

COST-BENEFIT SERIES

# *Wisconsin Results First Initiative Adult Criminal Justice Program Inventory: Initial Report*



June 2015

## **Results First Initiative Programs Component Team**

Inquiries regarding this report may be directed to the author:

Joseph R. Tatar II, Ph.D.

(608) 240-5814

Joseph.Tatar@wisconsin.gov

State of Wisconsin  
**Results First Initiative**



# STATE OF WISCONSIN CRIMINAL JUSTICE COORDINATING COUNCIL

SCOTT WALKER, GOVERNOR

ATTORNEY GENERAL BRAD D. SCHIMEL, CO-CHAIR  
SECRETARY EDWARD F. WALL, CO-CHAIR

---

June 15, 2015

As Co-Chairs of the State of Wisconsin Criminal Justice Coordinating Council (WI CJCC), we are pleased to share with you the first in a series of reports from the Wisconsin Results First Initiative, entitled the "Adult Criminal Justice Program Inventory." This report reflects the diligent and skillful efforts of a number of the State's criminal justice system partners, namely the Departments of Corrections, Justice, Health Services, and the Wisconsin Court System.

As part of the Results First Initiative, the Pew Charitable Trusts and MacArthur Foundation work with states to implement an innovative cost-benefit analysis approach that enables investment in policies and programs that are proven to work. By estimating the long-term costs and benefits of investments in public programs, policy makers are able to compare options and identify those that most effectively achieve outcomes with the best value for taxpayers.

The purpose of the Results First Initiative fits squarely within the central vision and mission of the WI CJCC. Specifically, the WI CJCC is tasked with promoting and facilitating the implementation of effective criminal justice policies and practices that maximize justice and the safety of the public while also ensuring that the criminal justice system reflects a better investment toward improving the quality of life in Wisconsin. In other words, the WI CJCC is intended to help balance the effectiveness of policies with fiscal responsibility. Focusing efforts toward cost-benefit analysis through the Results First Initiative helps to achieve this goal.

The Pew Charitable Trusts and MacArthur Foundation currently work with seventeen states to customize this approach to assess programs and inform policy and budget decisions in key areas, including adult criminal and juvenile justice, child welfare, education, mental health, and substance abuse. While the model can be expanded to assess programs in additional policy areas over time and can be honed to address local-level jurisdictions, the current work of Wisconsin's Results First efforts has focused on the adult criminal justice policy area at a statewide level.

The attached report represents a critical initial step in implementing the Results First Initiative, creating an inventory of programs in Wisconsin that are known to be evidence-based according to the research literature.

We hope that you find this report to be beneficial and informative.

Sincerely,

A blue ink signature of Brad D. Schimel.

Brad D. Schimel  
Attorney General

A blue ink signature of Edward F. Wall.

Edward F. Wall  
Secretary, Department of Corrections

## Results First Initiative

The Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative, a project of the Pew Charitable Trusts and the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, works with Wisconsin and other jurisdictions to implement an innovative cost-benefit analysis approach to state policy decision making. By offering cutting-edge tools and hands-on technical assistance, Results First helps public leaders identify and invest in policies and programs that produce the best outcomes for constituents. At the core of the Results First approach is a cost-benefit analysis model. Based on a model first developed by the Washington State Institute for Public Policy (WSIPP), it incorporates national research on program effectiveness and allows that national data to be analyzed in conjunction with Wisconsin-specific data. Additional details on the Results First Initiative can be found [here](#).

Though there has been a desire to conduct a cost-benefit analysis of criminal justice system inputs for some time, momentum for moving forward with the Results First Initiative in Wisconsin began with a unanimous vote by Wisconsin's Criminal Justice Coordinating Council (CJCC) in January 2014. Subsequently, letters of invitation and support for Wisconsin working with the Results First Initiative have come from representatives of all three branches of government, including Governor Scott Walker, Chief Justice Shirley Abrahamson, and the co-chairs of the Joint Committee on Finance (Senator Alberta Darling and Representative John Nygren). All shared the concern of adherence to evidence-based practices while optimizing fiscal efficiency through estimation of return on investment from cost-benefit analysis.

The Wisconsin version of the Results First model is currently housed within the Department of Corrections (WI DOC), as the adult criminal justice system serves as the initial focus of the cost-benefit analysis. The Results First Policy Team will help to decide a more permanent agency to house the model in future discussions. Since the initial kick-off of the Results First Initiative in Wisconsin, an administrative policy team and four distinct implementation teams (based on the four underlying data components of the Results First model; discussed in detail below) have been formed, with membership representing multiple state departments, and justice system and lawmaking entities, such as the Departments of Corrections, Health Services, Administration, Justice, and the Wisconsin Court System.

## Results First Infrastructure and Implementation Components

### Results First Policy Team

The Policy Team represents the administrative committee for the Results First Initiative. The group is primarily tasked with providing oversight and direction to the Implementation Team as well as facilitating inter-departmental collaboration and data sharing. Wisconsin has become one of three states that has recently advanced to Phase V of the National Institute of Corrections' (NIC) Evidence-Based Decision-Making (EBDM) Initiative, and as a result, is in the process of finalizing an Evidence-Based Decision-Making subcommittee to serve as the Policy Team. Given the high degree of overlap in membership and goals between these two initiatives, the CJCC EBDM subcommittee will also serve as the Policy Team for the Results First Initiative.

## Results First Implementation Team

Following discussions with the Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative regarding operation in other states, it was decided that the Implementation Team would be divided into four different groups focusing on distinct data component of the WSIPP cost-benefit analysis model: 1) cost, 2) recidivism 3) resource use, and 4) programs. Each component team's responsibilities are defined briefly below.

**Cost Component.** The Cost Team is dedicated to compiling information regarding the costs of crime, particularly in terms of the various justice system resources that are tapped by an offender after the commission of a crime. Specifically, the Cost Team compiles data and calculates the marginal costs (the slight, incremental cost of adding or subtracting a person to serve in a program or agency) of the police (for an arrest), the courts and prosecutors, adult jail, adult state prison, and adult community supervision. In addition, the Cost Team also compiles information regarding the cost of providing criminal justice programming that is designed to reduce recidivism (e.g., how much it costs to add one more offender to a treatment program). These costs are then applied to an expected reduction in recidivism (through meta-analytic research) to produce an expected return on investment by reducing future offender exposure to the justice system.

**Recidivism Component.** The core function of the Recidivism Team is to calculate recidivism rates (see how Wisconsin defines recidivism at right) for offenders who come into contact with the Wisconsin criminal justice system, going as far back as the historical data is accurate. Specifically, the Recidivism Team calculates a) how many offenders recidivated over a period of time since release; b) how many times they reoffended; c) what their most serious recidivating event was; and d) how many sustained charges they acquired per recidivist event. These recidivism rates are calculated for various subgroups of offenders, based on their risk-level and other significant defining characteristics (e.g. seriously mentally ill offenders, sex offenders, etc.). In addition, the Recidivism Team compiles a list of Wisconsin criminal statutes and codes them into seven different categories as defined by the model (for use in calculating various recidivism, resource use, and cost calculations): 1) murder/manslaughter, 2) sex offense, 3) robbery, 4) assault, 5) property, 6) drug/other non-victim crimes, and 7) misdemeanor. The Recidivism Team has determined that the recidivism analysis will focus on a ten-year follow-up period (for both releases from prison and admission to supervision) as a baseline for examining the impact of adult criminal justice programming.

*Wisconsin Department of Corrections (WIDOC)*

### Definition of Recidivism:

“Following an episode of incarceration with the WI DOC, to commit a criminal offense that results in a new conviction and sentence to WI DOC custody or supervision”

(Jones & Rogers, 2014, p. 5).

**Resource Use Component.** The Resource Use Team serves two main functions. The first is to assist the Recidivism Component Team in the preparation and evaluation of the offense statute list and categorization process. Given the central importance of the offense categorization process (described above) to the calculation of core resource use data elements, input from the Resource Use Team is also essential. The second function of the Resource Use Team is to compile a ‘probability tree’ of the likelihood that a recidivating offender would be exposed to the various

justice system agencies included in the model (e.g., prison, jail, community supervision) as a result of the recidivism event. Included in this calculation is an estimate of the average amount of time (in years) a recidivating offender would spend in any of these agencies as a result of the offense(s). Further, this ‘probability tree’ of offender-resource contact is broken down by distinct crime categories, which are defined by the offense statute list. For example, an individual who commits a sex offense would be more likely to go to prison than an offender who commits a misdemeanor, who would likely spend their confinement time (if any) in a county jail facility, though both offenders would also likely spend time under community supervision as a result of the recidivating event. In addition, the offender who committed a sex crime would also be likely to spend a longer amount of time both in confinement and under community supervision post-incarceration than the individual who had a misdemeanor recidivism event. The Resource Use Team is tasked with calculating sentencing patterns in Wisconsin to address these crime type variations in justice system resource exposure. Further, this probability of resource use and length of stay information is connected to per-person marginal cost information to determine how much and for how long recidivism reduction impacts future spending in multiple criminal justice agencies.

**Programs Component.** Finally, the Programs Team is primarily tasked with the compilation of a list of all programs provided by the justice system whose central goal is to reduce offender recidivism. The purpose of the program inventory is to categorize each of the adult criminal justice programs into defined categories of “evidence-based practices” (see definition at right) so as to sync up Wisconsin programming to research. The Programs Team also collects delivery-specific information, such as the primary population targeted by each program, where the program is provided, how long the program lasts, how many are eligible for the program,

*Wisconsin Criminal Justice  
Coordinating Council*

Definition of Evidence-Based  
Practice:

Evidence-Based Practice in the criminal justice system is the partnership between research and practice. Research is used to determine how effective a practice is at achieving positive measurable outcomes, including reduction of recidivism and increasing public safety.

and how many were served by the program in the most recent fiscal year. The final piece is the calculation of the per-person cost of program implementation and delivery. These programs would then become the focus of the cost-benefit analysis, wherein the cost effectiveness of each program would be compared to all other programs included in the analysis. The purpose and initial version of the Wisconsin Adult Criminal Justice Program Inventory produced by the Programs Team are described in the next section.

## Program Inventory

The purpose of the program inventory is to categorize the adult criminal justice programming that is provided in Wisconsin prisons and jails, under community supervision, and through the courts into defined categories of evidence-based practices. Programs defined here should meet the following three criteria:

- 1) Are primarily intended to reduce recidivism among individuals convicted of a crime
- 2) Are supported by a known research evidence base (provided by Pew/MacArthur and WSIPP) that have a demonstrable impact on offender recidivism

### 3) Are funded either fully or partially through the state budget

Examination of documentation provided by Results First and WSIPP produced the following list of program categories that can be classified as evidence-based programs.

Descriptions of the programs in question and the meta-analytic research evaluating each can be found at the [WSIPP Adult Criminal Justice Benefit Cost Results](#) page.

In collaboration with the Pew Charitable Trusts, Wisconsin's Results First Programs Team spent a considerable amount of time compiling programs implemented in criminal justice contexts and matching them to those program categories that have been evaluated by WSIPP. Each of these program categories are based on specific program design and delivery methods that have been evaluated in the scientific literature and shown to have an impact (either positive or negative) on offender recidivism patterns. The scientific literature pertaining to each program category was then reviewed by WSIPP using meta-analytic statistical methods to produce an overall effect size (standardized estimate of recidivism impact). This effect estimate was then adjusted to fit the quality and sample size of the evaluation research, the length of follow-up, and quality of measurements used in assessing offending and recidivism outcomes post-treatment. Additional details about WSIPP's methodology in estimating effect sizes and monetizing outcomes through their cost-benefit model can be obtained [here](#).

#### **Importance of the Program Inventory**

The program inventory is a key first step to completing the Results First Initiative in Wisconsin. In order to properly evaluate and compare criminal justice programming, it is necessary to ensure that program category assignment is accurately matched to the underlying meta-analytic research. This process is vital because the estimated return on investment (ROI) from the cost-benefit analysis is directly tied to this effect size indicator. The closer an assigned program approximates an exemplar program under a specific category, the more confidence one can hold in the ROI produced by the analysis.

For example, the *Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse (AODA) Continuing Care for Dual-Diagnosis Offenders in the Community* program is currently assigned to the Outpatient/Non-Intensive Drug Treatment in the Community category of the WSIPP model. Programs in this category reflect a more modest intensity than those offered by another community-based program category, such as Therapeutic Communities for Offenders with Co-Occurring Disorders. Programs in this latter category, such as Wisconsin's *Mental Illness Chemical Abuse (MICA) program*, also employ a therapeutic community model, which includes a residential component to the provided services. Not only do the underlying costs between these programs differ (outpatient/non-intensive programs are much less expensive), but the expected impact on recidivism also varies. The Therapeutic Community category produces a stronger reduction in recidivism than the Outpatient/Non-Intensive category. As a result, if one were to incorrectly assign the *AODA Continuing Care for Dual-Diagnosis Offenders* program to the Therapeutic Community category, the lower cost combined with the magnified effect size estimate would produce an overestimate of the expected return on investment of this program. As such, it was necessary for the Programs Team to be particularly methodical in the assignment of criminal justice programming to the categories defined in the WSIPP model.

Program-level detail for Wisconsin programming is presented in the next section, covering the type and representative types of a given program, the intended outcomes and criminogenic needs addressed, the

primary participant population and the programs' oversight department/division. In addition, descriptions of each of the program categories (defined by WSIPP) that fit with Wisconsin adult criminal justice programming are provided. Subsequent versions of the Wisconsin Adult Criminal Justice Program Inventory will fill in other program-specific information, such as the length of a program, how many are eligible for the program, how many were served by the program in the most recent fiscal year, and the per-person cost of implementing the program. At present, this level of detail is still in the process of being compiled at an aggregate-level.

# Wisconsin Results First Adult Criminal Justice Program Inventory

*Note:* This adult criminal justice inventory does not represent an exhaustive list of all programming provided within prisons, jails, community supervision, or the courts. There are numerous programs whose purpose is not primarily to reduce recidivism, but instead to improve the quality of life of offenders under the custody or supervision of the State. In addition, there are a number of programs that either do not fit within the reviewed and defined categories provided by WSIPP or do not have a strong enough evidence base to properly evaluate their effectiveness in reducing offender recidivism, and thus are not included in this initial version of the program inventory.

*Table 1. Wisconsin Results First Adult Criminal Justice Program Inventory*

Program Category	Program Description	Program Types	Oversight Agency	Intended Outcomes	Average Duration of Program	Primary Participant Population	Criminogenic Needs Addressed
Cognitive Behavioral Therapy - Prison	Central programs involving cognitive behavioral intervention for prison inmates in Wisconsin	Anger Management / Impulse Control; Cognitive Intervention Program (CGIP); Thinking for a Change	DOC	Anger reduction. Alleviating criminogenic thinking patterns.	15 weeks	Moderate- to High-Risk Offenders	Antisocial cognition
Cognitive Behavioral Therapy - Community	Central programs involving cognitive behavioral intervention for offenders under community supervision in Wisconsin	Anger Management / Impulse Control; Cognitive Intervention Program (CGIP); Thinking for a Change	DOC	Anger reduction. Alleviating criminogenic thinking patterns.	13 weeks	Moderate- to High-Risk Offenders	Antisocial cognition
Correctional Education (basic or post-secondary) in Prison	Basic prison educational practices	Adult Basic Education (ABE); HSED Preparation and Testing, Special Education (SPED); Title I; English as a Second Language (ESL)	DOC	Enhance inmate educational attainment	Variable	General Offenders	School
Correctional Industries in Prison	Work and employment training opportunities provided to inmates	Prison Correctional Industries; Badger State Industries; Correctional Farms	DOC	Improving inmate employment skills.	Variable	General Offenders	Employment
Domestic Violence (DV) Perpetrator Treatment	Programs designed to address precursors of DV behavior to reduce likelihood future engagement.	Prison DV Treatment; Community DV Treatment	DOC	Reduce likelihood of future DV perpetration.	25 weeks	General Offenders	Antisocial cognition, family/marital problems
Driving Under the Influence (DUI) Court	Specialty court diversion program for offenders arrested for DUI/OWI	DWI/OWI Court	Courts	Prison/jail diversion and reduction of future DUI/OWI activity.	12 months	General Offenders	Substance abuse
Drug Court for Adult Offenders	Specialty court diversion program for offenders arrested with a drug offense	Drug Court; Treatment Alternatives and Diversion (TAD) Program - Drug Court Component	Courts	Prison/jail diversion and reduction of future drug offense activity.	12-18 months	General Offenders	Substance abuse
Drug Offender Sentencing Alternative	Offers treatment as alternative to revocation or successful completion resulting in release	Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse (AODA) Program - Alternative to Revocation; Rock County Education and Criminal Addictions Program (RECAP); Kenosha County Living Free Program; Racine County Jail AODA Program; Earned Release Program (ERP); Challenge Incarceration Program (CIP)	DOC; Courts; Rock, Kenosha, and Racine County Jails	Prison/jail diversion and reduction of future drug offense/OWI activity.	Variable	General Offenders	Substance abuse

Program Category	Program Description	Program Types	Oversight Agency	Intended Outcomes	Average Duration of Program	Primary Participant Population	Criminogenic Needs Addressed
Electronic Monitoring	Electronic monitoring for offenders as an alternative to jail confinement and monitoring of sex offenders on the registry	Radio Frequency Electronic Monitoring; GPS Electronic Monitoring	DOC	Reduce recidivism by enhancing offender movement tracking	Variable	General Offenders and Sex Offenders	Unclear
Employment Training/Job Assistance in the Community	Employment opportunities and reentry services for offenders transitioning to the community from prison or admitted directly to supervision	Bureau of Correctional Enterprises Transition Program; Windows to Work; Operation Fresh Start; Wisconsin Fresh Start; Workforce Development Programs; Community Corrections Employment Program (CCEP); Community Partnership Outreach Program (CPOP); Goodwill Community Circles of Support Program; Madison Urban Ministry Reintegration/Reentry Program; Project RETURN (Returning Ex-offenders to Urban Realities and Neighborhoods)	DOC; Department of Workforce Development	Improving employment skills and enhancing reentry success for former prison inmates.	Variable	General Offenders	Employment, substance abuse, antisocial cognition, leisure and/or recreation
Inpatient/Intensive Drug Treatment in the Community	Intensive drug treatment for drug offenders and dual-diagnosis (mental health and substance use disorders) in the community	AODA Psychoeducation / Intervention for Dual Diagnosis Offenders; AODA Intensive Outpatient	DOC	Reduction of future drug and alcohol use.	12 weeks	General Offenders	Substance abuse
Inpatient/Intensive Drug Treatment in Prison	Intensive drug treatment for inmates in prison with a significant drug treatment need	Residential AODA Program	DOC	Reduction of future drug and alcohol use.	6 months	General Offenders	Substance abuse
Mental Health Courts	Specialty court diversion program for offenders with significant mental health issues	Mental Health Court	Courts	Prison/jail diversion, reduction of future offending behavior, allocation of mental health treatment services.	12-18 months	Offenders with Mental Illness	Employment, family/marital, substance abuse
Offender Re-Entry Community Safety Program (dangerously mentally ill offenders)	Pre-release and post-release services (particularly access to treatment) for seriously mentally ill offenders for up to 2 years post-release	Opening Avenues to Reentry Success (OARS)	DOC	Reduction of future offending behavior and allocation of mental health treatment services.	1-2 years	Moderate-to-High Risk Offenders with Mental Illness	Employment, school, family/marital problems, substance abuse

Program Category	Program Description	Program Types	Oversight Agency	Intended Outcomes	Average Duration of Program	Primary Participant Population	Criminogenic Needs Addressed
Outpatient/Non-Intensive Drug Treatment in the Community	Core curricula for substance abuse treatment for offenders transitioning to the community from prison or admitted directly to supervision. Includes specific programming for dual diagnosis offenders.	AODA Relapse Prevention / Continuing Care for Dual Diagnosis Offenders; AODA Primary Outpatient; AODA Relapse Prevention-General; AODA Aftercare; AODA Re-entry Program; AODA for Women with PTSD	DOC	Reduction of future drug and alcohol use.	16 weeks	General Offenders	Substance abuse
Outpatient/Non-Intensive Drug Treatment in Prison	Core curricula for substance abuse treatment for inmates in prison.	AODA Relapse Prevention; Self-Management and Recovery Training (SMART)	DOC	Reduction of future drug and alcohol use.	3-4 months	General Offenders	Substance abuse
Sex Offender Treatment in the Community	Core curricula of sexual offender treatment for offenders transitioning to the community from prison or admitted directly to supervision (intensive and non-intensive). Includes specific programming for cognitively impaired sexual offenders.	Sex Offender Treatment - General / Primary; Sex Offender Treatment - Cognitively Impaired; Sex Offender Treatment - Intensive; Sex Offender Treatment - Aftercare	DOC	Reduce likelihood of future sexual offense perpetration.	50 weeks	Sex Offenders	Antisocial cognition
Sex Offender Treatment in Prison	Core curricula of sexual offender treatment for inmates in prison (short- and long-term). Also includes an alternative to revocation option.	Sex Offender Treatment - SO-2; Sex Offender Treatment - SO-4; Sex Offender Treatment - Alternative to Revocation (ATR)	DOC	Reduce likelihood of future sexual offense perpetration.	1-2 years 90 days (ATR)	Sex Offenders	Antisocial cognition
Therapeutic Communities for Offenders with Co-Occurring Disorders	Intensive treatment of inmates in prison or offenders in the community with co-occurring substance abuse and mental disorder, drawing from a therapeutic community model.	Mental Illness Chemical Abuse (MICA) Program - Dual Diagnosis AODA; Community and Residential Program (CRP) with Dual Diagnosis Services	DOC	Reduction of future drug and alcohol use.	6-12 months	Offenders with Mental Illness	Substance abuse
Work Release	Work release programs for inmates in minimum security	Work Release in Minimum-Community Level	DOC	Improving employment skills and enhancing reentry success for prison inmates.	Variable	General Offenders	Employment

Program Category	Program Description	Program Types	Oversight Agency	Intended Outcomes	Average Duration of Program	Primary Participant Population	Criminogenic Needs Addressed
Vocational Education in Prison	General vocational training certificate programs.	Auto Detailing; Auto Maintenance; Barbering / Cosmetology; Braille Transcription; Building, Maintenance, & Construction; Cabinet Making; Cabinetry; Computer Assisted Drafting; Culinary Arts; Custodial Service; Dental Lab Technician; Electrician; Food Service / Culinary Arts; Horticulture; Institution Food Production; Machine Tool Operations; Masonry; Microsoft Office Software Apps; Motorcycle, Marine, and Outdoor Products; Multi-Occupational Aide; Office Assistant / Aide; Practical Computer Skills; Printing; Welding; Advanced Manufacturing Mobile Lab; Computer Numerical Control (CNC) Mobile Lab - Manufacturing	DOC	Improving employment skills, trade certification, and enhancing reentry success for prison inmates.	Variable	General Offenders	Employment

## Description of Adult Criminal Justice Program Categories

The following are program summaries that were established, defined, and reviewed by WSIPP and represents programming currently operating in the State of Wisconsin. Expanded versions of these descriptions and the empirical results of their meta-analytic work can be found on WSIPP's Benefit Cost Results link.

Note: These descriptions and program category names match the research reviewed by WSIPP and may not map exactly onto Wisconsin programming, but do encompass the 'spirit' of a number of adult criminal justice programs provided in the state. The WSIPP research underlying the program category can be found by clicking the hyperlinks in the program category name.

**[Cognitive Behavioral Therapy](#)** – Cognitive behavioral therapy (CBT) emphasizes individual accountability and teaches offenders that cognitive deficits, distortions, and flawed thinking processes cause criminal behavior. For this broad grouping of studies, CBT was delivered to adults in either an institutional or community setting and included a variety of “brand name” programs (Moral Reconation Therapy, Reasoning and Rehabilitation, and Thinking 4 a Change). Represents programming completed both in prison and in the community.

**[Correctional Education in Prison](#)** – This broad category of programs are delivered to persons in prison, and typically consist of classes for inmates in Adult Basic Education, General Educational Development preparation, and post-secondary education.

**[Correctional Industries in Prison](#)** – Correctional industries are prison jobs where inmates earn a wage for their work while developing necessary employment skills. In this broad grouping of programs, industries can provide private sector, non-profit, or institutional support jobs.

**[Domestic Violence Perpetrator Treatment](#)** – Treatment programs for domestic violence offenders most frequently involve an educational component focusing on the historical oppression of women and emphasizing alternatives to violence. Treatment is commonly mandated by the court and paid for by the offender. Represents programming completed both in prison and in the community.

**[Driving Under the Influence \(DUI\) Court](#)** – Driving under the influence (DUI) courts are a therapeutic court typically for offenders with a prior DUI conviction. Participants enter into a contract with the court and agree to comply with treatment and supervision requirements. Non-compliance may result in the imposition of harsher sentences. DUI courts typically involve a team of stakeholders (e.g. participant, judge, treatment provider, case manager, and supervising officer). While each DUI court is unique, most courts share similar characteristics such as treatment; judicial monitoring; DUI education; abstaining from alcohol; random breath or transdermal testing; incentives, rewards and sanctions; and progressive stages (e.g. less monitoring with compliance). DUI courts can vary in length. Studies in this systematic review were typically 12 to 24 months in length.

**[Drug Court for Adult Offenders](#)** – While each drug court is unique, they all share the primary goals of reducing criminal recidivism and substance abuse among participants. Drug courts use comprehensive supervision, drug testing, treatment services, and immediate sanctions and incentives in an attempt to modify the criminal behavior of certain drug-involved defendants.

**Drug Offender Sentencing Alternative** – Drug offender sentencing alternatives allow certain offenders to receive reduced prison terms in exchange for completing chemical dependency treatment while incarcerated.

**Electronic Monitoring** – A computer-based tracking device electronically monitors the location of an offender. Electronic monitoring devices are either radio frequency or Global Positioning System (GPS) units. Offenders are generally required to remain at home except for approved activities such as work, school, or treatment. Electronic monitoring is used for probationers, parolees, or pre-trial defendants and can be used in lieu of confinement.

**Employment Training/Job Assistance in the Community** – Employment and job training programs teach job preparedness and skills that are necessary for the workplace, such as effective job searches, applications, and resumes. Some programs may specifically address barriers to employment for convicted offenders.

**Inpatient/Intensive Drug Treatment (in Prison) (in the Community)**– This grouping of programs includes inpatient or intensive outpatient treatment delivered to inmates during incarceration or offenders supervised in the community. Represents programming completed both in prison and in the community.

**Mental Health Courts** – Mental health courts divert offenders with mental health issues from incarceration to community-based treatment. These courts utilize mental health assessments, individualized treatment plans, and judicial monitoring to address the mental health needs of offenders and public safety concerns.

**Offender Re-Entry Community Safety Program (dangerously mentally ill offenders)** – Program that identifies mentally ill inmates who pose a threat to public safety and provides them opportunities to receive mental health treatment and other services for several years after their release from prison.

**Outpatient/Non-Intensive Drug Treatment (in Prison) (in the Community)** – This broad category includes less intensive treatment modalities delivered to inmates during incarceration or offenders supervised in the community. These treatments are generally less intensive outpatient, group counseling, drug education, and relapse prevention. Represents programming completed both in prison and in the community.

**Sex Offender Treatment (in Prison) (in the Community)** – Therapeutic components for this broad group of studies include cognitive behavioral treatment, individual and group counseling, psychotherapy, behavioral therapy, and aversion therapy. Sex offender treatment for inmates in confinement is typically delivered in a separate therapeutic environment. While in the community, supervision is a key aspect of the treatment in these studies. Represents programming completed both in prison and in the community.

**Therapeutic Communities for Offenders with Co-Occurring Disorders** – Therapeutic communities are the most intensive form of substance abuse treatment. This meta-analysis included only therapeutic communities for inmates with co-occurring substance use and mental disorders. These residential living units are highly structured using a hierarchical model among peers. Inmates gain responsibility as they progress through the stages of treatment. Depending on the level of dependency and the program,

therapeutic communities for inmates in prison or offenders in the community with co-occurring disorders can range from 3 to 12 months.

**Work Release** – Work release programs are a form of partial confinement that enables certain inmates to serve all or a portion of their prison/jail sentence in a residential facility while employed in the community.

**Vocational Education in Prison** – Vocational education programs delivered in prison involve instruction for a specific trade, occupation, or vocation such as welding, auto repair, building maintenance, and graphic arts. The primary goal of vocational education is to help inmates develop marketable job skills upon release to the community. Certificates or college credit can be earned for some vocational programs.

## Next Steps for Wisconsin’s Results First Initiative

Following the completion of this initial adult criminal justice program inventory, which represents the first step to develop and implement Wisconsin’s Results First Initiative, the next task will be to complete a preliminary cost-benefit analysis (CBA) of Wisconsin’s adult criminal justice system. This early CBA should be considered preliminary for two distinct reasons. First, the initial results of the CBA will likely change over subsequent iterations as the data collection efforts are optimized and funding amounts change through future budget changes. Presently, much of the underlying Wisconsin-specific fiscal data is being compiled, with much of the information reflecting estimates rather than actual amounts. As the collection process improves and more information is made available, the calculated return on investment estimates will result in a closer approximation of reality. It is not expected that these estimates will vary wildly over subsequent CBA results, but it remains vital to be prepared for variation over time. Second, the CBA will only focus on a select number of primary programs provided by the DOC’s Division of Adult Institutions and Division of Community Corrections as well as by the Courts. The specific types of programs that will be included in the initial CBA are as follows:

### **DOC Division of Adult Institutions**

- Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse (AODA) Treatment
- Anger Management
- Cognitive-Behavioral Therapy
- Domestic Violence Treatment
- Sexual Offender Treatment

### **DOC Division of Community Corrections**

- Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse (AODA) Treatment
- Anger Management
- Cognitive-Behavioral Therapy
- Domestic Violence Treatment
- Sexual Offender Treatment

**Wisconsin Court System**

- Specialty Drug Courts / Treatment Alternatives and Diversion (TAD) Courts
- Specialty Mental Health Courts
- Specialty OWI/DUI Courts

These programs were selected for the initial CBA as they represent the core criminal justice programming offered in the State of Wisconsin. In addition, because some of the data collection efforts are still ongoing, program-specific data for each of these interventions will be the quickest and easiest to collect. Finally, a more streamlined version of the preliminary Results First CBA will allow for an easily digestible introduction to the cost-benefit output from the model. Later iterations of Wisconsin's Results First CBA reports will include a wider variety of programs included in the above program inventory as well as county- and local-level programming provided throughout the state.