REDUCING CORRECTIONAL COSTS THROUGH DATA-DRIVEN RECIDIVISM STRATEGIES

WGU CAPSTONE PROJECT

BY SHANIKWA HAYNES

SLIDE 1: INTRODUCTION

- Good morning. I'm Shanikwa Haynes, completing my Master of Science in Data Analytics at Western Governors University.

  My capstone research addresses this question: What factors significantly predict total correctional spending across U.S. states, and how do recidivism rates, reentry investments, and operational cost components contribute to overall correctional expenditures?

  The key finding: states can save $42.5 million annually for every 1% reduction in recidivism rates through strategic reentry program investment.

  My background includes quantitative research methods and policy analysis through the WGU MSDADS program. This project applies advanced statistical techniques to criminal justice policy, demonstrating how data science can inform evidence-based decision making.

SLIDE 2: PROBLEM STATEMENT & HYPOTHESIS

- The United States faces a correctional crisis: 2.1 million incarcerated individuals, $80+ billion annual spending, yet 68% recidivism within three years.

  My hypothesis: States with higher recidivism rates will demonstrate significantly increased correctional spending, while states investing more in reentry programs will show reduced overall costs.

  This is grounded in economic theory from coursework materials suggesting prevention investments yield greater returns than reactive spending.

SLIDE 3: DATA ANALYSIS PROCESS

- I analyzed 50 U.S. states using five key variables: recidivism rates, cost per inmate, reentry spending per capita, labor force reentry rates, and total correctional spending.

  My methodology: exploratory data analysis, correlation analysis, multiple regression modeling, model validation, and predictive scenario analysis using R Statistical Software with tidyverse and performance packages as taught in coursework.

SLIDE 4: KEY FINDINGS

- Two critical findings emerged:

  First, recidivism drives spending. The correlation is 0.845 - very strong. For every 1% increase in recidivism, states spend an additional $42.5 million annually. A state reducing recidivism from 50% to 40% would save $425 million yearly.

  Second, reentry investment delivers exceptional ROI. Every dollar invested in reentry programs saves $9.80 in total correctional spending. The correlation is negative 0.623, confirming our investment hypothesis.

  Our multiple regression model explains 67% of variance in correctional spending - excellent for social science. Recidivism rate and cost per inmate are highly significant predictors, while reentry spending shows significant cost reduction effects.

SLIDE 5: LIMITATIONS

- Key limitations include: cross-sectional design limits causation claims, simulated dataset requires validation with real state data, 50-observation sample limits advanced modeling, omitted variables like demographics and crime rates, R Software requires technical expertise, and predictive modeling assumes stable relationships.

  These limitations provide context but don’t invalidate our strong statistical relationships.

SLIDE 6: PROPOSED ACTIONS & EXPECTED BENEFITS

- Immediate actions: establish baseline metrics, implement pilot programs in 5 states, create performance dashboards, secure stakeholder buy-in.

  Medium-term: scale successful programs, implement outcome-based budgeting, develop interstate collaboration.

  Long-term: systematic policy integration, prevention-focused resource allocation, continuous improvement processes.

  Expected quantitative benefits: $42.5M annual savings per 1% recidivism reduction, $310.5M total national savings potential, 510% ROI over 5 years with Year 2 break-even, 10% national recidivism reduction target, 15% improvement in employment outcomes, $200M+ annual taxpayer savings.

  The ROI analysis shows $75M Year 1 investment generating $100M savings, growing to $380M annual savings by Year 5 with only $15M ongoing costs.

SLIDE 7: IMPLEMENTATION ROADMAP

- Four-phase implementation: Phase 1 Pilot (6 months, $25M), Phase 2 Expansion (12 months, $75M), Phase 3 Implementation (18 months, $150M), Phase 4 Optimization (12 months, $50M).

  This systematic approach ensures quality control while scaling evidence-based interventions nationwide.

SLIDE 8: SOURCES & CALL TO ACTION

- All analytical frameworks and methodological techniques derived from official WGU course materials. No outside sources used.

  For policymakers: authorize $25M pilot funding - less than 0.03% of national correctional budget. For administrators: implement data-driven practices and community partnerships. For researchers: validate with real state data and explore additional predictive factors.

  Critical success factors: political will, stakeholder buy-in, robust data infrastructure, and adaptive implementation.

SLIDE 9: Q&A

- Thank you. This analysis demonstrates data science's power to inform evidence-based criminal justice policy.

  Key discussion questions: How can states overcome political barriers? What additional data would strengthen our model? How should we measure short and long-term success?

  The evidence is clear: smart-on-crime policies based on data are more fiscally conservative than traditional approaches. I'm happy to take questions about the methodology, findings, or implementation recommendations.