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Purpose of the Session

Identify emerging performance challenges for community corrections policy and programming, based on Maine’s correctional program evaluation experience
Why Evaluate?

- Research demonstrates that programs that meet the principles of effective intervention have better outcomes.
- Periodic evaluation of correctional programs is necessary to ensure and strengthen adherence to those principles.
- Without routine evaluation, jurisdictions risk supporting programs that produce null or adverse effects.
Correctional Program Assessment Inventory 2000 (CPAI-2000)

- Developed by Andrews & Gendreau
- Validated instrument based on over 30 years of correctional research
- Administered in juvenile and adult offender programs across the U.S., Australia, New Zealand, and Canada
- Results provide an overview of program strengths and opportunities for improvement
Maine’s Partnership Approach

- The Muskie School of Public Service (MSPS) at the University of Southern Maine and the Maine Department of Corrections began a state-university partnership in 1995.
- Partnership includes a cooperative agreement to analyze recidivism rates, conduct program evaluation, and provide workforce and organizational development.
The CPAI 2000

Brief review of the relevant literature on the instrument and overview of the tool
CPAI Scores & Recidivism

- Lowencamp & Latessa (2005) n=38 CPAI scores correlated with reincarceration in adult residential facilities

- Holsinger (1999) n=28 CPAI scores correlated with any court contact, felony or misdemeanor, felony, personal offense, and commitment to a secure facility in juvenile community correctional facilities
CPAI Scoring Norms

  n= 135 CPAI assessed programs
  35% unsatisfactory, 55% satisfactory or satisfactory but needs improvement, 10% received score of very satisfactory

- Holsinger & Latessa (1999)
  n= 51 CPAI assessed programs
  60% satisfactory but needs improvement or unsatisfactory, 12% very satisfactory

- Gendreau & Goggin (2000)
  n=101 CPAI programs assessed
  10% satisfactory

- Matthews, Hubbard, & Latessa (2001)
  n=86 CPAI assessed programs
  54% satisfactory or satisfactory but needs improvement; 10% very satisfactory
The CPAI-2000

- New version of the tool
- Reflects stronger psychometric properties based on research done on prior version
- Scoring categories and items have changed
- Addition of a 33-item Core Correctional Practices section that can only be scored by observation (techniques staff are using)
- No published works on newer version of the tool
### CPAI-2000 Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Program Demographics (13 un-scored items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Organizational Culture (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>Program Implementation /Maintenance (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Management/Staff Characteristics (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>Client Risk and Need Practices (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td>Program Characteristics (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td>Core Correctional Practice (45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.</td>
<td>Inter-Agency Communication (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>Evaluation (8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Treatment Subtotal is 34 points (Section E and F combined)**

**131 available points**
CPAI Process and Scoring Categories

- **Data Collection Includes**
  - Structured Interviews
  - Documentation Review
  - Observation

- **CPAI Process Results:**
  - Quantitative Scores
  - Qualitative Indicators/Findings
  - Final Report/Recommendations

---

3 Scoring Categories:

- **Very Satisfactory**
  - (70+)

- **Satisfactory**
  - (50-69)

- **Unsatisfactory**
  - (below 50)
Maine’s CPAI Findings

Correctional Program Assessment Inventory-2000:
Results for 30 Maine based programs between 2006-2010
CPAIs by Program Characteristics

- **Juvenile Community**: 73% (N=22)
- **Juvenile Facility**: 73% (N=22)
- **External Treatment**: 67% (N=20)
- **Non Sexual Behavior Treatment, Juvenile**: 55% (N=12)
- **Sexual Behavior Treatment, Adult**: 27% (N=8)
- **Facility Internal**: 33% (N=10)
Total Score

Facility programs scored higher than community programs.

Internal programs scored higher than external programs.

Minimum 36%
Maximum 85%
Mean 59.63%
Treatment Sub-Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Count (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfactory</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum: 24%
Maximum: 88%
Mean: 54.20%

Facility programs scored higher than community programs.
Internal programs scored higher than external programs.
Organizational Culture

- 27% (N=8) Satisfactory
- 73% (N=22) Very Satisfactory

Minimum: 50%
Maximum: 100%
Mean: 75.30%
Program Implementation & Management

Facility programs scored higher than community programs.

Internal programs scored higher than external programs.

Minimum 40%
Maximum 100%
Mean 65.20%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfactory</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Management/Staff Characteristics

- **Unsatisfactory** (N=4): 13%
- **Satisfactory** (N=11): 37%
- **Very satisfactory** (N=15): 50%

Minimum: 35%
Maximum: 91%
Mean: 65.30%

Facility programs scored higher than community programs.
Client Risk & Need Practices

- Unsatisfactory (N=13): 43%
- Satisfactory (N=12): 40%
- Very satisfactory (N=5): 17%

Minimum: 8%
Maximum: 83%
Mean: 48.87%

Facility programs scored higher than community programs.

Internal programs scored higher than external programs.
Program Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>(N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfactory</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum 25%
Maximum 91%
Mean 57.30%

Facility programs scored higher than community programs.

Internal programs scored higher than external programs.
Core Correctional Practices

Minimum 29%
Maximum 89%
Mean 60.23%

Facility programs scored higher than community programs.
Internal programs scored higher than external programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Very satisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33% (N=10)</td>
<td>40% (N=12)</td>
<td>27% (N=8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interagency Communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Very satisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23% (N=7)</td>
<td>30% (N=9)</td>
<td>47% (N=14)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum 14%
Maximum 100%
Mean 64.23%

Juvenile programs scored higher than adult programs.

Internal programs scored higher than external programs.
Evaluation

- Minimum: 0%
- Maximum: 100%
- Mean: 35.90%

Juvenile programs scored higher than adult programs.

- Unsatisfactory: 70% (N=21)
- Satisfactory: 23% (N=7)
- Very satisfactory: 7% (N=2)
A sample of findings from an OJJDP funded grant to build the capacity of 6 residential programs serving youth who exhibit problem sexual behaviors.
CPAIs of SBT Programs Pre and Post

Average CPAI Pre and Post Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>Re-evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment Sub Score</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implications

Emerging performance challenges for corrections and need for future research
Emerging Performance Challenges

To improve program integrity, corrections program and policies must emphasize and support the following 3 areas:

1. Client risk/needs
   - Risk, need and responsivity assessment and matching
   - Rural settings make responsivity matching challenging

2. Treatment strategy aligned
   - Cognitive behavioral interventions

3. Core correctional practices
   - Coach staff beyond training to ensure consistent application of techniques with clients
Future Research

   - Little empirical research has been conducted on the scores of the CPAI-2000.
2. In Maine, link program integrity to program outcome.
   - Conduct a statewide study that links CPAI scores with recidivism rates.
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