justice matters (PA 16-147, An Act Concerning the Recommendations of the Juvenile Justice Policy Oversight Committee).

The JJPOC work groups continue to meet, charged with assessing or developing implementation plans for some of the provisions of PA 16-147, including one addressing the educational needs of children in, or reentering the community from, the justice system and another reporting on cost options for a community-based diversion system. The JJPOC must also establish a data working group to develop a data integration plan to evaluate programs, services, and outcomes across state agencies.

The Results First evaluation of juvenile parole services in DCF and their impact on recidivism (as required by PA 14-247, § 84 and described below) is expected to provide critical data for the JJPOC Recidivism work group to consider in developing its policy recommendations. The results of that study are expected in November 2016.

### **Collaboration with the Connecticut Sentencing Commission**

At its September 2015 meeting, the Connecticut Sentencing Commission (CSC) adopted a resolution stating that it would partner with and utilize the Results First approach when evaluating sentencing policies, practices, and programs (see Appendix C). Since then, Results First staff have been actively involved in CSC studies, particularly the study of Connecticut's pretrial diversionary programs.

## **PART III: CONNECTICUT RESULTS FIRST INITIATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN 2015-2016**

### **Connecticut Results First 2015-2016 Strategic Plan Status Update**

Following the Results First Initiative State Convening in August 2015, the Connecticut team developed major project goals and objectives for the coming year and beyond. Generally, those goals focused on (1) increasing awareness of the Results First project in Connecticut, (2) complete implementation of the law's program inventory requirement and the Results First model's benefit-cost analyses, and (3) integrating the Results First approach and use of evidence-based programs in policy- and budget-making decisions.

Table 1 shows each goal and specific objectives for each, along with the strategic plan's projected deadline and its current status.

**Table 1: Status of 2015 Strategic Plan Goals and Objectives**

**Goal 1: Increase the recognition and knowledge of the Connecticut Results First Team through the promotion of completed and ongoing studies and reports.**

<b>Objective</b>	<b>Deadline</b>	<b>Status</b>
Complete a detailed project management plan including activities focused on outreach and implementation of Results First in Connecticut.	December 2015	Developed and maintained, September 2015 to present
Meet with Representative Toni Walker, co-chair of the Results First Policy Oversight Committee and co-chair of the legislature’s Appropriations Committee, to identify additional members of the General Assembly to lead and participate in the Results First project.	December 2015	Ongoing
Engage the Office of the Governor and legislative leaders to renew the commitment letter to the Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative.	December 2015	Unnecessary, per Pew Results First Initiative, October 30, 2015
Assess the utility and role of the Results First Policy Oversight Committee and make recommendations.	December 2015	No action
Publish a case study describing the successful application of a data collection and utilization system that can be shared among agencies and posted on the website.	December 2015	Completed and distributed, March 8, 2016
In partnership with the Connecticut Sentencing Commission, co-release a report on the costs of recidivism.	December 2015	In progress
Complete and publicize among stakeholders, officials, and agencies with policy and budget discretion the studies required by PA 14-214.	March 2016	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The DOC study of vocational education programs for individuals in custody (Sec. 81).</li> </ul>		Submitted, October 16, 2015
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The DOC study of the department’s Medication Assisted Therapy pilot project (Sec. 82).</li> </ul>		Pending
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The IMRP evaluation of the effectiveness of the multidimensional family therapy (MDFT) program operated by DCF and CSSD (Sec. 83).</li> </ul>		Pending
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The IMRP assessment of the effectiveness of juvenile parole services programs that DCF</li> </ul>		Expected completion, November 2016

<b>Objective</b>	<b>Deadline</b>	<b>Status</b>
administers (Sec. 84).		
Draft a cost of recidivism study.	March 2016	In progress as of September 2016
Introduce OPM and OFA budget analysts to the principles and application of the Results First model.	March 2016	Meetings with OPM leadership and staff: November 2, 2015 and March 10 and July 26, 2016. Meeting with OFA director and budget analysts, March 10, 2016.
Introduce, train, and engage the Finance, Revenue and Bonding and Appropriations committee members, particularly Appropriations Committee subcommittee chairs, in the use of program inventories and cost-benefit analysis for program evaluation, cost-benefit analysis, and budget decisions.	March 2016	No action

**Goal 2: Complete implementation of the program inventory requirement and Results First model for adult criminal and juvenile justice agencies.**

<b>Objective</b>	<b>Deadline</b>	<b>Status</b>
Complete the work group's program inventories with estimates of programs' marginal cost.	December 2015	*
Draft documentation for agency use in completing marginal cost estimates using regression analysis. Two CSSD programs can be used as case studies.	March 2016	Training provided August 27, 2015 and August 9, 2016; no document produced
Receive agencies' inventories of adult criminal and juvenile justice programs categorized as evidence-based, research-based, promising, or lacking evidence by January 1, 2016. Each program inventory must be submitted to OPM, the legislative fiscal committees, OFA, and IMRP.	March 2016	*
Based on the inventories and using the Results First model, submit a report on program cost-benefit analyses	March 2016	Completed and distributed to

<b>Objective</b>	<b>Deadline</b>	<b>Status</b>
to OPM, the legislative fiscal committees, and OFA by March 1, 2016.		statutory recipients, March 1, 2016
Report cost-benefit analyses for adult criminal and juvenile justice programs to OPM, the legislature's fiscal committees, and OFA, pursuant to PA 15-5, June Special Session.	November 2016	Expected November 2016

\*Various training sessions and conference calls provided to four agencies' work group, June 17-October 19, 2015

- DMHAS submission: December 31, 2015; final February 5, 2016
- CSSD submission: January 31, 2016; final March 1, 2016
- DOC submission: January 29, 2016; final February 9, 2016
- DCF submission: final January 8, 2016

**Goal 3: Oversee integration of the Results First model of evidence-based policy in the decision-making and budget process.**

<b>Objective</b>	<b>Deadline</b>	<b>Status</b>
Meet with agency and OPM staff to explain benefits from Results First work, including the best use of program inventories and the Results First clearinghouse database.	December 2015	Introduction to OPM secretary, undersecretary, and supervisors, November 2, 2015
Identify and meet those stakeholders with involvement or an interest in the state's budget process, such as the MetroHartford Alliance, the Connecticut Association of Nonprofits, and private providers, to promote Results First.	December 2015	No action
Initiate or re-engage ongoing relationships with other entities, such as the Connecticut Sentencing Commission, DOC, the Juvenile Justice Policy Oversight Committee, to add cost-benefit analyses and apply the Results First model to their evaluation and analysis of public policy.	December 2015	**
Plan with other Results First states in the Northeast to gather at a regional convening highlighting how policymakers can use Results First to inform policymaking.	December 2015	Pew Results First Initiative to convene regional meeting scheduled for December 14-15,

<b>Objective</b>	<b>Deadline</b>	<b>Status</b>
		2016.
Schedule meetings for training of relevant agency and OPM staff on the use of program inventory data and cost-benefit analyses to (1) support or oppose current program investment, (2) evaluate pilot or sunset programs, and (3) substantiate requests for new funding. Sessions must include an overview of the Results First Initiative and its history in Connecticut, the application of the model, and training on data collection and use.	March 2016	Results First and budget priorities: OPM meeting with undersecretaries and budget analysts, PEW consultants, March 10, 2016. Re-engagement meeting with OPM staff, July 26, 2016
Research and select an additional public policy area for building out the Results First model in Connecticut. Investigate the technical and political implications of mental health or child welfare policy areas as potential candidates.	March 2016	No action
Document, monitor, and update the project management plan.	September 2016	Ongoing
Monitor recipients of the adult criminal and juvenile justice agencies' program inventories for their use and application in the budget process.	September 2016	***
Submit the report on program cost-benefit analyses to OPM, the legislative fiscal committees, and OFA by November 1 annually	November 2016	Expected November 2016

\*\*Ongoing collaboration with JJPOC's four workgroups from September 2015 to the adoption on January 21, 2016 of final recommendations for submission to the General Assembly

Connecticut Sentencing Commission adopted resolution No. 2015-1 regarding the Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative establishing partnership relationship, September 17, 2015

Connecticut Sentencing Commission study on pretrial diversionary programs approved, December 10, 2015. Results First collaboration on research, cost-benefit analysis, March 17, 2016 to present.

\*\*\*Meeting with OPM secretary, undersecretaries, and supervisors to promote use of program inventories and benefit-cost report in development of budget options as well as support for preparation of next round of inventories due October 1, 2016, on July 26, 2016.

## **Status of 2014 Juvenile Parole Recidivism Study**

In 2014, legislation required four targeted program evaluations intended to provide the data for application of the Results First model in two adult criminal and two juvenile justice programs (PA 14-217, An Act Implementing Provisions of the State Budget for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2015).

One of those studies required IMRP to assess the effectiveness of juvenile parole services programs DCF administers. The Institute had to consider its findings in connection with the Connecticut Results First cost-benefit analysis model. It was required to consult with DCF to develop recommendations to improve program cost-effectiveness. It had to report its findings and the program changes DCF should implement as a result. The report was also to include recommendations IMRP and DCF suggested for statutory or program changes to improve cost-effectiveness.

Though the report was due June 30, 2015, it wasn't until September 18, 2015 that the Memoranda of Agreement (MOA) with DCF and CSSD were negotiated to obtain access to the agencies' data required for this study. Because of technical hardware issues as well as other serious data management, coding, and analysis problems, this project encountered significant delays. A draft report must be submitted to the agencies (DCF and CSSD) for their review and to confirm interpretation of the data. This process is expected to be completed at the end of October 2016. After that, IMRP (in consultation with DCF) will make recommendations and release a final report, by mid-November.

Despite the long delay, this important report will provide critical data for policymakers, including the department, the legislature, and the Juvenile Justice Policy Oversight Committee. That group, as described above, has adopted a strategic plan that includes goals to increase the rate of diversion and decrease rates of incarceration and recidivism for juveniles. This long-awaited report will provide baseline data on juvenile recidivism focusing on the impact of the "Raise the Age" law, offenses, demographics, and program participation. The JJPOC will find this report to be an important element in its deliberations and a basis for its recommendations and decisions.

## **Connecticut Evidence-Based Program Inventories and Benefit-Cost Analyses Report**

### ***Process***

The 2015 "budget implementer" (PA 15-5, June Special Session, An Act Implementing Provisions of the State Budget for the Biennium Ending June 30, 2017 Concerning General Government, Education and Health and Human Services and Bonds of the State) included the provision (§§ 486 through 489) requiring certain state agencies to develop the so-called program inventories that provide the basis and data for implementation of Result First. Governor Dannel Malloy signed the legislation on June 30, 2015.

That act required the Judicial Branch's Court Support Services Division and the departments of Correction, Children and Families, and Mental Health and Addiction Services to

develop program inventories that are the basis and include the data for implementation of the Result First project. By January 1, 2016, the agencies had to (1) compile complete lists of each agency's adult criminal and juvenile justice programs and (2) categorize them as evidenced-based, research-based, promising, or lacking any evidence. In the future, the agencies must again do this by October 1 in every even-numbered year.

Each designated agency's list must include the following information for the previous fiscal year:

1. a detailed program description and the names of providers,
2. the intended treatment population and outcomes,
3. total annual program expenditures and a description of funding sources,
4. the method for assigning participants,
5. the cost per participant,
6. the annual capacity for and the number of actual participants, and
7. an estimate of the number of people eligible for or needing the program.

As noted above, CSSD and the departments submitted their program inventories to the Office of Policy and Management's (OPM) Criminal Justice Policy and Planning Division (CJPPD), the Appropriations and Finance, Revenue and Bonding committees, the Office of Fiscal Analysis (OFA), and IMRP. By January 31, 2016 (an extended deadline), each of the four agencies had submitted a complete or, in some cases partial, inventory.

Then the Results First staff at IMRP compiled and on March 1, 2016 submitted its report that included the benefit-cost analysis for each program included in the model for which the inventory provided the necessary information. By law, the report ([http://www.ccsu.edu/imrp/Publicatons/Files/Benefit\\_Cost\\_Analyses\\_2016.pdf](http://www.ccsu.edu/imrp/Publicatons/Files/Benefit_Cost_Analyses_2016.pdf)) was sent to CJPPD, the Appropriations and Finance, Revenue and Bonding committees, and OFA. The subsequent report is due by November 1, 2016 and annually thereafter by November 1. In addition, IMRP's benefit-cost analyses may be included as part of OPM's and OFA's annual fiscal accountability report due by November 15 to the legislature's fiscal committees.

By law, OPM must develop a plan to promote a more effective and cohesive state criminal justice system. Under the act, to accomplish this, OPM must also review the program inventories and benefit-cost analyses and consider incorporating them in its budget recommendations to the legislature.

### ***Round Two***

To prepare agency staff to compile their next program inventory, due October 1, 2016, IMRP convened another meeting to (1) assess the process, training, and technical assistance provided for the first inventories, (2) review inventory data components and marginal cost calculations and answer questions, and (3) discuss deadlines and goals for using the resulting inventories. Agency Results First work group members along with their key budget staff met at IMRP offices on August 9, 2016. Pew's Dr. Steve Lize and IMRP's economics consultant Dr. Ashley Provencher participated by telephone.

The work group members agreed that last year's technical assistance sessions were helpful to them. They indicated that the most difficult part of the process seemed to be matching programs with those in the WSIPP model or the Results First database clearinghouse. Participants discussed and agreed to certain minor modifications in the program inventory Excel templates which were quickly made and circulated to the agencies.

### ***Utilization***

After distributing the benefit-cost report, IMRP Results First staff was invited to describe the work and present findings to the leadership of OPM and OFA. These meetings occurred as they were finalizing the mid-term state budget revisions for FY 17. Normally, the budget is prepared during the months of September through May or June, depending on the year of the budget biennium. This budget involved significant financial challenges in order to achieve a balanced budget and the report and our discussions informed the final resolution, which involved deep spending reductions.

During the General Assembly's consideration of budget adjustments and the resulting budget reductions for FY 17, it became apparent that the data in the agencies' program inventories would provide important information and details. Program costs, utilization rates, and effectiveness measures found in the program inventories provided the basis for making these budget decisions. Subsequently, the mid-term 2017 budget year began on July 1, 2016 with agencies searching for ways to manage cuts. The four agencies involved in the Results First Initiative were able to and did refer to the information collected through their program inventories in the process of managing assigned budget reductions along with related policy implications.

In July, IMRP staff met with the leadership of OPM to discuss their plan to consider the next Results First report as they make their November reports to legislative committees and in developing their own budget recommendations. OPM indicated a strong interest in our analysis and pledged support in the future.

### **Outreach and Communication**

#### ***Newsletter***

Results First Connecticut staff publish a monthly newsletter with information on the project's status in Connecticut and other states as well as updates on the federal Commission on Evidence-Based Policymaking. The electronic newsletter distribution list includes almost 50 state executive, judicial, and legislative branch officials and staffers as well as other stakeholders.

Copies of the newsletter are under the Results First Connecticut heading at <http://www.ccsu.edu/imrp/Publicatons/index.html>.

## ***Website***

Since April 2, 2015, the Institute for Municipal and Regional Policy has maintained the website for the Results First Connecticut. It gives an overview of Results First work here in the state with links to documents, reports, legislation, and activities associated with the initiative elsewhere. The site is updated with relevant documents as necessary.

Usage figures for October 1, 2015 to mid-September 2016 indicate over 5,000 visits to the site, up from 500 in the prior year.

The Connecticut Results First website address is: [www.resultsfirstct.org](http://www.resultsfirstct.org)

## **PART IV: 2016 CONNECTICUT LEGISLATION**

### **Budget Provisions**

Public Act 16-2, May Special Session appropriates \$94,250 in fiscal year 2017 for the Results First project.

## **PART V: PEW-MACARTHUR RESULTS FIRST INITIATIVE SUPPORT**

### **General Technical Support and Products**

The Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative staff are available to provide advice on procedures and implementation strategies as well as technical assistance with the Results First model. Technical and liaison staff are quite responsive and knowledgeable. Regularly-scheduled conference calls provide the opportunity to exchange updated status information, discuss current activities, and answer questions.

The Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative website (<http://www.pewtrusts.org/en/projects/pew-macarthur-results-first-initiative>) includes updated news and research reports. Also available is the [Results First Clearinghouse Database](#) (with an accompanying user guide) that compiles ratings and information from eight national research clearinghouses on over 900 programs. This Excel database covers a wide range of policy areas and interventions.

Finally, this year Pew created Igloo, a social media site for Results First states to share their reports and products, discuss issues and pose questions, publicize relevant events, and take advantage of technical resources. Webinars on a variety of topics are promoted and supported on this Igloo site.

Pew strives to keep the benefit-cost analysis model tool up-to-date and the Connecticut team has access to the “cloud-based” version.

**Site Visit: January 11, 2016**

To provide some final technical assistance for agencies to help them complete their program inventories, the Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative liaison staff for Connecticut (Ronojoy Sen and Dr. Steve Lize) met in January with work group staff. That meeting focused on the inventory format (including the distinction between average and marginal costs), the use of inventories in the process of applying the model to arrive at the benefit-cost analysis, deadlines, and feedback from Pew on draft inventory submissions.

**Regional Convening**

This year the Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative plans to conduct a regional, rather than a national, convening of Results First states. A meeting is planned for December 14 and 15, 2016 in Providence, Rhode Island where all the Results First states in the Northeast (Connecticut, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Vermont, New York, and Delaware) will gather to share implementation strategies, activities, and plans.

## **PART VI: RECOMMENDATIONS**

Implementation of the 2015 legislation that required (1) adult criminal and juvenile justice agencies to compile program inventories and (2) IMRP to produce the Results First benefit-cost analyses for the state's executive and judicial branches and the General Assembly has been a major accomplishment of the IMRP's Results First efforts this year. In general in the future, we anticipate improved program inventories and an enhanced benefit-cost report as this requirement and process become more familiar, data collection improves, and users recognize the advantages of implementing evidence-based programs. To promote the benefits of the Results First Initiative, we make the following recommendations.

- ✓ Encourage OPM, OFA, and agencies to actively infuse evidence-based policy-making into their regular management practices.
- ✓ Maximize features in the upgraded cloud-based Results First model after the transition from the excel version, by expanding user access to include other stakeholders, easily updating data, producing additional benefit-cost analyses, taking advantage of help resources, and generating reports.
- ✓ Consider requiring agencies to (1) substantiate their budget options with evidence that any proposed new program is likely to solve an identified problem or (2) base new grant or contract awards, evaluations, and payments on the incorporation of and data from evidence-based practices.
- ✓ Expand outreach efforts to inform stakeholders, private providers, and other organizations interested in the effectiveness and efficiency of state government of the benefits of the Results First Initiative.
- ✓ Include evidence-based policy-making and budgeting practices in statewide manager training programs.
- ✓ Continue and develop collaboration efforts with current partners: the Connecticut Sentencing Commission, the Juvenile Justice Policy Oversight Committee, and the Connecticut Data Collaborative.
- ✓ Generally, promote IMRP as a resource in addressing budget- and policy-making decisions.

## Appendix A

**Relevant Section of Public Act 13-247**  
**Codified at Section 2-111 of the Connecticut General Statutes**  
***AN ACT IMPLEMENTING PROVISIONS OF THE STATE BUDGET***  
***FOR THE BIENNIUM ENDING JUNE 30, 2015 CONCERNING***  
***GENERAL GOVERNMENT***

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; and
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 B

### Members of the Connecticut Results First Policy Oversight Committee

<i>Member</i>	<i>Appointed By or Ex-Officio</i>
Representative Toni Walker	House Speaker
Senator Catherine Osten	Senate President pro Tem
Representative Dan Carter	House Minority Leader
Senator Robert Kane	Senate Minority Leader
Chip Flanagan	House Majority Leader
Ellen Durnin	Senate Majority Leader
Elizabeth Graham	Chief Court Administrator
John Clark	State Comptroller
Neil Ayers	Director, Office of Fiscal Analysis
Carrie Vibert	Director, Office of Program Review and Investigations
Stephanie D'Ambrose	Director, Office of Legislative Research
Andrew Clark	Director, Institute for Municipal and Regional Policy
Steven Hernandez	Executive Director, Commission on Women, Children and Seniors
Vacant	Connecticut Conference of Independent Colleges

September 27, 2016

## Appendix C

ADOPTED  
09/17/2015

### CONNECTICUT SENTENCING COMMISSION No. 2015-01 Resolution Regarding the Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative

#### Resolution

RESOLVED, That the Connecticut Sentencing Commission partner with The Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative and utilize the Results First approach when evaluating sentencing policies, practices, and programs.

#### Report

##### 1. Program Background

The Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative, a project of The Pew Charitable Trusts and the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, works with eighteen states and four California counties to implement an innovative cost-benefit analysis approach that helps them invest in policies and programs that are proven to work. Results First partners use data from evidence-based programs to conduct cost-benefit analyses and compare programs' likely return on investment. The process helps policy-makers make informed decisions to fund effective programs. In Connecticut, the Results First Initiative is staffed by the Institute for Municipal and Regional Policy at Central Connecticut State University, which also provides staffing resources for the Sentencing Commission.<sup>2</sup>

##### 2. Results First and the Commission's Mandate

The Connecticut Sentencing Commission's enabling legislation (C.G.S. Sec. 54-300) requires that the Commission:

- Facilitate the development and maintenance of a state-wide sentencing database;
- Evaluate existing sentencing statutes, policies and practices including conducting a cost-benefit analysis;
- Act as a sentencing policy resource for the state;
- Evaluate the impact of pretrial, sentencing diversion, incarceration and post-release supervision programs;
- Perform fiscal impact analyses on selected proposed criminal justice legislation; and
- Make recommendations concerning criminal justice legislation

The Results First Initiative is uniquely situated to assist the Commission with these mandates by extending its expertise in collecting and utilizing program data in the criminal justice arena,

---

<sup>2</sup> "An Overview of the Pew Mac-Arthur Results First Initiative," July 2015

conducting the required quantitative analyses, and providing the evaluations and evidence for making informed budget and policy decisions.

Using the Results First model, we can:

- Evaluate evidence-based or research-based programs;

- Provide the tools to assess the effectiveness of programs;

- Estimate a return on investment for each program evaluated;

- Provide the necessary information to conduct fiscal impact analyses on proposed legislation; and

- Share resources of the Institute for Municipal and Regional Policy.

## Appendix D

### Relevant Sections of Public Act 15-5, June Special Session

#### Senate Bill No. 1502

#### June Special Session, Public Act No. 15-5

### **AN ACT IMPLEMENTING PROVISIONS OF THE STATE BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM ENDING JUNE 30, 2017, CONCERNING GENERAL GOVERNMENT, EDUCATION, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES AND BONDS OF THE STATE.**

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Assembly convened:

...

Sec. 486. (NEW) (Effective July 1, 2015) For purposes of this section and sections 487 and 489 of this act:

(1) "Cost-beneficial" means the cost savings and benefits realized over a reasonable period of time are greater than the costs of implementation;

(2) "Program inventory" means the (A) compilation of the complete list of all agency programs and activities; (B) identification of those that are evidence-based, research-based and promising; and (C) inclusion of program costs and utilization data;

(3) "Evidence-based" describes a program that (A) incorporates methods demonstrated to be effective for the intended population through scientifically based research, including statistically controlled evaluations or randomized trials; (B) can be implemented with a set of procedures to allow successful replication in the state; (C) achieves sustained, desirable outcomes; and (D) when possible, has been determined to be cost-beneficial;

(4) "Research-based" describes a program or practice that has some research demonstrating effectiveness, such as one tested with a single randomized or statistically controlled evaluation, but does not meet all of the criteria of an evidence-based program; and

(5) "Promising" describes a program or practice that, based on statistical analyses or preliminary research, shows potential for meeting the evidence-based or research-based criteria.

Sec. 487. (NEW) (Effective July 1, 2015) (a) Not later than January 1, 2016, and not later than October first in every even-numbered year thereafter, the Departments of Correction, Children and Families and Mental Health and Addiction Services, and the Court Support Services Division of the Judicial Branch shall compile a program inventory of each of said agency's criminal and juvenile justice programs and shall categorize them as evidence-based, research-based, promising or lacking any evidence. Each program inventory shall include a complete list of all agency programs, including the following information for each such program for the prior fiscal year: (1) A detailed

description of the program, (2) the names of providers, (3) the intended treatment population, (4) the intended outcomes, (5) the method of assigning participants, (6) the total annual program expenditures, (7) a description of funding sources, (8) the cost per participant, (9) the annual number of participants, (10) the annual capacity for participants, and (11) the estimated number of persons eligible for, or needing, the program.

(b) Each program inventory required by subsection (a) of this section shall be submitted in accordance with the provisions of section 11-4a of the general statutes to the Criminal Justice Policy and Planning Division within the Office of Policy and Management, the joint standing committees of the General Assembly having cognizance of matters relating to appropriations and the budgets of state agencies and finance, revenue and bonding, the Office of Fiscal Analysis, and the Institute for Municipal and Regional Policy at Central Connecticut State University.

(c) Not later than March 1, 2016, and annually thereafter by November first, the Institute for Municipal and Regional Policy at Central Connecticut State University shall submit a report containing a cost-benefit analysis of the programs inventoried in subsection (a) of this section to the Criminal Justice Policy and Planning Division of the Office of Policy and Management, the joint standing committees of the General Assembly having cognizance of matters relating to appropriations and the budgets of state agencies and finance, revenue and bonding, and the Office of Fiscal Analysis, in accordance with the provisions of section 11-4a of the general statutes.

(d) The Office of Policy and Management and the Office of Fiscal Analysis may include the cost-benefit analysis provided by the Institute for Municipal and Regional Policy under subsection (c) of this section in their reports submitted to the joint standing committees of the General Assembly having cognizance of matters relating to appropriations and the budget of state agencies, and finance, revenue and bonding on or before November fifteenth annually, pursuant to subsection (b) of section 2-36b of the general statutes.

Sec. 488. Subsection (b) of section 4-68m of the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof (Effective July 1, 2015):

(b) The division shall develop a plan to promote a more effective and cohesive state criminal justice system and, to accomplish such plan, shall:

- (1) Conduct an in-depth analysis of the criminal justice system;
- (2) Determine the long-range needs of the criminal justice system and recommend policy priorities for the system;
- (3) Identify critical problems in the criminal justice system and recommend strategies to solve those problems;
- (4) Assess the cost-effectiveness of the use of state and local funds in the criminal justice system;
- (5) Recommend means to improve the deterrent and rehabilitative capabilities of the criminal justice system;
- (6) Advise and assist the General Assembly in developing plans, programs and proposed legislation for improving the effectiveness of the criminal justice system;

(7) Make computations of daily costs and compare interagency costs on services provided by agencies that are a part of the criminal justice system;

(8) Review the program inventories and cost-benefit analyses submitted pursuant to section 487 of this act and consider incorporating such inventories and analyses in its budget recommendations to the General Assembly;

[(8)] (9) Make population computations for use in planning for the long-range needs of the criminal justice system;

[(9)] (10) Determine long-range information needs of the criminal justice system and acquire that information;

[(10)] (11) Cooperate with the Office of the Victim Advocate by providing information and assistance to the office relating to the improvement of crime victims' services;

[(11)] (12) Serve as the liaison for the state to the United States Department of Justice on criminal justice issues of interest to the state and federal government relating to data, information systems and research;

[(12)] (13) Measure the success of community-based services and programs in reducing recidivism;

[(13)] (14) Develop and implement a comprehensive reentry strategy as provided in section 18-81w; and

[(14)] (15) Engage in other activities consistent with the responsibilities of the division.

Sec. 489. (NEW) (Effective July 1, 2016) The Departments of Correction, Children and Families and Mental Health and Addiction Services, and the Court Support Services Division of the Judicial Branch may include in the estimates of expenditure requirements transmitted pursuant to section 4-77 of the general statutes, and the Governor may include in the Governor's recommended appropriations in the budget document transmitted to the General Assembly pursuant to section 4-71 of the general statutes, an estimate of the amount required by said agencies for expenditures related to the implementation of evidence-based programs.