

**EVALUATION OF THE EFFECTIVE PRACTICES IN COMMUNITY SUPERVISION  
MODEL (EPICS) IN OHIO**

**Draft Report**

PREPARED BY:

Edward J. Latessa, Ph.D.  
Co-Principal Investigator  
Interim Dean and Professor, College of Education, Criminal Justice, and Human Services

Paula Smith, Ph.D.  
Co-Principal Investigator  
Associate Professor and Director, Corrections Institute

Myrinda Schweitzer, M.A.  
Project Director  
Associate Director, Corrections Institute

&

Ryan M. Labrecque, M.S.  
Research Assistant, Corrections Institute

University of Cincinnati  
School of Criminal Justice  
Center for Criminal Justice Research  
PO Box 210389  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45221-0389

February 22, 2013

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report is the product of the efforts and collaboration of many individuals. The authors would like to thank everyone involved in the project for their time and cooperation. Specifically, we would like to express our sincere gratitude to the following individuals: Gayle Dittmer, Kimberly Chandler, Brian Stein, Heather Stein, Tom Castetter, Aaron Minister, Amy Schofield, Carrie Landfair, Casey Gregory, Catherine Mories, Chris Sander, Jason Potts, Josh Vogel, Kendra Davis, Larry Mead, Laurie Winbigler, Lesley Madewell, Lindsay Oppenheimer, Lori Malone, Luci Sauer, Michele Treadway, Sara Shields, Stephanie McMannis, Steve Harshman, and Wendy Chopp (FCAP), Kevin Bonecutter, Brenda Sisk, Don Kathman, and James Daniels (HCAP), Edward Ryan, Brent Laman, Sabrenna Page, Sherri Lumpkin, Bethann Brenner, Cheryl Lee, Ed Pflum, Greg Daugherty, Marcy Bullerman, Nancy Niemer, Randall Mitchell, and Ryan Gross (HCJP), and Katrina Ransom, Eric Henley, Larome Myrick, Tom Brunty, Connie Maassel, Kelly Linebrink, Chris Niekamp, Craig Miller, Daniel Alexander, Desirae Bechstein, Jamie Rassman, Krista Burke, Michael Burkhart, Robert Watson, Sharlyn Key, Steven Elwood, Thomas McDaniel, Tim Johnson, and Tom Sanford (ODRC). We would also like to thank Angela Estes, Cara Thompson, Lesli Blair, Samantha Federick, Lia Gormsen, Lydie Loth, and Sam Peterson from the University of Cincinnati who have also devoted their time to the completion of the project.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Topic	Page
Acknowledgements.....	2
List of Tables.....	5
Introduction.....	6
Traditional Community Supervision.....	7
The Principles of Effective Intervention.....	9
Core Correctional Practices.....	11
RNR Approaches to Community Supervision.....	13
EPICS in Ohio.....	17
Implementation.....	18
Method.....	19
Research Objectives.....	19
Participants.....	20
Community Supervision Officers.....	20
<i>EPICS Officer Training</i> .....	20
<i>EPICS Coaching Sessions</i> .....	21
Probationers and Parolees.....	22
Data Collection.....	22
Audio-Recordings.....	22
Use of Core Correctional Practices.....	23
EPICS Adherence Score.....	23
Fidelity to the EPICS Model.....	24
Offender Surveys.....	24
PO Questionnaire.....	24
Criminal Sentiment Scale-Modified (CSS-M).....	25
Officer Information.....	27
Offender Information.....	27
Risk.....	27
Recidivism.....	28
Data Analysis.....	28
Results.....	28
Intermediate Measures.....	35
Discussion.....	43
Translating RNR Practices Into Practice.....	44
Improving Probation Officer-Offender Interactions.....	45
Improving Community Supervision Outcomes.....	46
Limitations.....	46

---

Implications.....	47
References.....	48
Appendix A.....	52
Appendix B.....	58
Appendix C.....	63

---

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Title	Page
Table 1	Descriptive Statistics of Officers for the Total Sample and Disaggregated Sample by Agency	29
Table 2	Descriptive Statistics of Offenders	31
Table 3	Recidivism by Group Assignment for the Total Sample and Disaggregated Sample by Agency	32
Table 4	Recidivism by Group Assignment and Offender Risk Level	33
Table 5	The Effect of EPICS Training on Officer Use of Core Correctional Practices	34
Table 6	Recidivism by Officer Use of CCP for the Total Sample and Disaggregated Sample by Agency	36
Table 7	Recidivism by Officer Use of CCP and Offender Risk Level	37
Table 8	Bivariate Correlations between Offender Perceptions of the Offender-Officer Relationship and Risk Level	38
Table 9	Bivariate Correlations between CSS-M Scores and Risk Level	39
Table 10	Comparison between Offender Perceptions of the Offender-Officer Relationship by Officer Fidelity to EPICS Model	40
Table 11	Comparison between CSS-M Scores by Officer Fidelity to CCP Model	41
Table 12	Bivariate Correlations between PO Questionnaire Scores and Recidivism	42
Table 13	Bivariate Correlations between CSS-M Scores and Recidivism	43

## INTRODUCTION

Over the last decade, several attempts have been made to integrate the principles of effective intervention into community supervision (Bourgon, Bonta, Rugge, Scott, & Yessine, 2010; Lowenkamp, Holsinger, Robinson, & Alexander, 2012; Robinson, Vanbenschoten, Alexander, & Lowenkamp, 2011; Smith, Schweitzer, Labrecque, & Latessa, 2012; Trotter, 1996; 2006). In contrast with “traditional” community supervision – which has underscored the importance of monitoring compliance with court-ordered conditions and making referrals to service providers – these recent initiatives attempt to teach probation and parole officers how to structure their face-to-face interactions with offenders using evidence-based practices (Bourgon et al., 2010; Lowenkamp et al., 2012; Robinson et al., 2011; Smith et al., 2012; Trotter, 1996, 2006). Preliminary results from several jurisdictions suggest that the use of core correctional practices within the context of community supervision has been associated with meaningful reductions in offender recidivism (Bourgon et al., 2010; Robinson et al., 2011; Lowenkamp et al., 2012). This work affirms the role of probation and parole officers as agents of behavioral change, and provides empirical support for the notion that community supervision can be effective in reducing recidivism.

In an effort to determine the success of a recent initiative designed to teach probation and parole officers to apply the principles of effective intervention to community supervision practices in the state of Ohio, the Ohio Office of Criminal Justice Services (OCJS) funded the University of Cincinnati Corrections Institute (UCCI) to implement the Effective Practices in Community Supervision (EPICS) model in four jurisdictions throughout Ohio and to study the results of the implementation. A quasi-experimental study was undertaken with a twofold purpose. First, UCCI was interested in how successfully probation and parole officers were able

to translate into daily practice the skills taught during the training and coaching process. Second, UCCI examined whether offenders supervised by EPICS-trained officers experienced reductions in recidivism compared with offenders supervised by untrained officers. The primary objective of this study is to examine the effectiveness of a newly integrated practice model that enhances the service delivery role of community supervision. The study addressed the following research questions:

1. Can researchers and practitioners work together to maintain research and program fidelity and translate EPICS techniques into practice?
2. Can researchers and practitioners collaborate to study and improve probation officer-offender interactions?
3. Can the EPICS model increase the effectiveness of community supervision outcomes?

What follows is a detailed report on the implementation of the EPICS model in Ohio, as well as an analysis of study outcomes.

### **Traditional Community Supervision**

Previous research suggests that the effect of probation and parole services on recidivism is less than optimal (Bonta, Rugge, Scott, Bourgon, & Yessine, 2008; Solomon, Kachnowski, & Bhati, 2005; Taxman, 2002). For example, Bonta et al. (2008) conducted a meta-analysis of 15 community supervision studies and 26 effect sizes. Results indicated that probation was no more effective than other community-based sanctions, such as fines and community service. Similarly, a study by the Urban Institute reported that prisoners released without parole performed about as well as their counterparts released with mandatory or discretionary parole requirements (Solomon et al., 2005). It is perhaps not surprising that previous research has also reported that relatively few probation officers adhere to the principles of effective intervention in their

individual sessions with offenders. For example, Bonta et al. (2008) evaluated audiotaped meetings in a community supervision setting with 62 probation officers and 154 adult and juvenile offenders, and reported that probation officers only discussed pro-criminal attitudes in 3% of sessions and used cognitive-behavioral interventions in less than 25% of the sessions. Results also indicated that officers did not discuss criminogenic needs in the majority of cases, and used community resources minimally to assist offenders. Moreover, officers based offenders' case plans more on what had been mandated by the court, and less on the results of offender risk assessments. Similarly, Raynor (2004, 2008) reported limited adherence to the principles of effective intervention in community correctional settings in the United Kingdom.

Notably, there has been a demand for a theory to explain the mechanism through which traditional community supervision would achieve the goal of reduced crime (Taxman, 2002). In the past, researchers have measured community supervision success by studying two main aspects of supervision: the number of contacts sessions per month—or the “intensity” of the supervision—and the caseload size of an officer. However, studies found that manipulating these variables had no effect on offender outcomes (Latessa, Travis, Fulton, & Stichman, 1998; Petersilia & Turner, 1993; for a review, see Taxman, 2002). That is, no matter the size of an officer's caseload or how frequently an offender met with his supervising officer, the outcomes for offenders remained unchanged.

The above evidence has suggested that traditional community supervision - both as an alternative to residential supervision (probation) and as a means to continue supervision after release from a correctional institution (parole) – is ineffective. All else being equal, sentencing an offender to community supervision instead of incarceration does not reduce that offender's likelihood to engage in future criminal activity (Bonta, Rugge, Scott, Bourgon, & Yessine, 2008;



Taxman, 2002). However, infused throughout the community supervision literature is studies that exemplify what can be expected when a therapeutic component is added to traditional community supervision practice: reductions in recidivism (Andrews et al., 1979; Petersilia, 1999; Trotter, 1996). When treatment is approached comprehensively, in accordance with the principles of effective intervention, community supervision agencies can expect to reduce the likelihood of re-offending by up to 50% (Bonta et al, 2008).

### **The Principles of Effective Intervention**

Since Robert Martinson's (1974) declaration that "nothing works", Canadian psychologists Paul Gendreau, Robert Ross, Don Andrews, and James Bonta have led the efforts to delineate the characteristics that distinguish effective treatment from ineffective treatment (Cullen & Gendreau, 2000). American scholars supported these efforts resulting in now more than 40 published meta-analyses (or quantitative syntheses) of the correctional treatment literature, and the results have been replicated with remarkable consistency (see Smith, Gendreau, & Swartz, 2009). These findings have been summarized, and are collectively referred to as the "principles of effective intervention" (Andrews & Bonta, 2010; Gendreau, 1996). In what follows, we will briefly review the three main principles of *risk*, *need*, and *responsivity*.

The *risk principle* asserts that criminal behavior is predictable using actuarial assessments of static (e.g., criminal history) and dynamic risk factors (e.g., pro-criminal attitudes, peers, and substance abuse). Furthermore, previous research has consistently indicated that the most intensive treatment should be delivered to higher risk offenders (Andrews & Bonta, 2010; Lowenkamp & Latessa, 2004; Lowenkamp, Latessa, & Holsinger, 2006).

The *need principle* highlights the importance of targeting dynamic risk factors, or criminogenic needs, in order to reduce offenders' likelihood of future criminal behavior

(Andrews, Bonta, & Hoge, 1990). Dynamic risk factors include those personal characteristics of offenders that both increase their risk of committing future offenses and are amenable to change (e.g., pro-criminal attitudes, peers, and substance abuse).

The *responsivity principle* refers to the fact that the most effective modes of treatment are those based on behavioral, cognitive, and social learning theories (Andrews, 1995). The responsivity principle also implies that interventions should be tailored to the learning style, motivation level, abilities, and strengths of the offender (Andrews & Bonta, 2010). This principle seeks to reduce potential barriers that offenders have to participating meaningfully in treatment. This principle is perhaps one of the most challenging (and least well understood) for correctional practitioners.

Previous training initiatives have attempted to increase staff adherence to the risk-need-responsivity (RNR) approach. Interestingly, the research demonstrates a cumulative impact of adherence to the RNR principles. For example, Andrews, Zinger, Hoge, Bonta, Gendreau, and Cullen (1990) reviewed 80 studies of juvenile and adult treatment interventions and determined that treatment effectiveness varied with the level of adherence to the RNR approach. Specifically, studies adhering to all three principles (i.e., risk, need, and responsivity) had a mean effect size of .32 (or a 32% reduction in offender recidivism) compared to a mean effect size of -.07 (or a 7% increase in offender recidivism) for those that did not adhere to any of the principles. More recently, Andrews and Bonta (2010) reviewed 374 treatment effect sizes, and reported that programs that did not adhere to any of the principles were associated with increases in recidivism ( $r = -.02$ ), whereas interventions that adhered to only one of the principles (i.e., risk, need, or responsivity) produced a slight decrease ( $r = .02$ ). Furthermore, interventions that

adhered to two principles produced a larger decrease ( $r = .18$ ), and those that adhered to all three principles produced the most dramatic reductions ( $r = .26$ ) in offender recidivism.

As space does not permit a detailed review of the empirical status of the principles of effective intervention, the reader is referred to Smith et al. (2009) for a more comprehensive discussion of the topic (see also Andrews & Bonta, 2010, Cullen & Gendreau, 2000; Gendreau, 1996). In short, it is clear the field of corrections has witnessed significant advancements in translating research into practice over the past two decades (Gendreau, Goggin, & Smith, 1999, 2000a, 2000b; Goggin & Gendreau, 2006; Mihalic, Irwin, Fagan, Ballard, & Elliot, 2004). The integration of these ideas into community supervision, however, is still a relatively new concept. It is possible that the effectiveness of community supervision may be enhanced as adherence to the principles of risk, need, and responsivity improves.

### **Core Correctional Practices**

These principles have been used to develop a set of core correctional practices (CCPs) that are designed to increase the therapeutic potential of correctional programs (Dowden & Andrews, 2004). Since their inception in the 1980s, these practices have evolved as a result of on-going empirical evaluation. Andrews and Kiessling (1980) first introduced five CCPs (*effective use of authority, antiriminal modeling and reinforcement, problem solving, use of community resources, and interpersonal relationships*) that were later expanded into a training curriculum (see Andrews & Carvell, 1998). In 1989, Gendreau and Andrews added to this list of practices with the development of the Correctional Program Assessment Inventory (CPAI). The CPAI is an instrument designed to evaluate how closely correctional treatment programs adhere to the known principles of effective correctional treatment (Smith & Schweitzer, 2012). The CPAI has gone through several revisions, including the CPAI-2000, and most recently the CPAI-

2010 (Gendreau, Andrews, & Theriault, 2010). While space does not permit a detailed review of the CCPs, the eight service delivery skills identified in the CPAI-2010 are described below:

***Anticriminal modeling*** – officers serve as an anticriminal model for offenders by engaging in prosocial behaviors and reinforcing them when they do the same.

***Effective reinforcement*** – officers use effective reinforcement to reinforce a specific behavior that includes immediate statements of approval and support and the reasons why this behavior is desirable followed by consideration of the short- and long-term benefits associated with continued use of the behavior.

***Effective disapproval*** – officers use effective disapproval to communicate disapproval for a specific behavior that includes immediate statements of disapproval and the reasons why this behavior is undesirable followed by consideration of the short- and long-term costs associated with continued use of the behavior and a clear demonstration of an alternate, prosocial behavior.

***Effective use of authority*** – officers make effective use of their authority by guiding offenders toward compliance, which includes focusing their message on the behavior exhibited, being direct and specific concerning their demands and specifying the offender's choices and attendant consequences.

***Structured learning*** – structured learning takes place when officers use behavioral strategies to assist offenders in developing prosocial skills to avoid or manage high risk situations. Skills are taught in a structured manner that involves defining, modeling, and rehearsing the skill followed by the constructive feedback. Likewise, offenders must practice the skill in increasingly difficult situations.

***Problem solving*** – problem solving is a specific social skill that is taught to offenders to address a variety of high risk situations.

***Cognitive restructuring*** – cognitive restructuring occurs when officers help offenders generate descriptions of problematic situations, the related thoughts and feelings, and then help offenders identify risky thinking and practice more prosocial alternatives.

***Relationship skills*** – effective officers possess several critical relationship skills including warm, open, nonjudgmental, empathetic, flexible, engaging, solution-focused, and directive to name a few.

These CCPs have been validated on more than 700 individual adult and juvenile programs by correlating scores with offender recidivism (Lowenkamp, 2004; Lowenkamp, Latessa, & Smith, 2006; Matthews, Hubbard, & Latessa, 2001).

## **RNR Approaches to Community Supervision**

During the last decade, several attempts have been made to improve the effectiveness of community supervision by implementing RNR and other evidence-based research into community supervision practices. (Bourgon, Bonta, Ruge, Scott & Yessine, 2010; Lowenkamp et al., 2012; Robinson et al., 2011; Smith et al., 2012; Trotter, 1996, 2006). Whereas traditional community supervision focuses on monitoring compliance with court-ordered conditions and making referrals to service providers, these recent initiatives teach probation and parole officers how to use RNR to manage caseloads and structure face-to-face interactions with offenders. Generally, RNR can be translated to community supervision by following the guidelines below.

Community supervision agencies that follow the *risk principle* assess offenders with a validated risk and need assessment and focus time and treatment resources on offenders who are deemed a moderate or high risk to reoffend (Andrews & Bonta, 2010). Probation and parole officers seeking to follow the *need principle* should focus on the dynamic risk factors that a validated needs assessment indicate are contributing to the likelihood that an offender will engage in future criminal behavior. Researchers have found seven dynamic risk factors linked to future offending (Andrews & Bonta, 2010). The top three of these factors are the most widespread among correctional populations and are thus considered the most important to focus on: antisocial attitudes and beliefs, antisocial peer groups, and certain personality characteristics, such as low self-control and lack of problem solving skills. The four remaining factors include education and employment status, family support, substance abuse, and recreational activities. These four factors tend to work through the top three—meaning, for example, that unless offenders are able to change the negative attitudes that support their substance abuse, they may

fail to achieve lasting reductions in substance use. Officers should target these needs directly during contact sessions, with a focus on long-term attitude and behavior change.

Applying the *responsivity principle* to community supervision means that officers incorporate techniques that are known to impact behavior change and do so in a manner that meets the individual learning styles of the offender. Cognitive-behavioral approaches grounded in social learning theory and focused on skill development and cognitive restructuring have been found to be the most effective with correctional populations (Andrews & Bonta, 2010). Therefore, officers trained in RNR use cognitive-behavioral interventions during contact sessions to target criminogenic needs. Such officers also refer offenders to treatment providers in the community that use cognitive behavioral approaches to focus on needs that cannot be fully met during contact sessions. Further, officers take steps to address any barriers that are preventing offenders from complying with treatment or the terms of supervision. For example, an officer may work with an offender to increase motivation to change before referring the offender to a treatment program.

Preliminary results from several jurisdictions suggest that when RNR is applied to community supervision meaningful reductions in offender recidivism occur (Bonta et al., 2011; Bourgon and Gutierrez, 2012; Robinson et al., 2011). This work affirms the role of probation and parole officers as agents of behavioral change, and provides empirical support for the notion that community supervision can be effective.

One of the earliest attempts to implement “what works” in community supervision was undertaken by Chris Trotter (1996, 2006). He compared the recidivism rates of offenders who were supervised by untrained officers with those supervised by officers who had been trained on relationship skills, prosocial modeling, effective use of reinforcement and punishment, and

problem solving. Despite the small sample size and non-random evaluation design, the recidivism rate for the experimental group was 18% lower than the control group over a follow-up period of four years (46% vs. 64%, respectively).

More recently, Bonta, Bourgon, and colleagues developed the Strategic Training Initiative in Community Supervision (STICS) model (Bonta et al., 2011; Bourgon et al., 2010; Bourgon and Gutierrez, 2012). STICS was designed to provide a framework for officers to adhere to the RNR model and for agencies to ensure implementation and evaluation of the strategy. The STICS model includes three main components: an initial three-day training, ongoing clinical supervision of skill maintenance, and a one-day refresher workshop one year after the initial training. Bonta and colleagues (2010) evaluated the impact of the training initiative in terms of officer proficiency in the model and reduction in recidivism of offenders supervised by trained officers. In order to evaluate the impact of the training initiative, officers were required to submit audiotapes of offender interactions after the intake assessment, after three months, and after six months. The audiotapes were then coded for the content of the discussions and the quality and use of the techniques of influence (structuring skills, relationship building skills, behavioral techniques, cognitive techniques, and effective correctional skills). The study included 295 audiotapes submitted by 52 probation officers, and the results were promising. As expected, trained officers spent significantly more time focusing on criminogenic needs and procriminal attitudes (61% of audiotapes) than untrained officers (45% of audiotapes) and significantly less time discussing non-criminogenic needs and conditions of release. Most important, the results indicated that offenders supervised by trained officers had lower rates of recidivism (25.3%) in comparison with offenders supervised by untrained officers (40.5%) during a two-year follow up period.

In another evaluation of the STICS model, Bourgon and Gutierrez (2012) found similar reductions in recidivism for offenders supervised by officers who used cognitive-behavioral techniques during contact sessions. Officers who discussed procriminal attitudes and cognitions had a one-year recidivism rate of 18.3% compared with a 28% recidivism rate for offenders supervised by officers who did not discuss procriminal cognitions. Similarly, officers who used cognitive techniques reduced their offenders' risk to recidivate by 18.3%.

Robinson et al. (2011) used an experimental pre-post design to investigate the effectiveness of the Staff Training Aimed at Reducing Re-arrest (STARR) curriculum. The STARR model takes a skill focused supervision approach and includes the following skills: Active Listening, Role Clarification, Effective Use of Authority, Effective Disapproval, Effective Reinforcement, Effective Punishment, Problem Solving, and Teaching, Applying, and Reviewing the Cognitive Model. In this study, a total of 88 federal probation and pretrial officers submitted 598 audio recordings for review. Officers in the experimental group participated in an initial training session. The officers then submitted three audiotaped interactions with offenders (i.e., the initial intake meeting, and then again after three and six months of community supervision). The audiotapes were used to provide feedback to the officers on their performance. A total of four booster sessions were held over the course of a year to provide additional training in deficient areas. Results from the STARR pilot indicate that trained officers were almost twice as likely to use behavioral strategies to shape offender behavior. In addition, discussions about cognitions, peers, and impulsivity occurred significantly more often among officers in the experimental group (44%) than the control group (30%). The experimental group also had a significantly lower recidivism rate at 12 months compared to the control group (26% vs. 34%, respectively). These results indicate that not only can training increase officer use of core



correctional practices, but it can also reduce the likelihood that offenders on supervision will commit future offenses (Robinson et al., 2011).

The results of Trotter (1996, 2006), Bonta et al. (2010), Bourgon and Gutierrez (2012) and Robinson et al. (2011) indicate that officers can be trained on evidence-based practices and can successfully translate these practices in their face-to-face interactions with offenders. Furthermore, the translation of these practices to contact sessions has been shown to reduce the risk that offenders on supervision will commit future offenses.

### **EPICS in Ohio**

The research on RNR, coupled with the most recent research on community supervision and implementation, provided impetus for the development of EPICS at UC.<sup>1</sup> Similar to the purposes of the STICS and STARR models, the EPICS model is designed to teach community supervision officers how to translate the principles of effective intervention into practice.

During the three-day EPICS training, officers learned to devote more contact time to offenders assessed at moderate and high risk levels. More face-to-face time allows officers to use the cognitive behavioral techniques taught during the training to target criminogenic needs and promote behavioral change during office visits with the offenders they supervise. Officers are also taught that EPICS is not to replace the traditional supervision practices of compliance monitoring and referring offenders out for community treatment; rather, EPICS incorporates compliance monitoring into the structure of a contact session and teaches officers to use compliance monitoring as a way to assist them in identifying an offender's most acute criminogenic needs. Further, when a need is so great that it cannot be fully addressed during

---

<sup>1</sup> The EPICS model was originally developed by Paula Smith and Christopher T. Lowenkamp, and has been revised since this time by the University of Cincinnati Corrections Institute. Additional training materials have been developed to adapt the EPICS model for case managers and for use with families.

contact session visits, officers are taught to refer offenders for treatment in the community. For example, an offender struggling with an aggression problem should be referred to a quality, cognitive-behavioral anger management treatment program. As such, officers are trained to include supervision, monitoring, and specific cognitive-behavioral techniques into their contact sessions with offenders.

A core component of EPICS is the on-going fidelity monitoring and coaching process that follows the classroom training. During this time, UCCI staff work closely with agency supervisors to plan and conduct monthly coaching sessions that focus on officer skill development. As part of fidelity monitoring, UCCI staff also train supervisors to provide support and feedback to the officers implementing these skills.

A preliminary study on officers' adherence to the EPICS model shows the importance of the coaching process (Smith et al., 2012). Results from coding audiotapes of trained and untrained officers indicate that trained officers became more proficient at core correctional skills as the coaching sessions progressed. For example, trained officers were twice as likely to use cognitive restructuring techniques after a coaching session in which UCCI staff demonstrated the skill, gave officers an opportunity to practice the skill, and provided officers feedback on their performance (Smith et al., 2012).

## **Implementation**

The Smith et al. (2012) study identified the importance of on-going coaching to help officers develop skills and increase fidelity to the model. Despite the importance of ensuring adherence to the RNR model and core correctional practices, corrections professionals continue to experience considerable challenges related to "how to make it work" (Gendreau, Goggin, & Smith, 2000a; Gendreau, 2001); in other words, practitioners often find it difficult to translate

research into practice. It is perhaps not surprising that the vast majority of correctional treatment programs assessed on measures of program integrity (e.g., the Correctional Program Assessment Inventory-2010, Evidence-Based Correctional Program Checklist) do not receive a passing grade (Gendreau, Goggin, & Smith, 2000b; Lipsey, 1989; see also Andrews & Bonta, 2010). For example, Taxman (2006), after implementing a proactive model of community supervision in which officers were trained to adhere to the principles of effective intervention, found that a process was needed to develop supervisor skills to assist staff skill develop and ensure long-term fidelity. A discussion of the challenges faced in “real world” applications of the principles of effective intervention, therefore, is critical in order to develop a “science of implementation” in the field of corrections generally, and community supervision specifically.

## **METHOD**

This section illustrates the research objectives for the study along with details regarding the methodological processes that were implemented. More specifically, it describes the sample, officer training and coaching process, data collection methods and forms, and data analytic procedures.

### **Research Objectives**

The primary purpose of this study is to test the overall effectiveness of the Effective Practices in Community Supervision (EPICS) model in reducing recidivism among criminal offenders within the context of a community supervision setting. To achieve this purpose, probation and parole officers were evaluated on their use of effective interventions in their contact sessions with offenders in order to determine if those interventions result in better outcomes for the offenders (i.e., fewer reincarcerations, new arrests, or technical violations, and improvements in attitude and quality of their relationship with supervising officer). This study

also assesses for potential differential effects of the effectiveness of the model (i.e., offender risk, race, gender, and age).

## **Participants**

Research took place at four sites within the state of Ohio: Hamilton County Juvenile Probation (HCJP), Hamilton County Adult Probation (HCAP)<sup>2</sup>, Franklin County Adult Probation (FCAP), and Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction Adult Parole Authority (ODRC). The ODRC site includes officers from three separate parole offices: Dayton, Defiance, and Lima. In order to best answer the research objectives of the study it examines data from two populations of interest (community supervision officers and the criminal offenders they supervise).

**Community Supervision Officers.** The first sample consists of probation and parole officers from each of the four sites. Officers were randomly assigned to one of two groups by a site coordinator: a trained group (i.e., trained in the EPICS model) and an untrained group (i.e., untrained in the EPICS model).

***EPICS Officer Training.*** All of the supervision officers assigned to the trained group attended a three-day training on the EPICS model. University of Cincinnati Corrections Institute (UCCI) staff facilitated the training for the Hamilton County Adult and Juvenile sites on May 18-21, 2010 and the Franklin County Adult site with the Lima and Dayton regions of the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction on June 28 – June 30, 2010.

The primary objective of the training was to provide officers with a sound understanding of the model and its implementation in officer-offender contact sessions. The first day of training introduced the rationale and development of the model in addition to the EPICS model

---

<sup>2</sup> Due to difficulties with participant recruitment, this site withdrew from the study.

structure. Day two of the training focused on various interventions and the mechanisms for their inclusion in the EPICS model. The last day of the training focused on behavioral practices, working with family and other sources of support, and the training summation. The format of the training included visual presentations, demonstrations of skills, workbook and participation exercises, and several opportunities for officers to practice skills.

***EPICS Coaching Sessions.*** Following the initial training, officers and supervisors participated in 24 coaching sessions (approximately one per month). Coaching sessions were led by UCCI staff and were designed to refresh officers on the EPICS model. Specifically, several coaching sessions were held with emphasis on the four components of the EPICS model (i.e., Check-In, Review, Intervention, and Homework), the importance of helping offenders recognize the link between thoughts and behaviors, and identifying high risk situations, thinking and behaviors and alternative prosocial thoughts and behaviors. Additional topics included techniques to address client motivation, skill building and problem solving, and other core correctional practices (e.g., anti-criminal modeling, effective reinforcement, effective disapproval, effective use of authority, and officer-client relationships).

The format of coaching sessions mirrored the EPICS model in that there were four components to the session. UCCI staff began sessions with a check-in on model implementation, questions, and concerns. Following was a discussion of topics from previous sessions. Officers were given the opportunity to ask questions and receive feedback regarding their performance through the recorded audios. After the review, a different topic from the initial training was expounded. UCCI staff provided the overview, and then provided additional demonstrations of the topic via audio, video, or live modeling. Following the demonstrations, officers were given the opportunity to practice with feedback from peers and UCCI staff.

**Probationers and Parolees.** The second sample consists of selected offenders supervised by the probation and parole officers in the study. Only probationers and parolees that met the following criteria were eligible to participate in the study: moderate- or high-risk for recidivism, age 14-65, and fluent in English. In addition, those offenders who were low-risk, diagnosed mentally ill, or classified as sex offenders were excluded. The criterion of risk level was adopted based on the principles of effective intervention, which demonstrate that the most promising reductions in recidivism are with moderate- to high-risk offenders versus low-risk offenders (for a review see Andrews & Bonta, 2010). Non-native English speakers, individuals with a diagnosed mental illness, and sex offenders were excluded due to their status as special populations.

### **Data Collection**

In addition to officer training and ongoing coaching of the model, data was collected on a regular basis by UCCI staff (i.e., officer and offender demographics, officer performance, offender views and feedback, and other offender case information). Sites provided UCCI access to pertinent offender and officer information.

### **Audio-Recordings**

In order to evaluate the impact of the training initiative and ongoing coaching feedback, officers were required to submit audio-recordings of interactions with offenders. Officers were instructed to record and submit three audiotapes with an offender new to supervision: the first within a month after placement on supervision, the second after three months, and the third after six months of supervision. Trained UCCI staff listened to each audio-recording and evaluated

the content according to the EPICS officer rating form<sup>3</sup> (see Appendix A). Each audiotape was coded for the content of the discussions and the quality and use of the techniques of influence (e.g., structuring skills, relationship building skills, behavioral techniques, cognitive techniques, and effective correctional skills). UCCI staff provided officers with feedback based on the ratings of each audiotape. Feedback indicated which components the officer satisfactorily completed and which components needed improvement.

### **Use of Core Correctional Practices**

Officer use of core correctional practices was measured in two ways: an EPICS adherence score and a dichotomous categorization in either a low fidelity or high fidelity group based on the EPICS score.

**EPICS Adherence Score.** Thirty-two of the coding sheet items went into the calculation of the composite EPICS adherence score. Only items where there was an opportunity for the officer to use the skill were included. Specifically, items were scored as 0 if the officer *had the opportunity to use the skill, but did not*, .5 = *used the skill, but missed some major steps*, and 1 = *proficient use of the skill*. Yes or no items were scored as 0 = *no* and 1 = *yes*. We then divided this total score by the number of included items. This produced a range of potential overall scores from .00 to 1.00. Thirty-eight officers in this study submitted a total of 755 recorded sessions for review. The number of tapes received per officer ranged from one to 47, with the average mean number of tapes per officer being 20. In order to obtain one overall EPICS adherence score for each officer, we added the scores for each officer and divided by the number of tapes submitted.

---

<sup>3</sup> The officer rating form was developed by the UCCI in conjunction with the EPICS model and was modeled after the initial STICS officer rating form.

**Fidelity to the EPICS Model.** The EPICS adherence score was used to classify officers into one of two categories: the high-fidelity group (overall scores  $\geq .50$ ) and a low-fidelity group (overall scores  $< .50$ ).

### **Offender Surveys**

The perspectives and participation of offenders are relevant to the effectiveness of the EPICS model. For this study, two different surveys were given to offenders to complete: the PO Questionnaire and the Criminal Sentiment Scale-Modified.

**PO Questionnaire.** There is evidence to suggest that the effectiveness of interventions can be influenced by the quality of the offender-officer relationship (Klockars, 1972; Paparozzi & Gendreau; 2005; Skeem & Manchak, 2008). Specifically, a strong therapeutic alliance can positively impact treatment success, offender motivation and supervision compliance (Kennedy, Skeem, Manchak, & Eno Louden, in press; Skeem, Eno Louden, Polaschek, & Camp, 2007). The philosophy of EPICS is that the standard compliance monitoring approach to community supervision is less effective in behavioral change than a combined therapeutic and supervision approach. Likewise, this study uses the PO Questionnaire to measure the quality of officer-offender relationships.

The PO Questionnaire is an offender-completed instrument designed to measure the relationship quality with their supervising probation or parole officer (see Appendix B). The PO Questionnaire comes from an earlier version of the Dual-Role Relationship Inventory-Revised (DRI-R) (Skeem et al., 2007). Similar to the DRI-R, the PO Questionnaire groups items into three factors: Caring/Fairness, Trust, and Toughness. One the whole, the items are generally consistent across the PO Questionnaire and the DRI-R; however, there are some notable differences. First, several items are negatively worded in the PO Questionnaire, whereas the



items of the DRI-R flow in the same direction. For example, item 26 on the PO Questionnaire is “I keep some important things to myself and don’t tell my PO,” where the equivalent question on the DRI-R is “I feel free to discuss the things that worry me with my PO”. As such, the negatively worded items were reverse coded in order to compute the PO Questionnaire scale scores. Second, the PO Questionnaire words the Toughness factors slightly different than the DRI-R. For example, item 14 on the PO Questionnaire is “My PO scolds me and tells me off when I’ve done something wrong,” where the equivalent question on the DRI-R is “I feel that he is looking to punish me”. Four of the five Tough items on the PO Questionnaire and the DRI-R match up in this way; however, one item would not match logically, so it was eliminated from the analyses.

There are 35 items on the PO Questionnaire. The responses to each item fall on a seven-point Likert scale, where 1 = *never*, 2 = *rarely*, 3 = *occasionally*, 4 = *sometimes*, 5 = *often*, 6 = *very often*, and 7 = *always*. The subscale of Fair/Care has 20 items, the subscale of Trust has five items, and the subscale of Tough has four items. Items that were negatively worded and all of the Tough items were reverse coded for scoring purposes. The PO Questionnaire total score is the sum of the Fair/Care, Trust, and Tough subscales, where higher scores indicate a fairer, caring, trusting and non-tough relationship than lower scores. As part of the research design, community supervision officers were to have participating offenders complete a PO Questionnaire within the first three months of supervision and then again during the final contact session (posttest) so that any change in relationship quality could be measured. There were a total of 290 PO Questionnaire assessments turned in for analysis (176 pretests and 114 posttests).

**Criminal Sentiment Scale-Modified (CCS-M).** There is strong evidence that links antisocial attitudes or beliefs – or procriminal sentiments – to criminal behavior (Andrews &

Bonta, 2010; Gendreau, 1996). Since EPICS is grounded in cognitive-behavioral theory (for more information see Spiegler & Guevremont, 2003) antisocial attitudes are a primary focus of the model. Thus, it is relevant to include an assessment of offender attitudes. In order to assess the level of procriminal beliefs and values, this study uses the Criminal Sentiment Scale-Modified (CCS-M; Shields & Simourd, 1991).

The CSS-M is an offender-completed instrument designed to measure antisocial attitudes (see Appendix C). The CSS-M is a modified version of the original Criminal Sentiment Scale (CSS; Gendreau, Grant, Leipziger, & Collins, 1979). The CSS-M is a 41-item questionnaire that requires offenders to rate their agreement with general statements on a 3-point Likert scale (i.e., agree, uncertain, or disagree). Statements can be prosocial or antisocial depending on the content and wording. Each endorsement of an antisocial statement (or rejection of a prosocial one) yields 2 points, whereas each rejection of an antisocial statement (or acceptance of a prosocial one) yields 0 points. Undecided responses receive a score of 1. Given the scoring scheme, higher scores are indicative of higher levels of antisocial attitudes than lower scores.

Offenders receive an overall score as well as ratings on three dimensions. The first subscale, Attitudes towards the Law, Courts, and Police (LCP, 25 items), evaluates respect for the law and the criminal justice system. The second sub-scale, Tolerance for Law Violations (TLV, 10 items), explores rationalizations for criminal behavior. The third subscale, Identification with Criminal Others (ICO, 6 items), assesses offenders' opinions of law violators.

A number of studies have established the validity of the CSS-M among criminal offenders (Shields & Simourd, 1991; Simourd, 1997). As part of the research design, community supervision officers were to have participating offenders complete a CSS-M during the first contact session (pretest) and then again during the final contact session (posttest) so that

any change in criminal attitudes could be measured. There were a total of 359 CSS-M assessments turned in for analysis (238 pretests and 121 posttests).

### **Officer Information**

The demographics of each officer were collected to determine if there are any differential effects of EPICS on recidivism by gender, race, or years of experience. Years of experience are defined here as a limited metric variable representing the total number of years the officer has worked for the agency. Gender and race were coded dichotomously, where 0 = *female* and 1 = *male*, and 0 = *nonwhite* and 1 = *white*.

### **Offender Information**

Pertinent case information was also collected for each offender. This data included gender (0 = *female* and 1 = *male*), race (0 = *nonwhite* and 1 = *white*), marital status (0 = *not married* and 1 = *married*), education (0 = *less than high school diploma or GED* and 1 = *high school diploma, GED, or higher degree*), employment (0 = *not employed at arrest* and 1 = *employed at arrest*), age, risk level (see below), criminal history (level of current offense: 0 = *Misdemeanor*, 1 = *Felony 1*, 2 = *Felony 2*, 3 = *Felony 3*, 4 = *Felony 4*, and 5 = *Felony 5*); number of months served for instant offense; and number of prior convictions, incarcerations, and probations) and recidivism data (see below).

**Risk.** The adult community supervision departments examined here changed the type of risk/needs instrument used to classify offenders from the Static Risk Assessment (SRA) to the Ohio Risk Assessment System (ORAS) during the course of this study. Since the change in assessments occurred early in the study, the majority of the offenders ( $n = 217$ ) were classified with an ORAS assessment and 35 were classified with the SRA (five cases were assessed with the Wisconsin Risk/Needs Assessment). The juvenile department used the Ohio Youth

Assessment System (OYAS) to measure risk for the juveniles in the study ( $n = 16$ ). Risk category was based on the respective standard cutoff scores for each assessment and is operationalized here as 0 = *moderate-risk* and 1 = *high-risk*.

**Recidivism.** The study is primarily focused on the relationship that the use of the EPICS model has on subsequent offender criminal behavior. Recidivism is operationalized here in the following three ways: (1) any reincarceration (0 = *no* and 1 = *yes*), (2) any arrest for a new crime (0 = *no* and 1 = *yes*), and (3) any technical violations of community supervision (0 = *no* and 1 = *yes*). Technical violations include, but are not limited to, failing to refrain from the use or possession of drugs or alcohol, failing to report as instructed, or failing to complete treatment as ordered by the court.

### **Data Analysis**

Given the nature of the research design proposed in this study, analysis will begin with simple bivariate analyses comparing the study groups. Descriptive statistics and bivariate analyses for all measures will be developed and reported for the entire sample and also by group. Correlations, t-tests, and chi-square tables will be calculated as appropriate. More complex multivariate analyses will also be conducted to analyze the data. The multivariate analyses will include linear models predicting residual scores for intermediate measures, and logistic regression models predicting all outcome measures.

## **RESULTS**

Table 1 describes the demographic information of the 41 trained and untrained probation and parole officers in this study. The majority of these officers are white and just about half are male. Both officer groups have approximately 10 years of experience in their current position. Pearson chi-square results indicate that the trained and untrained groups were not significantly

different on gender ( $\chi^2 = .02$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $p = .879$ ) or race ( $\chi^2 = 1.22$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $p = .269$ ) and an independent samples  $t$  test indicates trained and untrained groups were not significantly different on years of service ( $t = .80$ ,  $df = 39$ ,  $p = .432$ ).

**Table 1**

***Descriptive Statistics of Officers for the Total Sample and Disaggregated Sample by Agency***

<b>Characteristic</b>	<b>Trained</b>		<b>Untrained</b>	
	<b><i>n</i></b>	<b>%</b>	<b><i>n</i></b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Total Sample (<i>n</i> = 41)</b>	<i>n</i> = 21		<i>n</i> = 20	
Male	10	47.6	10	50.0
White	20	95.2	17	85.0
Mean years of service (SD)	9.6	4.4	10.8	4.1
<b>HCJP (<i>n</i> = 8)</b>	<i>n</i> = 4		<i>n</i> = 4	
Male	2	50.0	2	50.0
White	3	75.0	3	75.0
Mean years of service (SD)	7.8	3.2	8.5	3.4
<b>FCAP (<i>n</i> = 20)</b>	<i>n</i> = 10		<i>n</i> = 10	
Male	3	30.0	3	30.0
White	10	100.0	9	90.0
Mean years of service (SD)	9.0	4.1	9.8	5.6
<b>ODRC (<i>n</i> = 13)</b>	<i>n</i> = 7		<i>n</i> = 6	
Male	5	71.4	5	83.3
White	7	100.0	5	83.3
Mean years of service (SD)	11.4	5.1	13.8	4.4

Table 1 further describes the sample by disaggregating officers by agency. Two things are noteworthy in this regard. First, all of the HCAP officers and offenders have been excluded. As indicated above, HCAP dropped out of the study due to difficulties with recruitment. As a municipal probation department, HCAP supervises a high-proportion of low-risk offenders. Subsequently, HCAP submitted only information on low-risk cases, which were not included due

to the studies eligibility requirements. Second, there is a rather noticeable difference in the number of officers from the three remaining counties (8 from HCJP, 20 officers from FCAP, and 14 from ODRC). However, similar to the finding of statistical equivalence noted above for the total sample, no significant differences were found between groups within the individual sites. This finding indicates trained and untrained officers in this study are statistically similar on the characteristics of gender, race, and years of service.

Table 2 describes the 272 probationers and parolees in the study. This table separates offenders by their assignment to either a trained or untrained officer. Approximately half of the sample is white and the average age of the offenders in both groups is 31 years old. The only significant difference between the two groups is that the trained officer group has significantly more male offenders ( $\chi^2 = 4.27, df = 1, p = .039$ ). However, despite this gender difference, the majority of both groups consist of male offenders (87.9% trained and 78.6% untrained).

Table 2 further reveals 72.3% of the cases come from FCAP, 22.0% from ODRC, and 5.7% from HCJP. The total sample includes 159 moderate-risk and 113 high-risk offenders. While the trained group has a higher percentage of high-risk offenders than the untrained group (44.0% vs. 38.9%), Pearson chi-square results indicate there is not a statistically significant relationship between risk level and group ( $\chi^2 = .71, df = 1, p = .399$ ). Finally, the two groups have nearly identical criminal histories. Comparisons of both officers (Table 1) and offenders (Table 2) reveal a high degree of equivalence between the trained and untrained groups. This increases the internal validity of the studies design by eliminating many plausible alternative explanations for its findings.

**Table 2**

***Descriptive Statistics of Offenders (N = 272)***

<b>Characteristic</b>	<b>Trained (n = 141)</b>		<b>Untrained (n = 131)</b>	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
<b>Demographics</b>				
Male*	124	87.9	103	78.6
White	67	47.5	68	51.9
Married <sup>a</sup>	18	12.9	18	13.7
≥ H.S. diploma or GED <sup>b</sup>	81	58.7	75	58.6
Employed at arrest <sup>c</sup>	49	35.3	55	42.6
Mean age (SD)	31.1	9.4	31.5	10.2
<b>Agency</b>				
HCJP ( <i>n</i> = 15)	8	5.7	7	5.3
FCAP ( <i>n</i> = 200)	102	72.3	98	74.8
ODRC ( <i>n</i> = 57)	31	22.0	26	19.8
<b>Risk Level</b>				
Moderate ( <i>n</i> = 159)	79	56.0	80	61.1
High ( <i>n</i> = 113)	62	44.0	51	38.9
<b>Criminal History</b>				
Level of current offense <sup>d</sup>				
<i>Misdemeanor</i>	4	3.1	2	2.0
<i>Felony 1</i>	6	4.6	8	7.7
<i>Felony 2</i>	24	18.5	21	20.2
<i>Felony 3</i>	26	20.0	23	22.1
<i>Felony 4</i>	31	23.8	16	15.4
<i>Felony 5</i>	39	30.0	34	32.7
Mean months of current incarceration <sup>e</sup> (SD)	6.1	16.1	6.2	13.3
Mean prior arrests <sup>d</sup> (SD)	10.3	8.0	11.1	10.4
Mean prior convictions <sup>e</sup> (SD)	8.6	5.8	9.0	8.1
Mean prior incarcerations <sup>f</sup> (SD)	2.5	3.5	2.8	4.2
Mean prior probations <sup>g</sup> (SD)	2.2	1.8	2.1	2.0

\*  $p \leq .05$ .

<sup>a</sup>  $n = 271$  (140 trained and 131 untrained); <sup>b</sup>  $n = 266$  (138 trained and 128 untrained);

<sup>c</sup>  $n = 268$  (139 trained and 129 untrained); <sup>d</sup>  $n = 234$  (130 trained and 104 untrained);

<sup>e</sup>  $n = 257$  (136 trained and 121 untrained); <sup>f</sup>  $n = 264$  (137 trained and 127 untrained);

<sup>g</sup>  $n = 260$  (135 trained and 125 untrained); <sup>h</sup>  $n = 249$  (127 trained and 122 untrained);

<sup>i</sup>  $n = 260$  (134 trained and 12 untrained).

Table 3 examines the effect of group assignment (trained and untrained) on recidivism. In the total sample, the trained group of offenders has a higher percentage of reincarcerations (24.8% vs. 22.9%), arrests for new crimes (22.7% vs. 17.6%), and technical violations filed (42.6% vs. 35.9%). However, none of these differences meet statistical significance: reincarceration ( $\chi^2 = .14$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $p = .710$ ), arrest for new crime ( $\chi^2 = 1.11$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $p = .292$ ) or technical violations ( $\chi^2 = 1.27$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $p = .260$ ).

**Table 3**

***Recidivism by Group Assignment for the Total Sample and Disaggregated Sample by Agency***

	Incarceration			Arrest New Crime			Technical Violation		
	<i>n</i>	%	$\Phi$	<i>n</i>	%	$\Phi$	<i>n</i>	%	$\Phi$
<b>Total Sample</b>			.02			.06			.07
Trained	35	24.8		32	22.7		60	42.6	
Untrained	30	22.9		23	17.6		47	35.9	
<b>HCJP</b>			-.26			.20			-.13
Trained	5	62.5		7	87.5		6	75.0	
Untrained	6	85.7		5	71.4		6	85.7	
<b>FCAP</b>			.08			.10			.07
Trained	25	24.5		9	8.8		50	49.0	
Untrained	18	18.4		4	4.1		41	41.8	
<b>ODRC</b>			-.09			-.02			.25
Trained	5	16.1		16	51.6		4	12.9	
Untrained	6	23.1		14	53.8		0	0.0	

When the analyses are disaggregated by agency the percentage of offenders that are incarcerated is lower in the trained group for HCJP (62.5% vs. 85.7%) and ODRC (16.1% vs. 23.1%), but is higher for FCAP (24.5% vs. 18.4%). The percentage of offenders that are arrested for a new crime is also lower in the trained group for ODRC (51.6% vs. 53.8%), but is higher for



HCJP (87.5% vs. 71.4%) and FCAP (8.8% vs. 4.1%). The percentage of offenders that had a technical violation filed against them was lower in the trained group for HCJP (75.0% vs. 85.7%), but is higher for FCAP (49.0% vs. 41.8%) and ODRC (12.9% vs. 0.0%). Pearson chi-square results indicate there are no statistically significant relationships between any of the three recidivism measures and group type by agency. All of the effect sizes ( $\Phi = -.26$  to  $.25$ ) are also considered smaller than typical for the behavioral sciences according to Cohen's (1988) standards.

Prior research indicates an increased benefit for RNR approaches to supervision with moderate-risk offenders in comparison to high-risk offenders (Robinson et al., 2011). Therefore, Table 4 examines the effect of group assignment on recidivism separated by offender risk level. In the moderate-risk sample, the offenders supervised by trained officers have worse outcomes on all three measures of recidivism in comparison to the offenders supervised by the untrained officers. In the high-risk sample, offenders supervised by the trained officers have better outcomes for technical violations, but worse outcomes for incarceration and arrest for a new crime. However, none of these differences is significant.

**Table 4**

***Recidivism by Group Assignment and Offender Risk Level***

	Incarceration			Arrest New Crime			Technical Violation		
	<i>n</i>	%	$\Phi$	<i>n</i>	%	$\Phi$	<i>n</i>	%	$\Phi$
<b>Moderate-Risk</b>			.02			.05			.15
Trained	17	21.5		21	26.6		33	41.8	
Untrained	16	20.0		18	22.5		22	27.5	
<b>High-Risk</b>			.02			.11			-.06
Trained	18	29.0		11	17.7		27	43.5	
Untrained	14	27.5		5	9.8		25	49.0	

To explore why there may be different effects by officer group assignment, offender risk level, and site location, the officer use of EPICS skills is examined. In order to determine the impact of training on the subsequent officer use of core correctional practices skills, Table 5 uses independent samples *t* tests to compare the mean scores of the trained group with the mean scores of the untrained group. It should be noted that four officers did not submit any audiotapes; therefore, they could not be included in this analysis.

**Table 5**

***The Effect of EPICS Training on Officer Use of Core Correctional Practices (n = 37)***

<b>EPICS Score</b>	<b><i>M</i></b>	<b><i>SD</i></b>	<b><i>t</i></b>	<b><i>df</i></b>	<b><i>p</i></b>	<b>Cohen's <i>d</i></b>
<b>Total Sample</b>			-9.63 <sup>a</sup>	29.9 <sup>a</sup>	< .001	3.2
Trained ( <i>n</i> = 21)	.49	.12				
Untrained ( <i>n</i> = 16)	.20	.06				
<b>HCJP<sup>b</sup></b>			-3.03	3	.056	-
Trained ( <i>n</i> = 4)	.47	.08				
Untrained ( <i>n</i> = 1)	.20	-				
<b>FCAP</b>			-10.27	12.8 <sup>a</sup>	< .001	4.8
Trained ( <i>n</i> = 10)	.56	.10				
Untrained ( <i>n</i> = 10)	.20	.05				
<b>ODRC</b>			-3.41	10	.007	2.2
Trained ( <i>n</i> = 7)	.40	.11				
Untrained ( <i>n</i> = 5)	.19	.08				

<sup>a</sup>The *t* and *df* were adjusted because variances were not equal

<sup>b</sup>The *SD* for the untrained officers was not computed because there was only one officer. Also, Cohen's *d* could not be computed because there was only one untrained officer.

A couple of interesting findings emerge through this analysis. First, there is a significant difference between the EPICS scores of the trained and untrained officers. For the total sample, the trained officer outperformed untrained officer to 49% to 20%. Based on the values of Cohen's *d* (3.2), the magnitude of these group differences is considered much larger than typical

(Cohen, 1988). Large differences were also noted in the FCAP ( $d = 4.8$ ) and ODRC ( $d = 2.2$ ). Cohen's  $d$  could not be computed for the HCJP sample because there was only one untrained officer compared to four trained officers. However, in HCJP the mean EPICS score for trained officers (47%) was much higher than the score for the untrained officer (20%).

Second, untrained officers seem to perform with scores on average around 20%. There is much more variation between sites in how well the trained officers performed, with FCAP receiving the highest scores and ODRC the lowest. Despite this variation, the mean performance score was still under 50%. This means the average officer in this study correctly used the EPICS skills less than half of the time it was appropriate. This finding is much lower than expected and indicates officers struggled with using these skills in their interactions with offenders.

It is likely more important that an officer uses core correctional practices in his or her interactions with offenders, rather than whether or not the officer completed the EPICS training. As other programs and interventions also teach officers core correctional practices, it is likely that some of the untrained group may employ such techniques in their interactions with offenders. It is also possible, that an officer could go through the training and not utilize any of the skills taught through EPICS, or do a poor job using the skills.

Table 6 examines the officer use of EPICS skills on recidivism. All officers that submitted audiotapes were divided into one of two groups: a high-fidelity group (overall scores  $\geq .50$ ) and a low-fidelity group (overall scores  $< .50$ ). Eight offenders did not have an officer that submitted an audiotape; therefore those officers could not be included in this analysis. In the total sample, offenders supervised by high fidelity officers had 3.3% fewer incarcerations and 3.6% fewer arrests for new crimes in comparison to the offenders supervised by low fidelity

officers. Offenders supervised by high fidelity officers also had 8.1% more technical violations filed against them than the offenders supervised by low fidelity officers.

**Table 6**

***Recidivism by Officer Use of CCP for the Total Sample and Disaggregated Sample by Agency (n = 264)***

	Incarceration			Arrest New Crime			Technical Violation		
	<i>n</i>	%	$\Phi$	<i>n</i>	%	$\Phi$	<i>n</i>	%	$\Phi$
<b>Total Sample</b>			-.04			-.04			.08
High-Fidelity	17	20.5		13	15.7		46	44.6	
Low-Fidelity	43	23.8		35	19.3		66	36.5	
<b>HCJP</b>			-.07			.43			.15
High-Fidelity	3	60.0		5	100.0		4	80.0	
Low-Fidelity	4	66.7		4	66.7		4	66.7	
<b>FCAP</b>			-.05			.05			-.01
High-Fidelity	14	18.9		6	8.1		33	44.6	
Low-Fidelity	29	23.0		7	5.6		58	46.0	
<b>ODRC</b>			-.14			.01			-.08
High-Fidelity	0	0.0		2	50.0		0	0.0	
Low-Fidelity	10	20.4		24	49.0		4	100.0	

When the analyses are disaggregated by agency the percentage of offenders that are incarcerated is lower for the high fidelity officers in all three sites. The reductions in incarceration range from a 4.1% difference in FCAP to a 20.4% difference in the ODRC. The percentage of offenders that are arrested for a new crime is also lower in the high fidelity officer groups in all three sites, and the percentage of offenders that had a technical violation filed against them was lower in the high fidelity group for FCAP and ODRC, but is higher in HCJP. Pearson chi-square results indicate there are no statistically significant relationships between any of the three recidivism measures and group type by agency.

Table 7 examines the effect of officer use of EPICS skills on recidivism separated by offender risk level. In the moderate-risk sample, the offenders supervised by high-fidelity officers had a lower rate of new arrest, but a higher rate of incarceration and technical violations. Interestingly, in the high-risk sample, offenders supervised by the high fidelity officers had better outcomes on all three measures of recidivism compared to offenders supervised by low fidelity officers. This finding is consistent with the risk principle and suggests that there is an added benefit to targeting high-risk versus moderate-risk offenders for RNR approaches to supervision.

**Table 7**

***Recidivism by Officer Use of CCP and Offender Risk Level***

	Incarceration			Arrest New Crime			Technical Violation		
	<i>n</i>	%	$\Phi$	<i>n</i>	%	$\Phi$	<i>n</i>	%	$\Phi$
<b>Moderate-Risk</b>			.03			-.05			.16
High-Fidelity	9	20.5		8	18.2		20	45.5	
Low-Fidelity	19	17.8		24	22.4		31	29.0	
<b>High-Risk</b>			-.13			-.03			-.04
High-Fidelity	8	20.5		5	12.8		17	43.6	
Low-Fidelity	24	32.4		11	14.9		35	47.3	

**Intermediate Measures**

This study employs two offender-completed instruments: the PO Questionnaire – which is designed to measure the relationship quality with their supervising probation or parole officer, and the Criminal Sentiment Scale-Modified (CSS-M) – which is designed to assess offender criminal attitudes.

Table 8 examines the bivariate correlations between the measures of the PO Questionnaire and offender risk level. Supervising officers administered the pre-test

questionnaire to offenders within the first three months of supervision and the post-test questionnaire prior to the final contact session. Although the pre-test measures are not significantly related to offender risk level at pre-test, the post-test measures do correlate with risk level in the way one would expect. Specifically, moderate-risk offenders perceive the relationship to be more caring, fair, and trusting. In contrast high-risk offenders perceive the relationship to be tougher.

**Table 8**

***Bivariate Correlations between Offender Perceptions of the Offender-Officer Relationship and Risk Level***

Measure	<i>r</i>
<b>PO Questionnaire Pre-test</b>	
Caring-Fairness	.09
Trust	.00
Tough	.06
Total	.05
<b>PO Questionnaire Post-test</b>	
Caring-Fairness	-.16
Trust*	-.20
Tough	.14
Total*	-.20

\*  $p \leq .05$ .

Table 9 examines the bivariate correlations between the CSS-M measures and risk level. In the CSS-M, higher scores indicate more support for criminal sentiments. Both the overall pre-test and post-test CSS-M scores – as well as several of the specific domain categories – are significantly related to offender risk level. This indicates that high-risk offenders endorsed more criminal attitudes, whereas moderate-risk offenders endorsed fewer criminal attitudes.

**Table 9*****Bivariate Correlations between CSS-M Scores and Risk Level***


---

Measure	<i>r</i>
<b>CSS-M Pre-test</b>	
Law-Court-Police*	.14
Tolerance for Law Violations*	.19
Identification with Criminal Others	.10
Total Score*	.17
<b>CSS-M Post-test</b>	
Law-Court-Police	.16
Tolerance for Law Violations*	.18
Identification with Criminal Others*	.15
Total Score*	.19

---

\*  $p \leq .05$ .

While both the PO Questionnaire and the CSS-M relate to offender risk level in the way one would expect, we next want to examine if these scales can detect any offender changes from pre-test to post-test. The expectation is that offenders supervised by high-fidelity officers would see more positive changes (better relationship and less criminal attitudes) compared to low-fidelity officers. Table 10 compares the PO Questionnaire measures by officer fidelity to the EPICS model. At both pre-test and post-test, the high-fidelity group offenders were more likely to perceive a trusting relationship with their supervising officer. While none of the other relationships were significant, the total scores of the high-fidelity group at both pre-test and post-test were higher than the low-fidelity group scores.

**Table 10*****Comparison between Offender Perceptions of the Offender-Officer Relationship by Officer Fidelity to EPICS Model***

<b>Measure</b>	<b><i>M</i></b>	<b><i>SD</i></b>	<b><i>t</i></b>	<b><i>df</i></b>	<b><i>p</i></b>	<b>Cohen's <i>d</i></b>
<b>Caring-Fairness 1</b>						
High-Fidelity	144.0	19.6				
Low-Fidelity	143.0	17.9				
			-0.32	171	.751	.05
<b>Trust 1</b>						
High-Fidelity	44.4	4.7				
Low-Fidelity	42.7	5.9				
			-2.07 <sup>a</sup>	158.6 <sup>a</sup>	.040	.32
<b>Tough 1</b>						
High-Fidelity	9.1	4.2				
Low-Fidelity	10.2	4.8				
			1.62	171	.107	-.24
<b>Total 1</b>						
High-Fidelity	207.3	23.7				
Low-Fidelity	203.5	24.7				
			-1.00 <sup>a</sup>	139.1 <sup>a</sup>	.320	.16
<b>Caring-Fairness 2</b>						
High-Fidelity	141.5	21.8				
Low-Fidelity	141.9	19.9				
			.10	112	.924	-.02
<b>Trust 2</b>						
High-Fidelity	44.3	6.0				
Low-Fidelity	41.8	7.0				
			-1.94	112	.055	.38
<b>Tough 2</b>						
High-Fidelity	11.4	5.3				
Low-Fidelity	11.2	4.7				
			-.22	112	.828	.04
<b>Total 2</b>						
High-Fidelity	202.4	28.1				
Low-Fidelity	200.5	26.7				
			-.36	112	.720	.07

<sup>a</sup>The *t* and *df* were adjusted because variances were not equal

Table 11 compares the CSS-M measures by officer fidelity to the EPICS model. While none of the relationships were significant, the total scores of the low-fidelity group at both pre-test and post-test were higher than the high-fidelity group scores. This indicates the low-fidelity



group offenders have more criminal sentiments than the high-fidelity group offenders on each of the CSS-M scales.

**Table 11**

***Comparison between CSS-M Scores by Officer Fidelity to CCP Model***

<b>Measure</b>	<b><i>M</i></b>	<b><i>SD</i></b>	<b><i>t</i></b>	<b><i>df</i></b>	<b><i>p</i></b>	<b>Cohen's <i>d</i></b>
<b>LCP 1</b>			1.04	228	.300	-.15
High-Fidelity	14.9	7.6				
Low-Fidelity	16.1	8.1				
<b>TLV 1</b>			-.13	228	.895	.03
High-Fidelity	5.8	3.5				
Low-Fidelity	5.7	3.7				
<b>ICO 1</b>			-.07	228	.942	.00
High-Fidelity	4.0	1.9				
Low-Fidelity	4.0	2.0				
<b>Total 1</b>			.50	228	.618	-.08
High-Fidelity	24.7	11.2				
Low-Fidelity	25.6	11.9				
<b>LCP 2</b>			.73	118	.467	-.14
High-Fidelity	14.6	8.3				
Low-Fidelity	15.8	9.3				
<b>TLV 2</b>			-.36	118	.718	.07
High-Fidelity	5.3	4.1				
Low-Fidelity	5.0	4.0				
<b>ICO 2</b>			.28	118	.778	-.08
High-Fidelity	3.5	2.9				
Low-Fidelity	3.7	2.0				
<b>Total 2</b>			.43	118	.671	-.08
High-Fidelity	23.4	13.0				
Low-Fidelity	24.5	13.3				

<sup>a</sup>The *t* and *df* were adjusted because variances were not equal.

Table 12 examines the bivariate correlations between the PO Questionnaire measures and recidivism. At both pre-test and post-test, offenders that perceived a more trusting relationship with their supervising officer were significantly less likely to be arrested for a new crime. At post-test only, offenders that perceived a more tough relationship with their supervising officer were significantly more likely to be incarcerated and receive a technical violation.

**Table 12**

***Bivariate Correlations between PO Questionnaire Scores and Recidivism***

<b>Measure</b>	<b>Incarceration</b>	<b>Arrest New Crime</b>	<b>Technical Violation</b>
<b>PO Questionnaire Pre-test</b>			
Caring-Fairness	.05	-.06	-.02
Trust	-.06	-.32*	-.06
Tough	.05	.10	.04
Total	.01	-.13	-.04
<b>PO Questionnaire Post-test</b>			
Caring-Fairness	.01	-.05	-.07
Trust*	-.01	-.27*	-.04
Tough	.27*	.05	.19*
Total*	-.05	-.11	-.09

\*  $p \leq .05$ .

Table 13 examines the bivariate correlations between CSS-M measures and recidivism. At pre-test, the Identification with Criminal Others (ICO) measure was significantly correlated with two of the three measures of recidivism. This means offenders with more criminal identification had an increased risk of being arrested for a new crime and violating the conditions of their supervision. At post-test there are no significant relationships between the CSS-M measures and recidivism. The differences found from pre-test to post-test may be also be due to the differences in the number of assessments completed. While 238 pre-tests were completed, there were only 121 post-tests. It is likely that some of the offenders with high scores at pre-test

were incarcerated during the post-test, which means they may have been unable to complete a post-test assessment.

**Table 13**

***Bivariate Correlations between CSS-M Scores and Recidivism***

<b>Measure</b>	<b>Incarceration</b>	<b>Arrest New Crime</b>	<b>Technical Violation</b>
<b>CSS-M Pre-test</b>			
Law-Court-Police	-.01	.06	.02
Tolerance for Law Violations	-.03	.00	.10
Identification with Criminal Others	.06	.18*	.20*
Total Score	.00	.08	.07
<b>CSS-M Post-test</b>			
Law-Court-Police	-.11	.01	-.06
Tolerance for Law Violations	-.07	.06	-.01
Identification with Criminal Others	.00	.05	.02
Total Score	-.10	.04	-.04

\* $p \leq .05$ .

**DISCUSSION**

As offenders are increasingly sentenced to community supervision, probation and parole agencies now face the challenge of having to cope with decreased budgets and large caseloads, while simultaneously trying to improve the effectiveness of supervision (Skeem & Manchak, 2008). RNR approaches to community supervision, such as STICS, STARR, and EPICS are an effort to reintroduce rehabilitation to community supervision, while also aiming to improve the effectiveness of supervision. Within the RNR model, staff characteristics and training in the core correctional practices must be addressed to ensure the maximum therapeutic impact of correctional treatment (Dowden & Andrews, 2004). Unless offender-officer contacts are more than simply check-ins to monitor compliance with court-ordered conditions, this encounter may do little to reduce recidivism (Taxman, 2002). Moving beyond simply compliance monitoring, the recent initiatives to train community supervision officers to use core correctional

competencies in their face-to-face interactions with offenders have demonstrated an impact on recidivism rates and intermediate variables associated with recidivism (Bonta et al., 2010; Bourgon et al., 2010; Smith et al., 2012; Trotter, 1996, 2006).

The primary purpose of this study was to test the overall effectiveness of the Effective Practices in Community Supervision (EPICS) model in reducing recidivism among criminal offenders within the context of a community supervision setting. The findings of the study will now be summarized within the context of the three research questions investigated. Policy implications and limitations will also be discussed.

***1. Can researchers and practitioners work together to maintain research and program fidelity and translate EPICS techniques into practice?***

The findings of this study indicate officers trained in the EPICS model demonstrated a more consistent adherence to the model and related skills. It is important to note that skill acquisition occurred over the course of both training and coaching processes. In general, officers who received training and coaching in the EPICS model were more likely to focus on criminogenic needs during contact sessions than noncriminogenic needs. Likewise, the EPICS officers were more likely to help offenders recognize the link between thoughts and behaviors, identify high risk situations, thinking, and behaviors, and alternative prosocial thoughts and behaviors. Additional techniques to address client motivation, skill building and problem solving, and other core correctional practices (e.g., anti-criminal modeling, effective reinforcement, effective disapproval, effective use of authority, and officer-client relationships) were also more likely to be used by EPICS trained officers than non-trained officers.

These results demonstrate that researchers and practitioners can work together to maintain research and program fidelity and translate these techniques into practice. Furthermore,

the findings underscore the importance of training and coaching as an on-going process to assist officers in improving their adherence to the CCPs. However, these results should be interpreted cautiously as UCCI staff and agency supervisors provided a considerable amount of support via coaching sessions and performance evaluations (24 coaching sessions over two years) and despite all of this support, not all trained officers displayed a high-fidelity to the EPICS model. One possible explanation for this finding is that the level of support and commitment to the model varied by site, supervisor, and officer.

***2. Can researchers and practitioners collaborate to study and improve probation officer-offender interactions?***

As with others in the field, this study found the offender's perception of the relationship with the officer to be related to recidivism (Andrews & Kiessling, 1980; Papanozzi & Gendreau, 2005; Skeem et al., 2007). This finding is consistent with other promising signs that the relationship between the offender and their supervising probation or parole officer may be a core condition for changing the behavior and social circumstances associated with recidivism (Burnett & McNeill, 2005; Spiegler & Guevremont, 2003; Trotter, 1996, 2006). Training and coaching on establishing and maintaining a collaborative relationship is an integral part of the EPICS model, and the results suggest that this relationship between the offender and officer is important to improving outcomes.

However, it should be noted that officers may have varied in the type and quality of the interactions with offenders based upon the varying philosophical beliefs held by the officer and the organization in which he/she works. Some officers and sites shared the belief that their work is more like social work, whereas others may expressed their work is more about the control

function of supervision. These differences, although not measured, may also explain the differences in the interactions between officers and offenders.

### ***3. Can the EPICS model increase the effectiveness of community supervision outcomes?***

Consistent with previous research, the results of the study suggest that offenders under community supervision are more successful when probation officers adhere to the RNR model and incorporate core correctional practices into their contact sessions; however, the findings were mixed and varied across sites and type of measure used. The main finding of the study is when higher risk offenders' criminogenic needs are targeted using structured cognitive behavioral interventions by officers who have strong relationship skills, make effective use of reinforcement, disapproval, and authority, and are generally prosocial models, the number of offender incarcerations and new arrests are reduced.

Examining the effect of the EPICS model on offender outcomes more closely revealed a differential effect of offender risk level on the relationship between EPICS fidelity and recidivism outcomes. When the sample is separated by risk level, we see stronger effects for higher risk offenders than moderate risk offenders. To illustrate, when only moderate-risk offenders were considered, officers who regularly incorporated CCP's into their contact sessions actually had offenders with worse outcomes in the two outcome categories of incarceration and technical violations. In comparison, when only high-risk offenders were examined, high-fidelity officers had offenders with better outcomes in all three recidivism outcomes. This finding suggests that while stronger adherence to the EPICS model is generally effective in reducing recidivism, it is most effective when used with high-risk offenders.

### **Limitations**

It is important to note the limitations of this study. First, the study included a moderate

sample size: 41 officers and 272 offenders. Second, officers were not randomly assigned to the training condition. Instead, departmental administrators selected which officers were trained in the EPICS model, and subsequently which officers would serve as comparisons. Third, the offenders in the study do not represent all of the offenders on the officers' caseload; rather, each officer in the study selected a subsample of participants from his or her caseload based on the predefined criteria. It is unknown if similar findings would have occurred if all of the officers cases were included. Fourth, one of the sites withdrew from the study. Finally, the level of commitment varied notably both between and within sites. For example, during the study, some supervisors took on a caseload and participated in the audiotape submission process, whereas other supervisors did not. Further, some supervisors took the time to review feedback with officers, and even co-lead coaching sessions, whereas other supervisors did neither. Given these differences, it is logical to assume that the expectations of officers in carrying out EPICS skills varied by sites and officers as well. The current study does not allow us to assess the potential impact this had on the performance and subsequent offender outcome.

### **Implications**

Despite these limitations, there are a few policy considerations that warrant careful consideration. First, officer training alone in CCPs may not be enough to ensure fidelity to the model; rather, steps should be taken to ensure that skills are translated into practice (i.e., coaching, monitoring, booster training). Second, as part of the on-going coaching and feedback process offenders should be assessed for the relationship quality with supervising probation officers and steps should be taken to improve the relationship status of officers and offenders. Finally, use of the EPICS model should target high-risk, rather than moderate-risk offenders (i.e., prioritize offenders by risk level).

## REFERENCES

- Andrews, D. A. (1995). The psychology of criminal conduct and effective treatment. In J. McGuire (Ed.), *What works: Reducing reoffending-guidelines from research and practice*. New York, NY: John Wiley.
- Andrews, D. A., & Bonta, J. (2010). *The psychology of criminal conduct* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). Newark, NJ: LexisNexis.
- Andrews, D. A., Bonta, J., & Hoge, R. (1990). Classification for effective rehabilitation: Rediscovering psychology. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 17(1), 19-52.
- Andrews, D. A., & Carvell, C. (1998). *Core correctional training-core correctional supervision and counseling: Theory, research, assessment and practice*. Unpublished training manual, Carleton University, Ottawa, Canada.
- Andrews, D. A. & Kiessling, J. J. (1980). Program structure and effective correctional practices: A summary of the CaVic research. In R. R. Ross & P. Gendreau (Eds.), *Effective correctional treatment* (pp. 441-463). Toronto, Canada: Butterworths.
- Andrews, D. A., Zinger, I., Hoge, R. D., Bonta, J., Gendreau, P., & Cullen, F. T. (1990). Does correctional treatment work? A psychologically informed meta-analysis. *Criminology*, 28, 369-404.
- Bonta, J., Bourgon, G., Rugge, T., Scott, T., Yessine, A. K., Gutierrez, L., & Li, J. (2010). *The strategic training initiative in community supervision: Risk-need-responsivity in the real world* (User Report 2010-01). Ottawa: Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada.
- Bonta, J., Rugge, T., Scott, T., Bourgon, G., & Yessine, A. K. (2008). Exploring the black box of community supervision. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 47, 248-270.
- Bonta, J., Rugge, T., Sedo, B. & Coles, R. (2004). *Case management in Manitoba probation* (User Report 2004-01). Ottawa: Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada.
- Bourgon, G., Bonta, J., Rugge, T., Scott, T., & Yessine, A. K. (2010). The role of program design, implementation, and evaluation in evidence-based “real world” community supervision. *Federal Probation*, 74(1), 2-15.
- Burnett, R., & McNeill, F. (2005). The place of the officer-offender relationship in assisting offenders to desist from crime. *Probation Journal*, 52(3), 221-242.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power and analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Connors, G. J., Carroll, K. M., DiClemente, C. C., Longabaugh, R., & Donovan, D. M. (1997).



- The therapeutic alliance and its relationship to alcoholism treatment participation and outcome. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 65, 588-598.
- Cullen, F. T., Eck, J. E., & Lowenkamp, C. (2002). Environmental corrections: A new paradigm of effective probation and parole supervision. *Federal Probation*, 66, 28-37.
- Cullen, F. T., & Gendreau, P. (2000). Assessing correctional rehabilitation: Policy, practice, and prospects. In Horney, J. (Ed.), *NIJ criminal justice 2000: Volume 3 – changes in decision making and discretion in the criminal justice system*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.
- Cullen, F. T., & Gilbert, K. E. (1982). *Reaffirming rehabilitation*. Cincinnati: Anderson Publishing Company.
- Dowden, C., & Andrews, D. A. (2004). The importance of staff practice in delivering effective correctional treatment: A meta-analytic review of core correctional practice. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 48(2), 203-214.
- Gendreau, P. (1996). The principles of effective intervention with offenders. In Harland A. (Ed.), *Choosing correctional options that work: Defining the demand and evaluating the supply*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gendreau, P., Andrews, D. A., & Theriault, Y. (2010). *Correctional Program Assessment Inventory – 2010 (CPAI-2100)*. Saint John, Canada: University of New Brunswick.
- Kennealy, P. J., Skeem, J. L., Manchak, S. M., Eno Loudon, J. (2012). Firm, fair, and caring officer relationships protect against supervision failure. *Law and Human Behavior*. Advance online publication. doi: 10.1037/h0093935
- Klockars, C. (1972). A theory of probation supervision. *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science*, 64(4), 549-557.
- Lowenkamp, C. T. (2004). *Correctional program integrity and treatment effectiveness: A Multi-site program level analysis* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Cincinnati). Retrieved from <http://cech.uc.edu/criminaljustice/dissertations.html>
- Lowenkamp, C. T., & Latessa, E. J. (2004). Understanding the risk principle: How and why correctional interventions can harm low-risk offenders [Technical report]. *Topics in community corrections, 2004* (pp. 3-8). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections.
- Lowenkamp, C. T., Latessa, E. J., & Holsinger, A. M. (2006). The risk principle in action: What have we learned from 13, 676 offenders and 97 correctional programs? *Crime and Delinquency*, 52(1), 77-93.
- Lowenkamp, C. T., Latessa, E. J., & Smith, P. (2006). Does correctional program quality really

- matter? The impact of adhering to the principles of effective intervention. *Criminology and Public Policy*, 5(3), 575-594.
- Martinson, R. (1974). What works? Questions and answers about prison reform. *Public Interest*, 35, 22-54.
- Matthews, B., Hubbard, D. J., & Latessa, E. J. (2001). Making the next step: Using evaluability assessment to improve correctional programming. *The Prison Journal*, 18(4), 454-472.
- McCabe, R., & Priebe, S. (2004). The therapeutic relationship in the treatment of severe mental illness: A review of methods and findings. *International Journal of Social Psychiatry*, 50, 115-128.
- Miller, W. R., & Rollnick, S. (2002). *Motivational interviewing: Preparing people for change* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Paparozzi, M. A., & Gendreau, P. (2005). An intensive supervision program that worked: Service delivery, professional orientation, and organizational supportiveness. *The Prison Journal*, 85(4), 445-466.
- Raynor, P. (2004). The probation service “pathfinders”: Finding the path and losing the way? *Criminal Justice*, 4, 309-325.
- Raynor, P. (2008). Community penalties and home office research: On the way back to “nothing works”? *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, 8, 73-87.
- Robinson, C. R., Vanbenschoten, S., Alexander, M., & Lowenkamp, C. T. (2011). *A random (almost) study of staff training aimed at reducing re-arrest (STARR): Reducing recidivism through intentional design*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Ross, E. C., Polaschek, D., & Ward, T. (2008). The therapeutic alliance: A theoretical revision for offender rehabilitation. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 13, 462-480.
- Skeem, J. L., Eno Loudon, J., Polaschek, D., & Camp, J. (2007). Assessing relationship quality in mandated community treatment: Blending care with control. *Psychological Assessment*, 19(4), 397-410.
- Skeem, J. L., & Manchak, S. (2008). Back to the future: From Klockars’ model of effective supervision to evidence-based practice in probation. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 47(3), 220-247.
- Smith, P., Gendreau, P., & Swartz, K. (2009). Validating the principles of effective intervention: A systematic review of the contributions of meta-analysis in the field of corrections. *Victims and Offenders*, 4, 148-169.
- Smith, P. & Schweitzer, M. (2012). The therapeutic prison. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal*

*Justice*, 28(1), 7-22.

Smith, P., Schweitzer, M., Labrecque, R. M., & Latessa, E. J. (2012). Improving probation officers' supervision skills: An evaluation of the EPICS model. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, 35(2), 189-199.

Solomon, A. L., Kachnowski, V., Bhati, A. (2005). *Does parole work? Analyzing the impact of postprison supervision on rearrest outcomes*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute Justice Policy Center.

Spiegler, M. D., & Guevremont, D. C. (2003). *Contemporary behavior therapy* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Taxman, F. S. (2002). Supervision – exploring the dimensions of effectiveness. *Federal Probation*, 66(2), 14-27.

Taxman, F. S., Shepardson, E., & Byrne, J. (2004). Tools of the trade: A guide to incorporating science into practice. National Institute of Corrections, Maryland Division of Probation and Parole.

Trotter, C. (1996). The impact of different supervision practices in community corrections: Cause for optimism. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 29, 1-18.

Trotter, C. (2006). *Working with involuntary clients: A guide to practice* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

**Appendix A**

**EPICS Officer Rating Form**

**DEVELOPING RELATIONSHIP**

**1. Does the PO use feedback (e.g. giving information intended to build relationship)?**

<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>
There was no opportunity to use this skill.	Had the opportunity to use this skill, but didn't.	Used the skill, but not well (missed major steps).	Proficient use of this skill (consistent and used major steps).

**2. Does the PO use open-ended questions?**

Yes                  No

**3. Does the PO use summary statements of the content of conversation?**

<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>
There was no opportunity to use this skill.	Had the opportunity to use this skill, but didn't.	Used the skill, but not well (missed major steps).	Proficient use of this skill (consistent and used major steps).

**4. Does the PO use summary statements of the emotion of the offender?**

<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>
There was no opportunity to use this skill.	Had the opportunity to use this skill, but didn't.	Used the skill, but not well (missed major steps).	Proficient use of this skill (consistent and used major steps).

**CONTENT OF THE SESSION**

**5. Were criminogenic needs targeted?**

<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>
There was no opportunity to use this skill.	Had the opportunity to use this skill, but didn't.	Used the skill, but not well (missed major steps).	Proficient use of this skill (consistent and used major steps).

**6. \_\_\_\_\_ If so, how much time (in minutes)?**

7. \_\_\_\_\_ **How many topics of criminogenic needs were targeted (total checkmarks)?**

- \_\_\_\_\_ Criminal Personality
- \_\_\_\_\_ Procriminal Attitudes
- \_\_\_\_\_ Procriminal Associates
- \_\_\_\_\_ Family/Marital
- \_\_\_\_\_ Employment/School
- \_\_\_\_\_ Leisure/Recreation
- \_\_\_\_\_ Substance Abuse

8. \_\_\_\_\_ **How many topics of non-criminogenic needs were targeted?**

9. \_\_\_\_\_ **How much time (in minutes) was spent on compliance even if it is NOT a criminogenic need?**

### **EFFECTIVE REINFORCEMENT**

**10. Does the PO reinforce, using verbal praise, the offender's pro-social behavior, or comments?**

<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>
There was no opportunity to use this skill.	Had the opportunity to use this skill, but didn't.	Used the skill, but not well (missed major steps).	Proficient use of this skill (consistent and used major steps).

**11. Does PO have offender explore short and long term benefits of continuing pro-social behavior?**

<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>
There was no opportunity to use this skill.	Had the opportunity to use this skill, but didn't.	Used the skill, but not well (missed major steps).	Proficient use of this skill (consistent and used major steps).

**12. Were there instances of the PO reinforcing anti-social behavior or comments?**

Yes                  No

**13. If yes, how prevalent was the reinforcement of anti-social behavior or comments?**

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>
Briefly mentioned, but little to no effect. PO seemed unaware.	Discussed behaviors, PO seemed aware, but corrected the action.	Dwelled on behaviors, actions were never corrected.

**14. Did reinforcement of anti-social behavior outweigh reinforcement for pro-social behavior?**

- |   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <b>1</b><br>Not really, the tone of the session was still pro-social. | <b>2</b><br>The tone of the session was neutral between pro/anti-social behaviors. | <b>3</b><br>Anti-social reinforcement outweighed any progress towards pro-social behavior. |
|---|--|--|

**EFFECTIVE DISAPPROVAL**

**15. Does PO disapprove of anti-social behavior or comments?**

- |   |  |  |   |
|---|--|--|---|
| <b>0</b><br>There was no opportunity to use this skill. | <b>1</b><br>Had the opportunity to use this skill, but didn't. | <b>2</b><br>Used the skill, but not well (missed major steps). | <b>3</b><br>Proficient use of this skill (consistent and used major steps). |
|---|--|--|---|

**16. Does PO have offender explore short and long term consequences of continuing anti-social behavior?**

- |   |  |  |   |
|---|--|--|---|
| <b>0</b><br>There was no opportunity to use this skill. | <b>1</b><br>Had the opportunity to use this skill, but didn't. | <b>2</b><br>Used the skill, but not well (missed major steps). | <b>3</b><br>Proficient use of this skill (consistent and used major steps). |
|---|--|--|---|

**EFFECTIVE USE OF AUTHORITY**

**17. Does PO focus on behavior?**

- |   |  |  |   |
|---|--|--|---|
| <b>0</b><br>There was no opportunity to use this skill. | <b>1</b><br>Had the opportunity to use this skill, but didn't. | <b>2</b><br>Used the skill, but not well (missed major steps). | <b>3</b><br>Proficient use of this skill (consistent and used major steps). |
|---|--|--|---|

**18. Does PO keep a calm voice?**

Yes                  No

**19. Does PO specify choices and attendant consequences?**

<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>
There was no opportunity to use this skill.	Had the opportunity to use this skill, but didn't.	Used the skill, but not well (missed major steps).	Proficient use of this skill (consistent and used major steps).

**20. Does PO encourage/praise compliance?**

<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>
There was no opportunity to use this skill.	Had the opportunity to use this skill, but didn't.	Used the skill, but not well (missed major steps).	Proficient use of this skill (consistent and used major steps).

**PROBLEM SOLVING SKILLS**

**21. Does PO teach problem solving?**

<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>
There was no opportunity to use this skill.	Had the opportunity to use this skill, but didn't.	Used the skill, but not well (missed major steps).	Proficient use of this skill (consistent and used major steps).

**22. Which steps of problem solving did the PO teach?**

**1. Stop and think and identify the problem**

Yes No

**2. Clarify goals**

Yes No

**3. Generate alternative solutions**

Yes No

**4. Evaluate alternatives (short-term and long-term consequences)**

Yes No

**5. Implement the plan**

Yes No

**6. Evaluate the plan**

Yes No

**23. Does PO role play problem solving skills?**

<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>
There was no opportunity to use this skill.	Had the opportunity to use this skill, but didn't.	Used the skill, but not well (missed major steps).	Proficient use of this skill (consistent and used major steps).

**COGNITIVE RESTRUCTURING**

**24. Was the ABC model taught?**

<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>
There was no opportunity to use this skill.	Had the opportunity to use this skill, but didn't.	Used the skill, but not well (missed major steps).	Proficient use of this skill (consistent and used major steps).

**25. Did PO have offender identify high-risk attitudes, thoughts, and/or behavior?**

<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>
There was no opportunity to use this skill.	Had the opportunity to use this skill, but didn't.	Used the skill, but not well (missed major steps).	Proficient use of this skill (consistent and used major steps).

**26. Did PO help offender develop counters?**

<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>
There was no opportunity to use this skill.	Had the opportunity to use this skill, but didn't.	Used the skill, but not well (missed major steps).	Proficient use of this skill (consistent and used major steps).

**27. Did PO assign homework on cognitive restructuring OR problem solving?**

Yes                  No

**28. Did PO role play cognitive restructuring?**

<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>
There was no opportunity to use this skill.	Had the opportunity to use this skill, but didn't.	Used the skill, but not well (missed major steps).	Proficient use of this skill (consistent and used major steps).



**REFERRAL TO OUTSIDE AGENCIES**

**29. Are any referrals made by the PO to services that target criminogenic needs?**

Yes            No

**SESSION STRUCTURE**

**30. Did the PO “check in” with the probationer?**

Yes            No

**If yes, how much time (in minutes)?** \_\_\_\_\_

**31. Did the PO review homework or something from a previous session?**

Yes            No

**If yes, how much time (in minutes)?** \_\_\_\_\_

**32. Did the PO use intervention skills with the probationer?**

Yes            No

**If yes, how much time (in minutes)?** \_\_\_\_\_

**33. Did the PO assign any homework?**

Yes            No

**If yes, how much time (in minutes)?** \_\_\_\_\_

## Appendix B

### PO Questionnaire

#### Instructions

On the following pages there are sentences that describe some of the different ways a person might think or feel about his or her probation/parole officer (PO).

Below each statement inside there is a seven-point scale:

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Never</b>	<b>Rarely</b>	<b>Occasionally</b>	<b>Sometimes</b>	<b>Often</b>	<b>Very Often</b>	<b>Always</b>

If a statement describes the way you **always** think or feel, fill in the circle below the **always** column.

Never	Rarely	Occasionally	Sometimes	Often	Very Often	Always
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

If it **never** applies to you, fill in the circle below the **never** column.

Never	Rarely	Occasionally	Sometimes	Often	Very Often	Always
<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Use the numbers in between to describe the variations between these extremes.

This questionnaire is **CONFIDENTIAL**; neither your PO nor the agency will see your answers.

**Please answer honestly.**

Work fast, your impressions are the ones we would like to see.  
(PLEASE DON'T FORGET TO RESPOND TO **EVERY** ITEM.)

Thank you for your help!

1. My PO cares about me as a person.

Never  Rarely  Occasionally  Sometimes  Often  Very Often  Always

---

2. My PO is firm with me.

Never  Rarely  Occasionally  Sometimes  Often  Very Often  Always

---

3. My PO doesn't explain what I am supposed to do on probation or why it would be good to do.

Never  Rarely  Occasionally  Sometimes  Often  Very Often  Always

---

4. My PO doesn't try very hard to do the right thing by me.

Never  Rarely  Occasionally  Sometimes  Often  Very Often  Always

---

5. When I have trouble doing what I am supposed to do, my PO talks with me and listens to what I have to say.

Never  Rarely  Occasionally  Sometimes  Often  Very Often  Always

---

6. If I break the rules, my PO calmly explains what he/she has to do, and why.

Never  Rarely  Occasionally  Sometimes  Often  Very Often  Always

---

7. My PO is enthusiastic and optimistic with me.

Never  Rarely  Occasionally  Sometimes  Often  Very Often  Always

---

8. I feel safe enough to be completely open and honest with my PO.

Never  Rarely  Occasionally  Sometimes  Often  Very Often  Always

---

9. When I'm not doing what I'm supposed to, my PO warns me and takes me to task.

Never  Rarely  Occasionally  Sometimes  Often  Very Often  Always

---

10. My PO encourages me to work together with him/her.

Never  Rarely  Occasionally  Sometimes  Often  Very Often  Always

---

11. My PO doesn't trust me to be honest with him/her.

Never      Rarely      Occasionally      Sometimes      Often      Very Often      Always  
                                   

---

12. My PO really considers my situation when deciding what I'm supposed to do on probation/parole.

Never      Rarely      Occasionally      Sometimes      Often      Very Often      Always  
                                   

---

13. My PO doesn't seem devoted to helping me overcome my problems.

Never      Rarely      Occasionally      Sometimes      Often      Very Often      Always  
                                   

---

14. My PO scolds me and tells me off when I've done something wrong.

Never      Rarely      Occasionally      Sometimes      Often      Very Often      Always  
                                   

---

15. My PO isn't very interested in how I feel about the things I have to do on probation/parole.

Never      Rarely      Occasionally      Sometimes      Often      Very Often      Always  
                                   

---

16. My PO is warm and friendly with me.

Never      Rarely      Occasionally      Sometimes      Often      Very Often      Always  
                                   

---

17. My PO doesn't treat me very fairly.

Never      Rarely      Occasionally      Sometimes      Often      Very Often      Always  
                                   

---

18. My PO's very honest with me and clear about the things I have to do.

Never      Rarely      Occasionally      Sometimes      Often      Very Often      Always  
                                   

---

19. When I break the rules, my PO disapproves in a neutral way that is not angry at all.

Never      Rarely      Occasionally      Sometimes      Often      Very Often      Always  
                                   

---

20. My PO doesn't care much about my concerns.

Never  Rarely  Occasionally  Sometimes  Often  Very Often  Always

---

21. My PO doesn't praise me for the good things I do.

Never  Rarely  Occasionally  Sometimes  Often  Very Often  Always

---

22. If I'm going in a bad direction, my PO will talk with me before doing anything drastic.

Never  Rarely  Occasionally  Sometimes  Often  Very Often  Always

---

23. I know that my PO genuinely wants to help me.

Never  Rarely  Occasionally  Sometimes  Often  Very Often  Always

---

24. My PO doesn't consider my views.

Never  Rarely  Occasionally  Sometimes  Often  Very Often  Always

---

25. I worry that my PO will report any problems I have on probation/parole to the judge.

Never  Rarely  Occasionally  Sometimes  Often  Very Often  Always

---

26. I keep some important things to myself and don't tell my PO.

Never  Rarely  Occasionally  Sometimes  Often  Very Often  Always

---

27. My PO doesn't give me enough of a chance to say whether I want to do certain things I'm supposed to.

Never  Rarely  Occasionally  Sometimes  Often  Very Often  Always

---

28. My PO makes tough demands of me.

Never  Rarely  Occasionally  Sometimes  Often  Very Often  Always

---

29. My PO expects me to do things independently, and doesn't provide enough help.

Never  Rarely  Occasionally  Sometimes  Often  Very Often  Always

---

30. My PO knows that he/she can trust me.

Never  Rarely  Occasionally  Sometimes  Often  Very Often  Always

---

31. My PO is someone that I trust.

Never  Rarely  Occasionally  Sometimes  Often  Very Often  Always

---

32. My PO doesn't take enough time to really understand me.

Never  Rarely  Occasionally  Sometimes  Often  Very Often  Always

---

33. My PO doesn't try hard to take my needs into account.

Never  Rarely  Occasionally  Sometimes  Often  Very Often  Always

---

34. My PO shows me respect in absolutely all his/her dealings with me.

Never  Rarely  Occasionally  Sometimes  Often  Very Often  Always

---

35. I am willing to work hard together with my PO.

Never  Rarely  Occasionally  Sometimes  Often  Very Often  Always

---

## Appendix C

### Criminal Sentiment Scale-Modified (CCS-M)

Developed by David J. Simourd, Ph.D. (1997)

Copyrighted

**Directions:** For each question, please check only one box: Agree (A), Uncertain (U) or Disagree (D). Answer all questions. If you do not understand a question, please ask the staff person who gave you this questionnaire.

**A = Agree    U = Uncertain    D = Disagree**

		A	U	D
1	Pretty well all laws deserve our respect			
2	It's our duty to obey all laws.			
3	Laws are usually bad.			
4	The law is rotten to the core.			
5	You cannot respect the law because it's there only to help a small and selfish group of people.			
6	All laws should be obeyed just because they are laws.			
7	The law does not help the average person.			
8	The law is good.			
9	Law and justice are the same thing.			
10	The law makes slaves out of most people for a few people on the top.			
11	Almost any jury can be fixed.			
12	You cannot get justice in court.			
13	Lawyers are honest.			
14	Prosecutors often produce fake witnesses.			
15	Judges are honest and kind.			
16	Court decisions are pretty well always fair.			
17	Pretty well anything can be fixed in court if you have enough money.			
18	A judge is a good person.			
19	The police are honest.			
20	A cop is a friend to people in need.			

		A	U	D
21	Life would be better with fewer cops.			
22	The police should be paid more for their work.			
23	The police are as crooked as the people they arrest.			
24	Society would be better off if there were more police.			
25	The police almost never help people.			
26	Sometimes a person like me has to break the law to get ahead in life.			
27	Most successful people broke the law to get ahead in life.			
28	You should always obey the law, even if it keeps you from getting ahead in life.			
29	Its OK to break the law as long as you don't get caught.			
30	Most people would commit crimes if they know they wouldn't get caught.			
31	There is never a good reason to break the law.			
32	A hungry man has the right to steal.			
33	It's OK to get around the law as long as you don't actually break it.			
34	You should only obey those laws that are reasonable.			
35	You're crazy to work for a living if there's an easier way, even if it means breaking the law.			
36	People who have broken the law have the same sorts of ideas about life as me.			
37	I prefer to be with people who obey the law rather than people who break the law			
38	I'm more like a professional criminal than the people who break the law now and then.			
39	People who have been in trouble with the law are more like me than people who don't have trouble with the law.			
40	I have very little in common with people who never break the law.			
41	No one who breaks the law can be my friend.			