

STATE OF CONNECTICUT  
**Results First**  
Policy Oversight Committee  
Annual Report  
2015



INSTITUTE FOR MUNICIPAL AND  
REGIONAL POLICY



Central Connecticut State University

October 1, 2015

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 at Central Connecticut State University have been working 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.

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 2014-2015. We acknowledge and thank the technical support team from Results First and the state agency staff who have assisted and advanced this effort.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Toni Walker". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Toni" written in a larger, more prominent script than the last name "Walker".

Representative Toni Walker  
Chair

**PREPARED BY:**

**INSTITUTE FOR MUNICIPAL AND REGIONAL  
POLICY**

**Central Connecticut State University**

*Andrew J. Clark, Director*

*Mary Janicki, University Assistant*

*John Noonan, University Assistant*

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***

## **PART I: BACKGROUND**

The Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative Origins.....	3
Origins in Connecticut.....	3

## **PART II: CONNECTICUT ACTIVITY IN 2014-2015**

Results First Policy Oversight Committee .....	4
Contacts with Legislators and Other Groups.....	4
Collaboration with Juvenile Justice Policy Oversight Committee.....	7

## **PART III: CONNECTICUT RESULTS FIRST INITIATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN 2014-2015**

Connecticut Results First 2014 Strategic Plan Status Update.....	7
Status of 2014 Mandated Studies.....	10
Creation of Results First Connecticut Website.....	13
Connecticut Evidence-Based Program Inventory.....	14

## **PART IV: 2015 CONNECTICUT LEGISLATION**

Budget and Implementer Provisions.....	14
--	----

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

General Technical Support and Products.....	17
Site Visit: April 20 and 21, 2015.....	17
Site Visit: June 17 and 18, 2015.....	18
2015 State Convening.....	18

**PART VI: RECOMMENDATIONS**

Connecticut Results First 2015-2016 Strategic Plan .....20  
Legislative Recommendations for 2016.....22

**PART VII: APPENDICIES**

A. Relevant Section of Public Act 13-247.....23  
B. Members of the Connecticut Results First Policy Oversight Committee.....25  
C. Connecticut Results First Major Activity, October 1, 2014 - September 30, 2015....26  
D. Relevant Sections of Public Act 15-5, June Special Session .....27

## **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 states and selected counties identify opportunities to effectively invest limited resources to produce better outcomes and substantial long-term savings.

Results First employs a sophisticated econometric model to analyze the costs and benefits of evidence-based programs 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 the 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.

Results First currently offers technical assistance to 18 states and four California counties to help them customize and implement jurisdiction-specific versions of the model and related tools and use the results to help inform policy and budget deliberations.

This report was developed with assistance from the Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative staff and consultants.

### **Origins 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 Results First.

In 2013, the General Assembly included up to \$150,000 in the FY 14-15 budget act, An Act Concerning Expenditures and Revenue for the Biennium Ending June 30, 2015 (PA 13-184, Section 42) for a grant to the Institute for Municipal and Regional Policy (IMRP) to assist in the “development of the Connecticut specific model within the Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative.”

The budget “implementer,” An Act Implementing Provisions of the State Budget for the Biennium Ending June 30, 2015 Concerning General Government (PA 13-247, Section 42, codified at CGS Sec. 2-111) (see Appendix A), established a Results First Policy Oversight

---

<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.

Committee (RFPOC) 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.

## **PART II: CONNECTICUT ACTIVITY IN 2014-2015**

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

The Connecticut Results First Policy Oversight Committee and its three subcommittees were inactive during this period.

### **Contacts with Legislators and Other Groups**

During this reporting year, the IMRP's Results First team met with legislators and other interested parties to present information regarding the program. During site visits, staff from the Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative Washington staff accompanied the IMRP staff to supplement information and presentations about the project. These included:

- The Malta Justice Initiative Legislative Breakfast, March 26, 2015
- Municipal Opportunities and Regional Efficiencies (M.O.R.E.) Commission, Municipal Efficiencies Subcommittee meeting, April 20, 2015
- MetroHartford Alliance meeting in Hartford with President Oz Griebel, Patrick McGloin, and Spencer Cain, as well as Ian Scott, Vice President of Communications and Networks of the Association of Chamber of Commerce Executives, April 21, 2015
- Commissioner Scott Semple and staff of the Department of Correction at the dedication ceremony for the Cybulski Community Reintegration Center in Enfield Connecticut, April 21, 2015

Meetings were also scheduled during the Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative staff site visit in April with legislative leaders, including Senators Martin Looney and Len Fasano and Representative Aresimowicz; and Appropriations Committee co-chairs Senator Beth Bye and Representative Toni Walker and ranking members Senator Robert Kane and Representative Melissa Ziobron.

***Schedule of Appointments with Pew Results First Initiative Staff***

**Monday, April 20, 2015**

<i>Time</i>	<i>Appointment with</i>
11:00AM	House Majority Leader Representative Joe Aresimowicz
11:30AM	Staff, Senate Majority Leader Senator Bob Duff Policy Aide Dean O'Brien
12:30PM	Appropriations Committee Vice Chair Representative Robyn Porter
1:45PM	Appropriations Committee Ranking Members Senator Rob Kane and Representative Melissa Ziobron
2:30PM	Senate President pro Tem Senator Martin Looney
4:00PM	Planning meeting with IMRP and Pew staff

**Tuesday, April 21, 2015**

<i>Time</i>	<i>Appointment with</i>
9:45AM	Dedication Ceremony, Cybulski Community Reintegration Center <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commissioner Scott Semple, Department of Correction</li> <li>• Brian Hill, Court Support Services Division</li> </ul>
12PM	MetroHartford Alliance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oz Griebel, Spencer Cain, Patrick McGloin,</li> <li>• Ian Scott, Vice President, Communications and Networks, Association of Chamber of Commerce Executives</li> </ul>

To prepare for Results First activity in summer and fall of 2015, Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative staff made another site visit June 17-18, 2015.



**Schedule of Appointments with Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative Staff**

**Wednesday, June 17, 2015**

<i>Time</i>	<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Participants*</i>
10:00AM	Program Inventory Introduction and Training	IMRP Office	CSSD: Brian Hill, Cindy Theran; DCF: Steven Smith, Ines Eaton; DOC: Dr. Pat Hynes, Michael Lettieri, Justin Oles; DMHAS: Loel Meckel
	Review of Results First Model Parameters	IMRP Office	IMRP staff
2:00 PM	Department of Correction (DOC), Parole and Community Services Division (PCSD)	DOC 24 Wolcott Hill Rd. Wethersfield	Joseph Hagan, PCSD representatives
4:00 PM	Program Inventory Implementation Planning Session	Hartford	Pew and IMRP staff
7:00 PM	Results First Planning Session	Hartford	Pew and IMRP staff

\*Pew and IMRP staff plus those listed

**Thursday, June 18, 2015**

<i>Time</i>	<i>Meeting</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Participants*</i>
10:00AM	Legislative Nonpartisan Office Directors (Ex-officio members of the Results First Policy Oversight Commission)	State Capitol Room 501	Carrie Vibert, Director, Miriam Kluger, and Scott Simoneau, Program Review and Investigations Committee staff
12:30PM	Tow Youth Justice Institute	LOB	William Carbone, Jeanne Milstein
2:00PM	Juvenile Justice Policy Oversight Committee	LOB Room 1E	

## **Collaboration with the Juvenile Justice Policy Oversight Committee**

Legislation enacted in 2014 established the Juvenile Justice Policy Oversight Committee (JJPOC) to evaluate and report on policies related to the juvenile justice system and the expansion of juvenile jurisdiction to include persons sixteen and seventeen years of age (the so-called “Raise the Age” initiative). The Tow Youth Justice Institute at the University of New Haven was designated the staff and implementation team to research, evaluate, and report on the policies and programs identified in the legislation. Its reports were to include short-, medium-, and long-term goals. In addition, the law charged the JJPOC to “work in collaboration with any Results First initiative” (PA 14-217, Sec. 79 (h)). In 2015, the committee’s authorizing legislation was amended (PA 15-183) to require it to implement a strategic plan integrating goals it set.

Once the JJPOC adopted its one-year strategic plan on June 18, 2015, Tow Institute and IMRP Results First staff met to discuss the development of a program inventory of evidence-based programs associated with the diversion, incarceration, and recidivism rates for juveniles. This effort will provide data for estimating the monetary cost-benefit analysis of programs associated with the adopted goals of increasing diversion and reducing incarceration and recidivism. The intent is to provide, along with recommendations in the Tow evaluations, specific information on (1) projected cost savings to the state and (2) the level of potential reinvestment.

Work groups will begin developing strategies and action steps to implement the target goals of increasing the diversion rate by 20% and reducing the incarceration rate by 30% and the recidivism rate by 10% over the next three years. The work group action plans are due by February 1, 2016.

## **PART III: CONNECTICUT RESULTS FIRST INITIATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN 2014-2015**

### **Connecticut Results First 2014 Strategic Plan Status Update**

Following the Results First Initiative State Convening in August 2014, the Connecticut team developed major project goals and objectives for the coming year and beyond. Generally, those goals focused on (1) increasing awareness of the Results First project in Connecticut, (2) improving agencies’ data collection efforts associated with evidence-based programs, and (3) integrating the Results First approach and use of evidence-based programs along with a cost-benefit analysis in policy- and budget-making decisions.

Table 1 shows each goal and specific objects for each along with the strategic plan’s projected deadline and its status.

**Table 1: Status of 2014 Strategic Plan Goals and Objectives**

**Goal 1: Increase the recognition and knowledge of the Connecticut Results First Team through the promotion of completed and ongoing projects.**

<b>Objective</b>	<b>Deadline</b>	<b>Status</b>
<i>Issue 2014 Annual Report of the Policy Oversight Committee.</i> The Annual Report will summarize the recent accomplishments and the current status of ongoing projects of the Connecticut Results First Team.	October 2014	Completed October 2014
<i>Present the Results First Initiative</i> to (a) the Juvenile Justice Policy and Oversight Committee (on October 16, 2014) and (b) the Criminal Justice Policy Advisory Committee (on October 30).	November 2014	No action
<i>Submit a PEW-MacArthur Foundation case study</i> on Connecticut on the 2014 domestic violence treatment program evaluations done by the Department of Correction and the Judicial Branch's Court Support Services Division.	November 2014	Pew declined to disseminate pending a resolution of evaluation techniques
<i>Create a website</i> for Results First on the Institute for Municipal and Regional Policy website. The website will provide viewers with information about the history of the Connecticut Results First Team, the mission of the Team, and access to publications and presentations produced by the Team.	February 2015	Completed and available April 2, 2015
<i>Increase the number of key stakeholders attending next year's conference.</i> For the past three years, members of the working groups have attended the Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative State Convening but stakeholders such as members of the POC have not.	August 2015	IMRP staff member John Noonan attended, August 2015

**Goal 2: Improve the efficiency and timeliness of data collection and information dissemination.**

<b>Objective</b>	<b>Deadline</b>	<b>Status</b>
<i>Hire a full-time project manager</i> to head the Connecticut Results First and coordinate and prioritize the Results First projects. The project manager will be a full-time staff member of the IMRP.	February 2015	No action
<p><i>Develop a program inventory database</i> to catalogue evidence-based programs and practices in Connecticut. The database will include program-level cost and utilization data for a given fiscal year. The database would be updated every one or two years to minimize the workload burden on agency staff who provide the Working Group with updated information. In order to complete this task, two steps must be completed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. <u>Expand the current program inventory</u> which includes only those evidence-based programs in the Results First model operating in this state. A more detailed inventory would include all evidence-based programs in Connecticut, not just a subset of those that are also included in the model.</li> <li>ii. <u>Review electronic clearinghouses</u> (e.g., the Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative Clearinghouse Database) to match the list of agency programs with those listed in the clearinghouse inventory.</li> </ol> <p>Collaboration with other Results First states may be necessary as team members share ideas and resolve challenges for an improved final product.</p>	February 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Program inventory legislative mandate enacted June 30, 2015</li> <li>• Work group formed June 17, 2015 and meeting regularly to develop program inventories</li> </ul>
<i>Develop a workshop</i> for agency staff on how to estimate program costs and build capacity.	February 2015	June 17, 2015 et al.
<i>Develop a systematic method to collect evidence-based program-level data</i> from agency staff.	After August 2015	Ongoing starting with work group, pursuant to PA 15-5, JSS
<i>Update the recidivism cohort analysis</i> from 2004 to 2010 for use with the Results First model	After August 2015	No action

**Goal 3: Encourage evidence-based policy creation and assessment.**

<b>Objective</b>	<b>Deadline</b>	<b>Status</b>
<p><i>Continue to integrate findings from Results First into the state budget process. Any one of three steps may be taken to achieve this outcome:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. <u>Cooperate with Appropriations Committee</u> and agency efforts on Results-Based Accountability to support Results First.</li> <li>ii. <u>Engage Office of Policy and Management</u> budget analysts and encourage their use of the information generated by the Results First model in those agencies that have developed benefit-cost analyses.</li> <li>iii. <u>Encourage legislative oversight</u> of evidence-based programs and their funding.</li> </ul>	August 2015	Pursuant to PA 15-5, JSS and on-going
<p><i>Coordinate and offer training on performance-based management for agency managers through collaboration with faculty from CCSU's School of Business. Faculty will design a training module related to performance-based management for agency staff.</i></p>	August 2015	No action
<p><i>Expand the Results First model to new policy areas, including child welfare, education, and mental health. Most states participating in the Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative are populating the child welfare component of the model. Align with agencies more willing and able to work with the Results First Connecticut project to collect and provide the necessary data to the Results First project tea to populate the relevant policy areas of the model.</i></p>	After August 2015	No action
<p><i>Develop, solicit, and award grants using the Results First model.</i></p>	After August 2015	No action
<p><i>Analyze the fiscal impact of legislation using the Results First model.</i></p>	After August 2015	No action

**Status of 2014 Mandated Studies**

The General Assembly passed and the governor signed 2014 legislation (PA 14-247, An Act Implementing Provisions of the State Budget for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2015) requiring four targeted program evaluations intended to provide the data for application of the Results First model in two adult criminal and two juvenile justice programs. The deadline for completion of each of these studies was May 31, 2015, with a subsequent June 30 reporting deadline. Due to delays, some of which were out of the control of the responsible agencies and the IMRP, none of the four met these deadlines. However, they are currently underway with projected completion dates in place.

The evaluation scopes and status as of September 18, 2015 are described below.

### Vocational Education

Section 81 of PA 14-247 required DOC to assess the department's vocational education programs for individuals in its custody. The study had to consider its findings in connection with the Connecticut Results First cost-benefit analysis model. The commissioner was required to determine whether program changes should be implemented to improve program cost-effectiveness. A report on findings and recommendations for cost savings was to be submitted to the Appropriations Committee and the Results First Oversight Committee. The study was to be completed by May 31, 2015 and the report was due June 30.

#### Study Scope

*DOC selected for evaluation the popular culinary arts program from among the many vocational education programs the department operates. It issued a request for proposals for an impact analysis design as well as an evaluability assessment of the culinary arts program.*

#### Study Status

*CCSU Education Department professors conducted the study of the culinary arts program in DOC's York Correctional Institution for female offenders and the Manson Youth Institution for sentenced offenders under the age of 21. The final report on this evaluation is anticipated by September 30, 2015. The study included focus groups and data analysis of the three-year recidivism rate of culinary arts graduates compared to program non-completers and completers of other vocational education programs. It will include an impact analysis and suggestions for next steps in program operation.*

### Medication Assisted Therapy Program

Section 82 required DOC to study the department's Medication Assisted Therapy (MAT) pilot project. The study had to consider its findings in connection with the Connecticut Results First cost-benefit analysis model. The commissioner was required to determine whether program changes should be implemented to improve program cost-effectiveness. A report on findings and recommendations for cost-savings had to be submitted to the Appropriations Committee and the Results First Oversight Committee. The study was to be completed by May 31, 2015 and the report was due June 30.

#### Study Scope

*DOC awarded a contract to Yale University's School of Medicine to develop an impact analysis design as well as an evaluability assessment of the medication assisted therapy pilot project operated in New Haven. MAT is the use of medications, in combination with counseling and behavioral therapies, to provide a whole-patient approach to the treatment of substance use disorders.*

#### Study Status

*DOC contracted with researchers at the Yale School of Medicine to manage the evaluation of the Medication Assisted Therapy pilot program in the New Haven correctional facility. The APT Foundation, a private treatment provider under contract with DOC, provides methadone treatment to incarcerated individuals who participate in the program under strict criteria. The study will include a review of the relevant literature; a detailed description of the MAT program; the evaluation methodology; results and conclusions, including recommendations for future research and legislation, if appropriate. Data access agreements and institutional review board (IRB) approvals, though delayed, have been authorized for this evaluation. By October 1, 2015, researchers plan to begin to analyze the data and anticipate completing the study by October 30.*

### Multidimensional Family Therapy Program

Section 83 required IMRP to assess the effectiveness of the multidimensional family therapy program operated by both the Department of Children and Families and Judicial Branch's CSSD. IMRP was required to consider its findings in connection with the Connecticut Results First cost-benefit analysis model. It was authorized to enter a memorandum of understanding with DCF and with CSSD to conduct its assessment and it had to consult with those agencies to develop recommendations to improve cost-effectiveness. It was required to report its findings and program changes the agencies should implement as a result. The report was to also include recommendations all three suggest for statutory or program changes to improve cost-effectiveness. A report on findings and recommendations for cost savings was to be submitted to the Appropriations Committee and the Results First Oversight Committee. The study had to be completed by May 31, 2015 and the report was due June 30.

#### Study Scope

*The Multidimensional Family Therapy (MDFT) program is an evidence-based family-based intensive outpatient treatment program for high-risk adolescents between the ages of nine and 18 that focuses on the adolescent's drug use, delinquency and other key areas of life. Currently, DCF and CSSD fund and implement MDFT for their client populations and provide statewide coverage through the program. CSSD has contracted through DCF for MDFT program slots, but also recently began to fund its own program slots. DCF funds two residential programs that offer the MDFT program and CSSD is preparing to contract for a third residential MDFT program. IMRP must assess the effectiveness of the MDFT program for juveniles committed to DCF or CSSD, which includes committed juvenile delinquents on parole or probation or placed in a residential program. The purpose of the study is to estimate the effectiveness of MDFT programs to reduce the recidivism rate of committed juvenile program participants and estimate the marginal cost of delivering the program to additional committed juveniles and adolescents through the Results First Initiative.*

#### Study Status

*As of September 18, 2015, IMRP had negotiated Memoranda of Agreement (MOAs) with DCF and CSSD for access to the data required for this study. After data entry and analysis is complete, reports with recommendations are expected to be submitted by January 1, 2016.*

### Juvenile Parole Services Programs

Section 84 required IMRP to assess the effectiveness of juvenile parole services programs DCF administers. The Institute had to consider its findings in connection with the Connecticut Results First cost-benefit analysis model. It was required to consult with DCF to develop recommendations to improve program cost-effectiveness. It had to report its findings and the program changes DCF should implement as a result. The report was also to include recommendations IMRP and DCF suggested for statutory or program changes to improve cost-effectiveness. A report on findings and recommendations for cost-savings had to be submitted to the Appropriations Committee and the Results First Oversight Committee. The study was to be completed by May 31, 2015 and the report was due June 30.

#### Study Scope

*DCF's juvenile parole services programs are the subject of several research projects currently being conducted by different research entities and DCF. The same legislation requiring this IMRP study also established the Juvenile Justice Policy and Oversight Committee (JJPOC) that is, in part, responsible for (1) identifying a common definition of "recidivism" to be used by juvenile justice system agencies and (2) promoting information sharing between DCF and the Judicial Branch to ensure the collection and reporting of juvenile recidivism data. Given the current level of research on this issue, the IMRP seeks to fulfill its statutory mandate while avoiding duplication and the inefficient use of state resources. To identify an area for an effectiveness study within the juvenile parole system, the IMRP is working with the JJPOC to develop a common definition of juvenile recidivism and use existing juvenile justice system data to establish a baseline recidivism rate that can then be used to continually report on juvenile recidivism, trends, service and program effectiveness, and cost-benefit analyses.*

#### Study Status

*As of September 18, 2015, IMRP had negotiated Memoranda of Agreement (MOAs) with DCF and CSSD for access to the data required for this study. After data entry and analysis is complete, reports with recommendations are expected to be submitted by January 1, 2016.*

### **Creation of Results First Connecticut Website**

On April 2, 2015, the website for the Results First Connecticut project went "live." Built with significant assistance from the Central Connecticut State University Information Technology office and staff and student assistants at the IMRP, the website give 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.

The website was well-received and posted on the Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative online "mini-group" that other states can reference and consult. The mini-group provides examples of other states' website content and format. The Connecticut site is highlighted as an example to others.

Usage figures as of mid-September 2015 indicate almost 500 visits to the site.

The Connecticut Results First website address is: [www.resultsfirstct.org](http://www.resultsfirstct.org)



## **Connecticut Evidence-Based Program Inventory**

During the summer and fall of 2015, after the enactment of PA 15-5, June Special Session, the Results First team, under the direction of Dr. Ashley Provencher, began working with staff from CSSD, DCF, DOC, and DMHAS to develop inventories of currently funded programs in the areas of adult criminal and juvenile justice policy. These comprehensive program lists will include the data necessary to apply the Results First model and determine cost-benefit analyses and programs' return on investment. See the detailed description of the legislative requirements in Part IV below.

### **PART IV: 2015 CONNECTICUT LEGISLATION**

#### **Budget and Implementer Provisions**

##### Appropriation

Public Act 15-244 appropriates \$100,000 in each of fiscal years 2016 and 2017 for the Results First project.

##### Program Inventories

The 2015 "budget implementer" (PA 15-5, June Special Session, An Act Implementing Provisions of the State Budget for the Biennium Ending June 30, 2017 Concerning General Government, Education and Health and Human Services and Bonds of the State) included the provision (in Sections 486 through 489) requiring certain state agencies to develop the so-called program inventories that provide the basis and data for implementation of Result First. Governor Dannel Malloy signed the legislation on June 30, 2015. The relevant sections became effective on July 1, 2015, except the provision on estimates of agency expenditures on evidence-based programs, which becomes effective July 1, 2016.

This act requires the Judicial Branch's CSSD and the departments of Correction, Children and Families, and Mental Health and Addiction Services, by January 1, 2016, to (1) compile complete lists of each agency's criminal and juvenile justice programs and (2) categorize them as evidenced-based, research-based, promising, or lacking any evidence. Subsequently, the agencies must also do this by October 1 in every even-numbered year.

Each designated agency's list must include 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 annual program expenditures and a description of funding sources,
4. the method for assigning participants,

5. the 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.

CSSD and the departments must submit the program inventories to OPM's Criminal Justice Policy and Planning Division (CJPPD), the Appropriations and Finance, Revenue and Bonding committees, the Office of Fiscal Analysis (OFA), and IMRP.

Using the program inventory data, IMRP must develop a cost-benefit analysis for each program and submit the report of its analyses to CJPPD, the Appropriations and Finance, Revenue and Bonding committees, and OFA, by March 1, 2016 and annually by November 1 after that. IMRP's cost-benefit analyses may be included as part of OPM's and OFA's annual fiscal accountability report due by November 15 to the legislature's fiscal committees each year. Under the act, "cost beneficial" means that the cost savings and benefits realized over a reasonable period of time are greater than the costs of implementation.

By law, OPM must develop a plan to promote a more effective and cohesive state criminal justice system. Under the act, to accomplish this, OPM must also review the program inventories and cost-benefit analyses and consider incorporating them in its budget recommendations to the legislature.

*Agency Expenditure Estimates.* Under the act, the designated agencies' expenditure requirements submitted to OPM and the legislature may include costs to implement evidence-based programs and the governor may include these costs in the budget he submits to the legislature.

*Program Definitions.* The act defines each program category as follows:

1. An "evidence-based program" incorporates methods demonstrated to be effective for the intended population through scientifically based research, including statistically controlled evaluations or randomized trials; can be implemented with a set of procedures to allow successful replication in Connecticut; achieves sustained, desirable outcomes; and, when possible, has been determined to be cost-beneficial.
2. A "research-based program" is a program or practice that has some research demonstrating effectiveness, such as one tested with a single randomized or statistically controlled evaluation, but does not meet the full criteria for evidence-based.
3. A "promising program" is a program or practice that, based on statistical analyses or preliminary research, shows potential for meeting the evidence-based or research-based criteria.

Deadlines

<i>Deadline</i>	<i>Activity</i>
January 1, 2016	Agencies compile inventory of criminal and juvenile justice programs and categorize them as evidence-based, research-based, promising, or lacking evidence.
October 1, even-numbered years	
March 1, 2016	IMRP reports cost-benefit analyses to CJPPD, legislative committees, and OFA.
November 1 annually	
November 15 annually	OPM and OFA may include IMRP's cost-benefit analyses in their reports to legislative committees.

See Appendix D for the Results First-related sections (Secs. 486-489) of the 2015 budget implementer, PA 15-5, June Special Session.

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

### **General Technical Support and Products**

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. Regularly-scheduled conference calls provide the opportunity to exchange updated status information, discuss current activity, and answer questions.

The Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative website (<http://www.pewtrusts.org/en/projects/pew-macarthur-results-first-initiative>) includes updated news and research reports. Also available is the Results First Clearinghouse Database and user guide that compiles ratings and information from eight national research clearinghouses on over 900 programs. The Excel database covers a wide range of policy areas and interventions. The Clearinghouse Database is at <http://www.pewtrusts.org/en/research-and-analysis/issue-briefs/2014/09/results-first-clearinghouse-database>.

The Minigroup information sharing platform is maintained by Results First staff and is available to state partners for sharing ideas, activities, reports, and questions. It provides an effective way to introduce model enhancements and provide technical assistance. Results First states use the Minigroup to share products like program summaries, reports, and responses to frequently asked questions. Valuable webinar presentations give Minigroup members updates and training on Results First developments and continued instruction and support. The latest webinar topics introduced the new cloud-based model, and discussed recidivism analyses, criminal justice program costs, and program inventories.

### **Site Visit: April 20 and 21, 2015**

The Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative liaison staff for Connecticut (Sara Dube, Steve Lize, and Laura Donahue) visited in the spring to meet with legislative leaders as they finalized budget proposals for the next biennium. IMRP staff arranged meetings with majority and minority leaders of the Senate and House as well as the chairs and ranking members of the Appropriations Committee. To connect with partners in the state's Department of Correction, all attended the dedication ceremony of the Cybulski Community Reintegration Center. Pew staff included IMRP in its meeting with the head of the MetroHartford Alliance and a visiting official from the Association of Chamber of Commerce Executives to discuss strategies for the joint promotion of the Results First Initiative in Connecticut.

Recommendations from the visit included (1) approaching leaders and members of the Finance, Revenue and Bonding Committee to introduce and generate support for Results First efforts and (2) offering advanced conversations and training to agencies already involved in Results First. IMRP will continue to follow and provide information supporting a requirement to develop program inventories in adult criminal and juvenile justice agencies for implementation of the Results First model.

## **Site Visit: June 17 and 18, 2015**

Newly assigned state liaison Ronojoy Sen, Senior Associate, made the site visit with technical consultant Dr. Steve Lize to meet Connecticut Results First staff, begin the implementation and training for the program inventory project, meet with Department of Correction staff, make a presentation at the Juvenile Justice Policy and Oversight Committee, and plan strategy for the remainder of the year. The visit provided the opportunity for Pew and IMRP Results First staff to coordinate and plan for the upcoming months.

Though the program inventory proposal had not yet been enacted by the end of the regular legislative session on June 3, it was expected to be included in legislation that would be considered in the June Special Session. Because of the projected deadlines for preparing the program inventory, Results First staff offered an introduction and initial training to the affected agencies on how inventories are to be developed. Dr. Steve Lize discussed the purpose of program inventories and their importance to the Results First project. He and Dr. Ashley Provencher presented an overview of the process and described the contents of an inventory. A program inventory work group was established that has continued inventory development under the guidance of Dr. Provencher.

The Pew staff also attended a meeting of IMRP staff with DOC Parole and Community Services Division director and others to discuss the Institute's study of parole.

Dr. Lize and Andrew Clark, director of the Institute, provided at the June 18 meeting of the JJPOC a discussion and PowerPoint presentation on Cost/Benefit Analysis by explaining the analysis methodology for programs designed to reduce recidivism. Dr. Lize stated that the IMRP is building an inventory of all the programs that are evidence-based and reviewing how they are delivered in Connecticut. The goal will be to show the programs' impact on recidivism. The model (1) will show the cost and the net benefit for each of these programs and (2) is compatible with the goals of the JJPOC's plan, as presented.

## **2015 State Convening**

The Pew Charitable Trusts and the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation sponsored the annual Results First State Convening in Washington, D.C. on August 19 and 20, 2015. This year's conference focused on "Sustaining Momentum and Securing Success."

Over 100 participants attended, including Results First Initiative staff and consultants from the Pew Charitable Trusts and policymakers and staff from all 18 Results First state partners, including three recent additions: Alaska, Delaware, and Minnesota. From Connecticut, Andrew Clark, John Noonan, and Mary Janicki from IMRP and Dr. Ashley Provencher and Brian Hill (CSSD), long-standing members of the Results First Connecticut team attended.

The two-day meeting provided participants with substantive program content (including separate specialized tracks for technical and policy staffs). Results First Initiative staff highlighted two recent applications: the web-based benefit-cost model and clearinghouse

database. Moreover, an important element of the convening was the opportunity to meet with the staff of other Results First states to discuss and share activities and their efforts.

At the conference, Connecticut was highlighted as one of five Results First states to have enacted legislation with Results First references or program inventory requirements. Dr. Provencher was selected to serve as a panelist in the session on “Moving Beyond Criminal Justice” on the technical staff track. In addition, our Results First Connecticut website was featured in the workshop on state websites.

The conference agenda also included a session giving each state team the opportunity to develop a state implementation strategy. The format included identifying goals and strategies such as developing a program inventory and state costs, intervening in the budget process, and expanding the Results First approach to other policy areas. The Connecticut team began the process of articulating goals, objectives, and deadlines for each. The elements of the latest Strategic Plan are described in Part VI: Recommendations.

## **PART VI: RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **Connecticut Results First 2015-2016 Strategic Plan**

As articulated in the “Results First Strategic Plan/Fiscal Year 2015-2016,” the Connecticut team will focus on the following three goals with objectives and deadlines associated with them.

#### **Goal 1: Increase the recognition and knowledge of the Connecticut Results First Team through promotion of completed and ongoing studies and reports.**

##### *In three months (by December 2015)*

- Complete a detailed project management plan including activities focused on outreach and implementation of Results First in Connecticut.
- Meet with Representative Toni Walker, co-chair of the Results First Policy Oversight Committee, to identify additional members of the General Assembly to lead and participate in the Results First project.
- Engage the Office of the Governor and legislative leaders to renew the commitment letter to the Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative.
- Assess the utility and role of the Results First Policy Oversight Committee and make recommendations.
- Publish a case study describing the successful application of a data collection and utilization system that can be shared among agencies and posted on the website.
- In partnership with the Connecticut Sentencing Commission, co-release a report on the costs of recidivism.

##### *In six months (by March 2016)*

- Complete and publicize among stakeholders, officials, and agencies with policy and budget discretion the 2014 studies.
  - The DOC study of vocational education programs for individuals in custody (PA 14-214, Sec. 81).
  - The DOC study of the department’s Medication Assisted Therapy pilot project (PA 14-214, Sec. 82).
  - The IMRP evaluation of the effectiveness of the multidimensional family therapy (MDFT) program operated by DCF and CSSD (PA 14-214, Sec. 83).
  - The IMRP assessment of the effectiveness of juvenile parole services programs that DCF administers (PA 14-214, Sec. 84).

- Draft a cost of recidivism study.
- Introduce OPM and OFA budget analysts to the principles and application of the Results First model.
- Introduce, train, and engage the Finance, Revenue and Bonding and Appropriations committee members, particularly Appropriations Committee subcommittee chairs, in the use of program inventories and cost-benefit analysis for program evaluation, cost-benefit analysis, and budget decisions.

**Goal 2: Complete implementation of the program inventory requirement and Results First model for adult criminal and juvenile justice agencies.**

*In three months (by December 2015)*

- Complete the work group's program inventories with estimates of programs' marginal cost.

*In six months (by March 2016)*

- Draft documentation for agency use in completing marginal cost estimates using regression analysis. Two CSSD programs can be used as case studies.
- Receive agencies' inventories of adult criminal and juvenile justice programs categorized as evidence-based, research-based, promising, or lacking evidence by January 1, 2016. Each program inventory must be submitted to OPM, the legislative fiscal committees, OFA, and IMRP.
- Based on the inventories and using the Results First model, submit a report on program cost-benefit analyses to OPM, the legislative fiscal committees, and OFA by March 1, 2016.

*In one year (by September 2016)*

- Report cost-benefit analyses for adult criminal and juvenile justice programs to OPM, the legislature's fiscal committees, and OFA, pursuant to PA 15-5, June Special Session.

**Goal 3: Oversee integration of the Results First model of evidence-based policy in the decision-making and budget process.**

*In three months (by December 2015)*

- Meet with agency and OPM staff to explain benefits from Results First work, including the best use of program inventories and the Results First clearinghouse database.



- Identify and meet those stakeholders with involvement or an interest in the state's budget process, such as the MetroHartford Alliance, the Connecticut Association of Nonprofits, and private providers, to promote Results First.
- Initiate or re-engage ongoing relationships with other entities, such as the Connecticut Sentencing Commission, DOC, the Juvenile Justice Policy Oversight Committee, to add cost-benefit analyses and apply the Results First model to their evaluation and analysis of public policy.
- Plan with other Results First states in the Northeast to gather at a regional convening highlighting how policymakers can use Results First to inform policymaking.

*In six months (by March 2016)*

- Schedule meetings for training of relevant agency and OPM staff on the use of program inventory data and cost-benefit analyses to (1) support or oppose current program investment, (2) evaluate pilot or sunset programs, and (3) substantiate requests for new funding. Sessions must include an overview of the Results First Initiative and its history in Connecticut, the application of the model, and training on data collection and use.
- Research and select an additional public policy area for building out the Results First model in Connecticut. Investigate the technical and political implications of mental health or child welfare policy areas as potential candidates.

*Beyond one year (by September 2016)*

- Document, monitor, and update the project management plan.
- Monitor recipients of the adult criminal and juvenile justice agencies' program inventories for their use and application in the budget process.
- Submit the report on program cost-benefit analyses to OPM, the legislative fiscal committees, and OFA by November 1 annually.

**Legislative Recommendations for 2016**

Rather than recommend new legislative proposals for the 2016 session of the General Assembly to consider, the Results First Connecticut team will focus through the remainder of this and the next biennial budget cycles on implementing the program inventory requirements enacted in 2015. The Results First team will monitor current compliance activities to determine whether any statutory modifications are necessary for future recommendations.

## 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;
- (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

### 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 Tem
Representative Dan Carter	House Minority Leader
Senator Robert Kane	Senate Minority Leader
Chip Flanagan	House Majority Leader
Ellen Durnin	Senate Majority Leader
Elizabeth Graham	Chief Court Administrator
John Clark	State Comptroller
Vacant	Director, Office of Fiscal Analysis
Carrie Vibert	Director, Office of Program Review and Investigations
Stephanie D'Ambrose	Director, Office of Legislative Research
Andrew Clark	Director, Institute for Municipal and Regional Policy
Elaine Zimmerman	Executive Director, Commission on Children
Judy Greiman	Connecticut Conference of Independent Colleges

September 30, 2015

## Appendix C

### Connecticut Results First Major Activity October 1, 2014 to September 30, 2015

<i>Date</i>	<i>Event</i>
Ongoing	Status meetings on four 2014 mandated studies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DOC vocational education</li> <li>• DOC Medication Assisted Therapy pilot project</li> <li>• Multidimensional family therapy program for juveniles committed to DCF and CSSD</li> <li>• Juvenile parole services programs administered by DCF</li> </ul> Collaboration with the Juvenile Justice Policy Oversight Committee
October 16, 2014	Presentation at Juvenile Justice Policy Oversight Committee: "Connecticut Results First Project"
April 2015	Connecticut Results First Website available
April 20-21, 2015	Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative Site Visit
June 17, 2015 July 30, 2015 August 27, 2015	Program Inventory Work Group meetings
June 17-18/2015	Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative Site Visit
June 18, 2015	Presentation at Juvenile Justice Policy Oversight Committee: "Trends-Strategic Goals of Incarceration, Recidivism, and Diversion; Cost/Benefit Analysis"
June 30, 2015	An Act Implementing Provisions of the State Budget for the Biennium Ending June 30, 2017, Concerning General Government, Education, Health and Human Services and Bonds of the State (PA 15-5, JSS) signed by the Governor
August 19-20, 2015	The Results First Initiative: Sustaining Momentum and Securing Success State Convening, Washington, D.C.
September 17, 2015	Connecticut Sentencing Commission adopted Resolution No. 2015-1 to utilize the Results First approach when evaluating sentencing policies, practices, and programs.

## Appendix D

### Relevant Sections of Public Act 15-5, June Special Session

#### *Senate Bill No. 1502*

#### *June Special Session, Public Act No. 15-5*

### **AN ACT IMPLEMENTING PROVISIONS OF THE STATE BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM ENDING JUNE 30, 2017, CONCERNING GENERAL GOVERNMENT, EDUCATION, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES AND BONDS OF THE STATE.**

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

...

Sec. 486. (NEW) (Effective July 1, 2015) For purposes of this section and sections 487 and 489 of this act:

(1) "Cost-beneficial" means the cost savings and benefits realized over a reasonable period of time are greater than the costs of implementation;

(2) "Program inventory" means the (A) compilation of the complete list of all agency programs and activities; (B) identification of those that are evidence-based, research-based and promising; and (C) inclusion of program costs and utilization data;

(3) "Evidence-based" describes a program that (A) incorporates methods demonstrated to be effective for the intended population through scientifically based research, including statistically controlled evaluations or randomized trials; (B) can be implemented with a set of procedures to allow successful replication in the state; (C) achieves sustained, desirable outcomes; and (D) when possible, has been determined to be cost-beneficial;

(4) "Research-based" describes a program or practice that has some research demonstrating effectiveness, such as one tested with a single randomized or statistically controlled evaluation, but does not meet all of the criteria of an evidence-based program; and

(5) "Promising" describes a program or practice that, based on statistical analyses or preliminary research, shows potential for meeting the evidence-based or research-based criteria.

Sec. 487. (NEW) (Effective July 1, 2015) (a) Not later than January 1, 2016, and not later than October first in every even-numbered year thereafter, the Departments of Correction, Children and Families and Mental Health and Addiction 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: (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 of the general statutes to the Criminal Justice Policy and Planning Division within the Office of Policy and Management, the joint standing committees of the General Assembly having cognizance of matters relating to 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, 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 of the Office of Policy and Management, the joint standing committees of the General Assembly having cognizance of matters relating to 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 of the general statutes.

(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 appropriations and the budget of state agencies, and finance, revenue and bonding on or before November fifteenth annually, pursuant to subsection (b) of section 2-36b of the general statutes.

Sec. 488. Subsection (b) of section 4-68m of the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof (Effective July 1, 2015):

(b) The division shall develop a plan to promote a more effective and cohesive state criminal justice system and, to accomplish such plan, shall:

- (1) Conduct an in-depth analysis of the criminal justice system;
- (2) Determine the long-range needs of the criminal justice system and recommend policy priorities for the system;
- (3) Identify critical problems in the criminal justice system and recommend strategies to solve those problems;
- (4) Assess the cost-effectiveness of the use of state and local funds in the criminal justice system;

(5) Recommend means to improve the deterrent and rehabilitative capabilities of the criminal justice system;

(6) Advise and assist the General Assembly in developing plans, programs and proposed legislation for improving the effectiveness of the criminal justice system;

(7) Make computations of daily costs and compare interagency costs on services provided by agencies that are a part of the criminal justice system;

(8) Review the program inventories and cost-benefit analyses submitted pursuant to section 487 of this act and consider incorporating such inventories and analyses in its budget recommendations to the General Assembly;

[(8)] (9) Make population computations for use in planning for the long-range needs of the criminal justice system;

[(9)] (10) Determine long-range information needs of the criminal justice system and acquire that information;

[(10)] (11) Cooperate with the Office of the Victim Advocate by providing information and assistance to the office relating to the improvement of crime victims' services;

[(11)] (12) Serve as the liaison for the state to the United States Department of Justice on criminal justice issues of interest to the state and federal government relating to data, information systems and research;

[(12)] (13) Measure the success of community-based services and programs in reducing recidivism;

[(13)] (14) Develop and implement a comprehensive reentry strategy as provided in section 18-81w; and

[(14)] (15) Engage in other activities consistent with the responsibilities of the division.

Sec. 489. (NEW) (Effective July 1, 2016) The Departments of Correction, Children and Families and Mental Health and Addiction Services, and the Court Support Services Division of the Judicial Branch may include in the estimates of expenditure requirements transmitted pursuant to section 4-77 of the general statutes, and the Governor may include in the Governor's recommended appropriations in the budget document transmitted to the General Assembly pursuant to section 4-71 of the general statutes, an estimate of the amount required by said agencies for expenditures related to the implementation of evidence-based programs.