



INVESTING in children

Technical Report

November 2012

The cost-benefit model translation team consisted of:

Triin Edovald, Social Research Unit
Gretchen Bjornstad, Social Research Unit
Daniel Ellis, Social Research Unit

The coding team consisted of:

Vashti Berry, Social Research Unit
Daniel Ellis, Social Research Unit
Victoria Baker, Social Research Unit
Deborah Harburger, University of Maryland
Matthew Uretsky, University of Maryland
Daryl Dutrow, University of Maryland
Gretchen Bjornstad, Social Research Unit
Triin Edovald, Social Research Unit

Acknowledgements

The Social Research Unit would like to thank Steve Aos, Stephanie Lee, Elizabeth Drake, Annie Pennucci and the rest of the team at the Washington State Institute for Public Policy for their endless support throughout the work process. The Unit would also like to thank the volunteers at Pro Bono Economics, Julian Cox from New Economy Manchester and Sonja Jütte from NSPCC for their assistance during the preparation of the cost-benefit analysis. Finally, this work would not have been possible without funding from Birmingham City Council, Association of Greater Manchester Authorities and the Youth Justice Board.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Economic Evaluation	1
2.1. Cost-Effectiveness and Cost-Benefit Analysis	1
2.2. Applications of Cost-Benefit Analysis	2
3. The WSIPP Model	3
4. Translation	4
5. Description of Interventions	5
5.1. Youth Justice Interventions	5
5.2. Education Interventions	5
5.3. Early Years Interventions.....	6
5.4. Child Protection and Social Care	7
6. Effect Sizes and Standard Errors	7
7. Cost of Programmes and Approaches	9
8. Valuation of Outcomes that Affect Crime	10
8.1. Types of Crime.....	11
8.2. Unit Costs of Criminal Justice Resources and Victimisations	11
8.3. Criminal Justice Resource Use	13
8.4. Crime and Victimization Rates	17
8.5. Populations.....	19
9. Valuation of Outcomes that Affect Labour Market Earnings	21
9.1. Earnings Data.....	21
9.2. Parameters Related to Earnings Data	23
10. Model Inputs for Education Outcomes	25
10.1. Education Parameters	25
10.2. Education Resource Use.....	26
11. Valuation of Child Abuse and Neglect Outcomes	29
11.1 Prevalence Rates	29
11.2. Child Protection System Costs for a CAN Case	32
11.3. Victimization Costs	36
12. Other Parameters	37
12.1. Base Year for Monetary Denomination.....	37
12.2. Discount rates.....	37
12.3. GDP Deflator.....	38
12.4. Tax Rates.....	38
13. Limitations	38
Appendices	41
Appendix A: Meta-Analysis of Programme Effects	42
Appendix B: Intervention Costs for Youth Justice, Education and Early Years, and Child Protection and Social Care Interventions	46

List of Tables

Table 8.1. Criminal Justice Sector Costs and Victim Costs	13
Table 8.2. Probabilities of Criminal Justice Resource Use	15
Table 8.3. Years of Use per Criminal Justice Resource.....	17
Table 8.4. Total Recorded Crimes	17
Table 8.5. Percentage of Actual Crime Recorded	18
Table 8.6. Conviction Data.....	18
Table 8.7. Arrest Data	19
Table 8.8. Criminological Information for Different Populations	20
Table 8.9. Density Distribution Parameters for Different Populations	21
Table 9.1. Annual Earnings by Age (18-65) of Persons in the Labour Force Survey (2010 data).....	22
Table 9.2. Beta Distribution Parameters	23
Table 10.1. Model Inputs for Education Outcomes	28
Table 11.1. Child Abuse and Neglect Prevalence Rates in the General and Maltreated Population.....	30
Table 11.2. Child Protection System Costs for a Child Abuse and Neglect Case	36

1. Introduction

Investing in Children is produced by the Social Research Unit at Dartington (SRU) and provides free and independent advice on the costs and benefits of competing investment options in children's services. It is one of a series of innovations being prepared by the SRU that are designed to put useful evidence into the hands of hard-pressed policy makers, commissioners and practitioners.

Investing in Children will be published on a regular basis. The objective is to provide reliable information independent from government, providers or programme developers. Building on the model developed by the renowned Washington State Institute for Public Policy in the United States (WSIPP), *Investing in Children* has taken an approach to cost-benefit analysis that is consistent across policy areas, cautious in its estimates and relevant to the real world of public and private sector investments in child health and development.

The *Investing in Children* reports focus on Youth Justice, Early Years and Education and Child Protection and Social Care respectively.¹ This Technical Report should be read in conjunction with those reports.

The Technical Report gives a brief overview of the two main approaches used in economic evaluation and summarises the cost-benefit approach originally developed by the WSIPP. It also describes the sources and assumptions that the SRU used in the cost-benefit model to estimate the economic value of programmes and approaches to reduce juvenile delinquency and improve educational outcomes for children.

Future editions of *Investing in Children* will focus on other children's services systems, namely *Child and Adolescent Mental Health*, and *Public Health*. There will be several reports for each system each year, reflecting:

- Analysis of new interventions for which there is reliable data on impact and cost
- Improvements in the data sources on which the economic model relies
- Changing economic conditions

An updated version of this Technical Report will accompany each report.

2. Economic Evaluation

2.1. Cost-Effectiveness and Cost-Benefit Analysis

One way to conduct economic analysis in intervention research is to look at cost-effectiveness that assesses the change in outcomes relative to inputs. In the evaluation of crime interventions, cost-effectiveness studies allow us to determine how many units of an outcome (e.g., crime reduction) you will get for an amount of spending. Cost-effectiveness analysis enables us to compare the relative costs and outcomes (effects) of two or more courses of action by comparing the extra cost of providing the intervention with the extra benefits, such as a point reduction on a certain measurement scale. The results of such economic evaluation can be expressed in terms of the cost-effectiveness ratio. This is

¹ These are available at www.dartington.org.uk/investinginchildren

defined as the ratio of the change in costs of a therapeutic intervention (compared to the alternative intervention) to the change in effects of the intervention. Put simply, it is the ratio of pounds expended to an outcome obtained. Thus, the consequences of cost-effectiveness analysis are expressed in non-monetary units.

Cost-benefit analysis takes this approach one-step further by putting a monetary value on those units of outcome. In cost-benefit analysis, expected costs are weighed against expected benefits in order to determine whether the course of action is profitable. In the context of social interventions, the technique adds up the value of the benefits of an intervention, and subtracts the costs associated with it. A simple approach to cost-benefit analysis uses only financial costs and financial benefits. A more sophisticated approach, however, puts a financial value on intangible costs and benefits. For example, a cost-benefit analysis of a reduction in smoking would transform a quitter's improved health or longer life into a monetary value. The final product of cost-benefit analysis is the net benefit that is expressed in monetary terms.

Even though both types of analysis include the measurement of the consequences of the intervention or policy, cost-effectiveness analysis determines the change in outcomes relative to spending, whereas cost-benefit analysis determines the overall economic net benefits of the outcome - the difference between valuation of benefits and costs.

2.2. Applications of Cost-Benefit Analysis

There is a considerable amount of interest in cost-benefit analysis. The earliest cost-benefit analyses were developed for policies related to natural resource management and transportation services. A good example of an initiative of cost-benefit analysis in children's services is a study of Perry Preschool Project, which was the first study to quantify the cost and lifelong benefits of early education.² This study followed young children from 1962 through adulthood and showed that a well-designed preschool programme increased the potential of high school graduation, stable employment and income. In addition, the study showed that the intervention increased the amount of federal taxes paid by adults. Furthermore, the government money was saved over time through participants being less involved in the criminal justice and welfare systems compared to those children who did not participate in the Perry Preschool Project.

More recently, there has been a lot of work on cost-benefit analysis in the field of public health. Several groups, both public and private are working to improve the standards in this field. For example, the RAND Corporation has done a significant amount of work on cost-benefit analysis in the field of early childhood intervention³ and crime⁴. The MacArthur Foundation has set up the Benefit-Cost Analysis Center at the University of Washington's Evans School of Public Affairs in the US. This is aiming to set standards for cost-benefit analysis to improve the precision of estimates. The National Research Council and the Institute of Medicine in the US have recently published a summary of a workshop held by their Board on Children, Youth, and Families, which examines ways to improve cost-benefit

² Heckman, J. J., Moon, S. H., Pinto, R., Savelyev, P. A., & Yavitz, A. (2010). The rate of return to the HighScope Perry Preschool Program. *Journal of Public Economics*, 94, 114-128.

³ Karoly, L., Greenwood, P., Everingham, S., Hoube, J., Kilburn, R. M., Rydell, P., Sanders, M., & Chiesa, J. (1998). *Investing in our children: What we know and don't know about the costs and benefits of early childhood interventions*. RAND Corporation MR-898-TCWF, Santa Monica, CA, USA.

⁴ Greenwood, P., Model, K., Rydell, P. C., & Chiesa, J. (1998). *Diverting children from a life of crime: Measuring costs and benefits*. RAND Monograph Report, MR-699-1-UCB/RC/IF, Santa Monica, USA.

analysis methods so that they can be used to support effective policy decisions.⁵ In England and Wales, the Green Book by HM Treasury provides guidance in this area for the public sector.⁶

Most cost-benefit analysis is done *ad hoc* for particular projects. It is used extensively in the private sector. For example, the market valuation of assets such as corporate stock is a very common practice. It is rare to find a systematically developed model that can be used as a tool for policy-making purposes, which covers a range of policy areas and draws them together in the analysis. However, groups such as WSIPP are working to develop models that can be adapted and used internationally for a variety of policy areas.

3. The WSIPP Model

The WSIPP cost-benefit model predicts the impact of competing investment options on child well-being, as well as the costs and economic returns of various portfolios of interventions. The analytic approach generally follows the procedures that James Heckman used in his recent return on investment analysis of an early education programme.⁷

The WSIPP cost-benefit model follows a four-step approach:

- 1) Evidence is assessed against the highest standards of scientific evidence to determine the effectiveness of programmes and approaches (what works).
- 2) Costs and benefits are calculated, using an internally consistent framework, for Washington State. This produces a ranking of public policy options, similar to how *Which?* magazine ranks the pros and cons of similar consumer products.⁸
- 3) Where possible, a 'portfolio' analysis reveals how a combination of policy options affects outcomes, costs and benefits.
- 4) The riskiness of the conclusions is measured by testing how bottom lines vary when estimates and assumptions change.⁹

The SRU is translating this cost-benefit model developed in the US and publishes *Investing in Children* reports on the costs and benefits of competing investment options in children's services. *Investing in Children* has been funded by Birmingham City Council and the Association of Greater Manchester Authorities as part of their continued commitment to squeeze more value from local government investments, and by the Youth Justice Board as it seeks to reduce crime at lower cost to the taxpayer. Pro Bono Economics, an independent

⁵ National Research Council, & Institute of Medicine. (2009). *Strengthening benefit-cost analysis for early childhood interventions: Workshop summary*. A. Beatty, Rapporteur. Committee on Strengthening Benefit-Cost Methodology for the Evaluation of Early Childhood Interventions, Board on Children, Youth, and Families. Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

⁶ Available at http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/d/green_book_complete.pdf

⁷ Heckman, *et al.*, *op. cit.*

⁸ www.which.co.uk

⁹ WSIPP uses the Monte Carlo method, which is a mathematical simulation method for understanding the impact of uncertainty. It allows us to estimate the riskiness of our investment by enabling us to model situations that present uncertainty and play them out hundreds or thousands of times on a computer. Monte Carlo simulation estimates risk by building models of possible results by substituting a range of values – a probability distribution – for any factor that has inherent uncertainty (e.g., programme effect size, discount rates, programme cost, labour market earnings). By randomly sampling from the probability distribution for each variable factor, a new set of summary statistics are produced for each "run" through the simulation. The Monte Carlo method calculates and saves results over and over, each time using a different set of random values from the probability distributions. Once the analysis is complete, the range and shape of the results from individual runs can be examined visually and numerically.

charity that matches volunteer economists with charities wishing to address questions around measurement, results and impact, has provided invaluable support.

4. Translation

The SRU values the WSIPP model over alternatives for three main reasons:

- It is cautious in its estimates of potential savings to the public purse; *it does not make rash claims*;
- It has been consistently applied across a range of policy areas; *it uses the same methods to calculate costs and benefits for children in foster care as it does for young people in the youth justice system*;
- Its results have been used to inform major policy decisions such as switching resources from prisons to prevention.

However, to reap the full benefits of the Washington model for England and Wales, significant translation work is needed.

First, we examine the rules used in the analysis of 'what works'. WSIPP has a strong reputation for its conservative approach. As well as maintaining a high standard of evidence, any methodological flaws in the evaluations included are addressed by discounting the estimated effects of programmes and approaches (see section 6 below for further details). The relevance of these decisions to the UK context is considered in the translation, bearing in mind that the model converts the effect sizes that summarise the degree to which a programme or approach affects an outcome into units of outcomes that can be monetised.¹⁰

Second, children's services, youth justice, education, health and benefits in England and Wales differ from those in Washington State, for example in the way in which cases are processed. This has important consequences for the return on investments. The structure of the model was altered to reflect processes in England and Wales.

Third, the data values and inputs of the model are re-estimated to reflect the context of England and Wales, including, for example, the number of people processed through the justice system, the probabilities of different sentences, the unit costs of youth justice services, earnings data by age and education status and the rate of pupils with A-levels.^{11, 12}

A piece of software developed by WSIPP is used to enter and store information and run computational routines designed to produce four related cost-benefit summary statistics: net present value; benefit-to-cost ratio; internal rate of return on investment; and measure of risk associated with these bottom-line estimates. An overview of the model, the general approach and characteristics of WSIPP's modelling process, as well as assumptions and computational methods used in the model can be found in Technical Appendix of the WSIPP report from April 2012.¹³

¹⁰ For example, the units of high school graduation might be +0.03, which would indicate three extra percentage points on a high school graduation rate.

¹¹ Crime data used in the model are for England and Wales.

¹² For an overview of the translation work see Little, M., & Edovald, T. (2012). Return on investment: The evaluation of costs and benefits of evidence-based programs. *Psychosocial Intervention*, 21(2), 215-221.

¹³ For data inputs see Lee, S., Aos, S., Drake, E., Pennucci, A., Miller, M., & Anderson, L. (2012). *Return on investment: Evidence-based options to improve statewide outcomes, April 2012* (Document No. 12-04-1201). Olympia: Washington State Institute for Public Policy. The full report and Technical Appendix are available at <http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/pub.asp?docid=12-04-1201>

5. Description of Interventions

This section provides a brief summary of each of the programmes and approaches in the 'Youth Justice', 'Early Years and Education' and 'Child Protection and Social Care' reports for which cost-benefit results have been calculated. They are presented in alphabetical order.

5.1. Youth Justice Interventions

Aggression Replacement Training (ART) is a cognitive behavioural programme for chronically aggressive children and adolescents.

Coordination of Services (COS) provides an educational programme to low-risk young offenders and their parents in order to help to the young people achieve a positive pro-social future.

Drug Courts use comprehensive supervision, drug testing, treatment services and immediate sanctions and incentives to reduce criminal recidivism and substance abuse among young people.

Functional Family Therapy (FFT) is a structured family-based programme designed to reduce delinquency, violence and other problem behaviours in young people aged 11-18.

Multidimensional Treatment Foster Care (MTFC) involves intensive therapeutic foster care for adolescents displaying chronic antisocial behaviour, emotional disturbance, and delinquency.

Multisystemic Therapy (MST) is a home-based and family-driven intervention for young people aged 12-17 who are displaying serious antisocial or criminal behaviour.

Scared Straight uses organised visits to adult prisons to deter young offenders, or children at risk of becoming delinquent, from involvement in crime.

Victim Offender Mediation gets the victim and the offender sitting down together with a trained mediator in order to determine appropriate restitution for the harm done.

5.2. Education Interventions

Additional Day of Teaching refers to extra instruction time in schools for children aged 5-18, standardised here to represent an extra day.

Bonus for Teachers is a significant cash sum (\$5,000 in the US) given to teachers on completing an advanced teaching credential over a 1-3 year assessment process.

FAST (Families and Schools Together) is an eight-week after-school programme for children aged 6-13 and their families.

Good Behaviour Game is a universal classroom management strategy for children aged 6-8 and is designed to improve aggressive/disruptive classroom behaviour and prevent later criminality.

K-12¹⁴ Tutoring by Adults involves using adult community volunteers, often pre-service teachers in training, to provide one-on-one assistance to students typically aged 6-7 who are struggling to learn to read.

K-12 Tutoring by Peers involve students from the same classroom or higher year groups providing one-to-one help – with teacher oversight – to students who are struggling to learn to read.

Life Skills Training is a school-based curriculum that teaches children aged 11-14 social and self-management skills to reduce the risks to them of alcohol, tobacco, drug abuse and violence.

Parent Involvement Programmes involve teachers training and encouraging parents to engage in planned, structured academic activities with their children at home, often in the form of tutoring.

Quantum Opportunities is a four-year programme in which disadvantaged young people aged 14-18 work with a caring adult on basic skills, personal development, cultural enrichment and volunteering.

Quick Reads is a school-based programme designed to improve the reading efficiency and fluency of struggling readers aged 5-11.

Read 180 is a school-based programme designed to improve the reading fluency and comprehension of struggling readers aged 9-17.

Reading Recovery is a structured school-based early literacy intervention involving one-to-one tutoring for struggling readers aged 6-7.

Special Literacy Instruction for English as a Second Language involves a structured, direct instruction approach to teaching reading to students who are learning English as a second language.

Success for All is a whole-school reform model for children aged 4-12, with a focus on helping every child to read at or above the appropriate level for their age.

The Reading Edge is a school-based literacy programme designed to help all children aged 11-14 to be strategic, independent and motivated readers and learners.

Tutoring for English Language Learners involves one-to-one tutoring for students who are learning English and focuses on reading.

5.3. Early Years Interventions

Abecedarian provides high-quality, developmentally appropriate childcare and education for young children at risk of developmental delays and school failure.

Curiosity Corner is a pre-school programme designed to improve language ability and learning environments for children aged 3-4 at risk of starting school behind due to poverty.

¹⁴ K-12 refers to the US school system and the school grades Kindergarten through to Grade 12 (ages 5-18). Most of the evaluations included in the meta-analysis were of elementary school students, often children aged 6-7.

Early Childhood Education refers to model programmes (Perry Preschool, Abecedarian, and Chicago Parent Child Centers) and larger programmes (Head Start) for low-income children aged 3-4.

High Scope Perry Preschool is a universal early childhood education programme for children aged 0-5.

Parent Child Home Programme is a home-visiting programme for children aged 2-3 whose parents have a limited education or other obstacles to educational success.

5.4. Child Protection and Social Care

Alternative Response responds to child protection referrals using a family assessment (if there are no imminent concerns about a child's safety), with the goal of engaging a family to determine strengths and needs and plan for the future.

Family Nurse Partnership involves intensive home visiting by trained nurses for low-income mothers during pregnancy and the first 2 years after birth.

Family Preservation involves intensive support to help prevent removal of a child from their home (or promote return to that home) by improving family functioning.

Healthy Families America involves home visiting by trained paraprofessionals for at-risk mothers identified during pregnancy or shortly after birth.

Homebuilders is a short-term, home-based crisis intervention designed to prevent removal of a child from their home (or promote return to that home).

Other Home Visiting Programmes for At Risk Families are aimed at mothers considered to be at risk of parenting problems.

Parent-Child Interaction Therapy involves a therapist coaching a parent to help them interact more positively with their child and manage their child's behaviour.

Parents as Teachers is a home visiting programme for parents and children aged 0-5 that aims to have children ready to learn by the time they go to school.

SafeCare is a home-based parent training curriculum for parents who are at-risk, or have been reported, for child maltreatment.

Triple-P Universal is a multi-level parenting programme designed to prevent the development of serious behavioural and emotional problems in children.

6. Effect Sizes and Standard Errors

Meta-analytic procedures were used to estimate the effect of programmes and approaches on outcomes. These effects, as well as estimates of the margin of error in these effects, were provided mainly by WSIPP.¹⁵ However, some of the meta-analyses were carried out by the

¹⁵ Lee, *et al.*, *op. cit.*

SRU.¹⁶ The results of these analyses can be found in this technical report. Please see Appendix A for details.

Meta-analysis is a statistical technique for combining the findings from independent studies that have attempted to answer similar questions about effectiveness; for example, does a new crime reduction programme confer significant benefits compared with the treatment as usual? Meta-analysis provides a quantitative (statistical) estimate of effectiveness aggregated over all the included studies – an effect size which indicates the impact of a programme or policy in standard units. In general, the meta-analytic methods described by Lipsey and Wilson (2011) were used.¹⁷

The studies investigating the direct effects of the programme or approach on specific outcomes were selected based on whether they met WSIPP's standards of evidence, which focus on the quality of the research methodology, and whether monetary values for the outcomes (e.g., convictions, special education) could be estimated. Studies using random assignment were preferred, but non-randomised trials using control or comparison groups were also included if the groups were matched and any differences were statistically controlled for in the analyses.

In addition to direct programme or approach effect sizes, linked effect sizes were estimated. These are not directly measured in the original intervention evaluation. Linked effect sizes are based on a body of research that measures how one particular outcome is causally related to another outcome to which a monetary value can be estimated. For example, if the programme Functional Family Therapy (FFT) is shown to affect youth offending, and if separately analysed longitudinal research shows that youth offending is causally related to a probability of graduating from high school, then FFT can be assumed to have an effect on high school graduation. Longitudinal studies that establish temporal ordering (first outcome such as youth offending precedes another outcome such as high school graduation) and include measures of other factors that also influence the outcome were preferred. For further details on meta-analyses of linked outcomes see Technical Appendix of the WSIPP report from April 2012.¹⁸

The studies that met these criteria were entered into effect size modelling software designed by WSIPP. This software was used to code detailed information about the research design, population, study duration, and results of analyses of any outcomes that could be monetised. The software was then used to conduct a meta-analysis of all studies for each programme (e.g., FFT) and approach (e.g., an additional day of teaching) considered in this cost-benefit analysis. It computed a weighted average effect size, standard error as well as an adjusted effect size, which takes into account discounts that were applied.

The discounts were used to estimate an effect size that is more likely to be found in real-world dissemination of the interventions. These discounts were applied to each study individually in the meta-analysis to account for weaker research methodology and other factors that may have inflated the effect size, such as programme developer involvement in the trial. For example, if a developer was heavily involved in the research trial, it is likely that the intervention was delivered with higher fidelity to the model, which cannot be assumed to be the case when the intervention is disseminated more widely. In addition, studies with weaker designs such as non-randomised comparison groups are likely to yield

¹⁶ Some of the coding was assisted by colleagues from the University of Maryland.

¹⁷ Lipsey, M.W. & Wilson, D. (2011). *Practical meta-analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

¹⁸ Lee, *et al.*, *op.cit.*, pp. 111-112.

larger effects than those that do use random assignment. If a trial was conducted with weaker methodology, the resulting effect size was therefore discounted to estimate a more realistic effect for real world delivery. The description of WSIPP's adjustments to effect sizes for methodological quality, outcome measure relevance, developer involvement and laboratory or unusual setting can be found in Technical Appendix of the WSIPP report from April 2012.¹⁹ The most recently published WSIPP summary of meta-analytic results and the specific discounts that are applied in meta-analyses for the majority of programmes and approaches reviewed can be found in the main WSIPP report from April 2012.²⁰ A question remains over whether to introduce a discount that accounts for loss of impact when a programme is tested in one context – for example in the US – and implemented in another – the UK. Initial exploration found little systematic bias. However, this is a fast evolving area and the discounts should, and will, be reviewed as new evidence comes to light.

7. Cost of Programmes and Approaches

The costs that were used in the cost-benefit analyses were those related to the running costs of the intervention that occur on an on-going basis (see Table 7.1). This is because the estimates looked at the relative costs and benefits over the long term. Three aspects were considered in the calculations of the costs of each intervention: training costs, intervention delivery costs, and supervision costs. These, therefore, do not include additional start-up costs (e.g., site selection and readiness assessment, renting an office) necessary to introduce the interventions to a new area. Programme developers or local service providers in England and Wales provided some of the readily available intervention unit costs.

A number of programmes or approaches included in this analysis are currently not delivered in England and Wales and thus do not have local cost estimates available. The unit costs of these programmes/policies were obtained by converting either the WSIPP unit costs or cost estimates obtained from cost calculations produced for the Evidence2Success project funded by the Annie E. Casey Foundation from US dollars into Pounds Sterling. This was done using the annual Purchasing Power Parity (PPP) exchange rate for the year of dollars that the cost was provided in.²¹ These exchange rates were obtained from the OECD StatExtracts.²² All costs based on US estimates were increased by 25 per cent since a comparison of converted unit costs and available costs for England and Wales showed that unit costs tend to be significantly higher when the intervention is delivered in England and Wales. Some, but not all, of that difference may be due to differences in the scale of interventions. Namely, large-scale implementation of interventions tends to lower the average unit costs per person, particularly when delivered over a longer period of time. These converted unit costs of programmes and approaches will be replaced with estimates for England and Wales as soon as they become available.

The unit costs for the rest of the interventions were estimated based on the three elements that follow.

Training

When estimates on fixed price training packages were not available, training costs were based on the number of hours and average salary per hour for trainers who usually deliver

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 14-17.

²⁰ Lee, *et al.*, *op.cit.*

²¹ *Ibid.*

²² The PPPs and exchange rates are available at http://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?DataSetCode=SNA_TABLE4

the training. These costs also included other costs that occur when delivering training, such as training materials (e.g., curriculum and manuals) and rent for a venue, etc. These costs were sought from published materials as well as developers and commissioners of the interventions if delivered in England or Wales. When possible, staff turnover and thus re-occurring training costs were taken into account when calculating the unit costs.

Intervention Delivery

Intervention delivery costs were based on the number of hours and average salary per hour for practitioners who deliver the intervention. This was sometimes complicated by the fact that some of the interventions can be delivered by a range of practitioners with different qualifications. In order to overcome this problem and establish average estimates, the proportion of practitioners with different qualifications was estimated and then a weighted average of their salaries was calculated. Developers were encouraged to indicate clearly who should and should not deliver their intervention. The cost of materials required to deliver the intervention was also included where relevant.

Supervision and Fidelity Monitoring

These costs were based on the number of hours and average salary per hour for professionals who deliver supervision and/or fidelity monitoring when estimates on fixed price implementation fidelity support packages were not available. Supervision costs were based on real-life setting estimates. Namely, if certain supervision requirements were designed for an evaluation study only and would not be part of regular practice in real-life settings, then these requirements would not form the basis for cost estimates. At the same time, the estimates were based on what the costs would be to promote faithful delivery of the intervention, to reduce the likelihood of large differences in effect sizes between the trials and the real world.

The unit costs of programmes and comparison costs for Youth Justice, Education and Early Years, and Child Protection and Social Care interventions included in the analysis can be found in Appendix B.

8. Valuation of Outcomes that Affect Crime

This section of the technical report describes mainly the data sources used in the cost-benefit model that estimates the monetary value to taxpayers and victims of programmes and approaches that reduce crime. The current version of the model estimates the value to taxpayers if a crime is avoided, as well as the cost that can be avoided by people who would have been a victim of a crime had the crime not been prevented. To model avoided crime costs from the perspective of taxpayers and victims, life-cycle costs of avoiding six major types of crime and nine types of costs incurred as a result of crime were estimated. In addition to computing monetary values of avoided crime, the model is also used to estimate and count the number of prison beds and victimisation avoided when crime is reduced.

The crime part of the cost-benefit model uses four types of inputs to estimate benefits: per-unit crime costs; sentencing probabilities and resource-use estimates; longitudinal criminological information about different populations who would be eligible for interventions to prevent or reduce youth offending; and estimates of multiple crimes per officially recorded crimes, such as arrests or convictions. This section describes these four broad data sources.

8.1. Types of Crime

In this model, we used the following crime categories: violence against the person, sexual offences, robbery, property offences, drug offences, and summary offences (excluding motoring offences). Property offences were based on a weighted average of the probability of burglary and theft (and handling stolen goods when the latter was combined with the theft category and it was not possible to separate the two types of offences). These categories were used as they were the best match between those used by the WSIPP model and official statistics published by the Home Office and the Ministry of Justice.

8.2. Unit Costs of Criminal Justice Resources and Victimisations

The majority of unit costs were extracted from and estimated based on the technical paper on the cost of a cohort of young offenders to the criminal justice system by the National Audit Office (NAO).^{23,24} Unit costs for adult community sentences and post-custody supervision were based on estimates from the Ministry of Justice payment by results pilot 'Justice Reinvestment'. Unit cost for youth community sentences were calculated based on data provided by Birmingham Youth Offending Service. See Table 8.1 for these unit costs.

Police

The unit costs of police are adjusted to reflect the cost per arrest based on marginal operating costs.²⁵ The cost of an arrest was calculated in reference to the number of persons arrested.²⁶ Since it was not possible to break down the cost by type of offence, the same unit cost was applied to all types of offences. It should be acknowledged that the estimates made available by the Home Office reflect the number of persons arrested rather than arrests. Thus, the cost estimate in Table 8.1 is likely to overestimate the average cost per arrests.

Courts

The unit cost of court was calculated based on the marginal cost estimates per court event (in 2008/09 prices) published in the NAO technical paper for both under- and over-18s.²⁷ Based on these estimates, a weighted average unit cost of court was computed using the proportion of offenders sentenced by age (under- and over-18s) and offence group as the weighting. These data for weighting were taken from 2010 sentencing tables published by the Ministry of Justice.²⁸

Youth Community Supervision

The unit cost of youth community supervision was calculated as the weighted average cost based on the indicative cost estimates for typical disposals for young offenders. These estimates were taken from the NAO value for money report on the youth justice system in

²³ National Audit Office (2011). *The cost of a cohort of young offenders to the criminal justice system*. Technical Paper. London: National Audit Office. (See Figure 8)

²⁴ The following report was also considered as a resource: Home Office (2005). *The economic and social costs of crime against individuals and households 2003/04*. Home Office Online Report 30/05. Available at <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20110218135832/rds.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs05/rdsolr3005.pdf>

²⁵ NAO technical paper, *op.cit.*, p.18.

²⁶ Povey, D. (Ed.), Mulchandani, R., Hand, T., & Panesar, L.K. (2011). *Police Powers and Procedures England and Wales 2009/10*. 2nd Edition. Home Office Statistical Bulletin 07/11. London: Home Office. Available at <http://www.statewatch.org/news/2011/may/uk-police-powers-ho-11.pdf>

²⁷ NAO technical paper, *op.cit.*, p.18.

²⁸ Ministry of Justice, Criminal Justice Statistics, England and Wales 2010, Sentencing Tables, Table A5.5. Available at www.justice.gov.uk/downloads/statistics/...stats/sentencing-tables.xls; Property offence estimate includes burglary as well as theft and handling stolen goods.

England and Wales.²⁹ The Birmingham Youth Offending Service provided the prevalence of different disposals for young offenders.

Youth Custody

The unit costs of youth custody were calculated as the average marginal operating costs per offender per year for under-18s. The figures in the NAO technical paper were presented per month served in prison, and these were adjusted to get to average annual costs.³⁰

Youth Supervision Post-Custody

The unit costs of youth supervision post-custody were calculated as the average marginal operating costs per offender per year using the average time spent in community supervision and an average cost per person. These estimates were adjusted to represent a full year of community supervision and thus an average annual cost. Data were not located for under-18s, so figures for adult offenders were used instead.³¹ When data for youth post-custody supervision become available, these figures will be replaced in future updates.

Adult Community Supervision

The unit costs of adult community supervision were calculated as the average marginal operating costs per offender per year. The Association of Greater Manchester Authorities (AGMA) provided costs for specific court order requirements and the number of offenders receiving them.³² These costs were adjusted according to the average community sentence duration to estimate the cost for one full year per offender. We acknowledge that these costs may not be representative of average costs for England and Wales. Therefore, these costs will be replaced with more representative estimates when such data become available.

Adult Custody

The unit costs of adult custody were calculated as the average marginal operating costs per offender per year for over-18s. The NAO figures were presented per month served in prison, and these were adjusted to get to average annual costs.³³

Adult Supervision Post-Custody

The unit costs of adult community supervision sentences were used for the costs of supervision post-custody (see above).³⁴

Victim Costs

Both tangible and intangible victim costs were taken from the Home Office report on the economic and social costs of crime against individuals and households 2003/04.³⁵ This report provides figures for the emotional and physical impact on victims. However, these costs are only based on road accidents for violent crime, and a question from the British crime survey for property crime. It also specifically excludes any valuation of the fear of crime, so these figures may be underestimates.

²⁹ National Audit Office (2010). *The youth justice system in England and Wales: Reducing offending by young people*. Report by the Comptroller and Auditor General. London: The Stationary Office.

³⁰ NAO technical paper, *op.cit.*, p.18.

³¹ The Association of Greater Manchester Authorities (AGMA) data are based on estimates from the Ministry of Justice payment of results pilot 'Justice Reinvestment'. The costs data are for all the local authorities that are included in this Ministry of Justice's payment by results pilot. This includes all 10 Greater Manchester local authorities - Bolton, Bury, Manchester, Oldham, Rochdale, Tameside, Trafford, Salford, Stockport, Wigan; and also includes 5 London boroughs - Croydon, Lambeth, Lewisham, Hackney, Southwark.

³² *Ibid.*

³³ NAO technical paper, *op.cit.*, p.18.

³⁴ AGMA, *op.cit.*

³⁵ Home Office, *op.cit.*, Table 2.1.

Other resources were also considered. The NAO technical paper on the Cost of a Cohort of Young Offenders to the Criminal Justice System could not be used because it did not include victim costs. McCollister and colleagues present tangible and intangible costs based on US data only, which are not necessarily applicable to the UK (e.g. US medical costs, US jury awards).³⁶ The Victim Support report on The Cost of Crime from January 2011 used the same figures from the Home Office report but adjusted these estimates using the GDP deflator (as given by HM Treasury) to reflect inflation between 2003 and 2009 and updated recorded crime rates.³⁷ However, this is essentially what is done in this model. The Criminal Injuries Compensation Authority (CICA) Criminal Injuries Compensation Scheme 2008 was also considered, but it breaks costs down by type of injury rather than by offence.³⁸

Table 8.1. Criminal Justice Sector Costs and Victim Costs

Per Unit Costs	Violence Against the Person	Sexual Offences	Robbery	Property Offences	Drug Offences	Summary Offences excluding motoring
Police	1,668	1,668	1,668	1,668	1,668	1,668
Courts	11,871	10,194	3,040	3,7254	2,394	619
Youth Community Supervision	6,626	6,626	6,626	6,626	6,626	6,626
Youth Custody	58,776	58,776	58,776	58,776	58,776	58,776
Youth Supervision Post-Custody	3244	3244	3244	3244	3244	3244
Adult Community Supervision	3244	3244	3244	3244	3244	3244
Adult Custody	28,404	28,404	28,404	28,404	28,404	28,404
Adult Supervision Post-Custody	3244	3244	3244	3244	3244	3244
Victim Costs (tangible)	3,004	5,378	1,612	454	0	0
Victim Costs (intangible)	5,472	22,754	3,048	269	0	0

Note. Police per-unit cost reflects the cost per arrest (specifically, per person arrested due to data limitations). Court per-unit cost reflects the court cost per person convicted. Supervision and custody per-unit costs reflect the cost per offender per year. Victim per-unit cost reflect the cost per actual crime as measured by (for example) the British Crime Survey (BCS), rather than those as recorded by the police.

8.3. Criminal Justice Resource Use

Once a person is convicted for an offence, sentencing policies and practices in England and Wales affect the use of different criminal justice resources. This section of the report describes inputs that indicate how criminal justice resources are used in response to crime. Thus, in addition to per-unit crime costs described above (section 8.2), the crime model uses sentencing probabilities and resource-use estimates to work out the benefits of interventions that aim to reduce offending.

³⁶ McCollister, K. E., French, M. T., & Fang, H. (2010). The cost of crime to society: New crime-specific estimates for policy and program evaluation. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, 108, 98-109.

³⁷ Report available at <http://www.victimsupport.org/Aboutus/News/2011/01/Economic-impact-of-crime>

³⁸ CICA Scheme available at <http://www.justice.gov.uk/downloads/guidance/compensation-schemes/cica/am-eligible/Criminal%20Injuries%20Compensation%20Scheme%202008.pdf>

Probabilities

The model uses the probabilities of different sentences given different crimes (see Table 8.2). These sentencing probabilities were obtained from the Ministry of Justice Sentencing Tables 2010.³⁹

Youth Community Supervision

These figures are based on the Ministry of Justice Sentencing Tables 2010, Table A5.34. For example, if a young offender is convicted of robbery, there is a 73 per cent chance of being provided community supervision (e.g., intensive supervision and surveillance programmes).

Youth Custody

These figures are based on the Ministry of Justice Sentencing Tables 2010, Table A5.24. For example, if a young offender is convicted of robbery, there is a 22 per cent chance of receiving a custodial sentence.

Youth Supervision Post-Custody

These estimates are based on scenarios provided by the Greater Manchester Probation Trust in which a sentence length of less than 12 months leads to no probation supervision and a sentence length of greater than 12 months leads to some amount of probation supervision (see next section on years of use per resource for further details). Based on these estimates, for example, if a young offender is convicted of robbery, there is a 100 per cent chance of receiving post-custody supervision. We acknowledge that Greater Manchester estimates may not be representative of probabilities for England and Wales. Therefore, these estimates will be replaced with more representative estimates when such data become available.

Adult Community Supervision

These figures are based on the Ministry of Justice Sentencing Tables 2010. They were calculated by taking a weighted average of community sentences probabilities for 18-21 year olds and for 21+ from Table A5.34, using the number sentenced for each offence in each age group from table A5.5 as the weighting. For example, if an adult offender is convicted of robbery, there is nearly a seven per cent chance of being provided community supervision (e.g., intensive supervision and surveillance programmes).

Adult Custody

These figures are based on the Ministry of Justice Sentencing Tables 2010. They were calculated by taking a weighted average of custody probabilities for 18-21 year olds and for 21+ from Table A5.24, using the number sentenced for each offence in each age group from table A5.5 as the weighting. For example, if an adult offender is convicted of robbery, there is an 82 per cent chance of receiving a custodial sentence.

Adult Supervision Post-Custody

These estimates are based on scenarios provided by the Greater Manchester Probation Trust in which a sentence length of less than 12 months leads to no probation supervision and a sentence length of greater than 12 months leads to some amount of probation supervision (see next section on years of use per resource for further details). Based on these estimates, for example, if an adult offender is convicted of robbery, there is a 100 per cent chance of receiving post-custody supervision.

³⁹ Ministry of Justice, Criminal Justice Statistics, *op.cit.*

Table 8.2. Probabilities of Criminal Justice Resource Use

Probability Resource Use	Violence Against the Person	Sexual Offences	Robbery	Property Offences	Drug Offences	Summary Offences (Excluding Motoring)
Youth Community Supervision	0.80	0.80	0.71	0.74	0.49	0.64
Youth Custody	0.12	0.16	0.22	0.06	0.04	0.02
Youth Supervision Post-Custody	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00
Adult Community Supervision	0.29	0.23	0.07	0.30	0.19	0.10
Adult Custody	0.35	0.62	0.82	0.26	0.17	0.03
Adult Supervision Post-Custody	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00

Years of Use per Resource

In addition to sentencing probabilities, the average number of years various criminal justice resources are used were estimated for each of the crime categories (see Table 8.3 below).

Youth Community Supervision

As it was not possible to locate data for youth, adult data from Greater Manchester were used (see 'adult community supervision' below). Based on these estimates, for example, if a young offender is convicted of robbery, the average number of years that they receive community supervision is 0.65 years, which translates into nearly eight months of community supervision. If data for youth community supervision become available, these figures will be replaced in future updates.

Youth Custody

These figures were extracted from the Ministry of Justice Sentencing Tables 2010, Table A5.21.⁴⁰ Months of immediate custody reported in the table were divided by 12 to get the estimate in years. In order to estimate the actual length of stay, the resulting estimates were divided by two because offenders typically serve half of the sentence in custody.⁴¹ Based on these estimates, for example, if a young offender is convicted of robbery, the average number of years that the offender spends in custody is 0.7 years that translates into nearly eight and a half months of community supervision.

Youth Supervision Post-Custody

Similarly to youth community supervision, adult data from Greater Manchester are used here (see 'adult supervision post-custody' below). For example, if a young offender is convicted of robbery, the average number of years that the offender receives community supervision after serving the sentence is 0.7 years, which translates into nearly eight and a half months of post-custody community supervision. If data for youth community supervision become available, these figures will be replaced in future updates.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*

⁴¹ For an average length of immediate custody see Table 2m in the Ministry of Justice publication on sentencing. Available at www.justice.gov.uk/downloads/.../sentencing-stats-09-supp-tables.xls
For an indication of time served in prison see the Ministry of Justice's Offender management caseload statistics (annual) (NS). Available at <http://www.justice.gov.uk/statistics/prisons-and-probation/omcs-annual>

Adult Community Supervision

The sentence lengths for community sentences are based on data from the Greater Manchester Probation Trust on average lengths of community orders for each type of crime. The sentence lengths were estimated by calculating a weighted average of the duration of community orders in months, weighted by the number of offenders per offence for both successful and unsuccessful sentences. For example, if the adult offender is convicted of a sexual offence, the average number of years that they receive community supervision is 2.04 years.

Adult Custody

These figures come from the Ministry of Justice Sentencing Tables 2010, Table A5.21. Months of immediate custody were divided by 12 to get the estimate in years and weighted 18-20 year olds and 21+ using the number who committed each offence from Table A5.5. These estimates were divided by two given that half of the sentence is typically served in custody and half is served in the community.⁴² Based on the resulted estimates, for example, if an adult offender is convicted of robbery, the average number of years that the offender receives community supervision is 1.56 years.

Adult Supervision Post-Custody

Adult post-custody supervision estimates are based on the following scenarios provided by the Greater Manchester Probation Trust:

- Sentence length of less than twelve months: no probation supervision provided.
- Adults with sentence length of between twelve months and four years: generally let out of prison halfway through their sentence and spend remainder of sentence on licence with Probation supervision.
- Adults with sentence length of more than four years: minimum custody length usually specified by the judge.
- Adults with life sentences: parole board agrees on a release date, they remain under the supervision of the probation service for at least ten years (at which point the probation service may make a case that supervision is no longer required).
- Indeterminate Public Protection sentences: sentence length not set, release determined by parole board. If released always remain under the supervision of the probation service.

It has to be acknowledged that the estimates displayed in Table 8.3 do not take into account the years of resource use by those who have life sentences or those who have a sentence length of more than four years. Thus, some of the figures in Table 8.3 are likely to underestimate the actual years of resource use.

Change in the Length of Stay for Each Subsequent Sentence

In Washington State, the sentence for a crime is based on the seriousness of the offence and the offender's criminal history. The Washington State Sentencing Guidelines Commission publishes a grid showing the sentence by seriousness and the number of previous convictions.⁴³ In all, the sentence length (in years) for a given crime increases as criminal history increases. The model accounts for these lengthening sentences, which enables us to estimate the effect of increasing trips through the criminal justice system on sentence length. In the translated version of the model we set the value of change in the length of stay for each subsequent sentence for both adults and juveniles to zero, as there is no evidence to support a systematic increase in subsequent sentence lengths in England and Wales. Sentence length is up to the judges' discretion.

⁴² *Ibid.*

⁴³ Sentencing manuals available at <http://www.cfc.wa.gov/SentencingPublication.htm>

Table 8.3. Years of Use per Criminal Justice Resource

Number of Years of Use Per Resource	Violence Against the Person	Sexual Offences	Robbery	Property Offences	Drug Offences	Summary Offences (Excluding Motoring)
Youth Community Supervision	0.76	2.04	0.65	0.60	0.56	0.65
Youth Custody	0.65	1.30	0.70	0.19	0.63	0.19
Youth Supervision Post-Custody	0.65	1.30	0.70	0.00	0.63	0.00
Adult Community Supervision	0.76	2.04	0.65	0.60	0.56	0.65
Adult Custody	0.75	2.04	1.56	0.31	1.27	0.10
Adult Supervision Post-Custody	0.75	2.04	1.56	0.31	1.27	0.00

Age when a Juvenile is First Tried in Adult Courts

The age at which a youth is considered an adult varies for specific types of crimes in Washington State. The model is designed to take that into account. In England and Wales, under no circumstances would a juvenile (that is, someone under the age of 18 years) be sent to an adult prison; although they may be tried in Crown Court, they would not be allocated any adult criminal justice resources. Thus, the age when a juvenile is first tried as an adult is set to 18 years in the translated version of the model since this is when young people start to use adult resources for sentences.

8.4. Crime and Victimization Rates

Number of Recorded Crimes

These figures come from the Home Office Statistical Bulletin 2010/11 July 2011, Table 2.04 (see Table 8.4 below).⁴⁴

Table 8.4. Total Recorded Crimes

Victimisation	Total Violence Against the Person Offences	Sexual Offences	Robbery	Burglary	Theft	Total Offences Against Vehicles
Number of Recorded Crimes	821,957	54,982	76,179	522,640	1,078,727	449,681

Percentage of Actual Crime Recorded

These figures were calculated by dividing the Home Office Statistical Bulletin 10/11 (Table 2.04) data on recorded crime by the British Crime Survey figures for the same crimes (Table 2.01 extended).⁴⁵ For sexual offences, as the British Crime Survey did not include these, the percentage in Washington State was used (see Table 8.5).⁴⁶

⁴⁴ Chaplin, R., Flatley, J., & Smith, K. (Eds.) (2011). *Crime in England and Wales 2010/11. Findings from the British Crime Survey and police recorded crime* (2nd Edition). Home Office Statistical Bulletin 10/11. London: Home Office. Available at <http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/publications/science-research-statistics/research-statistics/crime-research/hosb1011/hosb1011?view=Binary>

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*

⁴⁶ Lee et al., *op.cit.*, p. 52.

Table 8.5. Percentage of Actual Crime Recorded

	Violence Against the Person	Sexual Offences	Robbery	Burglary	Theft	Offenses Against Vehicles/Vehicle-related theft
Per Cent of Actual Crime Recorded	0.37	0.31	0.31	0.70	0.33	0.38

Total Number of Convictions

This is the total number of court events resulting in a conviction (see Table 8.6 below). These figures are obtained from the Ministry of Justice Sentencing Tables 2010, Table A5.5.⁴⁷ The estimate for property crimes includes data on burglary as well as theft and handling stolen goods. It has to be acknowledged that the Ministry of Justice estimates reflect the number of offenders convicted at court rather than convictions. The offender will appear as convicted only of the most serious offence he/she committed at the crime event. However, no other sources were identified for convictions and therefore the figures used in the model are likely to underestimate the total number of convictions.

Total Number of Counts

The WSIPP cost-benefit model takes into account the total number of counts.⁴⁸ There may be more counts than convictions if offenders are convicted of more than one crime at one court event. For these figures, WSIPP data were used to come up with the ratio of counts to convictions and then the same ratio of counts to convictions was applied to England and Wales conviction rates (see Table 8.6).⁴⁹

Percentage of Other Crimes per Conviction

This is a way to estimate how many actual crimes were committed by the convicted offenders. A value of one indicates that all unrecorded crimes were committed by the convicted offenders and a value of zero indicates that none of them were. The model currently uses the estimates that WSIPP uses, as these are relatively conservative (see Table 8.6).⁵⁰ Another resource that was considered was Table 1 in a paper by Cohen and Piquero published in 2009.⁵¹ However, these data are largely based on US sources.

Table 8.6. Conviction Data

	Violence Against the Person	Sexual Offences	Robbery	Property Offences	Drug Offences
Total Number of Convictions, Adult and Juvenile	44,458	5,772	8,514	144,829	61,435
Total Number of Counts, Adult and Juvenile	60,774	11,469	13,373	300,343	Not required for model
Per Cent of Other Crimes per Conviction	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	Not required for model

⁴⁷ Ministry of Justice, Criminal Justice Statistics, *op.cit.*

⁴⁸ A count is a statement of a different alleged crime; each separate charge in a criminal action.

⁴⁹ Lee et al., *op.cit.*, p. 52.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p.52.

⁵¹ Cohen, M. A., & Piquero, A. R. (2009). New evidence on the monetary value of saving a high risk youth. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 25(1), 25-49.

Total Number of Arrests

Arrest data is obtained from the Home Office Statistical Bulletin Police Powers and Procedures England and Wales 2009/10, Table 1B (see Table 8.7 below).⁵² The estimate for property crimes includes data on burglary as well as theft and handling stolen goods. It has to be acknowledged that the estimates available from the Home Office reflect the number of persons arrested rather than arrests. Thus, the figures in Table 8.7 are likely to underestimate the total number of arrests.

Table 8.7. Arrest Data

	Violence Against The person	Sexual Offences	Robbery	Property Offences	Drug Offences
Total Number of Arrests, Adult and Juvenile	456,916	36,885	32,698	387,486	121,010

8.5. Populations

This section looks at reoffending rates and the timing of offences for the populations that will be receiving the interventions. This criminological information (base rates) for different populations is used to estimate the long-term impacts of evidence-based programmes and approaches on crime. Specifically, the effect sizes indicating intervention impact are applied to these base rates to compute the change in monetisable units.

The translated model only includes three populations: the general population, a low-income (high risk) population, and young offenders. The model currently uses WSIPP data for two of the populations that have been reanalysed to match England and Wales's crime categories (e.g. murder and aggravated assault were combined to create a category of Violence Against the Person). The low-income population data were calculated using a regression coefficient for the effect of poverty on crime to adjust the base conviction rate in the general population over the life-course (see Table 8.8).⁵³

Crime Probability

For the recidivating young offenders, the data refer to a cohort of 83,000 young offenders who committed their first proven offence in 2000, in England and Wales. The offending behaviour of this cohort was examined for the period 2000 to 2009.⁵⁴

For the non-offender populations, the probability of obtaining a conviction over the life course (35 years) was calculated from a 1974 birth cohort in Washington State (N=78,517).⁵⁵ The WSIPP model is designed to use the probability of being convicted for a certain type of crime using a ranked order of seriousness. The mutually exclusive categories from most serious to least serious in the WSIPP model include: murder, sex, robbery, assault, property, drug, and misdemeanour. In order to match the England and Wales data with the model requirements, the probability of being convicted for the most serious type of crime in the follow-up period was calculated, using a rank order of seriousness (from most to least serious: violence against the person, sexual offences, robbery, property offences, drug offences, and summary offences). We acknowledge the limitations of such rank order of seriousness in the context of crime data for England and Wales. For example, violence

⁵² Povey, D. (Ed.), *op.cit.*

⁵³ Data provided by WSIPP.

⁵⁴ NAO technical paper, *op.cit.*

⁵⁵ Data provided by WSIPP.

against the person category may include crimes that could be considered less serious than sexual offences.

Primary Proven Offences

Primary proven offence is the most serious offence committed in one criminal event and the focus of the judicial process. The estimate used in the model is the average number of primary proven offences per offender during the follow-up period, organised by the most serious offence committed in that period. This estimate aims to capture the average number of “trips” through the criminal justice system.

Volume of Offences

Offenders may have multiple offence convictions for each “trip” through the system. In order to capture this, the model uses the average number of total offences per conviction, including both primary and secondary offences. For the general population, UK cohort studies were considered to get offending rates, but the necessary data are not available from any studies that were identified in searches, usually because the offending rates were based on self-report and were not presented by type of crime.

Timing

For those persons convicted, a probability density distribution for each of the offender and non-offender populations was computed which indicates when convictions are likely to happen over the follow-up period. For density distribution parameters see Table 8.9.

Table 8.8. Criminological Information for Different Populations

	Violence Against the Person	Sexual Offences	Robbery	Property Offences	Drug Offences	Summary Offences (Excluding Motoring)
Young Offenders						
Crime Probability	0.35	0.11	0.03	0.32	0.12	0.18
Average Number of Proven Offences	8.42	6.14	8.29	5.49	3.01	1.98
Average Volume of Offences	1.79	1.72	1.80	1.68	1.40	1.23
General Population						
Crime Probability	0.07	0.02	0.02	0.15	0.05	0.69
Average Number of Proven Offences	1.37	1.13	1.60	2.42	2.80	2.25
Average Volume of Offences	1.22	1.34	1.19	1.33	1.22	1.15
Low-Income Population						
Crime Probability	0.07	0.02	0.02	0.18	0.05	0.66
Average Number of Proven Offences	1.37	1.13	1.60	2.42	2.80	2.25
Average Volume of Offences	1.22	1.34	1.19	1.33	1.22	1.15

Table 8.9. Density Distribution Parameters for Different Populations

	Young Offenders	General Population	Low Income Population
Distribution Type	2	6	6
Parameter 1	0.13	10.64	10.64
Parameter 2	-0.04	15.46	15.46
Parameter 3	0	38.42	38.42
Parameter 4	0	0	0

9. Valuation of Outcomes that Affect Labour Market Earnings

There are several outcomes in the cost-benefit model that are partially monetised with labour market earnings. In the current version of the translated cost-benefit model, the outcomes that are, in part, monetised with labour market earnings are: high school graduation (which is equated with the attainment of A-levels in the translated model); standardised student test scores; and number of years of completed education.

9.1. Earnings Data

The model makes use of average personal income from earnings by age of each person and by educational status based on the highest level completed.

Earnings data were derived from the Labour Force Survey (LFS, year 2010, Quarter 1- 4, wave 1). We calculated average earnings per person by single year of age in England and Wales (see Table 9.1). Earnings were estimated for the following educational status groupings:

- the total population – the Labour Force Survey sample including 18-65 year olds in England and Wales
- those who did not report attaining A-level but had other qualifications (e.g., GCSEs, NVQ level 1 and 2) and no qualifications
- those who reported attaining A-level and other equivalent qualifications;
- those who reported having higher education but had not completed an undergraduate degree
- those who reported attaining an undergraduate degree or higher qualifications (e.g., masters degree, doctorate).

Before creating these educational status groupings we tested whether the attainment of A-level qualifications best compares to the attainment of high school diploma in the US. Using, for example, the attainment of 5 GCSEs as a cut-off point did not suit the model's requirements, since people with 5+ GCSEs earn less on average than those who have fewer than 5 GCSEs as their highest qualification when using the LFS data.⁵⁶

The groupings were created using variable 'Highqual8' in the LFS dataset. Survey respondents who were missing qualifications were filtered out of the analysis as well as people who were under 16 years of age.

⁵⁶ It should be noted that even though it is counterintuitive, this is what the LFS data revealed when looking at the annual gross salary including people in employment, unemployed, part-time workers and people in training.

As for earnings, the earnings from both the main and second job were included into the annual gross salary. The average earnings reported are for all people (i.e., employed, unemployed and inactive according to the International Labour Organization definitions⁵⁷) at each age, not just for those with earnings (Table 9.1). Thus, these data take into account both earnings of the earners and the rate of labour force participation.

Table 9.1. Annual Earnings by Age (18-65) of Persons in the Labour Force Survey (2010 data)

Age of Person	Total Population	Less than A-level	A-level and equivalent	Higher education	Undergraduate degree or higher
18	£2,007	£2,002	£1,894	£3,876	£8,112
19	£3,707	£3,818	£3,463	£5,021	£4,992
20	£4,152	£4,281	£4,102	£3,325	£4,856
21	£5,505	£5,508	£5,148	£7,393	£5,877
22	£7,528	£6,301	£8,191	£14,405	£7,522
23	£9,104	£7,145	£9,490	£12,546	£10,995
24	£10,894	£6,438	£13,452	£11,933	£14,335
25	£12,120	£7,257	£12,078	£12,554	£18,507
26	£13,119	£8,598	£13,769	£15,039	£19,326
27	£14,470	£9,164	£14,122	£17,918	£21,431
28	£15,638	£10,122	£14,771	£16,648	£22,969
29	£16,912	£10,296	£16,408	£16,405	£25,587
30	£16,554	£9,631	£14,987	£18,365	£26,514
31	£19,675	£14,732	£18,107	£20,246	£26,813
32	£18,091	£9,311	£17,217	£19,280	£28,238
33	£17,977	£10,483	£15,889	£18,675	£28,482
34	£19,528	£10,474	£17,634	£20,006	£31,166
35	£19,046	£10,169	£16,769	£20,366	£31,634
36	£20,667	£10,941	£18,684	£21,796	£33,859
37	£19,442	£11,014	£19,258	£21,309	£31,843
38	£19,016	£10,037	£17,384	£23,159	£32,962
39	£18,894	£11,157	£18,707	£23,795	£33,004
40	£19,795	£12,486	£19,604	£24,829	£32,466
41	£20,644	£13,083	£21,056	£26,987	£34,016
42	£20,371	£12,067	£23,392	£23,038	£34,141
43	£22,208	£14,452	£19,300	£26,191	£42,671
44	£20,287	£12,739	£19,644	£24,247	£33,758
45	£20,377	£13,416	£20,177	£22,497	£34,485
46	£21,300	£14,166	£20,540	£22,569	£36,784
47	£20,306	£13,931	£18,941	£24,455	£34,572
48	£20,989	£14,248	£21,631	£22,893	£35,330
49	£20,573	£11,948	£19,375	£26,719	£38,846
50	£20,551	£10,414	£19,667	£39,729	£35,118
51	£20,614	£12,579	£18,084	£22,928	£39,858
52	£18,666	£11,264	£18,553	£23,753	£35,400
53	£18,092	£10,289	£17,027	£27,455	£31,230
54	£18,057	£10,696	£20,086	£22,989	£35,031
55	£17,700	£9,816	£22,233	£18,645	£34,199
56	£15,195	£8,876	£16,363	£18,057	£31,341
57	£14,214	£8,736	£13,931	£20,124	£27,939
58	£14,899	£9,333	£15,312	£18,297	£28,361
59	£11,924	£8,139	£14,314	£13,009	£21,668
60	£9,073	£5,412	£11,727	£13,206	£16,725
61	£7,128	£5,008	£8,620	£12,116	£12,162

⁵⁷ International Labour Organization - employment definitions available at <http://www.ilo.org/global/statistics-and-databases/statistics-overview-and-topics/employment-and-unemployment/lang-en/index.htm>

Age of Person	Total Population	Less than A-level	A-level and equivalent	Higher education	Undergraduate degree or higher
62	£6,269	£4,703	£8,021	£6,876	£10,700
63	£5,020	£3,349	£5,758	£5,439	£10,374
64	£4,740	£2,967	£5,804	£5,228	£12,711
65	£1,755	£1,541	£2,244	£2,903	£1,317

From these five annual earnings streams probability density distributions were fitted using Palisade Corporation's *@Risk* software to select the probability distribution with the lowest root mean square error. For all five series we found the best probability distribution to be a beta distribution. The four beta distribution parameters (Alpha, Beta, Lower Bound, Upper Bound) are shown in Table 9.2. These beta distributions are used to allocate the sum of all cross-sectional total earnings reported for all ages for the particular education cohort. See Technical Appendix of the WSIPP report for further details.⁵⁸

Table 9.2. Beta Distribution Parameters

Beta Distribution Parameters	Total Population	Less than A-Level	A-Level and Equivalent	Higher Education	Undergraduate Degree or Higher
Alpha	1.8801	1.945	1.7651	2.4107	2.2175
Beta	1.7934	1.7661	1.6259	1.8539	1.8192
Lower Bound	17.365	15.01	17.55	12.1	15.646
Upper Bound	65.275	65.386	65.181	65.202	65.221

9.2. Parameters Related to Earnings Data

Growth Rates in Earnings

Considering that the LFS earnings data are cross-sectional and the cost-benefit analysis reflects life-cycle earnings, it is important to estimate the long-run real rate of escalation in earnings for each of the five groups.

A search of the literature indicates that the average annual growth rate in real earnings for the UK between 1979 and 2009 was just over 2 per cent. For example, the Institute for Fiscal Studies produced a report called 'Poverty and Inequality in the UK: 2011'.⁵⁹ Section 2.2 states that between 1979 and 1996, the annual growth rate in real earnings was 2.1 per cent at the mean. Between 1997 and 2010 this decreased slightly to 1.9 per cent as a consequence of the economic crisis, which has produced higher inflation, rising unemployment and slower growth in incomes on average.

A report published by the Department for Trade and Industry in 2006 indicates that between 1995 and 2005 private sector real earnings grew at an annual average of 2.75 per cent, while public sector real earnings grew at an annual average of about 2.35 per cent (see Section 2 and Figure 2 of the document).⁶⁰

⁵⁸ Lee et al., *op.cit.*, pp. 22-23.

Lee et al., *op.cit.*, pp. 22-23.

Jin, W., Joyce, R., Phillips, D., & Sibiteta, L. (2011). *Poverty and Inequality in the UK: 2011*. Institute for Fiscal Studies. ICF Commentary C118. Available at <http://www.ifs.org.uk/comms/comm118.pdf>

⁶⁰ Fitzner, G. (2006). *How have employees fared? Recent UK trends*. Employment Relations Research Series No 56 Department of Trade and Industry. Employment Market Analysis and Research. Available at <http://www.bis.gov.uk/files/file27472.pdf>

Furthermore, the Office for National Statistics produced a report on Labour Market Statistics for February 2012.⁶¹ In the 'Earnings' section, the mean of the 'earnings annual growth rate for total pay including bonuses' was calculated as 2 per cent in December 2011. This indicates that the 2 per cent estimate is still current and fits a longer-term trend for the UK's average annual growth rate in real earnings.

Average annual growth rate in real earnings has averaged just above 2 per cent for much of the last 30 years, but this has decreased recently due to the economic recession. In light of this, and to use conservative rather than optimistic estimates, the translated cost-benefit model uses a 2 per cent rate for the average annual growth rate in real earnings. The same parameter was set for earnings for all groups because the review of the research does not provide separate estimates for each of the educational status groupings in the model.

Employee Benefits

The LFS data are for earnings only and do not include employee benefits associated with earnings. In order to measure these additions to earnings, we include an estimate of the ratio of total employee compensation to wage and salaries. This estimate was computed using data from Table J1 in a statistical bulletin Quarterly National Accounts, Q3 2011 published by the Office of National Statistics.⁶² Specifically, data for the year 2010 were used to calculate the ratio of benefits to wages and salaries by dividing the sum of wages and salaries and employers' social contributions by wages and salaries only. This resulted in an estimate of 1.21, which means that employers' social contributions form 21 per cent of employee benefits and earnings.

Total wages and salaries include categories such as "Total PAYE income", "Statutory Sickness & Maternity Pay", "Pay Below Tax Threshold" (very low earnings), "Profit Related Pay" (bonuses, stocks and shares payments), "Payroll Giving Scheme" (charity contributions) and "Employees' Contributions to Superannuation Funds" (pension schemes). In terms of social contributions, the "Employers' Contributions to Social Security" covers the National Insurance Scheme, the National Health Service, and the Redundancy Fund.⁶³

In order to estimate the annual rate of growth in the benefit ratio of total employee compensation to wage and salaries over the long term, the annual ratios for 1997 to 2010 were computed using data from the statistical bulletin series Quarterly National Accounts published by the Office of National Statistics. These estimates were then plotted and a curve (linear trend line) was fitted to these data. The resulting equation was used to compute a forecast of the annual growth rate in the benefit ratio over the 40-year interval. The annual ratio of benefits to wages and salaries (1.21) and the average projected growth rate (0.004) were entered into the model.

The earnings series is then used in the cost-benefit model to estimate labour market-related benefits of a number of outcomes.⁶⁴

⁶¹ Office for National Statistics. (2012). *Labour market statistics: February 2012*. Statistical Bulletin. Available at <http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/rel/lms/labour-market-statistics/february-2012/index.html>

⁶² Available at <http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/rel/naa2/quarterly-national-accounts/q3-2011/index.html>

⁶³ Office for National Statistics. (2000). *Gross National Income Inventory of Methods, UK Gross National Income (ESA95) Inventory*. Available at <http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/rel/naa1-rd/gross-national-income-inventory-of-methods/uk-gross-national-income--esa95--inventory/index.html>

⁶⁴ Lee et al., *op.cit.*, p. 25.

10. Model Inputs for Education Outcomes

Evaluations of education interventions often assess outcomes such as student test scores, years of education, graduation rates, special education, or grade retention (i.e., child kept back a year or repeating a year). The cost-benefit model developed by the WSIPP includes a number of education-related parameters to estimate the benefits of these education outcomes (see Table 10.1 below). The same parameters were entered for all students and for low-income students due to difficulties in identifying separate estimates for low-income populations.

10.1. Education Parameters

The Relationship between Gains in Student Test Scores and Labour Market Earnings

Many intervention programmes measure gains in student standardised test scores as outcomes. To evaluate these outcomes, the model contains a parameter and standard error to measure how a one standard deviation gain in test scores relates to a percentage increase in labour market earnings. The standard error for this input is used in Monte Carlo simulations.⁶⁵ A decision was made to use the parameter that WSIPP found in their review of the research on this topic.⁶⁶

The Relationship Between Gains in Years of Education Completed and Labour Market Earnings

To evaluate outcomes that measure gains in educational attainment, the model contains a parameter and standard error to measure how an extra year of education relates to a percentage increase in labour market earnings. WSIPP reviewed a number of studies on the topic and estimated this figure by taking the median of the estimates in these studies.⁶⁷ Even though the WSIPP review includes estimates relevant for the UK⁶⁸, a wider body of literature was reviewed to obtain an estimate specific to the UK. In a review of research, a median of nearly a 10 per cent increase in labour market earnings per additional year of education completed was found (with a standard error of 0.03).⁶⁹

The Standard Deviation in the Number of Completed Years of Education

Some intervention programmes measure gains in years of education as outcomes.⁷⁰ To evaluate these outcomes, the model contains a standard deviation to measure how a one standard deviation in years of education relates to a percentage increase in labour market earnings. Data from the International Social Survey Programme 1985–1995 were used to

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 126-127.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 83.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*

⁶⁸ Harmon, C., & Walker, I. (1995). Estimates of the economic return to schooling for the United Kingdom. *The American Economic Review*, 85 (5), 1278-1286.

⁶⁹ The figure was estimated by taking the median of the estimates in Bonjour, D., Cherkas, L., & Haskel, J. (2002). *Returns to education: Evidence from UK twins*. Discussion paper 3354. Queen Mary, University of London, Department of Economics. Centre for Economic Policy Research; Dearden, L. (1998). *Ability, families, education and earnings in Britain*. Working Paper 98/14. London: Institute for Fiscal Studies; Harmon, C., & Walker, I. (1995). Estimates of the economic return to schooling for the United Kingdom. *The American Economic Review*, 85 (5), 1278-1286; Harmon, C.P. & Walker, I., (1997). *Selective schooling, school quality, and labour market returns*. Keele Department of Economics Discussion Papers (1995-2001) 97/06, Department of Economics, Keele University; Harmon, C. & I. Walker, I. (1999). The marginal and average return to schooling. *European Economic Review*, 43 (4-6), 879-887; Harmon, C. & Walker, I. (2000). Returns to the quantity and quality of education: Evidence for men in England and Wales. *Economica*, 67(265), 19-35; Harmon, C., Oosterbeek, H., & Walker, I. (2003). The returns to education: Microeconomics. *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 17, 2, 115-156.

⁷⁰ There are currently no programmes in the model that measure years of education.

calculate the standard deviation in the number of years of education attained (1.46 years) by employed individuals aged 21–59 in the year of interview.⁷¹

The Rate of Pupils with A-levels

The WSIPP cost-benefit model contains a user-supplied parameter of the high school graduation rate. In the translated model, the high school graduation was equated with the attainment of A-levels (and equivalent qualifications). Both high school graduation and attainment of A-levels require a similar number of years of study and are required qualifications to enter undergraduate study. An estimate of 54.2 per cent was used in the model based on the provisional data on Level 2 and 3 attainment by young people in England by age 19 published by the Department for Education (DfE).⁷²

The Relationship Between A-levels and Labour Market Earnings

In the WSIPP model, there is a parameter to reflect the degree of causation between the observed earning differentials for high school graduates and non-graduates. The WSIPP's entries for the maximum, mode, and minimum values are set to one which indicates that all of the difference in observed earnings is due to the possession of a high school diploma. This parameter is modelled as a triangular probability density distribution.⁷³ WSIPP's estimates are based on the work of Rouse⁷⁴ and Heckman et al.⁷⁵. An initial review of literature on the returns of education suggests that even though there are differences between the UK and US labour market, there is a strong relationship between earnings and level of education in both.⁷⁶ There is, as yet, no strong evidence that associations between education and earnings in the UK are not causal.⁷⁷ Therefore, the same value was used in the translated model as in the US model, implying that there is a strong causal relationship between any observed differences in earnings that is due to the attainment of A-levels.

10.2. Education Resource Use

The model can also calculate the value of two other educational outcomes: years of special education and grade retention. The inputs entered into the model include the cost of a year of special education, the year in which the special education costs per year are denominated, and the estimated average number of years that special education is used,

⁷¹ Trostel, P., Walker, I., & Woolley, P. (2002). Estimates of the economic return to schooling for 28 countries. *Labour Economics*, 9, 1-16.

⁷² Department for Education. (2011). *Level 2 and 3 attainment by young people in England measured using matched administrative data: Attainment by age 19 in 2010 (provisional)*. Statistical First Release 04/2011. Available at <http://www.education.gov.uk/rsgateway/DB/SFR/s000995/index.shtml>

⁷³ See also Lee et al., *op.cit.*, p. 126-127.

⁷⁴ Rouse, C. E. (2007). *Consequences for the labor market*. In C. Belfield & H. M. Levin, (Eds.), *The price we pay: Economic and social consequences of inadequate education* (pp. 99-124). Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

⁷⁵ Heckman, J., Lochner, P., & Todd, P. (2008). Earnings functions and rates of return. *Journal of Human Capital*, 2, 1, 1-31.

⁷⁶ Crawford, C., Johnson, P., Machin, S., & Vignoles, A. (2011). *Social mobility: A literature review*. London: Department for Business, Innovation and Skills. Available at <http://www.bis.gov.uk/assets/biscore/economics-and-statistics/docs/s/11-750-social-mobility-literature-review.pdf>

⁷⁷ Blundell, R., Dearden, L., & Sianesi, B. (2004). *Evaluating the impact of education on earnings in the UK. Models, methods and Results from the NCDS*. CEE DP 47. London: Centre for the Economics of Education, London School of Economics. Available at <http://cee.lse.ac.uk/ceedps/ceedp47.pdf>; Bonjour, D., Cherkas, L. F., Haskel, J. E., Hawkes, D. D., & Spector, T. D. (2003). Returns to Education: Evidence from U.K. Twins. *American Economic Review*, 93(5), 1799-1812; Card, D. (1998). *The causal effect of education on earnings*. Center for Labor Economics Working Paper No 2. Berkeley: University of California. Available at <http://cle.berkeley.edu/wp/wp2.pdf>; Giuseppe Migali, G. & Walker, I. (2011). *Estimates of the causal effects of education on earnings over the lifecycle with cohort effects and endogenous education*. Working paper. Lancaster: Lancaster University Management School. Available at http://eprints.lancs.ac.uk/52301/1/paper_lfs_8jul11.pdf

conditional on entering special education. Also, the assumed age that special education provision is first provided is entered. In addition, the model requires an estimate of the marginal cost of a year one year of education and the year in which these dollars are denominated.

Repetition of a school year

The value for a proportion of pupils in state-funded schools who have been kept back or repeated at least one school year during the period up to Year 11 was set to 0.0001 since repeating a grade is not a common practice in the education system in England and Wales.⁷⁸ The average number of years repeated for those retained was set to 1.

Special Education

The model contains a parameter of the percentage of students with special educational needs (SEN). The estimate used in the model is 20.4 per cent (including both pupils with and without statement in state-funded schools).⁷⁹ The average number of years of special education for SEN pupils was set to 10 considering that the majority of children are identified as having special education needs when they start school and receive relevant support throughout their school years.⁸⁰ The average age when children are first identified with SEN was set to 5 as the statistics tend to show that a large proportion of pupils start using SEN provision in year 1 when they are 5 years old.⁸¹

Cost of a regular school year and SEN provision

The cost of one year of regular education was estimated to be £5,187 (2010 pounds). An overall cost per pupil was calculated (all pupils) using the cost estimates from “Benchmarking tables of LA planned expenditure: 2011-12” (per capita gross table) using average mean figures for all England local authorities.⁸²

The cost of one year of education for a student with SEN provision was estimated to be £6,575 (2010 pounds). Again, this cost was estimated based on data from the benchmarking tables of LA planned expenditure. The per capita cost figures were assessed to establish which of the cost elements relate to SEN. As these are costs averaged across all pupils (including those without SEN), the costs were reapportioned to those pupils with SEN (statemented and non-statemented pupils). These costs were divided by the number of SEN identifiers, establishing the cost of SEN provision (£1,388). The net cost of one year of education per pupil with SEN provision was computed by adding the cost of a year of regular education (see above) and SEN provision (£6,575).

It has to be acknowledged that these estimates are total costs, not marginal costs. Some elements of the cost breakdown are not directly proportional to the number of SEN pupils (e.g., central administration, assessment and information functions). Furthermore, this is an

⁷⁸ Eurydice (2011). *Grade retention during compulsory education in Europe: Regulations and statistics*. European Commission: Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA P9 Eurydice). Available at http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/documents/thematic_reports/126EN.pdf

⁷⁹ Department for Education. (2011). *Special Educational Needs Information Act: An analysis 2011*. (See Table 1.1.) Available at <http://www.education.gov.uk/rsgateway/DB/STR/d001032/index.shtml>

⁸⁰ Local authority data were used to make this assumption, e.g., Analysis of Statutory Assessment, and School Census data relating to Special Educational Needs provided by Greater Manchester.

⁸¹ Birmingham data on the count of pupils with SEN provision by year group was examined which indicated that a large proportion of pupils start using SEN provision in year 1 when children are 5 years of age.

⁸² Available at <http://www.education.gov.uk/childrenandyoungpeople/strategy/financeandfunding/section251/a00197971/benchmarking-2011-12>

average cost estimate. The exact costs for an individual pupil will depend on the type of SEN (e.g., learning disability, behavioural difficulty, physical disability). So any costs saved by a specific intervention that only targets one of the areas could be much higher or much lower than the given estimate.

For any programme or approach under consideration that measures (a) high school graduation, (b) gains in student standardised test scores, or (c) increases in the number of years of education achieved either directly or indirectly via a “linked” outcome, the LFS earnings data and other parameters are used to estimate the expected gain in life cycle labour market earnings. The model can also calculate the value of years of special education and grade repetition. For further details on the valuation of earnings from high school graduation, test scores and number of years of education as well as valuation of changes in the use of special education and grade retention see the technical appendix of the WSIPP report published in April 2012.⁸³

Table 10.1. Model Inputs for Education Outcomes

Education Parameters	All Pupils	Low Income Pupils
Gain in lifetime earnings from a 1SD increase in test scores (Mean)	0.118	0.118
Gain in lifetime earnings from a 1SD increase in test scores (Standard error)	0.03	0.03
Gain in lifetime earnings from one extra year of education (Mean)	0.099	0.099
Gain in lifetime earnings from one extra year of education (Standard error)	0.032	0.032
Standard Deviation for number of completed years of education	1.475	1.475
Percentage of pupils who have achieved A-levels	0.747	0.747
Causal link between graduating from high school and lifetime earning gains (Max)	1	1
Causal link between graduating from high school and lifetime earning gains (Mode)	1	1
Causal link between graduating from high school and lifetime earning gains (Min)	1	1
Percentage of pupils in state-funded schools who have repeated at least one school year during the period up to year 11	0.0001	0.0001
Average number of years repeated, for those retained	1	1
Percentage of pupils in state-funded schools with special educational needs (SEN)	0.204	0.204
Average number of years of special education for those who receive special education	10	10
Average age when children are first identified with SEN	5	5
Cost of one year of special education per pupil in state-funded schools	6575	6575
Year of pounds for cost of special education services	2010	2010
Cost of one year of regular education per pupil in state-funded schools	5187	5187
Year of pounds for cost of regular education	2010	2010

Note. ^a Graduation from high school was equated to attaining A-levels in our analysis.

⁸³ Lee et al., *op.cit.*, pp. 84-87.

11. Valuation of Child Abuse and Neglect Outcomes

This section of the technical report mainly describes the data sources inputted in the cost-benefit model that are used to estimate the monetary value of changes in the occurrence of child abuse and neglect (CAN), as well as the monetary value of changes in out-of-home placement (OoHP) in the child protection and social care system. In this model, the status of being looked after was equated with out-of-home placements in the US model.⁸⁴ For further details on the procedures to estimate the monetary benefits of intervention-induced changes in CAN and OoHP please see Technical Appendix of the latest published WSIPP report.⁸⁵

Overall, the cost-benefit model uses an incidence-based (as an alternative to prevalence-based) approach to estimate the costs of CAN. This approach aims to estimate the expected future benefits if CAN was reduced. The model includes estimates for the value of reducing a substantiated CAN case. In other words, a child protection case, where there is evidence a child is suffering, or is likely to suffer, significant harm in their current living conditions. It also estimates the value of children becoming looked after, from the perspective of the taxpayer. The direct benefits are derived by calculating the costs that are incurred with the incidence of a CAN case, or an occurrence of being looked after and in local authority care.

CAN costs include the expected value of public costs associated with a child protection case (e.g., child protection system and legal fees), and an estimate of the costs associated with being the victim of CAN. Other long-term costs that are causally linked to the incidence of CAN are discussed in the Technical Appendix of the WSIPP report from April 2012.⁸⁶ Care costs are derived from the expected value of public costs due to a care placement, conditional on that placement occurring. As the costs for being looked after are most often a function of CAN-related involvement in the child protection system, the “CAN model” is frequently referred to when describing computations below. The CAN model includes a set of parameters describing various aspects of CAN epidemiology, involvement in the child protection system, and links with other outcomes. This section describes the data sources used in the analysis of CAN and placement in care.

11.1 Prevalence Rates

CAN Prevalence in the General Population

One of the components central to the CAN model is the cumulative likelihood of experiencing child abuse or neglect. This epidemiological estimate becomes the ‘base rate’ of CAN that the intervention effect sizes are applied to calculate the change in the number of avoided CAN ‘units’ as a result of the intervention and over the lifetime following treatment.

⁸⁴ A limitation of this assumption is that there is a small proportion of looked after children who are placed with parents (e.g., 5.8% of all children who started to be looked after with child abuse and neglect as their primary need). A child who is subject to a Care Order (or Interim care Order) can only be placed with a parent (or other person with parental responsibility) in accordance with specific regulations. These regulations are known as the Care Planning, Placement and Case Review Regulations 2010.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 56-63.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 109-121.

The probability of being a victim of CAN was calculated using mid-2010 resident population estimates for England by age and sex⁸⁷ and the number of Section 47 enquiries as the basis for (substantiated CAN) child protection cases by age group⁸⁸. In any given year, some of these child protection cases are recurring cases from previous maltreatment episodes. In order to account for that, a recurrence rate of 13.3 per cent was assumed in computations. This estimate was based on the proportion of children who were subject to a child protection plan for a subsequent or second time in the Children in Need Census 2010-2011 data.⁸⁹ These parameters were used to calculate the annual probability of a new child protection case for a child from age zero to age 17 that gave an estimate of 14.81 per cent as the implied lifetime prevalence rate of CAN for the general population. The cumulative prevalence for CAN by age, after recurring cases are accounted for, is displayed in Table 11.1.

CAN Prevalence in the High Risk Population

Some of the interventions are not targeted at the general population but at higher risk populations that are often from lower socio-economic status. In order to compute the annual CAN prevalence rate for the low socio-economic status population, an odds ratio of 2.535 was applied to the general population prevalence rate (see above) in the model. This parameter was estimated by taking a weighted average of the results of six studies, including the ALSPAC study in the UK, that have examined this issue with control groups.⁹⁰

CAN Prevalence in the Maltreated Population

In order to estimate the likelihood of recurrence of abuse and neglect for children already in the child protection system, the results of three studies - reporting the recurrence of substantiated maltreatment as between 0.5 and 2.25 years from the first substantiation - were combined.⁹¹ Data from these studies were used to analyse the proportion of children who had experienced recurrence of abuse and neglect and a logarithmic curve was plotted to predict the likelihood of a recurrence up to 17 years after the initial incident. The recurrence rate for the maltreated population is displayed in Table 11.1 below.

Table 11.1. Child Abuse and Neglect Prevalence Rates in the General and Maltreated Population

General Population	Indicated Population
--------------------	----------------------

⁸⁷ Population estimates provided by ONS are available at <http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/publications/re-reference-tables.html?edition=tcm%3A77-231847>

⁸⁸ Data provided by the Department for Education (DfE).

⁸⁹ DfE: Characteristics of Children in Need in England, 2010-11, Final; Tabel 2.

Available at <http://www.education.gov.uk/rsgateway/DB/STR/d001041/index.shtml>

⁹⁰ Brown, J., Cohen, P., Johnson, J.G., & Salzinger, S. (1998). A longitudinal analysis of risk factors for child maltreatment: Findings of a 17-year prospective study of officially recorded and self-reported child abuse and neglect. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 22(11), 1065-1078; Hussey, J. M., Chang, J. J., & Kotch, J. B. (2006). Child maltreatment in the United States: Prevalence, risk factors, and adolescent health consequences. *Pediatrics*, 118(3), 933-942; Kotch, J. B., Browne, D. D., Dufort, V., Winsor, J., & Catellier, D. (1999). Predicting child maltreatment in the first 4 years of life from characteristics assessed in the neonatal period. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 23(4), 305-319; Lealman, G. T., Phillips, J. M., Haigh, D., Stone, J., & Ord-Smith, C. (1983). Prediction and prevention of child abuse—An empty hope? *The Lancet*, 321(8339), 1423-1424; Murphey, D. A., & Braner, M. (2000). Linking child maltreatment retrospectively to birth and home visit records: An initial examination. *Child Welfare*, 79(6), 711-728; Sidebotham, P., Heron, J., Golding, J., & ALSPAC study team. (2002). Child maltreatment in the "Children of the Nineties:" Deprivation, class, and social networks in a UK sample. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 26(12), 1243-59.

⁹¹ Gilbert, R., Widom, C. S., Browne, K., Fergusson, D., Webb, E., & Janson, S. (2009). Burden and consequences of child maltreatment in high-income countries. *The Lancet*, 373(9657), 68-81; Hamilton, C. E., & Browne, K. D. (1999). Recurrent maltreatment during childhood: A Survey of referrals to police child protection units in England. *Child Maltreatment*, 4(4), 275-286; Hindley, N., Ramchandani, P. G., & Jones, D. P. (2006). Risk factors for recurrence of maltreatment: a systematic review. *Archives of Disease in Childhood*, 91(9), 744-52.

Rate of First Substantiation by Age (Cumulative)		Recurrent Substantiation by Follow-Up Year (Cumulative)	
Age	Proportion	Follow-up year	Proportion
0	0.0155	1	0.1926
1	0.0251	2	0.2367
2	0.0345	3	0.2625
3	0.0439	4	0.2808
4	0.0532	5	0.2950
5	0.0619	6	0.3066
6	0.0705	7	0.3164
7	0.0790	8	0.3249
8	0.0874	9	0.3323
9	0.0958	10	0.3390
10	0.1033	11	0.3451
11	0.1106	12	0.3506
12	0.1180	13	0.3557
13	0.1252	14	0.3604
14	0.1324	15	0.3648
15	0.1396	16	0.3689
16	0.1439	17	0.3728
17	0.1481	18	0.3764

Likelihood of Being Looked After

In this model, the base rates of being looked after for various populations are used to estimate the value of avoiding placements in local authority care.⁹² For the general population, a lifetime probability of 2 per cent was calculated based on the prevalence of new CAN cases where the child started to be looked after in a year. The latter was computed based on the proportion of children in the population who started to be looked after in the year ending 31 March 2011 (N=14,790)⁹³ and the recurrence rate (13.3 per cent)⁹⁴ to account for repeat cases.

Some of the interventions that aim, amongst other outcomes, to reduce the likelihood of being taken into care, target more specific populations. For example, there is Multisystemic Therapy (MST) for youths with serious emotional disturbance. Although MST is often conducted with young offenders, some MST studies have focused on children with externalising problems who were not involved with the juvenile justice system at the time of intervention. A population with similar characteristics in the UK includes children with 'socially unacceptable behaviour' (SUB).^{95, 96} For the population of SUB children, a lifetime probability of 15 per cent was calculated based on the number of children in need at 31

⁹² Please see Footnote 84.

⁹³ DfE: Children Looked After by Local Authorities in England, year ending 31 March 2011; Table C1. Statistical First Release is available at <http://www.education.gov.uk/researchandstatistics/datasets/a00196857/children-looked-after-by-las-in-england>

⁹⁴ DfE: Characteristics of Children in Need in England, 2010-11, Final, *op.cit.*

⁹⁵ Meltzer, H., Gatward, R., Corbin, T., Goodman, R., & Ford, T. (2003). *The mental health of young people looked after by local authorities in England*. London: The Stationery Office. Available at <http://www.esds.ac.uk/doc/5280/mrdoc/pdf/5280userguide.pdf>

⁹⁶ Wagner, M. M. (1995). Outcomes for youths with serious emotional disturbance in secondary school and early adulthood. *The Future of Children*, 5(2), 90-112. Available at http://futureofchildren.org/futureofchildren/publications/docs/05_02_07.pdf

March 2011 who were identified with SUB as their primary need (N=8,230)⁹⁷ and the proportion of those SUB children who were looked after outside the home (N=1,230)⁹⁸.

11.2. Child Protection System Costs for a CAN Case

The estimated child protection system costs to a local authority and the number of children receiving each service are displayed in Table 11.2. In this model, the probability of receiving each service is multiplied by the per-child cost (over the life course) to calculate an expected value cost for each substantiated child protection case. In addition, the expected cost of being in care is calculated, conditional on a child being looked after.⁹⁹

Initial Assessment

An initial assessment is a brief assessment of each child referred to children's social care with a request for services to be provided. Based on the Children in Need Census data, there were 168,320 children who were identified with child abuse and neglect as their primary need at initial assessment.¹⁰⁰ If a child was the subject of more than one initial assessment during the reporting year, each assessment is coded separately. Unfortunately, it was not possible to identify the proportion of children who were subject to multiple initial assessments during that year and therefore this estimate is likely to include duplicates. The 13.3 per cent recurrence rate that was used in estimating the likelihood of becoming looked after was not used to account for repeat cases as the recurrence rate is used to refer to actual cases of CAN. However, initial assessment does not necessarily mean that there is a substantiated CAN case. It was assumed that it is only when a Section 47 enquiry is actually completed that we could be confident a case was a substantiated CAN one.

The cost of initial assessment (£487) was calculated based on the extensive costing work done by a group of researchers at the Centre for Child and Family Research (CCFR) at Loughborough University.¹⁰¹ The cost was weighted by the proportion of children in London and out of London who were identified as having child abuse and neglect as their primary need at initial assessment.¹⁰² The weighted average cost includes the cost of both referral and initial assessment as the former precedes the latter.

Section 47 Enquiries

Where a child is suspected to be suffering, or likely to suffer, significant harm, the local authority is required under section 47 of the Children Act 1989 to make enquiries, to determine whether action is needed to safeguard and promote the welfare of the child who is the subject of the enquiries and core assessment. Based on the Children in Need Census data, there were 111,700 children who were subject to section 47 enquiries, which started during the year ending 31 March 2011.¹⁰³ Similarly to initial assessment, if a child was the subject of section 47 enquiries on more than one occasion during the year, each occasion is recorded separately. Thus, this estimate is likely to include duplicates. Similarly to Initial Assessment, the 13.3 per cent recurrence rate that was used in estimating the likelihood of becoming looked after was not used to account for repeat cases (please see Initial Assessment above).

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, Table 3, see also Table 11.

⁹⁸ DfE: Children Looked After by Local Authorities in England, year ending 31 March 2011; *op.cit.*, Table A1.

⁹⁹ Please see Footnote 84.

¹⁰⁰ DfE: Characteristics of Children in Need in England, 2010-11, Final, *op.cit.*, Table 3, see also Table 11.

¹⁰¹ Holmes, L., McDermid, S., Soper, J., Sempik, J., & Ward, H. (2010). *Extension of the cost calculator to include cost calculations for all children in need*. Department for Education Research Brief. DFE-RB056.

Available at <https://www.education.gov.uk/publications/RSG/Childrenandfamilies/Page10/DFE-RB056>

¹⁰² DfE: Characteristics of Children in Need in England, 2010-11, Final, *op.cit.*, Table 11.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, Table 2.

The cost of section 47 enquiry and core assessment was calculated by taking the average cost of (1) standard section 47 enquiry, (2) section 47 enquiry if strategy meeting held, (3) section 47 enquiry including Achieving Best Evidence Interview, and (4) core assessment.¹⁰⁴ Data was sought at both a local authority and National level for the proportions of differing section 47. This was in order to create a weighted average of London and countrywide costs. Unfortunately such data could not be obtained. However, the average cost was weighted by the proportion of children London and out of London who were subject to section 47 enquiries.¹⁰⁵

Child Protection Plan

Children at risk may be made the subject of a child protection plan (CPP). A decision to make a child the subject of CPP is decided at a Child Protection Conference. CPP is a written record and a working tool that should enable the parents, carers and professionals to understand what is expected of them and what they can expect of others. Based on the Children in Need Census data, there were 49,000 children who became the subject of a plan throughout 2010-11.¹⁰⁶ However, this estimate unfortunately includes children who became the subject of a plan the second or subsequent time (N=6,500).¹⁰⁷ In the future, this estimate would need to be amended to improve the accuracy of this estimate.

The cost of CPP (£3,293) was calculated by taking the average cost of a child on CPP over a 6-month period¹⁰⁸ and adjusting it to reflect the cost based on the average time (10.6 months) that children spend on being the subject of CPP¹⁰⁹.

Looked After Children

A child may be 'looked after' by the local authority because the child's parents or the people who have parental responsibilities and rights to look after the child have been neglecting him/her. Based on the data on looked after children, there were 14,790 children who started to be looked after during the year ending 31 March 2011 and who were identified as having child abuse and neglect as their primary need.¹¹⁰ It has to be acknowledged that the most applicable need category was assigned at the time the child started to be looked after rather than necessarily the entire reason they are looked after.

The cost per year of being looked after, in either care homes or foster care (£38,896), was calculated using the cost per week estimate (£748) for children who have CAN as their need category and multiplying it with the number of weeks in a year.¹¹¹ This estimate captures (1) the costs of field and centre staff time carrying out social services activities with, or on behalf of, identified children in need and their families; (2) the costs of providing care and accommodation for children looked after (and similar regular, ongoing expenditure that can be treated in the same way); and (3) one off or ad hoc payments and purchases for children in need or their families.¹¹²

¹⁰⁴ Holmes, et al., *op.cit.*

¹⁰⁵ DfE: Characteristics of Children in Need in England, 2010-11, Final, *op.cit.*, Table 17.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, Table 2.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁸ Holmes, et al., *op.cit.*

¹⁰⁹ Meadows, P., Tunstall, J., George, A., Dhudwar, A., & Kurtz, Z. (2011). *The costs and consequences of child maltreatment. Literature review for the NSPCC*. London: NSPCC. Available at http://www.nspcc.org.uk/Inform/research/findings/costs_and_consequences_pdf_wdf88910.pdf

¹¹⁰ DfE: Children Looked After by Local Authorities in England, year ending 31 March 2011; *op.cit.*, Table C1.

¹¹¹ Curtis, L. (2011). *Unit costs of health and social care 2011*. The University of Kent. Personal Social Services Research Unit.

¹¹² *Ibid.*

In order to compute the average cost of being looked after (in either care homes or foster care) due to CAN (£92,611), the cost estimate per year (£38,896) was multiplied by the average duration of latest period of care (2.381 years). The latter was calculated by taking the weighted average duration of latest period of care for children who ceased to be looked after during the year ending 31 March by legal status of ceasing.¹¹³ It was presumed that the unit cost of being looked after due to CAN is applicable to all types of legal statuses. Based on the discussions with the DfE, it was assumed that most of those children who start to be looked after on an Interim Care Order move onto a full Care Order when calculating the average duration of the latest period of care. This also applies to about half of those detained for child protection (Police Protection Order, Emergency Protection Order, Child Assessment Order). Furthermore, it was assumed that the other half of the children detained for child protection do not go on to be on Care Orders or Interim Care Order. Therefore, it is likely that the average duration of the latest period of care is an underestimate as some of these children detained for child protection could end up on Voluntary Care Order (Section 20). At the same time, some of these children could also become a subject of CPP instead of an Order and thus cease to be looked after.

Public Law Outline and Legal Fees

There are various (legal) expenses that are likely to occur to the local authority when dealing with child abuse and neglect cases. For example, there are application fees for Interim and full Care Orders, Emergency Protection Orders, Child Assessment Orders and voluntary agreements under Section 20 (e.g., single placements, Placement Orders). Furthermore, there are costs involved in Public Law Outline (PLO) proceedings.¹¹⁴ A weighted average cost of legal fees (£702) was computed using the number of children who started to be looked after in year ending 31 March 2011 by legal status and category of need (i.e., child abuse and neglect)¹¹⁵, the cost of application fees presented in the Family Proceedings Fees Order 2008 (amended in 2010)¹¹⁶ and the cost of PLO¹¹⁷. The cost of PLO was weighted by the proportion of total disposals for Care Orders and Supervision Orders in London and out of London.¹¹⁸

In order to protect confidentiality, the DfE was not able to provide a figure for children under Child Assessment Order. Therefore, an overall estimate for children who started to be looked after during the years ending 31 March by starting legal status was used instead.¹¹⁹ As for Police Protection Order fees, these were excluded from the cost calculations as the authority to apply for the order would be with the officer/police force and therefore the local authority would not pay these fees.

It has to be acknowledged that the weighted average cost of PLO and legal fees includes costs that incur to local authorities only. For example, a value of £4,825¹²⁰ was used for Care Order applications that represent a small proportion of the overall cost of child care proceedings. There have been speculations that the actual cost of care proceedings may

¹¹³ DfE: Children Looked After by Local Authorities in England, year ending 31 March 2011; *op.cit.*, Table D4.

¹¹⁴ The Public Law Outline (PLO) is a guide to case management in public law proceedings (Care Orders and Supervision Orders) for courts and parties to such proceedings.

¹¹⁵ Data provided by the DfE on children who started to be looked after in year ending 31 March 2011 by legal status and category of need, Coverage: England.

¹¹⁶ Available at http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukxi/2010/1916/pdfs/ukxi_20101916_en.pdf

¹¹⁷ Holmes, et al., *op.cit.*

¹¹⁸ Data provided by the Ministry of Justice on 'Matters affecting children: Children Act (public law) disposals made in England courts in calendar year 2011.

¹¹⁹ DfE: Children Looked After by Local Authorities in England, year ending 31 March 2011; *op.cit.*, Table C3.

¹²⁰ The Family Proceedings Fees (Amendment) Order 2010, *op.cit.*

yield £65,000-70,000 though no information has been provided on how that figure was arrived at.¹²¹ However, the 2006 Review of the Child Care Proceedings System in England and Wales found that the on average each Care Order application costs £25,000 which includes legal aid (approximately 60% of total), local authorities' costs (25%), HMCS costs (5%); and CAFCASS costs (10%)".¹²²

Adoption

There were 2,190 looked after children in the need category of CAN who were adopted during the year ending 31 March 2011.¹²³ There are various costs that can occur in the adoption process. For example, the adoptive family would need to pay for the 'application to court' fee¹²⁴, inter-agency fees charged by local authorities and Voluntary Adoption Agencies for their services¹²⁵, and post-adoption care¹²⁶. The average cost of adoption to a local authority (£35,340 for the year 2007/2008) was used in the model.¹²⁷ This estimate includes the cost of overheads incurred by local authorities. However, the figure does not include any post-adoption support for after the adoption is fully finalised (i.e. this is the cost of placing a child and supporting the family until the final adoption order is in place).¹²⁸ The Adoption and Children Act that came into effect in 2002 made the offering of post-adoption support mandatory.¹²⁹ Since the actual provision of post-adoption support is not mandatory, it was not possible to identify the number of families that receive post-adoption support, the level of support, or the period over which the support is paid.

Decay rate for timing of CAN costs

In order to estimate the timing of costs incurred within the child protection system, the model requires two rates of decay after the incident of CAN. Specifically, one for costs within the child protection system and one for the cost to the victim.

Within the system, costs for a CAN case do not occur all at once but spread over time. Costs like referral, initial assessment, Section 47 and core assessment occur early in the case but a child may be looked after for a number of years. From data described above, the proportion of system-related costs that could be expected to be incurred within the first two years of a typical CAN case was estimated (84 per cent). Using that figure, a rate of 'decay' was calculated, which indicated that for each year after the beginning of a case the total cost decayed by -0.60. This means, in the first year, 60 per cent of the total expected costs were incurred; by the end of the second year, 84 per cent had incurred, 94 per cent by the end of the third year, etc. This 'decay' continues for a maximum of 17 years, as child protection

¹²¹ Plowden, F. (2009). *Review of Court Fees in Child Care Proceedings*. Ministry of Justice. Available at <http://dera.ioe.ac.uk/1044/1/court-fees-child-care-proceedings.pdf>

¹²² Department of Education and Skills, & Department of Constitutional Affairs. (2006). *Review of the child care proceedings system in England and Wales*. London: Department of Education and Skills, & Department of Constitutional Affairs. Available at http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+http://www.dca.gov.uk/publications/reports_reviews/childcare_ps.pdf

¹²³ DfE: Children Looked After by Local Authorities in England, year ending 31 March 2011; *op.cit.*, Table E1.

¹²⁴ HM Courts & Tribunals. (2011). EX50: Civil and Family Court Fees, available at <http://hmctscourtfinder.justice.gov.uk/courtfinder/forms/ex050-eng.pdf>

¹²⁵ Selwyn, J., Sempik, J., Thurston, P. and Wijedasa, D. (2009). *Adoption and the inter-agency fee. Report to DCSF*. RR149. Available online at <http://publications.dcsf.gov.uk/eOrderingDownload/DCSF-RR149.pdf>

¹²⁶ Selwyn, J. (2006). *Costs and outcomes of non-infant adoptions*. London: BAAF.

¹²⁷ Selwyn, et al., *op.cit.*

¹²⁸ Post-adoption support is only provided once the adoption order has been completely finalised. It is reported to be an average of £2334 per case per year (Selwyn, 2006), with most of that cost being used to pay an adoption allowance.

¹²⁹ Available at <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2002/38/contents>

system costs (e.g., a child being a subject of CPP or looked after) typically do not continue past the age of 17.

Table 11.2. Child Protection System Costs for a Child Abuse and Neglect Case

Services	Annual Number of Children	Year of Data	Pounds per Child	Year of Pounds
Initial Assessment	168,320	2011	487	2010
Section 47/Core Assessment	111,700	2011	1,311	2010
Child Protection Plan	49,000	2011	3,293	2010
Being Looked After	14,790	2011	92,611	2011
Public Law Outline and Legal Fees	12,310	2011	702	2011
Adoption	2,190	2011	35,340	2010

11.3. Victimization Costs

There are likely to be future impacts of victimisation by child abuse on medical, mental health, and quality of life costs in the adulthood. In the WSIPP model, the expected value of victim costs are derived from calculations based on the cost elements provided by Miller, Fisher and Cohen¹³⁰ and the total US number of victims by Miller, Cohen and Wiersema¹³¹.

Various sources were explored with the aim of identifying child abuse victim costs for the UK or England but no studies were identified that looked at the victim costs of CAN.^{132, 133, 134} In order to estimate potential victim costs, the assumption was made that the ratio between the cost of child abuse and the cost of certain crimes is the same in the UK and in the US. Specifically, it was assumed that the offences such as felony murder/manslaughter, felony sex offence, felony robbery and felony aggravated assault in the US are equivalent to violence against the person, sexual offences and robbery in the UK.

Based on these assumptions, a weighted victim cost of crimes against the person was calculated for Washington state using tangible and intangible victim costs for the abovementioned types of offences^{135, 136} and the annual number of state wide estimated felony-type crimes¹³⁷ (\$130,250 in 2011 dollars). The same computation was repeated focusing on the offences such as violence against the person, sexual offences and robbery using the Home Office study on the economic and social costs of crime and the number of estimated crimes for each offence category.¹³⁸ The number of estimated crimes was calculated using the number of total recorded crimes for England and Wales¹³⁹ and the percentage of actual crime recorded. The latter was computed by dividing the total recorded crimes by the British Crime Survey figures for the same types of crimes.^{140, 141} For sexual

¹³⁰ Miller, T., Fisher, D. A., & Cohen, M. A. (2001). Costs of juvenile violence: Policy implications. *Pediatrics*, 107(1), 1-7.

¹³¹ Miller, T. R., Cohen, M. A., & Wiersema, B. (1996). *Victim costs and consequences: A new look*. Washington, D.C: National Institute of Justice.

¹³² Meadows, et al., *op.cit.*

¹³³ Walby, S. (2004). *The cost of domestic violence*. London: Women and Equality Unit, Department of Trade and Industry. Available at <http://www.lancs.ac.uk/fass/sociology/papers/walby-costdomesticviolence.pdf>

¹³⁴ Walby, S. (2009). *The cost of domestic violence: Up-date 2009*. Lancaster: Lancaster University. Available at <http://ndvf.org.uk/files/document/1299/original.doc>

¹³⁵ McCollister et al., *op.cit.*

¹³⁶ Miller et al. (1996), *op.cit.*

¹³⁷ Lee et al., *op.cit.*, pp. 52.

¹³⁸ Home Office, *op.cit.* See also Table 8.1 in this report.

¹³⁹ Chaplin, et al., *op.cit.* See also Table 8.4 in this report.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*

¹⁴¹ Please also see section 8.4 in this report.

offences, as the British Crime Survey did not include these, the percentage in Washington State was used (see Table 8.5).¹⁴² These calculations resulted in the weighted victim cost of crimes against the person of £11,486 for England and Wales (2011 pounds).

The direct child abuse victim costs were computed by applying the ratio between the weighted victim cost of crimes against the person and the direct victim costs for Washington State¹⁴³ to England and Wales weighted victim cost of crimes against the person that yielded £242 (2011 pounds). The same computation was applied to estimate indirect child abuse victim costs which resulted in £2,925 (2011 pounds). As for the distribution of costs by payer, the direct costs were divided equally between the taxpayer and victim, whereas the indirect costs were assumed to incur fully to the victim.

It has to be acknowledged that these estimates are not necessarily unbiased estimates of the true value of CAN victim costs as these are modelled based on assumptions about an equivalence of offence types in the US and UK and the US ratio between the weighted victim cost of crimes against the person and the direct victim costs. However, the computed figures are likely to underestimate the true value of victim costs over the life cycle when comparing these estimates to victim costs in other countries.¹⁴⁴ These direct and indirect victim cost estimates will be replaced with estimates for the UK as soon as they become available.

Victim-related costs over time are likely to linger much longer than system related costs. Following the example of WSIPP, the rate of decay for these costs was estimated to be -0.10, which means that, relative to system costs, victim costs of mental health and quality of life are expected to be spread over a greater number of years.¹⁴⁵

12. Other Parameters

In addition to the parameters discussed in the previous sections, the model uses a number of additional inputs to compute benefits and costs.

12.1. Base Year for Monetary Denomination

The model contains many price and monetary values that are each denominated in a particular year's monetary values. In order to express all monetary values in a common year, a base year is selected. When the model is run, all monetary values entered into the model are converted to the base year values with the price index (see below) chosen by the user. The base year is set to 2011.

12.2. Discount rates

The model uses a range of real discount rates to compute net present values. The discount rates are applied to all annual benefit and cost cash flows and economic impacts arising in future years are converted to present values. The model uses low (2 per cent), modal (3.5 per cent), and high (5 per cent) discount rates in computation. These discount rates are the

¹⁴² Lee et al., *op.cit.*, p. 52.

¹⁴³ *Ibid.*, p.65.

¹⁴⁴ For example, Taylor, P., Moore, P., Pezzullo, L., Tucci, J., Goddard, C. and De Bortoli, L. (2008). *The cost of child abuse in Australia*. Melbourne: Australian Childhood Foundation and Child Abuse Prevention Research Australia. Available at <http://www.childhood.org.au/assets/files/976067aa-98e0-47fc-a608-cbc3d3c11f06.pdf>

¹⁴⁵ Lee et al., *op.cit.*, pp. 63.

same as the ones WSIPP applies and reflect the rates recommended by Moore and his colleagues.¹⁴⁶ However, the modal value of 3.5 per cent reflects the public sector discount rate used in other studies in the UK.¹⁴⁷ The modal discount rate gets used when the model is run in non-simulation mode. However, in Monte Carlo simulation, each run randomly draws a discount rate from a triangular probability density distribution with the low, modal, and high discount rates defining the triangle. For further details on discount rates see the WSIPP 2012 report.¹⁴⁸

12.3. GDP Deflator

As indicated above, many of the monetary values in the model are denominated in different years' monetary units that the model converts to the base year, set to be 2011 in this version of the model. A GDP deflator that is produced by the Treasury from data provided by the Office for National Statistics (ONS) is used in the model.¹⁴⁹ However, Consumer Price Indices (CPI) relevant for specific services will be used in the future where possible. For example, CPI for Medical Services will be used when modelling health care costs.¹⁵⁰

12.4. Tax Rates

The cost-benefit model uses average tax rates for several calculations. The household total effective tax rate of 32.9 per cent, provided by ONS, is used in the model to capture how much tax an individual pays, as a proportion of total income.¹⁵¹

13. Limitations

There are a number of limitations to the model translation that need to be acknowledged, the key ones have been described below.

It has not always been possible to locate the data for England and Wales that the model requires. In some cases, local authority data were used which may not be representative for other parts of England and Wales. For example, for the crime model, it was not possible to locate information on the duration of youth community sentences. The years of resource use estimates for adults that were provided by the Greater Manchester Probation Trust and were applied to youth offenders as well. Furthermore, the estimates provided by the Trust may not be representative estimates for England and Wales. The crime part of the model translation is also limited by the way that the available data are categorised. Some estimates are based on averages that may include quite a large amount of variation (e.g. violence against the person is a large category of crime that includes murder, assault and minor violent offences).

¹⁴⁶ Moore, M. A., Boardman, A. E., Vining, A. R., Weimer, D. L., & Greenberg, D. H. (2004). "Just Give Me a Number!" Practical Values for the Social Discount Rate. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 23 (4), 789-812.

¹⁴⁷ For example, Knapp, M., McDaid, D., & Parsonage, M. (Eds) (2011). *Mental health promotion and mental illness prevention: The economic case*. London: Department for Health. Available at <http://www2.lse.ac.uk/businessAndConsultancy/LSEEnterprise/pdf/PSSRUfeb2011.pdf>

¹⁴⁸ Lee et al., *op.cit.*, p. 101.

¹⁴⁹ Available at http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/data_gdp_fig.htm

¹⁵⁰ Office for National Statistics, CPI. Available at <http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/publications/re-reference-tables.html?edition=tcm%3A77-260874>

¹⁵¹ Office for National Statistics. (2011). *The effects of taxes and benefits on household income, 2009/2010*. Statistical Bulletin. Available at <http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/rel/household-income/the-effects-of-taxes-and-benefits-on-household-income/2009-2010/index.html>

In other cases, Washington State data were used, although this was only in rare cases. For example, it was not possible to locate suitable data for the baseline rates of crime for the general population and the low-income population over the lifetime for specific crimes. It was therefore necessary to use WSIPP figures for these, adjusting for the types of crimes that were used in the translated model. Furthermore, some of the educational interventions are specifically designed for low-income populations who tend to have different base rates for certain outcomes such as high school graduation and special education. In the translated version of the model, the same parameters were entered for both 'all students' and 'low-income students' due to difficulties in identifying separate estimates for low-income populations.

There are limitations to the unit costs used in the model. For example, the unit cost of an arrest was calculated in reference to the number of persons arrested rather than the number of arrests. This is likely to result in the overestimation of the average cost per arrest. As indicated above, a large proportion of unit costs were extracted and estimated from the technical paper on the cost of a cohort of young offenders to the criminal justice system by the National Audit Office.¹⁵² These unit costs come with limitations that affect the cost estimates. For further details on the cost estimates and assumptions made around the unit costs see Appendix One of the NAO report.¹⁵³ Furthermore, for the education part of the model, it was not possible to identify marginal cost for both one year of regular education and special education, so total costs were used instead. This means that any costs saved by a specific intervention that targets one of these outcomes could be much higher or lower than the given estimate.

There are likely to be other system costs or benefits that could be monetised in each policy area that are not taken into account here (e.g., additional services that are provided to offenders, indirect social benefits of crime prevention such as increased property values in areas with reduced crime rates). However, the current model will yield more conservative estimates as it means that the benefits are underestimates of the true benefits of each programme or approach.

The unit costs of criminal justice system resources (e.g., police, courts, youth custody, adult custody) were based on annual marginal operating costs. The estimates of annualised capital costs per unit and assumptions about the financing period in terms of number of years for each significant part of the publicly financed system were not included in the model at this stage. However, there is capacity to include per-unit capital costs in the model in the future. This is essential to take into account when favouring a long-term perspective for the analysis as the use of capital is an economic cost just like the use of labour.

Many of the interventions measure high school graduation as one of the outcomes that is valued in the WSIPP cost-benefit model by estimating the expected gain in life cycle labour market earnings. In the translated model, the high school graduation was equated with the attainment of A-levels and equivalent qualifications. Even though these educational levels are similar considering that both are an entry requirement for undergraduate study, we were not able to identify a body of research to support the fact that these interventions increase the attainment of A-levels in England to the same degree that they increase the high school graduation rate in the US. A similar limitation applies to the assumption made about the degree of causation between the observed earning differentials for people who attain A-levels and people who do not. Currently, this relationship is modelled using an

¹⁵² NAO technical paper, *op.cit.*

¹⁵³ *Ibid.*

assumption based on US data that suggests there is a strong causal relationship between observed differences in earnings for high-school graduates and non-graduates in the US, which is due to high school diploma.

As for earnings, the average earnings reported were for employed, unemployed and inactive people at each age and not just for those with earnings. Even though the current earnings data used in the model are similar to WSIPP earnings data in terms of population characteristics, these estimates do not include self-employed people, as this category was not available in the LFS dataset. In the future, the Family Resources Survey could be explored to examine earnings data and potentially include self-employed people in the estimates.

The current cost-benefit model is not set out to estimate the benefits of reducing CAN to the children of CAN victims. Instead, the model only looks at the effects on the two generations of CAN prevention and intervention programme participants: the parent and the child (potential victim). Research suggests that CAN victims are more likely to abuse or neglect their own children¹⁵⁴, which the model is currently unable to monetise. Also, even though there is a higher risk of death among CAN victims compared to other children, these deaths are not explicitly modelled and benefits are not computed derived from death adjusted life years (DALY) or the value of a statistical life. However, we do value victims costs in the CAN model. Finally, the CAN part of the model focuses mainly on the local authority spending focusing on processing CAN cases and a reduction in CAN victimisation costs. There are, of course, other costs related to CAN cases (e.g., HMCS, CAFCASS) that are not captured in this model.

The costs of the interventions were (a) provided by the programme/approach developers/commissioners, (b) estimated based on available information on the likely costs of dissemination in England and Wales, or (c) converted from US estimates published by WSIPP into Pounds Sterling. When commissioned in specific areas, the actual costs are likely to vary from these estimates depending on local conditions. This is likely to be particularly true for the start-up costs of a new intervention as increased training and capital costs may be needed at the outset.

In order to improve the accuracy of our cost-benefit estimates, we will continue to improve both intervention unit cost estimates and data inputs relevant for estimating the monetary benefits that are described in this report.

¹⁵⁴ Belsky, J. (1993). Etiology of child maltreatment: A developmental-ecological analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 114(3), 413-434; Hunter, R. S., Kilstrom, N., Kraybill, E. N., & Loda, F. (1978). Antecedents of child abuse and neglect in premature infants: A prospective study in a newborn intensive care unit. *Pediatrics*, 61(4), 629-635; Kim, J. (2009). Type-specific intergenerational transmission of neglectful and physically abusive parenting behaviors among young parents. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 31(7), 761-767; Whipple, E. E., & Webster-Stratton, C. (1991). The role of parental stress in physically abusive families. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 15(3), 279-291.

Appendices

Appendix A: Meta-Analysis of Programme Effects

Programme	Outcomes measured	Primary or Secondary Participant	Number of Effect Sizes	Unadjusted Effect Sizes (Random Effects Model)		Adjusted Effect Sizes and Standard Errors Used in the Cost-Benefit Analysis					
				ES	p-value	First Time ES is Estimated			Second time ES is Estimated		
				ES	p-value	ES	SE	Age	ES	SE	Age
Abecedarian	Test scores	P	2	0.379	0.006	0.379	0.1370	15	0.322	0.116	18
	Crime	P	1	0.271	0.506	-0.271	0.4070	21	0.271	-0.407	31
	High school graduation	P	1	0.084	0.744	0.084	0.2560	21	0.084	0.256	21
	Special education	P	1	-0.621	0.023	-0.621	0.2730	15	-0.621	0.273	18
	Grade retention	P	1	-0.584	0.027	-0.584	0.2630	15	-0.584	0.263	18
Curiosity Corner	Test scores	P	4	0.207	0.007	0.196	0.0770	1	0.096	0.038	17
Perry Preschool	Test scores	P	10	0.412	0.000	0.412	0.0820	15	0.350	0.070	17
	Crime	P	1	-0.415	0.14	-0.415	0.2810	19	-0.380	0.182	40
	Grade retention	P	1	-0.129	0.573	-0.129	0.2280	18	-0.129	0.228	18
	Special education	P	1	-0.672	0.014	-0.672	0.2740	18	-0.672	0.274	18
Quick Reads	Test scores	P	3	0.116	0.257	0.058	0.1020	1	0.034	0.060	17
Read 180	Test scores	P	9	0.149	0.013	0.105	0.0600	1	0.083	0.047	17
Success for All	Test scores	P	2	0.246	0.023	0.088	0.1090	6	0.045	0.056	17
Targeted Reading Instruction	Test scores	P	5	0.305	0.001	0.145	0.0900	1	0.074	0.046	17
The Reading Edge	Test scores	P	3	0.087	0.379	0.035	0.0980	1	0.026	0.073	17

Discount Rates Applied to the Meta-Analysis

The programmes Abecedarian and High Scope/Perry Preschool were coded by WSIPP as part of their Early Childhood Education for Low Income 3- and 4-Year Olds approach.^a Separate meta-analyses were run for Abecedarian and High Scope/Perry Preschool applying the multiplicative adjustments currently used by WSIPP.^b However, the effect sizes for all the other programmes were adjusted by using the discount rates that WSIPP used to apply prior to the report published in July 2011.^{c, d}

Adjustment Factors for Decaying Test Score Effect Sizes to Age 17

Some of the programmes have a positive impact on the standardised test scores of programme participants. The magnitude of these early gains, however, does not remain constant over time and are likely to “fade out” with each passing year. Similarly to WSIPP analysis, the meta-analysis carried out by the SRU include not only the initial effect size for pupils’ academic gains on standardised tests relative to the comparison group, but also an adjustment factor that is then applied to the initial effect size to account for fade-out from the age of measurement to age 17. For further details on how these adjustment factors are computed, see the WSIPP report.^a

Note. ^a Lee, S., Aos, S., Drake, E., Pennucci, A., Miller, M., & Anderson, L. (2012). *Return on investment: Evidence-based options to improve statewide outcomes, April 2012* (Document No. 12-04-1201). Olympia: Washington State Institute for Public Policy. The full report and Technical Appendix are available at

<http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/pub.asp?docid=12-04-1201>

^b *Op cit.* Discount types and discount rates and details on the analysis of discount rates are available at

<http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/rptfiles/2000.ECE.pdf>

^c For a summary of old discount rates used by WSIPP see, for example, Drake, E. K., Aos, S., & Miller, M. G. (2009). Evidence-based public policy options to reduce crime and criminal justice costs: Implications in Washington State. *Victims & Offenders, 4*(2), 170-196.

^d Aos, S., Lee, S., Drake, E., Pennucci, A., Klima, T., Miller, M., Anderson, L., Mayfield, J., & Burley, M. (2011). *Return on investment: Evidence-based options to improve statewide outcomes* (Document No. 11-07-1201). Olympia: Washington State Institute for Public Policy. The full report and Technical Appendix I are available at

<http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/pub.asp?docid=11-07-1201>

Studies Used in the Meta-Analysis

Abecedarian

Barnett, W. S., & Masse, L. N. (2007). Comparative benefit-cost analysis of the Abecedarian program and its policy implications. *Economics of Education Review, 26*(1), 113-125.

Campbell, F. A., Ramey, C. T., Pungello, E. P., Sparling, J., & Miller-Johnson, S. (2002). Early childhood education: Young adult outcomes from the Abecedarian project. *Applied Developmental Science, 6*(1), 42-57.

Curiosity Corner

Chambers, B., Chamberlain, A., Hurley, E. A., & Slavin, R. E. (2001). *Curiosity Corner: Enhancing preschoolers' language abilities through comprehensive reform*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Seattle, WA, April 2001.

Preschool Curriculum Evaluation Research (PCER) Consortium. (2008). Curiosity Corner: Success for All Foundation. In: Effects of preschool curriculum Programs on school readiness (pp. 75-83). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Research, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.

Perry Preschool

Heckman, J. J., Pinto, R., Shaikh, A. M., & Yavitz, A. (2011). *Inference with imperfect randomization: The case of the Perry Preschool program* (Working Paper No. 16935). Cambridge: National Bureau of Economic Research.

Quick Reads

- Vadasy, P. F., & Sanders, E. A. (2008). Benefits of repeated reading intervention for low-achieving fourth- and fifth-grade students. *Remedial and Special Education, 29*(4), 235-249.
- Vadasy, P. F., & Sanders, E. A. (2008). Repeated Reading Intervention: Outcomes and Interactions With Readers' Skills and Classroom Instruction. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 100*(2), 272-290.
- Vadasy, P. F., & Sanders, E. A. (2009). Supplemental fluency intervention and determinants of reading outcomes. *Scientific Studies of Reading, 13*(5), 383-425.

Read 180

- Kim, J. S., Capotosto, L., Hartry, A., & Fitzgerald, R. (2011). Can a mixed-method literacy intervention improve the reading achievement of low-performing elementary school students in an after-school program?: Results from a randomized controlled trial of READ 180 Enterprise. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 33*, 183-201.
- Lang, L., Torgesen, J., Vogel, W., Chanter, C., Lefsky, E., & Petscher, Y. (2009). Exploring the relative effectiveness of reading interventions for high school students. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness, 2*(2), 149-175.
- Mims, C., Lowther, D. L., Strahl, J. D., & Nunnery, J. (2006). *Little Rock School District READ 180 evaluation - final technical report*. Center for Research in Educational Policy, Memphis, Tennessee.
- Papalewis, R. (2004). Struggling middle school readers: successful, accelerating intervention. *Reading Improvement, 41*(1), 24-37.
- White, R. N., Haslam, M. B., & Hewes, G. M. (2006). *Improving student literacy in the Phoenix Union High School District 2003-04 and 2004-05 final report*. Policy Studies Associates Inc., Washington, DC.

Success for All

- Borman, G. D., Slavin, R. E., Cheung, A. C. K., Chamberlain, A. M., Madden, N. A., & Chambers, B. (2007). Final reading outcomes of the national randomized field trial of Success for All. *American Educational Research Journal, 44*(3), 701-731.
- Madden, N. A., Slavin, R. E., Karweit, N. L., Dolan, L. J., & Wasik, B. A. (1993). Success for All: Longitudinal effects of a restructuring program for inner-city elementary schools. *American Educational Research Journal, 30*(1), 123-148.

Targeted Reading Instruction

- Amendum, S.J., Vernon-Feagans, L., & Ginsberg, M.C. (2011). The effectiveness of a technologically facilitated classroom-based early reading intervention: The Targeted Reading Intervention. *Elementary School Journal, 112*(1), 107-131.
- Vernon-Feagans, L., Gallagher, K., Ginsberg, M.C., Amendum, S., Kainz, K., Rose, J., & Burchinal, M. (2010). A Diagnostic teaching intervention for classroom teachers: Helping struggling readers in early elementary school. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice, 25*(4), 183-193.
- Vernon-Feagans, L., Kainz, K., Hedrick, A., Ginsberg, M. & Amendum, S. (2010). *The Targeted Reading Intervention: A classroom teacher professional development program to promote effective teaching for struggling readers in kindergarten and first grade*.

Paper presented at the Society for Research in Educational Effectiveness, Washington, DC.

Vernon-Feagans, L, Kainz, K., Hendrick, A., Ginsberg, M. & Amendum, S. (2012b). *Literacy coaching of classroom teachers through webcam technology to promote effective instruction for struggling readers: The Targeted Reading Intervention*. Draft report.

Benefits and costs were not calculated for the Targeted Reading Intervention at this time.

The Reading Edge

Madden, N., Daniels, C., Chamberlain, A., Cheung, A. and Slavin, R. (2011). *The Reading Edge: Evaluation of a cooperative learning reading intervention for urban high schools*. Report for Department of Education.

Slavin, R., Chamberlain, A., Daniels, C., & Madden, N. A. (2009). The Reading Edge: A randomized evaluation of a middle school cooperative reading program. *Effective Education*, 1(1), 13-26.

Stevens, R.J. and Durkin, S. (1992). *Using student team reading and student team writing in middle schools: Two evaluations*. Report for Office for Educational Research and Improvement, Washington, DC.

Excluded Programmes

The following programmes were excluded from meta-analysis due to there being too few rigorous evaluations available:

Interactive Book Reading

Direction Instruction

Breakthrough to Literacy

Appendix B: Intervention Costs for Youth Justice, Education and Early Years, and Child Protection and Social Care Interventions

Intervention	Programme cost			Comparison cost			Source ^{a, b}
	Annual cost	Duration (years)	Year of Pounds	Annual cost	Duration (years)	Year of Pounds	
Youth Justice Interventions							
Functional Family Therapy (FFT)	£2,500	1	2010	£0	1	2010	National Academy for Parenting Research, Institute of Psychiatry, King's College London & Brighton & Hove Youth Offending Service. This cost estimate includes a fully staffed team of qualified systemic family psychotherapists.
Multidimensional Treatment Foster Care (MTFC)	£90,044	1	2010	£82,388	1	2010	The cost estimate is based on Curtis (2010, section 6.8, Tables 1 and 2). ^c The cost of other types of provision is based on an average of three provision options presented in Table 2 in Curtis (2010, p. 114).
Multisystemic Therapy (MST)	£9,500	1	2010	£0	1	2010	The Brandon Centre, UK. This estimate is based on a team of 3 MST therapists who work full time, 1 supervisor who works 3-4 days/week, and a coordinator who works 3 days/week. It includes all salary, overhead, training, travel, and the annual license fee costs. It is based on 10 cases per therapist and 30 cases per year for the team.
Aggression Replacement Training (ART)	£1,179	1	2008	£0	1	2008	The WSIPP cost is converted from USD into GBP and increased by 25%. ^d
Drug Court	£2,091	1	2004	£0	1	2004	The WSIPP cost is converted from USD into GBP and increased by 25%. ^e
Co-ordination of Services	£308	1	2008	£0	1	2008	The WSIPP cost is converted from USD into GBP and increased by 25%. ^d
Victim Offender Mediation	£465	1	2010	£0	1	2010	The WSIPP cost is converted from USD into GBP and increased by 25%. WSIPP estimated the costs of victim offender mediation based on the literature reviewed. They also received a cost estimate from the victim offender mediation programme in Clark County Washington. Their final cost estimate is the average of these two costs. The cost includes staff time, benefits, and volunteer time.
Scared Straight	£54	1	2010	£0	1	2010	The UK unit cost is based on the estimate provided by Foundation 4 Life, which offers prison visits as a crime diversion intervention. This estimate includes the cost of a minibus, driver and key worker.

Intervention	Programme cost			Comparison cost			Source ^{a, b}
	Annual cost	Duration (years)	Year of Pounds	Annual cost	Duration (years)	Year of Pounds	
Education Interventions							
Additional Day of Teaching	£23	1	2010	£0	1	2010	The WSIPP cost is converted from USD into GBP and increased by 25%. The Washington State legislative budget committee staff provided WSIPP with the estimates for the per-student annual cost of adding one day to the school year.
Bonus for Teachers	£55	1	2010	£0	1	2010	The WSIPP cost is converted from USD into GBP and increased by 25%. Washington State provides NBPTS-certified ^f teachers with a \$5,000 annual bonus. To calculate a per-student annual cost, WSIPP assumed that each teacher has an average of 3 classrooms with an average of 25 students per classroom. This cost estimate does not include the additional bonus provided to teachers who work in high-poverty schools or the private costs teachers incur when they apply for, and participate in, the certification process.
Families and Schools Together (FAST)	£225	1	2010	£0	1	2010	Save the Children UK. The cost estimate is based on an assumption that each children's centre or school will run 2 FAST projects within 12 months. Furthermore, each FAST project will recruit 40 parents and 80 children. Therefore, the cost estimate is based on a total of 160 children per year.
Good Behaviour Game	£55	2	2010	£0	2	2010	The cost is based on the estimate provided by Chan et al. (2012). ^g
K-12 Tutoring by Adults	£1,608	1	2010	£0	1	2010	The WSIPP cost is converted from USD into GBP and increased by 25%. The WSIPP cost estimates are based on the following assumptions derived from the programmes described in the studies included in the meta-analysis: on average, the programmes lasted for 8 months, with 63 sessions of about 40 minutes each. The programmes provide 1 to 5 hours of training and typically use unpaid adults volunteering their time. WSIPP used average teacher salaries (including benefits) in Washington State to compute the value of volunteers' time.
K-12 Tutoring by Peers	£819	1	2010	£0	1	2010	The WSIPP cost is converted from USD into GBP and increased by 25%. To estimate costs, WSIPP assumed that teachers spend an average of half an hour per day, each week to oversee an 8-week peer-tutoring programme. This is based on the evaluations included in their analysis. The value of teacher time was calculated using average teacher salaries (including benefits) in Washington State.
Life Skills Training (LST)	£7	3	1998	£0	3	1998	The WSIPP cost is converted from USD into GBP and increased by 25%. The WSIPP cost estimates for materials and per-teacher on-line training are from the LST website (www.lifeskillstraining.com). They also included a per-student estimate for the cost of training teachers. This estimate assumes that each trained teacher provides LST instruction to an average of 375 students over 5 years.
Parent Involvement Programmes	£669	1	2010	£0	1	2010	The WSIPP cost is converted from USD into GBP and increased by 25%. To estimate costs, WSIPP assumed that teachers spend an average of half an hour per week to maintain contact with parents during the school year. This is based on the evaluations included in their analysis. They calculated the value of teacher time using average teacher salaries (including benefits) in Washington State.

Intervention	Programme cost			Comparison cost			Source ^{a, b}
	Annual cost	Duration (years)	Year of Pounds	Annual cost	Duration (years)	Year of Pounds	
Quantum Opportunities Programme	£3,916	5	2006	£0	5	2006	The WSIPP cost is converted from USD into GBP and increased by 25%. Average cost per youth is \$25,000 for five years. ^h WSIPP put a 30% uncertainty estimate around this figure because the average costs vary widely by site.
Quick Reads	£68	1	2011	£0	1	2011	The unit cost has been calculated using the US cost estimates produced for the Evidence2Success project (funded by the Annie E. Casey Foundation). The unit cost calculation assumes that the programme is delivered in 1 classroom with 27 pupils each year, over a 5-year period. The unit cost is converted from USD into GBP and increased by 25%.
Read 180	£283	1	2011	£92	1	2010	The unit cost has been calculated using the US cost estimates produced for the Evidence2Success project (funded by the Annie E. Casey Foundation). The unit cost calculation assumes an annual programme delivery to 14 pupils over a 5-year period. The unit cost is converted from USD into GBP and increased by 25%. The comparison group cost is based on an average total cost per pupil with Special Educational Needs (SEN) using Local Authority 2010 expenditure data. The comparison group unit cost excludes the cost of provision for SEN pupils with a statement.
Reading Recovery	£2,591	1	2010	£0	1	2010	Tanner et al. (2011) ⁱ , please see Table 7.2, pp. 185.
Special Literacy Instruction for English as a Second Language Students	£1,143	3	2009	£1,061	3	2009	The WSIPP costs are converted from USD into GBP and increased by 25%. The WSIPP programme cost estimate reflects the sum of local, state, and federal dollars allocated per-student (averaged across Washington State school districts) for the 2008-09 school year. All students who qualify for the state Transitional Bilingual Instructional Program (TBIP) receive some form of services, so the comparison group cost is the same as the programme group cost. As specialised literacy programmes may require supplemental materials and training, WSIPP added \$100 to the cost estimate and increased the uncertainty around the estimate to 20 per cent. Source for dollars allocated per-student: Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction.
Success for All	£64	3	2010	£0	3	2011	SFA-UK and Success for All Foundation. The cost estimate is based on delivery in 3 classrooms per year, including a total of 81 pupils over a 5-year delivery period.
The Reading Edge	£64	3	2011	£0	3	2011	The unit cost has been calculated using the US cost estimates produced for the Evidence2Success project (funded by the Annie E. Casey Foundation). The unit cost calculation assumes a programme delivery to 200 pupils over a 5-year period. The unit cost is converted from USD into GBP and increased by 25%.

Intervention	Programme cost			Comparison cost			Source ^{a, b}
	Annual cost	Duration (years)	Year of Pounds	Annual cost	Duration (years)	Year of Pounds	
Tutoring for English Language Learners	£2,136	1	2009	£1,061	1	2009	The WSIPP costs are converted from USD into GBP and increased by 25%. The WSIPP programme cost estimates are based on the following assumptions derived from the programmes described in the studies included in the meta-analysis: on average, the programmes lasted for 4.5 months, with 60 sessions of about 25 minutes each. The programmes provide 1 to 3 hours of training. WSIPP used average teacher salaries (including benefits) in Washington State to compute the value of tutors' time. They assumed that tutoring costs are in addition to regular classroom instruction, for which the cost estimate reflects the sum of local, state, and federal dollars allocated per-student (averaged across Washington State school districts) for the 2008-09 school year. WSIPP increased the uncertainty around the cost estimate to 20 per cent. Source for dollars allocated per-student: Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction.
Early Years Interventions							
Abecedarian Programme	£10,944	5	2002	£1,383	5	2008	The cost is based on the estimates provided by Masse and Barnett (2002, p.13) ¹ and the estimates provided by the developer (USD). The cost was converted from USD into GBP and increased by 25%. The comparison group cost is the same as for Early Childhood Education: the average per-child payment for Washington State's Working Connections Child Care subsidy. The WSIPP cost for the comparison group is converted from USD into GBP and increased by 25%.
Curiosity Corner	£78	1	2011	£0	1	2011	SFA-UK and Success for All Foundation. The cost estimate assumes a programme delivery over 5 years of implementation serving 27 children in 1 school per year.
Early Childhood Education	£5,386	2	2010	£1,383	2	2008	The WSIPP costs are converted from USD into GBP and increased by 25%. The WSIPP intervention cost is the average per-child payment for Washington State's Early Childhood Education and Assistance Program (ECEAP). The comparison group cost is the average per-child payment for Washington State's Working Connections Child Care subsidy. WSIPP increased the uncertainty around the cost estimate to 25 per cent, which reflects the higher per-child costs for the model programmes included in this analysis.
High Scope/Perry Preschool	£6,501	2	2010	£1,383	2	2008	The cost is calculated based on estimates provided by the HighScope GB, South Tyneside Early Excellence Children's Centre at Tyne & Wear. The comparison group cost is the same as for Early Childhood Education: the average per-child payment for Washington State's Working Connections Child Care subsidy. The WSIPP cost for the comparison group is converted from USD into GBP and increased by 25%.
Parent Child Home Programme	£2,373	2	2011	£0	1	2011	The WSIPP cost is converted from USD into GBP and increased by 25%. Average annual cost per family provided by The Parent Child Home Program's National Centre.

Intervention	Programme cost			Comparison cost			Source ^{a, b}
	Annual cost	Duration (years)	Year of Pounds	Annual cost	Duration (years)	Year of Pounds	
Child Protection and Social Care							
Alternative Response	£75	1	2008	£0	1	2008	The WSIPP cost is converted from USD into GBP and increased by 25%. WSIPP reports that the two major evaluations of Alternative Response systems, that reported costs, found different results in their analyses. In the Minnesota evaluation, the observed costs for Alternative Response clients were slightly lower than those for clients receiving service-as-usual. In Ohio, the observed costs for Alternative Response clients were slightly higher than those for clients receiving service-as-usual. To be cautious, WSIPP used the per-family estimates from the Ohio evaluation (Loman et al., 2010) ^k .
Family Nurse Partnership	£3,500	1.74	2011	£0	1	2011	Department for Health, Family Nurse Partnership Programme: working figure. This estimate does not include the nationally provided elements of training or any other national support costs, but does include local training, which is also a substantial part of the FNP Learning Programme. Average length of service provided by the Institute for the Study of Children, Families and Social Issues, Birkbeck, University of London, 2012.
Family Preservation	£2,281	1	2003	£252	1	2003	The WSIPP cost is converted from USD into GBP and increased by 25%. The programme cost per family provided by DSHS Children's Administration. WSIPP adjusted for multiple children per family. Comparison group costs were calculated based on social worker time in Washington State.
Healthy Families America	£2,647	1.2	2004	£0	1	2004	The WSIPP cost is converted from USD into GBP and increased by 25%. Average annual cost per family from HFA survey of sites, Financial Year 2004 (available from: www.healthyfamiliesamerica.org/network_resources/hfa_state_of_state_systems.pdf). Average length of service provided by: Prevent Child Abuse America, WSIPP conversation in September, 2004.
Homebuilders	£2,812	1	2008	£319	1	2008	The WSIPP cost is converted from USD into GBP and increased by 25%. The programme cost per family provided by DSHS Children's Administration. WSIPP adjusted for multiple children per family. Comparison group costs were calculated based on social worker time in Washington State.
Other Home Visiting Programmes for At Risk Families	£4,367	1	2008	£0	1	2008	The WSIPP cost is converted from USD into GBP and increased by 25%.
Parent-Child Interaction Therapy	£1,967	1	2007	£806	1	2007	The WSIPP cost is converted from USD into GBP and increased by 25%. Standard PCIT expenditures provided by Children's Administration (average reimbursement rate for families receiving PCIT in Washington in 2007). WSIPP estimate of additional motivational component costs were calculated based on extra therapist time required.

Intervention	Programme cost			Comparison cost			Source ^{a, b}
	Annual cost	Duration (years)	Year of Pounds	Annual cost	Duration (years)	Year of Pounds	
Parents as Teachers	£1,752	2	2010	£0	2	2010	The programme unit cost is calculated in collaboration with Parents as First Teachers UK. As the majority of practitioners delivering the programme have Family Support Worker or similar qualification, the hourly pay of Family Support Worker was used in costing the programme delivery (Curtis, 2011) ^l . The unit cost assumes 10 annual visits per family on average. The average time that parents' stay in the programme is assumed to be 2 years. It is also assumed that an average practitioner delivers the intervention over a 4-year period. Parents as First Teachers UK also provided information on training, coaching and fidelity monitoring.
SafeCare	£4,089	1	2011	£3,805	1	2011	The programme unit cost is calculated based on the UK SafeCare pilot expenditure data provided by the NSPCC. The comparison group cost is based on Social Worker cost data in Curtis (2011) ^l .
Triple-P Universal (Triple P System)	£111	1	2008	£0	1	2008	The WSIPP cost is converted from USD into GBP and increased by 25%. Training costs were estimated from Foster et al. (2008) ^m . Parenting programme costs were estimated by multiplying average Washington cost per family by 10 per cent of the population assumed to receive the parenting programme, distributed over 100 per cent of the population.

Note.^a For WSIPP unit costs see Lee, S., Aos, S., Drake, E., Pennucci, A., Miller, M., & Anderson, L. (2012). *Return on investment: Evidence-based options to improve statewide outcomes, April 2012* (Document No. 12-04-1201). Olympia: Washington State Institute for Public Policy. The report is available at www.wsipp.wa.gov/pub.asp?docid=12-04-1201.

^b There is always some uncertainty around programme cost estimates. The uncertainty included in the model around these costs ranges from (+/-) 10-25%. The programme costs are varied in Monte Carlo runs when running cost-benefit analysis to test the model systematically for the riskiness inherent in the single point estimate. For some intervention a comparison group cost for treatment as usual is used when available.

^c Curtis, L. (2010). *Unit costs of health and social care 2010*. The University of Kent. Personal Social Services Research Unit.

^d For further details see also Barnoski, R. (2009, December). *Providing evidence-based programs with fidelity in Washington State juvenile courts: Cost analysis* (Document No. 09-12-1201). Olympia: Washington State Institute for Public Policy. Available at www.wsipp.wa.gov/rptfiles/09-12-1201.pdf

^e For further details see also Anspach, D. F., Ferguson, A. S., & Phillips, L. L. (2003). *Evaluation of Maine's statewide juvenile drug treatment court program*. Augusta, ME: University of Southern Maine.

^f National Board for Professional Teaching Standards: www.nbpts.org

^g Chan, G.K., Foxcroft, D.R., Smurthwaite, B., Coombes, L., & Allen, D. (2012). *Improving child behaviour management: An evaluation of the Good Behaviour Game in UK primary schools*. Oxford Brookes University, Oxfordshire County Council. Available at www.swph.brookes.ac.uk/images/pdfs/research/GBG_UK_Final_Evaluation_Report.pdf

^h Maxfield, M., Schirm, A., Rodriguez-Planas, N., & Mathematica Policy Research, Washington, DC. (2003). *The Quantum Opportunity Program demonstration: Implementation and short-term impacts*. Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. Available at www.mathematica-mpr.com/pdfs/quanimpshort.pdf

ⁱ Emily Tanner, E., Brown, A., Day, N., Kotecha, M., Low, N., Morrell, G., Turczuk, O., Brown, V., Collingwood, A., Chowdry, H., Greaves, E., Harrison, C., Johnson, G., & Purdon, S. (2011). Evaluation of Every Child a Reader (ECaR). DfE Research Report 114. London: Department for Education. Available at www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/DFE-RR114.pdf

^j Masse, L.N. & Barnett, W.S. (2002). *A benefit cost analysis of the Abecedarian Early Childhood Intervention*. New Brunswick, NJ: National Institute for Early Education Research.

^k Loman, L.A., Filonow, C.S., & Siegel, G. (2010). Ohio Alternative Response pilot project evaluation: Final report. St. Louis, MO: Institute of Applied Research.

^l Curtis, L. (2011). *Unit costs of health and social care 2011*. The University of Kent. Personal Social Services Research Unit.

^m Foster, E. M., Prinz, R. J., Sanders, M. R., & Shapiro, C. J. (2008). The costs of a public health infrastructure for delivering parenting and family support. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 30(5), 493-501.

Investing in Children has been funded by Birmingham City Council and the Association of Greater Manchester Authorities, and by the Youth Justice Board. Pro Bono Economics, an independent charity that matches volunteer economics with charities wishing to address questions around measurements, results and impact, has provided invaluable support.



The analyses and views presented are those of *Investing in Children*, not the funding organisations. Further funds are sought to continue the supply of free and independent investment advice for children's services.