A STATE PERSPECTIVE ON IMPLEMENTING RESULTS FIRST
Critical Policy Challenge

Government leaders want to make strategic budget choices, but often don’t know:

• What programs are currently funded
• What each costs
• What programs accomplish
• How they compare to alternatives
Results First Approach

1. Use the best national research to identify what works

2. Predict program impacts in your state

3. Calculate and compare long-term costs and benefits
## Consumer Reports Portfolio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADULT PROGRAMS</th>
<th>COST</th>
<th>LONG-TERM BENEFITS</th>
<th>COST/BENEFIT RATIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive behavioral therapy</td>
<td>$419</td>
<td>$9,954</td>
<td>$24.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic monitoring</td>
<td>$1,093</td>
<td>$24,840</td>
<td>$22.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional education in prison</td>
<td>$1,149</td>
<td>$21,390</td>
<td>$19.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational education in prison</td>
<td>$1,599</td>
<td>$19,531</td>
<td>$13.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug court</td>
<td>$4,276</td>
<td>$10,183</td>
<td>$3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Violence treatment</td>
<td>$1,390</td>
<td>-$7,527</td>
<td>-$4.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JUVENILE PROGRAMS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggression replacement training</td>
<td>$1,543</td>
<td>$55,821</td>
<td>$37.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination of services</td>
<td>$403</td>
<td>$6,043</td>
<td>$16.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug court</td>
<td>$3,154</td>
<td>$11,539</td>
<td>$4.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scared Straight</td>
<td>$66</td>
<td>-$12,988</td>
<td>-$195.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Washington State 2013 dollars
2013 State Successes

6 States
Completed implementation of the model and presented results to key stakeholders

3 States
Enacted legislation incorporating Results First into their policymaking process

2 States
Used models to analyze legislation

5 States
Used their models to target nearly $38 million in funding
Sara Dube, MANAGER
sdube@pewtrusts.org

www.pewstates.org/ResultsFirst
Division of Criminal Justice Services

DCJS = Multifunctional Support Agency

Mission: To Enhance Public Safety and Improve Criminal Justice

1) Collection and analysis of statewide crime data.
2) Administration of state CJ funding.
3) Research and best practice recommendations.
4) Statistical Analysis Center (SAC).
5) State Administering Agency (SAA) for funding from the federal Office of Justice Programs (USDOJ OJP).
New York’s Criminal Justice System

• 500+ local police agencies, ~600,000 arrests annually.

• 62 locally elected county district attorneys that prosecute arrestees.

• Probation is county run, supervise 115,000 offenders.

• 58 local jail systems (57 counties + NYC) house 30,000 inmates: Pre trial detainees and persons sentenced to 1 year or less of incarceration.

• DOCCS: Single state agency that runs the State prisons (54,000 felony inmates) and provides parole community supervision (36,000 parolees).
New York’s Interest in CBA?

Research tells us what works…
CBA tells us if what works is worth the cost.

CBA was a good fit for New York’s Public Safety Cluster:

- Excellent criminal justice data.
- Strong research capability.
- Centralized data systems.
- Commitment to efficiency/fiscal austerity.
Where *Results First* Lives in NYS

- **Governor**
- **Deputy Secretary for Public Safety** (Cabinet Position)
- **Seven agencies within the State’s Public Safety Cluster.**
  - Department of Corrections and Community Supervision (29,000 Staff)
  - Division of State Police (6,000 Staff)
  - **Division of Criminal Justice Services** (600 Staff)
  - Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Services (400 Staff)
  - Office of Victim Services (75 Staff)
  - Commission of Correction (25 Staff)
  - Office for the Prevention of Domestic Violence (25 Staff)
How *Results First* Works...

- Relies on a meta-analysis of national research to identify correctional programming that works.

- Applies the effect found in the national evidence base to a state’s correctional populations to predict each programming option’s impact on re-offending.

- Uses simulations to translate the predicted change in recidivism into an estimate of fiscal and public safety benefits.

- Can be used to help predict which combination of programs will achieve the best results at the lowest cost.
Components of the *Results First* Tool

1) **Meta-analysis Evidence Base**
   - Compilation of more than 250 rigorous criminal justice program evaluations (WSIPP created).

2) **State Recidivism Trajectory**
   - Benefit derived from the difference between baseline recidivism versus post-programming recidivism.
   - NYS: Seven discrete populations of felony offenders.

3) **Resource Use Probability Tree**
   - Type of sanction and length of sentence.

4) **Criminal Justice System Costs**
   - Cost of system response to recidivistic event.
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Mental Health Courts

Program description:

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.

Typical age of primary program participant: 28
Typical age of secondary program participant: N/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes Measured</th>
<th>Primary or Secondary Participant</th>
<th>No. of Effect Sizes</th>
<th>Unadjusted Effect Sizes (Random Effects Model)</th>
<th>Adjusted Effect Sizes and Standard Errors Used in the Benefit-Cost Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ES, SE, p-value</td>
<td>First time ES is estimated, SE, Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-0.22, 0.07, 0.00</td>
<td>-0.22, 0.07, 30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Studies Used in the Meta-Analysis
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Recidivism Data Prerequisites

Access to

*Criminal History*

and

*Judicial Disposition and Sentencing*

data is a must.
Recidivism *Results First* Style

1) **Cumulative Failure (Reconviction) Rate:** Terminal event measured as the time to an offender’s first reconviction.

2) **Reconviction Hazard Distribution:** (Timing) Risk of reconviction during any given year in the follow-up period regardless of the number of times an offender recidivates.

3) **Crime Type Probability:** Captures the most serious reconviction event occurring during the follow-up period.

4) **Trips Through the System:** Number of unique reconviction trips through the CJ system, per offender, during the follow-up period.

5) **Offenses per Trip:** Average number of offenses per trip, multiple offense charges related to a single crime event and multiple counts of an individual charge during a single trip through the criminal justice system.
Recidivism Trajectory – Offender Cohorts

*Results First* tool designed for Felony offenders:
Prison Inmates, Felons Sentenced to Jail, Felony Probationers

Approach allows the *Results First* tool to model the specific impact of a program on *different populations*. 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offender Cohort Recidivism Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># Sentenced in 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Cohort 16,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk 5,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Risk 2,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Offenders who Recidivated in 5 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Cohort 7,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk 3,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Risk 480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Offenders who Recidivated in 5 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Cohort 47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk 69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Risk 17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # of Reconviction Events over 5 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Cohort 17,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk 10,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Risk 726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average # of Reconvictions per Recidivist over 5 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Cohort 2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk 2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Risk 1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felony Jail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Cohort 5,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 25 2,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 25 3,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Offenders who Recidivated in 5 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Cohort 2,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 25 1,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 25 1,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Offenders who Recidivated in 5 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Cohort 51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk 60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Risk 44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # of Reconviction Events over 5 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Cohort 7,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 25 3,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 25 3,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average # of Reconvictions per Recidivist over 5 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Cohort 2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk 2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Risk 2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felony Probation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Cohort 5,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 25 2,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 25 3,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Offenders who Recidivated in 5 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Cohort 2,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 25 1,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 25 1,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Offenders who Recidivated in 5 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Cohort 51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk 60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Risk 44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # of Reconviction Events over 5 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Cohort 7,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 25 3,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 25 3,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average # of Reconvictions per Recidivist over 5 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Cohort 2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk 2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Risk 2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recidivistic event defined as a Felony or Misdemeanor re-conviction.
Age classification based upon offenders age at the time of his/her 2006 cohort qualifying sentence.
Convictions related to arrests that occurred prior to an offender's cohort qualification are excluded.
Components of the *Results First* Tool

1) Meta-analysis Evidence Base
   - Compilation of more than 250 rigorous criminal justice program evaluations (WSIPP created).

2) State Recidivism Trajectory
   - Benefit derived from the difference between baseline recidivism versus post-programming recidivism.
   - NYS: Seven discrete populations of felony offenders.

3) Resource Use Probability Tree
   - Type of sanction and length of sentence.

4) Criminal Justice System Costs
   - Cost of system response to recidivistic event.
# Resource Use

## Criminal Justice System Response upon Re-Conviction:

### Probability of Resource Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanction</th>
<th>Murder</th>
<th>Felony Sex</th>
<th>Robbery</th>
<th>Agg Assault</th>
<th>Felony Property</th>
<th>Felony Drug</th>
<th>Misd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prison</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jail</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jail Probation Split</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Non-Incarcerative/Non-Supervisory</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sentences</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Quantity of Resource Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Duration of Sanction</th>
<th>Murder</th>
<th>Felony Sex</th>
<th>Robbery</th>
<th>Agg Assault</th>
<th>Felony Property</th>
<th>Felony Drug</th>
<th>Misd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prison Sentence (Years)</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jail (Only) Sentence (Days)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model also accounts for the duration of probation and split sentences plus the rate and duration of parole supervision.
Components of the *Results First* Tool

1) Meta-analysis Evidence Base
   - Compilation of more than 250 rigorous criminal justice program evaluations (WSIPP created).

2) State Recidivism Trajectory
   - Benefit derived from the difference between baseline recidivism versus post-programming recidivism.
   - NYS: Seven discrete populations of felony offenders.

3) Resource Use Probability Tree
   - Type of sanction and length of sentence.

4) Criminal Justice System Costs
   - Cost of system response to recidivistic event.
Criminal Justice System Response Costs

Uses *marginal* operating costs to calculate realistic savings appropriate to scale:

Select NYS Marginal Operating Costs (2011 Dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanction</th>
<th>Marginal Cost per Day</th>
<th>Marginal Cost Annual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incarceration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Prison</td>
<td>$51</td>
<td>$18,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Jail</td>
<td>$69</td>
<td>$25,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervision</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Parole</td>
<td>$7</td>
<td>$1,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Probation</td>
<td>$8</td>
<td>$2,168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Model also accounts for police, court and prosecution costs.)
Programming Related Inputs

• Uses actual program delivery costs.
  $200 to $15,000+ per participant depending on program and modality.

• **Three primary elements:** 1) Cost per Participant, 2) Duration, and 3) Primary Participant Population.
  Also need a good program description and an understanding of current operating capacity.

• Program delivery costs are used to calculate the **net benefit** and the **ROI** of providing a particular programming option to particular offender cohort.

https://pewtrusts.webex.com/pewtrusts/lsr.php?RCID=9e4afa5b9a65a4fd38227be5dd31e3a96
Technical Expectations

• Implementation

• Customization

• Production/Utilization
  
  – Sell as a tool, not a panacea.
  
  – Tailor the work product to the audience.
  
  – Be sensitive to “big P” Politics.
  
  – Position as an ongoing research effort to avoid an ends justify the means exercise for each “flavor of the week” proposal.
Cost Benefit Analysis for Criminal Justice

Deployment and Initial Application of the Results First Cost Benefit Model

By Maro Sulemee

This report is the first in a series of technical reports related to the implementation and use of cost-benefit analysis in the public safety sector of New York State government. This report and future reports can be accessed at www.criminaljustice.ny.gov.

Background
Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA) has long been a standard practice of the private sector and has recently been implemented in the public sector. In 2018, the New York State Office of Public Safety decided to promote the implementation of a comprehensive cost benefit analysis model to serve the State’s public safety sector. The emphasis was on the belief that cost benefit analysis would assist in making informed spending decisions and shaping social policy. In 2018, the New York State Office of Public Safety decided to promote the implementation of a comprehensive cost benefit analysis model to serve the State’s public safety sector. The emphasis was on the belief that cost benefit analysis would assist in making informed spending decisions and shaping social policy.

Results First Model
In 2016, the Pew Charitable Trusts and the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation launched an effort to build upon the work of the Washington State Institute for Public Policy (WSIPP) and develop a cost benefit tool for use by interested state governments. The effort, known as the Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative, helped states implement customized versions of a cost benefit tool capable of identifying criminal justice programs that support evidence-based investments. The Results First process is based upon the techniques used in the proprietary, commissioned WSIPP tool that had been developed and is now being used in nearly two dozen states.

The Results First tool utilizes a sophisticated econometric model to analyze the costs and benefits of potential investments in criminal justice programming. By applying New York State specific...
Collaborating with Partners to Implement 
*Results First* in Massachusetts

February 18, 2014
Thank You to the Massachusetts Team

- Executive Office of Public Safety and Security (EOPSS) and Assistant Secretary Michael Coelho
- EOPSS Research and Policy Analysis Division/Mass. Statistical Analysis Center - Patricia Bergin and Brittany Peters
- Mass. Court System
  - Office of Commissioner of Probation, Research Division - Laura Lempicki
- Mass. Department of Correction (DOC)
  - Research and Planning Division - Rhiana Kohl, Hollie Matthews, Daniel Feagans
  - Program Services - Christopher Mitchell, Kelly Paquin
  - Budget Office - Kyra Silva
- Hampden County Sheriff’s Department - Martha Lyman
- Mass. Parole Board - Shawna Andersen, Caitlyn Casey
- Mass. Department of Youth Services - Robert Tansi, Robert Turillo, Tom Taylor
- Administration and Finance - Julia Chabrier
- The Pew Results First Team and our Technical Consultant Steven Lize

... and countless others who have helped to pull together the needed data on cost and programs for the model and provided support for our continuing work in this effort.
Special Commission on Criminal Justice * and *Results First*

- Commission to study the Massachusetts Criminal Justice System
- Implement policies to reduce prison overcrowding and reduce recidivism
- Obtain technical assistance from a nationally recognized criminal justice reform program with a data driven approach (at no cost)
- Reduce corrections spending and utilize the savings to reduce crime, strengthen public safety and fund other budget priorities
Massachusetts Model Strategies

- Hold informational webinars on different components of the model
- Provide updates and present to stakeholders including agency administrators and Special Commission on Criminal Justice
- Meet with Administration and Finance
- Meet with key legislators in the House and Senate
- Establish working groups for recidivism, costs and programs
- Draw on the expertise of the Pew Results First team for key presentations and meetings.
Establish Collaborations and Teams

- Established 3 teams to gather the information needed for the model – recidivism and resource use data, marginal costs, and programs.

- The SAC staff was tasked with leading the effort to coordinate the collection of recidivism data and program mapping from the various agencies.
  - Established the Recidivism Work Group and the Program Mapping Work Group.
  - Collaborated with DOC, DYS, Probation, Parole, Hampden County Sheriff’s Office, Sentencing Commission.

- Developed a strong working relationship with the Pew team: regular check in calls/multiple informational sessions on different model components.

- Continue to inform stakeholders including Special Commission on Criminal Justice, agency administrators, key legislators, and the Executive Office of Administration and Finance as new information is obtained.
Generate Data Needed for Results First Model

- Offender Groups
- Long-term recidivism outcomes for all systems (adult and juvenile probation, state and county corrections, parole, DYS)
- Probability of Resource Use
- Number of years per Resource Use (time served)
- Marginal Costs for almost every activity in criminal justice
- Assessment of evidence-based programming in Massachusetts and estimated cost
- Victimization Costs
Results First Recidivism Measurements

- Most states have used a 5 to 10 year follow-up period
- MA used a 6-year follow-up period due to the age of our systems, and more modern systems coming on line at Parole and Probation in 2005
- Includes felony and misdemeanor reconvictions
- Multiple recidivating events are captured and broken out by most serious crime type
  
  Advantage: allows a state to capture the long-term costs associated with recidivism
Definitions and Data Sets Included

- Recidivism defined for this project as a new conviction that leads to a “serious consequence”
- Technical violations of supervision excluded
- Convictions include misdemeanors leading to CWOF’s
- Traditional definition of Recidivism is one or three year after release; new convictions that lead to incarceration, and technical violations of supervision that lead to re-confinement
Building on Results First

- Extend recidivism period to 7 years
- Expand program inventory and mapping
- Document and Report
- Dedicate a team of people to work on the model.
- Expand to new policy areas: child welfare, education, substance abuse and mental health
Benefits of *Results First* for Massachusetts

- Has brought together **teams of people with similar areas of interest**, e.g. research, policy, programs, budget, etc. and has created a **common framework** for collecting and analyzing data and communicating the information.
- Has spurred effort to **design a platform for a data warehouse**, to stage criminal justice data across all systems to facilitate collection and analysis.
- Secretary of EOPSS **dedicating approximately $4.5 million in Byrne funding for evidence-based practices**, measurement of program fidelity, and program evaluation.
- Additional **legislative appropriation for two more researchers** to improve our analytical and data gathering capacity for the purpose of employing more evidence-based decision-making.
- Data compiled by inventory of programming helped EOPSS **advocate for a more robust reentry programming budget** for the DOC during House and Senate Budget debate.
- Through gap analysis, DOC has identified program capacity, and is working to change policies to move offenders to lower security and identify physical space in order to **increase inmate participation in programs**.
- DOC working toward **expanding education programming** from academic to full year.
• Competing priorities for already taxed staff

• Learning curve in internalizing complex model

• Identifying the right people at some agencies able to provide the needed data

• Different IT systems and technical capacity across entities

• Technical and/or human resources necessary to obtain needed data may not be available
Advice to States Implementing *Results First*

- Identify your policymaker champions and communicate regularly.
- Determine where the model will be housed.
- Identify your project leaders who will work with the teams and input data into the model.
- Develop your teams: identifying research, costs and programs people at the key agencies.
  - involve them in trainings and the process
  - Have regular check-ins with each team
  - Include members with different expertise
- Identify your team’s assets and gaps; be creative and resourceful about how you approach each task.
- Develop a means of sharing data, documents, information, scheduling meetings that everyone can access.
  - Need Excel 2010 to open the model
Questions???

Contact information:
Lisa Sampson, Director of Research and Policy Analysis
Division/Massachusetts Statistical Analysis Center
Office of Grants and Research
Executive Office of Public Safety and Security
Email: Lisa.sampson@state.ma.us
Questions?