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A STARTING POINT: EVIDENCE-BASED PRACTICES
“What Works” or EBP

- Evidence exists that the program or intervention is effective.

- This effectiveness is obtained through empirical research not anecdotes, stories, common sense, or beliefs about effectiveness.
Effective at what?

• Many measures of effectiveness:
  – Happiness
  – Stress reduction
  – Employment levels
  – Skill attainment
  – Attendance

  – RECIDIVISM
What is recidivism?

- Institutional misconducts
- Technical violations
- Probation/Parole revocations
- Arrests
- Convictions
- Incarcerations
Examining Research

Recidivism Rate

Control

Experimental
Is one study enough?
Literature Review

• Authors will locate and read all the research studies related to a chosen area of intervention.

• They will attempt to synthesize the results into a single report and draw conclusions from the available research.
Meta-Analysis

• Meta-analysis is the most current and informative method of synthesizing correctional research.

• It involves the combined statistical analysis of many studies of a type of correctional intervention – a study of studies.
Why use EBP?
Principles of Effective Intervention

• Risk
• Need
• Responsivity
• Treatment
• Program Integrity
Risk Principle

• Effective interventions must assess risk.

• Risk assessments classify individuals into risk categories such as high, medium, or low risk (or maximum, medium, and minimum custody).
Measuring Risk

- Actuarial measures of risk are more accurate than clinical judgments.
WHO do we target?

- Effective interventions match intervention and supervision levels to risk levels.

- This tells us WHO to target for intervention.

- Interventions should focus on medium and high risk offenders.
Need Principle

• Individuals in the criminal justice system often have many needs. Some of these are related to offending behavior and some are not.

• Criminogenic needs are those related to offending while non-criminogenic needs are those unrelated to offending.

• Criminogenic = crime producing
WHAT do we target?

• Criminogenic needs are dynamic, meaning they can be changed.
• These needs drive an individual’s risk level, so treating these needs can potentially reduce someone’s risk level.
• This tells us WHAT to target for intervention.
Criminogenic Needs

• Antisocial attitudes, values, and beliefs
• Antisocial peers or lack of prosocial peers
• Antisocial personality characteristics
• Dysfunctional family and relationship circumstances
• Low education and employment levels
• Lack of prosocial leisure pursuits
• Substance abuse
Responsivity Principle

• Responsivity addresses barriers to interventions so that individuals may “respond” successfully to treatment.
Types of Responsivity

• There are two types of responsivity: general and specific.
  – General responsivity refers to responsivity issues that apply to all correctional clients.
    • Using evidence-based interventions
    • Treating the needs at the correct time
    • Utilizing learning techniques appropriate for correctional settings
HOW do we intervene?

– Specific responsivity refers to responsivity issues that apply to individual correctional clients.
  • Offender-based
  • Resource-based
  • Staff/system-based

• This tells us HOW to intervene with correctional clients.
Treatment Principle

• Cognitive-behavioral programs are the most effective at reducing recidivism.
  – Cognitive
    • Targets attitudes and thought processes through cognitive restructuring
  – Behavioral
    • Targets actions through skills practices like role-modeling and reinforcement
Defining Themes of Cognitive-Behavioral Interventions

- Scientific
- Active
- Focus on the present
- Focus on learning
Examples of Cognitive-Behavioral Interventions

• **Aggression Replacement Training (ART)**
  – Goldstein et al. (1998)

• **Problem Solving**
  – Taymans & Parese (1998)

• **Reasoning and Rehabilitation**
  – Ross et al. (1989)

• **Reasoning and Rehabilitation 2**
  – Ross & Hilborn (1996)

• **Thinking for a Change (T4C)**
  – Bush et al. (1998)

• **Relapse Prevention Therapy**
  – Parks & Marlatt (2000)

• **Criminal Conduct and Substance Abuse Treatment**

• **Moral Reconciliation Therapy**
  – Little & Robinson (1998)

• **Options**
  – Bush & Bilodeau (1993)

• **CALM**
  – Van Dieten (1996)

• **Moving On**
  – Van Dieten (1998)
Program Integrity Principle

• Program integrity should be maintained throughout the delivery of services.
• Interventions must be implemented as designed.
  – Staff training
  – Adherence to principles and curricula
  – Pilot testing
  – Monitoring and supervision
Measuring Integrity

Correctional Program Checklist (CPC)

• Capacity
  – Program Leadership and Development
  – Staff Characteristics
  – Quality Assurance

• Content
  – Offender Assessment
  – Treatment Characteristics
Putting It All Together

• The Ohio Halfway House Study
  – Programs that had acceptable termination rates, had been in operation for 3 years or more, varied treatment and length of supervision by risk, targeted criminogenic needs, had a cognitive behavioral program, and used role playing in almost every session had a 39% reduction in recidivism.
JUSTICE-INVOLVED WOMEN
What About Gender?
Estimated percent of sentenced prisoners under State jurisdiction, by offense and sex, yearend 2004

- Violent Offenses
  - Male: 53%
  - Female: 34%
- Property Offenses
  - Male: 20%
  - Female: 31%
- Drug Offenses
  - Male: 19%
  - Female: 29%

The Female Offender

- Early 30s
- Drug-related crimes
- Under-educated/unskilled
- Poverty
- Unemployed
- Disproportionately women of color
- Mothers to minor children
- Victims of physical and/or sexual abuse
- Substance abuse problems
- Health problems
- Mental health issues

## Increasing Correctional Populations 1990-2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correctional Supervision</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison</td>
<td>108%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jail</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## History and Projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>COMMUNITY</th>
<th>INCARCERATED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>6,437,400</td>
<td>4,550,100</td>
<td>1,929,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>7,045,100</td>
<td>4,947,400</td>
<td>2,189,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>7,225,800</td>
<td>5,018,900</td>
<td>2,284,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Next Phase in What Works

• What is “Gender-Responsive”
  – Acknowledges the realities of women’s lives and how they may differ from men, including the pathways to offending and how relationships shape their lives.
  – Practices address issues like violence, abuse, family relationships, and substance abuse.

INTEGRATING NEW RESEARCH INTO PRACTICE
EBP for Women

• Application of the Risk Principle
  – Many risk/need assessments were originally created for men and then applied to women without being evaluated for their appropriateness or their validity.
  – As a result of this neglect, two major problems have emerged:
    • Many assessments over-classify women
    • Current assessments ignore needs specific to women
  – The female population as a whole reflects a group of low risk but high need women.
Is It Valid?

% With Misconducts

- Maximum
- Medium
- Minimum

Men
Women
Does it over-classify women?
Gender-Neutral Risk/Needs Assessments and Women

- National survey: 36 states had not validated their systems for women.
- They were designed for men and applied to women, with little concern for appropriateness.
- They are valid.
- Existing risk/needs assessments do not tap needs most pertinent to women.
- Existing risk/needs assessments don’t help us to understand these women as best we could.
EBP for Women

• Application of the Need Principle
  – A growing body of research demonstrates that females have unique risk factors/crininogenic needs.

  • Housing safety
  • Anger/Hostility
  • History of mental illness
  • Current symptoms of depression/anxiety
  • Current symptoms of psychosis

  • Abuse/Trauma
  • Family conflict
  • Relationship dysfunction
  • Parental stress
EBP for Women

• Application of the Need Principle
  – Research has also shown that the following strengths act as resiliency or protective factors for females.
  
  • Educational assets
  • Parental involvement
  • Family support
  • Self-efficacy
Table 1: Comparative Predictive Validity of Assessment Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Factor</th>
<th>Probation Samples</th>
<th>Pre-release Samples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missouri(^c) (N=313)</td>
<td>Minnesota(^d) (N=233)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td>AUC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Static Models</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.23***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Gender-Neutral Risk/Needs</td>
<td>.24***</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Gender-Responsive (Total)</td>
<td>.32***</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Gender-Responsive, Alone</td>
<td>.30***</td>
<td>.34***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p<.01  
**p<.05  
\(^c\)Outcome measure is incarcerated within 24 months.  
\(^d\)Outcome measure is new arrests within 12 months.  
\(^e\)Outcome measure is new arrests within 24 months.  
\(^f\)Outcome measure is technical violation, new arrest, or any failure (mean time at risk = 17 months).  
\(^g\)Outcome measure is returns to prison within 24 months.
Gender-Responsive Assessments

• Divided into two portions:
  – Interview
  – Survey

• Assessment procedures depend on use of Women’s Risk/Needs Assessment or Women’s Supplemental Risk/Needs Assessment.
Gender-Responsive Assessments

- Women’s Risk/Needs Assessment
  - Stand alone instrument
  - Assesses gender-neutral and gender-responsive risk factors
  - Probation, prison, and pre-release versions
  - Approximately 45 minutes to 1 hour to administer
  - Only available in English
  - Only validated on adult females
Gender-Responsive Assessments

• Women’s Supplemental Risk/Needs Assessment
  – Trailer instrument (attaches to gender-neutral assessments such as the LSI-R or Northpointe Compas)
  – Assesses gender-responsive risk factors
  – Probation, prison, and pre-release versions
  – Approximately 30 minutes to administer
  – Only available in English
  – Only validated on adult females
Table 2: Comparative Predictive Validity of Assessment Models – Revalidation of Original Assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Factor</th>
<th>WRNA</th>
<th>WRNA-T</th>
<th>Probation Samples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Combined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=85)</td>
<td>(N=102)</td>
<td>(N=187)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td>AUC</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Gender-Neutral Risk/Needs</td>
<td>.28***</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.22***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Gender-Responsive (Total)</td>
<td>.27***</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.18**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.24***</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.34***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Gender-Responsive, Alone</td>
<td>.27***</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.20***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p<.01  
**p<.05  
*p<.10

*aOutcome measure is any failure within 12 months.  
*bOutcome measure is arrest within 12 months.
Table 3: Comparative Predictive Validity of Assessment Models – Revised Assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Factor</th>
<th>Probation Samples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WRNA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missouri(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r     AUC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Gender-Neutral Risk/Needs</td>
<td>.28*** .67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Gender-Responsive (Total)</td>
<td>.28*** .67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Gender-Responsive, Alone</td>
<td>.27*** .18*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Outcome measure is any failure within 12 months.
\(^b\)Outcome measure is arrest within 12 months.
Table 4: Comparative Predictive Validity of Assessment Models – Revalidation of Original Assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Factor</th>
<th>Pre-Release Samples</th>
<th>WRNA</th>
<th>WRNA-T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missouri(^a) (N=187)</td>
<td>Ohio(^a) (N=169)</td>
<td>Kentucky(^a) (N=35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Gender-Neutral Risk/Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r AUC</td>
<td>r AUC</td>
<td>r AUC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Gender-Responsive (Total)</td>
<td>.18*** .76</td>
<td>.20** .63</td>
<td>.27*** .71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Gender-Responsive, Alone</td>
<td>.13** .60</td>
<td>.28* .70</td>
<td>.17** .60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Outcome measure is conviction within 12 months.  
\(^b\)Outcome measure is offense-related failure within 12 months.
Table 5: Comparative Predictive Validity of Assessment Models – Revised Assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Factor</th>
<th>Pre-Release Samples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WRNA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missouri&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=187)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>AUC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Gender-Neutral Risk/Needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Gender-Responsive (Total)</td>
<td>.20***  .82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Gender-Responsive, Alone</td>
<td>.22***  .65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p<.01  
**p<.05  
*p<.10

<sup>a</sup>Outcome measure is conviction within 12 months.

<sup>b</sup>Outcome measure is offense-related failure within 12 months.
EBP for Women

• Application of the Need Principle
  – This most recent round of research has identified a few additional needs and strengths for women.
  
  • Needs
    – PTSD Symptoms
  
  • Strengths
    – Relationship Satisfaction
    – Relationship Support
EBP for Women

• Application of the Responsivity Principle
  – Approaches to women’s supervision and services must utilize a gender-responsive approach.
    • Recognize that gender makes a difference.
    • Environments must be based on safety, respect, and dignity.
    • Relationships are central to women’s lives.
    • Services must be comprehensive, integrated, and culturally relevant.
    • Provide opportunities to improve women’s SES.
    • Collaborate with community resources.
EBP for Women

• Application of the Responsivity Principle
  – Females may experience barriers to success that are gender-specific.
    • Gender role expectations
    • Issues related to children/parenting responsibilities
    • Safety concerns
    • Relationship dynamics and family responsibilities
    • Financial difficulties
EBP for Women

• Application of the Responsivity Principle
  – Approaches to supervision and service must be informed by gender-based theories of offending.
    • Pathways, Relational, Trauma, and Addiction Theories
  – Development and use of women-only groups is essential.
  – A comprehensive, integrative, and collaborative system of care is key due to the prevalence of co-occurring needs.
  – A focus should be placed on the woman’s strengths and competencies.
EBP for Women

• Application of the Treatment Principle
  – Gender-Responsive Programming
    • Beyond Trauma
      – Covington (2003)
    • Dialectical Behavior Therapy
      – Linehan (2011)
    • Female Offender Treatment and Employment Programs
      – See Grella and Greenwell (2005)
    • Forever Free
    • Helping Women Recover
      – Covington (1999)
    • La Bodega de la Familia
      – See Shapiro & Schwartz (2001)
    • Moving On
      – Van Dieten (1998)
    • Seeking Safety
      – Najavits (1996)
    • Women Offender Case Management Model
      – Orbis Partners (2006)
EBP for Women

• Application of the Program Integrity Principle
  – Gender-Informed Program Assessment (GIPA)
    • National Institute of Corrections
  – Community Corrections Inventory for Women (CCIW)
    • University of Cincinnati Corrections Institute
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