



# RESULTS FIRST MISSISSIPPI

July 2014 Brief

## Why “Results First?”

*Mississippi is incorporating the Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative into its budgetary process as part of an effort to revitalize its use of performance-based budgeting. Results First provides the state with access to both a data set of evidence-based programs in critical public policy areas and cost-benefit analytics that will allow the state to direct public resources to cost effective programs that are proven to work.*

## Applying the Results First Model to the Adult Criminal Justice System

To pilot Results First in Mississippi, legislative staff inventoried adult criminal justice intervention programs and matched them to programs in the Results First model.

### Of the nineteen intervention programs identified:

**Nine** were found to meet the standards for evidence-based research:

**Seven** of the nine were projected to yield a positive return on investment in line with the returns reported in research literature;  
**Two** of the nine were showing poor returns on investment that need to be addressed.

**Ten** were excluded from analysis because the evidence-based research needed to assess long-term benefits was not available.

Comparative data for vetted programs can be analyzed in terms of return on investment from costs and benefits, as shown in the example below of two adult criminal justice programs:

Category	Education in Prison	Domestic Violence Programs
Benefit	\$ 13,051	\$ (886)
Cost	\$ (829)	\$ (530)
Net Present Value	\$ 12,222	\$ (1,416)
Benefit to Cost Ratio	\$ 15.74	\$ (1.67)
Positive Return On Investment?	Yes	No

*The exhibit on the reverse side presents the monetary benefits and costs of the nine Mississippi evidence-based adult criminal justice programs for similar comparisons.*

## What Have We Learned?

Using the Results First Model on a broader scale will provide decision-makers with options in the budgeting process that include, but are not limited to, the following:

- expansion of evidence-based programs with positive returns, based on the degree of relevant unmet needs and availability of resources;
- auditing of evidence-based programs without positive returns for practices that deviate from the research model; and,
- vetting programs without an evidence base through original research or eliminating such programs and reallocating resources to evidence-based programs.

## Next Steps

To be able to apply the Results First model broadly and arrive at the needed assessments, the state needs to complete a program inventory that will include additional public policy areas beyond adult criminal justice and improve its ability to attach costs to the specific intervention programs.

*Legislation passed during the 2014 session that furthers that goal requires:*

- the completion of program inventories and performance measures for the departments of Education, Health, Transportation, and additional work at Corrections (H.B. 677);
- recommendations as to how this information can be incorporated into the appropriations process (H.B. 677); and,
- the collection of additional data needed to produce more accurate cost-benefit analytics (H.B. 585, H.B. 593).

*In the near term, Mississippi plans to:*

- refine its cost-benefit analysis for the seven adult criminal justice intervention programs with positive returns on investment;
- expand its use of the Results First model to intervention programs in juvenile justice and education; and,
- conduct fidelity audits of community-based drug courts to improve their return on investment and institutional alcohol and drug treatment programs to ensure accuracy of projections.

*For more information on Results First in Mississippi, as well as the Legislature's broader effort to revitalize performance budgeting in the state, visit:*

[http://www.peer.state.ms.us/reports/budget\\_process.pdf](http://www.peer.state.ms.us/reports/budget_process.pdf)  
[http://www.peer.state.ms.us/reports/strategic\\_plan.pdf](http://www.peer.state.ms.us/reports/strategic_plan.pdf)

**Exhibit: Monetary Benefits and Costs of Mississippi's Evidence-Based Adult Criminal Justice Programs (in 2012 Dollars)**

A. Intervention Program	Monetary Benefits Per Participant (Derived from Avoided Cost of Recidivism)			Summary Statistics, Per Participant				I. Positive Return on Investment in MS? Y or N
	B. Total Benefits	C. Taxpayer Benefits	D. Non-Taxpayer Benefits	E. Cost Per Participant	F. Benefits Minus Costs (Net Present Value)	G. Benefit to Cost Ratio	H. Measured Risk (Odds of a Positive Net Present Value)	
<i>Prison-Based Programs</i>								
1. Correctional Education in Prison	\$13,051.00	\$2,041.00	\$11,010.00	<b>\$(829.00)</b>	\$12,222.00	\$15.74	100%	Y
2. Vocational Education in Prison	12,467.00	1,955.00	10,512.00	<b>(1,258.00)</b>	11,209.00	9.91	100%	Y
3. Outpatient/Non-Intensive Drug Treatment While Incarcerated	9,825.00	1,536.00	8,289.00	<b>(223.00)</b>	9,602.00	44.06	100%	Y
4. Work Release Programs (Compared to Cost of Incarceration at an MDOC Facility)*	4,621.00	725.00	3,896.00	674.00	5,295.00	*	99%	Y
5. Correctional Industries in Prison**	4,657.00	731.00	3,926.00	<b>(3,613.00)</b>	1,044.00	1.29	77%	Y
<i>Community-Based Programs</i>								
6. Electronic Monitoring in Community (Compared to Cost of Incarceration)*	\$1,535.00	\$965.00	\$570.00	\$5,714.00	\$7,249.00	*	100%	Y
7. Mental Health Courts	2,355.00	719.00	1,636.00	<b>(1,189.00)</b>	1,166.00	\$1.98	96%	Y
8. Domestic Violence Perpetrator Treatment**	<b>(886.00)</b>	<b>(270.00)</b>	<b>(616.00)</b>	<b>(530.00)</b>	<b>(1,416.00)</b>	<b>(1.67)</b>	15%	N
9. Drug Courts	2,622.00	796.00	1,826.00	<b>(6,905.00)</b>	(4,283.00)	0.38	0%	N

\*A benefit-to-cost ratio can only be calculated for a single program and this is a comparison of two programs.  
 \*\*Costs of this program are funded by participant fees or private providers.

SOURCE: Legislative staff analysis using the Results First cost-benefit analysis model. Legislative staff collected program information and data for populating the model from the Mississippi Department of Corrections, Legislative Budget Office, individual program providers, and states participating in the Results First Initiative.