# NIC / CJI Implementing Effective Correctional Management of Offenders in the Community Outcome and Process Measure Development
## October 19, 2004

## Evidence Based Practices: Outcome Measures

| Outcome Measure | Components | Definition | Tool / Data Source | Description | Frequency | Who collects data |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Recidivism** *(Required)* | Arrest | Any ticket, summons, or arrest for any new violation of a criminal municipal, state, or federal misdemeanor or felony crime (those coded within statute as criminal offenses). | NCIC Criminal History or appropriate management information system. | **Required**<br>• Use a random, representative sample.<br>• Any identifiable issues relative to sample attrition should be made explicit in data reporting.<br>• Include recidivism while on supervision and post supervision (2 years). Control for length of supervision.<br>• Gather baseline retrospectively (i.e., intakes 5-6 years prior to 2003). Include the following:<br>  ○ Average time on supervision<br>  ○ Average time post-supervision<br>  ○ Arrests during supervision<br>  ○ Arrests during post-supervision period<br>  ○ Arrest Date<br>  ○ Offense Type<br>  ○ Risk Level<br>  ○ Run proxy risk using current age, age at first arrest, and number or prior arrests.<br><br>**Recommended**<br>• Analyze arrest data considering time between arrests.<br>• Analyze arrest data considering seriousness of crimes. | Required: Annually<br><br>Recommended: Every six months | Appropriate State Agency or SAC |

## Evidence Based Practices: Outcome Measures

| Outcome Measure | Components | Definition | Tool / Data Source | Description | Frequency | Who collects data |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Conviction | Conviction for any municipal, state, federal misdemeanor or felony criminal violation (those coded within statute as criminal offenses). | NCIC Criminal History or appropriate management information system. | | Recommended: Annually | Appropriate State Agency or SAC |
| | Revocations | Official action to revoke supervision / release, based on official evidence of prosecutable behavior (those coded within statute as criminal offenses). | Appropriate management information system. | **Recommended**<br>■ Sort revocations by precipitating event (criminal and non-criminal violations).<br>■ Sort revocations by resulting consequence (incarceration/jail, incarceration/prison, and increased supervision intensity/duration without incarceration). | Recommended: Annually | Appropriate State Agency or SAC |

**Recommended**

**Recidivism (continued)**

## Evidence Based Practices:  System Process Measures

| System Process Measure | Components | Definition | Tool / Data Source | Description | Frequency | Who collects data |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Risk** — Required | Risk Level | Obtain sound actuarial risk information | ▪ Third-generation risk assessment tool (i.e., LSI-R, COMPAS). ▪ Appropriate management information system. | **Required:** ▪ Collect risk level data on entire representative sample. ▪ Include the overall risk score. ▪ Include criminogenic profile. **Recommended:** ▪ Include total protective score. | Required: Annually  Recommended: Every six months | On-site data collection |
| **Proxy Risk** — Required | Age at First Arrest | Age at first arrest. | Self-report at intake and / or appropriate management information system. | **Required:** ▪ Use a random, representative sample ● Self-report is critical as it allows for inclusion of juvenile arrests, which may not be accessible through management information system. ● Allows for comparison of risk scores across sites ● Can be used as an initial screening / triage tool prior to full assessment ● Highlights areas of operator error in the application of assessment tools | Required: Annually | On-site data collection (Intake Personnel) |
| | Current Age | Current age at intake. | Self-report at intake and / or appropriate management information system. | | | |
| | Number of Prior Arrests | Number of prior arrests. | Self-report at intake and / or appropriate management information system. | | | |
| **Supervision Length** — Required | Length of Supervision | Average length of supervision | Appropriate management information system. | **Required:** ▪ Use a random, representative sample ▪ Identify average length of supervision for all cohort offenders. **Recommended** ▪ Identify average length of supervision for all offenders. | Required: Annually | On-site data collection |

## Evidence Based Practices: System Process Measures

| System Process Measure | Components | Definition | Tool / Data Source | Description | Frequency | Who collects data |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Dosage** / **Required** | % referred | % of offenders referred to treatment | ■ Electronic: Appropriate management information system. ■ Paper: 5-part NCR form initiated at intake through PO & treatment provider. | **Required:** <br>■ Use a random, representative sample <br>● Most MIS systems have not yet incorporated adequate accounting of dose into their data systems. Data may be collected through the use of the NCR form as indicated, hand review of case files, and / or treatment attendance sheet records. <br>● Each referral is treated as a separate episode. <br>● % referred to treatment may be further broken-down by treatment type, depending on data availability. <br>● % adhered may be further broken-down by % compliance, i.e., Did s/he arrive and depart on time? Did s/he attend all sessions? | Required: Every six months <br><br> Recommended: Quarterly | On-site data collection |
| | % received | % of offenders that received / started treatment | ■ Electronic: Appropriate management information system. ■ Paper: 5-part NCR form initiated at intake through PO & treatment provider. | | | |
| | % adhered | For those offenders who completed treatment, % of assigned sessions attended | ■ Electronic: Appropriate management information system. ■ Paper: 5-part NCR form initiated at intake through PO & treatment provider. | | | |
| | % completed | % of offenders that completed the assigned dose of treatment | ■ Electronic: Appropriate management information system. ■ Paper: 5-part NCR form initiated at intake through PO & treatment provider. | | | |

## Evidence Based Practices: System Process Measures

| System Process Measure | Components | Definition | Tool / Data Source | Description | Frequency | Who collects data |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Dosage (continued)** — Required | Shear Dose Hours (SDh) | Identified through the following formula: *feasible shear treatment dose - % of non adherence = shear dose hours (SDh)*. | ▪ Electronic: Appropriate management information system. ▪ Paper: 5-part NCR form initiated at intake through PO & treatment provider. | ▪ Identification of feasible shear treatment dose requires the following data points: frequency (i.e., daily, weekly), intensity (i.e., session length: 1 hour, 3 hours), and duration of treatment (i.e., 3 months, 6 months). ▪ Identifying SDh allows for analysis using a Person's Correlation between risk level score and SDh to determine system fidelity to the Risk principle. | Required: Every six months<br><br>Recommended: Quarterly | On-site data collection |
| **Revocation & Violation** — Required | Revocation | Official action to revoke release, resulting in incarceration. | Appropriate management information system. | ▪ Use a random, representative sample • Sort by criminal and non criminal violations. • Sort incarcerations by jail and prison. • Include analysis of applied incarceration time sorted by jail and prison. | Required: Annually | On-site data collection |
| | Violations | Official action to impose a sanction in response to a violation of supervision conditions. | Appropriate management information system. | • Use a random, representative sample • Sort by precipitating event (criminal and non-criminal violations). • Sort by resulting consequence (incarceration/jail, incarceration/prison, and increased supervision intensity or duration without incarceration). • Do violations result in the application of a prescribed set of intermediate sanctions? • Is there a pattern of matching sanctions to violations or are sanctions applied randomly? • Is there a change in the seriousness of the violations? • Does the length of time in between violations change? | | |

## Evidence Based Practices: Program Measures

| Program Measure | Components | Definition | Tool / Data Source | Description | Frequency | Who collects data |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Program Effectiveness** — Required | Internal & External Program Data | Internal & External Program Information | Program management | ▪ Name of program ▪ Number of years the program has been in operation | Required: Annually | On-site data collection |
| | | Service Capacity | Program management | ▪ FTE to offender ratio ▪ Average daily attendance of offenders (residential vs. non-residential) ▪ Average length of staff service ▪ Average education level of staff ▪ Staff turnover rate | Required: Annually | On-site data collection |
| | | Curriculum Information | Program management | ▪ Does the program use a validated curriculum that specifies, in sequence, what information is delivered? Describe. ▪ Has the program been evaluated as successful in reducing recidivism for the population it serves? Describe the type of evaluation and the results. | Required: Annually | On-site data collection |
| **Program Effectiveness** — Recommended | Program Integrity | Degree to which a program meets the principles of effective intervention. | Correctional Program Assessment Inventory (CPAI)* or other validated program assessment tool. *Developed and copyrighted by Paul Gendreau & Don Andrews* | CPAI examines the following six areas: 1. Program Implementation & Leadership 2. Offender Assessment 3. Program Characteristics 4. Staff Characteristics 5. Evaluation 6. Other | Recommended: Annually | State assessment team or contracted team. |
| | Program Quality | Degree to which a program delivers interventions and services in a systematic & consistent manner. | | | | |

## Evidence Based Practices: Individual Performance Measures

| Indiv. Perform. Measure | Components | Definition | Tool / Data Source | Description | Frequency | Who collects data |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Assessment** — Required | Assessment Integrity/ Quality | Inter-coder reliability measures proficiency in motivational interviewing, affect, error rate, interview length of time, etc. | • Video and / or audio tape critique<br>• Review / observation by supervisor or other trained staff | • Complete reviews for all officers who interact with sample population.<br>• Identify officer skill balance and develop ongoing feedback system. Officers are rated on:<br>  o Interrater reliability<br>  o Adequacy of interpersonal skills | Each officer is reviewed annually (quarterly samples, repeated without replacement over the year). | Initial tape reviews completed by JSAT, followed by training of on-site reviewers. |
| **Assessment** — Recommended | Gain Score | Gain score of protective measures as identified on reassessment. | Third generation assessment tool (i.e., LSI-R, COMPAS) | • Use random, representative sample from each caseload.<br>• Protective measures are recommended because they are more dynamic than the overall risk score. | Recommended: Every six months | On-site data collection |
| **Case Plan** — Required | % of active cases with case plan | Does the case file include a detailed case plan? | Case file review and / or appropriate information management system. | • Use random, representative sample from each caseload. | Required: Every six months | On-site data collection |
| **Case Plan** — Required | % of case plans that address criminogenic needs | Does the case plan address the top four criminogenic needs identified in the assessment? | Case file review and / or appropriate information management system. | • Use random, representative sample from each caseload.<br>• Is the case plan congruent with the criminogenic needs identified in the assessment?<br>• Are the criminogenic needs prioritized? | Required: Every six months | On-site data collection |

## Evidence Based Practices:  Individual Performance Measures

| Indiv. Perform. Measure | Components | Definition | Tool / Data Source | Description | Frequency | Who collects data |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Workload** / **Required** | Caseload Size | Average active caseload size per officer. | Appropriate information management system. | • Average active caseload size sorted by type (i.e., specialized).<br>• Define *active caseload.* | Required: Annually<br><br>Recommended: Every six months | On-site data collection |
| | Rate of Contacts | Number of contacts per month. | Appropriate information management system. | • Use random, representative sample from each caseload.<br>• Identify number of contacts.<br>• Identify rate of contacts.<br>• Define contact types, (i.e., face-to-face, home, phone).<br>• NOTE: These are gross preliminary measures.  It is strongly recommended that corrections agencies develop alternative workload measures by work type (i.e., PSI, specialized caseload, etc.) | Required: Annually<br><br>Recommended: Every six months | On-site data collection |
| **Violations** / **Recommended** | Violation rates | How do officers respond to criminal and non-criminal violation? | Appropriate information management system. | • Is there variance in violation rates between officers?  Offices? Regions? | Recommended: Annually | On-site data collection |

## Organizational Development:  System Process Measures

| System Process Measure | Components | Definition | Tool / Data Source | Description | Frequency | Who collects data |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Organizational Climate** (Required) | Organizational Data | Average daily population of offenders on active supervision. | Appropriate information management system. | • Average daily population of offenders on active supervision.<br>  ○ Statewide<br>  ○ Local (county, region, or district) | Annually | On-site data collection |
| | | Total number of FTE by job type. | Human resources information system. | • Total of number of annual FTE sorted by job type / classification.<br>  ○ Statewide<br>  ○ Local (county, region, or district) | Annually | On-site data collection |
| | | Number of reporting levels within the organization. | Human resources information system. | • Number of reporting / hierarchy levels within the organization (for example, director + deputy director + regional manager + supervisor + line-staff = 5) | Annually | On-site data collection |
| | | Average span of control. | Human resources information system. | • Average number of line staff reporting to supervisors. | Annually | On-site data collection |
| | Organizational climate assessment | Satisfaction, communication, & productivity at all appropriate levels (regional, statewide, and central office). | Likert Organizational Climate Survey | • Run survey at each appropriate level, (i.e. regional / circuit, statewide, and central office / oversight agency)<br>• On-line survey completion.<br>• Feedback results to all participants.<br>• Use analysis of gap between ideal and current environment to prioritize areas needing attention. | Baseline, followed by a 6-month reassessment. Thereafter conducted annually. | U of CO has capacity to operate on-line survey and provide basic data analysis |
| | | Goal Attainment Scale | Likert Organizational Climate Survey | • Reduce gap between current & ideal environment scoring by 10% annually for the top three gap areas identified in Likert Survey. | Annually | On-site data collection |

## Organizational Development: System Process Measures

| System Process Measure | Components | Definition | Tool / Data Source | Description | Frequency | Who collects data |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Organizational Climate (continued)** / **Recommended** | Organizational Assessment | Additional organizational assessment as needed and aligned with strategic plan and goals. | • Probation & Parole Strategies Questionnaire (PPQ)<br><br>• Intrinsic Motivation Inventory (IMI)<br><br>• TCU Survey of Organizational Functioning<br><br>• Other tools | • The PPQ was developed by Robert Shearer, PhD at Sam Houston State University and measures orientation typology of officers.<br><br>• The Intrinsic Motivation Inventory (IMI) is a multidimensional measurement device intended to assess participants' subjective experience related to a target activity<br><br>• The TCU/CJ Survey of Org. Functioning is self-administered by correctional program staff and measures motivational factors, program resources, and organizational dynamics. | Annually | On-site data collection |

## Collaboration: System Process Measures

| System Process Measure | Components | Definition | Tool / Data Source | Description | Frequency | Who collects data |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Collaboration** / Required | Collaboration Data | Number of meetings scheduled and % held as scheduled. | Meeting minutes | • Include total number of meetings scheduled for appropriate teams:<br>　o statewide and local policy teams<br>　o statewide work teams / coordinating councils, and<br>　o inter-agency work teams.<br>• Include percentage of meetings held as scheduled. | Annually | On-site data collection |
| | | Level of team member participation. | Meeting minutes and attendance logs | • Include total number of members included on policy teams.<br>• Percentage of meetings attended (percentage sorted by attendance of actual member and proxy members). | Annually | On-site data collection |
| | | Representation Level | Team charter / membership list | • Include a membership list for each team, sorted by agency.<br>• Are partner agencies well represented? | Annually | On-site data collection |
| | | Team Productivity | Action plan | • Were timelines met for each specific action plan item? | Annually | On-site data collection |
| | Collaborative skills | How well do policy teams work together? | Profile of Collaboration: Working Together and / or Team Status Questionnaire | • Measure ability of policy and implementation teams to work well together. | Annually | U of CO has capacity to operate on-line survey and provide basic data analysis |
| | Team skills | How well do implementation teams work together? | Team Status Questionnaire | • Measure their comfort level with the collaborative process.<br>• Measure stakeholder commitment.<br>• Measure leadership commitment. | Every six months | |