



Cost-Benefit Analysis of Adult Drug Courts

ISSUE

This **Issue Review** provides a summary of national and Iowa research on the effectiveness of Adult Drug Courts, an overview of these programs currently operating in Iowa, including a description of offenders served and funding mechanisms, an analysis of the costs and benefits of the Adult Drug Courts operated by Community-Based Corrections, and the estimated need for funding.

AFFECTED AGENCIES

Department of Corrections (DOC), Community-Based Corrections (CBC), Judicial Branch, Office of the State Public Defender, Department of Public Health, Office of Drug Control Policy, county attorneys, and county jails

CODE AUTHORITY

Iowa Code chapters [904](#) and [905](#)

BACKGROUND

Nationally, Adult Drug Courts started in the late 1980s in response to high recidivism rates of drug offenders. High risk, prison bound offenders were diverted to Adult Drug Courts that provided intensive supervision and concentrated drug treatment using a multidisciplinary team approach. Adult Drug Courts across the country that use the judicial model have teams comprised of a judge, Probation/Parole Officer (PPO), county attorney and public defender staff, treatment staff, and community support. Some Adult Drug Courts use community panel models, where private citizens are actively involved in the program.¹

Over time, most states have implemented a variety of specialty courts based on the drug court model. This includes such programs as veteran courts, juvenile drug courts, mental health courts, reentry courts, and family drug courts.² In Iowa, adult drug courts, mental health courts, juvenile drug courts, and family courts have all been implemented. This **Issue Review** focuses on the Adult Drug Courts administered by the Iowa CBC District Departments.

¹ See the [Drug Court Process Evaluation Report](#) prepared by the [Iowa Consortium for Substance Abuse Research and Evaluation](#) published in February 2008 by the [University of Iowa](#) for an overview and evaluation of the drug courts operating in Iowa.

² Refer to [Trends in Sentencing and Corrections: State Legislation](#) published by the [National Conference of State Legislatures](#) (NCSL) in July 2013 for a discussion of problem-solving courts. Also, see the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs (OJP), [Bureau of Justice Assistance](#) (BJA) brief, [Drug Courts](#), published October 2011 for descriptions of the variety of specialized court dockets, research, and funding opportunities available.

CURRENT SITUATION

According to the DOC, about 26.3% of offenders currently under correctional supervision in Iowa have a drug conviction as their most serious offense.³ According to the Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning Division (CJJPD) of the [Department of Human Rights](#), drug offense admissions to prison have been one of the driving factors behind the continued rise in prison population projections, especially those offenses that carry mandatory minimum prison terms.⁴ Adult Drug Courts were developed and implemented in Iowa to address the needs of high risk drug offenders to divert them from prison. The first Adult Drug Court in Iowa started accepting clients in August 1996 in Des Moines.⁵

As of FY 2014, there are nine Adult Drug Courts operating in seven CBC District Departments. Most of the Adult Drug Courts follow the judicial model that has the active participation of a judge on the multidisciplinary team. The Third CBC District Department uses community panels; and this Drug Court also serves juveniles.⁶

Most of the Adult Drug Courts serve the community or county where they are located, with a few exceptions. The District Departments manage their Adult Drug Courts to meet the needs of their local communities. This results in variation across the state but it also permits the District Department to address the local system's culture/philosophy, target population, and program capacity. See **Attachment One** for the DOC's overview of the Adult Drug Courts currently operating in Iowa.⁷ The First CBC District Department discontinued its Adult Drug Court as well as its Mental Health Court in Waterloo at the end of FY 2013 due to funding constraints. The Second CBC District Department ended its Adult Drug Courts in December 2009 due to funding constraints.

Funding History

Adult Drug Court funding first started in Iowa in 1995 when the Fifth CBC District Department received a federal planning grant from the U.S. Department of Justice. The District Department then received a grant award from the Office of Drug Control Policy (ODCP) for four years, subject to annual renewal contingent upon successful compliance with grant criteria. Most, but not all, of the District Departments received grant funding from the ODCP to start up or supplement Adult Drug Court budgets. Refer to **Attachment Two** for a listing of the ODCP grant awards to the CBC District Departments from FY 2002 to the present.⁸

³ See the DOC Quick Facts website at <http://www.doc.state.ia.us/default.asp> for information about employees, offenders, and budgets.

⁴ Refer to the [Iowa Prison Population Forecast FY 2013 – FY 2023](#) published by the CJJPD on November 26, 2013.

⁵ Refer to the [Final Report of the Polk County Adult Drug Court](#) published by the CJJPD in January 2001 for specific information about this particular Drug Court. Also, see the **Issue Review, Adult Drug Courts** published by the LSA in October 2007 for an historical perspective of these programs in Iowa.

⁶ See the report, [Statewide Process and Comparative Outcomes Study of 2003 Iowa Adult and Juvenile Drug Courts](#) published by the CJJPD in August 2009. Both the judicial and community panel models for Drug Courts have proven to be effective in reducing recidivism in Iowa.

⁷ Any information regarding Mental Health Courts in **Attachment One** is incidental to this **Issue Review**. Adult Drug Courts and Mental Health Courts are two distinctly different programs, serving different offender populations with different cost structures, recidivism rates, and cost benefit analyses.

⁸ The ODCP received a three-year grant in 2012 for mental health treatment. The last portion of **Attachment Two** shows grant awards the ODCP made to six CBC District Departments for offenders participating in Adult Drug Courts that have mental health treatment needs. Three CBC District Departments are participating with two different Adult Drug Courts so there are a total of nine participating Adult Drug Courts. This grant enhances Adult Drug Courts by providing mental health services for those that need it through FY 2015. The grant also provides funding for an evaluation by the CJJP.

Adult Drug Courts have been funded through a variety of methods, including State General Fund appropriations, State Healthy Iowans Tobacco Trust (HITT) appropriations, ODCP grant awards, direct federal grants (received by a District Department directly from a federal agency), local income, and private donations. Refer to **Attachment Three** for the current District Department Adult Drug Court budgets by funding source.

Actual FY 2013 statewide expenditures for Adult Drug Courts were \$2.1 million and served 669 offenders, for an annual average cost of \$3,139 per offender.⁹ This statistic includes the number of offenders in Adult Drug Courts at the start of FY 2013 plus the number of offenders admitted to the program during FY 2013. Adult Drug Court budgets currently range from \$130,000 in the Seventh CBC District Department to \$409,996 in the Fifth CBC District Department. The average Adult Drug Court budget is approximately \$235,100 annually. **Table One** shows the number of offenders served and the average caseload by District Department in FY 2013. Average caseload is the offender to PPO staff ratio.¹⁰

Table One: Offenders Served and Average Caseload by District Department in FY 2013

CBC District	Offenders Served	Average Caseload
First	60	20.0
Third	128	32.5
Fourth	62	29.6
Fifth	174	58.0
Sixth	149	30.0
Seventh	27	17.0
Eighth	69	28.0

The budget is driven by the number of offenders served, funding opportunities, and contract costs. Some CBC District Departments reimburse the Office of the State Public Defender for local public defender costs while some do not. Some CBC District Departments fund treatment contracts within the drug court budget; some refer offenders to local treatment programs. All substance abuse treatment programs are licensed by the Department of Public Health.

The estimated FY 2014 Adult Drug Court budgets total \$2.0 million with 500 offenders expected to be served, for an annual average cost of \$4,000 per offender. The reduction in budget and offenders served reflect the elimination of the First CBC District Department's Waterloo Adult Drug Court at the end of FY 2013 due to the loss of a federal grant. Several District Departments indicate there is a significant need for additional funding to either maintain the Adult Drug Courts or expand the programs to meet identified needs in local communities.

⁹ This cost estimate compares favorably to the average annual cost for state prisoners that ranges from a low of \$20,715 at the North Central Correctional Facility at Rockwell City to a high of \$60,648 at the Iowa Medical Classification Center at Oakdale. These figures are provided by the DOC and published in the [LSA's Factbook](#).

¹⁰ All data in the tables in this **Issue Review** are from the Iowa Corrections Offender Network (ICON), the DOC data management system.

Offenders and Risk

All of the Adult Drug Courts address substance abuse treatment needs; they provide referral and/or treatment for any co-occurring disorders, such as mental health needs. Drugs abused include methamphetamines, cocaine, marijuana, and alcohol.¹¹

A review of offender risk, admissions by offense type and class, demographics, and length of stay in Drug Court is provided below. Also included is a discussion of Drug Court closures.

The DOC and CBC District Departments use a variety of risk assessment instruments to assist in determining the level of supervision and treatment needs of offenders. The Level of Services Inventory – Revised (LSI-R) has been shown to be valid in Iowa.¹² This tool provides a comprehensive assessment of risk factors that can be targeted for treatment interventions so as to reduce recidivism. The risk categories for the LSI-R are:

- 0 – 13 = low risk;
- 14 – 23 = low to moderate risk;
- 24 – 33 = moderate risk;
- 34 – 40 = moderate to high risk; and
- 41 or more = high risk.

The CBC District Departments are determining Adult Drug Court placement based on risk as measured by the LSI-R as well as other factors, such as criminal history or noncompliance with the current supervision plan. The Adult Drug Courts are admitting moderate to high risk offenders into their programs, as shown by the median scores in **Table Two** below.

Table Two: FY 2013 Drug Court Admissions by LSI-R Score

CBC District	Location	Median	Minimum	Maximum
First	Dubuque	32.0	22.0	45.0
	Waterloo	33.0	24.0	44.0
Third	Sioux City	29.0	14.0	46.0
Fourth	Council Bluffs	33.0	20.0	46.0
Fifth	Des Moines	35.0	13.0	49.0
Sixth	Cedar Rapids	40.0	14.0	48.0
	Coralville	35.5	19.0	48.0
Seventh	Davenport	36.0	23.0	38.0
Eighth	Burlington	33.0	18.0	46.0
	Ottumwa	32.5	14.0	43.0

Admissions

Table Three shows admissions by location and offense type. Most of the 328 admissions during FY 2013 were for drug offenses, followed by property offenses. Few offenders convicted of violent offenses are admitted to Adult Drug Courts; they are more likely to be sent to prison to incapacitate them. The data in the tables show the most serious offense conviction, that is, an offender may have multiple convictions including drug and property offenses. The offense that

¹¹ Refer to the report, [Statewide Process and Comparative Outcomes Study of 2003 Iowa Adult and Juvenile Drug Courts](#) published by the CJJPD in August 2009. The report documents type of drug by Drug Court location across the state.

¹² See the ICON Data Download, [LSI-R Assessment is Valid for Iowa Offenders](#) published by the DOC in September 2006 for a brief discussion of the validity of the LSI-R risk assessment tool and its risk categories, as well as how to apply it in a correctional setting.

has the longest sentence is the one that is counted in the tables below. The 328 offenders admitted to Adult Drug Courts in FY 2013 include all admissions; some may be screened out of the program as inappropriate referrals once more assessments are conducted.

Data in **Tables Three** and **Four** below show the most recent conviction that the offender is being supervised for in CBC. So, the offender may on supervision, violate the terms of probation, and be admitted to the Adult Drug Court rather than be revoked from community supervision and sent to state prison. Alternatively, the offender may be admitted to Drug Court for offenses that are in the process of being adjudicated. This is reflected in the "Court Diversion" column in **Tables Three and Four** below.

Table Three: FY 2013 Admissions by Offense Type

CBC District	Location	Admissions	Drug	Property	Public Order	Court		
						Diversion	Violent	Other
First	Dubuque	15	7	5	3	0	0	0
	Waterloo	15	6	1	7	1	0	0
Third	Sioux City	51	31	16	2	0	2	0
Fourth	Council Bluffs	25	9	3	1	9	0	3
Fifth	Des Moines	107	15	28	8	49	3	4
Sixth	Cedar Rapids	54	27	18	3	4	1	1
	Coralville	25	11	7	4	2	1	0
Seventh	Davenport	9	4	4	0	1	0	0
Eighth	Burlington	17	13	2	1	0	0	1
	Ottumwa	10	7	1	0	0	0	2
		<u>328</u>	<u>130</u>	<u>85</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>11</u>

Table Four shows admissions by location and offense class. The majority of offenders are convicted felons. Certain CBC District Departments admit offenders to the Adult Drug Court both preconviction and postconviction. These offenders may be convicted of a lower level offense, such as a serious misdemeanor, but have more serious charges pending. They are admitted to the Adult Drug Court in lieu of prosecution for the more serious offense. If they successfully complete the program, the charges are dropped, or the offender receives a deferred judgment, or is sentenced on a lesser charge. If they fail the Adult Drug Court, charges are reinstated.

Table Four: FY 2013 Admissions by Offense Class

CBC District	Location	Admissions	Serious	Aggravated	Class D	Class C	Class B	Felony	Court
			Misd.	Misd.	Felony	Felony	Felony	Enhanced	Diversion
First	Dubuque	15	0	1	10	4	0	0	0
	Waterloo	15	0	0	10	3	0	1	1
Third	Sioux City	51	1	4	36	9	1	0	0
Fourth	Council Bluffs	25	0	0	5	7	4	0	9
Fifth	Des Moines	107	2	14	27	8	1	5	50
Sixth	Cedar Rapids	54	0	1	30	19	0	0	4
	Coralville	25	0	2	16	5	0	0	2
Seventh	Davenport	9	0	0	4	4	0	0	1
Eighth	Burlington	17	0	0	6	10	0	1	0
	Ottumwa	10	0	0	2	6	0	2	0
		<u>328</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>146</u>	<u>75</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>67</u>

Table Five shows FY 2013 admissions to the Adult Drug Courts by location, gender, and race/ethnicity. The majority of offenders (72.3%) admitted to Adult Drug Courts were men and 82.5% were white. According to the [Minority Impact Memo](#) published by the LSA on February 11, 2013, the Iowa offender population is predominantly male and white. However, 17.4% of the offender population is black while 10.4% of Adult Drug Court admissions in FY 2013 were black offenders. Approximately 3.4% of Adult Drug Court admissions were Hispanic while Hispanics comprise 5.2% of the Iowa offender population. There may be a need to increase opportunities for offenders of different races and ethnicities to participate in the program.¹³

Table Five: FY 2013 Admissions by Gender and Race/Ethnicity

CBC District	Location	Admissions	Gender		Race or Ethnicity				
			Male	Female	White	Black	Hispanic	American Indian/Alaska	Asian or Pacific Islander
First	Dubuque	15	8	7	15	0	0	0	0
	Waterloo	15	10	5	11	4	0	0	0
Third	Sioux City	51	38	13	41	2	3	5	0
Fourth	Council Bluffs	25	20	5	22	1	1	1	0
Fifth	Des Moines	107	74	33	96	7	2	0	2
Sixth	Cedar Rapids	54	38	16	44	6	3	1	0
	Coralville	25	21	4	13	11	1	0	0
Seventh	Davenport	9	7	2	6	3	0	0	0
Eighth	Burlington	17	15	2	17	0	0	0	0
	Ottumwa	10	6	4	9	0	1	0	0
		<u>328</u>	<u>237</u>	<u>91</u>	<u>274</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>2</u>

Closures

Offenders may leave or close out of Drug Court by completing the program successfully, failing the program, receiving an intermediate sanction, or receiving an administrative closure. These closure types are shown in **Table Six** below. Examples of Administrative closure include: the program closed, the referral to Adult Drug Court was inappropriate, death, or transfers to other interventions. Intermediate sanctions are imposed due to noncompliance with the Adult Drug Court's conditions. Generally, an offender has 60 days to come into compliance before being closed out of the program. Examples of intermediate sanctions include home confinement, a county jail stay, residential placement, and/or electronic monitoring. An offender may also successfully complete the Adult Drug Court, or fail. Generally, offenders that fail are sent to state prison.

Table Six below shows the average length of stay in months in Adult Drug Courts before being closed out of the program for FY 2013. Generally, successful offenders remain in the program anywhere from 18 to 36 months. The long length of stay under supervision includes time served in intermediate sanctions (such as home confinement) while not actively participating in the Adult Drug Court. Offenders are accepted back into the program if they become compliant within 60 days of the intermediate sanction being imposed. Administrative closures occur relatively quickly compared to the other types of closures.

¹³ See the [Statewide Process and Comparative Outcomes Study of 2003 Iowa Adult and Juvenile Drug Courts](#) published by the CJJPD in August 2009. That study indicates white participants are more likely to be successful in Adult Drug Courts than nonwhites.

Table Six: Average Length of Stay in Months for FY 2013 Closures

CBC District	Location	Admin.	Intermediate	Successful	Unsuccessful
		Closure	Sanction		
First	Dubuque	0.0	0.0	19.2	4.8
	Waterloo	8.2	0.0	20.7	8.6
Third	Sioux City	9.7	17.0	19.2	11.9
Fourth	Council Bluffs	23.8	0.0	21.5	12.3
Fifth	Des Moines	0.8	0.0	37.9	8.2
Sixth	Cedar Rapids	1.3	3.2	24.3	7.4
	Coralville	0.2	0.0	23.0	10.2
Seventh	Davenport	0.0	0.0	31.7	15.4
Eighth	Burlington	25.0	0.0	24.4	6.9
	Ottumwa	0.0	0.0	25.3	19.7

Table Seven shows the number of closures (and percentages) by type of lead offense. Drug and property offenders are the most successful in the program. This success is not a recidivism rate that captures the percentage of offenders that commit a new offense after successfully completing the program. An offender may be unsuccessful in Adult Drug Court without committing a new offense. In such instances, the offender will be placed in a different intermediate sanction, such as intensive supervision.

Table Seven: Closures by Offense Type

Offense Type	Offense		Inter.		Total
	Success	Unsuccessful	Admin.	Sanction	
Drug	56 - 37.8%	53 - 35.8%	39 - 26.4%	0	148 - 100.0%
Other	3 - 15.8%	8 - 42.1%	7 - 36.8%	1 - 5.3%	19 - 100.0%
Property	17 - 17.3%	49 - 50.1%	31 - 31.6%	1 - 1.0%	98 - 100.0%
Public Order	6 - 24.0%	11 - 44.0%	8 - 32.0%	0	25 - 100.0%
Violent	3 - 42.8%	2 - 28.6%	2 - 28.6%	0	7 - 100.0%
Court Diversion	11 - 21.6%	8 - 15.7%	32 - 62.7%	0	51 - 100.0%
	<u>96 - 27.6%</u>	<u>131 - 37.6%</u>	<u>119 - 34.2%</u>	<u>2 - 0.6%</u>	<u>348 - 100.0%</u>

Table Eight shows the number of closures (and percentages) by offense class. Generally, offenders convicted of Class “C” or “D” felonies are more successful in the program. It appears offenders convicted of Class “C” or “D” drug or property offenses are the most successful in the Adult Drug Courts. This conclusion is in keeping with research published by the CJJPD.¹⁴

¹⁴ See the report, [Statewide Process and Comparative Outcomes Study of 2003 Iowa Adult and Juvenile Drug Courts](#) published by the CJJPD in August 2009. The report discusses drug court types, processes, treatment, costs, outcomes, plus offender employment, education, and demographics.

Table Eight: Closures by Offense Class

Offense Class			Inter.		Total
	Successful	Unsuccessful	Admin.	Sanction	
B Felony	1 - 11.1%	3 - 33.3%	5 - 55.6%	0	9 - 100.0%
C Felony	38 - 40.4%	35 - 37.2%	20 - 21.3%	1 - 1.1%	94 - 100.0%
D Felony	39 - 24.8%	72 - 45.9%	46 - 29.3%	0	157 - 100.0%
Felony Enhanced	3 - 20.0%	5 - 33.3%	4 - 40.0%	1 - 6.7%	15 - 100.0%
Aggravated Misd.	3 - 15.8%	7 - 36.8%	9 - 47.4%	0	19 - 100.0%
Serious Misd.	1 - 50.0%	0	1 - 50.0%	0	2 - 100.0%
Court Diversion	11 - 21.2%	9 - 17.3%	32 - 61.5%	0	52 - 100.0%
Total	96 - 27.6%	131 - 37.6%	119 - 34.2%	2 - 0.6%	348 - 100.0%

Recidivism

Recidivism is defined as being convicted of a new offense after successfully completing the Adult Drug Court. A literature review of Drug Court research shows that Adult Drug Courts significantly reduce recidivism for high risk probationers. According to the National Association of Drug Court Professionals ([NADCP](#)), Drug Courts “significantly reduce drug use and crime and do so with substantial cost savings.”¹⁵ The Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) of the U.S. Department of Justice conducted a multistate evaluation of Adult Drug Courts and found that criminal activity, drug usage, and arrest rates were all reduced for offenders in these programs compared to similar offenders not in an Adult Drug Court.¹⁶

The [Iowa DOC](#) has published a report that shows probationers that successfully complete Adult Drug Court are less likely to commit crimes than probationers that have not been in the program.¹⁷ The report shows recidivism rates ranging from a low of 24.2% in the Fifth CBC District Department to a high of 82.4% in the Seventh CBC District Department for offenders that participate in Adult Drug Court. Similar offenders not in Adult Drug Court had a recidivism rate of 76.0% over the same 4.75 year period. Some of these recidivism rates may be considered high. However, these are high risk offenders that have been diverted from state prison. One of the factors for considering an offender to be high risk is the risk to recidivate.¹⁸

The CJJPD published reports on Drug Courts in 2001, 2006, and 2009. The most recent CJJPD report, [Iowa Adult and Juvenile Drug Court Extended Recidivism Outcomes](#) was published July 2011. This report builds on CJJPD’s previous research by completing a longitudinal study of drug court participants and comparison groups over a six-year period. According to that report, “the reconviction rate for drug court participants was lower than all the other groups through the sixth year”.¹⁹

¹⁵ Refer to the report, [Research Update on Adult Drug Courts](#) published by the NADCP in December 2010. The report discusses drug court treatment and cost effectiveness, the target population, and the need to adhere to, or maintain fidelity to, the ten key components of drug courts.

¹⁶ Refer to [Drug Courts](#), published by the BJA in October 2011. By entering “Drug Courts” into the search function of the BJA website: www.bja.gov/ additional information about research, funding opportunities, and cost-benefit analyses of Adult Drug Courts is available.

¹⁷ See the report, [Iowa Corrections: What Works](#) published by the DOC on February 24, 2011, for a summary of CBC and prison programs and recidivism rates.

¹⁸ See the article, [Validating the LSI-R on a Sample of Jail Inmates](#) published in the Journal of Offender Monitoring Winter/Spring 2004. The article documents research that shows as the LSI-R score increases, the risk to reoffend increases as well.

¹⁹ Refer to the CJJPD publication page at <http://www.humanrights.iowa.gov/cjip/publications/index.html> for additional research reports.

COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS

A cost-benefit analysis calculates the costs of providing a product or service compared to the benefits created by providing that product or service, over a period of time such as 10 years. This calculation may also be called a return on investment (ROI). Calculating cost-benefit analyses for services is typically challenging because such calculations incorporate what are generally considered to be “soft costs” in addition to “hard costs,” such as those used in the analysis of the production of goods. For example, calculating the ROI for machinery for a production company lends itself to economic equations and quantitative analysis more readily than the impact of criminal sentencing on society. Calculating soft costs can be controversial and open to interpretation.

The State of Washington developed a model that permits policy makers and program supervisors to weigh the costs and benefits of a particular policy option over time. This model is maintained and updated by the Washington State Institute for Public Policy ([WSIPP](#)).²⁰ The Pew Center on the States partnered with the WSIPP and the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation in 2010 to develop a model that states could update with their own data. This model is called Results First.²¹

Iowa Results First

Iowa's [Public Safety Advisory Board](#) (PSAB) endorsed the idea of learning more about the model. The DOC Research Director serves on the PSAB and received training and technical assistance on the model from the Pew Center on the States and the WSIPP. The DOC built out the model and used it to analyze its programs. The DOC issued a report in May 2012, [Return on Investment: Evidence-Based Options to Improve Outcomes](#). The report reviews Adult Drug Courts that use the judicial model and indicates these have a positive return on investment; every \$1.00 spent on the program returns a \$9.61 benefit over a ten year time frame. These calculations are in 2011 dollars and are based on high risk offenders being diverted from prison. The calculations include CBC costs versus prison costs. If lower risk offenders are in Adult Drug Courts, the return on investment would be significantly less because these offenders are unlikely to be sent to prison.²²

The Iowa Results First cost-benefit analysis of Adult Drug Court Programs included calculation of all costs associated with the Adult Drug Court, such as the judge's salary, corrections costs, and treatment. Source documentation for costs included the CJJPD, the Iowa DOC, the Iowa Department of Public Health, and substance abuse treatment agencies. The average length of the program was calculated at 1.2 years. Annual cost per participant was calculated at \$7,401.67. For purposes of cost-benefit modeling, a program that diverts offenders from prison (as Adult Drug Courts do) must also include consideration of the cost of the prison penalty; therefore, the prison marginal cost was also included in the cost benefit analysis of drug courts. Recidivism rates for higher risk probationers in Iowa were used as the basis to calculate the risk reduction effect of Adult Drug Courts (fewer crimes per offender over a 10-year period). Benefit

²⁰ See the report, [Return on Investment: Evidence-Based Options to Improve Statewide Outcomes – April 2012 Update](#) published by the WSIPP. The report provides a history of the process, background on WSIPP, a review of the methodology, and a summary of policy topics available in the model. Refer to the link <http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/topic.asp?cat=18&subcat=0&dteSlct=0> for additional bulletins published by the WSIPP on cost-benefit analysis of specific programs.

²¹ The model is documented at <http://www.pewstates.org/projects/pew-macarthur-results-first-initiative-328069>. The website also has the report, [States' Use of Cost-Benefit Analysis Improving Results for Taxpayers](#) published in July 2013. This report discusses the Pew-MacArthur Results First initiative and how it has been implemented across the country.

²² See **Attachment Four** for the DOC's documentation of its report, including per unit costs, resource use, offender populations, victimization, program inputs, and Iowa cost data.

calculations were analyzed for taxpayer benefits, such as averted costs of arrest, court, and correctional supervision, and crime victim benefits such as injury and property loss.

Program Fidelity

The Iowa DOC's ROI calculations are based on programs that adhere to evidence-based principles, also known as program fidelity. Failure to adhere to fidelity will reduce the return on investment.²³ Fidelity is defined as delivering services consistently in a competent manner and adhering to the program design. For example, changing the caseload of a PPO assigned to Adult Drug Court beyond the parameters of the program's design, either by increasing or decreasing the number of offenders supervised, impacts program fidelity and the return on investment will change.²⁴

While the Adult Drug Courts have proven to be cost effective in Iowa, there is an ongoing budget need to adequately fund it in order to maintain fidelity to the program design and maintain the return on investment.

BUDGET IMPACT

The overall funding for FY 2013 for CBC District Departments is depicted in the following table. The State General Fund appropriation was \$83.4 million, or 78.8% of total revenue. The remaining receipts of \$22.4 million consisted of direct federal grants, offender fees, contracts for specific services with local governments (such as county jail diversion programs), and interest earned on cash balances held by the CBC District Departments.

The combined expenditures for the eight CBC District Departments were \$103.8 million. The \$2.0 million difference between revenues and expenditures is local income brought forward to FY 2014 (\$1,782,000) and reversion to the State General Fund (\$174,000). Personnel costs were \$90.7 million in FY 2013; this is 87.4% of the total expenditures. This one expense exceeds the General Fund appropriation by \$7.3 million. The CBC District Departments rely on local income to fund operating costs such as salaries, treatment contracts, utilities, food, supplies, and building repairs. The balance brought forward to FY 2014 will be used for salary adjustment costs, building repairs, and ongoing support costs.

FY 2013 Financial Summary		
(dollars in millions)		
Revenues		
General Fund appropriation	\$	83.4
Other Receipts		22.4
	\$	105.8
Expenditures		
CBC Districts - combined	\$	103.8
Net revenue	\$	2.0
Reversion to General Fund	\$	0.2
Carryover to FY 2014	\$	1.8

²³ See the BJA report, [Defining Drug Courts: The Key Components](#) published in January 1997 and reprinted in October 2004 for a discussion of the ten key components for successful drug courts. Refer to the report, [Research Update on Adult Drug Courts](#) published by the NADCP in December 2010 for a discussion of program and cost effectiveness, target population (high risk offenders), fidelity to the 10 key components, and recommendations to Adult Drug Court professionals.

²⁴ See the WSIPP report: [Intensive Family Preservation Programs: Program Fidelity Influences Effectiveness-Revised](#) for an in-depth discussion of program fidelity.

Given the current budget structure, it is unlikely the CBC District Departments will be able to absorb the potential loss of any receipts, such as direct federal grants or grants received from the ODCP. It has also been a challenge to absorb annual salary adjustment costs and maintain treatment contracts with no increase in the state appropriation. **Table Nine** below shows an estimated funding need of approximately \$1.5 million statewide for Iowa’s Adult Drug Courts. This estimate would maintain program fidelity for Adult Drug Courts, or reestablish the program in certain CBC District Departments. The estimate is based on information provided by the DOC and CBC District Departments and LSA calculations.

Table Nine: Estimate of the Funding Need for Adult Drug Courts in Iowa

CBC District	Location	Funding Estimate	Rationale
First	Dubuque	\$ 54,400	Replace one-time private sector contribution, and increase the budget to the statewide average.
	Waterloo	235,100	Re-establish the program that was discontinued in FY 2013 based on the statewide average funding level.
Second	Marshalltown	235,100	Re-establish the program that was discontinued in FY 2010 based on the statewide average funding level.
	Mason City	235,100	Re-establish the program that was discontinued in FY 2010 based on the statewide average funding level.
	Fort Dodge	235,100	Establish the program that was stopped in FY 2010 based on the statewide average funding level.
Third	Sioux City	0	No funding need was indicated.
Fourth	Council Bluffs	0	No funding need was indicated.
Fifth	Waukee	235,100	Dallas County is the seventh fastest growing county nationally. Funding a second Adult Drug Court would reduce the demand for the Polk County Adult Drug Court.*
	Des Moines	50,000	Fund treatment and support costs based on historical spending.
Sixth	Cedar Rapids	127,400	Fund the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) grant that expired in FY 2013 that served the Linn and Johnson County Adult Drug Courts. The grant provided employment opportunities with Goodwill Industries. Employment is not identified as one of the ten key components of a successful Adult Drug Court, however.
	Coralville	0	No funding need was indicated.
Seventh	Davenport	111,700	Fund an additional staff position (PPO III) and substance abuse treatment contract. This amount would also increase the budget to the statewide average.
	Burlington	0	No funding need was indicated.
Eighth	Ottumwa	0	No funding need was indicated.
	Total	\$ 1,519,000	

*Based on the Annual Estimates of the Resident Population: April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2012.
 Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Population Division. Release Dates: For the United States, regions, divisions, states, and Puerto Rico Commonwealth, December 2012. For counties and Puerto Rico municipios, March 2013.

The estimates above do not include the cost to reestablish the Adult Mental Health Court in Waterloo (\$169,000) that was eliminated at the end of FY 2013 or \$131,000 for staff and treatment costs for the Adult Mental Health Court in Ottumwa. Replacement costs for the ODCP mental health enhancement grants that expire at the end of FY 2015 (\$738,100) are not included in the estimate. See **Attachment Two** for the distribution of that funding.

The General Assembly may also consider discussing why the Office of the State Public Defender is reimbursed for public defender services by some CBC District Departments and not others. Refer to **Attachment Three** for budget details of the existing Adult Drug Courts.



Department of Corrections Drug Court Overview

First Judicial District

Black Hawk County (Started December 2005) and Dubuque/Delaware County Drug Courts (Started November 2008):

The Black Hawk County and Dubuque/Delaware County Drug Courts have used the judge model, with a dedicated District Court Judge. The teams also included a County Attorney, Defense Attorney, Probation/Parole Officer III, Law Enforcement Representative, Substance Abuse Treatment Provider, and a Mental Health Provider. The programs served non-violent high risk probationers whose drug addictions were a major contributing factor to their criminal behavior. The Black Hawk County Drug Court closed at the end of FY 2013 due to funding constraints.

Black Hawk County Mental Health Court: (Started 2009)

The Black Hawk County Mental Health Court used a judge model with a dedicated District Court Judge. The team also included a County Attorney, Defense Attorney, Probation/Parole Officer III, Law Enforcement Representative, and a Mental Health Provider. It served non-violent high risk probationers whose mental illness was a major contributing factor to their criminal behavior or inability to comply with supervision. This Mental Health Court closed at the end of FY 2013 due to funding constraints.

Second Judicial District

Second District CBC applied for and received federal grant money, passed through the Governor's Office of Drug Control Policy (ODCP), in FY 2002 to start up Community-Panel Drug Courts in Marshalltown (Marshall County) and Mason City (Cerro Gordo County). The grant money was continued annually through ODCP through FY2005 based on successfully meeting grant criteria for annual operating costs of the Mason City and Marshalltown Drug Courts. When the grant funding expired at the end of FY 2005, the District budgeted the annual operation costs of these two Community-Panel Drug Courts to be covered by receipt of Healthy Iowa Tobacco Trust (HITT) Funds received from the State of Iowa. This source of HITT funding allowed the Department to continue its Drug Courts from FY 2006 until FY 2009.

When the HITT Funds expired at the end of FY 2009, the District moved the Drug Courts to be funded by State of Iowa General Fund appropriations starting in FY2010. When the Department's FY 2010 Budget was ordered to implement a 10.0% Across-the-Board cut in October/November 2009, the Department made the decision to terminate its Drug Courts in Marshalltown and Mason City as of December 31, 2009, and included any treatment contracts associated with those Drug Courts. Second District Drug Court Officers were reassigned to traditional Intensive Supervision Program caseloads within the Department and have continued to operate in that manner in subsequent fiscal years.

The Department had also received a federal grant through ODCP to start up a Community-Panel Drug Court in Fort Dodge (Webster County) at the start of FY 2010. Again, when the 10.0% budget cut was ordered in October/November 2009, the District requested and received approval from ODCP to terminate the Drug Court start-up and redirect the grant funds to be used for an Intensive Supervision –

Team Approach program. This grant money then was renewed annually until FY 2013 for the District's Intensive Supervision – Team Approach program. The grant expired at the end of FY 2013; however this program is now part of our general Intensive Supervision Program funded by State of Iowa General Fund appropriations.

Third Judicial District

The District's Drug Court Program is the first multi-jurisdictional drug court in the State of Iowa and also is the first Drug Court in the nation to use community volunteers to serve as its "judges." Panels have held over 6,800 hearings since the drug court's inception in 1999 in Woodbury County, and Plymouth County in 2007. It is designed to provide services to both adults and juveniles after appropriate referrals. All individuals must be actively enrolled in and attending substance abuse treatment. Furthermore, offenders receive intensive supervision from their Drug Court Officer while the Community Courts closely monitor each individual's progress or lack thereof in the program.

Fourth Judicial District

After extensive planning and development during the period 1997-1999, the Fourth Judicial District, in partnership with the Pottawattamie County Court, implemented and began preparing to admit clients for a Drug Court for substance abusers. It is now a treatment-based program designed to achieve several basic goals including appropriate assessment of treatment needs, reduction of jail, prison, and residential treatment populations, reduced recidivism, and development of a court-based management team to facilitate the processing of clients through the various phases of treatment.

The Drug Court Team is composed of the judge, county attorney (prosecutor), defense attorney/public defender, Drug Court Coordinator (DCC), Probation/Parole Officer II, treatment service provider, police officer, evaluation representatives, and other representatives as deemed appropriate by the team. It is this team which provides the systematic support processing of clients through the program. There is one half-time clerical support staff who supplies much needed assistance throughout the proceedings of the court.

The Pottawattamie Drug Court (the court) has been operating since January 3, 2000 as a substance abuse diversion program to target non-violent offenders as candidates for treatment based programming through a projected 24 month, 4 phase process based upon daily/weekly monitoring of behaviors. The court has made substantial progress and has served many clients during the last 13 years of operation.

Using a "post-adjudicatory" structure, the Fourth Judicial District Drug Court provides intense case management and treatment monitoring for non-violent high risk drug abusers. By providing an array of services, offender accountability and a reduction in criminal activity has occurred. The court provides service for between 40-50 clients. Graduations are conducted twice a year.

Fifth Judicial District

The Fifth CBC District Department applied for and received a drug court planning grant from the US DOJ in 1995. This planning grant provided travel funds for staff, judges, treatment providers, and assistant county attorneys and local public defenders to observe drug courts operating in Florida and Kansas. The planning grant provided the opportunity to develop local support to divert high risk, drug addicted repeat offenders from State prison and county jails to community supervision. The District applied for and received a four year grant from the ODCP to implement the judicial model for drug courts. The grant award was subject to annual application and renewal, based on successfully meeting the

grant criteria. Once the grant expired, the District requested and received a State appropriation to continue its drug court in Des Moines. The District's total budget is \$409,996 from the General Fund.

Sixth Judicial District

The Drug Treatment Court was established in 2007 within the Sixth Judicial District from funding appropriated by the state legislature.

This Program is designed to provide intensive community supervision to probation clients who would be sent to prison if the program did not exist. The clients served in this program are those who have abuse and dependency issues related to one or more substances, and who are sentenced to probation on an Aggravated Misdemeanor or Felony charge. Many of the clients served in this program also have mental health issues of varying levels of severity.

Through supervision in the Drug Treatment Court Program, and through use of restorative justice principles, individuals are encouraged to invest in their community. They are encouraged to create ties to pro-social people and activities that will provide them the support needed to avoid relapse and the behaviors that lead to recidivism. Individuals are provided with substance abuse treatment and are also assisted in accessing mental health services, obtaining safe and stable housing, and obtaining employment. By investing in the community and creating these ties to supportive services, individuals involved in the Drug Treatment Court Program are better equipped to be self-sufficient and able to maintain the positive changes they create even after community supervision is completed.

The Drug Treatment Court team members attend regular court hearings where they are expected to update the Drug Treatment Court Team and their peers on their progress towards their case plan goals. The team consists of the judge, prosecuting attorney, defense attorney, drug treatment court coordinator, drug treatment court supervising agent, community substance abuse agency representative, and a mental health professional. The team rewards positive behavior with incentives, such as certificates, small prizes, and positive feedback from the judge. Negative behavior earns a sanction from the team, which could include loss of a privilege, an assignment of some sort, or jail time. In addition to court appearances, the client is expected to see their probation officer, attend all recommended substance abuse treatment, and provide random UAs as requested.

One unique aspect of the Sixth District's Drug Treatment Court is that the program addresses co-occurring disorders. According to the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA), which is a major contributor of research and evaluation within the substance abuse and mental health arenas, integrated treatment for substance abuse and mental health disorders is an evidenced based practice and proven to be more effective than independently or paralleled treatment of these disorders.

Seventh Judicial District

Drug Court began in the Seventh Judicial District in Scott County in July 2002. The program staff employed by this Department included two Probation and Parole Officers and one clerical position. The Drug Court team also involved a coordinator from the County Attorney's office, attorney for offenders in Drug Court, Judge, Assistant County attorney, and staff from CADS (Center for Alcohol and Drug Services). Department staff was involved fulltime and others only on a part-time basis. The first four years of operation were funded by a federal grant from the current ODCP. Budget cuts forced reduction in the program from 2 PPO's to 1 and the clerical position was eliminated. The program has always functioned with the judicial model. The program makes extensive use of CADS for treatment and often

uses the Scott County jail based treatment program for substance abuse treatment for offenders. The Department does have a small contract with CADS for coordination of treatment services but the bulk of the cost for treatment is paid for by others.

The focus of Drug Court in Scott County has been on the older offender who is deemed prison bound. The drug court team believed that was the most significant group of offenders that would impact prison commitments and that they would have the most effectiveness. This is not most successful population to impact but the one the team felt would be the most significant to change. Caseload size and participation generally focused on approximately 30 total active cases for drug court.

Drug Court is a District Court program. Cost of contract for defense attorney is paid for by State Public Defender's office and has been since the program started.

Eighth Judicial District

The Eighth Judicial District Department of Correctional Services received a two-year U.S. Department of Justice grant for \$475,054 in 2009 to create a regional adult drug court based in Fort Madison. The drug court serves offenders in Lee, Des Moines, and Henry Counties. An adult drug court has existed in Ottumwa since 2007. The program serves the following counties in the District's western division: Appanoose, Davis, Jefferson, Keokuk, Mahaska, Monroe, Poweshiek, Van Buren and Wapello. That program was originally supported through state HITT Funds. Both programs are currently funded through the General Fund.

In 2012, both drug court programs added a mental health enhancement component through a federal grant administered through the ODCP. The Mental Health Supervision Program, based on the mental health court model, was established in Ottumwa in 2012 through a Byrne-Justice Assistance Grant (JAG). The initial \$131,000 grant provided for the hiring of a new probation/parole officer to manage the specialized caseload as well as funding for contract mental health services for mentally ill offenders. The remainder of the treatment team includes a judge, prosecuting attorney, and public defender provides in-kind services. Grant funding ended in FY 2013 and the program continues through current budget. The District has also hired a full-time staff psychologist to provide the previously contracted mental health services for clients.

Source: Iowa Department of Corrections

ODCP Grant Awards to CBC District Departments

Attachment Two

<u>Organization Name:</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Awarded Amount</u>	<u>Fiscal Year</u>
First Judicial District DOCS	Black Hawk County Mental Health Jail Diversion Program Evaluation Project	Underway	\$ 13,734.00	2014
Seventh Judicial District DOCS	Mental Health Services for Community-Based Offenders	Underway	\$ 94,000.00	2014
Eighth Judicial District DOCS	Eighth Judicial District Mental Health Supervision Program	Underway	\$ 99,000.00	2013
First Judicial District DOCS	Black Hawk County Mental Health Court	Underway	\$ 108,000.00	2013
Seventh Judicial District DOCS	Mental Health Services for Community-Based Offenders	Underway	\$ 94,000.00	2013
Eighth Judicial District DOCS	Eighth Judicial District Mental Health Supervision Program	Closed	\$ 131,000.00	2012
First Judicial District DOCS	Black Hawk County Drug Court	Closed	\$ 55,000.00	2012
First Judicial District DOCS	Black Hawk County Mental Health Court	Closed	\$ 143,000.00	2012
Seventh Judicial District DOCS	Mental Health Services for Community-Based Offenders	Closed	\$ 95,000.00	2012
CJJD	Drug Court Evaluation	Closed	\$ 34,665.00	2011
First Judicial District DOCS	Black Hawk County Drug Court	Closed	\$ 60,000.00	2011
First Judicial District DOCS	Black Hawk County Mental Health Court	Closed	\$ 164,500.00	2011
Seventh Judicial District DOCS	Mental Health Services for Community-Based Offenders	Closed	\$ 112,462.00	2011
First Judicial District DOCS	Black Hawk County Mental Health Court	Closed	\$ 148,982.00	2010
Second Judicial District DOCS	Intensive Supervision (Community Drug Court)	Closed	\$ 137,932.00	2010
Third Judicial District Juvenile Court Services	Juvenile Drug Court	Closed	\$ 61,958.00	2007
Third Judicial District/Juvenile Court Services	Woodbury County Community Drug-Court-Juveniles	Closed	\$ 64,636.00	2006
Seventh Judicial District DOCS	Scott County Drug Court	Closed	\$ 98,904.00	2006
Second Judicial District DOCS	Community Drug Courts	Closed	\$ 148,777.00	2005
Seventh Judicial District DOCS	Scott County Drug Court	Closed	\$ 119,024.00	2005
Third Judicial District/Juvenile Court Services	Woodbury County Community Drug Court-Juveniles	Closed	\$ 105,332.00	2005
Polk County	Polk County Juvenile Drug Court	Closed	\$ 121,652.00	2004
Third Judicial District/Juvenile Court Services	Woodbury County Community Drug Court-Juveniles	Closed	\$ 89,094.00	2004

ODCP Grant Awards to CBC District Departments

Attachment Two

<u>Organization Name:</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Awarded Amount</u>	<u>Fiscal Year</u>
Fourth Judicial District DOCS	Offender Assessment/Treatment-Therapy For Drug Court Clients	Closed	\$ 30,000.00	2004
Second Judicial District DOCS	Community Drug Courts	Closed	\$ 137,849.00	2004
Seventh Judicial District DOCS	Scott County Drug Court	Closed	\$ 114,828.00	2004
Third Judicial District DOCS	Adult Drug Court	Closed	\$ 64,024.00	2004
<hr/>				
Third Judicial District DOCS	Drug Court Program	Closed	\$ 58,616.00	2003
Seventh Judicial District DOCS	Scott County Drug Court	Closed	\$ 122,166.00	2003
Fourth Judicial District DOCS	Drug Court Treatment	Closed	\$ 30,000.00	2003
Second Judicial District DOCS	Community Drug Courts	Closed	\$ 136,459.00	2003
<hr/>				
Second Judicial District DOCS	Drug Court Enhancement	Closed	\$ 98,236.00	2002
<hr/>				
Sixth Judicial District DOCS	Drug Court Mental Health Enhancement	Underway	\$ 153,188.00	2013 - 2015
Eighth Judicial District DOCS	Drug Court Mental Health Enhancement	Underway	\$ 125,342.00	2013 - 2015
First Judicial District DOCS	Drug Court Mental Health Enhancement	Underway	\$ 104,445.00	2013 - 2015
Fifth Judicial Dist DOCS	Drug Court Mental Health Enhancement	Underway	\$ 194,972.00	2013 - 2015
Seventh Judicial District DOCS	Drug Court Mental Health Enhancement	Underway	\$ 69,630.00	2013 - 2015
Fourth Judicial District DOCS	Drug Court Mental Health Enhancement	Underway	\$ 90,527.00	2013 - 2015
CJJD	Drug Court Mental Health Enhancement	Underway	\$ 69,000.00	2013 - 2015

Source: Iowa Office of Drug Control Policy (ODCP)

Actual FY 2013 and Estimated FY 2014 Drug Courts Expenditures by Funding Source

Attachment Three

CBC District	Location	Actual FY 2013 State Expenses	Actual FY 2013 Grant Expenses	Actual FY 2013 Local Expenses	Actual FY 2013 Total Expenses	Average Number of Offenders Served	Est. FY 2014 State Expenses	Est. FY 2014 Grant Expenses	Est. FY 2014 Local Expenses	Est. FY 2014 Total Expenses	Estimated Number of Offenders Served	Budget Information
First	Dubuque and Delaware Counties Drug Court	\$ 99,067	\$ 62,855	\$ 3,281	\$ 165,203	26	\$ 100,005	\$ 20,997	\$ 67,603	\$ 188,605	25	GRANT EXPIRED FY 2013 PPO III (In FY 2014 GF Budget, \$100,005). District Court Judge (in-kind) County Attorney Dubuque (in-kind) County Attorney Delaware (in-kind) Law Enforcement (in-kind) Defense Attorney \$15,600 (FY'14 currently the Public Defender providing services as in-kind) Substance Abuse Services \$73,000.
	Waterloo Drug Court	\$ 104,417	\$ 6,864	\$ 90,633	\$ 201,914	36	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	0	GRANT EXPIRED FY 2013 & PROGRAM ELIMINATED FY2014 PPOIII (In FY 2014 GF Budget, \$104,417) District Court Judge (in-kind) County Attorney Black Hawk County (in-kind) Law Enforcement (in-kind) Defense Attorney \$28,600 Substance Abuse Services \$72,000.
Third	Sioux City and Le Mars Drug Court	\$ 270,823	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 270,823	128	\$ 282,342	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 282,342	138	GRANT EXPIRED & PROGRAM GENERAL FUNDED \$262,292 for 3 PPOII, \$20,050 for support costs.
Fourth	Council Bluffs Drug Court	\$ 238,759	\$ 15,000	\$ 383	\$ 254,142	41	\$ 231,409	\$ 30,000	\$ 383	\$ 261,792	41	PROGRAM GENERAL FUNDED (Excluding Recent ODCP Grant) The Fourth Judicial District funds two PPO II positions and 50.0% funding for a secretarial position. FY 2013 costs for these positions was \$226,245.28. Support and overhead expenditures were \$1,404.01. Our District spent \$11,492.55 on drug testing supplies. <i>The 4th Judicial District received a Mental Health Enhancement Grant October 22, 2012 from the ODCP.</i> We spent \$15,000 of grant funds with Heartland Family Services for counseling of qualified Drug Court offenders.

Actual FY 2013 and Estimated FY 2014 Drug Courts Expenditures by Funding Source

Attachment Three

CBC District	Location	Actual FY 2013 State Expenses	Actual FY 2013 Grant Expenses	Actual FY 2013 Local Expenses	Actual FY 2013 Total Expenses	Average Number of Offenders Served	Est. FY 2014 State Expenses	Est. FY 2014 Grant Expenses	Est. FY 2014 Local Expenses	Est. FY 2014 Total Expenses	Estimated Number of Offenders Served	Budget Information
Fifth	Des Moines Drug Court	\$ 409,996	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 409,996	116	\$ 398,628	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 398,628	116	PROGRAM GENERAL FUNDED (FY 2013) 2 PPOIII & 1 Exec Sec \$255,954 Office Supplies \$24 Profess & Scientific Services \$151,931 Communication \$1,958 Outside Services \$129 (FY 2014) Same expenditures, less Professional & Scientific Services \$(11,368).
Sixth	Cedar Rapids Drug Court	\$ 184,550	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 184,550	53	\$ 137,902	\$ 0	\$ 73,000	\$ 210,902	53	PROGRAM GENERAL FUNDED 1.5 FTE Community Treatment Coordinator(s) \$137,402; ASAC contract \$55,000; .5 state public defender contract \$18,000.
	Coralville Drug Court	\$ 200,703	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 200,703	27	\$ 144,295	\$ 0	\$ 78,000	\$ 222,295	27	PROGRAM GENERAL FUNDED 1.5 FTE Community Treatment Coordinator(s) \$143,795; MECCA contract \$60,000; .5 state public defender contract \$18,000.
Seventh	Davenport Drug Court	\$ 104,434	\$ 0	\$ 25,572	\$ 130,006	17	\$ 104,491	\$ 0	\$ 25,572	\$ 130,063	17	GRANT EXPIRED & PROGRAM GENERAL FUNDED with Remaining Resources AFTER FY 2010 10.0% Budget Cuts (Excluding PPOIII and Contract Services Reduced during 10% Budget Cuts) General Fund Need: PPOIII \$67,696. Profess Services \$44,000
Eighth	Burlington and Ottumwa Drug Courts	\$ 241,523	\$ 50,561	\$ 6,727	\$ 298,811	83	\$ 308,234	\$ 0	\$ 5,000	\$ 313,234	83	GRANT EXPIRED & PROGRAM GENERAL FUNDED. Staff include 1.8 PPO IIIs, 0.1 Secretary, 0.20 of a PPO Supervisor II.
	Total	<u>\$ 1,854,272</u>	<u>\$ 135,280</u>	<u>\$ 126,596</u>	<u>\$ 2,116,148</u>	<u>527</u>	<u>\$ 1,707,306</u>	<u>\$ 50,997</u>	<u>\$ 249,558</u>	<u>\$ 2,007,861</u>	<u>500</u>	



Iowa Department of Corrections
**Iowa Results First Model
Documentation**

May 2012

Background of Results First. This report provides documentation of the Iowa Results First (IRF) Cost-Benefit Model for adult criminal justice programs. The IRF Model is based on the Results First initiative of the Pew Center on the States and the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation.¹ The Results First model was developed by the Washington State Institute for Public Policy and enables states to identify opportunities to invest their limited funds in more effective ways that can generate both better outcomes for citizens and substantial long-term savings.² Iowa is one of thirteen states that are customizing this model and using its results to inform policy and budget decisions.

General Notes:

- Only the Adult Crime module is functional at this time.
- The Iowa Results First Model incorporates felonies and indictable misdemeanors. Simple misdemeanors are invisible to this model.

¹ The Pew Center on the States is a division of The Pew Charitable Trusts that identifies and advances effective solutions to critical issues facing states. The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation supports creative people and effective institutions committed to building a more just, verdant, and peaceful world.

² The model is the culmination of over 15 years of development by the Washington State Institute for Public Policy and is based on an assessment of over 27,000 research studies that have evaluated a wide range of evidence-based programs. The model uses the findings of the strongest of these research studies to predict the outcomes that each program would achieve in [State], based on the state's unique characteristics and service delivery costs. The model uses a highly sophisticated econometric approach to generate its assessments, and was validated by independent expert panels in 2010 and 2012.

Sector Inputs – Crime

Per Unit Costs

WSIPP Benefit-Cost Model: Version 2.1

Enter Sector Inputs | Enter Program Inputs | Run Models & View Reports

General | Economic | **Crime** | Education | Child Welfare | Substance Use | Health Care | Mental Health | Public Asst | Housing | Teen Birth | Outcomes & Links

Crime

Back to Main Model

Per Unit Costs | Resource Use | Offender Populations | Victimization

	Marginal Operating Costs								Capital Costs			Misc.	
	Murder	Felony Sex Crimes	Robbery	Aggravated Assault	Felony Property	Felony Drug	Misdemeanor	Year of Estimate	Real Escalation Rate	Capital Cost Per Unit	Year of Estimate		Finance Years
Police	670	670	670	670	670	670	670	2009	0.0270	0	2006	5	0%
Courts and Prosecutors	95,657	13,991	39,268	6,625	4,822	7,882	208	2011	0.0200	0	2011	0	100%
Juvenile Local Detention	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2008	0.0570	0	2006	0	0%
Juvenile Local Supervision	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2008	0.0000	0		0	0%
Juvenile State Institution	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2008	0.0160	0		0	100%
Juvenile State Supervision	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2008	0.0000	0			100%
Adult Jail	18,250	18,250	18,250	18,250	18,250	18,250	18,250	2011	0.0220	0	2011	25	0%
Adult Local Supervision	1,274	1,423	1,274	1,377	1,457	1,425	1,295	2011	0.0640				100%
Adult State Prison	6,959	6,959	6,959	6,959	6,959	6,959	6,959	2011	0.0030	26,355	2012	17	100%
Adult Post Prison Supervision	1,311	1,311	1,311	1,311	1,311	1,311	1,311	2011	0.0640				100%
Victim Costs (tangible)	737,517	5,556	3,299	8,700	1,922	0	0	2008	0.0000				0%
Victim Costs (intangible)	8,442,000	198,212	4,976	13,435	0	0	0	2008	0.0000				0%

Notes: Police costs are dollars per arrest. Courts costs (including court, prosecutors, and defenders) are dollars per conviction. Victim costs are present value costs per victim. All other costs are annual costs per average daily population unit.

Cost Variance for Per Unit Criminal Justice and Victim Costs

	Low Variance	High Variance
Criminal Justice System Costs	-0.1	0.1
Crime Victim Costs	-0.2	0.1

Police. Per Washington State Institute for Public Policy analysis of cost of an arrest (2009).

Courts and Prosecutors. FY2011 data sources: Legislative Services Agency; Iowa Department of Management; Iowa Justice Data Warehouse. File: *IRF Per Unit Costs Courts Prosecutors FY2011.xlsx*. State Court Administrator, Judicial Branch, was consulted regarding capital costs.

Adult Jail. Per county jail reimbursement rate of \$50 per diem for FY2011.

Adult Local Supervision. FY2011 data sources: Legislative Services Agency; Iowa Department of Corrections; Iowa Justice Data Warehouse. File: *IRF Per Unit Costs Adult Prison_CBC FY2011.xlsx*.

Adult State Prison. FY2011 data sources: Legislative Services Agency; Iowa Department of Corrections. File: *IRF Per Unit Costs Adult Prison_CBC FY2011.xlsx*. Marginal cost represents net costs divided by official prison capacity. Capital costs based on actuals for projects at Iowa State Penitentiary and Iowa Correctional Institution for Women.

Adult Post Prison Supervision. FY2011 data sources: Legislative Services Agency; Iowa Department of Corrections; Iowa Justice Data Warehouse. File: *IRF Per Unit Costs Adult Prison_CBC FY2011.xlsx*.

Victim Costs. Per Washington State Institute for Public Policy documentation.

Sector Inputs - Crime

Resource Use

WSIPP Benefit-Cost Model: Version 2.1

Enter Sector Inputs | Enter Program Inputs | Run Models & View Reports

General | Economic | **Crime** | Education | Child Welfare | Substance Use | Health Care | Mental Health | Public Asst | Housing | Teen Birth | Outcomes & Links

Crime

Back to Main Model

Per Unit Costs | **Resource Use** | Offender Populations | Victimization

	Felony Violent & Property Crime Categories					Other		Sums		Year of Data
	Murder	Felony Sex Crimes	Robbery	Aggravated Assault	Felony Property	Felony Drug	Misdemeanor	Total Violent	Total Violent & Property	
Total current prison average daily population (ADP): 8507										
Probability of Resource Use										
Juvenile State Institution	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Adult State Prison	0.91	0.58	1.00	0.55	0.30	0.36	0.04	0.00	0.00	2011
Juvenile Local Supervision	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Juvenile State Supervision (Parole)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Adult Community Supervision Post-Jail	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.93	0.50	0.00	0.00	2011
Adult Community Supervision Post-Prison	0.79	0.99	0.83	0.61	0.73	0.82	0.42	0.00	0.00	2011
Number of Years of Use Per Resource										
Juvenile Detention, with Local Sentence	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00			
Juvenile Detention, with State Sentence	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00			0
Juvenile Local Supervision	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00			0
Juvenile State Institution	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00			0
Juvenile State Supervision	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00			0
Adult Jail, with Local Sentence	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.03	0.00	0.00	2011
Adult Jail, with Prison Sentence	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
Adult Community Supervision, Jail Sentence	3.84	27.17	0.00	2.62	3.14	2.77	1.35	0.00	0.00	2011
Adult Prison	15.37	6.09	9.17	3.01	1.80	1.77	0.82	0.00	0.00	2012
Adult Community Supervision, Post-Prison	3.77	23.70	1.54	1.25	1.45	2.00	1.16	0.00	0.00	2011
Change in the Length of Stay (in years) for Each Subsequent Sentence										
Adult	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000			
Juvenile	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00			
Age when a juvenile is first tried in adult court										
Age when juvenile is tried as an adult	17	17	17	17	17	17	17			

Total current prison average daily population (ADP). Data source: ICON Daily Population Report for February 13, 2012. A more recent population was substituted for actual ADP because the prison population has been declining since the beginning of FY2012 and remains several hundred offenders below the ADP for FY2011.

All Other Data. FY2011 data sources: Iowa Justice Data Warehouse. File: *IRF Resource Use FY2011*.

Sector Inputs - Crime Offender Populations

WSIPP Benefit-Cost Model: Version 2.1

Enter Sector Inputs | Enter Program Inputs | Run Models & View Reports

General | Economic | Crime | Education | Child Welfare | Substance Use | Health Care | Mental Health | Public Asst | Housing | Teen Birth | Outcomes & Links

Crime

Back to Main Model

Per Unit Costs | Resource Use | Offender Populations | Victimization

Select the type of population group to View/Modify

Adult Supervision- Higher Risk USE

Offender population name: Adult Supervision- Higher Risk USE

Number years follow-up: 10

Density distribution parameters

Cumulative recidivism rate (conviction rate)			Hazard rate (timing)		
Parameter 1	0.042		Distribution type	2	
Parameter 2	0.1714		Parameter 1	0.1695	
Parameter 3	-0.0237		Parameter 2	-0.046	
Parameter 4	0.0017		Parameter 3	0	
Parameter 5	-0.0001		Parameter 4	0	

	Murder	Felony Sex Crimes	Robbery	Aggravated Assault	Felony Property	Felony Drug	Misdemeanor	Total
Crime probability: most serious recidivism offense	0.0045	0.0148	0.0086	0.0634	0.1869	0.3004	0.4214	1
Trips: average number of adjudications through the system	2.25	2.25	2.435	3.386	3	2.347	1.885	
Offenses: average number of offenses per trip	1.222	1.589	1.661	1.28	1.294	1.254	1.123	

Main Offender Groups:

- **Adult Supervision-Higher Risk Offenders (shown above).** Data sources: Iowa Justice Data Warehouse; ICON. FY2002 probation admissions, whose levels of supervision were High Normal or Intensive during at least a portion of that supervision. Recidivism defined as any new conviction for an indictable misdemeanor or felony where offense date was within a ten-year tracking period, through January 2012. Some offenders' tracking periods were slightly less than the ten year period.
- **Adult Prison-General (all offenders).** Data sources: Iowa Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning; ICON. FY2000 paroles and discharges from prison and work release. Recidivism defined as any new conviction for an indictable misdemeanor or felony where offense date was within a ten-year tracking period.

Files: IRF *Recidivism.accdb*; *Density_Distributions_for_Crime_Populations_Iowa.xlsx*.

Sector Inputs – Crime

Victimization

WSIPP Benefit-Cost Model: Version 2.1

Enter Sector Inputs | Enter Program Inputs | Run Models & View Reports

Crime

Back to Main Model

Per Unit Costs | Resource Use | Offender Populations | **Victimization**

	Murder	Rape	Robbery	Aggravated Assault	Burglary	Theft	Motor Vehicle Theft	Year of Data
Number of statewide crimes reported to police	39	876	1190	6256	15595	48558	3807	2009
Multiplicative adjustment to align with felonies	1	2.588	1	1	0.684	0.268	1	
	Murder	Felony Sex Crimes	Robbery	Aggravated Assault	Burglary	Felony Theft	Motor Vehicle Theft	Year of Data
Number of statewide adjusted crimes reported to police	39	2267	1190	6256	10667	13014	3807	
Percent of crime reported to police	1	0.307	0.656	0.572	0.501	0.685	0.853	2007
Statewide estimated felony-type crimes	39	7384	1814	10937	21291	18999	4463	
	Murder	Felony Sex Crimes	Robbery	Aggravated Assault	Felony Property	Felony Drug	Year of Data	
Statewide number of convictions, adult and juvenile	71	379	124	590	2781	3297	2009	
Statewide number of counts, adult and juvenile	124	493	190	894	3517			
Average number of offenders per victim	1	1	1	1	1			
Statewide estimated felony-type crimes	39	7384	1814	10937	44753			
Percent of other crimes per conviction	0.62	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2			
Estimated victimizations per convicted offender	1	4.94	4.15	4.92	4.23			

Variance in ratios of victimizations per convicted offender

Low Percent	High Percent
-0.2	0.2

	Murder	Rape	Robbery	Aggravated Assault	Burglary	Theft	Year of Data
Statewide number of arrests, adult and juvenile	32	120	448	3987	15220	9091	2009
Maximum number of arrests per conviction	0.45	0.32	3.61	6.76	5.47	2.76	
Percent of other arrests attributed to a conviction	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Estimated number of arrests per conviction	1	1	1	1	1	1	

Number of statewide crimes reported to police. Calendar Year 2009 data source: Iowa Department of Public Safety, Iowa Uniform Crime Reports, Table 2: Summary-Based Crime Index.

Multiplicative adjustment to align with felonies. Adjustment for Rape based on Iowa Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning, Sex Offender Registry Study data on victim ages of felony sex offenses. Adjustments for burglary and theft based on calendar year 2009 adult and juvenile convictions, Iowa Justice Data Warehouse. Files: *IRF Victimization Sex Felony Multiplicative Adjustment.xlsx*; *IRF Victimization Adult/Juv Convictions Summary 2009.xlsx*; *2009 Adult Juv Convictions.accdb*.

Percent of crime reported to police. Per Washington State Institute for Public Policy documentation.

Statewide convictions, adult and juvenile. Calendar Year 2009 data source: Iowa Justice Data Warehouse. File: *2009 Adult Juv Convictions.accdb*.

Average number of offenders per victim. Per Washington State Institute for Public Policy documentation.

Statewide number of arrests, adult and juvenile. Calendar Year 2009 data source: Iowa Department of Public Safety, Iowa Uniform Crime Reports, Table 2: Summary-Based Crime Index. Also same source, number of drug arrests per the Drug/Narcotic Violations section.

Program Inputs

WSIPP Benefit-Cost Model: Version 2.1

Enter Sector Inputs Enter Program Inputs Run Models & View Reports

To View and Edit a Stored Program, or to Add a New Program, or to Delete a Stored Program

Select a Stored Program to View/Modify: Vocational Education in Prison Add New Program and fill in the yellow boxes below. Delete Stored Program from the Database

General Program Inputs

Long Name: Vocational Education in Prison Update Database

Short Name: Vocational Education in Prison

Check to make program available for the crime-sentencing portfolio. Check if "program" is the value of having an outcome or not.

Primary (P) Participant Population Information: Crime: Adult Prison- General Secondary (S) Participant Population Information: Adult Prison- General

Education: All Students

Program/Policy Cost Per Participant			Primary Participant Age	Secondary Participant Age
Annual Cost Per	Number of Years	Year of Dollars		
Treatment Group: 2000	1	2011	28	
Comparison Group: 0	1	2011		

Percentage range, +/-, in net treatment costs: 0.1

Description of program costs: Cost provided by Sandra Smith, State of Iowa Department of Corrections

Description of Program: Vocational education programs delivered in prison involve instruction for a specific trade, occupation, or vocation such as welding, auto repair, building maintenance, and graphic

Program Outcome Information

Add New Outcome Delete Outcome

	First Effect Size Measurement			Second Effect Size Measurement			Primary (P) or Secondary (S)	Number of studies in ES estimate	Unadjusted ES at first measurement	Total N in treatment groups	P-value for ES at first measurement
	Effect Size (ES)	ES Standard Error	Age at time of first ES	ES at second measurement	ES Standard Error	Age at time of second ES					
Crime	-0.226	0.042	30	-0.226	0.084	40	P	3	-0.256	1950	0

Iowa program inputs were compiled for all adult programs contained in the Washington State Institute for Public Policy Benefit-Cost Model. Additionally, Intensive Supervision with Risk Needs Responsivity Model was added per the December 2011 interim report, *“What Works” in Community Supervision*, Washington State Institute for Public Policy.

Annual Cost per Participant, Treatment Group. Data sources: Iowa Department of Corrections; district departments of correctional services; Iowa Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning (drug court judge costs); Iowa Department of Public Health and substance abuse treatment providers (drug court treatment and substance abuse treatment in the community program); Iowa Justice Data Warehouse (program lengths of stay). Mid-range correctional counselor salary (with benefits) was used to estimate the costs of a number of institutional programs. Mid-range probation/parole officer 2 salary (with benefits) was used to estimate the costs of a number of community programs.

Annual Cost per Participant, Comparison Group. Comparison group costs were necessary in order to reflect the true “above and beyond” costs of these programs: drug courts (alternatives to prison); mental health courts (alternatives to jail or prison); work release (alternative to prison); intensive supervision with treatment (alternative to regular supervision); intensive supervision with risk needs responsivity model (alternative to regular supervision).

File: *IRF Program Costs.xlsx*. Summary chart on the following page.

Primary Participant Population Information. See *Sector Inputs – Crime – Offender Populations*.

Program Outcome Information. Per Washington State Institute for Public Policy documentation.

Iowa Program Cost Data

Programs for Adult Offenders	Annual Cost per Participant	Comparison Group Cost
Vocational Education in Prison	\$ 2,000.00	
Correctional Education in Prison (basic or post-secondary)	\$ 3,000.00	
Cognitive Behavioral Programs in Prison	\$ 127.02	
Correctional Industries in Prison	\$ 1.00	
Drug Treatment in Prison	\$ 771.37	
Drug Treatment in the Community	\$ 946.86	
Drug Courts	\$ 7,401.67	\$ 6,959.00
Employment Training/Job Assistance in the Community	\$ 552.18	
Work Release	\$ 8,694.40	\$ 10,637.90
Cognitive Behavioral Programs in the Community	\$ 137.44	
Mental Health Courts(CBC)	\$ 4,991.04	\$ 5,490.94
Intensive Supervision: Treatment	\$ 2,730.78	\$ 1,224.99
Domestic Violence Perpetrator Treatment Programs (BEP in the community - OLD curriculum)	\$ 272.58	
Electronic Monitoring (radio frequency or GPS)	\$ 1,451.93	
Supervision with Risk Need Responsivity model	\$ 2,730.78	\$ 1,224.99

Program Effect Sizes

Effect size examines the extent to which a program affects a particular outcome. In criminal justice programming, the effect size of a given program estimates the change in crime rates as a result of program participation. Effect sizes for the adult criminal justice programs included in the Iowa Results First Model are based on the meta-analysis conducted by Aos et al (2011) for the Washington State Institute of Public Policy (WSIPP) model³. As such, the studies do not solely rely on Iowa-based data to calculate effect sizes; however this is a strength for a number of reasons. First, WSIPP researchers selected only high quality studies to use in their analysis. All studies that meet their specifications were included which allowed the researchers to calculate the average effectiveness among all studies used rather than relying on a single study. Secondly, studies that used random assignment were given inclusion preference in the meta-analysis. Random assignment is the gold standard of sampling methodology because it allows a causal relationship to be estimated through the use of a control group and a comparison group.

Victimization Costs

In addition to taxpayer costs, victims also incur costs as the result of crime, such as loss of life, loss of property, and psychological effects. While it can be difficult to quantify victim costs, the WSIPP model uses estimates calculated by McCollister (2010)⁴. McCollister's studies divide victim costs into two categories: tangible victimization costs (include medical and mental health care expenses, property damage and losses, and reductions in future earnings experienced by victims) and intangible victimization costs (place a monetary value on the pain and suffering experienced by crime victims)⁵. The WSIPP model and the Iowa Results First Model incorporate both types of victimization costs, as well.

³ Aos, S., Lee, S., Drake, E., Pennucci, A., Klima., T., Miller, M., Anderson, L., Mayfield, J., and Burley, M. (2011). *Return on Investment: Evidence-Based Options to Improve Statewide Outcomes. Technical Appendix II Methods and User-Manual*. Retrieved April 25, 2012 from: <http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/rptfiles/11-07-1201B.pdf>.

⁴ Aos, S., and Drake, E. (2010). *WSIPP's Benefit-Cost Tool for States: Examining Policy Options in Sentencing and Corrections*. Retrieved April 25, 2012 from: <http://www.saferfoundation.org/files/documents/WSIPP%20Cost%20tool%20for%20states.pdf>.

⁵ K. E. McCollister, M. T. French, & H. Fang (2010). The Cost of Crime to Society: New Crime-Specific Estimates for Policy and Program Evaluation. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, 108(1), 98-109.

Glossary of Terms

Benefits: economic advantages bestowed on a person, business, or society from a policy or program.

Capital Costs: cost of purchasing and/or developing tangible property, such as equipment, buildings, and land.

Cost-benefit Analysis: an economic tool that allows policymakers to make informed decisions about the effectiveness of programs and policies by comparing monetary benefits against costs. Involves four steps: assessing the impact of the policy or program, measuring costs, measuring benefits, and comparing the monetized costs against monetized benefits.

Intangible Costs: costs that cannot be directly allocated to a specific activity (such as pain and suffering) .

Marginal Costs: change in cost as the result of increased or decreased units of output.

Non-taxpayer Benefits: benefits other than state and local resources, realized from a given policy or program (such as increased feelings of safety in the community, enhanced relations with law enforcement, and so on).

Net Present Value: the difference between the present value of cash inflows (benefits) from a given program and the present value of cash outflows (costs).

Return on Investment: ratio of money gained or lost on an investment relative to the amount invested.

Tangible Costs: costs that can be directly measured in dollar terms, such as medical costs, lost wages, and property damage.

Taxpayer Benefits: state and local resources avoided as a result of a program that reduces future crime, including arrest, prosecution/courts, jail, and corrections custody/supervision.

Taxpayer Cost: costs associated with law enforcement, courts, corrections, and programs.

Victim Benefits: monetized value of avoided victimizations as the result of a given program (i.e. medical and mental health expenses, property damage and losses, and reductions in future earnings).

Victimization Costs: monetary value of physical, psychological, and financial harms experienced by the victims of crime.