

STATE OF CONNECTICUT  
Results First  
Policy Oversight Committee  
Annual Report  
2018



INSTITUTE FOR MUNICIPAL AND  
REGIONAL POLICY



Central Connecticut State University



October 1, 2018

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

This report, as required by Section 2-111(f) of the Connecticut General Statutes, describes the Connecticut Results First project and its implementation activity in the year from October 1, 2017 through September 30, 2018 and makes recommendations. In 2017, though not required by law, the Judicial Branch Court Support Services Division submitted its inventory of programs related to adult criminal and juvenile justice and IMRP issued its third benefit-cost analyses report using the Results First model.

Connecticut's Results First agencies have used their previously submitted program data to make informed budget and program decisions. Results First in Connecticut has been expanded pursuant to legislation enacted in 2017 and we look forward to a more rigorous and valuable application of the Results First Initiative in the coming biennium with a new administration.

That expectation is contingent on the continued partnership with the Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative, which has informed us that it will require a written, renewed commitment from Connecticut's governor and legislative leaders in 2019.

We acknowledge and thank the state agency staff who have assisted and diligently advanced this effort. Results First Connecticut is made possible through state support as well as technical assistance from the Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative.



## PREPARED BY:

### INSTITUTE FOR MUNICIPAL AND REGIONAL POLICY

#### Central Connecticut State University

*Andrew J. Clark, Director*

*Mary Janicki, Senior Research and Policy Analyst*

*Andrew Bolger, Budget and Policy Analyst*

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



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

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

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



## ***TABLE OF CONTENTS***

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b> .....	2
<b>PART I: BACKGROUND</b>	
The Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative Origins.....	4
Results First in Connecticut.....	4
Results First in Other States.....	5
Looking Ahead.....	7
<b>PART II: CONNECTICUT ACTIVITY IN 2017-2018</b>	
Results First Connecticut Accomplishments and Impact.....	8
Connecticut Evidence-Based Program Inventories and Benefit-Cost Analyses Report.....	9
Outreach and Communication.....	10
Results First Policy Oversight Committee .....	11
Phase Five Update of the Results First Benefit-Cost Model.....	11
Collaboration with the Connecticut Sentencing Commission.....	12
Collaboration with the Connecticut Reentry Collaborative.....	12
<b>PART III: RECENT CONNECTICUT LEGISLATION</b> .....	12
<b>PART IV: PEW-MACARTHUR RESULTS FIRST INITIATIVE SUPPORT</b> .....	14
<b>PART V: RECOMMENDATIONS AND STRATEGIES</b> .....	15
<b>APPENDICIES</b>	
A: Relevant Section of Public Act 13-247.....	18
B: Relevant Section of Public Act 17-2, June Special Session.....	19
C: Members of the Connecticut Results First Policy Oversight Committee.....	21

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- Results First Connecticut staff continued to reach out to state agency and General Assembly staff to promote the use of evidence-based practices and programs in order to implement and apply the Results First model. In light of the state's upcoming budget challenges, investment in policies and programs proven to work is more essential than ever.
- The Connecticut General Assembly expanded the statutory requirements for the Results First project by (1) applying the program inventory and benefit-cost analyses report to all of an agency's programs, not only adult criminal and juvenile justice programs; (2) making the inventory and report requirements annual, rather than biennial; and (3) adding the Department of Social Services (DSS) to the agencies required to comply. The legislation (PA 17-2, June Special Session, enacted in October 2017) also requires the Office of Policy and Management (OPM) to create, by January 1, 2019, a pilot program that applies the principles of the Results First Initiative model to at least eight state-financed grant programs and submit a report by April 1, 2019.
- The Judicial Branch's Court Support Services Division (JB-CSSD) submitted a third program inventory, providing FY 17 data for its adult criminal and juvenile justice programs. IMRP issued its 2017 "Benefit-Cost Analyses" report showing cost-benefit comparisons for five adult and three juvenile programs.
- IMRP and the Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative renewed their Results First Platform License Agreement giving the Institute access to the benefit-cost model and technical assistance.
- The Connecticut Sentencing Commission and Results First Connecticut implemented their partnership utilizing the Results First approach when evaluating sentencing policies, practices, and programs.
- Results First Connecticut is supporting the Reentry Roundtable Collaborative in their effort to assist OPM in updating the state's Comprehensive Reentry Strategy by providing cost-benefit analyses of reentry programs.

- Recommendations for the coming year focus on:
- ✓ Preparing the 2018 benefit-cost analyses of evidence-based programs in Connecticut
  - ✓ Developing new strategies to implement and promote Results First with a new governor, OPM secretary, executive agency commissioners, the 2019 General Assembly and legislative leaders, and other interested parties
  - ✓ Reengaging the Results First Policy Oversight Committee
  - ✓ Encouraging executive and legislative leaders, OPM, OFA, and agencies to actively integrate evidence-based policy making into their decision making
  - ✓ Expanding Connecticut's Results First model into new policy areas
  - ✓ Expanding outreach efforts, including resumption of the monthly Results First newsletter
  - ✓ Incorporating new data presentation techniques
  - ✓ Promoting IMRP and Results First as a resource in addressing budget- and policy-making decisions

## **PART I: BACKGROUND**

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

The Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative (Results First)<sup>1</sup> works with jurisdictions to implement an innovative evidence-based policymaking approach and cost-benefit analysis model that helps them invest in policies and programs that are proven to work in order to make policy decisions based on probable outcomes and return on investment. It is intended to help participating states and counties identify opportunities to effectively invest limited resources to produce better outcomes and substantial long-term savings.

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

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

Nationally, the Results First Initiative currently offers technical assistance to 18 states and eight counties in California, Maryland, and Pennsylvania to help them (1) customize and implement jurisdiction-specific versions of the model and related tools and (2) use the results to help inform policy and budget deliberations.

### **Results First in Connecticut**

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

The project was established in the non-partisan Institute for Municipal and Regional Policy where staff could provide research and expertise to both the executive and legislative branches of state government. The 2013 budget “implementer,” An Act Implementing Provisions of the State Budget for the Biennium Ending June 30, 2015 Concerning General Government

---

<sup>1</sup> The Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative, a project of The Pew Charitable Trusts and the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, works with states to implement an innovative cost-benefit analysis approach that helps them invest in policies and programs that are proven to work. Results First has also received support from the Annie E. Casey Foundation.

(PA 13-247, Section 42, codified at CGS § 2-111) (see Appendix A), established the Results First Policy Oversight Committee 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.

Subsequently, PA 15-5, June Special Session put in place the framework for ongoing implementation of the principles of Results First: program inventories from specified agencies; program identification as evidence-based, research-based, or promising; collection of program data on participants and cost for each; and a benefit-cost analysis for policy and budget decision-makers. In compliance with that law, the adult criminal and juvenile justice agencies submitted program inventories in January 2016 and again in October 2016 and IMRP issued its “Results First Benefit-Cost Analyses of Adult Criminal and Juvenile Justice Evidence-Based Programs” on March 1, 2016 and November 1, 2016, based on those respective inventories.

Though the law then required program inventories only in even-numbered years, in 2017 JB-CSSD agreed to prepare an updated program inventory based on FY 17 cost and participation data. The benefit-cost analyses report for November 2017 was thus an abbreviated version but included information on JB-CSSD programs that are evidence-based and in the Results First model.

PA 17-2, June Special Session (see Appendix B) expanded Connecticut’s Results First project to cover all programs provided by JB-CSSD and the departments of Correction (DOC), Children and Families (DCF), and Mental Health and Addiction Services (DMHAS), not just those related to adult criminal and juvenile justice; and it added the Department of Social Services (DSS) to the list of agencies required to submit a program inventory. The legislation also revised the program inventory deadline to require it every year rather than only in even-numbered years. Agencies must submit program inventories by October 1 and IMRP must publish benefit-cost reports by November 1 annually, in time for consideration by the Office of Policy and Management (OPM) and Office of Fiscal Analysis (OFA) in developing the biennial budget and budget adjustments.

## **Results First in Other States**

### *California*

In 2011, the U.S. Supreme Court upheld a lower court ruling requiring California to reduce overcrowding in its state prison system. In response, the California legislature passed Assembly Bill 109. The act transferred responsibility for lower-level felony offenders as well as most parole violators from the state prison system to several California counties. Beginning in 2013, Pew-MacArthur Results First partnered with six California counties to help identify the most effective and cost-beneficial adult criminal justice programs. Today, the Results First Initiative partners with Fresno, Kern, Santa Barbara, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, and Ventura counties. In 2016, following demonstrated success at the local level, Results First began a partnership with the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) to implement the evidence-based approach in the state’s adult criminal justice system. In November





2017, CDCR used the Results First approach to issue a [Benefit-Cost Analysis](#) on state-funded programs for in-prison and community-based substance use disorder treatment.

### *Colorado*

Since 2014, the Results First model in [Colorado](#) has been overseen by analysts in the Governor's Office of State Planning and Budgeting (OSPB). OSPB, in partnership with the General Assembly's Joint Budget Committee, compiles program inventories and conducts cost-benefit analyses for adult criminal justice, juvenile justice, and child welfare programs. In 2016, Colorado began including "evidence requirements" in its budget instructions. Any new funding request now must be accompanied by research on expected outcomes, a timetable for return on investment with program-specific cost-benefit information, and a plan for evaluation. OSPB reviews the evidence behind the request and makes funding recommendations accordingly.

OSPB's Results First team reports are at [Quick Guides and complete reports](#).

### *Illinois*

The [Illinois Sentencing Policy Advisory Council](#) (SPAC) partnered with Pew-MacArthur to analyze adult criminal justice programs. Since 2011, the council has used the Results First model to produce system-wide fiscal impact statements for legislation related to criminal justice. The council directs a multi-agency team of analysts and practitioners in customizing the model and producing cost-benefit analyses of state-funded criminal justice programs. Over the last three years, SPAC has issued and updated a report on "[The High Cost of Recidivism](#)."

In 2017, the Budgeting for Results Commission (BFR), a division of the Governor's Office of Management and Budget, voted to adopt and participate in the Results First Initiative. BFR, with SPAC serving in an advisory role, plans to develop a comprehensive list of adult criminal justice programs and demonstrate the long-term value in recidivism reduction. Following the completion of this project, BFR intends to expand the Results First model to other policy areas.

### *Minnesota*

[Minnesota Management and Budget Agency](#) (MMB) uses the Results First framework to inventory services in the areas of child welfare, adult mental health, substance use disorder, juvenile justice, adult criminal justice, and higher education. MMB engages with executive and legislative leaders, agency staff, counties, courts, and other stakeholders to conduct a comprehensive inventory of state-funded programs, conduct cost-benefit analyses, and incorporate findings into budget and policy decisions.

As an example of the comprehensive work done by MMB in the area of child welfare, Minnesota published "[Child Welfare Inventory and Benefit-Cost Analysis](#)" in April 2018. The 62-page report includes an inventory of 74 of the state's child welfare services of which five had the qualifying research data needed to calculate the benefit-cost analyses.

## *Mississippi*

Results First in Mississippi is overseen by the [Joint Legislative Committee on Performance Evaluation and Expenditure Review](#) (PEER). Mississippi requires state agencies to send a completed program checklist to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee and PEER for any funding request for a new program or activity. Agencies are required to submit research demonstrating a program's effectiveness and identify whether the program is "evidence-based, research-based, promising, or none of the above." Agencies are also required to submit program data, including potential outputs, outcomes, efficiencies, and a timeline for measurement. Analysts from PEER provide funding recommendations to the Mississippi legislature.

## *New Mexico*

The New Mexico Results First project is led by the [Legislative Finance Committee](#) (LFC). The LFC leads the Results First Stakeholder Group, comprised of the Sentencing Commission, Administrative Office of Courts, the Department of Corrections, and other executive and judicial branch agencies. The group meets regularly to discuss and plan next steps for Results First in New Mexico. With the input of the Stakeholder Group, LFC created a "Legislating for Results Framework" that includes five action steps and best practices for an evidence-based budget. They are to:

1. identify priorities and use performance data to highlight areas in need of more oversight;
2. review evidence on program effectiveness;
3. incorporate performance and effectiveness data into the budget development process, prioritizing allocations for programs that are likely to work and yield a positive return;
4. monitor program implementation through performance reports and other tools; and
5. assess whether programs are achieving desired outcomes through performance reports; evaluations; and comparison with state, industry, or national data.

## **Looking Ahead**

As noted above, Connecticut committed to participating in the Results First Initiative in 2011. Since then IMRP has been the agency assigned to implement the program and it has complied with the responsibilities associated with that charge. The Institute has supported agencies in their production of program inventories and has issued three benefit-cost analyses reports since that statutory requirement was enacted in 2015.

This report documents the progress that agencies have made in developing useful program inventories and incorporating that exercise and the resulting data into their decision-making, as the effort is intended to do. However, a broader and deeper application of Results First in Connecticut would benefit (1) agencies in evaluating and making decisions about programs and resource allocation, (2) the Office of Policy and Management in reviewing budget

options and developing the governor's budget, and (3) the legislature in assessing policy and budget alternatives. As described above, other states have been more successful in integrating the Results First management approach and Connecticut should consider and adopt certain of their strategies and techniques.

Considering the budget challenges facing this state in the upcoming biennium, a process that identifies what state programs are the most successful in producing positive outcomes in order to most efficiently allocate limited resources is valuable and timely.

Importantly, the staff of the Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative has indicated that a written recommitment from the new administration and 2019 legislative leadership that renews Connecticut's request for assistance and the state's promise to implement this approach is necessary in order for the Results First Initiative staff to continue to provide technical support to IMRP, as well as continued access to the Results First benefit-cost model.

## **PART II: CONNECTICUT ACTIVITY IN 2017-2018**

### **Results First Connecticut Accomplishments and Impact**

- JB-CSSD submitted its program inventory (October 1, 2017) and the IMRP published the third edition of the "Results First Benefit-Cost Analyses of Adult Criminal and Juvenile Justice Evidence-Based Programs" (November 1, 2017). [See report here.](#)
- PA 17-2, June Special Session expanded Results First Connecticut to require an evaluation of all programs provided by Judicial Branch's Court Support Services Division and the departments of Correction, Children and Families, and Mental Health and Addiction Services, and added the Department of Social Services to the list of agencies that must submit a program inventory. The legislation also changed the program inventory deadline to October 1 of every year rather than only even-numbered years. The Results First Connecticut team has been and will continue to facilitate and implement compliance with this legislation.
- Staff met with representatives from JB-CSSD, DOC, DSS, and DMHAS to discuss program inventories and the cost-benefit analysis process.
- Results First Connecticut staff is collaborating with the Connecticut Sentencing Commission on its studies of (1) pretrial release and detention; (2) the sexual offender sentencing, registration, and management system; (3) voting rights of justice-involved individuals; (4) certificates of employment and occupational licensure; (5) record erasure; and (6) sentence review and sentence modification.
- The Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative sponsored (and Results First Connecticut staff participated in) periodic webinars as training and communication opportunities for Results First jurisdictions. Staff also benefit from the web-based Igloo site, a tool for Pew-MacArthur to communicate with Results First jurisdictions and for them to share reports, technical resources, model updates, and training opportunities. The Results First

Initiative [website](#) includes articles and issue briefs updating Results First activity in other jurisdictions.

- Results First Connecticut staff participated in the “Building Bridges: Refocused” conference on March 1, 2018, consulting with participants and speakers from the Connecticut Reentry Collaborative and the Vera Institute of Justice.
- Results First Connecticut staff worked with and continues to support the Connecticut Reentry Roundtable Collaborative and OPM’s Criminal Justice Policy and Planning Division in the effort to update Connecticut’s Comprehensive Reentry Strategy Report.

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

### ***Process***

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

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

Each designated agency’s inventory must include, among other things, the following information for the previous fiscal year:

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

This year, Results First Connecticut staff met with agency staff from DMHAS (on February 14), JB-CSSD (on June 27), DOC (on August 2) and DSS (on August 15) to discuss compliance and preparation of each agency’s program inventory in preparation for their October 1, 2018 submission deadline.

## ***Utilization***

Last year, during the General Assembly’s consideration of budget adjustments and the resulting budget reductions for FY 18, it became apparent that the data in the agencies’ program inventories would provide important information and details. Program costs, utilization rates, and effectiveness measures found in the program inventories provided the basis for making these budget decisions. The four agencies involved in the Results First project were able to and did refer to the information collected through their program inventories in the process of managing assigned budget reductions along with related policy implications.

JB-CSSD reports that “the Results First inventory is a valuable resource to guide our program planning and decisions.” The division relies on the inventory data “for operational and fiscal impact, analysis, and most recently as a research tool when seeking to implement evidence-based program models to address client needs and reduce recidivism within our juvenile justice and adult criminal justice populations.”

DMHAS reports that the department had been collecting and using program data as part of its budgeting process and continues to do the same with the Results First project.

## **Outreach and Communication**

### ***Website***

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

Table 1 shows the usage figures for FY 18, July 1, 2017 through June 30, 2018. Compared to the same period in the prior year (7,510 visitors), the number of visitors increased by 61%.

**Table 1: Visitors to the Results First Connecticut Website in FY 18**

DATE	VISITORS
07/01/2017 - 07/31/2017	2,005
08/01/2017 - 08/31/2017	1,986
09/01/2017 - 09/30/2017	823
10/01/2017 - 10/31/2017	974
11/01/2017 - 11/30/2017	991
12/01/2017 - 12/31/2017	990
01/01/2018 - 01/31/2018	832
02/01/2018 - 02/28/2018	679
03/01/2018 - 03/31/2018	105
04/01/2018 - 04/30/2018	1,184
05/01/2018 - 05/31/2018	833
06/01/2018 - 06/30/2018	708
<b>Total</b>	<b>12,110</b>

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

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

The Connecticut Results First Policy Oversight Committee (RFPOC) and its three subcommittees were inactive during this period. (See Appendix C for a list of its members.)

The RFPOC co-chairs may want to re-activate the committee in the coming year. In that case, staff will contact the appointing authorities and update the membership, introduce new members to the committee, and conduct training on the Results First approach to policy and budget decision making. At a committee meeting, members can discuss strategies by which they can promote and support broader implementation of Results First in Connecticut. A recommended time for such a meeting would be after the state election in November 2018, once legislative committee co-chairs have been assigned and before the new governor delivers his FY 2020-21 budget address to the General Assembly in February 2019.

### **Phase Five Update of the Results First Benefit-Cost Model**

On September 17, 2018, the Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative released the fifth update of the Benefit-Cost cloud-based model. The update included a number of improvements and expansions to the model in the areas of Child Welfare, Higher Education, and Adult Criminal Justice. The update also added several new programs analyzed by WSIPP and improved program estimates and other technical aspects of the model.



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

Since the Connecticut Sentencing Commission (CSC) adopted a resolution in 2015 stating that it would partner with and utilize the Results First approach when evaluating sentencing policies, practices, and programs, Results First Connecticut staff have been actively involved in CSC studies, particularly the study of Connecticut's pretrial release and detention policy; sexual offender sentencing, registration, and management system; collateral consequences of incarceration including employability certificates, occupational licensing, and the erasure of criminal records; and sentence review and sentence modification.

## **Collaboration with the Connecticut Reentry Collaborative**

IMRP is working with the Connecticut Reentry Roundtable Collaborative and OPM's Criminal Justice Policy and Planning Division to update the state's Comprehensive Reentry Strategy report. The report will summarize recent policy changes and the governor's Second Chance Society initiatives, inventory current reentry programs and services, and identify and update reentry goals and the strategies needed to achieve them. The study will also consider budget changes that impact the reentry population and relevant programs. The study work group hopes to use program participant and fiscal data from DOC and JB-CSSD program inventories and apply the Results First model to include benefit-cost analyses in its report and inform its strategy recommendations.

## **PART III: RECENT CONNECTICUT LEGISLATION**

### **2017**

In 2017, bipartisan support for Results First was demonstrated during the regular and special legislative sessions in separate Democrat and Republican proposals that endorsed the use of evidence-based programs, pilot grant programs that apply Results First principles, the inclusion of benefit-cost analyses in contracting requirements, and the evaluation of return on investments for budget- and policy-making decisions.

The General Assembly did not pass the state's biennial budget during its regular session that ended June 7, 2017. However, during its June Special Session, it enacted (signed by the governor on October 31, 2017) the biennial budget for FYs 18 and 19 that included provisions to (1) expand the Results First program inventory and benefit-cost analyses requirements to include agency programs beyond the adult criminal and juvenile justice programs in DMHAS and DCF (DOC and JB-CSSD are still required to submit program inventories), (2) add the Department of Social Services to those agencies required to submit program inventories, and (3) require program inventories annually rather than biennially.

The law (PA 17-2, June Special Session) also requires OPM to create, by January 1, 2019, a pilot program applying the principles of the Results First cost-benefit analysis model to at least eight state-financed programs selected by the secretary. His selections must include programs that provide services for families in the state, employment programs, and at least one program contracted by a state agency with a budget over \$200 million. The pilot program's goal



must be to promote cost-effective state policies and programs. By April 1, 2019, the secretary must report to the Appropriations Committee on this pilot program.

In addition, Section 212 of PA 17-2, June Special Session (codified at CGS § 2-33b) establishes policy- and budget-making provisions related to the principles underpinning Results First. The act establishes a procedure under which an agency or agencies specified by the legislature submit information and analysis for a “performance-informed budget review.” The act created a joint bipartisan review subcommittee consisting of seven members each from the Finance, Revenue and Bonding and the Appropriations committees. Appointments to the subcommittee had to be made by February 1, 2018 and expire December 31, 2018. New members must be appointed by January 1, 2019 and serve two-year terms. Under the act,

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.

The required information (some of which is similar to an agency’s data in the Results First program inventory) includes a description of a program’s goals, fiscal and staffing data, the populations served, level of funding, costs, and benefits to recipients. The law requires the governor and legislature to consider the submitted information and analysis in their development of the biennial budget.

## **2018**

No legislation specifically related to Results First was raised or enacted during the 2018 legislative session.





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

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

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

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

In February 2018, The Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative updated and expanded program summaries in several policy areas, based on updated literature reviews that the Washington State Institute for Public Policy conducted the prior summer. Technical resources provided to Results First jurisdictions include program inventory templates, user guides, and program summaries.

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

- ✓ Embedding Evidence into the Budget Process (November 1, 2017)
- ✓ Strategies for Conducting Rigorous Evaluations (November 14, 2017)
- ✓ Evidence-Based Practices to Address the Opioid Epidemic (December 19, 2017)
- ✓ Sharing your Results First Findings: Best Practices For Putting Evidence Into Action (June 26, 2018)
- ✓ Overview of the Enhanced Results First Clearinghouse Database Results First Webinar (June 28, 2018)
- ✓ An Introduction to the Enhanced Result First Clearinghouse Database (July 12, 2018)
- ✓ Using Evidence to Help Assess Budget Requests (August 29, 2018)
- ✓ Results First Model: Phase Five Update (September 17, 2018)

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

Finally, the Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative has expanded program inventories and model components to include the following policy areas (where Connecticut may consider expanding): child welfare, education, health, mental health, and substance abuse.

## **PART V: RECOMMENDATIONS AND STRATEGIES**

In the coming program year (from October 1, 2018 through September 30, 2019), Results First Connecticut expects to assist agencies in the preparation of their 2018 program inventories and publish the fourth edition of its benefit-cost analyses report. In general in the future, staff will work toward improved program inventories and an enhanced benefit-cost report. As this requirement and process become more familiar, data collection should improve, more agency programs can be matched to the Results First model, and users will recognize the advantages of implementing evidence-based programs.

More importantly, in light of the difficult budget situation expected in at least the upcoming biennium, we highlight the importance of such a process and budget-making tool. The value of information showing a program's return on investment is even greater in times of a budget crisis than when the state has a surplus. The thorough integration of the Results First principles and approach can impact policy- and budget-making decisions well into the future.

The designated agencies generally cooperate and participate in the Results First project; however, it seems that agencies and others making important budget decisions could support a more robust application and integration of Results First in Connecticut. Other jurisdictions are further along in this effort. The Results First Connecticut staff at IMRP appreciate the support for Results First received since 2011 and also recognize the opportunity to approach a new executive branch administration and 2019 legislative leaders to solicit a renewed letter of commitment to participate in the Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative and request technical assistance. New efforts to engage the next administration will include (1) outreach to a new OPM secretary to introduce Results First as a budgeting tool, (2) renewed discussions with OPM staff in the Budget and Financial Management Division, and (3) introductions to Results First for participating agency commissioners.

In addition to the executive branch, staff will re-engage legislators (primarily Appropriations Committee co-chairs and members) to support the use of evidence-based programs and the utilization of the Results First program inventories and benefit-cost analyses report in their program and budget deliberations at the subcommittee level and above.

To accomplish these goals, Results First Connecticut staff recommend a recommitment to the principles underlying the Results First Initiative, including dedication to the introduction and continued use of evidence-based programs in state agencies, the appropriate operation and evaluation of those programs, and the collection of all data necessary to apply the Results First model to determine their benefit-cost analyses. State agencies should understand and appreciate the utility of their program listings and the data included in their inventories to the extent that they review them in making program and budgetary decisions. The Office of the Governor and

OPM should provide support that not only encourages agency participation but shows that they make use of the information provided by Results First in connection with their consideration of programs and budget options. Finally, a broader, more calculated approach to Results First by members of the Appropriations Committee and its subcommittees should help them and other legislators consider proposed budget legislation. Newly created policy briefs, presentations, and renewed outreach will fortify these efforts.

The following recommendations are intended to promote the benefits of the Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative in Connecticut.

- ✓ Review the program inventories submitted by the participating agencies on October 1, 2018 and prepare and publish the November 2018 edition of the “Results First Benefit-Cost Analyses of Evidence-Based Programs in Connecticut.”
- ✓ Offer assistance to OPM on its compliance with the pilot program requirements specified in the 2017 legislation.
- ✓ After the November 2018 state election, reach out to new public officials and stakeholders including the governor, the OPM secretary and any new budget staff, legislative leadership including chairs of the Appropriations Committee, members of the Appropriations Committee as well as other interested members of the General Assembly, new commissioners of the affected agencies and their program and fiscal teams.
- ✓ Re-activate the Results First Policy Oversight Committee to renew participation of these stakeholders and allow for greater collaboration in the initiative.
- ✓ Resume publication of the monthly Results First Connecticut newsletter as well as develop new medium to share information from the Results First effort in Connecticut.
- ✓ Avail executive and legislative branch leaders, OPM, OFA, and agencies as to how they can actively integrate evidence-based policy making into their regular management practices and report any cost-savings that result.
- ✓ Maximize features in the Results First model by expanding user access to include other stakeholders, easily updating data, producing additional benefit-cost analyses, taking advantage of resources providing assistance, and generating reports.
- ✓ Develop a plan to expand Connecticut’s application of the Results First model to additional policy areas outside of criminal and juvenile justice, including child welfare, substance abuse, public assistance, and others.



- ✓ Expand outreach efforts to inform stakeholders, private providers, and other organizations interested in the effectiveness and efficiency of state government of the benefits of the Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative.
- ✓ Incorporate new data presentation tools and strategies in the 2018 benefit-cost analyses report and other documents to better inform policy makers.
- ✓ Generally, promote IMRP as a resource in addressing budget- and policy-making decisions.

## Appendix A

### Relevant Section of Public Act 13-247

#### Codified at Section 2-111 of the Connecticut General Statutes

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

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

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

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

(c) All appointments to the committee under subdivisions (1) to (11), inclusive, of subsection (b) of this section shall be made not later than thirty days after the effective date of this section. Any vacancy shall be filled by the appointing authority.

(d) A member of the General Assembly selected jointly by the speaker of the House of Representatives and the president pro tempore of the Senate shall be the chairperson of the committee. Such chairperson shall schedule the first meeting of the committee, which shall be held not later than sixty days after the effective date of this section.

(e) Members of the committee shall serve without compensation, except for necessary expenses incurred in the performance of their duties.

(f) Not later than October 1, 2013, and annually thereafter, the committee shall submit a report to the Governor and the joint standing committee of the General Assembly having cognizance of matters relating to appropriations and the budgets of state agencies, in accordance with section 11-4a of the general statutes, recommending measures to implement the Pew-MacArthur Results First cost-benefit analysis model.



## Appendix B

### Senate Bill No. 1502 June Special Session, Public Act No. 17-2

#### ***AN ACT CONCERNING THE STATE BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM ENDING JUNE 30, 2019, MAKING APPROPRIATIONS THEREFOR, AUTHORIZING AND ADJUSTING BONDS OF THE STATE AND IMPLEMENTING PROVISIONS OF THE BUDGET.***

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

...

Sec. 247. Section 4-68s of the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof (*Effective from passage*):

(a) Not later than [January 1, 2016, and not later than October first in every even-numbered year] October 1, 2018, and annually thereafter, the Departments of Correction, Children and Families, [and] 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 [criminal and juvenile justice] programs and shall categorize them as evidence-based, research-based, promising or lacking any evidence. Each program inventory shall include a complete list of all agency programs, including the following information for each such program for the prior fiscal year, 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 [Criminal Justice Policy and Planning Division within] 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 [March 1, 2016] 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 [Criminal Justice Policy and Planning Division] 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.

Section approved October 31, 2017

## APPENDIX C

### 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 Tempore
Chip Flanagan	House Majority Leader
Ellen Durnin	Senate Majority Leader
Representative Holly Cheeseman	House Minority Leader
Vacant	Senate Minority Leader
Elizabeth Graham	Chief Court Administrator
John Clark	State Comptroller
Neil Ayers	Director, Office of Fiscal Analysis
Stephanie D'Ambrose	Director, Office of Legislative Research
Andrew Clark	Director, Institute for Municipal and Regional Policy
Steven Hernandez	Executive Director, Commission on Women, Children and Seniors
Vacant	Connecticut Conference of Independent Colleges

October 1, 2018