

STATE OF CONNECTICUT
Results First
Policy Oversight Committee
Annual Report
2014



INSTITUTE FOR MUNICIPAL AND
REGIONAL POLICY



Central Connecticut State University

October 2014

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 at Central Connecticut State University have been working with the Judicial Branch's Court Support Services Division and the departments of Correction, Mental Health and Addiction Services, and Children and Families to implement Results First in Connecticut.

This report describes the Connecticut Results First project and its activity in 2014. We acknowledge and thank the technical support team from Results First and the state agency staff who have assisted and advanced this effort.

Sincerely,

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

Representative Toni Walker
Chair

PREPARED BY:

INSTITUTE FOR MUNICIPAL AND REGIONAL POLICY

Central Connecticut State University

Andrew J. Clark, Director

Mary Janicki, University Assistant

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



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

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

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I: BACKGROUND

The Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative Origins	3
Origins in Connecticut	3

PART II: CONNECTICUT ACTIVITY IN 2014

Policy Oversight Committee	4
Adult Criminal Justice Subcommittee	5
Juvenile Justice Subcommittee	6
Process Subcommittee	7
Staff Working Group	8

PART III: CONNECTICUT RESULTS FIRST INITIATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN 2014

Connecticut Evidence-Based Program Inventory	9
2013 Family Violence Prevention Program Studies	9
Department of Correction: “Domestic Violence Evaluation”	10
Judicial Branch, Court Support Services Division: “Evaluation of Three Court-Mandated Family Violence Interventions: FVEP, EXPLORE, and EVOLVE”	11

PART IV: 2014 CONNECTICUT LEGISLATION

Budget Provisions and Status of Mandated Studies	12
--	----

PART V: PEW-MACARTHUR RESULTS FIRST INITIATIVE SUPPORT

Technical Support and Products	15
2014 State Convening	16
Other States' Results First Activity	17

PART VI: RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 2015

Connecticut Results First Strategic Plan Highlights	17
Legislative Recommendations	18

PART VII: APPENDICIES

A. Relevant Sections of Public Act 13-247	19
B. Members of the Connecticut Results First Policy Oversight Committee	21
C. Connecticut Results First Major Activity – October 1, 2013 to September 30, 2014	22
D. Relevant Sections of Public Act 14-217	23

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 states and selected counties identify opportunities to effectively invest limited resources to produce better outcomes and substantial long-term savings.

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

Results First currently offers technical assistance to 16 states and four California counties to help them customize and implement jurisdiction-specific versions of the model and related tools and use the results to help inform policy and budget deliberations. Policy areas in which states are now working include (1) adult criminal justice (16 states); (2) juvenile justice (five states), (3) child welfare (three states), (4) education (two states), and (5) substance abuse and mental health (one state).

This report was developed with assistance from the Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative staff and consultants.

Origins in Connecticut

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

In 2013, the General Assembly included up to \$150,000 in the FY 14-15 budget act, An Act Concerning Expenditures and Revenue for the Biennium

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.

Ending June 30, 2015 (PA 13-184, Section 42) for a grant to the Institute for Municipal and Regional Policy (IMRP) to assist in the “development of the Connecticut specific model within the Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative.”

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

Public Act 13-247 also required evaluations of domestic violence treatment programs funded by the Judicial Branch’s Court Support Services Division (CSSD) and the Department of Correction (DOC) for family violence offenders. The studies were required to “consider findings from the Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative's cost-benefit analysis model with respect to such programs.” After conducting these assessments, the agencies had to determine whether any program changes should be implemented to improve their cost-effectiveness.

PART II: CONNECTICUT ACTIVITY IN 2014

The Connecticut Results First Policy Oversight Committee and its three subcommittees held several meetings as described separately below between November 1, 2013 and September 30, 2014. Appointed and ex-officio policy advisory committee members are listed in Appendix B.

In addition, the Connecticut Results First staff working group met once with Results First staff and consultants in Connecticut and attended the Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative Annual State Convening with other state policy staff involved with Results First that was held in Santa Fe, New Mexico in August.

Appendix C lists the year’s major activities.

Policy Oversight Committee

On *November 12, 2013*, the RFPOC met when the Results First technical assistance team (Sara Dube, Director, State Policy and technical consultant Steve Lize, Ph.D.) described the Results First national initiative and the working group presented a summary of the work completed to date in Connecticut. They described the details of criminal justice system cost estimates, marginal costs of programs in both the adult and juvenile justice systems, a recidivism analysis, and a cost-benefit analysis and effects on recidivism of evidence-based programs.

At that meeting, the Committee created subcommittees to focus on (1) adult criminal justice, (2) juvenile justice, and (3) process. The Adult Criminal Justice and Juvenile Justice subcommittees would review the relevant components of the Connecticut Results First model and develop recommendations for the full committee. The Process Subcommittee was formed as a steering committee to (1) ensure the work in Connecticut aligns with other Results First-state performance-based policy initiatives and (2) explore other policy areas for which the state might want to implement other components of the Results First model.

The RFPOC met again on *March 25, 2014*. At that meeting, the IMRP staff reviewed the draft of the 2013 Annual Report and discussed the activity of the Results First staff working group. Dr. Steve Lize presented and explained the Results First model upgrade. The subcommittee chairs reported on their activity and progress. Department of Correction and Judicial Branch's Court Support Services Division staff reported on the status of the domestic violence perpetrator treatment program studies the agencies conducted as required by PA 13-247.

After these status reports covering ongoing activities, the members discussed the development of a program inventory for Connecticut evidence-based programs.

Adult Criminal Justice Subcommittee

Senator Catherine Osten heads the Adult Criminal Justice subcommittee. This group reviews that component of the cost-benefit model. Members met twice (on *February 27* and *March 10, 2014*) with project staff to develop recommendations for studying evidence-based programs in DOC.

Subcommittee members discussed possible study areas for FY 15, which included the topics below as well as the Unified School District #1, operated by DOC, and mental health programs available to inmates. They decided on the following funding recommendations:

- Authorize DOC to spend a percentage of the department's community reentry and community-based program funds on training, quality assurance, and evaluation (critical elements of the Results First approach). This will ensure that department resources will be directed to effective programs.
- Expand and evaluate vocational education and training in prisons.

Vocational education has been determined to be an effective program in reducing recidivism and targeted expansion of the program is recommended. The benefit to cost ratio, as determined by an initial Connecticut analysis using the state's Results First model, is calculated to be \$5.50 to every \$1 spent on the program. Focusing on vocational

education in prisons coincides with recommendations from the Connecticut Sentencing Commission and the business community to reduce recidivism by training and certifying individuals released from prison for employment.

- Expansion of vocational education in prisons would increase the number of the eligible DOC population served.
 - Authorization of a study will produce return on investment information and allow application of the Connecticut Results First model to ascertain the vocational education programs that warrant future investment.
- Expand and evaluate the Medication Assisted Therapy (MAT) pilot project.

DOC currently operates a pilot MAT program. The Pew-MacArthur Results First clearinghouse database indicates MAT is a promising practice. The increase in deaths from unintended heroin overdose has been identified as a national crisis and this expanded evidence-based treatment and program evaluation is particularly timely.

- Expansion of the MAT pilot would increase the number of eligible DOC population served.
- Authorization of a study will provide outcome information and allow application of the Connecticut Results First model to ascertain whether the MAT program warrants future investment.

Juvenile Justice Subcommittee

The Juvenile Justice Subcommittee, headed by Representative Toni Walker, met twice (on *February 7* and *March 18, 2014*) to discuss recommendations for program studies that would provide additional data for the Connecticut Results First model.

Subcommittee members considered developing a risk assessment protocol for juveniles; reviewing the marginal costs associated with their detention at the Connecticut Juvenile Training School (CJTS); and studying alternatives to confinement at CJTS. Members also discussed evaluations of evidence-based programs for juveniles.

The subcommittee reached consensus on final recommendations.

- Evaluate Multidimensional Family Therapy (MDFT) programs operated by (1) DCF and (2) CSSD to measure Connecticut-specific results and determine potential cost savings using the Connecticut Results First model.

- The proposed MDFT studies will analyze a \$2.2 million program for purposes of the inclusion in Connecticut's cost-benefit analysis and *Consumer Reports*-style index.
- Review juvenile parole and residential services in DCF to determine marginal cost data for the Connecticut Results First model.
 - The subcommittee suggested collecting data on savings that could be realized when juvenile confinement is minimized and resources can be shifted to community-based programs, increasing the return on investment for juvenile justice programs.
 - This evaluation could be coordinated with and utilize findings and recommendations from the Georgetown University Center of Juvenile Justice Reform's 2013 study of residential and parole services, including the CJTS.

Process Subcommittee

The Process Subcommittee, chaired by Elaine Zimmerman, Executive Director of the Commission on Children, functions as a steering committee for the RFPOC to (1) oversee and ensure that Results First activities in Connecticut align with other statewide performance based policy initiatives and (2) make recommendations regarding the application of the Connecticut Results First model to additional policy areas, such as education, child welfare, and mental health.

This subcommittee met twice (on *March 19* and *April 14, 2014*) to discuss strategies to promote Connecticut Results First efforts in the executive branch agencies; integrate the Results First approach into the state budget process; link Results First in Connecticut to ongoing related statewide programs such as Results-Based Accountability, the Connecticut Sentencing Commission, Justice Reinvestment, and the Municipal Opportunities and Regional Efficiencies (MORE) Commission; and market Connecticut Results First among the state's business community. It also addressed the process for considering other policy areas for inclusion in the Connecticut Results First model.

There was interest in expanding and diversifying subcommittee membership to reach out to other interested legislators, the business community, or policy experts.

Members discussed communication, marketing, and training strategies within the state as well as a northeastern states convening to share best practices

and implementation ideas among Results First states, similar to the convening Results First held in Connecticut in December 2012.

Results First staff shared the recently completed Rhode Island evidence-based program inventory and indicated that Dr. Ashley Provencher is finalizing the data for a Connecticut program inventory.

Staff Working Group

Initial planning and organization efforts to establish Results First in Connecticut began in 2011, when the project was installed in the Institute for Municipal and Regional Policy at Central Connecticut State University. In 2012, IMRP staff recruited a working group of relevant state agency employees to begin the application of WSIPP's meta-analysis of criminal justice programs to Connecticut programs. The staff working group included analysts from university, legislative, and executive branch offices involved in criminal justice programs. The group reviewed reports and identified evidenced-based criminal justice programs provided in Connecticut. Coordinating with staff from the Judicial Branch and the departments of Correction and Children and Families, the group matched state programs with the WSIPP model. They solicited input and evaluation data related to those programs.

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

This past year, the working group continued and expanded its efforts to utilize the Results First approach in the state. On *March 18, 2014*, members of the working group met with Results First's technical assistance staff for a presentation on the updated 2014 version of the Results First model. They considered the subcommittee recommendations for 2014 studies, based on their familiarity with agency data.

PART III: CONNECTICUT RESULTS FIRST INITIATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN 2014

Connecticut Evidence-Based Program Inventory

Dr. Provencher, on behalf of the Connecticut Results First working group, has prepared a program inventory for adult criminal and juvenile justice evidence-based, state-funded programs in Connecticut that can be assessed using the Results First model. Staff at CSSD and the departments of Correction, Children and Families, and Mental Health and Addiction Services provided program level data for the inventory.

The program inventory describes the 12 categories of evidence-based programs for convicted adult offenders and five categories for convicted juvenile offenders in Connecticut for which cost-benefit analysis can be conducted using the Results First model. Information on the specific programs in each category includes the intended client population, the nature of the program, the numbers of those eligible and those actually served (utilization data), and the average cost per program participant. Application of the model will subsequently require estimates of program costs, criminal justice expenditures, and recidivism rates.

In the process of compiling the inventory, staff found that program-level data is not always routinely collected and recommend that departments collect and maintain more detailed participation and expenditure information. Departments should also monitor, assess, and provide assurances that programs are delivered with fidelity, that is, competently and as prescribed. Finally, the inventory indicates that “nearly all” the identified programs in Connecticut lack a rigorous evaluation of effectiveness. Results should indicate outcomes for those who complete a program compared with those who do not.

Attention to these three recommendations will enhance the value of expanded Connecticut-specific program inventories and their use in the Connecticut Results First model.

2013 Family Violence Prevention Program Studies

As required by Sections 53 and 54 of PA 13-247, the Judicial Branch’s Court Support Services Division and the Department of Correction submitted reports on their evaluations of programs they maintain for those convicted of family violence crimes. Their studies were to provide data that could be used in the Connecticut Results First model to assess the programs’ cost-benefit ratio and return on investment. They are intended to provide the Connecticut-specific impact data for the state’s Results First model. Furthermore, the reports had to include any recommended program changes that, in the view of the chief court administrator and the DOC commissioner, would improve cost-effectiveness.

Department of Correction Evaluation. The DOC study, “Domestic Violence Evaluation,”² was conducted by Patrick Hynes, Ph.D., DOC Director of the Best Practices Unit; Frank Baker, Ph.D. and Melissa Ives, MSW, of the University of Connecticut School of Social Work research staff and DMHAS, and Ashley Provencher, Ph.D., currently at Siena College and a member of the Results First working group.

The DOC evaluation included the following seven findings with accompanying recommendations:

1. To a large extent, the comprehensive domestic violence program model was not followed. Department evaluators should conduct a “process formative evaluation” to improve training, add quality assurance measures, and modify measurements.
2. Cooperation between personnel involved in operations and programming needs improvement. Use the newly created position of deputy commissioner of operations and rehabilitative services to emphasize the importance of collaboration between these two functions within the department.
3. Data collection is incomplete or inaccurate. Create accountability and an audit system to monitor data recording.
4. Cost data for programs required for use of the Results First model is inadequate. Contract with the Results First economist to determine what and how to collect necessary cost information for model application.
5. Parole staff have not been integrated into the operation of the domestic violence treatment program. Assign a parole liaison to the domestic violence program and encourage participation of parole officers in the treatment program for domestic violence offenders.
6. The department’s comprehensive domestic violence treatment program is complex, including training, quality assurance, and supervision. Assign a staff person to coordinate the program’s implementation.
7. Domestic violence treatment programs that include community-based components have a larger effect size. The process formative evaluation should address development of a model community-based program. A private provider should be retained to monitor quality assurance and program fidelity.

² Connecticut Department of Correction, submitted to Commissioner, James E. Dzurenda, June 25, 2014.

Judicial Branch, Court Support Services Division Evaluation. The CSSD study, “Evaluation of Three Court-Mandated Family Violence Interventions: FVEP, EXPLORE, and EVOLVE,”³ was conducted by faculty from the Institute for the Study of Crime and Justice at Central Connecticut State University.

Mary 10/20/2014 12:41 PM

Deleted: .

Findings in the Judicial Branch CSSD study showed:

1. program completion rates for participants were: FVEP (84%), EXPLORE (68%), and EVOLVE (65%);
2. one year re-arrest rates were lower for programs participants (compared to nonparticipants) in all three programs but statistically significant only for EXPLORE; and
3. there was a positive, though small effect size for FVEP participants and a positive moderate effect size for EXPLORE and EVOLVE, though a calculation of odds ratios for EXPLORE participants showed that nonparticipants in that program were almost twice as likely to be arrested for another family violence offence than participants.

The CSSD study’s recommendations addressed future research as well as proposed legislation. The study addressed the legislation’s requirements but acknowledged the need for additional research that could improve these domestic violence prevention programs. Future evaluations should investigate program fidelity and collect additional information from program participants, using data beyond official agency records. The study should be extended to include program effects on longer term future criminal behavior. A future study should also involve research on victims to expand the scope beyond the question of recidivism.

Because the evaluation found the Judicial Branch domestic violence programs reduce recidivism, the legislature should continue to support them. In addition, legislation should require all domestic violence programs that are offered be evidence-based. Legislation should mandate that programs be “state-certified and required to adopt consistent protocols for screening and assessment, program content and modality, program length, state education and training qualifications, data collection and reporting, and periodic outcome evaluations and dissemination of findings.” Substitute approaches should be prohibited.

³ Cox, Stephen M., Ph.D., Pierre M. Rivolta, PhD., Institute for the Study of Crime and Justice, Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice, Central Connecticut State University, June 2014.

PART IV: 2014 CONNECTICUT LEGISLATION

Budget Provisions and Status of Mandated Studies

In the 2014 legislative session, the General Assembly passed and the governor signed “An Act Implementing Provisions of the State Budget for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2015,” (PA 14-217) that included five sections directly related to Connecticut’s Results First Initiative. The budget act, PA 14-47, appropriated the funding for these activities.

Section 80 of PA 14-217 allocates \$330,000 of DOC’s appropriation to a new Program Evaluation account in the department. Funds are to be used for training, quality assurance, and evaluation of programs to support community reentry and community programs. Money can be used for training providers, department staff including parole officers, and other state and municipal staff. The law explicitly allows IMRP to use the quality assurance financing and program evaluation data for the Results in Connecticut.

Section 81 requires DOC to assess the department’s vocational education programs for individuals in its custody. The study must consider its findings in connection with the Connecticut Results First cost-benefit analysis model. The commissioner must determine whether program changes should be implemented to improve program cost-effectiveness. A report on findings and recommendations for cost savings must be submitted to the Appropriations Committee and the Results First Oversight Committee. The study must be completed by May 31, 2015 and the report is due June 30.

Study Scope:

As of mid-October, DOC is about to issue a request for proposals for an impact analysis design as well as an evaluability assessment of the culinary arts program the department operates. It has selected for evaluation the popular culinary arts program from among the many vocational education programs the department operates.

Section 82 requires DOC to study the department’s Medication Assisted Therapy pilot project. The study must consider its findings in connection with the Connecticut Results First cost-benefit analysis model. The commissioner must determine whether program changes should be implemented to improve program cost-effectiveness. A report on findings and recommendations for cost-savings must be submitted to the Appropriations Committee and the Results First Oversight Committee. The study must be completed by May 31, 2015 and the report is due June 30.

Study Scope

As of mid-October, DOC is about to issue a request for proposals for an impact analysis design as well as an evaluability assessment of the medication assisted therapy pilot project operated in New Haven. MAT is the use of medications, in combination with counseling and behavioral therapies, to provide a whole-patient approach to the treatment of substance use disorders.

Section 83 requires IMRP to assess the effectiveness of the multidimensional family therapy program operated by both the Department of Children and Families and Judicial Branch's CSSD. The Institute must consider its findings in connection with the Connecticut Results First cost-benefit analysis model. It is authorized to enter a memorandum of understanding with DCF and with CSSD to conduct its assessment and it must consult with those agencies to develop recommendations to improve cost-effectiveness. It must report on its findings and program changes the agencies implement as a result. The report must also include recommendations all three suggest for statutory or program changes to improve cost-effectiveness. A report on findings and recommendations for cost savings must be submitted to the Appropriations Committee and the Results First Oversight Committee. The study must be completed by May 31, 2015 and the report is due June 30.

Study Scope

The Multidimensional Family Therapy (MDFT) program is an evidence-based family-based intensive outpatient treatment program for high-risk adolescents between the ages of nine and 18 that focuses on the adolescent's drug use, delinquency and other key areas of life. Currently, DCF and CSSD fund and implement MDFT for their client populations and have statewide coverage through the program. CSSD has contracted through DCF for MDFT program slots, but also recently began to fund its own program slots. DCF funds two residential programs that offer the MDFT program and CSSD is preparing to contract for a third residential MDFT program. IMRP must assess the effectiveness of the MDFT program for juveniles committed to DCF or CSSD, which includes committed juvenile delinquents on parole, probation or placed in a residential program. The purpose of the study is to estimate the effectiveness of MDFT programs to reduce the recidivism rate of committed juvenile program participants and estimate the marginal cost of delivering the program to additional committed juveniles and adolescents through the Results First Initiative.

Section 84 requires IMRP to assess the effectiveness of juvenile parole services programs DCF administers. The Institute must consider its findings in connection with the Connecticut Results First cost-benefit analysis model. It must consult with DCF to develop recommendations to improve program cost-effectiveness. It must report on its findings and program changes DCF should

implement as a result. The report must also include recommendations the Institute and DCF suggest for statutory or program changes to improve cost-effectiveness. A report on findings and recommendations for cost-savings must be submitted to the Appropriations Committee and the Results First Oversight Committee. The study must be completed by May 31, 2015 and the report is due June 30.

Study Scope

DCF's juvenile parole services programs are the subject of several research projects currently being conducted by different research entities and DCF. The same legislation requiring this IMRP study also establishes a Juvenile Justice Policy and Oversight Committee (JJPOC) that is, in part, responsible for (1) identifying a common definition of "recidivism" to be used by juvenile justice system agencies and (2) promoting information sharing between DCF and the Judicial Branch to ensure the collection and reporting of juvenile recidivism data. Moreover, in 2012 DCF was one of four states selected to participate in the Juvenile Justice System Improvement Project (JJSIP) sponsored by the Center for Juvenile Justice Reform, Institute for Public Policy, at Georgetown University. The JJSIP project focused on three specific research areas related to DCF including the juvenile parole revocation process and graduated sanctions. Its 2013 report included detailed descriptions of the juvenile parole revocation process and graduated sanctions, and department resources. JJSIP concluded that DCF did not have sufficient data capabilities to provide analytical support for most of the juvenile parole findings and recommended the department upgrade its data collection and analysis capabilities. With the continued assistance of Georgetown University, DCF is in the process of implementing some of the JJSIP recommendations, including identifying the data within existing resources that can be analyzed and reported on and replacing the current data system. IMRP has learned also that the University of Connecticut (UConn) is currently conducting research on juveniles who are involved with CSSD juvenile probation and subsequently committed to DCF and placed on juvenile parole—termed "crossover youth." The purpose of the UConn research is to develop a practice guide for both DCF and CSSD in supervising and treating this population. Further, in October 2014, DCF and CSSD began a data sharing project on juveniles on probation and parole.

Given the current level of research on this issue, the IMRP seeks to fulfill its statutory mandate while avoiding duplication and the inefficient use of state resources. To identify an area for an effectiveness study within the juvenile parole system, the IMRP is working with the JJPOC to develop a common definition of juvenile recidivism and use existing juvenile justice system data to establish a baseline recidivism rate that can then be used to

continually report on juvenile recidivism, trends, service and program effectiveness, and cost-benefit analyses.

Recidivism studies require a sufficient period of time during which the identified measures (e.g., rearrest, reconviction, recommitment/resentencing) among the study sample groups can be tracked. Therefore, the IMRP recommends the sample group consist of juveniles committed to DCF between 2006 and 2010. To account for any effects of Connecticut's "Raise The Age" legislation (PA 95-225), which incrementally increased the age at which an adolescent is considered an adult for criminal justice purposes from 16 to 18 years, the study will include a cohort group of 16-year-old juveniles committed to DCF in 2011 and a cohort group of 17-year-old juveniles committed to DCF. The three cohort groups will be tracked through 2014 and comparisons where data are available will be included in the recidivism baseline analysis.

See Appendix D for the Results First-related sections of the budget implementer.

Table 1: Summary of Results First Provisions in Public Acts 14-47 and 14-217

PA 14-217 Section Number	Department	Provision	Appropriation
80	DOC	Program Evaluation Account	\$330,000
81	DOC	Vocational education program evaluation	
82	DOC	Medication Assisted Therapy pilot program evaluation	
83	IMRP	Multidimensional Family Therapy Program evaluation for juveniles committed to DCF and CSSD	50,000
84	IMRP	Juvenile parole services programs administered by DCF	50,000

PART V: PEW-MACARTHUR RESULTS FIRST INITIATIVE SUPPORT

Technical Support and Products

The Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative staff are available to provide advice on procedures and implementation strategies as well as technical assistance with the Results First model. Staff members Sara Lepore Dube, Director, State Policy; Dr. Steven E. Lize, Technical Consultant; and Mimi Aledo-Sandoval, Senior Associate, State Policy; have attended POC and subcommittee meetings.

They visited the IMRP on March 18, 2014, to conduct a session with the working group to explain and discuss the Results First model update. IMRP staff periodically consult with Sara Dube and Dr. Steven Lize by telephone to stay in touch regarding activity and progress in Connecticut.

The Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative website (<http://www.pewtrusts.org/en/projects/pew-macarthur-results-first-initiative>) includes updated news and research reports. Also available is the Results First Clearinghouse Database and user guide that compiles ratings and information from eight national research clearinghouses on over 900 programs. The Excel database covers a wide range of policy areas and interventions. The Clearinghouse Database is at <http://www.pewtrusts.org/en/research-and-analysis/issue-briefs/2014/09/results-first-clearinghouse-database>.

The information sharing platform Minigroup is maintained by Results First staff and is available to state partners for sharing ideas, activities, reports, and questions. It provides an effective way to introduce model enhancements and provide technical assistance. Results First states use the Minigroup to share products like program summaries, reports, and responses to frequently asked questions. Valuable webinar presentations give Minigroup members updates on Results First developments and continued instruction and support.

2014 State Convening

The Pew Charitable Trusts and the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation sponsored the fourth annual State Convening in Santa Fe, New Mexico on August 6 and 7, 2014. Over 100 participants attended, including Results First Initiative staff and consultants and policymakers and staff from all 16 Results First state partners. From Connecticut, Andrew Clark and Mary Janicki from IMRP and Dr. Ashley Provencher, Dr. Pat Hynes (DOC), and Brian Hill (CSSD), long-standing members of the working group attended.

The two-day meeting provided participants with substantive program content (including separate specialized tracks for technical and policy staffs). Moreover, an important element of the convening was the opportunity to meet with the staff of other Results First states to discuss and share activities and efforts in other states.

The conference agenda also included a session giving each state team the opportunity to develop a state implementation strategy. The format included identifying goals and strategies such as developing a program inventory and state costs, intervening in the budget process, and expanding the Results First approach to other policy areas. The team articulated goals and deadlines for each.

Other States' Results First Activity

Sixteen states, including Connecticut, have partnered with the Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative. As mentioned above, most participate in the annual state convening meetings and on the Minigroup site. Other states' accomplishments include:

- ✓ Rhode Island has shared its state program inventory of adult criminal and juvenile justice programs.
- ✓ Results First released a case study highlighting New Mexico's successes using the Results First approach entitled "New Mexico's Evidence-based Approach to Better Governance, A Progress Report on Executing the Results First Approach" (August 2014). In addition, the New Mexico Results First team has released four reports highlighting their Results First work, including "Evidence-Based Behavioral Health Programs to Improve Outcomes for Adults" (September 24, 2014), and used their Results First model to inform several evaluations.
- ✓ New Mexico's Legislative Finance Committee (the primary user of the state's Results First model), Corrections Department and Sentencing Commission established a memorandum of understanding to facilitate data sharing and model implementation.
- ✓ Mississippi's Joint Committee on Performance Evaluation and Expenditure Review (PEER) published a paper on "Improving Mississippi's Budgeting Process" for the Subcommittee on State Performance Goals of the Joint Legislative Budget Committee, describing its implementation of Results First.

PART VI: RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 2015

Connecticut Results First Strategic Plan Highlights

Following the Results First Initiative State Convening in August 2014, the Connecticut team developed the following major project goals and objectives for the coming year and beyond.

By November, 2014, the team expects to issue the Policy Oversight Committee's annual report, disseminate to the POC the updated status of Results First activities in the state, conduct other outreach activities that include presentations at the Juvenile Justice Policy and Oversight Committee and the Criminal Justice Policy Advisory Committee, submit the 2014 domestic violence treatment program evaluations to Results First for inclusion in a publication, and publish the Connecticut Program Inventory.

By February, 2015, the IMRP plans to have developed a website for Results First and hired a project manager to head the Results First team.

In one year, the team's goal is to increase the number of key stakeholders in the Connecticut Results First effort and enhance their level of involvement. This would include their participation in the next Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative-sponsored state convening. The other important goal is to continue to integrate the Connecticut Results First model into the state budget process, including its use by the Office of Policy and Management and the General Assembly's Appropriations Committee. To promote this, IMRP would encourage and assist departments to evaluate their evidence-based programs and focus on training, program fidelity, and data collection.

In the long term, the team sees an expansion of the Connecticut Results First model to (1) develop a systematic method agencies can use to collect program-level data from agencies, (2) cover additional policy areas, (3) apply the model to routinely analyze the fiscal impact of legislation and to assist in agencies' service procurement process, and (4) update the criminal justice recidivism cohort analysis.

Legislative Recommendations

The FY 15 budget included specific funding for the Department of Correction's Program Evaluation Account. In the FY 15-16 budget, appropriations for additional agencies should include similar evaluation accounts to support data collection, program evaluation, training, quality assurance and program fidelity. Such funding benefits not only the department, but also facilitates implementation of the Results First Initiative in Connecticut. Initially, the state's Results First work has focused on adult criminal justice and juvenile justice programs and policies. Its expansion to other policy areas is predicated on the tools needed to apply cost-benefit analyses.

To the extent that appropriations are required, the legislature should support building on the Results First project's progress and capacity in selected state agencies. The Policy Oversight Committee should identify other policy areas with evidence-based programs to evaluate for inclusion in the Results First model. Where recommended by the Policy Oversight Committee, Results First can be expanded and extended to additional departments or policy areas.

The 2014 CSSD study of family violence treatment programs concluded that they are effective in reducing the recidivism of program participants and therefore, should continue to be supported by the legislature. The study recommends enacting a statutory requirement that *all* state family violence treatment programs be evidence-based and state-certified. Such legislation should prohibit the use of any alternative treatment approach.

Appendix A

Relevant Sections of Public Act 13-247

AN ACT IMPLEMENTING PROVISIONS OF THE STATE BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM ENDING JUNE 30, 2015 CONCERNING GENERAL GOVERNMENT

Sec. 42. (NEW) (*Effective from passage*) (a) There is established a Results First Policy Oversight Committee. The committee shall advise on the development and implementation of the Pew-MacArthur Results First cost-benefit analysis model, with the overall goal of promoting cost effective policies and programming by the state.

(b) The committee shall consist of the following members:

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

Sec. 53. (*Effective from passage*) (a) Not later than May 31, 2014, the Chief Court Administrator shall assess the effectiveness of programs maintained by the Court Support Services Division within the Judicial Branch with respect to family violence, including, but not limited to, the pretrial family violence education program established in section 46b-38c of the general statutes and the EVOLVE and EXPLORE programs. Such assessment shall consider findings from the Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative's cost-benefit analysis model with respect to such programs. After conducting such assessment, the Chief Court Administrator shall determine whether any program changes may be implemented to improve the cost-effectiveness of such programs.

(b) Not later than June 30, 2014, the Chief Court Administrator shall submit a report, in accordance with section 11-4a of the general statutes, to the joint standing committees of the General Assembly having cognizance of matters relating to appropriations and the judiciary that (1) describes such assessment, (2) identifies any program changes implemented by the division as a result of such assessment, and (3) makes any recommendations that the Chief Court Administrator deems appropriate concerning statutory or program changes that may improve the cost-effectiveness of such programs.

Sec. 54. (*Effective from passage*) (a) Not later than May 31, 2014, the Commissioner of Correction shall assess the effectiveness of each program maintained by the Department of Correction specifically for persons convicted of a family violence crime, as defined in section 46b-38a of the general statutes, who are committed to the custody of the Commissioner of Correction. Such assessment shall consider findings from the Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative's cost-benefit analysis model with respect to such programs. After conducting such assessment, the Commissioner of Correction shall determine whether any program changes may be implemented to improve the cost-effectiveness of such programs.

(b) Not later than June 30, 2014, Commissioner of Correction shall submit a report, in accordance with section 11-4a of the general statutes, to the joint standing committees of the General Assembly having cognizance of matters relating to appropriations and the judiciary that (1) describes such assessment, (2) identifies any program changes implemented by the Department of Correction as a result of such assessment, and (3) makes any recommendations that the Commissioner of Correction deems appropriate concerning statutory or program changes that may improve the cost-effectiveness of such programs.

APPENDIX B

Members of the Connecticut Results First Policy Oversight Committee

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

Appendix C

Connecticut Results First Major Activity October 1, 2013 to September 30, 2014

<i>Date</i>	<i>Event</i>
11/12/13	Policy Oversight Committee meeting
2/7/2014	Juvenile Justice Subcommittee meeting
2/27/2014	Adult Criminal Justice Subcommittee meeting
3/10/2014	Adult Criminal Justice Subcommittee meeting
3/18/2014	Staff Working Group meeting
3/18/2014	Juvenile Justice Subcommittee meeting
3/19/2014	Process Subcommittee meeting
3/25/2014	Policy Oversight Committee meeting
4/14/2014	Process Subcommittee meeting
5/29/2014	An Act Making Adjustments to State Expenditures and Revenues for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2015 (PA 14-47) signed by the Governor
6/13/2014	An Act Implementing Provisions of the State Budget for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2015 (PA 14-217) signed by the Governor
7/1/2014	Final reports of 2013 mandated studies on Family Violence Prevention programs submitted <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Court Support Services Division • Department of Correction
7/1/2014	Commencement of four 2014 mandated studies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DOC vocational education • DOC Medication Assisted Therapy pilot project • Multidimensional family therapy program for juveniles committed to DCF and CSSD • Juvenile parole services programs administered by DCF
8/6 & 7/2014	"The Results First Approach: Using Evidence to Invest in Programs that Work" Results First Initiative State Convening, Santa Fe, New Mexico
October 2014	Connecticut Evidence-Based Program Inventory published

Appendix D

Relevant Sections of Public Act 14-217

AN ACT IMPLEMENTING PROVISIONS OF THE STATE BUDGET FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 2015.

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

Sec. 80. (*Effective July 1, 2014*) The sum of \$330,000 appropriated to the Department of Correction's Other Expenses account for fiscal year ending June 30, 2015, shall be transferred to the new Program Evaluation account in the department. Such funds shall be used for training, quality assurance and evaluation of programs to support community reentry and community programs. Expenditures may include training programs for staff of (1) private, nonprofit providers; (2) the department, including parole officers; and (3) other state agencies and municipalities. Quality assurance findings and program evaluation data may be used by the Institute for Municipal and Regional Policy at Central Connecticut State University for inclusion in its Results First Initiative project.

Sec. 81. (*Effective from passage*) (a) Not later than May 31, 2015, the Commissioner of Correction shall assess the effectiveness of the vocational education programs of the Department of Correction for persons who are committed to the custody of the department. Such assessment shall consider findings from the Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative's cost-benefit analysis model with respect to such programs. After conducting such assessment, the commissioner shall determine whether any program changes may be implemented to improve the cost-effectiveness of such programs.

(b) Not later than June 30, 2015, the Commissioner of Correction shall submit a report, in accordance with section 11-4a of the general statutes, to the joint standing committees of the General Assembly having cognizance of matters relating to appropriations and the judiciary and to the Results First Policy Oversight Committee, established pursuant to section 42 of public act 13-247, that (1) describes such assessment, (2) identifies any program changes implemented by the Department of Correction as a result of such assessment, and (3) makes recommendations that the commissioner deems appropriate concerning additional statutory or program changes that may improve the cost-effectiveness of such programs.

Sec. 82. (*Effective from passage*) (a) Not later than May 31, 2015, the Commissioner of Correction shall assess the effectiveness of the Medication Assisted Therapy pilot project administered by the Department of Correction for persons who are committed to the custody of the department. Such assessment shall consider findings from the Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative's cost-benefit analysis model with respect to such pilot project. After conducting such assessment, the commissioner shall determine whether any program changes may be implemented to improve the cost-effectiveness of such pilot project.

(b) Not later than June 30, 2015, the Commissioner of Correction shall submit a report, in accordance with section 11-4a of the general statutes, to the joint standing committees of the General Assembly having cognizance of matters relating to appropriations and the judiciary and to the Results First Policy Oversight Committee, established pursuant to section 42 of public act 13-247, that (1) describes such assessment, (2) identifies any pilot project changes implemented by the Department of Correction as a result of such assessment, and (3) makes recommendations that the commissioner deems appropriate concerning additional statutory or pilot project changes that may improve the cost-effectiveness of such pilot project.

Sec. 83. (*Effective from passage*) (a) Not later than May 31, 2015, the Institute for Municipal and Regional Policy at Central Connecticut State University shall assess the effectiveness of the multidimensional family therapy program maintained for juveniles committed to the custody of both the (1) Department of Children and Families, and (2) Court Support Services Division of the Judicial Branch. Such assessment shall consider findings from the Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative's cost-benefit analysis model with respect to such program. Said institute, the Department of Children and Families and the Court Support Services Division of the Judicial Branch shall enter into a memorandum of understanding relating to the institute's assessment of the effectiveness of the multidimensional family therapy program. After conducting such assessment, the institute, in consultation with the department and the Court Support Services Division of the Judicial Branch, shall recommend program changes that may be implemented to improve the cost-effectiveness of such program.

(b) Not later than June 30, 2015, the Institute for Municipal and Regional Policy at Central Connecticut State University shall submit a report, in accordance with section 11-4a of the general statutes, to the joint standing committees of the General Assembly having cognizance of

matters relating to appropriations, the judiciary and children and to the Results First Policy Oversight Committee, established pursuant to section 42 of public act 13-247, that (1) describes such assessment, (2) identifies any program changes implemented by the Department of Children and Families as a result of such assessment, and (3) makes any recommendations that said institute, the Commissioner of Children and Families and the Court Support Services Division of the Judicial Branch deem appropriate concerning additional statutory or program changes that may improve the cost-effectiveness of such program.

Sec. 84. (*Effective from passage*) (a) Not later than May 31, 2015, the Institute for Municipal and Regional Policy at Central Connecticut State University shall assess the effectiveness of juvenile parole services programs administered by the Department of Children and Families for persons who are committed to the custody of the department. Such assessment shall consider findings from the Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative's cost-benefit analysis model with respect to such programs. After conducting such assessment, said institute, in consultation with the department, shall recommend program changes that may be implemented to improve the cost-effectiveness of such programs.

(b) Not later than June 30, 2015, the Institute for Municipal and Regional Policy at Central Connecticut State University shall submit a report, in accordance with section 11-4a of the general statutes, to the joint standing committees of the General Assembly having cognizance of matters relating to appropriations and children and to the Results First Policy Oversight Committee, established pursuant to section 42 of public act 13-247, that (1) describes such assessment, (2) identifies any program changes implemented by the Department of Children and Families as a result of such assessment, and (3) makes any recommendations that the institute and the Commissioner of Children and Families deem appropriate concerning additional statutory or program changes that may improve the cost-effectiveness of such programs.