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Things that make me go

- What is the purpose of community supervision?
- What is role of the officer?
- How does one best fulfill the purpose and role?
SO I GO GET A LITTLE HELP FROM GOOGLE ....
Probation Officers...
Or Probation Officer?
Probation Officer...
Or Probation Officer?
Dual Purpose of Community Supervision

- *Sentence Administration*

- *Community Safety*
Dual Purpose of Community Supervision

- **Sentence administration**
  - Gather information on compliance and noncompliance with sentence
  - Provide information to the courts, police, crown, etc

- **Community Safety**
  - Enhance safety of community
  - The devil in the “how”
    - “Risk Management” through control, surveillance…
    - “Client Change” through human services
Sentence Administration

- Pre-Sentence Investigations/Reports
  - Tailor sentence to client
  - May include risk/need assessments

- Monitoring client fulfilling sentence
  - The “do’s of the sentence
  - The “don’ts” of the sentence

- Information sharing
  - Informing all players involved
Community Safety

- Risk Management Emphasis
  - Identify level of risk
  - Tailor supervision to level of risk
    - Actions at individual and system levels to minimize risk to community
    - Continuum from “enforcer” to “helper”

- May acknowledge changes in risk
  - Continual evaluation of risk/need factors
  - Connect to services to reduce risk/address needs
  - Alter supervision requirements accordingly
Community Safety

- Client Change Emphasis
  - Identify level of risk **AND** needs
    - Client profile informs services and supervision
    - Matching service level to client profile
    - Helper role acknowledge via case plan

- Indirect “change” service
  - Broker/match to community treatment/services
  - Assist and support services
  - Potentially motivational interviewing
    - Goal to get client to service
Community Supervision Tradition:

The “Case Management” Model:
Case Management Approach

Primary Responsibilities

▪ **Sentence Administration**
  • Monitor compliance
    ➢ Encourage → Enforce → Coerce
    ➢ Information: gather and share

▪ **Community Safety**
  • Client’s risk managed
    ➢ Initial and ongoing assessment & case planning
    ➢ Supervision & services target risk and need
  • Services are brokered
    ➢ Facilitate access to those services
    ➢ Support these services
Case Management & RNR

Adherence via Policies & Procedures

- **Risk**
  - Assess Risk/Need
  - Higher Risk = enhance supervision & services

- **Need**
  - Case Plan identifying Criminogenic Needs
  - Services targeting Criminogenic Needs

- **Responsivity**
  - Motivational Interviewing
  - Refer/Broker to appropriate services
  - Support the work of brokered services & supports
Manage the Case:
 Manage information
 Administer Sentence
 Connect to services

But...

The Services are responsible for facilitating client change!
Case Management means to direct, guide, motivate, support and assist client to services

AND IT IS THE SERVICES THAT FACILITATE & RESPONSIBLE FOR CLIENT CHANGE!
So is “Case Management” working?

What does the research tell us about supervision and community safety?
## Community Supervision Effectiveness?

### Meta-Analytic Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>$\Phi$</th>
<th>$k$</th>
<th>$N$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Recidivism</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>53,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent Recidivism</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28,523</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$k =$ number of effect sizes  

Bonta et al. (2008)

➤ Minimal impact on recidivism
However...

*Risk – Need – Responsivity Model of Effective Corrections*
Three Principles of Effective Correctional Intervention

1. Risk Principle
   Intervention intensity is proportional to risk levels; higher risk = more time, energy and resources.

2. Need Principle
   Target the criminogenic needs of moderate and high risk offenders (i.e., the dynamic risk factors that, when changed, will change the probability of an offender’s recidivism).

3. Responsivity Principle
   Create an optimal learning environment by:
   - **General**: Utilize cognitive-behavioral techniques.
   - **Specific**: Matched to the individual abilities, learning style, culture and personality, create an environment via the skills, language, and activities that enhance client engagement and facilitates learning.
Treatment Programs
Adherence to RNR Principles = \downarrow \text{Recidivism}

![Bar chart showing the effect size (r) for different adherence levels of RNR principles. The chart is color-coded for general, violent, females, young offenders, and sex offenders. The effect size decreases from 'None' to 'Three'.]
What about RNR in Community Supervision?
What about the RNR principles? Does adherence make a difference?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RNR Adherence</th>
<th>$\phi$</th>
<th>k</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RNR = 0</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RNR = 1</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RNR = 2</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RNR = 3</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>914</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Increase in RNR adherence = Decrease in recidivism
It “Works” But…
Demands of RNR are high…

- **Assessment**
  - Criminal risk factors and needs (changeable)
  - Strengths and learning styles (responsivity)

- **Services that target appropriate needs**
  - Requires appropriate intensity and targets
  - Commitment to reduce re-offending

- **Services are tailored for “offenders” learning styles**
  - Use cognitive-behavioural social learning strategies
  - Optimal learning environment = respect and collaboration
How tough? Tough enough for formal treatment programs...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adherence to principle</th>
<th>% of studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsivity</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All 3 Principles</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RNR Adherence in Community Supervision?

The MB Probation Study:

Do RNR policies translate into RNR practice “behind closed doors”?
Manitoba Probation Study

Jurisdictional policies congruent with RNR but what about “behind closed doors”?

Analysis of 211 audiotapes & file records
From 62 PO on 154 offenders

Questions:

1. Risk: Is PO-client contact related to level of risk?
2. Need: Do PO target criminogenic needs?
3. Responsivity: Do PO use techniques congruent with effective correctional practices?

(Bonta et al., 2004, 2008)
Adherence to the Risk Principle?

- More face-to-face sessions for higher risk?
  - Mean: 1.4 face-to-face/month
  - Modestly related to risk (r = .19)

- Longer sessions with higher risk?
  - Mean: 22 min. 34 sec
  - Weakly related to risk (r = .07)

Answer: Only modest adherence to Risk principle at best!
## Adherence to the Need Principle?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need Area</th>
<th>% Discussed When Need Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family/Marital</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment/Academic</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Problems</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Answer:** Sort of adherence to need principle: Modest adherence for some, Minimal for others - especially “Big Four”
### Adherence to Responsivity Principle?

**Relationship & Structuring skills**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>@ Intake</th>
<th>@ 6 months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship Skills</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prompts/Encourages</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmth</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiastic</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Structuring or “Change Agent” Skills</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prosocial reinforcement</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homework assigned</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procriminal discouragement</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosocial modeling</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Answer:** Weak as officers positive but “change agent” skills and activities minimal
Improving Community Supervision:

Taking on a more active role in change

Change Agent Supervision
Change Agent Approach

Primary responsibilities

- Actively and directly facilitate client change
  - Requires a holistic view of human behaviour
  - Must adhere to RNR principles
  - Have good road map & skills to navigate

- Sentence Administration
  - Monitor sentence fulfillment
  - Information source for CJ players
Change Agent Approach

Active and Direct Facilitating Change

- Integrate Cognitive Behaviourism & RNR
  - CB model to understand client risk/need profile

- Create an optimal learning environment
  - Understanding learning process within 1:1 work
    - Create collaborative relationship
    - Lay a “foundation” to permit change work
    - Individual change work
Change Agent Approach: Adhering to RNR Principles

Through Policies, Procedures & Practices

- **Risk**
  - Assess Risk/Need
  - Higher Risk = enhanced service & supervision

- **Need**
  - Change Plan identifying Criminogenic Needs
  - Primary target: Attitudes/Thinking in client context

- **Responsivity**
  - Create optimal learning environment
  - Directly Facilitate Change
  - Utilize community services to support your work
Facilitate Client Change:

Create optimal change environment

Directly facilitate client learning

Administer sentence

But...

You are responsible for facilitating client change!

Services support your change efforts!
Manage the Case:

- Manage information
- Administer Sentence
- Connect to services

But…

You are responsible for facilitating client change!
## Case Management vs. Change Agent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Management</th>
<th>Change Agent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CM:</strong> point person for information about case and activities</td>
<td><strong>CA:</strong> point person for facilitating change &amp; information about client</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can emphasize:</td>
<td>Facilitating change best when</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Nail ‘e, &amp; jail ‘em (remember google!)</td>
<td>1. RNR adherence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Continual risk assessment to “Risk Manage” the “case”</td>
<td>2. Collaborative relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Service brokerage to address needs</td>
<td>3. Lay foundation for “work”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Enhance motivation so connects to services</td>
<td>4. Promote change work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typically community services are responsible facilitating client change with support from probation.</td>
<td>Officer is responsible for facilitating client change with support from community services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHAT IS BEING ASKED...

- Change from Case Manager to Change Agent
  - Do “clinical” work with clients
  - Take on new responsibilities and tasks
  - Learn new knowledge and skills
  - Be active and responsible for facilitating change

- And for Organizations to change!
  - Mission and values (law enforcement to rehab)
  - Policies, procedures, and activities
  - Others in CJ to recognize, value, prioritize this work
From Case Manager...
To Change Agent
Evidence of Change Agent Community Supervision Training Efforts:

Approximately 11% difference in recidivism

Figure 1: Individual study effect sizes and overall meta-analytic average (random effects; $k = 10, N = 8,335$). Squares represent the odds ratio each study contributed surrounded by the 95% confidence interval for each effect.

Change Agent Supervision & STICS:

Integrating Cognitive Behaviorism, RNR, and the process of facilitating change
What causes behaviour?
STICS...a Change Agent Approach

- Adds “therapeutic” work
  - Translate RNR to “behind closed doors” work
  - Special attention to responsivity
  - Target procriminal attitudes & cognitions

- Recognizes that it requires skill sets (training)
  - To enhance collaborative relationship
  - To “bring to the table” and work with a CB model
  - To teach & model new skills to facilitate change

- Integrity & Implementation over the long run
  - Different Training Model – continuing education model
    - Initial training & on-going clinical support activities
  - Ongoing evaluation
Cognitive-Behavioural Model: Understanding Human Behaviour

- Cognitive-Behavioural Model:
  - Explains why we do what we do
  - Responsivity Principle: best approach with clients

- Fundamental View:
  - Thinking is only way to explain behaviour
  - External stimuli are context (not causes)
  - Consequences influence learning (not causes)
  - Behaviour is goal oriented
Evidence Base: RNR Model

- RNR principles for effective “change agents” with criminal justice clients

- Risk:
  - Focus change efforts on higher risk clients

- Need:
  - Focus change efforts on criminogenic needs

- Responsivity:
  - Create an optimal learning environment to promote change
Theory of Human Behaviour:
Cognitive-Behavioural Model
Cognitive-Behavioral Model: Key Points to Understanding

- **Cause of Behavior = Thoughts!**
  - “What” I think explains what I do – NOTHING ELSE
  - Causal relationship – Thought causes action!
  - Without thoughts, explanation is incomplete…
Cognitive-Behavioral Model: Key Points to Understanding

- I am RESPONSIBLE for all of me!
  - What I do…
  - What I think…
  - What I feel… ALL OF ME!

- With responsibility comes CONTROL: I control me!

- With responsibility & control comes CHOICE. I have choices!
DOES NOT STOP THERE...

- Things outside of me DO NOT control me!
  - Situations are context – they DO NOT MAKE me!
  - Sole exception – true biological reflexes only!

- I DO NOT control things outside of me!
  - Nor am I responsible for things outside of me

Means I’m not responsible for other’s choices
But my choices have consequences!
Some key pieces...

- **Antecedent Stimuli are “Signals” or “Cues”!**
  - Not controlling stimuli (bell = salivate) of classical conditioning
  - Not controlling stimuli (triggers) in early operant learning days
  - They are context and provide information for choice

- **Consequences Important BUT…**
  - Come from 2 sources: Outside of me & Inside of me
  - Internal most powerful:
    - Occur first…
    - I control those inside of me BUT NOT those outside of me
Some key pieces...

- **Reinforcers as a Consequence Teaches!**
  - I always have choices in what I learn, what I reinforce.
  - What behaviours/thoughts are we try to teach?

- **Punishers as a Consequence Confuse!**
  - At best – can teach “what not to do” but only when…
  - Never teach “what to do to get reinforcer”
Implications...

- Understanding the causes of behavior
  - Complete explanation requires “thoughts”

- Holistic unifying lens to understand RNR Principles
  - Improves understanding of risk assessment
  - Improves change planning as changing behavior
    - Must change thinking… (identify and evaluate)
    - To change behavior (identify and evaluate)
    - To change consequences (identify and evaluate)
Cognitive Behaviorism: Unifying lens for RNR

Improving Understanding and Enhancing Risk/Need Assessment
The Evolution of Risk Assessment

- What is the likelihood that client will re-offend?
  - Influence “correctional” response…

- RNR principles established
  - Consideration of criminogenic needs
  - Influence “service” response…

- Today, Assessment guides…
  - Sentencing, supervision, correctional policies, budgets, etc..
  - Effective & efficient CJ management of offenders
Why do risk assessment?

- Effectively manage population
  - Corrections is given lots of responsibilities
  - Expected to “do something”…
  - Expected results….

- Efficiently manage population
  - Scarce resources…
  - Cannot “do” everything with everyone
  - Don’t expect same outcome for every offender

- Identify “Change Plan”
What exactly does risk assessment tell us?

- About the client…
  - The probability of reoffending AND…
  - Needs: Criminogenic & Non-criminogenic
  - Strengths & Resources

- Directs “correctional management/services”
  - Guides and directs services & supervision

- Expected outcome for client
  - Without and WITH interventions
Is Risk Assessment psychological, social or both?

• Assesses multiple factors
  Criminal history          Antisocial personality
  Procriminal attitudes    Procriminal peers
  Family/marital            Employment/education
  Substance abuse            Leisure/Recreation

• But do these different factors cause crime?

• Psychology? Sociology? Criminology?
• Where does Cognitive-Behaviorism fit?
# About the person - psychological

## TRAIT: Propensity for Rule Violations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>“Psychological Flags”</th>
<th>“Interpersonal Flags”</th>
<th>“Lifestyle Flags”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive, emotional, and behavioural factors that facilitate rule breaking</td>
<td>Key relationships that support rule violations</td>
<td>Engagement/connection to pursuits that are conducive to rule violation or compliance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors/Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal skills/learning</td>
<td>Intimate relationships</td>
<td>Employment/education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>Peer relationships</td>
<td>Substance abuse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>Family relationships</td>
<td>Leisure activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples of indicators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior offences</td>
<td>Addicted partner</td>
<td>Academic/job skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impulsive acts</td>
<td>Criminal peers</td>
<td>Addiction severity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Suckers deserved it”</td>
<td>Abusive parents</td>
<td>Aimless use of leisure time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**STICS:** Strategic Training Initiative in Community Supervision
CB & RNR Integration
STARTS WITH THINKING!

**Indicators:**
- Criminal History
- Antisocial Personality
- Procriminal Attitudes

Thinking patterns (i.e., attitudes) are primary cause of behavior!
Strongest Predictors of Future Behavior!

Past Behavior Pattern (Criminal History) = reflects thinking patterns and attitudes

Personality Pattern (Antisocial Personality) = behavior and thinking patterns

Attitudes & Thinking (Procriminal Attitudes) = specific procriminal thoughts
CB & RNR Integration

**Indicators:**
- Criminal History
- Antisocial Personality
- Procriminal Attitudes

**Indicators:**
- Family
- Marital/Intimate
- Peers/Associates

Relationship Choices (i.e., who/how much time with) are reflection of thinking patterns!
Remember it is a CHOICE and reflects what behaviors are reinforced!

Family of Origin (**Family**) = reflects what was reinforced/punished (including attitudes)

Marital/Intimate (**Marital**) = reflects what is reinforced/punished (including attitudes)

Friends/Associates (**Peers**) = reflects what is reinforced/punished (including attitudes)
CB & RNR Integration

**Indicators:**
- Criminal History
- Antisocial Personality
- Procriminal Attitudes

**Indicators:**
- Family
- Marital/Intimate
- Peers/Associates

**Indicators:**
- Employment/Education
- Substance Abuse
- Aggression/Impusivity
- Leisure/Recreation
- Financial/Housing

**Relationships Choices**

**Lifestyle Choices**

**Attitudes & Thought Patterns**
CB & RNR Integration:
The Central 8 of RNR

Indicators:
- Employment/Education
- Substance Abuse
- Aggression/Impulsivity
- Leisure/Recreation
- Financial/Housing

Relationship Choices

Attitudes & Thought Patterns

Indicators:
- Family
- Marital/Intimate
- Peers/Associates

Indicators:
- Criminal History
- Antisocial Personality
- Procriminal Attitudes

Lifestyle Choices
Cognitive-Behavioral Implications to RNR Assessments:

- **Cause of Behavior = Thoughts!**
  - “What” I think explains what I do – NOTHING ELSE
  - What I think influences relationships
    - Criminogenic needs (choices in) of peers, family, intimates
  - What I think influences lifestyle
    - Criminogenic needs (choices in) Employment, Substance Abuse, Aggression, and other lifestyles
  - Interventions start with THINKING!
Translating Risk/Need Assessment Into Meaningful Groups
Important considerations about communicating risk/need assessment

- Within organization…
  - Grouping offenders
    - Manage large numbers by guiding policies/practices
    - Directs Resources
  - Common language/meaning for effective communication

- Outside organization…
  - Collaborate with others
    - Utilizing scarce resources
  - More effective and efficient “corrections”
What is the meaning of risk categories/labels?

- Does each label mean the same thing…
  - Across risk instruments?
  - For different offender populations
  - To different CJ professionals?

- What is the impact of imprecision…
  - Those responsible for assessment?
  - Those responsible for supervision/management?
  - Those responsible for treatment/interventions?
  - Those responsible for decisions?
  - Those responsible for policy development?
Considerations for Risk Communication

- Practical implications necessary
  - Context of risk - dosage - outcome relationship

- Informing Correctional Interventions
  - Correctional supervision
  - Treatment
    - Targets and types of services
    - Dosage levels of services
    - Duration of services
  - If successful, the expected outcome
Meaningful (perceptible) differences between categories

- Life problems/criminogenic needs
- Personal and social resources
- Response to treatment
- Response to supervision
- Outcomes
  - Recidivism rates
  - Life course adjustment
CSG Justice Center’s Proposal: 5 Universal Levels of Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>Level 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

STICS: Strategic Training Initiative in Community Supervision
Level I

Profile:
- Criminogenic needs: none or transitory
- Non-Criminogenic needs: none or transitory
- Resources: clearly identifiable personal and social resources
- Reoffending Base Rate: same as non-offender community at large (<5%)

Correctional Strategies:
- Human services: unnecessary/ direct to social services if desired
- Community Supervision: minimal as not necessary for compliance
- Custody: counterproductive

Outcomes:
- Short-term: No change in probability of re-offending
- Life Course: Desistance
Level II

- **Profile:**
  - **Criminogenic needs:** Few, if any, more acute than chronic.
  - **Non-Criminogenic needs:** Few if any, transitory and quick to respond
  - **Resources:** Clearly identifiable personal and social resources
  - **Reoffending Base Rate:** Higher than individuals without a criminal record but lower than typical offender (> 5% but < 30%)

- **Correctional Strategies:**
  - **Human services:** Brief interventions: social problem solving aided through existing community services.
  - **Community Supervision:** simple case management with minimal supervision for compliance
  - **Custody:** may be productive for crisis management but unnecessary long-term

- **Outcomes:**
  - **Short-term:** Probability of re-offending reduces quickly to non-offender levels (Level I)
  - **Life Course:** Desistance (i.e., one and done)
Level III

- **Profile:**
  - **Criminogenic needs:** Some; may be severe in one or two discrete needs or less chronic/severe across multiple needs
  - **Non-Criminogenic needs:** Some; typical to offenders
  - **Resources:** Some identifiable personal and social resources, sporadic use
  - **Reoffending Base Rate:** Same as the average rate for offenders as a group (30% to 50%)

- **Correctional Strategies:**
  - **Human services:** Structured services target criminogenic needs over months; (e.g. ~ 100-200 hours of service); assist with non-criminogenic needs/responsivity factors.
  - **Community Supervision:** Change focused supervision with supervision for enhance engagement and compliance
  - **Custody:** May support short-term risk management

- **Outcomes**
  - **Short-term:** Probability of re-offending can significantly ↓ with appropriate strategies BUT still higher than community at large (Level II)
  - **Life Course:** Expected involvement in crime over time but desistance possible over years
Level IV

Profile:
- **Criminogenic needs:** Multiple; may be chronic in one or two discrete needs and moderate in others
- **Non-Criminogenic needs:** Multiple, moderate to severe.
- **Resources:** Few identifiable personal and social resources, sporadic prosocial use
- **Reoffending Base Rate:** Higher than the rate of “typical” offender (>50% but < 85%)

Correctional Strategies:
- **Human services:** Structured comprehensive services target multiple criminogenic needs over lengthy period with community follow-ups and supports (e.g. ~ 300+ hours of service); assist with non-criminogenic needs/responsivity factors.
- **Community Supervision:** Intensive and change focused supervision with supervision for enhance engagement and compliance as well as risk management
- **Custody:** may be productive for short-term risk management and beginning treatment

Outcomes:
- **Short-term:** Probability of re-offending can ↓ with appropriate strategies BUT still “average” for offender population at large.
- **Life Course:** Chronic offending rate shows gradual decline with appropriate services and time (i.e., years/decades).
Level V

Profile:
- **Criminogenic needs**: Multiple, chronic and entrenched
- **Non-Criminogenic needs**: Multiple, moderate to severe
- **Resources**: Few identifiable personal and social resources; use for procriminal pursuits
- **Reoffending Base Rate**: 85% and higher re-offending rate (Top 5% of offenders)

Correctional Strategies:
- **Human services**: Structured comprehensive services target multiple criminogenic needs over years ideally prior to community release (e.g. ~ 300+ hours of service); assist with non-criminogenic needs/responsivity factors
- **Community Supervision**: Long-term supervision begins with intensive/risk management focus and gradual change to change focus (Level IV) with success over time
- **Custody**: Incapacitation for community safety, long-term change strategy starts with behavioral management

Outcomes
- **Short-term**: Probability of re-offending still significantly higher than offender population even with appropriate long-term correctional strategies
- **Life Course**: Chronic offending rate gradually declines over decades or advanced age, cascade within custody environments
Benefits of Universal Risk Levels

- Precision of describing offenders
  - Above and beyond just reoffending probability
    - Reflects broader scope of what we know
  - Applicable to all risk instruments
    - Risk-Need Levels not dependant on instrument, jurisdiction, etc.
  - Systematic empirical basis
    - Justification for policies, practices, funding, and results
  - Improve effectiveness and efficiencies
    - Consistency improves CJS over short and long term
Risk Levels

Boundaries = Appropriate Treatment Effect Size
Odds Ratio: ±1.44
5 Case Examples
Example A: 35 Year Old Male

**Index: 12 counts - Aggravated Assault, Rape, & Kidnapping**

Two incidents of serious physical on adult males and one incident involving a women whom he kidnapped and raped over 2 days.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“Psychological”</th>
<th>“Interpersonal”</th>
<th>“Lifestyle”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extensive &amp; consistent criminal &amp; delinquency history. Convictions for property, drugs, violence, and sexual violence. Presents as hostile and resentful Long history of acting impulsively Anti-authority, sexist, values aggression and power; no remorse, projects blame Criminal pride, rejecting of convention.</td>
<td>Single: No history of relationships lasting more than 1 month Many sexual partners Known gang member since late teens Family of origin: criminal and addicted, little present connection</td>
<td>Gang “muscle” No record of employment for past 10 years Lengthy history of drug (all types but meth has been primary over past 2 years) and alcohol abuse.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Example B: 27 Year Old Male**

**Index: Burglary X3, Possession narcotics**

*Series of thefts and possession of drugs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“Psychological”</th>
<th>“Interpersonal”</th>
<th>“Lifestyle”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 previous convictions plus juvenile history. Two prior custody sentences for robbery, weapons, and drug related offences. Index offence while on community supervision following relapse</td>
<td>history of several short-term intimate relationships (all users). 1 child but no contact. Present partner of 3 months is prosocial. Peer group: except partner, primarily drug users. Family of origin: only contact is with brother who is drug user with lengthy criminal history</td>
<td>Sporadic seasonal work in construction; presently unemployed. Chronic substance use since teenager. Leisure: local pubs; gambling through a bookie, pickup basketball.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of impulsiveness, holds procriminal anti-authority attitudes. Previous PO describes as likable, motivated but chaotic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Example C: 35 Year Old Male

**Index: Reckless driving causing injury**

*On cell phone while driving, accident resulted in serious injuries to bicyclist*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“Psychological”</th>
<th>“Interpersonal”</th>
<th>“Lifestyle”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No history of criminal behavior/delinquency</td>
<td>Divorced (7 yrs), 2 kids joint custody positive &amp; cooperative with ex-wife and kids</td>
<td>College degree Full time employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extravert, thoughtful and goal oriented</td>
<td>Present C/L partner (3 yrs) is employed, prosocial, supportive and healthy</td>
<td>No history of drug abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosocial values and cognitions, has remorse, takes</td>
<td>Peer group: prosocial, same age, mostly through work and prosocial activities</td>
<td>Social drinker, rarely to excess and infrequent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responsibility, and embarrassed by actions</td>
<td>(e.g. kid soccer)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family healthy and supportive</td>
<td>Leisure: kids activities, travel, volleyball league, and playing music with friends.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example D: 32 Year Old Male

**Index:** DWI and possession narcotics

*Stopped at a RIDE program, .10 BAC and search found 5 grams of marijuana*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“Psychological”</th>
<th>“Interpersonal”</th>
<th>“Lifestyle”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 previous convictions for assault age 19.</td>
<td>Married 7 years, 2 children. Relationship positive and stable. Wife employed</td>
<td>Own his own cleaning company (past 5 years), employing 10 employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful completion of 1 year probation.</td>
<td>full time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mature and embarrassed; accepts responsibility and</td>
<td>Peer group: close friends all employed and have no criminal history,. Some</td>
<td>History of “partying” as teenager, recent assessment indicates alcohol as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acted on it through Employee Assistant Program</td>
<td>smoke weed and some do not.</td>
<td>“problematic” and drug use as “recreational”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>immediately after arrest.</td>
<td>Family of origin: close (non-criminal) to his and wife’s. Supportive and</td>
<td>Leisure: many organized activities including recreational hockey and golf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holds prosocial values and respects authority.</td>
<td>prosocial.</td>
<td>league.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Example E: 32 Year Old Male**

**Index: DWI, driving without a license**

Erratic driving called in and stopped at 2AM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“Psychological”</th>
<th>“Interpersonal”</th>
<th>“Lifestyle”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 previous convictions, one for property offence in early 20’s and two previous DWI in mid 20’s and another at 30. Generally prosocial, does not identify self as criminal, see self as blue collar man Minimizes his drinking, driving while impaired, and rationalizes use of vehicle without license. Poor problem solving skills, pessimistic, rigid thinking and can be impulsive at times.</td>
<td>Divorced and remarried (3 years), 2 children (1 step). Relationship positive with disaccord about drinking and finances. Peer group: primarily construction co-workers and old friends. Some have criminal history, many drink. Some interpersonal conflict with boss at work. Family of origin: Minimal contact as father functional alcoholic and was abusive. Mother deceased 4 years ago.</td>
<td>Construction trade. Fairly stable and full time, with sporadic seasonal layoffs. Same company for 4 years. Alcohol abuse indicated for past 10 years. No treatment. Works hard, party’s hard. Leisure: no organized activities. Typical Friday is early at pub after short work day.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How can you use this...

- PSR and other reports...
  - Describe category and all five aspects
    - Risk to re-offend
    - Criminogenic needs and other life problems
- Plus additional information to convey
  - Evidence-based correctional strategies
    - Treatment, supervision and custody
  - Expected outcomes if strategies successful
    - Evidence of change
Change Agent Approach Means...

A Very Different Way of Working!
Holistic CB model: psychological!
RNR principles to keep on track

Keep focus on our efforts –

“I am the Intervention!”
Evidence of Change Agent Community Supervision Training Efforts:
Approximately 11% difference in recidivism

Figure 1: Individual study effect sizes and overall meta-analytic average (random effects; $k = 10$, $N = 8,335$). Squares represent the odds ratio each study contributed surrounded by the 95% confidence interval for each effect.

Further Information

Available on the Public Safety Canada Website

www.publicsafety.gc.ca

Contact
Guy.Bourgon@canada.ca
340 Laurier Ave West
Ottawa, ON Canada
K1A 0P8