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ALASKA
JUSTICE INFORMATION CENTER
Mission

• To compile, analyze, and report on criminal justice topics to policymakers and practitioners in order to improve public safety, to increase criminal justice system accountability, and to reduce recidivism.

  – AJiC helps **improve public safety** by promoting evidence-based best practices, and by providing data to inform administrative and funding decisions.

  – AJiC facilitates **criminal justice system accountability** by developing, producing, and tracking criminal justice agency performance measures.

  – AJiC assists with **reductions** by providing criminal justice policymakers and practitioners with data and analyses that can be used to assess the effectiveness, costs, and benefits of existing programs and practices.

A Brief Introduction

**ALASKA RESULTS FIRST**
Alaska’s Results First Initiative

• State of Alaska applied to join *Results First*
  – Tri-branch agreement to pursue this work
    • Alaska Legislature
    • Office of the Governor
    • Alaska Court System

• In 2015 Alaska became the 19th jurisdiction to partner with Pew-MacArthur *Results First*

• Alaska Justice Information Center (AJiC)
  – Tasked with conducting data collection, analyses, and dissemination of findings

An Overview

**STEPS IN THE PROCESS**
The *Results First* Process

- **Program Inventory**
  - Comprehensive listing of all programs provided in a particular policy area (e.g., criminal justice)
- **Match state programs to the evidence base**
  - Results First Clearinghouse Database; Results First Ratings Database
  - *How effective are programs that are provided?*
- **Pew-MacArthur Benefit-Cost Model**
  - Estimates benefit-cost ratios for programs that have been rigorously researched/evaluated

### Alaska Results First: Adult Criminal Justice Programs

**Distribution of State Investments in Adult Criminal Justice Programs**

- **Substance Abuse** $10.1M
- **DV** $0.5M
- **VGE** $3.1M
- **Reentry** $1.3M
- **Sex Offender** $1.7M
- **Tech. Assisted** $3.8M
- **Therapeutic Courts** $4.5M
- **DV** $0.5M

**Step 1:**

**Program Inventory**

- 54 adult criminal justice programs identified
- Separated into 8 groupings:
  - Chaplaincy services
  - Domestic violence (DV)
  - Vocational and general education (VGE)
  - Re-entry services
  - Sex offender
  - Substance abuse
  - Technology-assisted
  - Therapeutic courts
- 36 adult criminal justice programs were funded wholly or in part by the State of Alaska
  - $25.5 million annually
- 18 adult criminal justice programs in the inventory did not receive dedicated state funding allocations
Step 2: Program Matching

- Compare Alaska adult criminal justice programs with programs that have been rigorously evaluated
  - Program features
    - Program content/curriculum
    - Program structure/process
  - Locus of Treatment
    - Prison vs. community
    - Inpatient vs. outpatient
  - Target population/eligible participants
- Key Findings
  - 32 of 54 (59.3%) adult criminal justice programs matched to evidence base
  - Of the 32 programs matched, 26 funded wholly or in part by State of Alaska ($23 million)
  - 90% of state investment in adult criminal justice programs directed to programs matched in evidence base

Step 3: Populate Results First Benefit-Cost Model

- Prerequisite steps:
  - Estimate per-participant program costs
  - Estimate criminal justice resource use and cost parameters
    - Probability of resource use for prison, community supervision
    - Marginal costs of: police ($ per arrest), courts ($ per conviction), prison ($ per inmate), and community supervision ($ per offender)
  - Estimate recidivism parameters for Alaska program-eligible populations
    - 2007 cohorts
      - 9 cohorts in total
    - 8-year recidivism estimates
- THEN...populate the Results First benefit-cost model to estimate benefit-cost ratios for programs
Step 3 (continued):
Populate *Results First* Benefit-Cost Model

- Not all of Alaska’s evidence-based programs were put in the model
  - Evidence not about recidivism
    - For example: 12-step programs >>> relapse
  - Evidence insufficient to determine a reliable recidivism reduction effect
    - Too few studies
    - Studies of substandard scientific rigor
  - No dedicated, program-specific funding
    - For example: Ignition interlock (self-pay)

- Total programs entered into the model: 19

Programs Included in Model

- **ASAP**: Alcohol Safety Action Program (DHSS)
- **BIP**: Batterer Intervention Program (DPS via CDVSA)
- **EM**: Electronic Monitoring (DOC)
- **IOPSAT**: Intensive Outpatient Substance Abuse Treatment (DOC)
  - Community-based
  - Prison-based
  - Dual diagnosis
- **PACE**: Probation Accountability with Certain Enforcement (DOC)
- **PsychEd**: Psych-Educational Substance Abuse Program (DOC)
- **RSAT**: Residential Substance Abuse Treatment (DOC)
- **SOTX**: Sex Offender Treatment (DOC)
  - Community-based outpatient
  - Prison outpatient
  - Residential (therapeutic community)
- **TC**: Therapeutic Courts (ACS)
  - Anchorage Municipal DUI Wellness Court
  - Felony DUI Wellness Courts
  - Hybrid DUI/Drug Wellness Courts
  - Anchorage Felony Drug Court
  - Mental Health Courts
- **VGE**: Vocational/Adult General Education
  - Vocational education
  - Adult general education
Benefit-Cost Ratio

• A monetary metric for assessing “return on investment”

• Consists of two elements
  \[
  \frac{Benefits}{Costs} = \frac{(Avoided CJ Costs) + (Avoided Victimization Costs)}{Program Costs}
  \]

• Note: Benefits are triggered by recidivism reduction achieved by each adult criminal justice program

• The ratio can be made larger by...
  • Increase benefits
  • Decrease costs

Interpretation

• How does one interpret a benefit-cost ratio?!

• Ratio greater than 1.0
  – Benefits exceed costs
  – Example: 3.07 >>> $1 investment by state produces $3.07 of benefits

• Ratio of 1.0
  – “Break even”
  – $1 invested by state produces a return of $1 of benefits

• Ratio greater than 0.0, but less than 1.0
  – Positive return with tangible monetary benefits, but not equal to amount invested
  – Example: 0.80 >>> $1 investment by state produces $0.80 of benefits

• Ratio of 0.0
  – No return on investment

• Ratio less than 0.0
  – Negative return
  – State investment lost, plus additional costs produced
  – Example: -0.96 >>> $1 investment by state lost, and an additional $0.96 in costs incurred
## BENEFIT-COST RATIOS
### ADULT CRIMINAL JUSTICE PROGRAMS

**Results First Model Results**

**Benefit – Cost Ratios**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>Benefit – Cost Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PsychEd</td>
<td>$23.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult General Education</td>
<td>$10.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Education</td>
<td>$7.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult: Community Outpatient '17</td>
<td>$6.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOPSAT: Dual Diagnosis</td>
<td>$4.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOPSAT: Prison</td>
<td>$4.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult: Community Outpatient '15</td>
<td>$4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACE</td>
<td>$3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM: Post Prison</td>
<td>$3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult: Prison Outpatient</td>
<td>$2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSAT</td>
<td>$1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASAP</td>
<td>$1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOPSAT: Community '17</td>
<td>$1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchorage Fel Drug Court</td>
<td>$1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health Courts</td>
<td>$1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOPSAT: Community '16</td>
<td>$1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid Courts [as Drug]</td>
<td>$0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Offender: Residential</td>
<td>$0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid Courts [as DUI]</td>
<td>$0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fel DUI Wellness Courts</td>
<td>$0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchorage Misd DUI Court</td>
<td>$0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIP: Community-Based</td>
<td>-$0.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Program Type**

- PsychEd
- Adult General Education
- Vocational Education
- Adult: Community Outpatient
- IOPSAT: Dual Diagnosis
- IOPSAT: Prison
- Adult: Community Outpatient
- PACE
- EM: Post Prison
- Adult: Prison Outpatient
- RSAT
- ASAP
- IOPSAT: Community
- Anchorage Fel Drug Court
- Mental Health Courts
- IOPSAT: Community
- Hybrid Courts [as Drug]
- Sex Offender: Residential
- Hybrid Courts [as DUI]
- Fel DUI Wellness Courts
- Anchorage Misd DUI Court
- BIP: Community-Based

**Alaska Results First: Adult Criminal Justice Programs**
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Alaska Results First: Adult Criminal Justice Programs
SUMMARY

“3 Things”

1. 90% of state investment in adult criminal justice directed to programs matched in evidence base
2. Of the 19 adult criminal justice programs modeled, all but one produced positive returns
   - 14 benefits exceeded costs
   - 4 positive return with tangible monetary benefits, but not equal to amount invested
   - 1 negative return
3. Benefit-cost ratios are not fixed!
   - “Return on investment” – that is, the monetary performance – of a program can change
   - Increase benefits (e.g., program elements, participants)
   - Decrease costs (e.g., capacity, contracting/procurement)
3 More For The Road…

1. Results First findings are intended to be used as a decision making TOOL, not a decision making rule

2. What are our expectations, RE: “return on investment” when it comes to the delivery of public services?

3. Model estimates could be improved
   - Program level
     • Programmatic data collection and compilation
     - Collect/compile data with research/evaluation in mind
   - Policy level
     • Establish a program (and culture) of rigorous program evaluation and assessment, and institutionalize a paradigm of continual process improvement