From the Earliest Reviews

- No meta-analysis examining the effects of punishment alone (e.g., custody, mandatory arrest, increased surveillance, etc.) has found consistent evidence of reduced recidivism.
- A 2005 meta-analysis found that programs delivering EBP (i.e., cognitive-behavioral therapy) were capable of reducing recidivism by 20%.
  - When programs had a greater number of effective program elements, they reduced recidivism up to 50%, relative to their respective comparison groups.
  - So, what works? And, what are we looking for in programs that serve correctional clients?


Principles of Effective Interventions

- Risk: Deliver more intense intervention to higher risk offenders.
- Need: Target criminogenic needs to reduce risk for recidivism.
- Responsivity: Use CBT approaches matched to needs of service to offender.
- Fidelity: Deliver treatment services as designed.

Evidence-Based Correctional Program Checklist

RNR and Reductions in Recidivism: General Recidivism

Change versus Compliance

- A program's goal should be to help the client manage behavior in a prosocial way through the use of new thinking and new behaviors, in unsupervised situations and sustained across environment and time!!
Meta-Analysis of CBT with Offenders

- 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.


Meta-Analysis of CBT:

- Effects were stronger if:
  - Sessions per week (2 or more) - RISK
  - Implementation monitored - FIDELITY
  - Staff trained on CBT - FIDELITY
  - Higher proportion of treatment completers - RESPONSIVITY
  - Higher risk offenders - RISK
  - Higher if CBT is combined with other services - NEED


Core Correctional Practices (CCPs)

- Quality Interpersonal Relationships
- Effective Reinforcement
- Effective Disapproval
- Effective Use of Authority
- Anti-criminal Modeling
- Cognitive Restructuring
- Structured Skill Learning
- Problem Solving Techniques
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CCPs & Recidivism

![Graph showing effect sizes for different CCPs and recidivism rates]


Montana Training Accomplishments

- Core Correctional Practices training
- Graduated Skill Practice training
- Evidence-Based Correctional Program Checklist (CPC) training
- CPC-Group Assessment (CPC-GA) training

Implementing and Sustaining EBP is Not Easy!

- 2-4 years to full implementation, so measuring change at least 3-5 years after initial roll-out
- Training is not enough. What hampers implementation?
  - Lack of uptake
  - Lack of fidelity
- Concerning implementation, “the quality with which the intervention is implemented [fidelity] has been as strongly related to recidivism effects as the type of program, so much so that a well-implemented intervention of an inherently less efficacious type can outperform a more efficacious one that is poorly implemented” (Lipsey, 2009).
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Washington State Example

Examined two evidence-based curricula with juvenile offenders:

- Functional Family Therapy.
- Aggression Replacement Training.

Purpose was to determine the effect of the quality of implementation:

- Specifically, quality of therapists.
- Quality of therapist determined by clinician offering clinical supervision and assessment of treatment staff.

Programs targeted moderate to high risk kids.

- Measured staff competence and recidivism reductions.


Staff Competency & Recidivism

- Functional Family Therapy: Increased Recidivism -10.4
- Aggression Replacement Therapy: Increased Recidivism -16.7

Therapist Competency Ratings & Recidivism

- Competent: 38
- Marginal: 24
- Not Competent: 16.7

**Things to Consider**

- Staff training is only the starting point.
- Staff support (observation, feedback, and coaching) has to occur for EBPs to be used with fidelity.
- Think about funds to sustain initial training, ongoing training, observation and coaching, and communities of practice.
- Consider aligning policies and procedures (e.g., integrating CCP training into the academy, including CCP on annual performance evaluations, etc.) with EBP to help with integration efforts.

**Integrating the CPC**

- The CPC and CPC-GA provides the state several key benefits:
  - It tells you how well programs are adhering to RNR;
  - It tells you how well programs are delivering what they said they would;
  - It gives the programs a blueprint for delivering high quality services; and
  - It helps you help programs improve their service delivery.
  
  *Helps keep a dialogue with your treatment providers!*

**Purpose of the CPC**

- To evaluate the extent to which correctional programs adhere to the principles of effective interventions.
- To assist agencies with developing and improving the services provided to offender/delinquent populations.
- To assess funding proposals and external service contracts.
- To stimulate research on the effectiveness of correctional treatment programs.

**Development of the CPC**

- Based on the Correctional Program Assessment Inventory (CPAI).
  - A checklist of indicators correlated with reductions in recidivism.
- UCCI researchers completed three large outcome studies testing the items on the CPC as well as items added from:
  - Meta-analytic reviews; and
  - The collective experience of staff.

**Outcome Studies Used in the Development of the CPC**

- 2002 study of adult residential facilities – over 13,000 offenders, 50+ programs
- 2005 study of adult diversion programs – over 17,000 offenders, 91 programs
- 2005 study of juvenile programs: community, residential, and institutional – 14,500 youthful offenders, 72 programs

**Program Integrity And Treatment Effect for Adult Residential Programs**

As scores for integrity rise, recidivism rates decrease.

Percentage of Indicators Met

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>30%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>60%</th>
<th>70%</th>
<th>80%</th>
<th>90%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 59%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60% +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Program Integrity And Treatment Effect for Adult Non-Residential Programs

As Scores for integrity rise, recidivism rates decrease.

Percentage of Indicators Met


Program Integrity And Treatment Effect for Juvenile Programs

As Scores for integrity rise, recidivism rates decrease.

Percentage of Indicators Met


CPC Tool

- These three outcome studies show that integrity can be measured, that it matters, and that programs with higher integrity can reduce recidivism.
- From the data collected in the three large outcome studies, researchers completed item level analyses to develop the CPC.
  - Most items not significant in at least one study were dropped.
  - Groups monitored by staff and discharge planning were retained as they increased the overall correlation for the treatment characteristics domain.
  - Items significant in at least one study were retained.
  - Items with a stronger correlation with reductions in recidivism were weighted.
Recidivism and the CPC

- These three studies were used to create and validate the CPC.
  - Domains and overall instrument correlated with recidivism reduction between .38 and .60.
- Data from a 2010 study of adult residential facilities was used to further test the indicators.
  - A large number of items were significantly correlated with recidivism.
  - Slightly weaker (but still strong) relationship for overall score than the original validation.


Example of the Relationship Between Factors and Effectiveness


Formatting of the CPC

CAPACITY AREA:
Evaluates the ability of the program to consistently deliver effective programming.

CONTENT AREA:
Assesses the degree to which program adheres to the principles of effective interventions.

5 DOMAINS
1. Program Leadership & Development
2. Staff Characteristics
3. Quality Assurance
4. Offender Assessment
5. Treatment Characteristics
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Format of the CPC-GA

CAPACITY AREA:
Evaluates the ability of the program to consistently deliver effective programming.

CONTENT AREA:
Assesses the degree to which program adheres to the principles of effective interventions.

4 DOMAINS
1. Program Staff and Support
2. Quality Assurance
3. Offender Assessment
4. Treatment Characteristics

Limitations of the CPC

• Based on “ideal” program which is impossible to achieve
• Time-specific (i.e., based on program at the time of assessment).
• Does not take into account “system” issues.
• Does not address “why” a problem exists within a program.
• Administration concerns:
  – Objectivity is critical; self-administered results are questionable.
  – Reliability can be a problem.
  – Extensive knowledge of correctional treatment is needed.

Advantages of the CPC

• Based on empirically achieved principles.
• Applicable to a wide range of programs.
• Provides a measure of program integrity & program quality.
• Results can be obtained quickly.
• Identifies strengths and areas in need of improvement.
• Provides recommendations for program improvement.
• Should be used for “benchmarking.”
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CPC Scoring
- 73 items worth 79 points (some items are weighted) on the CPC.
- 48 items worth 50 points (some items are weighted) on the CPC-GA.
- To calculate the final score, sum the items and divide by the total number of possible points for each domain, then area, and finally the overall score.
- Occasionally some items are not applicable (N/A) and they are removed from the scoring process.

Scoring Categories
- Very High Adherence to EBP 65% or more
- High Adherence to EBP 55% - 64%
- Moderate Adherence to EBP 46% - 54%
- Low Adherence to EBP 45% or less

*CPC Scoring Norms
- Very High Adherence to EBP (65%+)
- High Adherence to EBP (55-64%)
- Moderate Adherence to EBP (46-54%)
- Low Adherence to EBP (45% or less)

*The average scores are based on 660 assessment results across a wide range of programs.
Evidence-Based Correctional Program Checklist

CPC Scoring Norms by Category

- Low Adherence: 42.3%
- Moderate Adherence: 23.8%
- High Adherence: 20.2%
- Very High Adherence: 13.8%

*The average scores are based on 660 assessment results across a wide range of programs.

CPC Scores In Comparison

- MT Average
- National Average

Very High Adherence to EBP (65%+)
High Adherence to EBP (55-64%)
Moderate Adherence to EBP (46-54%)
Low Adherence to EBP (45% or less)

*The MT average is based on 5 CPC assessments and the national average scores are based on 660 assessment results across a wide range of programs.

CPC Categories In Comparison

- MT Percentage
- National Percentage

*The MT average is based on 5 CPC assessments and the national average scores are based on 660 assessment results across a wide range of programs.
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CPC-GA Scoring Norms

*The average scores are based on 78 assessment results.

CPC-GA Scoring Norms by Category

*The average scores are based on 78 assessment results.

CPC-GA Scores In Comparison

*The MT average is based on 3 CPC-GA assessments and the National average scores are based on 78 assessment results across a wide range of programs.
**Evidence-Based Correctional Program Checklist**

**CPC-GA Categories In Comparison**

*The MT average is based on 3 CPC-GA assessments and the National average scores are based on 78 assessment results across a wide range of programs.*

**Research Using the CPC**

- Study of recidivism among parolees participating in residential and community-based programs.
  - Recidivism was lower for those in treatment programs.
  - Larger reductions seen in higher-quality programs.
- Study of eight community correctional facilities that serve sex offenders.
  - Moderate to strong correlations between CPC scores and program effect sizes.


---

**Research Using the CPC-GA**

- Study of recidivism rates for 13 stand-alone inmate programs in one large county and a qualitative evaluation of 21 inmate programs.
  - There was a lower return to custody for the treatment group.
  - Programs achieved greatest effect on recidivism when they were focused on moderate and high risk inmates.
  - CPC-GA scores linked with reductions in recidivism.

(Husky & Associates. (2012). *Recidivism Study of the Santa Clara County Department of Correction’s Inmate Programs Final Report*.)
**CPC Certification Process**

- CPC is a proprietary tool.
- CPC assessors must sign an MOU and participate in an intensive training process.
- To become a certified assessor, you must be rated as satisfactory on 3 of 4 components:
  - Training performance (reading, attendance, and participation).
  - Score at least 80% on the CPC Training Quiz (taken on the last day of training).
  - Proficiency during certification assessment scoring call.
  - Performance on your written section of the report for your certification assessment.

**Conducting a CPC**

- CPC assessments are time consuming
  - Pre-site visit procedures
  - Site visit procedures
  - Post-site visit procedures

**Let's Look at a CPC Report**

- Montana State Prison Sex Offender Program
Report Ownership

• Reports will be publicly available through a request at: https://cor.mt.gov/EvidenceBasedPrograms

• Anticipating effects of making the reports public.
  – Participant refusal to participate in a program.
  – Legal ramifications.

CPC Quality Assurance & Fidelity

• The reports must be high quality:
  – A process for reviewing the scoring and reports should be developed.

• There are several different strategies your agency could use to ensure there is ongoing fidelity to the CPC:
  – Booster Trainings/Communities of Practice for assessors.

• Program support is also a crucial piece to CPC success:
  – Action Planning Sessions for programs.

• Ensuring fidelity helps with sustainability!

UCCI Contact Information

Carrie Sullivan
Senior Research Associate
PO BOX 210389
Cincinnati, OH 45221
Carrie.Sullivan@uc.edu
513-556-2036