



Itasca County Wellness Court Evaluation

AUGUST 2015

Prepared by:
Laura Schauben

Contents

Introduction.....	1
Process and outcome evaluation	2
Methodology	2
Participants and program participation	2
Program outcomes	7
Return on Investment results	10
Economic benefits of the Itasca County Wellness Court.....	11
Program costs and resources	11
Conclusion	12
Process and outcome evaluation	12
ROI estimates.....	12
Appendix.....	14
Outcome evaluation: Description of participants and program participation by intake year.	15
ROI methods and estimations by outcomes.....	19
ROI references	25

Figures

1. Intakes, exits, and total served	2
2. Characteristics at intake of all participants served.....	3
3. Education, employment and housing	4
4. Participants substance use and level of service needs at intake	5
5. Program participation.....	6
6. Outcomes for clients who graduated or terminated between July 1, 2013 and June 30, 2015.....	8
7. Return on investment of Wellness Court Itasca County	10
8. Economic benefits of the Itasca County Wellness Court.....	11
A1. Only participants with intakes during FY: Characteristics at intake	15
A2. Education, employment and housing	16
A3. Only participants with intake during FY: substance use and level of service needs at intake.....	17
A4. Only participants with intake during FY: Program participation	18
B1. Incarceration costs.....	19
B2. Jail statistics Wellness Court graduates (N=54)	19
B3. Incarceration costs avoided from reduced original sentence	19
B4. Recidivism of Wellness Court participants.....	20
B5. Logistic regression: recidivism	20
B6. Incarceration costs avoided from reduced recidivism	21
B7. Full time employment of Wellness Court participants	21
B8. Logistic regression: employment	22
B9. Increased personal income and tax revenues	22
B10. Total and per diem costs of jail (Itasca County)	23
B11. Effective tax rates.....	23
B12. Consumer price index	24

Introduction

The Itasca County Wellness Court (Wellness Court) began in April 2007 as a post-conviction specialty court which provides for a non-adversarial community-based approach to treat members with drug dependence violations of the law. The Wellness Court operates through Itasca County and the Leech Lake Tribal Court (LLTC), via a Joint Powers Agreement which allows tribal and district court judges to jointly preside over Wellness Court hearings and more effectively administer justice.

The Wellness Court targets those individuals charged with felony drug possession in the 3rd, 4th, or 5th degree, felony DWI, or gross misdemeanor DWI in the 2nd or 3rd degree that are alcohol/ substance dependent, and specific efforts are made to reach Native Americans. All participants must reside in Itasca County, voluntarily commit to participate, be deemed chemically dependent by a clinical assessment (Rule-25), and not a violent offender as defined by Federal Law (28 C.F.R. 93.3(d)).

The mission of the Itasca County Wellness Court is to unite judiciary, criminal justice entities, substance abuse treatment providers, and the community to support the long-term recovery of Wellness Court participants and, thereby, restore participants to law-abiding productivity; reduce drug use of non-violent drug-addicted participants; enhance public safety; reduce the financial impact on society; and change behaviors. The goals of the Itasca County Wellness Court are to reduce costs associated with chemical use and criminal behavior, reduce criminal behavior and recidivism, enhance public safety, and enhance the well-being of participants.

In 2013, with funding from Minnesota Department of Human Services' Alcohol and Drug Abuse Division (ADAD), Itasca County Wellness Court contracted with Wilder Research to conduct a two-year evaluation of its impact.

This report covers the findings from the outcome evaluation and Return-on-Investment analysis conducted as part of this evaluation. Specifically, this report summarizes the characteristics of the 63 participants served by the Wellness Court from July 1, 2013 through June 30, 2015, and the impact that the Wellness Court has had on the 32 participants who were discharged during this period. In addition, the methodology and results of a Return-on-Investment analysis conducted on Wellness Court program data from 2007 to 2014 is included.

Process and outcome evaluation

Methodology

Itasca County staff were responsible for collecting and tracking all process, outcome, and financial data for this evaluation, including client demographic information, Level of Service Inventory-Revised (LSI-R) and Level of Service-Case Management Inventory (LS-CMI) scores, employment and education status changes, and drug screening results, as well as dates of key events related to the judicial process and programming. Wilder Research conducted the analysis of the process and outcome data and created this evaluation report.

The process and outcome evaluation includes information on the characteristics and program participation of the 63 individuals served by the Wellness Court from July 1, 2013 through June 30, 2015, as well as the outcomes for the 32 participants who were discharged during this period (Figure 1).

1. Intakes, exits, and total served

Point of entry into Wellness Court	Intakes	Exits	Service recipients
FY14 (July, 2013 - June, 2014)	20	17	43
FY15 (July, 2014 - June, 2015)	18	15	46
FY14-FY15 (July, 2013 - June, 2015)	38	32	63

Participants and program participation

Participant characteristics

This section describes the 63 clients who received services in the Wellness Court between July 1, 2013 and June 30, 2015 at intake (Figure 2). (Similar information on only those clients who were accepted into the Court during this period can be found in the Appendix (Figures A1-A4))

During this period, over half (54%) of the participants were women. All of the clients identified as either White (79%), American Indian or Alaskan Native (18%), or Hispanic or Latino (3%). Clients were, on average, 32 years old. The median age was 28 and the range 19 to 63. Six percent of clients were military veterans.

2. Characteristics at intake of all participants served

	FY14 (N=46)	FY 15 (N=46)	FY14-15 (N=63)
Gender			
Female	57%	50%	54%
Male	44%	50%	46%
Missing	0%	0%	0%
Race			
White	85%	78%	79%
American Indian/Alaskan Native	15%	17%	18%
Latino/Hispanic	0%	4%	3%
Black/African American	0%	0%	0%
Asian/Pacific Islander	0%	0%	0%
Missing	0%	0%	0%
Age at acceptance into Wellness Court			
19-29	61%	57%	57%
30-39	13%	15%	16%
40-49	13%	20%	16%
50 or older	13%	9%	11%
Missing	0%	0%	0%
Mean age	32 yrs.	32 yrs.	32 yrs.
Median age	27 yrs.	28 yrs.	28 yrs.
Range	19-63 yrs.	20-58 yrs.	19-63 yrs.
Military veteran	7%	7%	6%

Note: FY14 is from July 1, 2013 through June 30, 2014. FY15 is from July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015. FY14-15 is from July 1, 2013 through June 30, 2015. Category total may vary from 100% due to rounding.

In regard to employment and education, clients had either a GED or high school diploma comprised 79 percent of the group, and included 35 percent who had completed at least some college coursework (Figure 3). Twenty-one percent of clients were employed part-time or full-time. Slightly over 30 percent had valid driver’s license. As to housing, the majority of participants lived in temporary housing (49%), followed by renting or owning their own home (44%), and living in a facility (6%).

3. Education, employment and housing

	FY14 (N=46)	FY 15 (N=46)	FY14-15 (N=63)
Highest level of education			
Less than a GED/high school diploma	20%	17%	20%
GED/high school diploma	44%	48%	44%
Some college or advanced degree	35%	33%	35%
Missing	2%	2%	2%
Current employment status			
	(N=45*)	(N=45*)	(N=62*)
Full or part time employment	22%	24%	21%
Unemployed	78%	76%	79%
Missing	0%	0%	0%
Housing situation			
In facility	7%	7%	6%
Own or rent home	41%	46%	44%
Temporary/transient housing	52%	48%	49%
Missing	0%	0%	0%
Has valid driver’s license			
	35%	30%	32%

Note: FY14 is from July 1, 2013 through June 30, 2014. FY15 is from July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015. FY14-15 is from July 1, 2013 through June 30, 2015. Category total may vary from 100% due to rounding.

* N varies for current employment as the category was deemed “not applicable” by one individual.

All participants had a chemical health assessment and were determined to be chemically dependent at the time of intake (Figure 4). The most common substances used in the previous year included alcohol (73%), methamphetamines (65%), and marijuana (90%). In addition, over half of participants had misused prescription drugs (56%). Based on the LS-CMI, 59 percent of clients had high or very high need and an additional 24 percent medium/high need.

4. Participants substance use and level of service needs at intake

	FY14 (N=43)	FY 15 (N=46)	FY14-15 (N=63)
Rule 25 Chemical Health assessment results			
Dependent	100%	100%	100%
Specific substance(s) used in the previous year (multiple responses possible)			
Alcohol	70%	72%	73%
Methamphetamines	59%	67%	65%
Prescription drugs	59%	57%	56%
Marijuana	52%	70%	60%
Heroin	24%	26%	24%
Cocaine/Crack	11%	7%	10%
Inhalants	2%	2%	2%
Other*	35%	28%	32%
Level of Service Needs/Risk of recidivism level (from LS-CMI)			
	(n=37)**	(n=44)**	(n=54)**
Low/Moderate or Moderate	16%	20%	17%
Medium/High	14%	25%	24%
High or Very High	70%	55%	59%

Note: FY14 is from July 1, 2013 through June 30, 2014. FY15 is from July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015. FY14-15 is from July 1, 2013 through June 30, 2015.

*"Other" responses include synthetic drugs, hallucinogens, barbiturates, and methadone/suboxone.

**Some participants completed a previous version of the instrument, the LSI-R, and are not included in the analysis.

Of the 43 clients, 46 percent entered Wellness Court post-adjudicatory, 30 percent due to a probation violation and 24 percent due to a probation violation with a new offense (Figure 5). All clients were participating in the Wellness Court for the first time. As of June 30th, 2015, 49 percent were still participating in Wellness Court, 24 percent had graduated, and 27 percent had been terminated.

Of the 41 participants who entered the Wellness Court between July 1, 2013 and June 30, 2015, the average time between conviction for the crime that led to entry in the Wellness Court and appearance in the Wellness Court is 12 days, with a median of 4 days and a range from 1 to 93 days.

5. Program participation

Point of entry into Wellness Court	FY14 (N=43)	FY 15 (N=46)	FY14-15 (N=63)
Post adjudicatory	46%	48%	46%
Probation violation	30%	30%	30%
Probation violation with a new offense	24%	22%	24%
First time admission into Wellness Court	100%	100%	100%
Wellness Court status as of June 30, 2015			
Active	37%	67%	49%
Graduated	33%	13%	24%
Terminated	30%	20%	27%
Days between conviction in traditional court and appearance in Wellness Court			
	(N=22)*	(N=18)*	(N=40)*
7 days or less	59%	61%	60%
8 – 14 days	18%	28%	23%
15 – 21 days	5%	0%	3%
Over 21 days	18%	11%	15%
Mean	12 days	11 days	12 days
Median	4 days	4 days	4 days
Range	1 – 53 days	1 – 93 days	1 – 93 days

Note: FY14 is from July 1, 2013 through June 30, 2014. FY15 is from July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015. FY14-15 is from July 1, 2013 through June 30, 2015.

* Only participants with intakes during the given funding year were included in this component of the analyses.

Program outcomes

Outcomes were assessed for the 32 Wellness Court participants that were discharged from the Court between July 1, 2013 and June 30, 2015. Analyses were conducted on all participants that were discharged, as well as on these individuals grouped by whether they successfully graduated or were terminated. Given the small sample sizes, results for each funding year are not provided.

Key findings from the analysis of data on clients discharged between July 1, 2013 and June 30, 2015 include (Figure 5):

- The percentage of participants with stable housing increased from 50 percent at intake to 75 percent at discharge, including 87 percent of successful graduates.
- 72 percent of clients had a valid driver's license at discharge, up from 34 percent at intake. Considering successful graduates only, 80 percent had a valid license at exit.
- 77 percent of the clients at discharge had full-time or part time employment compared to 26 percent at intake, including 86 percent of the successful graduates.
- 14 percent of all discharge clients who completed the same version of the LSI at intake and exit had an intake score in the low or moderate range. At exit, 55 percent of all discharged clients did, including all of the successful graduates.
- 47 percent of all clients who were discharged had 90 days or more of sobriety. All of the successful graduates and none of the clients who were terminated had 90 days or more of sobriety, a statistically significant difference. Successful graduates had, on average, 663 days of sobriety.

6. Outcomes for clients who graduated or terminated between July 1, 2013 and June 30, 2015

Intake to discharge comparisons	At intake	At exit
Stable housing		
FY14-15 All (N=32)	50%	75%
FY14-15 Graduated only (n=15)	47%	87%
FY14-15 Terminated only (n=17)	53%	65%
Valid driver's license		
FY14-15 All (N=32)**	34%	72%
FY14-15 Graduated only (n=15)	27%	80%
FY14-15 Terminated only (n=17)	41%	65%
Employed or in school full-time		
FY14-15 All (N=32)	26%	77%
FY14-15 Graduated only (n=15)	21%	86%
FY14-15 Terminated only (n=17)	29%	71%
Low or moderate risk of recidivism level		
FY14-15 All (N=22)	14%	55%
FY14-15 Graduated only (n=10)	19%	100%
FY14-15 Terminated only (n=12)	17%	17%
At least 90 days sobriety***		
FY14-15 All (N=32)	N/A	47%
FY14-15 Graduated only (n=15)	N/A	100%
FY14-15 Terminated only (n=17)	N/A	0%

Note: * signifies $p < .05$, ** signifies $p < .01$, *** signifies $p < .001$. The tool to assess risk was changed during program implementation from the LSI-R to the LS-CMI which limited the number of discharged participants on which comparisons of risk level could be made.

This page intentionally left
blank

Return on Investment results

Some of the outcomes of the Wellness Court program summarized throughout this report have economic consequences for society. These consequences include costs and benefits accrued by taxpayers, participants, and other agents in society. For example, graduates from the program spend only a fraction of days incarcerated compared to their original sentences. The avoided days in jail/prison represent savings to the judicial system. In addition, program graduates are less likely to re-offend and be incarcerated after they leave the program than terminated participants, generating additional savings. Successful participants are also more likely to find full-time employment and pay taxes from their additional personal income. The total economic value of these positive outcomes for the graduates of the Wellness Court at Itasca County between 2007 and 2014 is \$2,078,031. The cost of operating the program during this period is \$1.2 million. Subtracting costs from benefits results in a net benefit of \$857,924, and a return of 1.70 dollars for every dollar invested in the program (Figure 7). Extensive details about the calculation of the ROI can be found in the Appendix (Figures B1-B12).

7. Return on investment of Wellness Court Itasca County

Total benefits	\$2,078,031
Program costs	\$1,220,108
Net benefit (benefits minus costs)	\$857,924
Return on investment to society	\$1.70

Out of the \$2 million in benefits to society, \$1.8 is received by taxpayers in the form of avoided incarceration costs and tax revenues. Since the program costs are accrued solely by taxpayers, the resulting ROI from the perspective of the government is 1.45 dollars for every dollar invested in the Wellness Court program.

Benefits and costs were computed using participant and program data for the period 2007-2014. Cost of local resources (e.g. per diem jail costs and program costs) was provided by Wellness Court program leaders and Itasca County administrators. Detailed methods and data sources are described in the last part of this section.

Economic benefits of the Itasca County Wellness Court

The ROI includes benefits from three main outcomes: avoided incarceration costs from reduced original sentence, savings from reduced recidivism, and benefits from increased employment (increased personal income and additional tax revenues) (Figure 8).

8. Economic benefits of the Itasca County Wellness Court

Avoided incarceration costs from reduced original sentence	\$964,745
Avoided incarceration costs from reduced recidivism	\$790,268
Additional personal income from increased employment	\$307,837
Additional tax revenues from increased income	\$15,182
Total benefits	\$2,078,031

The main source of benefit is the days of incarceration avoided by Wellness Court graduates. Wellness Court sentences are on average 181 days shorter than the required jail time from original sentences. In total, graduates avoided at least 8,084 days in jail during the period studied; multiplying these days by the per-diem cost of jail of \$119.34 results in savings of \$964,745.

The odds of reoffending (and conviction) of a Wellness Court graduate are only 0.6 times the odds of terminated participants. This reduced likelihood of reoffending translates into an estimated 28 fewer crimes committed by Wellness Court graduates. Given the average sentence and the severity of the crimes of Wellness Court participants, the avoided incarceration costs of these crimes are estimated to total \$790,268.

Graduates are 34 percent more likely to be employed full time than terminated participants. A conservative estimate of the total income of these employed graduates, using only the current minimum wage rate, leads to personal earnings totaling \$307,837. The tax revenues associated with this income reaches \$15,182.

Program costs and resources

The total cost of the Wellness Court program during the eight years of operation analyzed was \$1,220,218. This amount includes direct operational costs (\$817,802) and indirect and in-kind costs (\$402,306). The indirect costs represent costs that are not included in the program's budget but represent resources employed, such as judges' time, referred services, and other non-paid staff time.

Conclusion

Process and outcome evaluation

The process evaluation results suggest that the Wellness Court is serving participants with significant needs related to chemical health, housing, and employment. Participants' LS-CMI scores at intake support this conclusion, with 59 percent of participants having scores indicating high or very high need and an additional 24 percent having scores indicating medium/high need.

In regard to the impact of the Wellness Court, successful graduates are exiting the program with an average of 663 days of sobriety. In addition, all of the program graduates had low to moderate service needs when they left the program, as measured by the LS-CMI completed at client discharge. In addition, the majority of program graduates have stable housing and paid employment. Some of the clients who were terminated from the program also experienced program benefits, the most common of which was obtaining paid employment.

ROI estimates

The ROI estimation based on data from the program from 2007 through 2014 estimates a return of 1.70 dollars for every dollar invested in the Itasca County Wellness Court. Not all the economic benefits of the Wellness Court program are included in this ROI estimation. There may be additional benefits derived indirectly from programs where participants are referred. For example, participants who are referred to third party programs to deal with substance abuse may generate positive outcomes derived from reduced drug use, including increased educational achievement and reduced health care costs and mortality. In addition, we do not include savings accrued by victims of avoided crimes, mainly due to the fact that the majority of the offenses were drug possession crimes, which have small direct victimization impacts. However, some of the crimes committed by Wellness Court participants may have affected other private individuals causing material and psychological losses. By preventing future crimes, Wellness Court is also saving potential victims of these crimes from the associated costs. Furthermore, this ROI is based on short-term benefits that occurred during the time of participation in the program. But, it is reasonable to assume that at least some of the positive impact of the program will last beyond the time of participation. For example, graduates may retain full-

time employment for many months or years after leaving the program¹. Also, participants may commit fewer crimes in the future than they would have committed otherwise, adding more avoided costs to the sum of future benefits. For these reasons, the ROI results are conservative and only represent the minimum returns that the program can achieve.

ROI analysis can be used as an objective way to make allocation decisions among alternative interventions under scarce resources. The return on investing in the Wellness Court program are positive and show that allocating resources to this initiative makes economic sense for society and specifically to taxpayers.

¹ To fully capture the total long-term benefits of the program, a data collection strategy can be devised to follow participants beyond participation. Primary data could be collected from government agencies after following all the data privacy and administrative procedures.

Appendix

Outcome evaluation: Description of participants and program participation by intake year

ROI methods and estimations by outcomes

ROI references

Outcome evaluation: Description of participants and program participation by intake year.

A1. Only participants with intakes during FY: Characteristics at intake

	FY14 (N=20)	FY 15 (N=18)	FY14-15 (N=38)
Gender			
Female	60%	50%	55%
Male	40%	50%	45%
Missing	0%	0%	0%
Race			
White	85%	67%	76%
American Indian/Alaskan Native	15%	22%	18%
Latino/Hispanic	0%	11%	5%
Black/African American	0%	0%	0%
Asian/Pacific Islander	0%	0%	0%
Missing	0%	0%	0%
Age at acceptance into Wellness Court			
19-29	60%	44%	53%
30-39	15%	22%	18%
40-49	20%	28%	24%
50 or older	5%	6%	5%
Missing	0%	0%	0%
Mean age	31 yrs.	33 yrs.	32 yrs.
Median age	26 yrs.	32 yrs.	28 yrs.
Range	20-50 yrs.	20-54 yrs.	20-54 yrs.
Military veteran	5%	6%	5%

A2. Education, employment and housing

	FY14 (N=20)	FY 15 (N=18)	FY14-15 (N=38)
Highest level of education			
Less than a GED/high school diploma	15%	17%	16%
GED/high school diploma	55%	50%	53%
Some college or advanced degree	25%	33%	29%
Missing	5%	0%	3%
Current employment status			
Full or part time employment	20%	22%	21%
Unemployed	70%	78%	79%
Missing	0%	0%	0%
Housing situation			
In facility	0%	6%	3%
Own or rent home	35%	56%	45%
Temporary/transient housing	65%	39%	53%
Missing	0%	0%	0%
Has valid driver's license	35%	22%	29%

Note: FY14 is from July 1, 2013 through June 30, 2014. FY15 is from July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015. FY14-15 is from July 1, 2013 through June 30, 2015. Category total may vary from 100% due to rounding.

A3. Only participants with intake during FY: substance use and level of service needs at intake

	FY14 (N=20)	FY 15 (N=18)	FY14-15 (N=38)
Rule 25 Chemical Health assessment results			
Dependent	100%	100%	100%
Specific substance(s) used in the previous year (multiple responses possible)			
Alcohol	50%	83%	66%
Methamphetamines	70%	78%	74%
Prescription drugs	75%	44%	61%
Marijuana	60%	78%	68%
Heroin	35%	22%	29%
Cocaine/Crack	0%	6%	3%
Inhalants	5%	0%	3%
Other*	35%	22%	29%
Level of Service Needs/Risk of recidivism level (from LS-CMI)			
	(n=19**)	(n=18)	(n=37**)
Low/Moderate or Moderate	26%	17%	22%
Medium/High	11%	50%	30%
High or Very High	63%	33%	49%

Note: FY14 is from July 1, 2013 through June 30, 2014. FY15 is from July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015. FY14-15 is from July 1, 2013 through June 30, 2015.

*Other" responses include synthetic drugs, hallucinogens, barbiturates, and methadone/suboxone.

**Some participants completed a previous version of the instrument, the LSI-R, and are not included in the analysis.

A4. Only participants with intake during FY: Program participation

Point of entry into Wellness Court	FY14 (N=20)	FY 15 (N=18)	FY14-15 (N=38)
Post adjudicatory	55%	44%	50%
Probation violation	20%	33%	26%
Probation violation with a new offense	25%	22%	24%
First time admission into Wellness Court	100%	100%	100%
Wellness Court status as of June 30, 2015			
Active	65%	83%	74%
Graduated	10%	0%	5%
Terminated	25%	17%	21%

Note: FY14 is from July 1, 2013 through June 30, 2014. FY15 is from July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015. FY14-15 is from July 1, 2013 through June 30, 2015.

ROI methods and estimations by outcomes

Benefits and costs estimations by outcomes

Incarceration costs avoided from reduced original sentence

The average original sentence of graduates is 277 days, but the average actual days incarcerated (usually the “good time” required) is 185. The average Wellness Court sentence is only four days, for an average reduction in sentence of 181 days.

The total number of days in jail that graduates would have to serve according to their original sentence is 8,315. The actual time spent incarcerated for these group is 231 days, for a total of 8,084 days of jail that are avoided. Multiplying these days by the per-diem cost of jail of \$119.34 results in savings of \$964,745, for an average saving per participant of \$21,618, (Figures 9-11).

B1. Incarceration costs

Itasca County jail total annual operating cost	\$3,600,000
Itasca County jail per diem cost per day	\$119.34

B2. Jail statistics Wellness Court graduates (N=54)

Variable	Mean	Standard Dev.	Min	Max
Criminal jail time sentence (days)	277	410.3	30	1620
Good time required	185	273.5	20	1080
Wellness Court jail time	4	10.7	0	44

B3. Incarceration costs avoided from reduced original sentence

Sum of original sentence times (days)	8,315
Sum of Wellness Court sentences (days)	231
Total days of jail avoided	8,084
Total savings from reduced sentences	\$964,745
Average savings per participant	\$21,618

Incarceration costs avoided from reduced recidivism

Savings from reduced recidivism are computed using estimated likelihood of reoffending computed using a logistic regression based on re-offense data from participants (Figure 12). Detailed estimation steps for savings are summarized in figure H.

B4. Recidivism of Wellness Court participants

	Re-offended	
	Yes	No
Terminated (n=17)	24%	76%
Graduated (n=71)	56%	44%*

*Difference is statistically significant at the 5% level of confidence.

B5. Logistic regression: recidivism

	Odds Ratio	Std. Err.	z	P>z	[95% Conf. Interval]
Graduated	0.059	0.096	-1.740	0.082	0.002 1.430
Distance	1.055	0.026	2.150	0.032	1.005 1.107
Constant	0.325	0.374	-0.980	0.328	0.034 3.090
Model statistics					
Number of obs. 88					
LR chi2(2) = 107.9					
Prob > chi2 = 0					
Log likelihood = -7.0490785					
Pseudo R2 = 0.8844					
Dependent variable: reoffended					
Distance: days between termination/graduation and re-offense					

Odds ratio interpretation: For graduates of Wellness Court, the odds of reoffending are 0.6 times as large as the odds of reoffending of a terminated participant. This coefficient is significant at the 10% level, as indicated by the probability of the z-statistics of being greater than the critical value of 0.082. That is, graduates are significantly less likely to reoffend than terminated participants.

B6. Incarceration costs avoided from reduced recidivism

(1) Proportion of serious re-offenses among re-offenders (require minimum sentence of a year)	0.30
(2) Estimated number of graduates who reoffended (based on odds ratio from logistic regression = No. graduates x % of reoffenders among terminated x Odds ratio of re-offence of graduates)	3
(3) Estimated number of graduates who would have reoffended (based on observed recidivism of terminated = % of reoffended among graduates x Number of graduates)	31
(4) Number of avoided offenses (No. of graduates who reoffended x % of graduates with re-offenses x No. of graduates)	-28
(5) Savings from avoided serious crime: $(0.3) \times (-28) \times (\$113, \text{Per diem cost of jail}) \times (365)$	(357,749)
(6) Savings from average offenses avoided: $(1 - 0.30) \times (-28) \times (\$113, \text{Per diem cost of jail}) \times (185, \text{average good time required})$	(432,520)
(7) Total savings: (5)+(6)	(790,268)

B7. Full time employment of Wellness Court participants

	Employed full time	
	No	Yes
Terminated (n=43)	77%	23%
Graduated (n=54)	57%*	43%

*Difference is statistically significant at the 5% level of confidence.

B8. Logistic regression: employment

	Odds Ratio	Std. Err.	z	P>z	[95% Conf. Interval]
Reduced level of risk	1.81	1.05	1.02	0.31	0.58 5.63
Graduated from WC	2.57	1.49	1.62	0.11	0.82 8.02
Some college	1.00	0.91	0.00	1.00	0.17 6.02
High School/GED	0.92	0.70	-0.11	0.91	0.21 4.06
2 year degree	1.26	1.62	0.18	0.86	0.10 15.62
Age	0.95	0.02	-1.91	0.06	0.91 1.00
American Indian	0.92	0.88	-0.09	0.93	0.14 5.97
Female	1.32	0.77	0.48	0.63	0.42 4.12
Valid driver license	1.09	0.57	0.17	0.86	0.40 3.02

Model statistics

Number of obs. = 70

Wald chi2(9) = 9.31

Prob > chi2 = 0.4095

Log likelihood = -7.0490785

Pseudo R2 = 0.8844

Dependent variable: employed full time

Omitted education category: less than high school, white

Odds ratio interpretation: For graduates of Wellness Court, the odds of being employed full time are 2.57 times the odds of a terminated participant being employed. This coefficient is significant at the 15% level, as indicated by the probability of the z-statistics of being greater than the critical value of 0.11. That is, graduates are significantly more likely to be employed than terminated participants.

B9. Increased personal income and tax revenues

(1) Increased odds of employment (% terminated full-time employed [23%] x odds ratio [2.57] - % terminated full-time employed [23%])	36%
(2) Additional employed (No. graduates x [1])	20
(3) Minimum wage (As of 8/1/14)	\$8.00
(4) Average assumed annual income (Min. wage x fulltime/2054 hrs)	\$16,416.00
(5) Additional income from increased employment ([4] x [20])	323,019
(6) Effective Tax Rate (Minnesota Department of Revenues)	0.047
(7) Additional tax revenues ([6] x [5])	15,182
(8) Net additional income ([5] - [7])	307,837

Parameters and assumptions

All participants’ data, including Wellness Court and original sentencing information, demographics, and costs data were provided by Wellness Court administration. Cost data was provided by Itasca County and Department of Corrections.

All dollar values are constant dollars of 2014 adjusted using annual average consumer price index.

B10. Total and per diem costs of jail (Itasca County)

Itasca County jail total annual operating cost	\$3,600,000
Itasca County jail per diem cost per day	\$119.34

B11. Effective tax rates

Income decile	Income range	Total state taxes on individuals
First	\$35,524 and under	4.6%
Second	\$35,526 - \$54,496	6.0%
Third	\$54,497 - \$73,908	6.5%

Minnesota Management and Budget (2014)

B12. Consumer price index

Year	Annual
2013	232.957
2012	229.594
2011	224.939
2010	218.056
2009	214.537
2008	215.303
2007	207.342
2006	201.6
2005	195.3
2004	188.9
2003	183.96
2002	179.88
2001	177.1
2000	172.2
1999	166.6
1998	163

Source: Bureau of labor and statistics

ROI references

Minnesota Department of Revenue (2013, March). 2013 Minnesota tax incidence study.

Retrieved September 5, 2014, from

http://www.revenue.state.mn.us/research_stats/research_reports/2013/2013_tax_incidence_study_links.pdf

Minnesota Management and Budget (2014). Department of Corrections general fund expenditures by program since 2000. Unpublished raw data.

Washington State Institute for Public Policy (2014). Drug offender sentencing alternative (For drug offenders). Retrieved May 19, 2015, from

<http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/BenefitCost/Program/46>