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Learning Objectives

The goal of this webinar is to educate community corrections professionals in both adult and juvenile sectors on the current trends of evidence-based practices (EBPs) of probation supervision.

By the conclusion of this webinar, participants will be able to:

- Understand the core elements of EBPs and probation supervision.
- Discuss the pros and cons of EBPs implementation.
- Recognize leadership qualities that are conducive to using a successful evidence-based approach.
- Identify at least two practices that they could implement to enhance probation supervision.
What are EBPs?

The objective, balanced, and responsible use of current research and the best available data to guide policy and practice decisions, such that outcomes for consumers are improved.

- Offenders
- Victims and Survivors
- Communities

fair, just, proportionate, and effective sanctioning goals

So, what’s the point of EBPs?

- Reduces recidivism
- Upholds public safety
- Reduces costs
- Enhances collaboration

Establishes a core quality assurance and evaluation process.
3. Target Interventions
   - Risk Principle
   - Need Principle
   - Responsivity Principle
   - Dosage
   - Treatment Principle

1. Assess Actuarial Risk/Needs
2. Enhance Intrinsic Motivation
Principles of Effective Intervention

4. Skill Train w/ Directed Practice
5. Increase Positive Reinforcement
6. Engage Ongoing Support in Natural Communities

7. Measure Relevant Processes/Practices
8. Provide Measurement Feedback
EBPs of Adult Probation

1. EBPs agency currently employs
2. Impact on outcomes?
3. Major challenges?
4. Essential elements for successful implementation?
5. Leadership styles/characteristics
Travis County EBP Phases

Phase I: 2006/07 Planning & Implementation
- Diagnosis process
- Supervision strategies
- Sanctioning strategies
  - “Programs and caseloads”
- Quality control
- Training
- Personnel evaluations

Phase II: Fine tuning key areas
- Interfacing better with the broader CJ system
- First set of outcomes

Phase III: 2008/09 Refinement
- Ongoing measurement of fidelity
- Data driven policy development
  - “Learning Organization”
- Culture

Phase IV: 2010+ Fidelity
- Policy development
  - “Learning Organization”
- Culture
Example 1: New Diagnostic Report

Before April 2, 2007

**PSI**
A “biography” collected using inconsistent interview protocols, with the “story telling” effected by different writing styles and utilizing no proven diagnosis tools to assess offenders

Implemented April 2, 2007

**Diagnosis Report**
Identifying the offender along risk and behavioral characteristics related to supervision success using proven assessment tools and with short narratives generated from assessment instruments
Based on the SCS protocol, the following shaded areas in the Potential Concern and Salient Problem categories indicate criminogenic risk factors placing this individual at greater risk of recidivating.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>Not An Issue (NI)</th>
<th>Potential Concern (PC)</th>
<th>Salient Problem (SP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Thinking/</td>
<td>First time offender. Pro-social</td>
<td>Negative environmental influences, peers etc.</td>
<td>Lengthy criminal history. Entrenched criminal value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Escalating Criminal History</td>
<td>system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Relations</td>
<td>Generally positive and associations with non-offenders</td>
<td>Occasional association with other offenders</td>
<td>Lived off prostitution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nine prior offenses of theft, forgery, or burglary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>One prior felony term of probation revoked.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assaultive Behavior</td>
<td>No evidence of emotional instability or aggressive behavior</td>
<td>Single prior episode of assaulitive behavior</td>
<td>Current or multiple episodes of assaulitive behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Use</td>
<td>None or Social.</td>
<td>Occasional abuse, some disruption of functioning</td>
<td>Frequent abuse, serious disruption</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example 2: New Supervision Strategies

- Redesign conditions of supervision and develop decision rules to adopt conditions
- Conduct mapping analysis to understand potential of neighborhood based caseloads
- Redesign supervision strategies to match diagnosis classifications
- DSHS MH, parole and probation integrated in one-stop service center
- Redesign field interview protocols to allow for motivational interviewing techniques
- Redesign format and protocol related to the development of supervision plans
- Redesign of documentation “chronos” to support new supervision strategies
- Automate new forms
- Strategy to reduce caseload in targeted areas
- Adopt new sex offender treatment protocol and supervision strategy
EBP Model: Fidelity and Outcomes

- **Outcomes**
  - High
  - Low

- **Fidelity**
  - Low
  - High

- **Effective Program**
  - Outcomes due to other factors
  - Poorly Implemented

- **Ineffective Program**
  - High
EBP Impact on Re-Arrests (post YR1)

Test Recidivism Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent Rearrested One Year Later By Risk Level</th>
<th>Pre-TCIS Jan. to June 2006 N=1,287</th>
<th>Transition Jan. to April 2007 N=734</th>
<th>Post-TCIS July to Oct. 2007 N=614</th>
<th>% Change in Rate Pre-TCIS to Past-TCIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>-77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>-50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>-17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Revocations & Absconding

Revocations

New Felony Absconders

- Revocations
- Technical Revocations

FY 2004: 1,067
FY 2005: 1,140
FY 2006: 1,156
FY 2007: 1,037
FY 2008: 872
FY 2009: 837
FY 2010: 797

FY 2004: 581
FY 2005: 608
FY 2006: 449
FY 2007: 399
FY 2008: 318
FY 2009: 317
FY 2010: 287

FY 2004: 892
FY 2005: 824
FY 2006: 738
FY 2007: 672
FY 2008: 557
FY 2009: 505
FY 2010: 470
Measuring Fidelity: EBP Elements & Implementation

- Court
- Start

Diagnostic Report
- Risk
- SCS
- Criminogenic Domains

Interlude
- Jail
- Treatment
- Abscond
- Other

Supervision
- Risk-need assessment
- Correct Caseload
- Supervision Plan
- Motivational Interviewing
- Contacts
- Referrals

Sanctions / Incentives
- Timely
- Appropriate

Outcomes
- Probation Completion
- Abscond
- Violations
- Arrests
- Revocation
Case File Review Form – Fidelity to EBP

Court

Diagnostic Report (PSI)  Interlude  Supervision  Sanctions / Incentives  Outcomes
### Example: Supervision Agreement

#### 3) On-Going Supervision
- Was offender placed on correct caseload?

#### Supervision Agreement Completed: 85%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Was it signed by the probationer?</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was it negotiated?</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were Criminogenic needs identified?</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domains same as Diagnostic Report?</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the Supervision Agreement the foundation for office visits?</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminogenic Need Areas discussed?</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the probationer make progress toward Supervision Agreement goals?</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Relationship of Supervision Agreement Quality to Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes N = 116</th>
<th>No N = 27</th>
<th>Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revoked</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- New Offense</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Technical Violation</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrested</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>-12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Felony Arrest</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Misdemeanor</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Since N=small this should be interpreted as promising but not conclusive.*
Common Challenges

• Misunderstanding of the term “EBP”
  • Not a program but a set of principles

• Infrastructure Not In Place
  • Correctional data systems incomplete or not designed to provide relevant measures
  • Lack of expertise at the local level to conduct or interpret research

• Funding/Resources

• Departments attempt to implement components without attention to culture

• Minimal involvement of judiciary and other CJ stakeholders
Leadership

- Engage staff and stakeholders
- Assess your organization’s readiness for change and address organizational issues
- Strike a balance between big picture and detail
- Think strategically & systemically
- Decision-making skills are key
- Effective utilization of data is essential
- Pay attention to the pace of change
Council of State Governments
Justice Center
August 2, 2011

http://justicecenter.csg.org/
EBPs of Juvenile Probation

1. EBPs agency currently employs
2. Impact on outcomes?
3. Major challenges?
4. Essential elements for successful implementation?
5. Leadership styles/characteristics
Multnomah County, Oregon

- Oregon’s most populous county with over 735,000 residents, including the state’s most populous city, Portland.

- Race/Ethnicity:
  - 72.1% White (not Hispanic)
  - 10.9% Hispanic or Latino origin
  - 6.5% Asian
  - 5.6% Black
  - 1.5% American Indian/Alaskan Native or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander

- Persons under the age of 18 comprise 20.5% of the county’s population.

- In 2009, the median household income was $50,604 and 15.1% of residents fell below the poverty line.
The Department of Community Justice provides community supervision to both Adults and Juveniles.

The Juvenile Services Division is comprised of three sections:

1. Counseling & Court Services (probation)
2. Custody Services (detention)
3. Treatment Services
EBPs in Juvenile Services

_Counseling and Court Services_ (Probation)

- Risk-Based Case Processing (opposed to Offense Driven)
- Validated Risk Instrument (the JCP)
- Sanctions Grid and Service Options Based on Risk Level
- Functional Family Probation Services (FFPS)
EBPs in Juvenile Services

Custody Services (Detention)

- RAI – Risk Assessment Instrument
- Detention Alternatives
  - Community Detention/Electronic Monitoring
  - GPS
  - Shelter
- Aggression Replacement Training (ART) – Skillstreaming
- Thinking for a Change (T4C)
**EBPs in Juvenile Services**

**Treatment Services**
- NCTI Skill Groups
- Global Appraisal of Individual Needs (GAIN)
- Multi-Dimensional Family Therapy (MDFT)
- Motivational Interviewing (MI)
- Stages of Change
- Truthought curriculum
Impact of EBPs on Outcomes

- Significantly reduced juvenile probation population
- Created extremely small detention population
- Target limited resources to the highest risk youth
- Divert lower risk youth away from the justice system
- Juvenile crime has steadily declined
- Recidivism rates have remained steady
Impact of EBPs on Outcomes

- Use actuarial instruments to assess risk and needs
- Refer youth and their families to services that address identified criminogenic needs
- Actively engage parents/caregivers in probation services
- Train probation officers to be “alliance-based” rather than fear-based
- Strongly emphasize the importance of quality assurance – both adherence measures as well as outcomes for youth and community
Major Challenges

- A LOT of work!
- Takes time to shift a culture
- Need absolute buy-in & commitment from “the top”
- Staff “resistance”
- Expensive (but cost-effective)
- Need to become experts and adopt the role of “coach”
- Requires involvement of partners/stakeholder
- Focus on Fidelity/Adherence
- Need some capacity for Quality Assurance
Essential Elements to Promote Effective Implementation of EBPs

- Build a Powerful Business Case
- Vision and Clarity
- Leadership & Accountability
- Specific Communications
- Increased Capability
- Integrated Planning and Teams to Affect Change
- Stakeholder Commitment
- Align Performance with Culture
Leadership

An “eclectic” approach works best

Helpful Characteristics:

- Transformational Leadership
- Participative/Democratic Leadership
- Servant Leadership
Leadership Styles

Six Emotional Leadership Styles:

1. The Visionary Leader
2. The Coaching Leader
3. The Affiliative Leader
4. The Democratic Leader
5. The Pace-setting Leader
6. The Commanding Leader

Let’s Recap

- Use of EBPs have proven to be effective in reducing costs and recidivism, while maintaining public safety
- Must be cognizant of the challenges to implementing EBPs in your jurisdiction
- Specific elements are essential to successful implementation of EBPs
- Effective leaders must take a variety of stances
Useful Resource

Crime and Justice Institute’s “EBP Integrated Model”
Available at: http://cjinstitute.org/projects/integratedmodel
Questions...

...Comments
For Additional Information

Nathan Lowe
859.244.8057 or nlowe@csg.org

Shawn Rogers
646.383.5745 or srogers@csg.org