STATE OF CONNECTICUT

Results First
Policy Oversight Committee

Annual Report

2020

INSTITUTE FOR MUNICIPAL AND
REGIONAL POLICY

Central Connecticut State University

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.

State law requires: (1) five specified state agencies to submit their respective program inventories annually and (2) the Institute for Municipal and Regional Policy (IMRP) to publish an annual benefit-cost analyses report of programs identified in the inventories. Agencies and legislators making policy and budget decisions are encouraged to use program inventories and the resulting benefit-cost analyses to allocate resources, prioritize program offerings, and improve program effectiveness and outcomes.

In 2019, three of the five required agencies submitted program inventories (the Judicial Branch's Court Support Services Division [JB-CSSD], the Department of Children and Families (DCF) and the Department of Correction [DOC]). The departments of Mental Health and Addiction Services (DMHAS) and Social Services (DSS) did not. Both DMHAS and DSS have previously indicated an interest in working with IMRP to pursue this effort.

In 2020, two of the five required agencies submitted program inventories – DOC and JB-CSSD – and notably without prompt. The departments of Mental Health and Addiction Services (DMHAS), Children and Families (DCF) and Social Services (DSS) did not submit inventories.

- **DMHAS** reports the agency has been working over the past year to collect the program and fiscal data for its inventory and continues its process for completing and submitting one.
- **DSS** reports the agency plans to complete a list and descriptions of its current programs.
- **DCF** has not provided an update.
- **JB-CSSD** and **DOC** submitted program inventories that listed a total of 108 programs and services, 18 in JB-CSSD (8 for adults and 10 for juveniles) and 90 in DOC, of which were identified by the agency as evidence-based programs or services with evidence-based programs.*

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 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.

Despite IMRP and agency staff working to identify evidence-based programs and agencies utilizing such information in their budget decision-making, in December 2019 the Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative notified IMRP and invested legislators that Pew was curtailing collaboration

with the state of Connecticut and would no longer offer access to the benefit-cost model. Thus, the expansion of cost-benefit analysis faces difficulty unless another tool or method of performing CBAs is identified. See the Executive Summary for more information and Appendix A for the full email correspondence.

PREPARED BY:

The Institute for Municipal and Regional Policy (IMRP)
Central Connecticut State University
Andrew Clark, Director
Brittany Kane, MSW, Program Administrator/Coordinator

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.

Unfortunately, IMRP's Results First senior staff members, Mary Janicki and John Noonan, retired since last year's Annual Report. IMRP is currently operating Results First in CT without adequate staffing or legislative and executive branch utilization and/or buy-in.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

   A. Email from Sara Dube, Director, The Pew MacArthur Foundation Results First Initiative
   B. Legislative Language for Consideration in 2021 Legislation Session
   C. Results First Oversight Committee (Relevant Section of Public Act 13-247)
   D. Program Inventories of Agency Programs and Cost-Benefit Analysis Report Statutory Requirements (Relevant Section of Public Act 17-2, June Special Session)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Pew Charitable Trusts and the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation started the *Results First Initiative* to help states and counties answer these questions starting in 2010. Results First promotes the use of evidence-based programs and supports ways to analyze their effectiveness. Since inception, 27 states and 10 counties have applied customizable tools to inform policy and budget processes and direct funding to effective programs that are proven to work, including Connecticut. Connecticut became an early participant in March 2011 when Governor Dannel Malloy and legislative leaders submitted formal letters of support to Results First.

In 2019, Pew-MacArthur began scaling back its work in multiple states, including Connecticut. There are now just 10 Results First states. The cost-benefit model is no longer available for use in Connecticut. To date, the work of Results First in Connecticut has featured a comprehensive benefit-cost analysis of the state's adult criminal and juvenile justice programs. The utilization of cost-benefit analysis faces difficulty unless another tool or method of performing CBAs is identified.

Future evidence-based policymaking and budgeting analyses can be utilized by developing and sustaining the agency and analytic infrastructure to support improved decision-making.

Recommendations for 2021 include:

1. Passage and implementation of performance-review budget processes by the General Assembly in the 2021 legislative session.

2. Re-engaging the [Results First Policy Oversight Committee](#) or [Appropriations Accountability subcommittee](#).

3. Identifying and utilizing another cost-benefit analysis model.

4. Supporting agencies with training and technical assistance.

5. Supporting technology development for data collection and program inventory reports.

6. Instituting routine program evaluations to assure program fidelity and overall effectiveness by dedicating in-agency personnel to assess state-run programs and including performance measures, program evaluation requirements, and more refined cost details in private provider contracts.

7. Dedicating adequate resources in each agency to support the preparation of complete and consistent program inventories.

8. Training staff in evidence-based policy and budget decision-making.

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 has employed 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 using unique state population characteristics and costs. Currently, Results First emphasizes the inclusion of evidence-based criteria in state contracting requirements, adherence to evidence-based programs with fidelity, and the collection of program data to monitor and evaluate program outcomes.

Results First in Connecticut

The Pew Charitable Trusts and the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation started the *Results First Initiative* to help states and counties answer these questions starting in 2010. Results First promotes the use of evidence-based programs and supports ways to analyze their effectiveness. Since inception, 27 states and 10 counties have applied customizable tools to inform policy and budget processes and direct funding to effective programs that are proven to work, including Connecticut. Connecticut became an early participant in March 2011 when Governor Dannel Malloy and legislative leaders submitted formal letters of support to Results First.

In March 2011, at the request of then Governor Dannel P. Malloy, previous Senate President Pro Tempore Donald E. Williams, Jr., and former House Speaker Christopher G. Donovan, Results First provided state leaders with the tools, resources, and training to use the Results

---

[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.

First cost-benefit model to help identify and support cost-effective interventions for adult criminal and juvenile offenders. Representative Toni Walker, House Chair of the Appropriations Committee, and Mike Lawlor, then undersecretary for criminal justice policy and planning, co-chaired the initial policy work group that oversaw the first phase of the effort. The Institute for Municipal and Regional Policy (IMRP) at Central Connecticut State University staffed Connecticut's Results First work to produce a program inventory and cost-benefit analysis of programs in Connecticut's adult criminal justice system.

The legislature in 2013 and 2014 supported the state's Results First work by appropriating funds to IMRP to continue staffing the initiative, along with designating funds to evaluate adult and juvenile justice programs. Subsequently, in the 2014-15 biennium budget, and every state budget implemented since, the legislature has appropriated funding to IMRP to continue to assist in the development and use of the Results First cost-benefit model. In July 2015, lawmakers passed legislation requiring all state agencies to provide a program inventory to the legislature by January 1 of every subsequent year. The legislation directed IMRP to develop a benefit-cost analysis for programs in the inventory and produce a report by March 1, 2016, and annually by November 1, thereafter. Legislation enacted in 2017 further created a pilot program within the Office of Policy and Management to apply the principles of Results First cost-benefit analysis to eight grant-funded programs.

In December 2019, though, Pew expressed concerns that the Results First Initiative was not currently being utilized by the state of Connecticut as discussed and envisioned and, therefore, without active direction from the legislature and the executive branch agencies, the state's user agreement for accessing the Results First cost-benefit model would lapse.

To date, Connecticut's work with Results First has focused on conducting a comprehensive benefit-cost analysis of the state's adult criminal and juvenile justice programs. Expanding the cost-benefit model to include additional policy areas faces difficulty unless another tool or method of performing CBAs is identified and utilized.

Results First in Other States

The Pew-MacArthur Foundation is currently only working with 10 states, which no longer includes Connecticut. Pew currently lists Alabama, California, Colorado, Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Mississippi, New Mexico, New York, and North Carolina. Pew identifies Connecticut as a "previous partner".

PART II: CONNECTICUT ACTIVITY IN 2019-2020

Results First Connecticut Accomplishments and Impact

State law requires: (1) five specified state agencies to submit their respective program inventories annually and (2) the Institute for Municipal and Regional Policy (IMRP) to publish an annual benefit-cost analyses report of programs identified in the inventories. Agencies and legislators making policy and budget decisions are encouraged to use program inventories and the resulting benefit-cost analyses to allocate resources, prioritize program offerings, and improve program effectiveness and outcomes.

As anticipated in the 2019 Annual Report, the Connecticut Results First team reached out to the new officials and staff appointed by recently-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, and 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 meetings with the Lamont Administration included Marc Pelka, Paul Mounds, David Wilkinson and Alison Fisher. In addition, IMRP staff met with agency program and finance staff at the designated agencies to consult with and coordinate their agency's 2019 program inventory submissions.

Although Pew is no longer working with Connecticut to use the Results First model and collected data thus far, the work towards utilizing evidence-based outcomes and cost-benefit analysis can continue if Connecticut seeks to move forward with alternatives. Such alternatives are further in the report.

Legislative Proposal – AAC Performance-Informed Budget Reviews

In response to the action taken by the Pew Center for the States' Results First Initiative, IMRP proposed legislation in the General Assembly's 2020 regular session that would have conformed to the changed status of Results First Connecticut while updating agency and IMRP duties and responsibilities with respect to the utility of program inventory data and performance-informed budget analyses - H.B. 5484: An Act Concerning Performance-Informed Budget Review.

However, since the 2020 regular legislative session adjourned due to the coronavirus pandemic before any action was taken on this bill, it did not pass. It is our recommendation that this bill be considered again in the 2021 legislative session to continue working toward evidence-based budgeting and policymaking.

Connecticut Analyses of Evidence-Based Programs Report

In October 2020, JB-CSSD and DOC still submitted program inventories as required that listed a total of 108 programs and services which the agencies identified as evidence-based programs or services that included evidence-based programs (18 in JB-CSSD [eight for adults and 10 for juveniles] and 90 in DOC).

Since Pew is no longer offering their Results First econometric model, IMRP is not able to calculate the benefit-cost analyses for each of those programs. However, based on the program inventory information from the two agencies, the IMRP published summary program data in its fifth edition of the report, "Connecticut Analyses of Evidence-Based Programs" (November 1, 2020).

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 evidence-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.

Results First Connecticut 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.

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

Table 1: Visitors to the Results First Connecticut Website in FY 20

Date	Site Visitors
07/01/2019 - 07/31/2019	16
08/01/2019 - 08/31/2019	35
09/01/2019 - 09/30/2019	32
10/01/2019 - 10/31/2019	37
11/01/2019 - 11/30/2019	34
12/01/2019 - 12/31/2019	14
01/01/2020 - 01/31/2020	32
02/01/2020 - 02/28/2020	30
03/01/2020 - 03/31/2020	22
04/01/2020 - 04/30/2020	26
05/01/2020 - 05/31/2020	331
06/01/2020 - 06/30/2020	12
Total	**621**

The Results First Policy Oversight Committee (RFPOC)

The Connecticut Results First Policy Oversight Committee (RFPOC), and its three subcommittees, were inactive during this period. As mentioned previously in Recommendations, one priority for this work to continue is to re-engage the members of the CT-RFPOC members.

In March 2011, Governor Dannel P. Malloy, Senate President Pro Tempore Donald E. Williams, Jr., and House Speaker Christopher G. Donovan requested Results First's help to utilize the cost-benefit model to identify and support cost-effective interventions for adult criminal and juvenile offenders. Representative Toni Walker, chair of House Appropriations, and Mike Lawlor, undersecretary for criminal justice policy and planning, launched the Connecticut Results First project in December 2011. Together they co-chaired the initial policy work group that oversaw the first phase of the effort. That group comprised representatives from a range of organizations with an interest in cost-benefit analysis and evidence-based policymaking, including the Office of Policy and Management, the legislative Office of Fiscal Analysis, relevant agencies, and state universities.

The FY2014-FY2015 biennium budget established the Results First Policy Oversight Committee to "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" and required the Court Support Services Division of the Judicial Branch and the Department of Correction to assess the effectiveness of family violence programs and "consider findings from the Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative's cost-benefit analysis model with respect to such programs." In addition, the budget provided funds for the Institute of Municipal and Regional Policy to continue to assist "in the development of the Connecticut specific model within the Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative."

The CT-RFPOC co-chairs may want to re-activate the committee in the coming year; however, it appears membership has not been updated since 2013. To assist in this, IMRP staff could contact the appointing authorities and update the membership, work with the co-chairs to set a meeting timeline, and conduct training on the Results First approach to policy and budget decision making. A recommended time for such a meeting would be in the initial stages of the 2021 legislative session.

Appropriations Committee Subcommittee on Accountability

If legislators, policymakers, and stakeholders are looking to further this work, and do not necessarily want to resurrect the CT-RFPOC, another option is to introduce and implement this work directly into the Appropriations Committee subcommittee on Accountability.

As of February 2020, the Subcommittee Members are:

Co-Chairs   Sen. Julie Kushner
Rep. Toni Walker

Members: Sen. Heather Somers
Sen. Dennis Bradley
Sen. Mae Flexer
Rep. Bill Simanski
Rep. Jillian Gilchrest
Rep. Noreen Kokoruda
Rep. Kate Rotella
Rep. Gail Lavielle
Rep. Michael DiMassa
Rep. Jay Case

PART III: PEW-MACARTHUR RESULTS FIRST INITIATIVE SUPPORT

The Pew Charitable Trusts and the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation started the Results First Initiative to help states and counties answer these questions starting in 2010. Results First promotes the use of evidence-based programs and supports ways to analyze their effectiveness. Since inception, 27 states and 10 counties have applied customizable tools to inform policy and budget processes and direct funding to effective programs that are proven to work, including Connecticut.

Firstly, when alerting Connecticut Results First stakeholders that they would no longer be working in our state, alternative technical assistance opportunities were offered by Pew that would provide value to state leaders and staff without requiring significant staff resources. Such technical assistance would include: 1) assistance with state-specific research identifying gaps and opportunities for strengthening the use of evidence in budget decisions; 2) short-term training for staff on developing and using program inventories; and 3) as requested, feedback on proposed policy language or budget guidelines related to evidence-based policymaking.

Secondly, another tool that can be utilized by the Governor's Office, General Assembly and state agencies when developing budgets is the [Washington State Institute for Public Policy's Benefit-Cost Clearinghouse](#) (WSIPP). Since the 1990s, the Washington State legislature has directed WSIPP to identify "evidence-based" policies. The goal is to provide Washington policymakers and budget writers with a list of well-researched public policies that can, with a high degree of certainty, lead to better statewide outcomes coupled with a more efficient use of taxpayer dollars.

WSIPP has developed a three-step process to draw conclusions about what works and what does not in order to achieve particular outcomes of legislative interest. First, they systematically assess all high-quality studies from the United States and elsewhere to identify policy options that have been tested and found to achieve improvements in outcomes. Second, they determine how much it would cost Washington taxpayers to produce the results found in Step 1, and calculate how much it would be worth to people in Washington State to achieve the improved outcome. That is, in dollars and cents terms, they compare the benefits and costs of each policy option. Third, they assess the risk in the estimates to determine the odds that a particular policy option will at least break even.

It is important to note that the benefit-cost estimates information available on WSIPP's website are *specific to Washington State only* and are not numbers for the state of Connecticut; however, the clearinghouse information is generic and robust enough to use as a baseline. Topics in the clearinghouse include, but is not limited to: juvenile justice, adult criminal justice, child welfare, pre-k-12 education, children's mental health, health care, substance use disorders, adult mental health, public health, workforce development, and higher education. See Table 3 for examples in Adult Criminal Justice.

Program name (click on the program name for more detail)	Date of last literature review	Total benefits	Taxpayer benefits	Non-taxpayer benefits	Costs	Benefits minus costs (net present value)	Benefit to cost ratio	Chance benefits will exceed costs
Employment counseling and job training (transitional reentry from incarceration into the community)	Aug. 2016	$46,030	$13,277	$32,753	($2,528)	$43,502	$18.21	88 %
Offender Reentry Community Safety Program (for individuals with serious mental illness)	Apr. 2012	$72,384	$24,750	$47,635	($38,067)	$34,318	$1.90	96 %
Circles of Support and Accountability	Nov. 2016	$29,658	$7,199	$22,459	($4,060)	$25,597	$7.30	92 %
Correctional education (post-secondary education)	Jul. 2016	$25,614	$6,986	$18,628	($1,298)	$24,316	$19.74	100 %
Drug Offender Sentencing Alternative (for persons convicted of drug offenses)	Nov. 2016	$23,582	$7,015	$16,567	($1,690)	$21,892	$13.95	99 %
Vocational education in prison	Jul. 2016	$18,541	$5,138	$13,403	($1,553)	$16,988	$11.94	98 %
Case management ("swift, certain, and fair") for drug-involved persons	Nov. 2016	$15,582	$4,536	$11,046	$396	$15,978	n/a	99 %
Electronic monitoring (probation)	Dec. 2014	$14,357	$4,058	$10,299	$1,181	$15,538	n/a	93 %
Mental health courts	Oct. 2016	$17,893	$5,187	$12,706	($3,221)	$14,672	$5.56	96 %

*You can find all information pertaining to WSIPP's Adult Criminal Justice cost-benefit information here.

Lastly, another resource that can be used in lieu of Pew's Results First model and data is the organization, Results for America. "Results for America is creating standards of excellence, supporting policymakers in implementation and mobilizing champions committed to investing in what works." Results for America provides a national benchmark for how governments (state and federal) can consistently and effectively use evidence and data in budget, policy, and management decisions to achieve better outcomes for their residents.

With their recent publication, *2020 Invest in What Works State Standard of Excellence (State Standard of Excellence)*, Results for America identified 169 examples of data-driven and evidence-based practices, policies, programs, and systems in effect as of June 2020 in 35 states across the nation. Furthermore, Results for America has also been tracking the impact of COVID-19 on states. In their 2020 report, Connecticut is identified as one of 7 states "leading the way" toward better policy and budgeting due the state's use of data-driven and evidence-based practices. For more information on Results for America and their important work, please visit their website here.

It is important to remind legislators, policymakers, and agency heads why utilizing evidence-based and cost-benefit analysis information in budget development is necessary and imperative, especially during a time of state fiscal frugality and cutbacks. Realizing the true payback to the state in tax dollars for each dollar spent is essential as we move forward into the new decade; however, this work and efforts need to be supported and implemented by the Connecticut General Assembly to truly be beneficial as intended.

PART IV: RECOMMENDATIONS AND STRATEGIES

It is important to remind legislators, policymakers, and agency heads why utilizing evidence-based and cost-benefit analysis information in budget development is necessary and imperative, especially during a time of state fiscal frugality and cutbacks. Realizing the true payback to the state in tax dollars for each dollar spent is essential as we move forward into the new decade; however, this work and efforts need to be supported and implemented by the Connecticut General Assembly to truly be beneficial as intended.

The Institute for Municipal and Regional Policy (IMRP) supports the principles of a deliberative, transparent, and outcome-based approach to policymaking. Even though access to the Results First Model is no longer available in Connecticut, the IMRP still believes in evidence-based policy and budgeting of which Results First was one form. The IMRP looks towards an alternative.

Since 2011, IMRP has committed itself to a vigorous implementation of the Connecticut Results First Initiative. As such, the IMRP developed relationships with those agencies required to complete 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 evidence-based policy and budgeting [and former benefit-cost analyses] IMRP publishes.

Yet more could be done. If this approach is to be fully implemented in Connecticut, policy- and budget-decisionmakers must not only recognize the advantages and applications of evidence-based policy and budgeting, but they must also support its integration into agency practices and the budget process, from initial development to enactment by the legislature. To realize its "highest and best use," this evidence-based tool must be supported and utilized by all the intended stakeholders. Does the state prioritize the use of evidence-based programs? What is the value of evidence-based policy and budgeting in determining the allocation of state resources to achieve agreed-upon policy outcomes? These questions linger a full nine years after Connecticut's establishment as a Results First site.

Other states such as Minnesota and Colorado provide good examples of effective and comprehensive application of the Results First Initiative. The Minnesota Management and Budget Office (MMB) oversees the Results First Initiative there. A team of MMB analysts works with legislators, state agency and county officials, and practitioners to develop that state's inventories and reports. Since 2018, agencies must complete MMB's budget proposal form documenting evidence-based program results. Governor Walz based parts of his 2019 proposed budget on the information, and legislators use the forms to prioritize evidence-based proposals. The MMB Results First team maintain program assessments in a database, the Minnesota Inventory. In addition, two MMB evidence policy specialists maintain an archive of benefit-cost analyses. A November 2019 Pew issue brief reports that the MMB Commissioner Frans "finds it rewarding to make possible the use of quality evidence in decision-making processes." Legislators recognize the importance of a "culture of evidence" in long-term fiscal management, particularly when anticipating a downturn in the economy. In 2018, MMB's Results First Initiative was a recipient of the University of Minnesota's Humphrey School of Public Affairs' State Government Innovation Award.

Likewise, in Colorado the Results First team works in the Office of State Planning and Budgeting (OSPB) and has produced inventories and reports in the areas of adult criminal and juvenile justice, child welfare, behavioral health, prevention, and health policies. The OSPB's Results First team coordinates with and provides support to the Performance Management and Pay for Success units in the Governor's Office. More importantly, it consistently builds research, evidence, and data into the state's budget process. In developing the budget, OSPB (1) requires agencies to document research and demonstrated program effectiveness in their budget requests; (2) runs predictive benefit-cost analyses and evaluation designs; and (3) include Results First benefit-cost findings, when possible. In addition, a 2007 update notes that the Colorado Results First team "coordinates with the Governor's Office chief operating officer on a long-term vision for sustaining good government practices" and offers training on evidence-based policymaking and benefit-cost analyses to stakeholders, including legislators.

When the goal is to "find out" what programs are proven to work and maximize the benefits of taxpayer-funded spending, agencies in these states utilize evidence-based programs and have the built-in capacity to measure its program costs and benefits. The most effective way to implement the evidence-based policy and budgeting approach requires agencies to develop an accounting system that produces cost data <u>by program</u> and a formula for calculating its marginal costs. Armed with the evidence-based policy and budgeting information supplied by IMRP, the state budget office can then use this tool 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.

The implementation of evidence-based policy and budgeting in Connecticut to date confirms that a combination of additional resources and re-alignment of priorities must be devoted to this effort if the IMRP and state agencies are to comply with existing statutory requirements and reap the full benefits of this model. Staff with the knowledge and expertise to complete this project must be hired. In addition, 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 these efforts as well.

2021 RECOMMENDATIONS

1. **Passage and implementation of performance-review budget processes by the General Assembly in the 2021 legislative session.**

2. **Re-engaging <u>the Results First Policy Oversight Committee</u> or <u>Appropriations Accountability subcommittee</u>.**

3. **Identifying and utilizing another cost-benefit analysis model.**

4. **Supporting agencies with training and technical assistance.**

5. **Supporting technology development for data collection and program inventory reports.**

6. **Instituting routine program evaluations to assure program fidelity and overall effectiveness by dedicating in-agency personnel to assess state-run programs and including performance measures, program evaluation requirements, and more refined cost details in private provider contracts.**

7. **Dedicating adequate resources in each agency to support the preparation of complete and consistent program inventories.**

8. **Training staff in evidence-based policy and budget decision-making.**

APPENDIX A

Email Correspondence from Sara Dube
The Pew MacArthur Foundation Director, Results First Initiative
Received Tuesday, December 17, 2019

From: Sara Dube <SDube@pewtrusts.org>
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2019 12:42 PM
To: toni.walker@cga.ct.gov; Melissa.McCaw@ct.gov; Clark, Andrew (IMRP) <clarkanj@ccsu.edu>;
Janicki, Mary M. (IMRP) <mary.janicki@ccsu.edu>
Cc: Ronojoy Sen <rsen@pewtrusts.org>; Steven Lize <slize@pewtrusts.org>; Ashleigh Holand
<aholand@pewtrusts.org>
Subject: Update on Results First in Connecticut

Good afternoon,

I am reaching out to you to update you on Connecticut's partnership with the Pew-MacArthur
Results First Initiative and to let you know about new short-term technical assistance
opportunities that may be of interest.

As you know, Results First works with jurisdictions by providing tools, training, and technical
assistance to help policymakers use evidence to identify and invest in policies and programs that
are proven to work. Traditionally, these partnerships have been multi-year engagements with a
state agency or central legislative or executive budget office focused on building staff capacity to
assess its funded programs for evidence of effectiveness and conduct cost-benefit analysis to
project those programs' returns on investment. In March 2011, at the request of then Governor
Dannel P. Malloy, previous Senate President Pro Tempore Donald E. Williams, Jr., and former
House Speaker Christopher G. Donovan, Results First provided state leaders with the tools,
resources, and training to use the Results First cost-benefit model to help identify and support
cost-effective interventions for adult criminal and juvenile offenders. Representative Toni Walker,
House Chair of the Appropriations Committee, and Mike Lawlor, then undersecretary for criminal
justice policy and planning, co-chaired the initial policy work group that oversaw the first phase of
the effort. The Institute for Municipal and Regional Policy (IMRP) at Central Connecticut State
University staffed Connecticut's Results First work to produce a program inventory and cost-
benefit analysis of programs in Connecticut's adult criminal justice system.

The legislature in 2013 and 2014 supported the state's Results First work by appropriating funds
to IMRP to continue staffing the initiative, along with designating funds to evaluate adult and
juvenile justice programs. Subsequently, in the 2014-15 biennium budget, and every state budget
implemented since, the legislature has appropriated funding to IMRP to continue to assist in the
development and use of the Results First cost-benefit model. In July 2015, lawmakers passed
legislation requiring all state agencies to provide a program inventory to the legislature by January
1 of every subsequent year. The legislation directed IMRP to develop a benefit-cost analysis for
programs in the inventory and produce a report by March 1, 2016 and annually by November 1,
thereafter. Legislation enacted in 2017 further created a pilot program within the Office of Policy
and Management to apply the principles of Results First cost-benefit analysis to eight grant-

19

funded programs. Currently, Results First in Connecticut operates without active direction from the legislature and the executive branch agencies.

Our team feels fortunate to have worked with the state of Connecticut on this effort, but as our work together is inactive and the state's user agreement for accessing the Results First cost-benefit model is lapsing at the end of this year, it is our understanding that technical assistance from our team is no longer needed. To update our records, we will soon reorganize our Where We Work page to note our "previous engagement." Those who were working on this project will no longer have access to the Results First model and your data may be deleted. If you have concerns about this or would like to download any of your reports, please let us know and we will make sure you get what you may need.

With that said, there are new technical assistance opportunities available from Results First that would provide value to state leaders and staff without requiring significant staff resources; opportunities include state-specific research identifying gaps and opportunities for strengthening the use of evidence in budget decisions; short-term training for staff on developing and using program inventories; and, as requested, feedback on proposed policy language or budget guidelines related to evidence-based policymaking.

Results First remains committed to helping the citizens of Connecticut advance the systematic use of evidence in budget and policy decisions. We hope you and your colleagues will explore our new [Evidence-Based Policymaking Resource Center](#) to identify promising practices from key state and county examples. If state leadership would like to pursue one of the new technical assistance opportunities described above or would like information on the use of evidence-based policymaking in general, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Best,
Sara

PEW

Sara Lepore Dube

Director, Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative

The Pew Charitable Trusts

901 E Street NW, 10th Floor, Washington, DC 20004

p: 202.540.6410 | *e:* sdube@pewtrusts.org

APPENDIX B

Legislative Language for Consideration in 2021 Legislation Session
House Bill 5484 – AAC Performance-Informed Budget Review

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

Section 1. Section 2-33b of the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof (*Effective from passage*):
(a) As used in this section:

[(1) "Program" means any distinguishable service or group of services within a budgeted agency, as defined in section 4-69, designed to accomplish a specific public goal and result in specific public benefits.**]**

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

(2) "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;

[(2)**]** (3) "Performance-informed budget review" means consideration of information and analysis concerning the programs administered by a budgeted agency, prepared by such agency in accordance with the provisions of subsection **[**(d)**]** (e) of this section, by the Governor and the General Assembly during the development of each biennial budget in accordance with the provisions of subsection **[**(e)**]** (g) of this section. Such review shall involve a results-oriented approach to planning, budgeting and performance measurement for programs. **[**that focus on the quality of life results the state desires for its citizens and that identify program performance measures and indicators of the progress the state makes in achieving such results.**]**

(4) "Program" means any distinguishable service or group of services within a budgeted agency, as defined in section 4-69, designed to accomplish a specific public goal and result in specific public benefits.

(5) "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;

(6) "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; and

(7) "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.

(b) Not later than October 1, 2020, 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 each compile a program inventory

of each of said agency's programs and shall categorize such programs 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. For the biennium commencing July 1, 2019, and for each biennial budget thereafter, the joint bipartisan subcommittee established in subsection (e) of this section may identify one or more additional budgeted agencies to annually compile a program inventory in the manner prescribed in this subsection. The Office of Fiscal Analysis and the Institute for Municipal and Regional Policy at Central Connecticut State University shall provide technical support in the compilation of such inventories.

(c) Each program inventory required by subsection (b) 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 the 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.

[(b) For the biennium commencing July 1, 2017, and for each biennial budget thereafter, the General Assembly shall identify one or more budgeted agencies to transmit the information and analysis specified in subsection (d) of this section for purposes of a performance-informed budget review for the next succeeding biennium. The Office of Fiscal Analysis shall provide technical support in the identification of such agencies.**]**

[(c)**]** (d) There is established a joint bipartisan subcommittee on performance-informed budgeting consisting of seven members of the joint standing committee of the General Assembly having cognizance of matters relating to finance and seven members of the joint standing committee of the General Assembly having cognizance of matters relating to appropriations. Not later than **[**February**]** July 1, **[**2018**]** 2020, (1) the chairpersons of the finance committee shall appoint six members of the finance committee to such subcommittee, at least two of whom shall be members of the minority party, and the ranking member of the finance committee shall appoint one member of the finance committee to such subcommittee, and (2) the chairpersons of the appropriations committee shall appoint six members of the appropriations committee to such subcommittee, at least two of whom shall be members of the minority party, and the ranking member of the appropriations committee shall appoint one member of the appropriations committee to such subcommittee. The subcommittee shall be chaired by two chairpersons, each selected from among the subcommittee members. One chairperson shall be selected by the chairpersons of the finance committee and one chairperson shall be selected by the chairpersons of the appropriations committee. The term of such appointments shall terminate on December 31, **[**2018**]** 2020, regardless of when the initial appointment was made. Members of the subcommittee appointed on or after January 1, **[**2019**]** 2021, shall serve for two-year terms, which shall commence on the date of appointment. Members shall continue to serve until their successors are appointed, except that the term of any member shall terminate on the date such member ceases to be a member of the General Assembly. Any vacancy shall be filled by the respective appointing authority.

[(d)**]** (e) On or before October 1, **[**2018**]** 2020, and on or before October first of each even-numbered year thereafter, the administrative head of each budgeted agency identified in the biennial budget adopted for the immediately preceding biennium, in accordance with the provisions of subsection (b) of this section, shall transmit a report to (1) the Secretary of the Office of Policy and Management, (2) the joint standing committee of the General Assembly having cognizance of matters relating to appropriations, through the Office of Fiscal Analysis, (3) the joint standing committee of the General Assembly having cognizance of

matters relating to finance, and (4) the joint standing committee of the General Assembly having cognizance of matters relating to such budgeted agency. **[**, utilizing the results-based report format developed by the accountability subcommittee of said appropriations committee,**]** Such report shall include the following information and analysis for each program administered by such agency:

(A) **[**A statement of the statutory basis, or other basis, and the history of the program**]** The program inventory compiled pursuant to subsection (b) of this section.

(B) A description of how the program fits within the strategic plan and goals of the agency. **[**and an analysis of the quantified objectives of the program.**]**

[(C) A description of the program's goals, fiscal and staffing data and the populations served by the program, and the level of funding and staff required to accomplish the goals of the program if different than the actual maintenance level.**]**

[(D)**]** (C) Data demonstrating **[**the amount of service provided, the effectiveness of said service provision, and**]** the measurable impact on quality of life results for service recipients.

[(E) An analysis of internal and external factors positively and negatively impacting the change in quality of life outcomes over time.**]**

(D) Any other information as prescribed by the subcommittee.

[(F) The program's administrative and other overhead costs.

(G) Where applicable, the amount of funds or benefits that actually reach the intended recipients of the program.

(H)   Any   recommendations   for   improving   the   program's

performance.**]**

(f) Any agency or division that compiles a program inventory pursuant to subsection (b) of this section shall include in the estimates of expenditure requirements transmitted pursuant to section 4-77, and the Governor shall 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, in accordance with section 4-77c, as amended by this act.

[(e)**]** (g) The Governor and General Assembly shall consider the information and analysis transmitted by budgeted agencies pursuant to subsection **[**(d)**]** (e) of this section in developing each biennial budget. A public review of the reports transmitted by such agencies shall be incorporated into the agency budget hearing process conducted by the relevant subcommittees of the joint standing committee of the General Assembly having cognizance of matters relating to appropriations.

Sec. 2. Subsection (b) of section 4-68m of the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof (*Effective from passage*):

(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] 2-33b, as amended by this act, 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.

Sec. 3. Section 4-77c of the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof (*Effective from passage*):

[The Departments of Correction, Children and Families and Mental Health and Addiction Services, and the Court Support Services Division of the Judicial Branch may**]** <u>Any agency or division that compiles a program inventory pursuant to subsection (b) of section 2-33b, as amended by this act, shall</u> include in the estimates of expenditure requirements transmitted pursuant to section 4-77, and the Governor **[**may**]** <u>shall</u> 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<u>, as defined in section 2-33b, as amended by this act</u>.

Sec. 4. Subsection (h) of section 46b-121n of the 2020 supplement to the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof (*Effective from passage*):

(h) The committee shall complete its duties under this section after consultation with one or more organizations that focus on relevant issues regarding children and youths, such as the University of New Haven and any of the university's institutes. The committee may accept administrative support and technical and research assistance from any such organization. **[**The committee shall work in collaboration with any results first initiative implemented pursuant to section 2-111 or any public or special act.**]**

Sec. 5. Sections 2-111, 4-68r and 4-68s of the general statutes are repealed. (*Effective from passage*)

This act shall take effect as follows and shall amend the following sections:		
Section 1	*from passage*	2-33b
Sec. 2	*from passage*	4-68m(b)
Sec. 3	*from passage*	4-77c
Sec. 4	*from passage*	46b-121n(h)
Sec. 5	*from passage*	Repealer section

Statement of Purpose:
To update the performance-informed budget review process of state agencies.

[Proposed deletions are enclosed in brackets. Proposed additions are indicated by underline, except that when the entire text of a bill or resolution or a section of a bill or resolution is new, it is not underlined.]

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.

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.