

New York State Results First Net Program Impact Table

Seeking to identify the most effective correctional programming available, New York State is using a customized version of the Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative's computerized cost-benefit modeling tool to evaluate the cost-effectiveness of various criminal justice interventions. Results First uses national research to identify programming interventions that work, and then predicts how each intervention would impact re-offending by a state's correctional populations. With the assistance of the Pew Charitable Trusts and the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, the NYS Division of Criminal Justice Services (DCJS) has customized the Results First cost-benefit tool for use in New York State and has created the below captioned table of simulation results to illustrate which interventions generate the most public safety and at what cost. Simulations of interventions offered to incarcerated offender populations are provided on page one, simulations of interventions offered in a community supervision setting are detailed on page two. Page three contains data definitions and is meant to serve as a guide to assist the reader in interpreting the presented data.

Population Receiving Programming			Five Year Cumulative Recidivism Rate		Gross Monetary Benefits (Per Program Participant)			Cost of Programming Per Participant	Net Monetary Benefits (Per Program Participant)				Reduction in Victimization (Per 100 Program Participants)	
			Baseline Recidivism	Recidivism w/ Programming	Taxpayer Benefits	Victim Benefits	Total Benefits		Taxpayer Only		Total			
									Benefits Minus Costs	Benefit to Cost Ratio	Benefits Minus Costs	Benefit to Cost Ratio		
State Inmate (Prison) Programming Modalities														
Basic Skills	General Education in Prison Meta-analytic Effect Size: -.238 Evaluations in Meta Analysis: 11	Prison General	47%	36%	\$2,368	\$458	\$2,827	\$1,493	a,i	\$875	\$1.59	\$1,334	\$1.89	15.0
	Vocational Education in Prison Meta-analytic Effect Size: -.226 Evaluations in Meta Analysis: 3	Prison General	47%	36%	\$2,249	\$435	\$2,683	\$2,295	a	-\$46	\$0.98	\$388	\$1.17	14.1
		Prison High Risk	69%	57%	\$3,145	\$918	\$4,062	\$2,295	a	\$850	\$1.37	\$1,767	\$1.77	20.7
	Correctional Industries in Prison Meta-analytic Effect Size: -.078 Evaluations in Meta Analysis: 9	Prison General	47%	43%	\$816	\$157	\$973	\$185	a,h	\$631	\$4.41	\$788	\$5.26	5.2
Employment: Basic Training/Job Readiness Meta-analytic Effect Size: -.074 Evaluations in Meta Analysis: 16	Prison General	47%	43%	\$781	\$151	\$932	\$940	a	-\$159	\$0.83	-\$8	\$0.99	4.9	
	Prison High Risk	69%	65%	\$1,031	\$301	\$1,332	\$940	a	\$91	\$1.10	\$392	\$1.42	6.6	
	Prison Low Risk	17%	15%	\$299	\$110	\$410	\$940	a	-\$641	\$0.32	-\$530	\$0.44	1.4	
Chemical Dependency	Drug Tx while Incarcerated: Therapeutic Community Meta-analytic Effect Size: -.119 Evaluations in Meta Analysis: 18	Prison General	47%	41%	\$1,229	\$238	\$1,467	\$1,828	a	-\$599	\$0.67	-\$361	\$0.80	7.9
	Drug Tx while Incarcerated: Residential or IOP Meta-analytic Effect Size: -.172 Evaluations in Meta Analysis: 6	Prison General	47%	39%	\$1,747	\$338	\$2,085	\$1,292	a	\$455	\$1.35	\$793	\$1.61	10.9
	Drug Tx while Incarcerated: Standard Outpatient Meta-analytic Effect Size: -.173 Evaluations in Meta Analysis: 8	Prison General	47%	39%	\$1,743	\$338	\$2,081	\$426	a	\$1,317	\$4.09	\$1,655	\$4.88	11.1
Behavioral	Cognitive Behavioral Intervention Meta-analytic Effect Size: -.125 Evaluations in Meta Analysis: 38	Prison General	47%	41%	\$1,279	\$248	\$1,526	\$1,024	a	\$255	\$1.25	\$502	\$1.49	8.1
		Prison High Risk	69%	62%	\$1,772	\$514	\$2,285	\$1,024	a	\$748	\$1.73	\$1,261	\$2.23	11.4
		Prison Low Risk	17%	14%	\$478	\$176	\$654	\$1,024	a	-\$546	\$0.47	-\$370	\$0.64	2.3
Domestic Violence Perpetrator Treatment Meta-analytic Effect Size: +.064 Evaluations in Meta Analysis: 9	Prison General	47%	50%	-\$755	-\$145	-\$901	\$1,638	c	-\$2,393	-\$0.46	-\$2,539	-\$0.55	-4.3	
Other	Work Release Meta-analytic Effect Size: -.080 Evaluations in Meta Analysis: 7	Prison General	47%	43%	\$853	\$165	\$1,017	\$170	a	\$683	N/A	\$847	N/A	5.3
		Prison Low Risk	17%	15%	\$309	\$114	\$423	\$170	a	\$139	N/A	\$253	N/A	1.5
Local Inmate (Jail) Programming Modalities														
Basic Skills	Employment: Basic Training/Job Readiness Meta-analytic Effect Size: -.074 Evaluations in Meta Analysis: 16	Jail General	51%	47%	\$999	\$313	\$1,312	\$490	f,g	\$509	\$2.04	\$822	\$2.68	5.8
		Jail Under 25	60%	57%	\$1,201	\$459	\$1,660	\$490	f,g	\$711	\$2.45	\$1,170	\$3.39	7.9
Chemical Dependency	Drug Tx while Incarcerated: Residential or IOP Meta-analytic Effect Size: -.172 Evaluations in Meta Analysis: 6	Jail General	51%	42%	\$2,202	\$688	\$2,889	\$2,998	d	-\$796	\$0.73	-\$109	\$0.96	13.3
		Drug Tx while Incarcerated: Standard Outpatient Meta-analytic Effect Size: -.173 Evaluations in Meta Analysis: 8	Jail General	51%	42%	\$2,240	\$696	\$2,936	\$1,094	d	\$1,146	\$2.05	\$1,842	\$2.68
Behavioral	Cognitive Behavioral Intervention Meta-analytic Effect Size: -.125 Evaluations in Meta Analysis: 38	Jail General	51%	45%	\$1,648	\$515	\$2,163	\$653	f,g	\$995	\$2.52	\$1,510	\$3.31	9.9
		Jail Under 25	60%	54%	\$2,004	\$773	\$2,777	\$653	f,g	\$1,351	\$3.07	\$2,124	\$4.25	13.2
		Domestic Violence Perpetrator Treatment Meta-analytic Effect Size: +.064 Evaluations in Meta Analysis: 9	Jail General	51%	54%	-\$938	-\$290	-\$1,228	\$1,638	c	-\$2,576	-\$0.57	-\$2,866	-\$0.75
Other	Work Release Meta-analytic Effect Size: -.080 Evaluations in Meta Analysis: 7	Jail General	51%	47%	\$1,049	\$328	\$1,378	\$170	b	\$879	N/A	\$1,208	N/A	6.3

General Notes:

Meta-analytic program inventory and effect sizes sourced from Washington State Institute for Public Policy April 2012 and December 2013 meta-analyses. Standardized mean difference methodology. See WSIPP Document Nos. 12-04-1201 & 12-04-1201B. All offender cohorts constructed from felony offenders.
 Monetary benefits derived from the change in recidivistic events occurring over a five-year period.
 Victim Benefits include tangible victim benefits only. See McCollister, French & Fang (2010). The cost of crime to society: New crime-specific estimates for policy and program evaluation. Drug and Alcohol Dependence, 108(2010) 98-109.
 All monetary figures presented in 2013 dollars.

Programming Cost Notes:

- a Based on existing NYS programming delivered in actual setting.
- b Based on existing NYS programming delivered in comparable setting.
- c Estimated cost based on program components.
- d Based on OASAS treatment reimbursement rates.
- e Based on information received from local departments/providers.
- f Based on proposed budgets submitted in response to Dec 2013 ATI RFP.
- g Based on information received from a certified practitioner trainer.
- h Net cost taking in to account program revenue and value of services provided.
- i State cost only, additional 7% borne by Federal government.
- j Differential cost from standard incarceration.
- k Based on 2013 FDOL Pay for Success initiative.
- l Modality not currently operating in NYS. Cost unable to be estimated at this time. No net benefits calculated.

			Five Year Cumulative Reconviction Rate		Gross Monetary Benefits (Per Program Participant)			Cost of Programming	Net Monetary Benefits (Per Program Participant)				Reduction in Victimizations (Per 100 Program Participants)	
									Taxpayer Only		Total			
									Benefits Minus Costs	Benefit to Cost Ratio	Benefits Minus Costs	Benefit to Cost Ratio		
Population Receiving Programming			Baseline Recidivism	Recidivism w/ Programming	Taxpayer Benefits	Victim Benefits	Total Benefits	Per Participant						
State Parolee Programming Modalities														
Supervision	Supervision w/ Risk Need & Responsivity Principles Meta-analytic Effect Size: -.239 Evaluations in Meta Analysis: 7	Parole General	47%	36%	\$2,397	\$461	\$2,858	\$696	c	\$1,701	\$3.44	\$2,162	\$4.11	15.0
		Parole High Risk	69%	56%	\$3,335	\$975	\$4,310	\$696	c	\$2,639	\$4.79	\$3,614	\$6.19	22.3
	Intensive Supervision: Surveillance Only Meta-analytic Effect Size: +.004 Evaluations in Meta Analysis: 14	Parole General	47%	47%	-\$30	-\$6	-\$36	\$10,449	c	-\$10,479	\$0.00	-\$10,485	\$0.00	-0.4
		Parole High Risk	69%	69%	-\$42	-\$13	-\$55	\$10,449	c	-\$10,491	\$0.00	-\$10,504	-\$0.01	-0.4
	Intensive Supervision: Treatment Meta-analytic Effect Size: -.205 Evaluations in Meta Analysis: 17	Parole General	47%	37%	\$2,011	\$389	\$2,399	\$11,405	c	-\$9,394	\$0.18	-\$9,006	\$0.21	8.8
		Parole High Risk	69%	58%	\$2,824	\$826	\$3,649	\$11,405	c	-\$8,581	\$0.25	-\$7,756	\$0.32	18.4
	Case Management: Referral Style Meta-analytic Effect Size: -.074 Evaluations in Meta Analysis: 13	Parole General	47%	43%	\$742	\$142	\$884	\$1,066	a	-\$324	\$0.70	-\$182	\$0.83	4.6
Parole High Risk		69%	65%	\$1,053	\$304	\$1,357	\$1,066	a	-\$13	\$0.99	\$291	\$1.27	7.0	
Parole Low Risk		17%	15%	\$277	\$102	\$379	\$1,066	a	-\$789	\$0.26	-\$687	\$0.36	1.4	
Case Management: Swift and Certain Meta-analytic Effect Size: -.258 Evaluations in Meta Analysis: 6	Parole General	47%	35%	\$2,521	\$485	\$3,006	N/A	i	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	16.0	
Electronic Monitoring Meta-analytic Effect Size: -.264 Evaluations in Meta Analysis: 16	Parole General	47%	35%	\$2,590	\$503	\$3,093	\$464	a	\$2,126	\$5.58	\$2,629	\$6.67	16.2	
	Parole High Risk	69%	55%	\$3,678	\$1,070	\$4,748	\$464	a	\$3,214	\$7.93	\$4,284	\$10.23	24.3	
Basic Skills	Employment: Basic Training/Job Readiness Meta-analytic Effect Size: -.074 Evaluations in Meta Analysis: 16	Parole General	47%	43%	\$776	\$151	\$927	\$613	a	\$163	\$1.27	\$314	\$1.51	4.9
		Parole High Risk	69%	65%	\$1,025	\$297	\$1,321	\$613	a	\$412	\$1.67	\$708	\$2.15	6.6
		Parole Low Risk	17%	15%	\$297	\$110	\$407	\$613	a	-\$316	\$0.48	-\$206	\$0.66	1.4
	Employment: Transitional Wage Employment Meta-analytic Effect Size: -.139 Evaluations in Meta Analysis: 1	Parole General	47%	40%	\$1,426	\$274	\$1,700	\$6,600	a,k	-\$5,174	\$0.22	-\$4,900	\$0.26	9.0
Parole High Risk	69%	61%	\$1,897	\$551	\$2,449	\$6,600	a,k	-\$4,703	\$0.29	-\$4,151	\$0.37	12.8		
Parole Low Risk	17%	14%	\$533	\$197	\$730	\$6,600	a,k	-\$6,067	\$0.08	-\$5,870	\$0.11	2.4		
Behavioral	Cognitive Behavioral Intervention Meta-analytic Effect Size: -.125 Evaluations in Meta Analysis: 38	Parole General	47%	41%	\$1,299	\$253	\$1,552	\$919	c,g	\$380	\$1.41	\$633	\$1.69	8.1
		Parole High Risk	69%	62%	\$1,767	\$512	\$2,278	\$919	c,g	\$848	\$1.92	\$1,359	\$2.48	11.4
		Parole Low Risk	17%	14%	\$476	\$176	\$652	\$919	c,g	-\$443	\$0.52	-\$267	\$0.71	2.3
Chemical Dependency	Drug Tx in Community: Residential or IOP Meta-analytic Effect Size: -.048 Evaluations in Meta Analysis: 5	Parole General	47%	45%	\$510	\$99	\$609	\$2,738	d	-\$2,228	\$0.19	-\$2,129	\$0.22	3.2
		Parole High Risk	69%	66%	\$676	\$198	\$874	\$2,738	d	-\$2,062	\$0.25	-\$1,864	\$0.32	4.5
	Drug Tx in Community: Standard Outpatient Meta-analytic Effect Size: -.076 Evaluations in Meta Analysis: 4	Parole General	47%	43%	\$807	\$157	\$964	\$992	d	-\$185	\$0.81	-\$28	\$0.97	5.0
		Parole High Risk	69%	65%	\$1,080	\$316	\$1,396	\$992	d	\$88	\$1.09	\$404	\$1.41	6.9
Local Probationer Programming Modalities														
Supervision	Supervision w/ Risk Need & Responsivity Principles Meta-analytic Effect Size: -.239 Evaluations in Meta Analysis: 7	Probation General	28%	20%	\$1,809	\$615	\$2,424	\$610	c	\$1,199	\$2.97	\$1,814	\$3.97	10.1
		Probation Under 25	39%	29%	\$2,844	\$1,081	\$3,925	\$610	c	\$2,234	\$4.66	\$3,315	\$6.43	17.6
	Intensive Supervision: Surveillance Only Meta-analytic Effect Size: +.004 Evaluations in Meta Analysis: 14	Probation General	28%	28%	-\$45	-\$15	-\$60	\$9,387	c	-\$9,432	\$0.00	-\$9,447	-\$0.01	-0.4
		Probation Under 25	39%	39%	-\$58	-\$24	-\$81	\$9,387	c	-\$9,445	-\$0.01	-\$9,468	-\$0.01	-0.5
	Intensive Supervision: Treatment Meta-analytic Effect Size: -.205 Evaluations in Meta Analysis: 17	Probation General	28%	21%	\$1,577	\$533	\$2,110	\$10,166	c	-\$8,589	\$0.16	-\$8,056	\$0.21	8.7
		Probation Under 25	39%	30%	\$2,482	\$944	\$3,426	\$10,166	c	-\$7,684	\$0.24	-\$6,740	\$0.34	15.1
	Case Management: Referral Style Meta-analytic Effect Size: -.074 Evaluations in Meta Analysis: 13	Probation General	28%	25%	\$563	\$192	\$755	\$1,309	a,b	-\$746	\$0.43	-\$554	\$0.58	3.5
Case Management: Swift and Certain Meta-analytic Effect Size: -.258 Evaluations in Meta Analysis: 6	Probation General	28%	20%	\$1,912	\$650	\$2,562	N/A	i	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	10.5	
Electronic Monitoring Meta-analytic Effect Size: -.264 Evaluations in Meta Analysis: 16	Probation General	28%	19%	\$1,962	\$665	\$2,627	\$405	a,e	\$1,557	\$4.84	\$2,222	\$6.49	10.9	
	Probation Under 25	39%	28%	\$3,143	\$1,198	\$4,341	\$405	a,e	\$2,738	\$7.76	\$3,936	\$10.72	19.6	
Basic Skills	Employment: Basic Training/Job Readiness Meta-analytic Effect Size: -.074 Evaluations in Meta Analysis: 16	Probation General	28%	25%	\$609	\$207	\$816	\$236	f,g	\$373	\$2.58	\$580	\$3.46	3.4
		Probation Under 25	39%	35%	\$948	\$360	\$1,308	\$236	f,g	\$712	\$4.02	\$1,072	\$5.54	5.7
Beha- vioral	Cognitive Behavioral Intervention Meta-analytic Effect Size: -.125 Evaluations in Meta Analysis: 38	Probation General	28%	24%	\$998	\$340	\$1,339	\$553	f,g	\$445	\$1.80	\$786	\$2.42	5.7
		Probation Under 25	39%	33%	\$1,577	\$601	\$2,178	\$553	f,g	\$1,024	\$2.85	\$1,625	\$3.94	9.4
Chemical Dependency	Drug Tx in Community: Residential or IOP Meta-analytic Effect Size: -.048 Evaluations in Meta Analysis: 5	Probation General	28%	26%	\$379	\$129	\$508	\$2,750	d	-\$2,371	\$0.14	-\$2,242	\$0.18	2.3
		Probation Under 25	39%	36%	\$627	\$238	\$865	\$2,750	d	-\$2,123	\$0.23	-\$1,885	\$0.31	3.8
Drug Tx in Community: Standard Outpatient Meta-analytic Effect Size: -.076 Evaluations in Meta Analysis: 4	Probation General	28%	25%	\$605	\$205	\$810	\$1,004	d	-\$399	\$0.60	-\$194	\$0.81	3.5	
Probation Under 25	39%	35%	\$984	\$377	\$1,360	\$1,004	d	-\$20	\$0.98	\$356	\$1.35	6.0		

General Notes:

Meta-analytic program inventory and effect sizes sourced from Washington State Institute for Public Policy April 2012 and December 2013 meta-analyses. Standardized mean difference methodology. See WSIPP Document Nos. 12-04-1201 & 12-04-1201B. All offender cohorts constructed from felony offenders.
 Monetary benefits derived from the change in recidivism events occurring over a five-year period.
 Victim Benefits include tangible victim benefits only. See McCollister, French & Fang (2010). The cost of crime to society: New crime-specific estimates for policy and program evaluation. Drug and Alcohol Dependence, 108(2010) 98-109.
 All monetary figures presented in 2013 dollars.

Programming Cost Notes:

- a Based on existing NYS programming delivered in actual setting.
- b Based on existing NYS programming delivered in comparable setting.
- c Estimated cost based on program components.
- d Based on OASAS treatment reimbursement rates.
- e Based on information received from local departments/providers.
- f Based on proposed budgets submitted in response to Dec 2013 ATI RFP.
- g Based on information received from a certified practitioner trainer.
- h Net cost taking in to account program revenue and value of services provided.
- i State cost only, additional 7% borne by Federal government.
- j Differential cost from standard incarceration.
- k Based on 2013 FDOL Pay for Success initiative.
- l Modality not currently operating in NYS. Cost unable to be estimated at this time. No net benefits calculated.

Produced by: New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services, Office of Justice Research and Performance, July 2014.

A Guide to Using the New York State *Results First* Net Program Impact Table

		Population Receiving Programming	Five Year Cumulative Recidivism Rate		Gross Monetary Benefits (Per Program Participant)			Cost of Programming Per Participant	Net Monetary Benefits (Per Program Participant)				Reduction in Victimization (Per 100 Program Participants)	
			Baseline Recidivism	Recidivism w/ Programming	Taxpayer Benefits	Victim Benefits	Total Benefits		Taxpayer Only		Total			
									Benefits Minus Costs	Benefit to Cost Ratio	Benefits Minus Costs	Benefit to Cost Ratio		
State Inmate (Prison) Programming Modalities														
Behavioral	Cognitive Behavioral Intervention <small>Meta-analytic Effect Size: -.125 Evaluations in Meta Analysis: 38</small>	Prison General	47%	41%	\$1,279	\$248	\$1,526	\$1,024	a	\$255	\$1.25	\$502	\$1.49	8.1
		Prison High Risk	69%	62%	\$1,772	\$514	\$2,285	\$1,024	a	\$748	\$1.73	\$1,261	\$2.23	11.4
		Prison Low Risk	17%	14%	\$478	\$176	\$654	\$1,024	a	-\$546	\$0.47	-\$370	\$0.64	2.3

Class/category of program intervention modality. A narrative description of the intervention, including its main components, is available as an appendix. Not all intervention modalities are currently offered in New York. Only interventions for which a reliable scientific evidence base exists can be modeled/simulated using the Results First CBA process.

This field describes the population or sub-population used to conduct the modeling.

Cumulative 5-year recidivism rate for the population without programming. (NYS Specific)

This information relates to the meta-analytic evidence base of program evaluations. Displayed are the standardized mean difference effect size (this is different than program effect) and the number of evaluations that were found to be of acceptable rigor and utilized to compute the SMD effect size.

Expected cumulative 5-year recidivism rate for the population when offered a specific program. Rate accounts for program failures but assumes that program is delivered competently and with fidelity to the program model.

Benefits (savings) accrued by government due to reduced criminal justice costs from fewer recidivations (over 5 yrs)

Avoided tangible victimization costs. These savings are based on avoided medical bills, avoided lost wages, etc, and are realized by society as a whole, not by government.

Total benefits that result from one unit of program participation. (Government Benefits + Victim Benefits)

Estimated cost of delivering the intervention to a single offender in NYS. Footnotes provide additional information regarding source calculations.

Taxpayer benefits less program cost. This is the *net benefit* from a governmental or budgeting perspective.

Ratio displaying the amount of governmental return (savings) for each dollar spent on programming.

Total benefits less program cost. This is the *net benefit* from an overall perspective. (Govt + Society)

Ratio displaying the total benefit returned (govt + society) for each dollar spent on programming.

Estimated number of victimizations avoided (via reduced recidivism) when intervention is provided to 100 participants.