

STATE OF CONNECTICUT
Results First
Policy Oversight Committee
Annual Report
2019



INSTITUTE FOR MUNICIPAL AND
REGIONAL POLICY



Central Connecticut State University



December 1, 2019

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 initially worked 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. Since then, the Department of Social Services has been added to the covered agencies.

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 the year from October 1, 2018 through September 30, 2019 and makes recommendations. It also covers the calendar quarter from October 1, 2019 through the end of the year. In 2018, the Judicial Branch Court Support Services Division (JB-CSSD) and the Department of Correction (DOC) submitted their inventories of programs related to adult criminal and juvenile justice and IMRP issued its benefit-cost analyses report using the Results First model. In 2019, IMRP published the benefit-cost analyses report with data from JB-CSSD, the Department of Children and Families, and DOC. At the end of the 2019 calendar year, Connecticut's partnership with the Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative terminates, though access to program clearinghouses and different technical assistance opportunities remains.

We know that Connecticut's Results First agencies have used their previously submitted program data to make informed budget and program decisions, particularly when required to identify budget rescissions.

Since Governor Lamont's administration assumed office in January 2019, we have reached out to key officials in the executive branch to introduce and coordinate efforts for a more rigorous and valuable application of the Results First Initiative in our state.

We acknowledge and thank the state agency staff who have assisted and diligently advanced this effort. Results First Connecticut is made possible through state support.



PREPARED BY:

INSTITUTE FOR MUNICIPAL AND REGIONAL POLICY

Central Connecticut State University

Andrew J. Clark, Director

Mary Janicki, Senior Research and Policy Analyst

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.....	4
Results First in Connecticut.....	4
Results First in Other States.....	5
PART II: CONNECTICUT ACTIVITY IN 2018-2019	
Results First Connecticut Accomplishments and Impact.....	5
Connecticut Evidence-Based Program Inventories and Benefit-Cost Analyses Report.....	7
Website.....	8
Results First Policy Oversight Committee	8
Collaboration with the Connecticut Sentencing Commission.....	9
Collaboration with the Connecticut Reentry Collaborative.....	9
PART III: PEW-MACARTHUR RESULTS FIRST INITIATIVE SUPPORT	9
PART IV: RECOMMENDATIONS AND STRATEGIES	10
APPENDICIES	
A: Results First Oversight Committee (Relevant Section of Public Act 13-247).....	13
B: Program Inventories of Agency Programs and Cost-Benefit Analysis Report Statutory Requirements (Relevant Section of Public Act 17-2, June Special Session).....	14



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- Since 2011, Connecticut has partnered with the Pew Charitable Trusts and MacArthur Foundation to implement the Results First program that promotes the use of evidence-based programs and cost-benefit analyses in making state policy and budget decisions. However, the Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative has informed Results First Connecticut that the user agreement providing access to the cost-benefit model is lapsing at the end of 2019 and technical assistance for preparation of the benefit-cost analyses report will no longer be provided. A review of any shift in emphasis to evidence-based program inventories will determine the nature and future focus of the project.
- Results First Connecticut staff continued to reach out to state agency and General Assembly staff to expand implementation and application of the Results First econometric model.
- The inauguration of Governor Ned Lamont and the appointment of his new cabinet and budget agency staff provided an important opportunity to introduce the principles of Results First and offer support consistent with their administration's performance goals.
- The statutory requirements for the Results First project had been expanded to (1) apply the program inventory and benefit-cost analyses report to all of the designated agencies' programs, not only adult criminal and juvenile justice programs; (2) make the inventory and report requirements annual, rather than biennial; and (3) add the Department of Social Services (DSS) to the agencies required to comply.
- In October and November, 2018 the Judicial Branch's Court Support Services Division (JB-CSSD) and the Department of Correction (DOC) submitted program inventories, providing FY 18 data for its adult criminal and juvenile justice programs. IMRP issued its 2018 "Benefit-Cost Analyses" report showing cost-benefit comparisons for 11 adult and three juvenile programs and highlighting all programs that are evidence-based.
- In October and November, 2019, JB-CSSD, the Department of Children and Families (DCF), and DOC submitted program inventories with FY 19 data. The Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services (DMHAS) collected program inventory data; but because the department's funding allocations are based on "level of care" not separate programs, no Results First analysis could be calculated. IMRP issued its 2019 "Benefit-Cost Analyses" report showing cost-benefit comparisons for 35 adult and three juvenile programs and highlighting all programs that are evidence-based.



- The Connecticut Sentencing Commission and Results First Connecticut continued their partnership utilizing the Results First approach when evaluating sentencing policies, practices, and programs. The Sentencing Commission’s subcommittee concerning inmates identified as chronically mentally ill will include data from the DOC program inventory in its study.
- Results First Connecticut supported the Reentry Roundtable Collaborative in their effort to implement the state’s 2018 comprehensive reentry strategy by providing cost-benefit analyses of reentry programs.

Recommendations for the coming year focus generally on efforts to:

- ✓ Determine the path forward for the Results First Initiative and propose corresponding amendments to the Connecticut General statutes
- ✓ With an emphasis on the benefits of program inventories, work with the mandated agencies to develop evidence-based program-specific data that improves the contents and utilization of their inventories
- ✓ Reengage the Results First Policy Oversight Committee
- ✓ Continue to encourage executive and legislative leaders, the Office of Policy and Management (OPM), the Office of Fiscal Analysis (OFA), and other agencies to actively integrate evidence-based policy making into their decisions
- ✓ Promote IMRP as a resource in addressing budget- and policy-making decisions



PART I: BACKGROUND

Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative Origins

The Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative (Results First)¹ 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 participating states and counties identify opportunities to effectively invest limited resources to produce better outcomes and substantial long-term savings.

The Results First Initiative promotes the implementation of evidence-based policymaking, recognizing that limited public resources should be focused on effective programs based on fidelity and comprehensive assessments. States should make the best-informed decisions to allocate funds and support their most effective programs, *particularly when resources are scarce*. The Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative encourages and supports integrating such an approach in agency and legislative operations.

Results First employs a sophisticated econometric model to analyze the costs and benefits of evidence-based programs (EBP) 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 our state. By calculating the long-term return on investment for multiple programs through the same lens, it produces results that policymakers can use in their planning and budgeting decisions.

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 The Pew Charitable Trusts and MacArthur Foundation.

The project was established in the non-partisan Institute for Municipal and Regional Policy where staff could provide research and expertise to both the executive and legislative branches of state government. The Results First Policy Oversight Committee was established in 2013 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.

¹ 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.



Subsequently, PA 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, or promising; collection of program data on participants and cost for each; and a benefit-cost analysis for policy and budget decision-makers.

PA 17-2, June Special Session expanded Connecticut's Results First project to cover *all* programs provided by JB-CSSD and the departments of Correction (DOC), Children and Families (DCF), and Mental Health and Addiction Services (DMHAS), not just those related to adult criminal and juvenile justice; and it added the Department of Social Services (DSS) to the list of agencies required to submit a program inventory. Every year, agencies must complete their inventories and IMRP must publish its benefit-cost report, in time for consideration by the Office of Policy and Management (OPM) and Office of Fiscal Analysis (OFA) in developing the biennial budget and budget adjustments.

The Connecticut project staff have been informed that access to the cost-benefit model will terminate at the end of the 2019 calendar year. Thus, no resources should be devoted to expanding Connecticut data or program assessment to include additional policy areas such as education, substance abuse, or child welfare.

Results First in Other States

The Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative currently partners with 13 states and six county governments. The Pew Center for the States has developed a new [Evidence-Based Policymaking Resource Center](#), available to states to identify promising practices from other states in program assessment, budget development, implementation oversight, outcome monitoring, and targeted evaluation.

PART II: CONNECTICUT ACTIVITY IN 2018-2019

Results First Connecticut Accomplishments and Impact

- As anticipated in the last Annual Report, the Connecticut Results First team reached out to the new officials and staff appointed by newly-elected Governor Ned Lamont as the new administration took office in January 2019. At these meetings, we introduced the principles of the Results First Initiative, described the reports and studies completed to date and our work with legislators and Results First agencies in the executive and judicial branches.

Most importantly, we discussed how the Results First project meets the governor's stated goals with his emphasis on achieving efficiencies and using evidence-based



programs, and how the Results First team could collaborate and provide support to these officials' efforts. Staff met with:

- ❖ Marc Pelka, Undersecretary of the Office of Policy and Management, Criminal Justice Policy and Planning Division (January 2019)
 - ❖ Paul Mounds, Chief Operating Officer and Deputy Chief of Staff (February 27)
 - ❖ Dave Wilkinson, the Cabinet-level Chief Performance Officer and co-chair of the governor's Transition Policy Committee (April 25)
 - ❖ Alison Fisher, Project Director, LeanCT, OPM Office of Finance (June 26)
-
- JB-CSSD and DOC submitted their program inventories (October 1, 2018) and the IMRP published the fourth edition of the ["Benefit-Cost Analyses of Evidence-Based Programs"](#) (November 1, 2018).
 - JB-CSSD, DCF, and DOC submitted their program inventories (October 1, 2019) and the IMRP published its fifth edition of the ["Benefit-Cost Analyses of Evidence-Based Programs"](#) (November 1, 2019).
 - Throughout the year, staff met with agency representatives from JB-CSSD, DCF, DOC, DSS, and DMHAS to discuss program inventories and the cost-benefit analysis process.
 - Results First Connecticut began the work required to expand application of the model beyond criminal justice to additional policy areas such as education, adult mental health, health, substance abuse, child mental health, and child welfare. Staff collected relevant data available to the public and met with the State Department of Education's chief performance officer to explain and request the necessary data.
 - Results First Connecticut staff is providing program data and collaborating with the Connecticut Sentencing Commission on its studies of (1) disparities in pretrial and sentencing outcomes (PA 19-17), (2) offenders in the state's prisons identified as chronically mentally ill, (3) pretrial release and detention, and (4) voting rights of justice-involved individuals.
 - The Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative sponsored (and Results First Connecticut staff participated in) periodic webinars as training and communication opportunities for Results First jurisdictions. Staff also benefit from the web-based Igloo site, a tool for Pew-MacArthur to communicate with Results First jurisdictions and for them to share reports, technical resources, model updates, and training opportunities. The Results First Initiative [website](#) includes articles and issue briefs updating Results First activity in other jurisdictions.
 - Results First Connecticut staff participated in the "Building Bridges: Refocused" conference on March 13, 2019, consulting with participants and speakers from the Connecticut Reentry Collaborative.



Results First Connecticut staff worked with and continues to support the Connecticut Reentry Roundtable Collaborative and OPM's Criminal Justice Policy and Planning Division in the effort to implement Connecticut's December 2018 *Planning for Successful Reentry, Strategies to Continue Connecticut's Second Chance Initiatives* report.

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

Process

The focus of Results First in Connecticut has expanded from the program inventories that adult criminal and juvenile justice agencies must prepare and the resulting benefit-cost analyses that IMRP publishes to include all programs supported by those agencies and those in DSS. The benefit-cost analyses report identifies the programs that are evidence-based; their effectiveness ratings; detailed information on their implementation and cost; and, for those programs included in the Results First model, a benefit-cost comparison. The deadlines for the inventories and benefit-cost analyses reports are intended to coincide with and inform the state's budget cycle.

By law, the agencies must develop program inventories that are the basis for the benefit-cost analyses report and include the data for application of the Result First model. The agencies must (1) compile complete lists of each agency's programs; (2) categorize them as evidenced-based, research-based, promising, or lacking any evidence; and (3) categorize programs as highest rated, second-highest rated, mixed effects, no effects, negative effects, or insufficient evidence.

Each designated agency's inventory must include, among other things, 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 program expenditures and a description of funding sources,
4. the method for assigning participants,
5. the annual 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.

The Results First team provides advice and technical assistance to those agencies required to compile the program inventory. This year, Dr. Ashley Provencher developed an enhanced inventory template using excel and created a complete list of Program Summaries in a single document for agencies' use in determining whether programs match those in the Results First model.

Expanding the Results First Model



The Pew-MacArthur Results First model can assess programs in the following nine policy areas: adult criminal justice, adult mental health, child mental health, child welfare, health, higher education, juvenile justice, pre-K to 12 education, and substance use disorder. In 2019, Results First Connecticut began the process of expanding the model beyond criminal justice policy areas to collect and include state data on adult mental health, health, and education. That effort will be discontinued in 2020.

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.

Table 1 shows the usage figures for FY 19, July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019. Compared to the same period in the prior year (12,110 visitors), the number of visitors increased by 39%.

Table 1: Visitors to the Results First Connecticut Website in FY 19

DATE	VISITORS
07/01/2018 - 07/31/2018	807
08/01/2018 - 08/31/2018	585
09/01/2018 - 09/30/2018	543
10/01/2018 - 10/31/2018	1,023
11/01/2018 - 11/30/2018	851
12/01/2018 - 12/31/2018	1,064
01/01/2019 - 01/31/2019	3,620
02/01/2019 - 02/28/2019	2,560
03/01/2019 - 03/31/2019	2,743
04/01/2019 - 04/30/2019	1,010
05/01/2019 - 05/31/2019	1,063
06/01/2019 - 06/30/2019	969
Total	16,838

The Results First Connecticut website address is: <http://resultsfirstct.org/>.

Results First Policy Oversight Committee



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

The RFPOC co-chairs may want to re-activate the committee in the coming year. In that case, staff will contact the appointing authorities and update the membership, introduce new members to the committee, and conduct training on the Results First approach to policy and budget decision making. At a committee meeting, members can discuss strategies by which they can promote and support broader use of agencies' program inventories. A recommended time for such a meeting would be prior to and in preparation for the 2020 legislative session.

Collaboration with the Connecticut Sentencing Commission

Since the Connecticut Sentencing Commission (CSC) adopted a resolution in 2015 stating that it would partner with and utilize the Results First approach when evaluating sentencing policies, practices, and programs, Results First Connecticut staff have been actively involved in CSC studies, particularly the study of Connecticut's pretrial release and detention policy; diversion programs; collateral consequences of incarceration; and Department of Correction programs for the chronically mentally ill.

Collaboration with the Connecticut Reentry Collaborative

IMRP is working with the Connecticut Reentry Roundtable Collaborative to implement the state's "[Planning for Successful Reentry](#)". This December 2018 report summarizes recent policy changes and the governor's Second Chance Society initiatives, inventory current reentry programs and services, and identify and update reentry goals and the strategies needed to achieve them. The study also considers budget changes that impact the reentry population and relevant programs. The study work group hopes to use program participant and fiscal data from DOC and JB-CSSD program inventories and apply the Results First model to include benefit-cost analyses in its strategy implementation.

PART III: PEW-MACARTHUR RESULTS FIRST INITIATIVE SUPPORT

On June 26, 2018, IMRP and Pew-MacArthur executed a renewal of the Results First Platform License Agreement. The agreement, in effect until September 1, 2019, gives IMRP access to the Results First proprietary technology platform (the Results First model) that produces the benefit-cost analyses for program data specific to Connecticut. IMRP expects to receive continued technical assistance. In addition, access to the model has been provided to Connecticut agency personnel allowing them to run cost-benefit analyses of their programs that are included in the model.

The Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative website (<http://www.pewtrusts.org/en/projects/pew-macarthur-results-first-initiative>) includes updated news and research reports.



On June 23, 2018, Pew-MacArthur introduced its revamped Results First Clearinghouse Database and provided webinar training on its improvements and changes. The updated database includes information on over 2,800 programs and can be found at <http://www.pewtrusts.org/en/research-and-analysis/data-visualizations/2015/results-first-clearinghouse-database>.

As recently as September 2019, the Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative updated and expanded program summaries in several policy areas, based on updated literature reviews that the Washington State Institute for Public Policy. Technical resources provided to Results First jurisdictions include program inventory templates, user guides, and program summaries. Expanded program summaries and model components include the following policy areas (where Connecticut may consider expanding): child welfare, education, health, mental health, and substance abuse.

The Pew-MacArthur staff use a closed, web-based communication tool called Igloo to share announcements, discuss issues and pose questions, post state reports, publicize events, and provide training opportunities and technical resources to Results First jurisdictions. It promotes and presents webinars on the Igloo site and Results First Connecticut staff participated in the following training sessions:

- ✓ An Introduction to the Enhanced Result First Clearinghouse Database (July 12, 2018)
- ✓ Using Evidence to Help Assess Budget Requests (August 29, 2018)
- ✓ Results First Model: Phase Five Update (September 17, 2018)

Additional webinars on a variety of topics are available to download and view on the Igloo site.

In a December 17, 2019 email, Sara Dube, Director of the Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative, informed state and IMRP officials that their technical assistance for Connecticut is no longer needed and thus terminated. Connecticut will be listed on their website as a “Previous Partner.”

PART IV: RECOMMENDATIONS AND STRATEGIES

Since 2011, the IMRP has committed itself to the vigorous implementation of the Connecticut Results First Initiative. As such, the IMRP developed relationships with those agencies required to conduct the work needed to complete program inventories and apply the Results First model. Beyond that, the IMRP has reached out to the Office of Policy and Management and the General Assembly (legislative leaders, the Appropriations Committee, and staff) to promote the use of evidence-based programs and the benefit-cost analyses that IMRP publishes.



Yet more could be done. Though a benefit-cost analyses report is impossible to compile without access to the model, the promotion of evidence-based programs and their assessment remains valuable. If this approach is to be fully implemented in Connecticut, policy- and budget-decisionmakers must not only recognize these advantages but must also support integration into agency practices and the budget process, from initial development to enactment by the legislature. Does the state prioritize the use of evidence-based programs? What is the value of program data analysis in determining the allocation of state resources to achieve agreed-upon policy outcomes? Can requirements for the use of evidence-based programs be incorporated in state contracting language? The benefits associated with evidence-based programs are widely recognized nationally and among states (as many as 26 of which have participated, at one time or another, in the Results First program). Even without access to the econometric model, program benefits can still accrue for clients, participants, providers, and the state.

When the goal is to determine what programs are proven to work and maximize the benefits of taxpayer-funded spending, agencies can utilize evidence-based programs and build in capacity to measure program costs and benefits. The state budget office can encourage agencies to use this approach to help determine appropriate budget allocations to recommend to the governor and the legislature. Concurrently, the General Assembly's Appropriations Committee, indeed all legislators, can make more informed decisions regarding the budget, approving program expenditures based on costs and outcomes.

Based on positive interactions with the mandated agencies as they complete their critical element of the project, it is clear they must dedicate a considerable amount of time, effort, and resources to produce a usable program inventory. Agency budgets must include the funding to support their efforts. Moreover, IMRP determines that with additional resources the Institute can provide agencies with the technical assistance they require to complete program inventories. Beyond that, IMRP should continue to work throughout the year with the executive and judicial branches, as well as the legislature to educate decision-makers using the valuable information available through the resources accessible through the Results First Initiative.

In the coming year, Results First Connecticut will solicit agency feedback to improve the program inventory template and attempt to resolve the inability to disaggregate separate program costs in order to evaluate program outcomes. In addition, each agency should identify its programs that are evidence-based and their effectiveness using the [Results First Clearinghouse Database](#) and use the resources available through the Washington State Institute for Public Policy website (<http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/>) to clearly evaluate its own programs. IMRP expects to assist agencies in the preparation of their 2020 program inventories and publish the sixth edition of its benefit-cost analyses report.

The Office of the Governor and OPM should provide support that not only encourages agency participation but shows that they make use of evidence-based program information in connection with their consideration of programs and budget options. A broader, more calculated approach by members of the Appropriations Committee and its subcommittees



should help them and other legislators consider proposed budget legislation. Newly created policy briefs, presentations, and renewed outreach by IMRP will fortify these efforts. The co-chairs may want to re-activate the Results First Policy Oversight Committee to renew participation of these stakeholders and allow for greater collaboration in the initiative.

In addition, IMRP will complete the following:

- Review with Results First Connecticut stakeholders the state’s current status vis a vis the Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative and develop a new approach for Connecticut’s continued efforts in this direction, without support of the Initiative.
- Propose 2020 legislation language that deletes references to “Results First” but maintains requirements for program inventories or assessments and/or incorporates evidence-based program requirements in state contracting language.
- Convene follow-up meetings with the agency staff who worked on program inventories to determine what worked, the challenges experienced, any improvements to the process and the program inventory template, and lessons learned, given the altered relationship with the Pew-MacArthur Initiative.
- Use evidence-based program data from 2019 inventories to prepare additional materials for stakeholders to use in the budget process. Outreach efforts will inform agency staff and policy- and budget-decisionmakers at all levels and in all branches of state government.
- Engage the secretary of the Office of Policy and Management and her appropriate staff to examine the utility of this approach in OPM’s work.
- Request funding to support the time, staff, and funding necessary to (1) provide support and technical assistance to agencies preparing program inventories and (2) support fuller integration of the preparation and use of program inventories in additional state agencies, the Office of Policy and Management, and the General Assembly.



Appendix A

Results First Oversight Committee

Section 2-111 of the Connecticut General Statutes

(From Public Act 13-247, An Act Implementing Provisions Of The State Budget For The Biennium Ending June 30, 2015 Concerning General Government

§ 2-111. (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 Women, Children, Seniors, Equity and Opportunity; 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

Program Inventories of Agency Programs and Cost-Benefit Analysis Report Statutory Requirements CGS §§ 4-68r and -68s, 4-68m, and 4-77c

CGS Sec. 4-68r. Definitions. For purposes of this section and sections 4-68s and 4-77c:

- (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.

CGS Sec. 4-68s. Program inventory of agency criminal and juvenile justice programs. Pilot program re Pew-MacArthur cost-benefit analysis of state grant programs. Report.

(a) Not later than October 1, 2018, and annually thereafter, the Departments of Correction, Children and Families, Mental Health and Addiction Services and Social Services and the Court Support Services Division of the Judicial Branch shall compile a program inventory of each of said agency's 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, as applicable: (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 to the Secretary of the Office of Policy and Management, the joint standing committees of the General Assembly having cognizance of matters relating to children, human services, 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 November 1, 2018, 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 Secretary of the Office of Policy and Management, the joint standing committees of the General Assembly having cognizance of matters relating to children, 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.

(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 children, appropriations and the budgets of state agencies and finance, revenue and bonding on or before November fifteenth annually, pursuant to subsection (b) of section 2-36b.

(e) Not later than January 1, 2019, the Secretary of the Office of Policy and Management shall create a pilot program that applies the principles of the Pew-MacArthur Results First cost-benefit analysis model, with the overall goal of promoting cost-effective policies and programming by the state, to at least eight grant programs financed by the state selected by the secretary. Such grant programs shall include, but need not be limited to, programs that provide services for families in the state, employment programs and at least one contracting program that is provided by a state agency with an annual budget of over two hundred million dollars.

(f) Not later than April 1, 2019, the Secretary of the Office of Policy and Management shall submit a report, in accordance with the provisions of section 11-4a, to the joint standing committee of the General Assembly having cognizance of matters relating to appropriations and the budgets of state agencies. Such report shall include, but need not be limited to, a description of the grant programs the secretary has included in the pilot program described in subsection (e) of this section, the status of the pilot program and any recommendations.

Sec. 4-68m. Criminal Justice Policy and Planning Division. Duties. Collaboration with other agencies. Access to information and data. Reports. (a) There is established a Criminal Justice Policy and Planning Division within the Office of Policy and Management. The division shall be under the direction of an undersecretary.

(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 4-68s and consider incorporating such inventories and analyses in its budget recommendations to the General Assembly;
- (9) Make population computations for use in planning for the long-range needs of the criminal justice system;
- (10) Determine long-range information needs of the criminal justice system and acquire that information;
- (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;
- (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;
- (13) Measure the success of community-based services and programs in reducing recidivism;
- (14) Develop and implement a comprehensive reentry strategy as provided in section 18-81w; and
- (15) Engage in other activities consistent with the responsibilities of the division.

CGS Sec. 4-77c. Estimates of expenditure requirements for implementation of evidence-based programs. 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, 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, an estimate of the amount required by said agencies for expenditures related to the implementation of evidence-based programs.