

Albemarle and Charlottesville EBDM Process 2011 Cost Analysis and Recidivism Study

Step 1: Mapped and itemized costs for the adult criminal justice process for both Albemarle and Charlottesville

- Assigned direct costs per case, client, arrest, victim, etc.
- Used annual budgets and populations to determine cost per case, client, investigation, etc.
- Police departments utilized a “manpower to arrest” formula to determine cost of arrest
- Data was gathered from official published sources such as annual reports, state fiscal summaries, jurisdiction official budgets, state finance departments, and state caseload reports, etc.
- Made an inquiry to one state agency (Supreme Court) for one type of non-public report
- Determined costs by adding both state and local funding
Data sources included: Virginia DOC, Virginia DCJS, Virginia Supreme Court, Virginia Compensation Board, National Center for State Courts, Albemarle County Adopted Budget, Charlottesville Adopted Budget, Virginia Criminal Code, OAR Annual report, OAR local probation PTCC database, Victim Witness database, Albemarle arrest statistics, Charlottesville arrest statistics

Step 2: Completed baseline recidivism study (3 year – 2008 to 2011)

- Generated a database of all local probation cases closed during month of March 2008
- Sorted by jurisdiction and charge type
- Ensured sample was comparable to total (success/failure rate, gender, race, risk score, etc.)
- Ensured valid sample size using sample size generator (95% confidence rate)
- Converted list into format requested by Virginia State Police for recidivism research
- Requested records from Virginia State Police

Step 3: Using the itemized average costs for each criminal justice process in Step 1, determined the criminal justice process costs for both counties and both charge classes

- Most and least expensive felony system costs
- Most and least expensive misdemeanor system costs
- Most and least expensive misdemeanor probation violation system costs
- Most and least expensive felony probation violation costs
- Established midrange costs for all categories

NOTE: Established and utilized a quartile (25%) range to ensure a conservative estimate of system costs

Step 4: Completed recidivism study

- Reviewed sample of criminal records from Step 2 to gather/record positive responses post March 2008
- Recorded type of new offense, charge, and sentence for positive responses
- Sorted according to jurisdiction and charge class
- Calculated recidivism outcomes for 2008 cases for both jurisdictions and charge classes

Step 5: Allocated costs to violations and recidivism

- Gathered 2009–2010 local probation aggregate outcomes
- Determined outcomes based on jurisdiction and charge class
- Retrieved percentages and totals of probation success/failure and misdemeanor/felony
- Applied 2008 recidivism percentages to total (2009–2010) by jurisdiction
- Estimated using 2008 recidivism percentages for new conviction (both felony and misdemeanor) totals (2009–2010) to get system costs for recidivism
- Applied costs to probation violations for 2009–2010 for both jurisdictions to get system costs for violations

Outcome: Total system costs for probation violations¹ and total system costs for recidivism².

¹ For violations that occurred in 2009-10.

² Future three-year recidivism rate is based on the recidivism percentage from 2008-11.