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Evidence-Based Policymaking Framework
Program Assessment

Systematically review available evidence on the effectiveness of public programs

• Develop an inventory of funded programs
• Categorize programs by their evidence of effectiveness
• Identify programs’ potential return on investment (benefit-cost analysis)
Incorporate evidence of program effectiveness into budget and policy decisions, prioritizing funding to those that deliver a high return on investment of public funds

- Integrate program performance information into budget development
- Include relevant studies in budget hearings and committee meetings
- Present information to policymakers in user-friendly formats that facilitate decision-making
- Target funding to evidence-based programs
Implementation Oversight

Ensure that programs are effectively delivered and are faithful to their intended design

• Develop capacity for ongoing quality improvement and fidelity monitoring
• Balance fidelity requirements with local needs
• Conduct data-driven reviews to improve program performance
Outcome Monitoring

Routinely measure and report outcome data to determine whether interventions are achieving desired results

- Develop meaningful outcome measures for programs, agencies, and the community
- Conduct regular audits of systems for collecting and reporting performance data
- Regularly report performance data to policymakers
Conduct rigorous evaluations of new and untested programs to ensure that they warrant continued funding

- Leverage available resources to conduct evaluations
- Require evaluations as a condition for continued funding of new initiatives
- Develop a centralized repository for program evaluations
Results First Technical Assistance
The Results First Approach: Bring Evidence into the Process

1. **INVENTORY** your current program investments

2. **CONSIDER** whether benefits justify costs

3. **TARGET** funds using rigorous evidence

**ACHIEVE** dramatic improvements *without* increased spending
The Results First Approach: Bring Evidence into the Process

1. Program Inventory
2. Benefit-Cost Analysis
3. Using your Results
The Results First Approach: Bring Evidence into the Process

1. Program Inventory
## SAMPLE Program Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM INFORMATION</th>
<th>BUDGET</th>
<th>EVIDENCE-BASE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Name</td>
<td>Program Budget (FY13)</td>
<td>Evaluated in Jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking for a Change</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocation Education</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Monitoring</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sober Living Environment</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Court</td>
<td>$820,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Violence (non-CBT)</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Boot Camps</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans Courts</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## RF Clearinghouse Database

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Blueprints for Healthy Youth Development</th>
<th>California Evidence-Based Clearinghouse for Child Welfare</th>
<th>CrimeSolutions.gov</th>
<th>Promising Practices Network</th>
<th>NREPP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexual/Dating Violence</td>
<td>4th R Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Promising</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>Abecedarian Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proven</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health: Adult</td>
<td>Acceptance and Commitment Therapy (ACT)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1: Well-Supported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Prevention</td>
<td>All Stars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No Effects</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Justice</td>
<td>Functional Family Therapy (FFT)</td>
<td>Model</td>
<td>2: Supported</td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Behavior/Character Education</td>
<td>Good Behavior Game</td>
<td>Promising</td>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Database Ratings Categorized

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clearinghouse</th>
<th>Highest rated</th>
<th>Second-highest rated</th>
<th>No evidence of effects</th>
<th>Mixed effects</th>
<th>Negative effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blueprints for Healthy Youth Development</td>
<td>Model (10)</td>
<td>Promising (42)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Evidence-Based Clearinghouse for Child Welfare</td>
<td>1 = Well-supported by research evidence (27); 2 = Supported by research evidence (41)</td>
<td>3 = Promising research evidence (98)</td>
<td>4 = Evidence fails to demonstrate effect (0)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5 = Concerning practice (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition for Evidence-Based Policy</td>
<td>Top tier (10)</td>
<td>Near top tier (6)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CrimeSolutions.gov</td>
<td>Effective (80)</td>
<td>Promising (193)</td>
<td>No effects (42)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Registry of Evidence-based Programs and Practices</td>
<td>Score of 3.0-4.0 (205)</td>
<td>Score of 2.0-2.9 (113)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promising Practices Network</td>
<td>Proven (29) and proven/promising (4)</td>
<td>Promising (59)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What Works Clearinghouse</td>
<td>Positive (24)</td>
<td>Potentially positive (87)</td>
<td>No discernible effects (38)</td>
<td>Mixed effects (7)</td>
<td>Negative (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What Works in Reentry Clearinghouse</td>
<td>Strong beneficial (28)</td>
<td>Modest beneficial (16)</td>
<td>No evidence of effect (11)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Modest harmful (0) and strong harmful (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## RF Clearinghouse Database

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Blueprints for Healthy Youth Development</th>
<th>California Evidence-Based Clearinghouse for Child Welfare</th>
<th>CrimeSolutions.gov</th>
<th>Promising Practices Network</th>
<th>NREPP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexual/Dating Violence</td>
<td>4th R Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Promising</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>Abecedarian Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proven</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health: Adult</td>
<td>Acceptance and Commitment Therapy (ACT)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1: Well-Supported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Prevention</td>
<td>All Stars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No Effects</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Justice</td>
<td>Functional Family Therapy (FFT)</td>
<td>Model</td>
<td>2: Supported</td>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Behavior/Character</td>
<td>Good Behavior Game</td>
<td>Promising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Funding by evidence base

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Program Budget (FY13)</th>
<th>% of FY13 Program Budget</th>
<th>Evaluated in Literature (Clearinghouses)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thinking for a Change</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Evidence-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Education</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>Evidence-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Monitoring</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sober Living Environment</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>Promising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Court</td>
<td>$820,000</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>Promising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Violence (non-CBT)</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>No Effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Boot Camps</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>No Effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans Courts</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others (no evidence)</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **44% Effective**
- **26% No Effects**
- **30% No Evidence**
The Results First Approach: Bring Evidence into the Process

1. Program Inventory

2. Benefit-Cost Analysis
Results First benefit-cost model

1. Use the **best research** to identify what works

2. Predict the **impact** in your jurisdiction

3. Calculate long-term **costs** and **benefits**
## Build on program inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Program Budget</th>
<th>Participant Cost</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thinking for a Change</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$419</td>
<td>Evidence-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Education in Prison</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$1,599</td>
<td>Evidence-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Monitoring</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$1,093</td>
<td>Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sober Living Environment</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>Promising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Court</td>
<td>$820,000</td>
<td>$4,276</td>
<td>Promising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Violence (non CBT)</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$1,390</td>
<td>No effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Boot Camps</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$408</td>
<td>No effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans Courts</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$4,101</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Predict and monetize outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Program Budget</th>
<th>Participant Cost</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Long-term Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thinking for a Change</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$419</td>
<td>Evidence-based</td>
<td>$9,954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Education in Prison</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$1,599</td>
<td>Evidence-based</td>
<td>$19,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Monitoring</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$1,093</td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>$24,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sober Living Environment</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>Promising</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Court</td>
<td>$820,000</td>
<td>$4,276</td>
<td>Promising</td>
<td>$10,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Violence (non CBT)</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$1,390</td>
<td>No effects</td>
<td>-$7,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Boot Camps</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$408</td>
<td>No effects</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans Courts</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$4,101</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Compare costs and benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Program Budget</th>
<th>Participant Cost</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Long-term Benefits</th>
<th>Benefit-Cost Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thinking for a Change</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$419</td>
<td>Evidence-based</td>
<td>$9,954</td>
<td>$24.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Education in Prison</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$1,599</td>
<td>Evidence-based</td>
<td>$19,531</td>
<td>$13.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Monitoring</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$1,093</td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>$24,840</td>
<td>$22.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sober Living Environment</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>Promising</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Court</td>
<td>$820,000</td>
<td>$4,276</td>
<td>Promising</td>
<td>$10,183</td>
<td>$3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Violence (non CBT)</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$1,390</td>
<td>No effects</td>
<td>-$7,527</td>
<td>-$4.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Boot Camps</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$408</td>
<td>No effects</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans Courts</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$4,101</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Results First Approach:
Bring Evidence into the Process

1. Program Inventory
2. Benefit-Cost Analysis
3. Using your Results
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Maria D. Griego
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New Mexico Legislative Finance Committee (LFC)
- Joint Interim Budget Committee
- Makes comprehensive budget recommendations, separate from Governor, to full legislature
- Includes Program Evaluation Unit

Using Results First Approach since 2011
- Program Areas:
  - Adult Criminal Justice
  - Child Welfare
  - Early Childhood Education
  - Behavioral Health
Incorporating the approach to aid in budget and policy decisions through

• **Budget and policy analysis**
  – Providing benchmarks for expected performance from evidence-based programs that have already been implemented.

• **Consumer reports**
  – Inventory existing programs.
  – Prioritize funding for programs with a high likelihood of success.

• **Program evaluations**
  – More in-depth evaluations to investigate if state is getting expected results, also offering recommendations for improvement.
Legislation authorized the department to double ISP caseloads, with no requirement for treatment as part of the program. Effectively implemented in-prison drug treatment programs reduce recidivism.
Results First: Current Program Cost Effectiveness

- Electronic monitoring
- Education in Prison
- Vocational Education
- Community Drug Treatment
- Mental Health Courts
- Drug Treatment in Prison
- Drug Courts
- Intensive Supervision With Treatment
- Intensive Supervision Only
- Cognitive Behavioral Therapy
- Employment Training
- Perpetrator Treatment

Forecasted Recidivism Reduction vs. Cost per Participant

Source: LFC Files
Targeting Funding to What Works

Criminal Justice

- $3 million was appropriated to expand recidivism reduction programming including:
  - $1.5 million for inmate education, estimated to reduce recidivism by almost 12 percent,
  - $750 thousand for behavioral health services, such as cognitive behavioral therapy, estimated to reduce recidivism by 7 percent, and
  - $750 thousand for community-based employment training and education.

- $950 thousand was appropriated to the Judiciary expanding drug courts
Results First – What Works? Child Welfare

Total Benefit to Cost Ratio By Program

- Alternative Response: $15.64
- Safecare: $10.98
- Nurse Family Partnerships: $9.70
- Triple P (All Levels): $9.28
- Parent Child Interaction Therapy: $5.48
- Homebuilders: $2.86
- Triple P (Level 4): $1.56
- Parents as Teachers: $1.54
- Other home visiting programs: $1.49
- Healthy Families America: $0.72
- Parent Child Home Program: $0.53
- Other family preservation: ($0.68)
## Alternative Response Benefits Breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Benefits</th>
<th>To Participant</th>
<th>To Taxpayer</th>
<th>To Others</th>
<th>Indirect Benefits</th>
<th>Total Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crime Reduction</td>
<td></td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>$89</td>
<td>$7</td>
<td>$111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Earnings Based on HS degree</td>
<td>$71</td>
<td>$26</td>
<td></td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Earnings based on Test scores</td>
<td>$27</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td></td>
<td>$13</td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoided health care costs via educational attainment</td>
<td>$-2</td>
<td>$12</td>
<td>$-9</td>
<td>$6</td>
<td>$8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in child abuse/neglect</td>
<td>$233</td>
<td>$59</td>
<td></td>
<td>$29</td>
<td>$321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced out of home placements</td>
<td></td>
<td>$159</td>
<td></td>
<td>$80</td>
<td>$239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$7</td>
<td>$8</td>
<td>$4</td>
<td>$3</td>
<td>$24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Preliminary estimates from September 2013 version of NM Results First model*
Anticipating Benefits

Alternative Response Benefit Per Participant

Years from Program Start

Cumulative Taxpayer Benefit

Cumulative Total benefit

Break Even Point

Preliminary estimates from September 2013 version of NM Results First model
Cost–benefit analysis provides data–driven decision–making tools for policy makers allowing for more targeted funding of programs that are proven to work.

The Results First approach allows for strong pre–decision analysis, as well as post–implementation benchmarking.

Maria D. Griego, M.B.A.
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New Mexico Legislative Finance Committee

Maria.Griego@nmlegis.gov
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Background

- **Jan. 2015 released solicitation**
  *Improving Recidivism Outcomes: Evidence-Based Programs and Promising Practices in the Administration of the Criminal and Juvenile Justice Systems, Corrections, and Supervision*

- **Approx. $2.6 million to support programs**
  - Federal Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) program funds from the U.S. Department of Justice
Key Components of the Solicitation

- Evidence-based or promising programs
  - Results First Clearinghouse Database or WSIPP
  - Only ‘highest’ or ‘second highest’ rated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mental health: adult</td>
<td>Acceptance and Commitment Therapy</td>
<td>1: Well-supported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult criminal justice</td>
<td>Amity In-Prison Therapeutic Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Promising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance abuse: adult</td>
<td>Brief Alcohol Screening and Intervention of College Students</td>
<td>Model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3: Promising research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile justice</td>
<td>Family Centered Treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implementation oversight and fidelity monitoring

- Encouraged to include monitoring, process evaluation in proposed budget

- Use of a validated Risk/Needs Assessment tool
- **Evaluation plan and data collection**

- **Post-Award Grant Compliance Requirements**
  - **Program Inventory**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Inventory Components</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>List of Programs and Basic Information</td>
<td>Name of program and description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant and Capacity Information</td>
<td>Primary participant population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Information</td>
<td>Program budget in FY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lessons Learned

- **Strong partnerships**
  - Research team and JAG administrators

- **Educate bidders**

- **Include promising/EBP summary in fillable application**

- **Utilize reviewers w/ expertise in programs, research**

- **Time consuming**
  - Reprioritize, dedicate ongoing resources
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To submit questions for the presenters please use the chat feature on the right hand side of your screen. Please select Host and Presenter.
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