

## Risk Need & Responsivity supervision (for high and moderate risk offenders) Adult Criminal Justice

Benefit-cost estimates updated December 2016. Literature review updated December 2013.

Current estimates replace old estimates. Numbers will change over time as a result of model inputs and monetization methods.

The WSIPP benefit-cost analysis examines, on an apples-to-apples basis, the monetary value of programs or policies to determine whether the benefits from the program exceed its costs. WSIPP's research approach to identifying evidence-based programs and policies has three main steps. First, we determine "what works" (and what does not work) to improve outcomes using a statistical technique called meta-analysis. Second, we calculate whether the benefits of a program exceed its costs. Third, we estimate the risk of investing in a program by testing the sensitivity of our results. For more detail on our methods, see our [Technical Documentation](#).

**Program Description:** For this broad grouping of programs, supervision of adult offenders utilizing "Risk Need Responsivity" (RNR) principles were included in this analysis. The risk principle pertains to interventions commensurate with an offender's risk for re-offense. The need principle targets offender's criminogenic needs such as anti-social attitudes or substance abuse. The responsivity principle refers to interventions geared toward the offender's individual abilities and motivation level. Supervision using RNR principles focuses on high to moderate risk offenders and interventions are either cognitive behavioral or social learning techniques. The corrections officer uses motivational interviewing to engage the offender and supervision is based on a behavioral or contingency management style to motivate, engage, and change the offender's behavior.

### Benefit-Cost Summary Statistics Per Participant

#### Benefits to:

Taxpayers	\$5,642	Benefit to cost ratio	\$3.42
Participants	\$0	Benefits minus costs	\$12,121
Others	\$11,163	Chance the program will produce	
Indirect	\$320	benefits greater than the costs	100 %
<b>Total benefits</b>	<b>\$17,125</b>		
<b>Net program cost</b>	<b>(\$5,005)</b>		
<b>Benefits minus cost</b>	<b>\$12,121</b>		

The estimates shown are present value, life cycle benefits and costs. All dollars are expressed in the base year chosen for this analysis (2015). The chance the benefits exceed the costs are derived from a Monte Carlo risk analysis. The details on this, as well as the economic discount rates and other relevant parameters are described in our [Technical Documentation](#).

## Detailed Monetary Benefit Estimates Per Participant

Benefits from changes to: <sup>1</sup>	Benefits to:				
	Participants	Taxpayers	Others <sup>2</sup>	Indirect <sup>3</sup>	Total
Crime	\$0	\$5,642	\$11,162	\$2,828	\$19,632
Adjustment for deadweight cost of program	\$0	\$0	\$1	(\$2,508)	(\$2,507)
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$5,642</b>	<b>\$11,163</b>	<b>\$320</b>	<b>\$17,125</b>

<sup>1</sup>In addition to the outcomes measured in the meta-analysis table, WSIPP measures benefits and costs estimated from other outcomes associated with those reported in the evaluation literature. For example, empirical research demonstrates that high school graduation leads to reduced crime. These associated measures provide a more complete picture of the detailed costs and benefits of the program.

<sup>2</sup>"Others" includes benefits to people other than taxpayers and participants. Depending on the program, it could include reductions in crime victimization, the economic benefits from a more educated workforce, and the benefits from employer-paid health insurance.

<sup>3</sup>"Indirect benefits" includes estimates of the net changes in the value of a statistical life and net changes in the deadweight costs of taxation.


## Detailed Annual Cost Estimates Per Participant

	Annual cost	Year dollars	Summary	
Program costs	\$4,853	2012	Present value of net program costs (in 2015 dollars)	(\$5,005)
Comparison costs	\$0	2012	Cost range (+ or -)	10 %

Per-participant cost estimate provided by the Washington State Department of Corrections.

The figures shown are estimates of the costs to implement programs in Washington. The comparison group costs reflect either no treatment or treatment as usual, depending on how effect sizes were calculated in the meta-analysis. The cost range reported above reflects potential variation or uncertainty in the cost estimate; more detail can be found in our [Technical Documentation](#).

## Detailed Annual Cost Estimates Per Participant



The graph above illustrates the estimated cumulative net benefits per-participant for the first fifty years beyond the initial investment in the program. We present these cash flows in non-discounted dollars to simplify the "break-even" point from a budgeting perspective. If the dollars are negative (bars below \$0 line), the cumulative benefits do not outweigh the cost of the program up to that point in time. The program breaks even when the dollars reach \$0. At this point, the total benefits to participants, taxpayers, and others, are equal to the cost of the program. If the dollars are above \$0, the benefits of the program exceed the initial investment.

## Meta-Analysis of Program Effects

Outcomes measured	No. of effect sizes	Treatment N	Adjusted effect sizes and standard errors used in the benefit-cost analysis						Unadjusted effect size (random effects model)	
			First time ES is estimated			Second time ES is estimated			ES	p-value
			ES	SE	Age	ES	SE	Age		
Crime	7	3165	-0.243	0.043	33	-0.243	0.043	43	-0.267	0.001

Meta-analysis is a statistical method to combine the results from separate studies on a program, policy, or topic in order to estimate its effect on an outcome. WSIPP systematically evaluates all credible evaluations we can locate on each topic. The outcomes measured are the types of program impacts that were measured in the research literature (for example, crime or educational attainment). Treatment N represents the total number of individuals or units in the treatment group across the included studies.

An effect size (ES) is a standard metric that summarizes the degree to which a program or policy affects a measured outcome. If the effect size is positive, the outcome increases. If the effect size is negative, the outcome decreases.

Adjusted effect sizes are used to calculate the benefits from our benefit cost model. WSIPP may adjust effect sizes based on methodological characteristics of the study. For example, we may adjust effect sizes when a study has a weak research design or when the program developer is involved in the research. The magnitude of these adjustments varies depending on the topic area.

WSIPP may also adjust the second ES measurement. Research shows the magnitude of some effect sizes decrease over time. For those effect sizes, we estimate outcome-based adjustments which we apply between the first time ES is estimated and the second time ES is estimated. We also report the unadjusted effect size to show the effect sizes before any adjustments have been made. More details about these adjustments can be found in our [Technical Documentation](#).

## Citations Used in the Meta-Analysis

- Bonta, J., Bourgon, G., Rugge, T., Scott, T., Yessine, A., Gutierrez, L., & Li, J. (2011). An experimental demonstration of training probation officers in evidence-based community supervision. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 38(11).
- Jalbert, S.K., Rhodes, W., Kane, M., Clawson, E., Bogue, B., Flygare, C., Kling, R., & Guevara, M. (2011). *A multi-site evaluation of reduced probation caseload sizes in an evidence-based practice setting* (NCJ No. NCJ 234596). Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Latessa, E., Smith, P., Schweitzer, M., & Labrecque, R. (2013). *Evaluation of the effective practices in community supervision model (EPICS) in Ohio*. Center for Criminal Justice Research: University of Cincinnati.
- Robinson, C., VanBenschoten, S., Alexander, M., & Lowenkamp, C. (2011). A random (almost) study of staff training aimed at reducing re-arrest (STARR): Reducing recidivism through intentional design. *Federal Probation*, 75(2).
- Taxman, F.S. (2008). No illusions: Offender and organizational change in Maryland's proactive community supervision efforts. *Criminology and Public Policy*, 7(2), 275-302.
- Trotter, C. (1996). The impact of different supervision practices in community corrections: Cause for optimism. *The Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 29(1), 1-19.

For further information, contact:  
(360) 664-9800, [institute@wsipp.wa.gov](mailto:institute@wsipp.wa.gov)

Printed on 02-08-2017



### Washington State Institute for Public Policy

The Washington State Legislature created the Washington State Institute for Public Policy in 1983. A Board of Directors—representing the legislature, the governor, and public universities—governs WSIPP and guides the development of all activities. WSIPP's mission is to carry out practical research, at legislative direction, on issues of importance to Washington State.