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CYPM Research

It’s “messy” – integrating multiple agencies

- Multiple different “languages”
- Multiple philosophies
- Multiple datasets

Things to think about for:

1. Data Collection Efforts
2. Evaluation Components
3. Cost-Benefits Analysis
4. Potential Partnerships
Data Collection Efforts...Before You Start

• Leadership and team “buy-in” is essential

• Plan to get multiple outcomes of interest to team members & stakeholders
  ▪ E.g., priorities for justice, child welfare, and local/national stakeholders

• Make sure you have a firm understanding of:
  ▪ The target population for the jurisdiction
  ▪ The CYPM process that is in place in the jurisdiction
Data Collection Efforts...In the Weeds

• Data can be messy and frustrating
  ▪ Remember, you are doing important work – it’s worth the effort!
  ▪ Expect & plan for multiple meetings with team members/data coordinator to keep everyone on same page

• Need a data coordinator, or “point” person
  ▪ They should be:
    • Committed to the project
    • Knowledgeable of the data, AND
    • Available to answer your questions (within reason)
Suggested Evaluation Components

**Process evaluation**
- Is the target population being met?
- Are all components of the CYPM fully implemented? If not, what is lacking?
- Is the team doing what it set out to do? If not, why? What are the barriers?

**Interviews and/or surveys**
- With team members, leadership, and youth/families
- These can inform both process and outcome evaluations
Suggested Evaluation Components, con’t

**Outcome evaluation**
- Get feedback from key team members (or data coordinator) to help you understand the “meaning” of the findings
  - E.g., perhaps attorneys direct file on certain offenses, etc.

**Process + outcome evaluation = whole picture**
- Many times, the process-related information helps “fill in” what the numbers can’t tell you
Cost-Benefit Analysis

• Do this if you can – agencies and stakeholders really value this information!

• Some tips:
  - Aggregate or “mask” individual or agency data
    - E.g., agencies might not want to disclose individual salary or benefit costs
  - Estimate implementation costs as well as yearly administration costs
  - Decide upfront what costs and what benefits should “count”
Cost-Benefit Analysis

• Implementation costs = $59,752 (in 2016 dollar amounts)
  – Staffing/technical support; Data system enhancement

• Total annual cost of administering = $212,264
  – Salary/benefits for: County attorney, JAC, Probation, DHHS, BT, Court costs, NFSN, PH, NCFF

• Total annual benefits = $385,425
  – Savings of 4 FT probation officers ($237,925); $1,475 court costs per diverted youth (x100 = $147,500)

Annual Net Benefit = $173,161
## Cost-Benefit Analysis

### Annual Benefits and Costs of the Youth Impact! of Douglas County Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>County Attorney</th>
<th>Juvenile Assessment Center</th>
<th>Probation</th>
<th>DHHS</th>
<th>Boys Town</th>
<th>Court Costs</th>
<th>NFSN</th>
<th>Project Harmony</th>
<th>NCFF</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries/Benefits</td>
<td>$20,982</td>
<td>$80,133(^1)</td>
<td>$39,000(^2)</td>
<td>$31,733(^3)</td>
<td>$21,582(^4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$10,850(^5)</td>
<td>$1496(^6)</td>
<td>$2,480</td>
<td>$208,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies/Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$300.00(^7)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Costs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$2,200(^8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$598.00(^9)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$2798</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Benefits            |                |                          |           |      |           |             |      |                |      | $237,925|
| Salaries/Benefits    | 0              | 0                        | $237,925\(^10\) | 0    | 0         | 0           | 0    | 0              | 0    | 0     |
| Supplies/Services    | 0              | 0                        | 0         | 0    | 0         | 0           | 0    | 0              | 0    | 0     |
| Other Costs          | 0              | 0                        | 0         | 0    | 0         | 0           | 0    | 0              | 0    | $147,500|

| Total Benefit       | $20,892        | $83,333                   | $39,000   | $31,733 | $22,480   | 0           | $10,850 | $147,500       | 0    | $385,425 |
| Total Cost          | ($20,892)      | ($83,333)                 | $198,925  | ($31,733) | ($22,480) | 0           | $10,850 | ($147,500)     | 0    | $212,264 |
| Net Benefit         | ($20,892)      | ($83,333)                 | $198,925  | ($31,733) | ($22,480) | $147,500    | ($10,850) | ($1,496)      | ($2,480) | $173,161 |

\(^1\) \(2009\) \(2) \(2010\) \(3) \(2011\) \(4) \(2012\) \(5) \(2013\) \(6) \(2014\) \(7) \(2015\) \(8) \(2016\) \(9) \(2017\) \(10) \(2018\) \(11) \(2019\)
Conclusion of Cost-Benefit Analysis

Primary costs saved in probation and court costs

YI! diverted approx. 100 youth/year

YI! paid for itself in the first year of implementation

Very conservative estimate, doesn’t include: Victim costs; crime career costs; intangible costs

Saving a 14-yr old from “life of crime” saves approximately $2.9-$5.9 million dollars (Cohen & Piquero, 2009)
Cost-Benefit Analysis Resources

• Resource for calculating court costs: http://www.ibo.nyc.ny.us/iboreports/JJpath.pdf

• Resources for calculating broader societal costs of delinquency and crime:
  
  
  
  
  
Potential Partnerships

- County attorney’s office
- Juvenile diversion
- DHHS
- Probation
- Child welfare private providers
- Child advocacy center
- Service providers
Potential Partnerships

• To ensure sustainability, partnership work best when partners:
  ▪ Have something to offer the group...if you do not feel like you are contributing, enthusiasm fades
  ▪ Have authority/have a “say” in the process
  ▪ Have opportunities for learning and professional growth
Our Goals

Research & Evaluation → Feedback & Consultation

Feedback & Consultation → Better Practices

Better Practices → Enhanced Safety

Enhanced Safety → Improved CJS/JJS

"The purpose of evaluation is to improve, not prove." - D.L. Stufflebeam
Thank you!

Emily Wright: emwright@unomaha.edu
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