

## Case management (not "swift, certain, and fair") for drug-involved persons Adult Criminal Justice

Benefit-cost estimates updated December 2023. Literature review updated November 2016.

Current estimates replace old estimates. Numbers will change over time as a result of model inputs and monetization methods.

The WSIPP benefit-cost analysis examines, on an apples-to-apples basis, the monetary value of programs or policies to determine whether the benefits from the program exceed its costs. WSIPP's research approach to identifying evidence-based programs and policies has three main steps. First, we determine "what works" (and what does not work) to improve outcomes using a statistical technique called meta-analysis. Second, we calculate whether the benefits of a program exceed its costs. Third, we estimate the risk of investing in a program by testing the sensitivity of our results. For more detail on our methods, see our [Technical Documentation](#).

**Program Description:** In general, case management is a process that coordinates, and monitors services on behalf of a participant. The studies included in this meta-analysis evaluate a variety of case management approaches to community reentry and supervision for individuals involved in the criminal justice system who have histories of drug involvement. The primary goals of case management for this population are 1) to improve collaboration between correctional staff and substance abuse treatment staff and 2) to increase the individual's participation in substance abuse treatment.

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

This meta-analysis excludes case management studies focused on the "swift, certain, and fair" approach, which were analyzed separately.

### Benefit-Cost Summary Statistics Per Participant

#### Benefits to:

|                            |                |                                 |         |
|----------------------------|----------------|---------------------------------|---------|
| Taxpayers                  | \$1,844        | Benefit to cost ratio           | \$16.29 |
| Participants               | \$418          | Benefits minus costs            | \$6,943 |
| Others                     | \$2,885        | Chance the program will produce |         |
| Indirect                   | \$2,251        | benefits greater than the costs | 58%     |
| <b>Total benefits</b>      | <b>\$7,397</b> |                                 |         |
| <b>Net program cost</b>    | <b>(\$454)</b> |                                 |         |
| <b>Benefits minus cost</b> | <b>\$6,943</b> |                                 |         |

The estimates shown are present value, life cycle benefits and costs. All dollars are expressed in the base year chosen for this analysis (2022). The chance the benefits exceed the costs are derived from a Monte Carlo risk analysis. The details on this, as well as the economic discount rates and other relevant parameters are described in our [Technical Documentation](#).

## Meta-Analysis of Program Effects

| Outcomes measured                   | Treatment age | No. of effect sizes | Treatment N | Adjusted effect sizes and standard errors used in the benefit-cost analysis |       |     |                             |       |     | Unadjusted effect size (random effects model) |         |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|---|-------|-----|-----------------------------|-------|-----|---|---------|
|                                     |               |                     |             | First time ES is estimated  |       |     | Second time ES is estimated |       |     | ES  | p-value |
|                                     |               |                     |             | ES  | SE    | Age | ES                          | SE    | Age |   |         |
| Crime                               | 33            | 19                  | 3624        | -0.047  | 0.051 | 35  | -0.047                      | 0.051 | 45  | -0.075  | 0.163   |
| Illicit drug use <sup>^</sup>       | 33            | 2                   | 448         | 0.096   | 0.090 | 33  | n/a                         | n/a   | n/a | 0.096   | 0.288   |
| Illicit drug use disorder           | 33            | 9                   | 1175        | -0.238  | 0.091 | 33  | 0.000                       | 0.187 | 35  | -0.246  | 0.011   |
| Substance use <sup>^</sup>          | 33            | 4                   | 795         | -0.104  | 0.104 | 33  | n/a                         | n/a   | n/a | -0.104  | 0.320   |
| Substance use disorder <sup>^</sup> | 33            | 1                   | 224         | -0.030  | 0.132 | 33  | n/a                         | n/a   | n/a | -0.030  | 0.823   |
| Employment <sup>^^</sup>            | 33            | 4                   | 616         | -0.132  | 0.141 | 33  | n/a                         | n/a   | n/a | -0.136  | 0.395   |
| Technical violations <sup>^^</sup>  | 33            | 7                   | 1282        | 0.108   | 0.133 | 34  | n/a                         | n/a   | n/a | 0.136   | 0.322   |

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

<sup>^^</sup>WSIPP does not include this outcome when conducting benefit-cost analysis for this program.

Meta-analysis is a statistical method to combine the results from separate studies on a program, policy, or topic in order to estimate its effect on an outcome. WSIPP systematically evaluates all credible evaluations we can locate on each topic. The outcomes measured are the types of program impacts that were measured in the research literature (for example, crime or educational attainment). Treatment N represents the total number of individuals or units in the treatment group across the included studies.

An effect size (ES) is a standard metric that summarizes the degree to which a program or policy affects a measured outcome. If the effect size is positive, the outcome increases. If the effect size is negative, the outcome decreases.

Adjusted effect sizes are used to calculate the benefits from our benefit cost model. WSIPP may adjust effect sizes based on methodological characteristics of the study. For example, we may adjust effect sizes when a study has a weak research design or when the program developer is involved in the research. The magnitude of these adjustments varies depending on the topic area.

WSIPP may also adjust the second ES measurement. Research shows the magnitude of some effect sizes decrease over time. For those effect sizes, we estimate outcome-based adjustments which we apply between the first time ES is estimated and the second time ES is estimated. We also report the unadjusted effect size to show the effect sizes before any adjustments have been made. More details about these adjustments can be found in our [Technical Documentation](#).

## Detailed Monetary Benefit Estimates Per Participant

| Affected outcome:         | Resulting benefits: <sup>1</sup>                                       | Benefits accrue to: |              |                     |                       |                |
|---------------------------|--|---------------------|--------------|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------|
|                           |  | Taxpayers           | Participants | Others <sup>2</sup> | Indirect <sup>3</sup> | Total          |
| Crime                     | Criminal justice system  | \$1,324             | \$0          | \$2,508             | \$662                 | \$4,494        |
| Illicit drug use disorder | Labor market earnings associated with illicit drug abuse or dependence | \$124               | \$292        | \$0                 | \$0                   | \$416          |
| Illicit drug use disorder | Health care associated with illicit drug abuse or dependence           | \$366               | \$57         | \$376               | \$183                 | \$983          |
| Illicit drug use disorder | Mortality associated with illicit drugs                                | \$29                | \$69         | \$0                 | \$1,633               | \$1,731        |
| Program cost              | Adjustment for deadweight cost of program                              | \$0                 | \$0          | \$0                 | (\$227)               | (\$227)        |
| <b>Totals</b>             |  | <b>\$1,844</b>      | <b>\$418</b> | <b>\$2,885</b>      | <b>\$2,251</b>        | <b>\$7,397</b> |

<sup>1</sup>In addition to the outcomes measured in the meta-analysis table, WSIPP measures benefits and costs estimated from other outcomes associated with those reported in the evaluation literature. For example, empirical research demonstrates that high school graduation leads to reduced crime. These associated measures provide a more complete picture of the detailed costs and benefits of the program.

<sup>2</sup>"Others" includes benefits to people other than taxpayers and participants. Depending on the program, it could include reductions in crime victimization, the economic benefits from a more educated workforce, and the benefits from employer-paid health insurance.

<sup>3</sup>"Indirect benefits" includes estimates of the net changes in the value of a statistical life and net changes in the deadweight costs of taxation.


## Detailed Annual Cost Estimates Per Participant

|                  | Annual cost | Year dollars | Summary  |         |
|------------------|-------------|--------------|--|---------|
| Program costs    | \$4,738     | 2016         | Present value of net program costs (in 2022 dollars) | (\$454) |
| Comparison costs | \$4,353     | 2016         | Cost range (+ or -)                                  | 10%     |

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


The figures shown are estimates of the costs to implement programs in Washington. The comparison group costs reflect either no treatment or treatment as usual, depending on how effect sizes were calculated in the meta-analysis. The cost range reported above reflects potential variation or uncertainty in the cost estimate; more detail can be found in our [Technical Documentation](#).

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




The graph above illustrates the estimated cumulative net benefits per-participant for the first fifty years beyond the initial investment in the program. We present these cash flows in discounted dollars. If the dollars are negative (bars below \$0 line), the cumulative benefits do not outweigh the cost of the program up to that point in time. The program breaks even when the dollars reach \$0. At this point, the total benefits to participants, taxpayers, and others, are equal to the cost of the program. If the dollars are above \$0, the benefits of the program exceed the initial investment.

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



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



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

## Citations Used in the Meta-Analysis

- Alemi, F., Taxman, F., Baghi, H., Vang, J., Thanner, M., & Doyon, V. (2006). Costs and benefits of combining probation and substance abuse treatment. *The Journal of Mental Health Policy and Economics*, 9(2), 57-70.
- Anglin, M.D., Longshore, D., & Turner, S. (1999). Treatment alternatives to street crime: An evaluation of five programs. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 26(2), 168-195.
- California Department of Corrections. (1996). *Parolee Partnership Program: A parole outcome evaluation*. Sacramento: California Department of Corrections; Evaluation, Compliance, and Information Systems Division; Research Branch.
- Chan, M., Guydish, J., Prem, R., Jessup, M.A., Cervantes, A., & Bostrom, A. (2005). Evaluation of probation case management (PCM) for drug-involved women offenders. *Crime & Delinquency*, 51(4).
- Friedmann, P.D., Green, T.C., Taxman, F.S., Harrington, M., Rhodes, A.G., Katz, E., O'Connell, D., ... Step'n Out Research Group of CJ-DATS. (2012). Collaborative behavioral management among parolees: drug use, crime and re-arrest in the Step'n Out randomized trial. *Addiction*, 107(6), 1099-108.
- Guydish, J., Chan, M., Bostrom, A., Jessup, M.A., Davis, T.B., & Marsh, C. (2011). A randomized trial of probation case management for drug-involved women offenders. *Crime and Delinquency*, 57(2), 167-198.
- Hanlon, T.E., Nurco, D.N., Bateman, R.W., & O'Grady, K.E. (1999). The relative effects of three approaches to the parole supervision of narcotic addicts and cocaine abusers. *The Prison Journal*, 79(2), 163-181.
- Johnson, J.E., Friedmann, P.D., Green, T.C., Harrington, M., & Taxman, F.S. (2011). Gender and treatment response in substance use treatment-mandated parolees. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, 4(3), 313-321.
- Longshore, D., Turner, S., & Fain, T. (2005) Effects of case management on parolee misconduct. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 32(2), 205-222.
- Martin, S.S., & Scarpitti, F.R. (1993). An intensive case management approach for paroled iv drug users. *Journal of Drug Issues*, 23(1), 43-59.
- Owens, S.J., Klebe, K.J., Arens, S.A., Durham, R.L., Hughes, J., Moor, C.J., ... & Stommel, J. (1998). The Effectiveness of Colorado's TASC Programs. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 26(1-2), 161-176.
- Prendergast, M., Frisman, L., Sacks, J. Y., Staton-Tindall, M., Greenwell, L., Lin, H. J., & Cartier, J. (2011). A multi-site, randomized study of strengths-based case management with substance-abusing parolees. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 7(3), 225- 253.
- Rhodes, W., & Gross, M. (1997). *Case management reduces drug use and criminality among drug-involved arrestees: An experimental study of an HIV prevention intervention*. US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice.

Rossman, S., Sridharan, S., Gouvis, C., Buck, J., Morley, E. (1999). *Impact of the Opportunity to Succeed (OPTS) aftercare program for substance-abusing felons: Comprehensive final report*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

Scott, C.K., & Dennis, M.L. (2012). The first 90 days following release from jail: Findings from the Recovery Management Checkups for Women Offenders (RMCWO) experiment. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, 125, 110-118.

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

Printed on 03-20-2024



## Washington State Institute for Public Policy

The Washington State Legislature created the Washington State Institute for Public Policy in 1983. A Board of Directors—representing the legislature, the governor, and public universities—governs WSIPP and guides the development of all activities. WSIPP's mission is to carry out practical research, at legislative direction, on issues of importance to Washington State.