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Evidence Based – What does it mean?

There are different forms of evidence:

– The lowest form is anecdotal evidence; stories, opinions, testimonials, case studies, etc - but it often makes us feel good

– The highest form is empirical evidence – research, data, results from controlled studies, etc. - but sometimes it doesn’t make us feel good
Evidence Based Practice is:

1. Easier to think of as Evidence Based Decision Making

2. Involves several steps and encourages the use of validated tools and treatments.

3. Not just about the tools you have but also how you use them
Evidence Based Decision Making Requires

1. Assessment information
2. Relevant research
3. Available programming
4. Evaluation
5. Professionalism and knowledge from staff
What does the Research tell us?

*There is often a Misapplication of Research: “XXX Study Says”*

- the problem is if you believe every study we wouldn’t eat anything (but we would drink a lot of red wine!)

• Looking at one study can be a mistake

• Need to examine a body of research

• So, what does the body of knowledge about correctional interventions tell us?
A Large Body of Research Has Indicated….

….that correctional services and interventions can be effective in reducing recidivism, however, not all programs are equally effective

• The most effective programs are based on some principles of effective interventions

  • Risk (Who)

  • Need (What)

  • Treatment aka Responsivity (How)

  • Program Integrity (How Well)
Let’s Start with the Risk Principle

Risk refers to risk of reoffending and not the seriousness of the offense.

Seriousness usually trumps risk.
Risk Principle

As a general rule treatment effects are stronger if we target higher risk individuals, and harm can be done to low risk
Risk Level by Recidivism for the Community Supervision Sample

- Low Risk: 9.1%
- Medium Risk: 34.3%
- High Risk: 58.9%
- Very High Risk: 69.2%

Percent with New Arrest:
- Low 0-14
- Medium = 15-23
- High = 24-33
- Very High 34+
There are Three Elements to the Risk Principle

1. Target those with higher probability of recidivism

2. Provide most intensive treatment to higher risk

3. Intensive treatment for lower risk can increase recidivism
#1: Targeting Higher Risk

- It is important to understand that even with EBP there will be failures.

- Even if you reduce recidivism rates you will still have high percentage of failures.
Example of Targeting Higher Risk

- If you have 100 High risk individuals about 60% will fail
- If you put them in well designed EBP for sufficient duration you may reduce failure rate to 40%
- If you have 100 low risk individuals about 10% will fail
- If you put them in same program failure rate will be 20%
Targeting Higher Risk continued:

- In the end, who had the lower recidivism rate?
- Mistake we make is comparing high risk to low risk rather than look for treatment effects
#2: Provide Most Intensive Interventions to Higher Risk
The question is: What does more “intensive” treatment mean in practice?

• Most studies show that the longer someone is in treatment the greater the effects, however:

• Effects tend to diminish if treatment goes too long
Results from a 2010 Study (Latessa, Sperber, and Makarios) of 689 Adult Males

- 100-bed secure residential facility for adult male felons
- Cognitive-behavioral treatment modality
- Average age 33
- 60% single, never married
- 43% less than high school education
- 80% moderate risk or higher
- 88% have probability of substance abuse per SASSI
2010 Dosage Study of 689 Adult Males

Results from 2014 Study

• We expanded sample

• Hours examined by increments of 50

• Looked at low/moderate, moderate, and high
2014 Dosage Study involving 903 Adult Males

Results from 2013 Ohio Study of over 10,000 Youth:
Recidivism Rates by Total Months in Programs

Findings from Ohio Study

• Recidivism rates for low risk youth served in the community were 2 to 4 times lower than those served in Residential or Institutional facilities.

• We also found that placing low risk youth in Substance Abuse programs significantly increased their recidivism rates.

• High risk youth were more successful when they received a higher dosage of treatment (programming for 13 months or more).

• Lower and moderate risk youth did better with lower dosage programs.
Provide Most Intensive Interventions to Higher Risk

• Higher risk individuals will require much higher dosage of treatment
  – Rule of thumb: 100-150 hours for moderate risk
  – 200+ hours for high risk
  – 100 hours for high risk will have little effect
  – Does not include work/school and other activities that are not directly addressing criminogenic risk factors
#3: Intensive Treatment for Low Risk will Often Increase Failure Rates

- Low risk will often learn anti social behavior from higher risk
- Disrupts pro-social networks
- Increased reporting/surveillance leads to more violations/revocations
STUDY OF COMMUNITY CORRECTIONAL PROGRAMS IN OHIO

• Largest study of community based correctional treatment facilities ever done up to that time.

• Total of 13,221 offenders – 37 Halfway Houses and 15 Community Based Correctional Facilities were included in the study.

• Two-year follow-up conducted on all offenders

• Recidivism measures included new arrests & incarceration in a state penal institution

Increased Recidivism

Reduced Recidivism

Treatment Effects for Low Risk Offenders
Treatment Effects For High Risk Offenders

Probability of Reincarceration
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Results from 2013 Ohio Study of over 10,000 Youth: Risk Level by New Felony Adjudication

To understand the Need Principle we need to review the body of knowledge related to risk factors.

What are the risk factors correlated with criminal conduct?
Andrews and Bonta’s Major Set of Risk/Need Factors

1. Antisocial/procriminal attitudes, values, beliefs & cognitive emotional states

2. Procriminal associates & isolation from anticriminal others

3. Temperamental and anti social personality patterns conducive to criminal activity including:
   - Weak socialization
   - Impulsivity
   - Adventurous
   - Restless/aggressive
   - Egocentrism
   - A taste for risk
   - Weak problem-solving/self-regulation & coping skills

4. A history of antisocial behavior
Major Set of Risk/Need Factors

5. Familial factors that include criminality and a variety of psychological problems in the family of origin including Low levels of affection, caring, and cohesiveness, poor parental supervision and discipline and outright neglect and abuse.

6. Low levels of personal, educational, vocational, or financial achievement

7. Low levels of involvement in prosocial leisure activities

8. Substance Abuse
Study by Bucklen and Zajac of parole violators in Pennsylvania found a number of criminogenic factors related to failure*

Pennsylvania Parole Study
Social Network and Living Arrangements
Violators Were:

• More likely to hang around with individuals with criminal backgrounds
• Less likely to live with a spouse
• Less likely to be in a stable supportive relationship
• Less likely to identify someone in their life who served in a mentoring capacity
Pennsylvania Parole Study
Employment & Financial Situation
Violators were:

• Less likely to have job stability
• Less likely to be satisfied with employment
• Less likely to take low end jobs and work up
• More likely to have negative attitudes toward employment & unrealistic job expectations
• Less likely to have a bank account
• More likely to report that they were “barely making it” (yet success group reported over double median debt)
Pennsylvania Parole Study
Alcohol or Drug Use
Violators were:

- More likely to report use of alcohol or drugs while on parole (but no difference in prior assessment of dependency problem)

- Poor management of stress was a primary contributing factor to relapse
Pennsylvania Parole Study
Life on Parole - Violators were:

• Had poor problem solving or coping skills
• Did not anticipate long term consequences of behavior
• Failed to utilize resources to help themselves
• Acted impulsively to immediate situations
• Felt they were not in control
• More likely to maintain anti-social attitudes
• Viewed violations as an acceptable option to situation
• Maintained general lack of empathy
• Shifted blame or denied responsibility
• Had unrealistic expectations about what life would be like outside of prison
Pennsylvania Parole Violator Study:

• Successes and failures did not differ in difficulty in finding a place to live after release

• Successes & failures equally likely to report eventually obtaining a job
Need Principle

By assessing and targeting criminogenic needs for change, agencies can reduce the probability of recidivism.

Criminogenic

- Anti social attitudes
- Anti social friends
- Substance abuse
- Lack of empathy
- Impulsive behavior

Non-Criminogenic

- Anxiety
- Low self esteem
- Creative abilities
- Medical needs
- Physical conditioning
The Christopher Columbus Style of Program Design

WHEN HE SET OUT...

He didn’t know where he was going.

WHEN HE GOT THERE...

He didn’t know where he was.

WHEN HE GOT BACK...

He didn’t know where he had been.
Definitely *NOT* Criminogenic Needs
Dance Program Gets Juveniles Moving on the Right Track

By Meghan Mandeville, News Research Reporter

The beats blaring from the high security unit of the Santa Clara County (Calif.) Juvenile Hall have a ring of rehabilitation to them. There, in a small, secure, concrete area young male offenders dance their way toward a new outlook on life.

The Juvie Jazz dance program gives young offenders in two boys units and one girls unit an opportunity to let loose on the dance floor to the music of rappers like Tupac, 50 Cent and R. Kelly. At the same time, the juveniles are learning how to follow instructions, work together in a group and build their self-esteem.

"I don't think they are going to be professional dancers, but I want them to see the potential they have to do different things," said program creator and instructor Ehud Krauss. "[My goal is] to make them better human beings [and] better kids.

Aside from juvenile offenders in Santa Clara County, Krauss, who owns a dance studio in Palo Alto, Calif., teaches dance to juveniles in San Mateo County, Calif. and autistic and handicapped kids in the area.
Running teaches inmates value of success

'This is the highlight of our year'

Inmate Jason Upchurch runs the marathon at the Middle Tennessee Correctional Complex.

NASHVILLE, Tennessee (AP) -- Until this week, Jordan Davis had never run 3.1 miles, much less completed a race.

Now he's finished one in a place not usually associated with running free: the Middle Tennessee Correctional Complex. It hosted a 5-kilometer, half-marathon and full marathon Wednesday, open to inmates and outsiders alike.

Jordan and older brother Johnathan finished the 5-kilometer race -- nine laps around a track lined with razor wire -- in 26 minutes, 48 seconds. Jordan is serving 20 years for theft; Johnathan works at a skateboard park.

"I was about to fall out, but I feel really good now. I never thought I could do anything like that," said Jordan Davis, 21.

That feeling of achievement is the whole point of the race, said Winnie Binkley, recreation director for the prison, which organized the "Jaunt in the Joint."

"Most of these guys have been told they can't succeed. They've never had positive reinforcement," Binkley said. "Last year there were three guys who said it was the first time they had ever started something and finished it."

The race was first organized three years ago by inmate Craig Nunn, who was the only runner to complete the entire 26.2 miles. Last year, he wrote a letter inviting the Nashville Striders running club to participate.

This year, 33 Striders provided timing clocks, Gatorade, T-shirts for participants and medals. A similar number of prisoners joined the "freewinders," as inmates call non-inmates.
To; Marta Daniel

Subject; Drum Circles

I am enclosing the latest research and articles on drum circles. I have been researching drum circles for the past year since experiencing one at the Southeastern Conference. I am amazed that something so basic actually boost the immune system and its fun. I am enclosing an e-mail from a friend that works in a New Zealand prison. She introduced the first drum circle in a New Zealand prison and she describes it as WOW. The staff was amazed because most clients continued drumming for two hours without stopping to smoke.

I am uncertain as to how parolees will respond to a drum circle, however I am sure it will be very positive. I realize that substance abuse and cognitive behavioral programs are probably your number one priority. I would like to introduce drum circles to the prison system. It may be cost effective preventing depression therefore saving money on antidepressants. In addition research indicates that it is stress reducing which may prevent Disciplinary Reports.

I am willing to demonstrate a drum circle free of charge to any prison within a 150 mile radius of Athens. I realize that you are very busy and I appreciate your taking the time to read over the materials that I have enclosed.

Sincerely,
Patricia Thomas MA., MAC., LPC.,

Patricia Thomas
In 1982, Catherine Sneed was lying in a hospital bed, so ill with kidney disease that her San Francisco County Jail co-workers were coming to say their good-byes -- prematurely, it turns out. While in the hospital, Sneed read Steinbeck's "Grapes of Wrath" and came to the pivotal realization that people feel most hopeful when they have a connection to the land, and that vital connection was missing at the county jail.

Sneed, a high school dropout who put herself through law school, became a jail counselor rather than a lawyer because, she says, she wanted to keep people out of jail rather than put them in. She attributes her recovery to that Steinbeck-inspired epiphany which then led to her determination to start the Garden Project.

Today, the county jail's Garden Project has employed more than 4,300 ex-prisoners and served thousands of incarcerated men and women, teaching them essential job and life skills and providing literacy courses and computer training all while they work the jail's 12-acre organic garden in San Bruno or the project's second garden in Hunters Point.

The garden serves as a setting where the participants not only acquire horticultural skills and an awareness of the role plants play in our lives but also learn the basics required in the working world, such as adhering to a schedule, working with a group and accepting responsibility for specific tasks.

Sneed says her goal is to provide Garden Project apprentices an alternative to the cycle of crime that has more than half the parolees returning to jail within a year. Her program shows them that "getting up every day and going to work, doing the best you can while there and getting a paycheck is easier than dealing drugs, easier than prison," she adds.

And it works. According to San Francisco County Sheriff Mike Hennessy, "The Garden Project is a tremendously effective crime-prevention program. It not only helps individuals rebuild their lives, but recidivism studies we've conducted also show that while 55 percent of our prisoners are rearrested within a year, those who go through the Garden Project have a recidivism rate of 24 percent, and that's after two years.

"The participants of the Garden Project are what we call 'frequent fliers' -- those people who were in and out of jail many times," Hennessy points out. "You don't find too many other programs this successful."
Circus clown trains troubled teens
Paul Miller shows them there's life off the street
1:10 AM, Aug. 29, 2011 | SPRINGFIELD TOWNSHIP -- Paul Miller’s hands were a blur - toss, catch, toss, catch - keeping three colored balls in the air as eight teens watched, wondering what juggling had to do with their stay at Hamilton County’s school for juvenile criminals. "We’re trying to show them there are things out there besides the streets," said Juvenile Court Judge Karla Grady. Miller, owner of Circus Mojo, has completed two programs at Hillcrest Training School. The Springfield Township correctional and treatment school is for delinquent males ages 12-18 and too often the last stop before juvenile prison. His Ludlow-based circus arts program teaches students how to juggle, walk on stilts, balance on a giant ball and some tumbling in addition to the real objectives - team building and boosting self-esteem. "It teaches them responsibility, teamwork, respect and commitment. All of that influences their academics and influences their home life," said Debbie Hill, of the nonprofit Community Arts Initiatives, the agency that paid for the $6,000, six-week program at Hillcrest. It’s an unusual step, Grady admits, to have a clown teach troubled teens circus skills, but she wanted to get their attention.
The Hollow Water First Nation, who live 200 km northeast of Winnipeg, have used dogsledding as a restorative justice program, which tries to restore relationships between victims and perpetrators in criminal cases. Exercising wilderness skills was seen as a way of rebuilding the perpetrator’s self-esteem, explained Marcel HARDESTY, restorative justice program director.
Needs Targeted & Correlation with Effect Size for Youthful Offenders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fear of Punishment</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond Anti Social Peers</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Self-Esteem</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vague Emotional Problems</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect Anti Social Thinking</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Activity</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminogenic Needs</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Targeting Criminogenic Need: Results from Meta-Analyses

Criminal Thinking and Mental Illness*

Morgan, Fisher, Duan, Mandracchia, and Murray (2010) studied 414 adult inmates in prison with mental illness (265 males, 149 females) and found:

- **66% had belief systems supportive of criminal life style** (based on Psychological Inventory of Criminal Thinking Scale (PICTS))

- When compare to other offender samples, **male offenders with MI scored similar or higher than non-mentally disordered offenders**.

- On Criminal Sentiments Scale-Revised, **85% of men and 72% of women with MI had antisocial attitudes, values and beliefs – which was higher than incarcerated sample without MI.**

Conclusion

• Criminal Thinking styles often differentiate people who commit crimes from those who do not independent of mental illness

• Incarcerated persons with mental illness are often mentally ill *and* criminal

• Needs to be treated as co-occurring problems
Assessment is the engine that drives effective correctional programs

- Need to meet the risk and need principle
- Reduces bias
- Aids decision making
- Allows you to target dynamic risk factors and measure change
- Best risk assessment method is the actuarial (statistical) approach
To Understand Assessment it is Important to Understand Types of Risk Factors
Dynamic and Static Factors

• Static Factors are those factors that are related to risk and do not change. Some examples might be number of prior offenses, whether an offender has ever had a drug/alcohol problem.

• Dynamic factors relate to risk and *can change*. Some examples are whether an offender is currently unemployed or currently has a drug/alcohol problem.
There are two types of dynamic risk factors

• Acute – Can change quickly

• Stable – Take longer to change
According to the American Heart Association, there are a number of risk factors that increase your chances of a first heart attack:

✓ Family history of heart attacks
✓ Gender (males)
✓ Age (over 50)
✓ Inactive lifestyle
✓ Over weight
✓ High blood pressure
✓ Smoking
✓ High Cholesterol level
Best Assessments include both Static and Dynamic Factors

• Just because we can’t change static factors doesn’t mean they are not important

• Dynamic factors are often more difficult to measure, but they are critical to developing case plans, prioritizing targets for change and gauging progress
The Treatment (Responsivity) Principle

• General
  – Most people respond to programs that are based on cognitive behavioral/social learning theories

• Specific
  – People learn differently and have certain barriers that should be addressed so that they are more likely to succeed in programs
Responsivity areas can include:

- Motivation to change
- Anxiety/psychopathy
- Levels of psychological development
- Maturity
- Cognitive functioning
- Mental disorders
- Housing
- Transportation
- Gender/Ethnicity/Race
Prioritizing Interventions: What to Change and Why

- Criminogenic targets – reduce risk for recidivism

- Non-criminogenic targets: may reduce barriers but NOT risk
• List three speeches that have changed your life
• List three people who have changed your life
Treatment Principle (general responsivity)

The most effective interventions are behavioral:

• Focus on current factors that influence behavior

• Action oriented

• Staff follow “core correctional practices”
Results from Meta Analysis: Behavioral vs. NonBehavioral

Type of Treatment and Effect Sizes for Youth


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Treatment</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Behavioral</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most Effective Behavioral Models

• Structured social learning where new skills and behaviors are modeled

• Family based approaches that train family on appropriate techniques

• Cognitive behavioral approaches that target criminogenic risk factors
Social Learning

Refers to several processes through which individuals acquire attitudes, behavior, or knowledge from the persons around them. Both modeling and instrumental conditioning appear to play a role in such learning.
Some Family Based Interventions

• Designed to train family on behavioral approaches
  – Functional Family Therapy
  – Multi-Systemic Therapy
  – Teaching Family Model
  – Strengthening Families Program
  – Common Sense Parenting
  – Parenting Wisely
Effectiveness of Family Based Intervention: Results from Meta Analysis

• 38 primary studies with 53 effect tests

• Average reduction in recidivism = 21%

However, a great deal of variability was present (-0.17 - +0.83)

Dowden & Andrews, 2003
Mean Effect Sizes: Whether or not the family intervention adheres to the principles
The Four Principles of Cognitive Intervention

1. Thinking affects behavior

2. Antisocial, distorted, unproductive irrational thinking can lead to antisocial and unproductive behavior

3. Thinking can be influenced

4. We can change how we feel and behave by changing what we think
Reasons that CBT is Popular in Corrections

• Can be done in any setting
• Existing staff can be trained on CBT
• Relatively cheap to deliver
• Wide range of curriculums are available
Some Examples of Cognitive Behavioral Correctional Curriculums

- Aggression Replacement Training (ART)
- Criminal Conduct and Substance Abuse Treatment (proprietary)
- Thinking for a Change (non-proprietary)
- UC's Cognitive Behavioral Interventions for Offenders Seeking Employment (non-proprietary)
- Changing Offender Lives (Specifically for MDOs – non-proprietary)
- UC’s Cognitive Behavioral Interventions for Substance Abuse for adolescents (non-proprietary)
- Moving On (Female Offenders-proprietary)
- UC’s Cognitive Behavioral Treatment for Sex Offenders (non-proprietary)
- UC's Cognitive Behavioral Interventions for Offenders - A comprehensive curriculum (non-proprietary). Also adaptable for MDOs.
Meta-Analysis of Cognitive Behavioral Treatment for Offenders by Landenberger & Lipsey

- Reviewed 58 studies:
  - 19 random samples
  - 23 matched samples
  - 16 convenience samples

- Found that on average CBT reduced recidivism by 25%, but the most effective configurations found more than 50% reductions

Factors Not significant:

- Setting – residential versus community
- Juvenile versus adult
- Minorities or females
- Brand name of the curriculum
Significant Findings (effects were stronger if):

- Sessions per week (2 or more) - RISK
- Implementation monitored - FIDELITY
- Staff trained on CBT - FIDELITY
- Higher proportion of treatment completers – SPECIFIC RESPONSIVITY
- Higher risk offenders - RISK
- Higher if CBT is combined with other services - NEED
Core Correctional Practices

1. Effective Reinforcement
2. Effective Disapproval
3. Effective Use of Authority
4. Quality Interpersonal Relationships
5. Cognitive Restructuring
6. Anti-criminal Modeling
7. Structured Learning/Skill Building
8. Problem Solving Techniques
Core Correctional Practices and Recidivism

2015 Meta Analysis: Staff Trained in Core Correctional Practices: Effects on Recidivism

Fidelity Principle

Making sure the program is delivered as designed and with integrity:

• Ensure staff are modeling appropriate behavior, are qualified, well trained, well supervision, etc.

• Make sure barriers are addressed but target criminogenic needs

• Make sure appropriate dosage of treatment is provided

• Monitor delivery of programs & activities, etc.

• Reassess participants in meeting target behaviors
What Do We Know About Fidelity?

• Is the most difficult principle to sustain

• Fidelity is related to successful outcomes (i.e., recidivism reductions). Poor fidelity can lead to null effects or even iatrogenic effects

• Fidelity cannot be assumed

• Fidelity can be measured and monitored
Effects of Quality Programs Delivery for Evidenced Based Programs for Youth Offenders


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Functional Family Therapy</th>
<th>Aggression Replacement Therapy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competently Delivered</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Competent</td>
<td>-16.7</td>
<td>-10.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What Doesn’t Work?
Lakota tribal wisdom says that when you discover you are riding a dead horse, the best strategy is to dismount. However, in corrections, and in other affairs, we often try other strategies, including the following:

- Buy a stronger whip.
- Change riders
- Say things like “This is the way we always have ridden this horse.”
- Appoint a committee to study the horse.
- Arrange to visit other sites to see how they ride dead horses.
- Create a training session to increase our riding ability.
- Harness several dead horses together for increased speed.
- Declare that “No horse is too dead to beat.”
- Provide additional funding to increase the horse’s performance.
- Declare the horse is “better, faster, and cheaper” dead.
- Study alternative uses for dead horses.
- Promote the dead horse to a supervisory position.
Ineffective Approaches

- Programs that cannot maintain fidelity
- Programs that target non-criminogenic needs
- Drug prevention classes focused on fear and other emotional appeals
- Shaming techniques
- Drug education programs
- Non-directive, client centered approaches
- Bibliotherapy
- Talking cures
- Self-Help programs
- Vague unstructured rehabilitation programs
- “Punishing smarter” (boot camps, scared straight, etc.)
Some Lessons Learned from the Research

➢ Who you put in a program is important – pay attention to risk

➢ What you target is important – pay attention to criminogenic needs

➢ How you target offender for change is important – use behavioral approaches

➢ Program Integrity makes a difference - Service delivery, training/supervision of staff, support for program, QA, evaluation, etc.