

## Sex offender registration and community notification

### Adult Criminal Justice

Benefit-cost estimates updated December 2019. Literature review updated November 2016.

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:** Registration laws require individuals convicted of certain sex offenses to register with local law enforcement. Notification laws authorize officials to notify the public when high-risk individuals are released from confinement into the community. These measures aim to increase community safeguards and assist law enforcement in tracking convicted persons.

In this meta-analysis, we analyzed both the specific and general deterrent effects of the law. Specific deterrence refers to the concept of discouraging further criminal behavior through the experience of punishment. General deterrence refers to the concept of discouraging criminal behavior through the threat of punishment. In this analysis, the benefit-cost results rely solely on the effects of specific deterrence effect size. We are unable to estimate the benefits of the general deterrent effect at this time.

### Benefit-Cost Summary Statistics Per Participant

#### Benefits to:

Taxpayers	(\$399)	Benefit to cost ratio	(\$5.27)
Participants	\$0	Benefits minus costs	(\$2,311)
Others	(\$1,159)	Chance the program will produce	
Indirect	(\$384)	benefits greater than the costs	32 %
<b>Total benefits</b>	<b>(\$1,942)</b>		
<b>Net program cost</b>	<b>(\$369)</b>		
<b>Benefits minus cost</b>	<b>(\$2,311)</b>		

The estimates shown are present value, life cycle benefits and costs. All dollars are expressed in the base year chosen for this analysis (2018). 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](#).

## Meta-Analysis of Program Effects

Outcomes measured	Treatment age	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	35	7	19142	0.016	0.046	37	0.016	0.046	47	0.022	0.836
Sex offense <sup>^</sup>	35	8	24392	-0.043	0.063	35	n/a	n/a	n/a	-0.078	0.590
General deterrence <sup>^</sup>	35	1	825	-0.050	0.013	35	n/a	n/a	n/a	-0.050	0.001

<sup>^</sup>WSIPP's benefit-cost model does not monetize this outcome.

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](#).

## Detailed Monetary Benefit Estimates Per Participant

Affected outcome:	Resulting benefits: <sup>1</sup>	Benefits accrue to:				
		Taxpayers	Participants	Others <sup>2</sup>	Indirect <sup>3</sup>	Total
Crime	Criminal justice system	(\$399)	\$0	(\$1,159)	(\$199)	(\$1,758)
Program cost	Adjustment for deadweight cost of program	\$0	\$0	\$0	(\$184)	(\$184)
<b>Totals</b>		<b>(\$399)</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>(\$1,159)</b>	<b>(\$384)</b>	<b>(\$1,942)</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	\$350	2016	Present value of net program costs (in 2018 dollars)	(\$369)
Comparison costs	\$0	2016	Cost range (+ or -)	10 %

The per-participant cost estimates for this program were calculated using data provided by the Washington State Patrol and the Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs.


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](#).

## Benefits Minus Costs Over Time (Cumulative Discounted Dollars)




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 discounted dollars. 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.

## Benefits by Perspective Over Time (Cumulative Discounted Dollars)



The graph above illustrates the breakdown of the estimated cumulative benefits (not including program costs) per-participant for the first fifty years beyond the initial investment in the program. These cash flows provide a breakdown of the classification of dollars over time into four perspectives: taxpayer, participant, others, and indirect. "Taxpayers" includes expected savings to government and expected increases in tax revenue. "Participants" includes expected increases in earnings and expenditures for items such as health care and college tuition. "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. "Indirect benefits" includes estimates of the changes in the value of a statistical life and changes in the deadweight costs of taxation. If a section of the bar is below the \$0 line, the program is creating a negative benefit, meaning a loss of value from that perspective.

## Taxpayer Benefits by Source of Value Over Time (Cumulative Discounted Dollars)



The graph above focuses on the subset of estimated cumulative benefits that accrue to taxpayers. The cash flows are divided into the source of the value.

## Citations Used in the Meta-Analysis

- Agan, A. (np). *Sex offender registries: Fear without function?*
- Barnoski, R. (2005). *Sex offender sentencing in Washington State. Has community notification reduced recidivism?* Document No. 05-12-1202. Olympia: Washington State Institute for Public Policy.
- Duwe, G., & Donnay, W. (2008). The impact of Megan's Law on sex offender recidivism: the Minnesota experience. *Criminology*, 46(2), 411-446
- Freeman, N.J. (2009). The public safety impact of community notification laws: Rearrest of convicted sex offenders. *Crime & Delinquency*.
- Maddan, S., Miller, J. M., Walker, J. T., & Marshall, I. H. (2011). Utilizing criminal history information to explore the effect of community notification on sex offender recidivism. *Justice Quarterly*, 28(2), 303-324.
- Schram, D.D., Milloy, C.D. 1995. *Community Notification: A Study of Offender Characteristics and Recidivism*. Olympia: Washington State Institute for Public Policy.
- Shao, L. & Li, J. (not published). *The effect of sex offender registration laws on rape victimization*.
- Tewksbury, R., & Jennings, W.G. (2010). Assessing the impact of sex offender registration and community notification on sex-offending trajectories. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 37(5), 570-582.
- Tewksbury, R., Jennings, W.G., & Zgoba, K.M. (2011). A longitudinal examination of sex offender recidivism prior to and following the implementation of SORN. *Behavioral Sciences & The Law*.
- Zgoba, I., Veysey, B.M., & Dalessandro, M. (2010). An analysis of the effectiveness of community notification and registration: Do the best intentions predict the best practices? *Justice Quarterly*, 27(5), 667-691.

