

Case management ("swift, certain, and fair") for drug-involved persons 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: In general, case management is a process that coordinates and monitors services on behalf of a participant. The studies included in this meta-analysis evaluate a variety of case management approaches for individuals involved in the criminal justice system who have histories of drug involvement and are being supervised in the community under a "swift, certain, and fair" approach. The primary goals of case management for this population are 1) to improve collaboration between correctional staff and substance abuse treatment staff and 2) to increase participation in substance abuse treatment.

Case managers or specially-trained supervision officers use a variety of strategies to assess the participant's treatment and programming needs, coordinate access to substance abuse treatment, monitor the participant, and advocate on the participant's behalf. In some circumstances, the case manager or officer can provide these services, such as counseling or therapy, directly to the client. Program length ranges from three to six months.

"Swift, certain and fair" is an approach to community supervision wherein participants receive immediate sanctions when they violate the conditions of supervision. Sanction severity is proportional to the severity of the violation, with minor violations resulting in only a few days of incarceration. In response to repeat violations, sanctions gradually increase in severity. Participants are required to check in with their supervising officer regularly and are tested frequently and randomly for substance use. Case management studies that did not incorporate "swift, certain, and fair" approach were analyzed separately.

Benefit-Cost Summary Statistics Per Participant

Benefits to:

Taxpayers	\$4,600	Benefit to cost ratio	n/a
Participants	\$6	Benefits minus costs	\$16,202
Others	\$8,695	Chance the program will produce	
Indirect	\$2,500	benefits greater than the costs	99 %
Total benefits	\$15,801		
Net program cost	\$401		
Benefits minus cost	\$16,202		

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	SE	Age	ES	SE	Age	ES	p-value
Crime	31	9	4570	-0.183	0.072	33	-0.183	0.072	43	-0.174	0.023
Illicit drug use [^]	31	4	962	-0.287	0.115	31	n/a	n/a	n/a	-0.287	0.013
Illicit drug use disorder	31	3	777	-0.050	0.249	31	0.000	0.187	34	-0.050	0.842
Technical violations ^{^^}	31	2	514	-0.260	0.105	33	n/a	n/a	n/a	-0.260	0.013

[^]WSIPP's benefit-cost model does not monetize this outcome.

^{^^}WSIPP does not include this outcome when conducting benefit-cost analysis for this program.

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: ¹	Benefits accrue to:				
		Taxpayers	Participants	Others ²	Indirect ³	Total
Crime	Criminal justice system	\$4,590	\$0	\$8,687	\$2,295	\$15,572
Illicit drug use disorder	Labor market earnings associated with illicit drug abuse or dependence	\$2	\$4	\$0	\$0	\$6
Illicit drug use disorder	Health care associated with illicit drug abuse or dependence	\$8	\$1	\$8	\$4	\$21
Illicit drug use disorder	Mortality associated with illicit drugs	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1	\$1
Program cost	Adjustment for deadweight cost of program	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$201	\$201
Totals		\$4,600	\$6	\$8,695	\$2,500	\$15,801

¹In 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.

²"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.

³"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	\$3,972	2016	Present value of net program costs (in 2018 dollars)	\$401
Comparison costs	\$4,353	2016	Cost range (+ or -)	10 %

There are three components of this per participant cost estimate. First, the cost of supervision is based on WSIPP's analysis (see Technical Documentation) of community supervision delivered by the Washington State Department of Corrections. Second, we include the cost of violation behavior. For this estimate, we rely on the cost of violations for the treatment group in Hamilton, Z., van Wormer, J., Kigerl, A., Campbell, C., & Posey, B. (2015). *Evaluation of Washington State Department of Corrections Swift and Certain Policy Process, Outcome and Cost-Benefit Evaluation*. Washington State University. Finally, we include the cost for the Washington State Department of Corrections to provide outpatient substance abuse treatment with the assumption that most persons on supervision are required to engage in treatment. We assume both the treatment and comparison groups receive community supervision, but that treatment participants incur less violation costs. We assume 50% of the treatment group receives substance abuse treatment.


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

- Baird, C., Wagner, D., Decomo, B., & Aleman, T. (1994). *Evaluation of the effectiveness of supervision and community rehabilitation programs in Oregon*. San Francisco: National Council on Crime and Delinquency.
- Grommon, E., Cox, S.M., Davidson, W.S., & Bynum, T.S. (2012). Alternative models of instant drug testing: evidence from an experimental trial. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 9(2), 145-168.
- Grommon, E., Davidson, I.I. W.S., & Bynum, T.S. (2013). A randomized trial of a multimodal community-based prisoner reentry program emphasizing substance abuse treatment. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 52(4), 287-309.
- Harrell, A., Mitchell, O., Hirst, A., Marlow, D., & Merrill, J. (2002). Breaking the cycle of drugs and crime: Findings from the Birmingham BTC demonstration. *Criminology and Public Policy*, 1(2), 189-216.
- Harrell, A., Roman, J., Bhati, A., & Parthasarathy, B. (2003). *The impact evaluation of the Maryland Break the Cycle initiative*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.
- Hawken, A., & Kleiman, M. (2009). *Managing drug involved probationers with swift and certain sanctions: Evaluating Hawaii's HOPE*. Malibu, CA: Pepperdine University, School of Public Policy.
- Hawken, A., Kulick, J., Smith, K., Mei, J., Zhang, Y., Jarman, S., Yu, T., Carson, C., Vial, T. (2016). *HOPE II: A Follow-up to Hawaii's HOPE Evaluation*.
- Mitchell, O., & Harrell, A. (2006). Evaluation of the breaking the cycle demonstration project: Jacksonville, FL and Tacoma, WA. *Journal of Drug Issues*, 36(1), 97-118.
- O'Connell, D.J., Brent, J.J., & Visher, C.A. (2016). Decide your time: A randomized trial of a drug testing and graduated sanctions program for probationers. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 15(4), 1073-1102.

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

Printed on 05-16-2021



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.