

MINUTES OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON CORRECTIONS AND JUVENILE JUSTICE.

The meeting was called to order by Vice-Chairperson Tim Owens at 1:30 p.m. on February 10, 2003, in Room 526-S of the Capitol.

All members were present except:
Chairperson Ward Loyd - excused

Committee staff present:
Jill Wolters - Office of Revisor
Mitch Rice - Office of Revisor
Jerry Ann Donaldson - Legislative Research Department
Martha Dorsey - Legislative Research Department
Nicoletta Buonasera - Legislative Research Department
Bev Renner - Committee Secretary

Conferees appearing before the committee:
Roger Haden, Deputy Secretary of Programs and Staff Development, Kansas Department of Corrections (KDOC)
Dr. Alex Holsinger, Professor—University of Missouri at Kansas City

The meeting was called to order by Vice-Chairperson Tim Owens.

Roger Haden, Department of Corrections appeared before the committee to introduce Dr. Alex Holsinger, Professor-University of Missouri at Kansas City and Consultant for the National Institute of Corrections. Professor Holsinger briefed the committee on the "What Works" curriculum (Attachment 1) with a slide presentation of pertinent charts and graphs. Involved in the curriculum is a close look at correctional rehabilitative research; research that looks at the strategies that are the most effective, but more importantly, the characteristics that are indicative of an effective correctional treatment program. In a time of budget constraints, "What Works" looks at existing programs to determine those that are effective and can be used as a measurement for new programs to determine which will effect real behavioral change within the offender population.

Public opinion supports punishment and imprisonment for violent and serious offenders. Polls show a balanced approach is favored with support for early intervention and rehabilitation, especially at the juvenile level. People realize that the majority of those who are in prison come back to the community.

Professor Holsinger has been working with KDOC and Johnson County to implement a new offender assessment process (Level of Service Inventory-Revised [LSI-R]) Risk and Case Planning assessment are basic to the process. There are four major principals to effective offender assessment: 1) Risk - what are the major predictors of criminal behavior; 2) Need - dynamic factors that should be targeted and changed through appropriate correctional intervention; 3) Responsivity - assessing characteristics of the offender that may provide barriers to treatment receptivity; and, 4) Professional Discretion - using multiple methods and sources of information for assessment and classification. These are the factors that should be assessed at intake.

Kansas is ahead of the curve of state correctional systems. The implementation of a sound, dynamic risk/means assessment process is the cornerstone of an effective system overall and Kansas has that piece in place.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:17 p.m. The next scheduled meeting is February 11, 2003.

Overview of “What Works” In Correctional Intervention

What has come to be known as the “What Works” curriculum spans several different areas, and large amounts of research. Specifically, the areas under consideration include:

- Examining the effects of ‘punishment’ (only) vs. treatment models
- Examining public opinion – what does the public really want?
- Examining effective correctional programming – specifically, what do effective (crime-reducing) correctional programs ‘look like’? What do ineffective programs ‘look like’?
- Examining the actual effectiveness of correctional treatment
- Offender risk prediction (offender assessment)
- The Principles of Effective Intervention (PEI)
- Measuring effectiveness through the Correctional Program Assessment Inventory (CPAI) (Gendreau and Andrews, 1994)

PUBLIC OPINION

Brief Summary:

- Many polls present misleading picture of public opinion. Single-item questions tap only surface views, not the complexity of what the public wants
- Public is rational – favor a balanced approach
- They support punishment/getting tough. Also support rehabilitation
- Support imprisonment – for violent/serious offenders
- Support community supervision – with treatment
- Very supportive of the rehabilitation of juveniles
- Very supportive of early intervention programs

OFFENDER ASSESSMENT

Four major principles of assessing and classifying offenders:

- (1) RISK
- (2) NEED
- (3) RESPONSIVITY
- (4) PROFESSIONAL DISCRETION

H. Corr & J.J.
2-10-03
Attachment 1

Through the use of “meta-analysis” (quantitative study of existing research) the best predictors of criminal behavior are known.

The Kansas Department of Correction has undertaken a major overhaul of their classification system through the implementation of the Level of Service Inventory - Revised (LSI-R), a comprehensive Third-generation risk/need assessment tool

Risk – what are the major predictors of criminal behavior?

Need – dynamic factors that should be targeted and changed through appropriate correctional intervention

Responsivity – assessing characteristics of the offender that may provide barriers to treatment receptivity

Professional Discretion – using multiple methods and sources of information for assessment and classification

The best assessment/classification methods include Andrews and Bonta’s “Big Four” (The LSI-R covers all four of these domains)

- Antisocial Attitudes
- Antisocial Associates/Peers
- Antisocial Personality
- Antisocial Behavior (priors)

THE PRINCIPLES OF EFFECTIVE INTERVENTION (PEI)

Brief Overview of PEI:

- Intensive services, behavioral in nature, focused on high-risk offenders
- Program/behavioral strategies enforced in a firm but fair manner
- Responsivity – offender, therapist, program
- Therapists relate in sensitive/constructive ways
- Program structure and activities disrupt delinquent/criminal network
- Relapse Prevention in the community
- High level of advocacy and brokerage

Appropriate correctional treatment strategies have been found to reduce recidivism between 25% and 60% depending on the setting, and the clientele. This is particularly true when the following are adhered to:

Detailed Overview of PEI:

- Intensive programs behavioral in nature
 - Intensive services occupy 40-70% of the offender's time while in the program
 - The program is 3 to 9 months in duration
- Behavioral programs target criminogenic needs of high risk offenders
 - High risk offenders are much more likely to benefit from treatment than low-risk offenders
- Responsivity of offender, therapist, and program is taken into account
 - Programs should not be limited to one modality – should take many different types of offenders into account whenever possible
 - Treatment programs should be delivered in a manner that facilitates the learning of new pro-social skills by the offender
- Program contingencies/behavioral strategies enforced in a firm and fair manner
 - Reinforcement contingencies must be under the control of the therapist
 - Staff, with meaningful input from offenders design and enforce case plans
 - Positive reinforcers outnumber punishers @ a ratio of 4:1
 - Behavioral strategies are applied
 - Grounded in operant conditioning
 - Reinforcement is an integral part of program
 - Three types of reinforcers – tangible, activities, social
 - Reinforcers must be individualized
 - See token economies; modeling; cognitive behavioral
 - Internal controls used to detect antisocial activity (EM/UA)
- Therapists relate in interpersonally sensitive and constructive ways – and are trained and supervised appropriately
 - To what extent do staff adhere to PEI?
 - To what extent are staff competent?
 - How much treatment is diluted in correctional environments so that it becomes treatment in name only?

- Program structure and activities disrupts delinquency network by managing and monitoring social situations
- Relapse prevention in the community
 - Teaches the offender to monitor problem situations
 - Plan/rehearse alternate pro-social alternatives
 - Practice new pro-social behaviors and reward improvement
 - Train significant others (family) to provide reinforcement for pro-social behavior

PRINCIPLES IF *IN-EFFECTIVE* PROGRAMMING

- Psychodynamic therapies
- Non-directive therapies
- Drug therapies
- Punishment strategies
 - Boot camps
 - Electronic Monitoring
 - Intensive Supervision Probation/Parole
 - Scared Straight
 - Solitary Confinement
- Intensive services to low risk offenders (waste – and penal harm!)
- Intensive services for behaviors that are not good predictors of criminality
- Any program that encourages offenders to:
 - Externalize blame
 - Disregard the feelings of victims
 - Ventilate anger
 - Not enroll in treatment unless they are self-motivated
- Improving the neighborhood and ignoring the problems of high risk people

MEASURING PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS/QUALITY/INTEGRITY

Correctional Program Assessment Inventory (CPAI) (Gendreau and Andrews 1994)

Represents quantitative operationalization/measurement of the PEI.
Measures programs across six areas:

1. Program Implementation
2. Client Assessment
3. Programming
4. Staff
5. Evaluation
6. Other

Not all sections are weighted equally. The process results in a report that is designed to:

- Highlight areas of strength/quality
- Point out areas in need of improvement
- Provide a road map in order to improve areas in need – detailed recommendations
- Provide a score and rating to indicate overall quality which is related to how effective the program may be in the long term
- Provide norming data in order to allow the program to compare itself to other programs (the national norm)

For questions, or additional information/materials, please contact:

Alex M. Holsinger, Ph.D.
208 Haag Hall
Department of Sociology/Criminal Justice & Criminology
University of Missouri – Kansas City
Kansas City, MO 64110-2499

Office phone: 816 235 5288
Office fax: 816 235 1117
Home office phone: 913 381 7361
Home office fax: 913 381 8550
Email: holsingera@umkc.edu