October 1, 2004

Dear colleague:

Enclosed you will find the two-day curriculum for training officers on Thinking for a Change concepts that was developed by staff at the Dallas County Community Supervision and Corrections Department. In working with offenders, we have found that many offenders can benefit from brief interventions utilizing Thinking Reports and the Problem Solving process. As such, we developed this curriculum to help officers and other line staff learn how to use these techniques. It is not necessary for either the offender or the staff member to be familiar with the Thinking for a Change program in order to use these techniques. Rather, we have developed this program as a stand-alone process. Much like the Thinking for a Change program, the curriculum focuses on first teaching the concepts, then modeling their use, then allowing participants to practice utilizing the techniques. We believe it is essential that everyone going through this training be given the opportunity to practice using the techniques so that they may receive constructive feedback and improve their ability to use the techniques. It is also important to note that, when done properly, these techniques can be completed in brief interactions (i.e. 20 minutes or less).

We have included a section that calls for the use of a movie clip. Unfortunately, we have not yet received copyright permission for its use, thus are recommending using The Breakfast Club clip, or any other clip for which you have permission to use, instead of the one listed. Once we have received approval we will notify NIC.

We hope you will find this curriculum helpful. We consider this curriculum to be a work in progress, and would welcome any feedback you have.

Sincerely,

Brad Marshall
Charles Robinson
Melissa Cahill

INTRODUCTION

Good morning and welcome to the "What are They Thinking?" officer training. I would like to take time to provide you with some information about what to expect over the next two days. We will spend some time exploring Thinking for a Change, it's components, and how the ideas of Thinking for a Change can be implemented in daily supervision. During this training you will have an opportunity to learn a lot about Thinking for a Change and you will be given an opportunity to demonstrate it's application in the daily supervision of offenders.

Be enthusiastic and grab the attention of the training audience. This will set the tone for the rest of the training.

No explanation needed about the T4C program or daily application. It is just an overview.

This training will likely differ from other trainings you've attended in that it will require a lot of "doing" and "trying out" in front of your peers. This training will require participant interaction.

With those things in mind, let's get started. I would like to start by introducing myself and then having my co-trainers introduce themselves. My name is _____ and my current position is _____. My involvement with cognitive behavioral programming like Thinking for a Change includes _____. Will you introduce yourself _____?

Introductions should be brief, but thorough. Include all cognitive behavioral experience (especially T4C)

Now that you know who we are, tell us a little about you. I would like you to _____.

Make the group introductions fun and exciting. This will get the group comfortable with speaking in front of the class and set the stage for an interactive training. Possible strategies include:

1. Have participants introduce themselves individually (name, position, title, and experience with cognitive programming;
2. Assign each participant a partner. Allow each participant to be introduced by his/her partner;
3. Divide the group into smaller groups and have each group creatively introduce all members of the group.

Now that we have some background information about each other, let's discuss the next two days. We will begin each day at _____ and conclude the training at _____ on each day. Lunch will begin at about 12:00 and will last about an hour each day.

The bathrooms are located _____ and the vending machines are located _____.

In a moment we will begin talking about what you expect over the next two days. First, let's review the training objectives for the next two days. 1. Present and discuss the components of Thinking for a Change. 2. Provide research that supports the cognitive behavioral approach. 3. Explain how Thinking for a Change Techniques can be applied to the daily supervision of offenders. 4. Facilitators will model the application of the presented techniques during a monthly report with an offender. 5. Finally, you will have an opportunity to practice the techniques as they were modeled.	Show slide 3 (training objectives). Present each objective and show how it will be met.
Take a few moments, examine the objectives we've listed and consider what you would like to learn over the next two days. After looking at the list and considering past training experiences, what else are you expecting to learn over next few days? It looks like our list of objectives and expectations is complete. We will revisit this list at the completion of the two days to ensure that all of our goals were met.	Have participants review objectives. If other suitable objectives are identified write them on a flip chart. These objectives should also be reviewed at the end of the training session.
We will discuss the background of cognitive interventions shortly. Before we do that, let's discuss the officer's role in supervision and how a cognitive approach can aid supervision efforts. What role does the probation officer play in offender supervision? 1. Protect Society 2. Provide an atmosphere and opportunity to bring about and support changes in the offender.	Show slide 4 (Officer's Role). Be exciting and enthusiastic. You are giving the audience the reason for being here and the possible benefits of the training.
How do you believe Cognitive approaches will help fulfill these roles? That's exactly right. The use of cognitive approaches provides the offender with an opportunity to change behavior patterns and at the same time helps reduce the risk the offender poses on society. The cognitive approach aims to provide a meaningful opportunity for internal change (vs. external control) and the opportunity to develop pro-social skills and consequential thinking abilities.	Use this question to solicit responses that reflect protecting society vs. providing an opportunity to change. Discussion should identify the equal importance of both. Take time to discuss internal change vs. external control.

There has been a long-time debate over the role of the community supervision officer. One side of the debate has argued that we are here to keep the community safe (security). While the other side has argued that we are here to rehabilitate or to habilitate the criminals that come before us (treatment). Cognitive programs embrace the importance of both the security side of the pyramid and the treatment side of the pyramid. Cognitive programs require offenders to be held accountable for their behavior by abiding by rules, such as the conditions of probation. At the same time, offenders are provided with a meaningful opportunity to change. While understanding that the offender should provided an opportunity to change, cognitive programs embrace the idea that it will ultimately be the offender's choice to change. Think about this for a minute. When it comes down to it, you really can't make somebody do something. While you can make the consequences of their not doing what you want painful or aversive, ultimately, it will be the offender who makes the decision to change.	Show slide 5 (One Voice, One Message). The discussion should illustrate how cognitive programs can deliver both messages.
Before we wrap up this section of the training, let's take a look at some of the principles of cognitive interventions. Let's begin with the first one "self-awareness and self responsibility promote self-change." Studies have shown that when the offender becomes aware of the problem it is more likely that the offender will accept responsibility for the problem and become motivated to make changes. Cognitive interventions have also proven to be effective with the "development of internal control". Studies indicate that the development of internal control can help with long-term behavior change. Another basic truth about cognitive interventions is that they help the offender "manage risk" and aid in "relapse prevention". By helping the offender develop new ways of thinking, we are helping the offender develop tools that can be used to manage risk. In order to facilitate these techniques and other cognitive interventions it is important that we remain objective and non-judgmental. By remaining objective and non-judgmental we increase the chance that the offender will share valuable information with us.	Show slide 6 &7 (Principles of Cognitive Interventions). Discuss each principle and it's importance to the training session.

It is also important to remember that the offender has the power of choice. When the offender recognizes the problem and chooses a solution, it is more likely that the offender will follow through with the action that resolves the problem.

Just as it is important to remain objective, providing the offender with the power of choice and to use authority without coercing the offender, it is equally important to understand that "thinking drives behavior" and that offenders may not see things as quick as we do.

By understanding that thinking drives behavior, we can help the offender develop the internal control that has proven to have a long-term impact on behavior change.

Lastly, as an officer it is important to understand that offenders may not recognize problems or solutions.

Many times, when we see an offender, we recognize the problem and the solution after only a few minutes. To help the offender develop the self-awareness and self-responsibility that will motivate the offender to change, it is important that we recognize the need for the offender to see the problem and solution as well. Thus, we want to use "their eyes" and go at "their speed" so they can develop self-awareness.

Applying these principles will be important over the next two days.

Please keep the things we've discussed in mind over the next two days.

1. The objectives we've outlined. We will review them at the end of the training session.
2. The dual roles we've outlined as part of offender supervision.
3. The principals of cognitive interventions that we've discussed.

Let's get ready to have some fun!

THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS

Display slide 1 (cover- slide)

Now that you have some idea of what to expect over the next two days, let's look at the background on Thinking for a Change and cognitive interventions. Cognitive Behavioral Theory began to catch on in the field of psychology in the 1950's. Essentially, Cognitive Behavioral Theory posits that "thinking controls behavior" and therefore, by changing your thinking you can change your behavior. While this idea has garnered widespread acceptance these days, it was fairly radical and controversial at that time.

Cognitive Behavioral theorists are generally regarded as falling into one of two paradigms or schools of thought. The first school of thought was the cognitive restructuring paradigm and the second was the cognitive skills paradigm. We will talk more in depth about these two schools of thought in a minute, but first I want to give a conceptual overview of Cognitive Behavioral Theory in general.

Display slide 2 (iceberg)

Often times, when discussing Cognitive Behavioral Theory, an analogy comparing people and icebergs is employed. This triangle represents an iceberg and this wavy line represents the water line. As you can see in the illustration, most of the iceberg is beneath the water and can't be seen. We only see the tip of the iceberg, the small portion above the water.

People's actions, the external part of the behavior that people see, are represented by the tip of the iceberg. The tip of the iceberg could be any observable behavior, such as showing up for work on time, doing charity work, lying, stealing, or overeating.

Just as the iceberg is made up of much more than can be seen, the majority of what is gong on with people lies beneath the surface. People have thoughts, feelings, and physical reactions beneath the surface. Underlying our thoughts and feelings are our core attitudes and beliefs, which are connected to our self-worth. In Cognitive Behavioral Theory, it is these cognitive events beneath the surface that are most important, as they drive human behavior.

Let's look at how the iceberg analogy applies to a particular situation. For example, imagine you are in a convenience store when you see an elderly gentleman inadvertently drop his wallet on the floor and begin to exit the store. What might some of your

Example Thoughts: I need to alert the gentleman that he dropped his wallet; I'd better pick up the wallet before someone steals it.

thoughts be in that scenario? What are some feelings you might experience in such a scenario? And finally, what are some of your beliefs that might come into play in that scenario? Beliefs are at the lower level of the iceberg and tend to be more global and generalized than thoughts. Beliefs often express your values, the way you perceive the world, or the way you believe the world *should* or *ought* to be. In fact, belief statements often contain words such as "should" or "ought." Okay, what about the top of the iceberg: behavior. Given the thoughts, feelings and beliefs you listed in the given scenario, what behavior are you likely to engage in? Now what about some of the clients you supervise? How might their behavior differ from your own in such a scenario? Do you think the elderly gentleman is likely to get his wallet returned? It's certainly less likely. But how do we account for the differences in behavior between a probation officer and an offender in that circumstance? Well, cognitive behavioral theory posits that thinking drives behavior and different thinking leads to different behavior. Let's look at the scenario again through an offender's eyes. What might be some thoughts offenders have when they see an elderly man in a convenience store drop a wallet? How about feelings? Might some of the clients you supervise be having particular feelings in such a scenario? And finally, can you think of any particular beliefs that offenders might hold that would come into play in such a scenario? One more point that needs to be made in terms of Cognitive Behavioral theory and the iceberg analogy: Beliefs come in layers. For example, I may hold a belief that speeding is wrong. However, I may have another belief that tells me that there are some situations in which speeding is okay, such as being late to work. I may also have another belief that speeding in school zones is never okay, so even if I am speeding to work, I will not speed in school zones. In other words, my behavior is	Example Feelings: concerned, protective Example Beliefs: You *ought* return things that don't belong to you; People *should* watch out for the elderly; Good deeds beget good deeds. Any prosocial responses ensuring the return of the wallet to the owner. Probably not Example offender thoughts: "I wonder how much money is in that wallet; I bet I could pick up the wallet and be out of here without being detected; It's my lucky day." Example feelings: lucky, opportunistic, sneaky, entitled You have to look out for number one; Finders keepers, losers weepers.

entirely consistent with how I am thinking about that particular situation. Cognitive Behavior Theory tells us that we cannot fully understand people's behavior without understanding their internal cognitive structures: their thoughts, feelings, attitudes, and beliefs. In Thinking for a Change and other cognitive behavioral programs, much effort is focused on helping clients become aware of their thoughts, feelings and beliefs in particular circumstances. That's because, if we know what thoughts, feelings, and beliefs a person is experiencing in a particular circumstance, we are more likely to facilitate a change in behavior. We will talk in more detail about facilitating behavior change later, but does everyone understand the iceberg analogy and the relationship between cognitions and behavior?	Make sure everyone understands the iceberg analogy and how thinking drives behavior
We will now turn our attention to a discussion of two different schools of thought, which both impacted and influenced program development. Essentially, there are two paradigms or schools of thought that fall under the umbrella of Cognitive Behavioral Theory. The first school of thought is Cognitive Restructuring, which teaches people new ways of thinking in order to change behavior. Cognitive Restructuring became popularized in the late 1950's and early 1960's by Aaron Beck. Aaron Beck was a psychiatrist who worked with the mentally ill, particularly patients with major depression. He promoted the idea that, "thinking controls behavior" and in order to change behavior, one has to change their thinking. Beck is known as "the father of cognitive restructuring" and his work was the foundation upon which many other programs were developed. In the 1960's and 1970's, another psychiatrist (and protege of Aaron Beck) named Albert Ellis expanded on Beck's theory with what he termed Rational Emotive Therapy (RET) (now termed Rational Emotive Behavior Therapy [REBT]). Albert Ellis emphasized "rational thinking" in everyday life and challenged patients to rationally analyze thoughts and emotions prior to a given behavior. Ellis realized that individuals could control their own irrational thinking by learning new thinking. In the 1970's we begin to see the application of cognitive restructuring principles to criminality. Yochelson and Samenow identified over 50 criminal thinking errors which are associated	Display Slide 3 (Cognitive Restructuring)

with criminal behavior. They also worked on changing criminal behavior by changing these thinking errors. How many of you have either heard of Yochelson and Samenow or used their work with thinking errors? Can you identify some of the thinking errors used? The 1980's brought along another duo to this school of thought. Ross and Fabiano developed Reasoning and Rehabilitation, a structured curriculum to train offenders how to reason and think differently. Also in the 1980's, Jack Bush, one of the authors of the Thinking for a Change program, developed the concept of cognitive self-change by using "Thinking Reports." I'll talk more about thinking reports later, but essentially they are tools which individuals can use to monitor their thoughts and feelings. In other words, he promoted the idea that individuals can take control of their behavior by monitoring and changing their own thoughts and feelings. The second school of thought within Cognitive Behavioral Theory is known as the Cognitive Skills paradigm. What is a skill? The cognitive skills paradigm emphasized the role of learning and skill acquisition on behavior. In other words, one can learn cognitive skills. One of the most famous cognitive skills theorists was Albert Bandura. Albert Bandura was a psychologist in the 1960s who introduced the concept of "modeling." Essentially, modeling means that we learn by observing others and then trying to perform the behavior ourselves. One of Bandura's most famous demonstrations of modeling came in his "Bobo Doll" experiments. In these experiments, young children were playing in a room with a bunch of toys, including a bobo doll. For the most part, children typically ignored the bobo doll until a confederate came into the room and began playing with the doll aggressively. After the confederate left the room, the children too played with the doll in the same aggressive manner as the confederate. In other words, the children learned by watching others who had "modeled" how to play with the doll. As probation officers, think about how relevant this concept is to certain types of offenses, such as domestic violence offenses, where we often see problems in generation after generation.	Possible answers; justifying, minimization, blaming others, self-centered thinking Display slide 4 (cognitive skills) A skill is an ability to do something; learned through learning the steps of the skill and practice of the skill

Based on Bandura's work, several programs and interventions were developed, beginning in the early 1960's with the development of Social Skills for the Mentally Ill. Arnold P. Goldstein developed this list of skills while working with the mentally ill. During the 1970's Goldstein and Barry Glick, another author of the Thinking for a Change Program, modified the initial 60-skill curriculum. Their work highlighted how skills are learned (and should be taught) in steps. During the 1970's the Cognitive Skills movement began to focus on applying the skills to a specialized population. Novaco and Michenbaum applied the skills technique to aggressive and violent individuals. They used the technique to develop both anger management skills programs and skills techniques to reduce anger. Barry Glick continued his influence on this school of thought in the 1980's by applying the cognitive skills technique while developing Aggression Replacement Training. Finally, during the 1990's Juliana Taymans began applying the cognitive skills technique to problem solving. Taymans, who also helped author the Thinking for a Change program, developed a six-step problem solving skills curriculum. The information from both schools was used to create the Thinking for a Change program. By synthesizing the two schools we are providing the offender with the skills to help develop new thinking that will influence and/or control behavior. Now that we know the developmental history of cognitive behavioral programs, let's take a look at the criminogenic risk factors. Research has identified a number of risk factors that are thought to contribute to criminal behavior. These are termed criminogenic risk factors. This research has led to the conclusion that there are six factors that seem to be consistently related to criminal behavior. They are listed in order of the strength of their relationship to criminal behavior. As you can see, antisocial attitudes, values, beliefs, and cognitive-emotional states are the most strongly related to criminal behavior. This is exactly what cognitive restructuring aims at addressing. Following that is antisocial friends AND isolation from anti-criminal (pro-social) others. This is an important combination.	Display slide 5 (risk/need factors)

Often we focus on telling offenders that they can't be around other people that break the law. That makes sense. But how did they end up associating with these folks in the first place? In addition to having similar interests (including illegal behavior), offenders often have the same social skills. Consider some of your offenders; do they act socially in ways that you find attractive? If you met them on the street, would you want to be their friend? In many cases, the answer is we wouldn't be their friend because we don't like the way they interact - they may be hostile, aggressive, unwilling to listen, etc. So they don't have friends that influence them to be pro-social. In Thinking for a Change, offenders are taught multiple social skills, such as dealing with an accusation, responding to anger, and preparing for a stressful conversation, so that they have the interpersonal skills to better associate with pro-social people. Finally, there are some temperamental and personality factors that seem to be related to criminal behavior. As you can see, problem solving is one of those factors. The final component of Thinking for a Change provides offenders with a concrete method of problem solving. The last 3 factors are also related to criminal behavior, but not as strongly. As you can see 4 and 5 are generally unchangeable, while 6 covers some of the areas we address with programs such as GED attainment and job training. Here is a list of dynamic criminogenic risk factors, the factors that we think we can impact through programming. Looking at this list, do you recognize any of these characteristics in the offenders you supervise? We've discussed the theory surrounding cognitive behavior programs and the risk factors we want to address. Before we conclude this section of the training, let's discuss the offender population we hope to impact with these techniques. To help identify our target population we will use the criminal continuum. During our discussion of the criminal continuum we will define crime as ANYTHING that infringes on the rights, dignity, or property of another. The person committing no errors and no crime marks the criminal continuum at the pro-social end. This person is characterized by	Display Slide 6 (Risk/Need Continued) Show slide 7 (Dynamic Criminogenic Risk) Show slide 8 (criminal continuum)

other centered values; family, friends, and service to others. While at the other end of the continuum we find the person marked by total crime and total errors. This person is characterized by self-centered values; looking good, feeling good, having power, and having control. The pro-social side of the continuum starts with those committing minimal crime. These individuals are characterized as being responsible and are often times involved in unarrestable crimes like lying, cheating, and breaking promises. Also on the pro-social side of the continuum, but nearing that continuum boundary, we find the occasional criminal. The occasional criminal may be involved in some of those unarrestable crimes, but may also be involved in some petty law breaking crimes. The occasional criminal is characterized by the ability to self-adjust. This person would be similar to the offender who is placed on misdemeanor probation and does everything right from day one. This person understands the wrong that was done and self-adjusts to correct the situation and prevent it from happening again. On the other side of the continuum boundary is the habitual criminal. This person has exhibited a loss of control and is characterized by irresponsibility. The final person on the criminal continuum is the continuous criminal. This person is considered maladjusting and often times involved in serious crime; rape, murder, robbery, etc. If you were going to design a program, which group represented on the continuum would you attempt to impact? That is exactly right. We want to focus on some of the habitual criminals and some of the continuous criminals. In comparison, we can say that the occasional criminal will represent the minimum offender on the risk/needs assessment; while the habitual offender represents those that score medium on the risk/needs, and the continuous criminal is the equivalent of those that score max on the assessment. Thinking for a Change targets the medium to high risk offenders because they tend to be the population committing most of the crimes. Also, there is some research suggesting that we may make low risk offenders worse by putting them in a group with a bunch of high risk offenders. Can anyone guess why that might be? When dealing with the self-centered thinking of those that we are trying to impact, we often ask why they engage in power struggles knowing the negative outcome. To better understand this, we start with the self-centered thinking (looking good, feeling good, having power, being in control, being right) that	Solicit responses that point to impacting the habitual and the continuous criminal. Exposure to pro-criminal thinking and beliefs. Display slide 9 (rewards of criminal thinking)

leads to the power struggle. It is easy to see how winning a power struggle is reinforcing for an offender. However, when offenders lose a power struggle it can often times be just as reinforcing. When the offender loses the power struggle they feel belittled or threatened, which leads to them taking the victim stance. Once the offender takes the victim stance, he/she gets a sense of entitlement. Think about offenders and how often they say "you violated me so I had a right to do _____" or "you did this so it was alright for me to ____". Once offenders adopt this feeling of entitlement they engage in a criminal or irresponsible behavior. If the behavior goes undetected the offender wins and receives reinforcement. However, if the behavior is detected or punished, the offender loses and begins the cycle again. We have covered a lot of information. We have discussed the theory that supports cognitive programming, the risk factors that we are attempting to impact through application of cognitive techniques, and the target population. Are there any questions about any of the topics we've covered?	
Thinking For a Change (Group Overview) Thinking for a Change is a cognitive-behavioral program developed by Jack Bush, Barry Glick, Juliana Taymans and Steve Swisher for NIC in the 1990's. How many people have heard of NIC?	Display slide 1 (cover- slide)
NIC is a small agency under the Department of Justice that was formed in the 1970's following the Attica prison riots. The Goal of NIC is to develop corrections knowledge, coordinate research, formulate policy and provide training for jails, prisons and community corrections.	Display slide 2 (NIC)
The Thinking for a Change program was developed to address criminal behavior via three components : 1. Cognitive Restructuring 2. Social Skills 3. Problem Solving The program is considered synthesized, meaning all of these components are blended together. It was designed in such a manner that just about anyone can facilitate a group, once you	Display Slide 3 (T4C)

have received training in the program. Thinking for a Change is based on the "What Works" literature. How many people have heard of the "What Works" literature ?	Display Slide 4 (What Works)
The "What Works" literature began when a criminologist by the name of Martinson performed a meta-analysis of over 800 published corrections programs during the 1970s. How many people have ever heard of meta-analysis? Essentially, it is a type of research study in which one takes a whole bunch of different studies by different individuals and attempts to equate them on different variables of interest, such as outcomes. Based on Martinson's analysis of the data in his study, he concluded "nothing works"- programs provided to offenders in the correctional system were not found to be effective in reducing criminal behavior or recidivism.	
Another criminologist, Ted Palmer, replicated Martinson's study but broke things down differently. In contrast to Martinson, Palmer concluded that some interventions do work with specific populations when a targeted outcome is identified. In other words, you have to understand the offender's needs before attempting to facilitate change. For example, you can't just put all offenders in anger management classes and expect that to impact recidivism rates because not all offenders violate the law as a result of anger management issues. But how do you know what interventions are effective with which populations? NIC created the "What Works" project to provide such answers.	Display Side 5 (What works con't)
Before we move on to discussing specific techniques from Thinking for a Change, I want to share the results of some preliminary research conducted on the efficacy of Thinking for a Change programming in Dallas County. While the full research study can be found on the NIC website (www.nicic.org), I wanted to highlight a few findings of interest. First, 33% fewer subjects who completed the program committed new offenses. Group completers also evidenced significantly improved problem solving skills when compared to controls. It was also found that those who dropped out of T4C programming had a significantly higher number of technical violations than those who completed the group and those who never attended. Moreover, this study suggests that problem solving skills were predictive of technical violations.	Display Slide 22 (Effectiveness) &/or discuss anecdotal evidence of change by group participants.

As I mentioned before, there are three components of Thinking for a Change. Does anyone recall what they are? I want to begin talking about some of the specific components of Thinking for a Change and how we have adapted these techniques for use in the everyday supervision of offenders. While we think teaching social skills would prove difficult during a monthly report, we have found that the cognitive self change and problem solving techniques are applicable during monthly reports and can benefit both the offender and the officer. Thinking for a Change breaks down the process of cognitive self change into three steps : 1. Pay attention to our thoughts and feelings. 2. Recognize when there is risk of our thoughts and feelings leading us into trouble. 3. Use new thinking to reduce the risk. Sounds easy doesn't it? Well, in fact it is not quite so easy. Based on these three steps, what do you think is the most challenging step of cognitive self change? Many people feel step one is difficult as it is not natural to be conscious of all of our thoughts and feelings all of the time. Step two can be challenging because it requires a certain amount of insight (and foresight) into how our thoughts and feelings can lead to trouble. We call these thoughts "risk thoughts" and we aim to replace these types of thoughts before they lead us into trouble. That brings us to step three, which is to use new thinking to reduce the risk. Again, risk means the risk that a particular thought or feeling will lead to behavior which gets us into trouble. You will get a chance to see how these three steps work in a minute. But first, I want to introduce the tool we use in Thinking for a Change that helps us accomplish these steps. We talked before about Jack Bush and how he developed a tool called a thinking report to help us perform the steps of cognitive self change. Thinking reports are best used when an offender has done something they should not do, such as using drugs, rather than in situations where they failed to do something (i.e. failed to pay fees). It is much easier to do a thinking report when there is a particular behavior to look at, rather than a lack of behavior. We will talk more about this difference later on, but for now keep in mind that we want to use thinking reports to address a behavior someone has engaged in.	Display slide 24, Cognitive Self Change Display Side 25 (TR- Narrative)

Essentially, thinking reports have four components:

1. A brief, objective description of the situation.
2. A list of all thoughts you had in that situation.
3. A list of all feelings you had in that situation
4. Beliefs behind your thoughts and feelings.

Let's look at these four components one at a time. The first one is to briefly and objectively describe the situation. By situation, we usually mean situations that are typically problematic for offenders, such as times they broke a rule, hurt somebody or had conflict with others.

Are offender's particularly good at describing situations briefly or objectively? Usually not. They tend to describe situations at length from their own perspective without empathizing with others. One of the advantages of having offenders describe situations objectively is that they learn to identify how situations may be perceived or interpreted by others. Ultimately, this lays the foundation for learning to empathize with others. So when we have offenders practice giving brief and objective descriptions of a given situation, we typically ask them to describe their situation without interpretation or judgement, but instead, like a videotape or audiotape. That is, have them describe situations in such a manner that everyone present, or anyone who was watching a tape of that event, would agree with his or her description of the situation. This component often takes a certain amount of practice, but is certainly an important step in changing offender behavior. Therefore, you may need to provide a great deal of assistance in helping them describe situations briefly and objectively. For example, if an offender reports a situation as "My wife was nagging me about getting a job last night and I told her to shut up," you will need to point out that the term "nagging" is not objective and help the offender reframe the situation. How can we reframe that situation to be more objective?

Examples: My wife suggested I get a job; I told my wife to shut up.

The next component of a thinking report is to have the offender list all of his or her thoughts in the particular situation. This is not a hard step if you keep in mind that we are wanting a list of all of the thoughts leading up to a particular behavior. In other words, we want a list of thoughts <u>prior to the occurrence</u> of a particular behavior, not a list of thoughts or regrets after the behavior occurred. For example, if a particular offender's situation is "I sold some drugs to an undercover police officer" we want a list of the thoughts that the offender had that generated or permitted that

behavior <u>in that circumstance.</u> Examples might be "I need to make some money to feed my family," or " This guy is not a cop." Again, we don't want after-the-fact statements such as "I let my family down" or "I should have know that guy was a cop." Also, when helping an offender to do a thinking report, it is imperative that you record his or her thoughts verbatim. That is, record their thoughts exactly as expressed- without filtering or abbreviating. This also includes swear words. We do this because we need to understand exactly what the offender was thinking in order to help them make changes. Also, we don't want to come across as judgmental with regard to their thoughts and feelings or instructing them on how they should think or feel. The next component of a thinking report is to have the offender list all of the feelings he or she experienced in their situation. Why would we be interested in offenders' feelings about a particular situation? That's right, true to cognitive behavioral theory, thoughts are related to feelings. In other words, the way we feel is related to the way we think. Therefore, by asking an offender to describe their feelings in a particular situation, it provides clues to what they were thinking. For example, if an offender says they had a thought such as "I won't get caught" before committing a crime, we might infer that they were feeling "confident." Conversely, if an offender says they were feeling "disrespected" in a particular situation, we might challenge the offender to recall the thought that led them to feel that way. Just an aside: Offenders often say they feel angry or "pissed off" in their situations. However, often times, when looking at their list of thoughts, you may sense that the offender was having other feelings as well, such as hurt or disrespected. It is appropriate to suggest these feelings to offenders so long as this is done in a manner that they feel free to agree or disagree. We will discuss this in further detail later. The final component of a thinking report is to have the offender describe any beliefs that might have come into play in that particular circumstance. Beliefs are more global or generalized patterns of thinking. If you recall, the iceberg analogy, we discussed how beliefs fall in the lower layer of the iceberg and are connected to our values and self-worth. We gave an example that "speeding is wrong." Using the example of an offender's	Because feelings provide clues to what the offender is thinking.

situation "I sold some drugs to an undercover police officer," what beliefs might you expect to find when doing a thinking report with that offender about that situation? Ex. "Drugs are everywhere, so I might as well be one of the people profiting from it" or "Marijuana should be legalized." Since the identification of beliefs requires a certain amount of introspection, some offenders will struggle with this concept as it is fairly abstract. That's okay as we can still make cognitive changes using the thinking report, even if the offender has difficulty with this component. So those are the components of a thinking report. In thinking for a change groups, offenders get acclimated to using this format to accomplish the three steps of cognitive self change. Often, probation officers find this format helpful to know when attempting to do cognitive restructuring during the course of a monthly report with an offender. Here is an example of a thinking report done by an offender who was on electronic monitoring. He had a history of small violations and was asked to do a thinking report in response to a monitor violation. He described his situation as "I was in trouble for being out of the area." He listed his thoughts prior to the violation. Looking at this sample thinking report, it looks like we have a pretty good idea of what was going on in that offender's mind prior to his violation. His behavior to leave the area certainly makes sense. I know if I was having those thoughts and feelings, I might leave as well. That is, unless I changed my thinking about the situation. Now that we have a picture of the offender's thinking in a given situation, we can attempt to do the second step of cognitive self change. Does anyone recall what step two entails? That's right, step two is to recognize when there is risk of our thoughts and feelings leading us into trouble. In thinking for a change, we begin step two by having them identify one (and only one) specific risk thought that led to the situation. That is, while there may be several thoughts in a thinking report that may pose a risk to the offender, we ask the offender to identify the most important thought that led to the rule breaking or hurtful behavior. Often, this is the thought that "justified" or "permitted" the rule-breaking or hurtful behavior. We also ask the offender to narrow their selection to one specific thought because we can only work at	Display Slide 26 (blank thinking report format) Display Slide 27 (offender sample) Note: Have participants take turns reading through the entire list of thoughts, followed by feelings and then beliefs.

replacing one thought at a time. The key is to make sure that the risk thought they choose is truly the one that needs to be replaced. Of course, we will also ask the offender to identify a specific risk feeling and a risk attitude as well, which helps us to understand where cognitive change needs to take place to reduce criminogenic risk. One of the most important concepts in facilitating cognitive change is allowing the offender to have the final authority when it comes to their thinking. In other words group facilitators, peers and probation officers are free to make suggestions in terms of what an offender *might* have been thinking or feeling at a particular time; however, only the offender truly knows what they were thinking and feeling in a particular situation. Similarly, when it comes to identifying risk thoughts and choosing new thinking, the offender must be the one to determine what will work for them. Again, making suggestions is fine but the offender is the final authority when it comes to their thinking. Let's try to do step two with this offender's sample thinking report. Since the offender is not here, we can only speculate which thought was crucial in leading to his behavior. Nevertheless, of the thoughts he has listed here, which one do you think most likely led him to be outside of the area? Break into groups of 2-5 people and discuss which thought you believe should be identified as the risk thought. Good job, the class has chosen # ___ as the risk thought in need of replacement. That brings us to step three, which is to use new thinking to reduce the risk. That is, what are some replacement thoughts that the offender could have had that might have prevented him from being outside of the area? (Get a few suggestions and then move on). Excellent, you have now seen all three steps of cognitive self change and are familiar with the thinking report. Now, I would like everybody to do their own thinking report in class. Take a few minutes and write a thinking report on a time you broke a rule or hurt somebody that you don't mind sharing with the class. Remember, hurting somebody can entail saying something insensitive or being overly critical. Take about ten minutes and do a thinking report. Once everyone completes their thinking reports, we will demonstrate all three steps of Cognitive Self Change.	Break class down to groups of two to five. After approximately five minutes, ask a spokesperson to relate why the group chose a particular thought as a risk thought. Keep a tally of the most chosen thought and circle that thought as the identified risk thought. Pass out blank thinking reports. While participants are preparing their thinking reports, walk around the room and look for those who understand and those in need of help. Choose those participants who understand to read their thinking reports first. Then choose an exemplary thinking report and write in on chart paper or dry erase board. Then have the thinking report's owner identify a risk thought. Solicit feedback from other participants as to other possible thoughts, feelings or attitudes

	but always ask the owner if these were things he or she actually experienced prior to writing them down. Make sure the class understands that, while we can make suggestions, others are their own authority when it comes to their thoughts and feelings. After completing the model's thinking report and having him or her identify a risk thought, ask the model to identify some new thinking that would have reduced the risk and write them down beside the identified risk thought. Again, solicit suggestions from other class members but only write those that the model agrees they could have realistically used n that situation. Once the model has chosen the best replacement thought that would have reduced the risk in that situation, have them role play the new thinking. Set up the role play choosing any necessary co-actors and gathering props to try and set the stage and get the actor back in the moment of the situation rather than the "here and now" of the role play. Then, have the model begin reading down his or her list of thoughts on the displayed thinking report. Immediately after the model speaks his risk thought, have him or her verbalize the new thinking (replacement thinking). Instructors can repeat this exercise with several class members until the class demonstrates understanding.
Okay, now that we have done all three steps of Cognitive Self Change, I want to practice these steps in the context of a monthly report with an offender. This is a different context for a couple of different reasons. First, the offender does not know about thinking	Display Slide 28

reports or cognitive self change, so you will need some practice in doing a thinking report on someone else. In order to demonstrate how this can be done, we are going to watch a clip from a movie called "Lost in America." Has any one seen this movie? Well, the main actor in this clip is Albert Brooks who plays an advertising executive who is up for a promotion. In the clip, he attends a meeting with his boss and learns that he has been passed over for a promotion. I am going to give each of you a blank thinking report form. I want you to complete a thinking report based on the clip, <u>from the main character's perspective.</u> While it is challenging to do thinking reports on others, I think you will agree that we can get a pretty good idea of others' thoughts and feelings by listening to what they say, how they say it, and watching what they do. I now want to present what we call the "Thinking Check-In." Essentially, it is very similar to what you have just done. It is taking a thinking report on someone else, helping them identify a risk thought and some replacement thinking, and then asking them to try out the new thinking. Let's look at the thinking check-in one step at a time. You will find the first step of the thinking check-in is to simply state the rule breaking behavior to the offender. This makes sense as probation officers are often aware of violations before the offender. Of course, if the offender acknowledges a violation, you can always start from there. The second step is to have the offender describe the circumstances that led to the rule violation. The key to this step is keeping the offender discussing events and circumstances prior to the violation. We don't need a long story here, just some of the facts associated with the violation. This can be challenging with offenders who are intent on blaming others or minimizing their actions. Just like in a thinking report, steps three and four are to identify thoughts and feelings leading to the rule violating behavior respectively. The key to doing these steps correctly is to keep them focused on what they were thinking and feeling <u>prior to</u> the occurrence of the behavior. This is challenging as offenders often committed their actions impulsively and they may not have been monitoring their thinking prior to taking action. This does not mean they did not have thoughts or feelings, just that they were	Pass out blank thinking report forms and then show the film clip. Have class participants identify all of the thinking report components and then ask them to identify thoughts that may have posed a risk as well as new thinking that could have been used. Display Slide 29

not paying attention to them or that they do not want to share them with you. Address offender resistance by expressing confidence in their ability to participate in this process. The next step is to identify one specific risk thought or "trigger thought" – the thought that triggered the behavior. Often times, offenders will identify having a risk thought to the effect that they did not think they would get caught committing the violation. While this may not be the only risk thought, these types of risk thoughts often work well with the replacement thoughts about getting caught, revoked, or thrown in jail. However, it is imperative that the offender be the one to choose the replacement thought in step number five. While you may feel free to make suggestions of others' thoughts, remember that what might work for you may not work for them. <u>Always have the client choose the risk and replacement thoughts</u>. The last step of a thinking check in is to contract with the offender to use the replacement thought. Essentially, they are pledging to try some new thinking out in future situations involving risk. However, while this is the last step of this technique, it is implied that you must follow up with the offender at the next report and discuss whether he or she was able to use the new thinking to avoid risk. My partner and I are now going to model the steps of doing a Thinking Check-In during the course of a monthly report. As you observe the model, pay close attention to the steps, especially whether we perform them correctly and in order. We will have the opportunity to discuss the model afterwards.	The two trainers act out a vignette, with one trainer playing the role of the officer and the other playing the role of the offender. The model should be a very simple scenario and all of the steps should be clearly demonstrated. Upon completion, solicit feedback from participants as to whether each step was performed correctly and how each step was accomplished.
For the remainder of the day, we will practice using this technique by conducting role pays. Therefore, we need everybody to team up with a partner and come up with two role pay scenarios. You will play the role of the officer performing the thinking check in one role play and play the role of an offender with a rule violation in the other role play. Please try to choose realistic scenarios and	Display Slide 30

to use the role plays to emphasize and correctly illustrate the steps of the thinking check-in. While we realize there are offenders who are extremely resistant to discussing or acknowledging violations, we have to learn to walk before we can learn to run, so keep the role plays simple. Also please remember that we will be role playing a problem solving technique tomorrow, so scenarios with logistical problems, such as transportation and childcare, are often more appropriate for tomorrow's lesson. If you have any questions about your role plays, let me know. If not I will give you approximately 15 to 20 minutes to prepare them. I suggest that you each have a copy of the offender's thinking report in front of you and that you practice the role plays prior to performing these in front of the class.	Before conducting role plays, again emphasize that the purpose is to have officers demonstrate they can perform a Thinking Check-In in accordance with the written steps. Assign onlookers to watch for the steps prior to conducting each role play. Stop any role play when the officer (main actor) departs from the steps, and re-instruct regarding the steps. Debrief each role play be inviting feedback from the group, asking officers who watched for assigned steps in order to report how the main actor accomplished that step. If a step was not performed, or it was unclear whether it was done, repeat the role play. Finish the debriefing by asking for feedback from the main actor and giving positive and encouraging comments.
CONFLICT CYCLE Today we will discuss how problematic client behavior is part of an ongoing cycle driven by specific stresses and beliefs, and the client's response to them. Let me start by asking this – why do clients act the way they do? The way an offender responds to a problem can make their situation worse, engaging them in the Conflict Cycle. As we proceed through this process remember that we are not attempting to justify the client's bad behavior, rather we are trying to understand why it is occurring and will later try to develop alternative strategies to modify it. To better understand the conflict cycle, let's take a look at a situation that goes from bad to worse. This is a scene from the movie, *The Breakfast Club.*	Show slide 31 (cover slide – conflict cycle) Solicit responses from the class about why they think clients do what they do. Show clip from The Breakfast Club starting from Bender removing the screw from the

	door.
In this scene you will see a group of teenagers doing Saturday detention in the high school library. The two main characters are Bender and Verne. Bender is one of the students and Verne is the assistant principal in charge of detention. Verne's rules are that everyone stays in their seat and no talking. Let's take a look at the Conflict Cycle and apply it to the scenario we just saw.	Display slide 32 Point out that for the purpose of reviewing the conflict cycle you are referencing the last stage of the conflict between Bender and Verne, when Bender tells Verne, "Eat my shorts".
	He was spending Saturday in detention, this confrontation was taking place in front of other students, Verne was in his face.
What stress was Bender feeling?	He had to have the final say, he had to look tough to save face in front of his peers, he had to attempt to maintain control of the situation.
What beliefs do you think Bender had that added to the confrontation?	Verne is trying to put me down in front of my peers, Verne is out to get me expelled from school, Verne hates me.
Based on these stresses and beliefs, how would Bender describe the problem?	Angry, challenged, upset, embarrassed
What do you think Bender was feeling when Verne was in his face, pointing his finger at him?	He's not going to do this to me, he's not going to get away with this, I'll show him who's in control
What thoughts do you think might have been going through Bender's mind?	He looked Verne in the face and said "Eat my shorts" a second time. (impulsive)
What action did Bender take…was it impulsive or well thought out?	More detention
What were the consequences?	

Bender now has more problems and is more stressed than when the confrontation started. What are some examples from your interactions with clients where you can apply the Conflict Cycle? Clients' beliefs are not always rational, but they do result in real stress, and most often an inappropriate response to those stresses to solve the problem. Knowing the clients' thoughts and feelings are the key if the Conflict Cycle is to be diffused. New feelings and thoughts must occur if the action and outcome are to be different. Officers can assist in breaking the Conflict Cycle by helping the client identify their behaviors in the cycle and by assisting with problem solving. Where must intervention occur within the Conflict Cycle for it to be broken? Intervention must occur before actions are taken. The problem will continue to exist, as will the client's feelings about it, but the client should begin to think of alternative actions in order to break the cycle and avoid consequences. Intervening in the Conflict Cycle should be a preventative measure and not used for crisis intervention. It will be most effectively used as part of the supervision planning process and as an ongoing means to measure the effectiveness of the plan during reports. Understanding why clients do what they do is essential if their negative behaviors are to be changed. In our next section we will discuss how problem-solving techniques should be introduced in the Conflict Cycle. **PROBLEM SOLVING** **Introduction** As we begin this section of the training, let's remember that we are focusing on providing conflict cycle intervention. Furthermore, we are focusing on the area between the area labeled "thoughts and feelings" and the area labeled "actions".	Have participants cite specific problems one of their clients has and have participants identify all parts of the Conflict Cycle with their example. Chart these for easy identification of all five components. Display slide 32 Show slide 33 (Mock Supervision Plan) Note the similarities in the different areas of the supervision plan and conflict cycle. Show slide 35. Emphasize the area of intervention. Use this time to help the officers

We are attempting to input some thinking and action steps that will enhance "risk reduction". Before we begin our discussion of the Problem Solving technique, let's discuss the "why" of the Problem Solving. As an officer, what benefits do you believe you will gain from providing offenders with this concrete method of problem solving? Yes. Officers will build better rapport, take away the offender's excuses, force the offender to take responsibility, and improve documentation. How will offenders benefit from learning this problem-solving method? This is absolutely right. If we can help offenders learn to solve their own problems, he/she develops better relationships at home and better rapport with the supervising officers, he/she becomes empowered, and he/she develops a method that can be used to measure progress/success. While the offender will receive multiple benefits from learning this skill, the officer will also benefit from the application of the problem solving technique. Also, let's talk about when it might be useful to use the problem solving technique. Since you are focusing on problems an offender is experiencing, this technique can be used to address barriers to offenders accomplishing what they need to do. For instance, if someone tells you they can't attend a class because they have no childcare, you can use the problem solving technique to help them figure out how to get childcare. We'll talk more about the differences between thinking check-ins and problem solving later, but for now, keep in mind that problem solving can help remove barriers to offenders performing a certain behavior. Now that we've examined some of the benefits, let's focus on the offender's current need for this skill. To examine the offender's need, let's compare and contrast some of the current problem solving techniques being used. Let's start with people attending this training. Would someone volunteer and tell me one thing you do when you have a problem to solve? Great! Let's just go around and get a few volunteers.	discover a need for the skill. Officers should see a benefit for both the officer and the client. Chart the answers to show impulsive vs. thought oriented problem solving techniques.

Tell me one thing you do when you have a problem and I'll write it here on the board. This appears to be a complete list. Let's develop another list. Think about some of those medium and high-risk offenders that we discussed earlier in the training. Would someone volunteer to tell me one of the things they do when they have a problem. Great! Again, we want to put together a list of ways they solve problems. Let's just go around the room and get a few suggestions on ways that they solve problems. Ok. This list appears complete. Looking at the two lists, it appears that one side uses a thought-oriented process to solve problems while the other side is more impulsive. By providing the offender with a concrete method of problem solving we are meeting the obvious need of the offender and reducing the risk of impulsive behavior. **<u>Problem Solving Steps</u>** We've discussed the need and the benefit of conflict cycle intervention through the use of problem solving. To begin our "how to" discussion of problem solving, let's look at Thinking for a Change and the problem solving steps developed by Juliana Taymans. The Thing for a Change problem solving steps begin with STOP AND THINK. This step requires the offender to do what is labeled as the "three step": be quiet, get space, and calm down. Secondly this step asks the offender to ask two questions: 1. What am I thinking and feeling right now? And 2. How can what I am thinking and feeling right now lead me to do something worse? By intervening the conflict cycle with step 1 the offenders gets control of his emotions and prepares to use his head rather than his emotions to solve his problem. The next step is to understand what our problem is. The Thinking for a Change program provides the offender with a formula for describing the problem. The formula will allow the offender to	Show slide 36. Solicit responses that require identification of a goal.

objectively describe the problem while acknowledging the offender's thoughts, feelings and risk reaction. We now know we have a problem and we have described it effectively. What do we do next? That's right. We identify what we want. In step three, the program asks the offender to consider relevant information and set a goal using a specific formula. The formula requires the offender to identify what he wants and if necessary, what he does not want. After identifying what he wants, the offender has to decide how to get it. Step 4 requires the offender to consider the choices and consequences, based on the identified goal. Step 5 instructs the offender to select the choice that will get the offender closest to the identified goal, develop a plan to achieve the goal, and to implement the plan. The final step involved in the Thinking for a Change group is evaluation. The offender is required to ask questions to determine the success of his plan. Thinking for a Change requires the offender to do a lot of thinking when solving problems (steps 1-4, the first 2 parts of step 5, and step 6). The use of thinking steps increases the likelihood that the offender will process situations in a more rational, goal-directed manner rather than reacting emotionally and impulsively. **<u>Applying Techniques to Monthly Reports</u>** It is believed that by improving problem-solving skills we can impact offender recidivism. With that in mind we will begin discussing how we can use our daily interactions with offenders to improve problem-solving skills using the Thinking for a Change principles. We will begin the technique by having the offender describe and analyze the situation. To analyze the situation we will discuss three types of information with the offender: "FACTS", "OTHERS' THOUGHTS AND FEELINGS", and "THE OFFENDER'S	Show slide 37 (Technique Steps 1 and 2). Define facts and have class identify examples of fact that are common to report taking.

OPINIONS AND BELIEFS ABOUT THE SITUATION". What type of information should we look for when discussing the facts with the offenders? That's correct. We are asking the offender to consider things that can be proven; things that are verifiable. What are some examples of facts that the offender will need to consider? Yes, dates, times, conditions of problem, etc. These are all facts that the offender should consider. Why is it important to consider facts? Sometimes facts alone can provide information that will help solve problems. For example, an offender wishes to put off completing drug treatment until after he completes anger management. However, the conditions of supervision state that the drug treatment must be completed immediately and allows time to complete anger management after drug treatment. Providing the offender with this factual information may change the desire of the offender. Let's move to our next piece of relevant information; others' thoughts and feelings. Who does the word "others" refer to and why is it important to consider others? All of you are correct. "Others" refers to anyone else who might be involved or affected by the situation. When dealing with offenders, an "other" that should always be considered is the Court. "Other" may also represent family members or employers. Having the offender consider others is a way of helping the offender understand empathy; putting themselves in someone else's shoes. Secondly, having the offender consider others helps the offender understand how to achieve goals without hurting others.	Make sure that participants get a clear understanding of "others" and how it relates to empathy training.
The final piece of information is the offender's opinions and beliefs the offender becomes aware of how his thinking may be contributing to his situation. It is important to note that the offender's beliefs and opinions may not be factual, but are the perception of the offender.	After giving the formula discuss the goal statement and the necessary characteristics, discuss the importance of the characteristics.

After describing and analyzing the problem, the second step is to have the offender identify a goal related to the identified situation. The goal should use one of the following formats: I want (states what the offender wants). Or I want (states what the offender wants), but I don't want (states the negative consequence the offender doesn't want). The goal statement should have two characteristics. The goal statement should be positive and realistic. Why do you believe these two characteristics are important? That is exactly the reason why we want the goal statement to be positive and realistic. Having the offender identify a positive goal reduces the chance of ongoing problems. A realistic goal will increase the chance for success and help motivate the offender. On the other hand, an unrealistic goal limits the opportunity for Success and could decrease the offender's motivation.	Show slide 38
When do you believe we should use each formula? If the offender does not identify a negative consequence that he wishes to avoid, use formula one. However, if a negative consequence is identified (missing work, leaving child at home alone, not being able to pay rent, etc.), use formula two. Now that the offender has a clearly defined goal that is based on the identified problem, the offender should begin brainstorming possible options to achieve the identified goal. Begin step three by brainstorming only the choices. Generate as many options as possible; both pro-social and antisocial choices. If you, the officer, assist the offender in option generating, it is important that you offer more than one choice. Offering more than once choice will prevent the offender from selecting the choice he believes you want him to select.	Lead a discussion on the importance of considering a consequence for each choice.
After a complete list of choices has been generated, the offender should go back and consider a consequence for EVERY choice listed. It is important that the offender consider the consequences of each choice before moving to the next step.	

Once the list of choices and consequences is complete, the offender is prepared to move to step four. Step 4 will require the offender to select from the list the choice that will get him closest to the identified goal. If a complete list of choices has been generated there should be an option that will maximize the chance of a positive outcome and minimize the chance of a negative outcome. To complete step five; use the selected choice to help the offender develop a plan to implement the choice. To develop the plan answer the following questions: 1. Who will be involved? 2. When will the plan be implemented? 3. Where will the plan be implemented? 4. What will the offender say or do? Now that the plan has been developed, contract with the offender to implement the plan outlined. After obtaining a verbal commitment from the offender, have the offender sign and date the plan. As the person initiating the plan, you should also sign the agreement. At this point, the offender has worked through the problem solving steps and he is prepared to follow through with the plan. However, the final step will not be completed until the offender returns for the next meeting. The final step is evaluation. When the offender returns for the next meeting (usually a monthly report) the success of the plan should be evaluated using the following questions: 1. Did the plan work? 2. Am I closer to my goal? 3. Did I hurt anyone else? 4. What have I learned? The final step is very important in the process. Why do you think this is such an important step? Yes, you are exactly right. By having the offender evaluate the results of their implementation, the offender is able to celebrate their success and learn from their mistakes. If the offender is successful it provides internal motivation to continue applying the new skill. However, if the offender is not successful evaluation will help determine where improvements could be made.	Officers should understand the evaluation of the plan takes place at the officer's next contact with the offender. Rehearse the model to make sure that all of the steps are done and all are done in order.

That completes the discussion on how to apply the problem solving steps during monthly reports. Are there any questions concerning any of the steps we've discussed?

Role Play the Technique

Now that you have had an opportunity to hear how the steps are applied, my partner and I are going to illustrate for you how they work. Mr./Ms. _____and I are going to model the skill. Mr./Ms. _____will play the _____and I will play the _____. Can I get a volunteer to watch (whomever plays the officer) to see if he follows step one? Who would like to volunteer for step two? Step three?

Step four?

Step five?

And step six?

Thanks. We will debrief the role-play once we are finished.

Ok. Who had step one? How was the problem described in the role-play? What were some of the facts? Who did we consider as others and what were there thoughts and feelings? What opinions and beliefs did this offender have?

Who had step two? Which formula did the offender use? What goal did the offender identify? Was the goal based on the identified problem?

Who was watching for step three? What are some of the choices and consequences that were identified by the officer and the offender? Did the officer consider choices first and then go back and consider a consequence for each choice?

Who's reporting on step four? What choice was selected? Did the officer allow the offender to select the choice?

If you were watching for step five, tell me how the officer did developing a plan with the offender?

Finally, will the person watching for step six tell me how the officer did with the contract? Did the officer get the verbal agreement? Did the officer have the offender sign the agreement?

Debriefing the model should involve showing how each step was done during the model, like with the Thinking Check-In. If the debriefing shows that the steps were not done in order or were done incorrectly, the model should be done again with the corrections made.

Participant Role Play and Debriefing

Now that we all agree that the steps were followed and followed in order, you will have an opportunity to practice the steps of this skill. Just as we did with Technique A, each of you will have an opportunity to participate in a role-play practicing the skill.

Here are the instructions for today's role-play. Pair up with another participant in today's group. You and your partner are to prepare TWO role-plays. Each of you should play the officer once and the offender once. You are to select a situation that will allow you to practice the steps of today's skill. Once you have finished preparation please let my partner or me know you are done.

It appears that everyone has finished preparing. Would someone like to volunteer to role-play his or her situation first? Thank you for volunteering.

Once you are finished, we will debrief your role-play just like we did the model. Let's assign the steps of the skill before we start.

Good job. Let's review what you've done.

Great! You completed all of the steps and you completed them in order. Who would like to volunteer to go next?

Give participants time to prepare the role-plays. Display Slide 39. Ensure role plays are done exactly like the model. If a step is missed or done incorrectly the role-play should be stopped and started again from the beginning. Remember to be objective and non-threatening when stopping the role plays.

Utilizing the Techniques: Thinking Check-In vs. Problem Solving

Perhaps the most challenging aspect of utilizing these techniques successfully is differentiating between when to use the Thinking Check-In and when to use the Problem Solving Technique. After all, they are both cognitive techniques designed to deal with offenders who are not successfully meeting their conditions of probation. While there is considerable overlap between these two techniques, I want to talk in general about when to use which technique. However, I want to stress two points. First, these are just guidelines and ultimately, you as the officer will have to decide which technique you want to try first. Second, if the technique you are trying doesn't appear to be working, try using the other technique.

We indicated that these techniques are similar in that they are both techniques for dealing with offenders who are not successfully meeting their conditions of probation. Typically,

this means that the probationer is either not doing what they are supposed to do, such as paying fees, completing community service hours or attending classes OR they are continuing to do things they are not supposed to do, such as using drugs, associating with criminal others, or having contact with someone that they are not supposed to (such as the victim of their offense). When deciding how to address probation violations via these techniques, one question to ask yourself is: **is the violation resulting from a failure to perform a particular behavior, or is the violation stemming from a failure to stop performing a particular behavior?** While this question does not totally differentiate between which technique to try first, it is an important conceptualization to make, as it clarifies whether we are attempting to facilitate new behavior or stop an existing behavior. While both types of failures contain cognitive errors and result in problems, probation officers should be aware that the latter scenario (continued problematic behavior) often contains many rationalizations, excuses and other cognitive errors. In such cases, attempting to address the offender's cognitive errors with the Thinking Check-In is probably the place to begin. Also, note that in Step 3 of the Thinking Check-In, you're asked to have the offender "identify thoughts and feelings leading to a particular behavior." It is often easier for offenders to identify thoughts and feelings prior to the occurrence of a particular behavior rather than in situations where there the offender failed to perform a behavior (a non-occurrence of the behavior). In such circumstances, particularly when an offender has difficulty recalling a specific time they failed to perform a behavior, or has difficulty identifying thoughts or feelings at such a time, the Problem-Solving technique would probably be easier to use. Ultimately, which technique to try first will be based on the probation officer's understanding of the offender's violation(s). This means the officer needs to analyze **WHY** the offender violated in an effort to determine whether the situation stems from a cognitive error or a logistical problem. The best way to answer this question is to ask the offender to explain why he or she violated and evaluate his or her response in context of other violations or difficulties. For example, if an officer feels the offender's explanation is largely an excuse or rationalization, a Thinking Check-In may help to highlight and correct the cognitive error. However, if the offender has a logistical problem, such as being unable to attend classes due to childcare, transportation or scheduling conflicts, the Problem Solving technique would likely be a more beneficial place to start.	Show slide 40,points 1 and 2 Show slide 40, point number 3

Remember, if changing an offender's thinking about a violation won't enable him or her to succeed in similar circumstances in the future, the Problem Solving technique would be indicated. Conversely, if an offender continues to violate his or her probation despite having the means to comply, one should be alert for cognitive errors. One more guideline to consider when deciding which technique to use is determining the depth or complexity of the problem. A good example is when a probationer fails to pay probation fees as agreed. He or she may not be paying because of thoughts such a "nobody gets locked up for failing to pay probation fees" or may have several difficulties related to his or her ability to pay fees such as unemployment, which may stem from having a felony record, a lack of transportation, and a lack of childcare. With these types of multilayered problems, the Problem Solving Technique is probably the best place to help the probationer prioritize and set goals. However, the supervising officer should remain alert for opportunities to correct cognitive errors via the Thinking Check-In as they arise. For example, let's say the above probationer completes a job readiness program but is not hired after going to a job interview and he tells the probation officer that he is thinking "Nobody is going to hire me with a felony record." Certainly, doing a thinking check-in with this probationer would be appropriate, even if in the midst of problem solving. In fact, there is nothing wrong with using both of these techniques in conjunction with one another, provided that all the steps are followed correctly. In order to help officers learn to differentiate between these techniques, I have a few scenarios I would like to present. Remember, there is really no right or wrong place to start; however, by analyzing why a violation occurred and clueing-in on thinking errors, we become better and more efficient facilitators of behavioral change. For each scenario, pair up and decide (a) whether the scenario resulted from failing to perform a particular behavior or as a result of failing to stop performing a particular behavior, (b) any additional information you would seek in analyzing why the offender violated and (c) which technique you would try first and why.	Show slide 41. Hand out the "scenarios" handout and give participants 15 minutes to discuss scenarios. Observe each pair to ensure that they understand the exercise and are able to logically articulate why they would use one technique over another. Help as needed. Discuss scenarios as needed.

Welcome back. I hope you found this exercise helpful. Are there any questions? You might have found that, for many of the scenarios, there wasn't necessarily a "right" answer. If so, that's ok. The purpose is to get you to think about each situation and determine in a logical, purposeful way how you would go about addressing the issue. Keep the guidelines we discussed, and the scenarios you examined, in mind when choosing a technique to use with your offenders.	Show slide 42.
CONCLUSION Well, we have reached the final few moments of two enjoyable days. We have a few more things to complete before we dismiss and return to our regular jobs where we can continue practicing and developing the skills we have learned over the past two days.	Show slide 43.
Before we pass out certificates and dismiss, let's review the things we covered. Over the past two days, we have worked together to develop skills in using techniques that address the criminogenic risk factors that we identified. Can someone identify a few of the risk factors we discussed?	Participants should be identifying risk factors identified during the theoretical foundations.
You are exactly right. We also discussed how we could use the techniques to help avoid power struggles with offenders. During the training you have seen and participated in examples that illustrate this idea. Along with addressing risk factors and avoiding power struggles, we have given you examples of how these techniques can be used to assist in effective documentation. We have all agreed on the importance of accurate and effective documentation of an offender's progress and failures. The examples given to you illustrate a way to document both success and failure along with tools given to the offender. As trainers, we believe that these techniques will help you improve your abilities to perform your daily job duties. We also believe that if you will continue to develop the skills you've learned over the past two days, you will be able to provide the offender with a meaningful opportunity to change. By teaching the offender how to pay attention to his thinking, recognize the	

risk in his thinking, identify new thinking and by teaching a concrete m method of problem solving, we are providing the offender with the necessary skills for long-term behavior change. Let's take a look at the list of expectations that we created at the beginning of our training sessions. Let's look at each of our expectations one at a time and determine if we met the expectation. If we met the expectation I will put a check beside it, if we didn't I will put a – beside it. Now let's look at the first one. Did we meet it? Great how about the second one? Now that we have reviewed our expectations, the training team would like to take time to express our gratitude for your attendance and participation during this training. You have all worked really hard to learn the new skills. As we prepare to dismiss and you go back to your regular job duties, we hope that you will continue practicing and developing the skills you have learned. Before we distribute the training certificates and evaluation forms, we would like to provide you with the accurate trainer contact information. If you need assistance using the techniques, please do not hesitate to contact one of us. We would be more than happy to do whatever possible to assist in your skill development. As we get ready to distribute the certificates, are there any final questions, issues you would like to discuss, or outstanding matters that need to be discussed? Ok. It is finally time to distribute the certificates you've earned with you hard work. As we call your name, please come forward and receive your certificate. Please accept the certificate as a token of our gratitude and a way for us to applaud all of your hard work. Before we dismiss, we would like to remind you to complete the evaluation form. We take your comments seriously. We try to make improvements and refinements in this training based on	Display Slide 44. Have trainers list current contact information on chart paper or a dry erase board. Assemble the training team together as the certificates are being distributed. Distribute the certificates evenly among the training team.

your input, so we appreciate your effort in this task. Again, thank you so much for your courage, participation, and your hard work. GOOD LUCK DEVELOPING THE SKILLS YOU HAVE LEARNED.	DISMISS THE PARTICIPANTS.

Scenarios for "Choosing a Technique" Exercise

Scenario 1: An offender violates his probation by failing to attend an outpatient drug and alcohol treatment program. When asked why he failed to attend, he responds "I didn't go because I don't have a problem."

Scenario 2: An offender reports he violated his probation by having contact with his ex-wife, who is the victim of the probationer's domestic violence offense. When asked about the contact, he reported that his ex-wife called him and asked him to come by her residence to talk about reconciling.

Scenario 3: A homeless offender is delinquent on fees. He receives some SSI benefits for depression but it is barely enough for him to live on.

Scenario 4: An offender violates his probation by testing positive for marijuana. He denied using marijuana but acknowledged being inside of a car with friends who were smoking a blunt. He agrees that he should not be associating with such individuals.

Scenario 5: A probationer fails to attend a drug and alcohol education program as mandated in his probation conditions. The probationer explains he has not attended due to transportation issues, explaining he car is not working and he lives in an area without access to public transportation.

Scenario 6: A probationer violates her probation by failing to complete any of 160 hours of community service during her first year of a two-year probation term. She explained she works over 40 hours per week.

Scenario 7: A probationer reports she recently had to quit her minimum wage job because her mother was no longer available to provide childcare for the probationer's three young children. She stated the she can't afford to pay for childcare.

Scenario 8: A probationer who was arrested for DWI and possession of cocaine continues to work at a topless bar after her arrest, despite acknowledging difficulties maintaining sobriety. She explained that she cannot afford to change to another line of work.