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- Developing, implementing and evaluating assessment instruments
- Responsivity – measures used to increase the likelihood that offenders are ready for, and will respond to, programming
- Producing rehabilitative Sentence Plans for offenders
- Current programs – particularly those that effectively reduce the risk of reoffending
- Employment programs
- Staffing - structures including the custodial/non-custodial set up
- Classification - Security rating scales, instruments - their use and development
- Specialist therapeutic units
- Case Management - systems, processes, case loads, case allocation, the management, development and evaluation of it
- Electronic information systems that enable the above functions
- Organisational Development/Change Management - from developing Mission statements to Strategic Planning to mobilising a workforce from being reactive to proactive
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Executive Summary

Name: Ross Feenan  
Position: Manager, Inmate Assessment and Case Planning  
NSW Department of Corrective Services  
Address: 99B Cary Street, Marrickville, NSW, 2204  
Contact: Ph: (02) 9289 5057, Fax: (02) 9289 5041  
email: ross.feenan@dcs.nsw.gov.au

Fellowship Objective: To study the assessment of offending behaviour and rehabilitation of offenders with a view to the Organisational Change required for the integration of new practices within current systems – New Zealand, Canada & England/Wales

In Australia we are geographically a long way from most advanced practices in the corrections world – particularly North America. We rely on texts, research articles and reports and the occasional guest lecturer from countries we know to be effectively reducing recidivism. I had the great honour of being able to experience the workplace practices of the textbook theory and seeing “What Works” in a very real way.

If, as has been reported, 70% of all crime is conducted by 10% of all criminals, then we must assess all criminals to see who pose the highest risk. We must find out which criminogenic factors contribute most to their offending behaviours – especially those at work during the offending cycle. We must assess the responsivity of offenders and move them towards readiness to engage in effective programs.

We must share the responsibility of planning sentences with offenders in our institutions as well as use most effective therapeutic techniques such as CBT and Social Learning Theory as the basis for our interventions. We must also make the transition back in to the community one that supports not only the skills they have learnt, but the offenders themselves – through proper resettlement plans and structured follow up.

The three countries I visited are models to us in Australia and we should make every effort in finding out exactly what works, for whom, when and how. Recommendations from this fellowship are made in section 5 of this report.

The information contained in this report will be disseminated to my colleagues throughout Australia in the following ways:

- Feb 2004 – Presentations to correctional staff from NSW, Victoria, SA, WA, Tas at the Case Management Society of Australia Conference
- Publication of parts of this report in the Australian Journal of Case Management
- August 2004, Presentations to the 1st National “What Works” Forum (organised by NSW Corrections)
- Printing of this report and sending it to state Ministers for Justice and CEOs of various departments of Corrective Services
- Sending the report to my network of colleagues and contacts throughout Australia
- Placement of the report into the NSW Correctional Services Academy Library at Eastwood, NSW
- Presentations to key departmental staff in NSW, with offers to other states for similar presentations
- Offer to share the resources (see section 6) which were brought back from overseas
Program
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1 Introduction

In the pursuit of reducing criminal recidivism research has always favoured treatment over punishment, yet that has not always been the case in practice. The phrase “What Works?” is taken from a much-cited article of that title by Martinson (1974)\(^1\) who expressed a general concern that in fact “nothing works”. He concluded nothing, including education or psychotherapy could appreciably reduce “the powerful tendency for offenders to continue in criminal behaviour” (Martinson 1974 p.49). Such a point of view was eagerly welcomed by many prison systems and governments of the day, probably for the cost “benefit” and has been attributed to not just a paucity of intervention programs but a general warehousing of prisoners throughout the world over the past 20 years.

By 1979, however, Martinson\(^2\) withdrew his initial conclusions. He acknowledged both the errors in his own reviews and the overwhelming research, which had begun to emerge as a result. This research began to show that some positive results, and a subsequent reduction in recidivism were possible through intervention.

In some ways, however, it was too late, for despite the increasing evidence that gains were possible through programming, the ‘Nothing Works’ view had become deeply embedded in the thinking and planning of a majority of professionals and policy makers in criminal justice systems. It has taken almost three decades, and at least another 500 research findings and meta-analyses to persuade governments that it is in fact counter-productive to NOT introduce a set of effective interventions.

At the heart of effective interventions are several general key principles. Firstly it has emerged that interventions must match the offender’s risk of reoffending level to the level of service intervention, i.e. high-risk offenders receive more intensive programs and services while those of lower risk receive minimal intervention. Secondly, interventions should focus on those modifiable factors that contribute most highly to the offending (known interchangeably as dynamic risk factors or Criminogenic Needs). Thirdly, it is imperative to match the programs to the learning style of an offender to increase the likelihood that the offender will respond in a positive fashion. This is known as the responsivity principle and covers not just learning style but all factors that increase response such as the timing of interventions, facilitator-offender match and program settings.

The fourth principle implies programs located in the community yield the more effective outcomes. This is not to dismiss institutional based work, but the need to apply the skills learnt in real life. Fifth is the treatment modality principle, that is that programs should be (a) multimodal – focusing on more than one criminogenic need, (b) skills oriented – such as problem solving, social and coping skills and (c) utilise


methods drawn from behavioural (especially social learning theory) and cognitive
behavioural sources.

It was with the above principles in mind that I set out to discover the most recent
innovations across three countries, said to be the leaders in these areas of
corrections, to look at the ASSESSMENT of risk, Criminogenic Needs and
responsivity factors such as motivation and learning styles as well as effective
intervention PROGRAMS which have been shown to be effective in reducing
reoffending by targeting Criminogenic Needs. I was also keen to gain some insight
into how these jurisdictions have applied organisational development methods to
move from a passive to a proactive workforce where all staff work for the same goals,
that is, to contribute to a safer community by reducing reoffending.
2 Assessments and Sentence Planning

In order to establish the right level of service and the type of intervention programs each offender must undergo a Risk and Needs Assessment. In each country assessments were undertaken immediately after the offender was sentenced or had pleaded guilty, although in some cases some of the information used for assessment had already been collected prior to sentencing as part of the pre-sentence report or screening stages.

These assessments had all taken some years to design and develop and an equal amount of time in their implementation. The ability to record the assessment data electronically was crucial to their development. Automated assessments mean accurate calculation of scores, instant access for all staff, printable results, easy access by Sentence Planners who don’t need to re-write or re-enter any data, and easy recalculation once a significant assessment-changing event occurs. On a macro level the assessment results can be added to other offenders’ results to provide a bigger picture for Program Managers and developers.

Most importantly for Australian jurisdictions, where sentences range from one day to life, it was recognised that only those offenders who had longer sentences were assessed. Given that the higher risk cases led to further specialist assessment prior to programming, it seemed unnecessary to assess short serving offenders. Generally the start point was a 12-month or longer sentence. Those serving less time may or may not be assessed.

Integrity of assessment was paramount in all visited jurisdictions, after all, not only are the results reflected in the activity of the offender while incarcerated or on parole, but their results are used to calculate the risk levels and Criminogenic Needs in the prison population as well as the types of programs to be developed and run. Any miscalculation of assessments will lead, therefore, to incorrect risk levels, or worse, inappropriate programs provided in a prison or across a jurisdiction.

In all jurisdictions only specialist assessors (known as Sentence Planners in NZ & the UK and Correctional Planners in Canada) carry out assessment. These staff, without exception, had extensive training in interviewing, risk and needs assessment and Sentence Planning. This training was followed up with quality assurance processes such as co-assessment, supportive supervision and regular assessment training.

Placing quality assessments and the ensuing Sentence Planning into the fabric of each workplace and department was a matter of starting at the top and working down. Mission statements were changed to herald the move from basic security, corporate plans and strategy documents were written and assessment was placed either within an existing branch (e.g. within the Psychology Branch in New Zealand) or new assessment units were set up (e.g. the OASys Unit in the UK). Centralised procedures manuals were written and the assessments encoded into the departments’ computer databases. Training manuals and courses were also developed, as were assessor certification guidelines. Informing the workforce about the need for assessment was not easy and so feedback of risk levels and Criminogenic Needs at local and national levels was important. This assessment ‘PR’ was needed to convince the service of the importance of assessment.
In introducing such assessments the focus should never be just about the questionnaire itself, but on the variety of sources from which the assessment is made. Put succinctly it was stated: “You never just do the LSI-R (OIA, CNI, OASys etc). You do the observations, reality checks, file reviews, collect the collateral information and then perform interviews to collect enough information to answer the rest of the 54 questions on this person”.

In general, a structured Judgement Model is used in assessment. These steps include the following:

a) Determine the objective of the assessment e.g. Sentence Planning, parole report etc.,

b) Screen the relevant information – all data available and other assessments, read files thoroughly, conduct the interview, observations, interview outside sources, interview the offender,

c) In-depth analysis – evaluate the information,

d) Analysis validation – Is this the right way to draw conclusions, are there any other interpretations?,

e) Strategy/Recommendations – draft Sentence Plan,

f) Outcome assessment – what will be the effect of this Sentence Plan? Will the strategies and recommendations meet the objectives?
2.1 ASSESSMENT – NEW ZEALAND

In New Zealand risk assessment is conducted using static indicators from an actuarial tool known as the ROC/ROI (Risk of Conviction and Risk of Imprisonment), whilst the Criminogenic Needs Inventory (CNI) is used for assessing dynamic risk factors.

A benefit of conducting a needs assessment separate to the risk assessment is in its efficiency. Since New Zealand generally place offenders who pose a low risk of reoffending into education and employment only, the CNI is not conducted if the ROC/ROI is less than 0.4.

Another aspect of the CNI different from other jurisdictions was the separation of Predisposing Needs to Offence Cycle Needs. The former set of needs features pre-existing behaviours and cognitions acquired over time while the latter set are those behaviours, cognitions and emotions demonstrated in the 12-24 hours leading up to the offence, a time known as the Offence Cycle. An example of an offence cycle follows:

![Diagram of Offence Cycle]

**Figure 1: Example of “Offence Cycle”**
Included in the assessments besides risk and needs is a measure of responsivity and motivation. Security risk is also built into the risk of reoffending instruments.

An important aspect of these assessments is the methodology used. This is important in achieving the most accurate true score for each offender. In order to achieve this a narrative approach is employed, using a conversational style of questioning. This information is verified through the seeking out and analysis of collateral information to confirm as many answers as possible.

Consent is given by offenders for the Sentence Planner to access records from other government and non-government sources such as police facts, judges comments, family, community and employers to ensure the highest quality of assessment possible. Information held in community corrections files is vital as well as the prison-held information. If consent is not given to take part in the assessment, offenders automatically receive a “Motivation” category (see Table 1 below) and their Sentence Plan is based on facts alone (e.g. Judges comments, screenings etc) – they simply do not have input into their assessments.

If the ROC/ROI results in a low risk of reoffending (< 0.4) Post Sentencing Assessments are conducted in place of the CNI. These include the IEEA (Inmate Employment and Education Assessment), LNA (Living Needs Assessment) and if less than 3 years to the earliest possible release date, the RNA (Reintegration Needs Assessment).

Copies of these are all available (see resources – section 6).

2.1.1 NZ Sentence Planners
In New Zealand Sentence Planners (specially trained Prison Officers, many of whom have other qualifications and training), carry out the risk/needs assessments. These Prison officers have to apply to become Sentence Planners and undergo extensive psychological testing and interviews before their appointment.

Training for Sentence Planners is extensive and includes a 20 day course for the CNI – 10 days for the PCN (Predisposing Criminogenic Needs) and 10 days for the OCN (Offence Cycle Needs), as well as additional training for creating the Sentence Plan itself. Sentence Planners are responsible only for these assessments and Sentence Plans, and do not conduct programs or have caseloads (other than their assessment caseloads). An Assessment Centre Manager supervises their work.

2.1.2 NZ Further Assessments
Whilst risk and needs assessment forms the basis of the Sentence Plans these are generally insufficient for developing a treatment plan in specialist program areas. Psychologists carry out specialist assessments once an offender has been placed at his/her prison. In NZ these consist of the Static-99 and SONAR for high risk high need sex offenders, For violent offenders, the V-RAG, PCL-R and Violence Risk Scale are carried out.

2.1.3 NZ Sentence Planning
One person I interviewed announced we are “beyond” Case Management now that we have the Integrated Offender Management System (IOMS), however it seemed to
me that IOMS provides an organising capacity very similar to the process of Case Management!

Sentence Plans are provided for all offenders and are based on (1) the Category of inmate as well as (2) their assessment results. The following table outlines how inmates are categorised for the purpose of Sentence Planning and targeting for intervention programs.

### Table 1: Categories of Inmates (New Zealand)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>CASE MANAGEMENT &amp; PROGRAM FOCUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REMAND</strong></td>
<td>Remanded in custody</td>
<td>To manage long term Remandees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUNCTIONAL SUPPORT</strong></td>
<td>Chronic psychiatric or intellectual disability</td>
<td>To improve functioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHORT SERVING</strong></td>
<td>Sentenced with &lt; 13 weeks to serve</td>
<td>To ensure effective reintegration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAINTENANCE</strong></td>
<td>Lower risk, ≥ 13 weeks to serve</td>
<td>To minimise adverse effects of imprisonment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MOTIVATION</strong></td>
<td>Higher risk, Unmotivated, ≥ 13 weeks to serve</td>
<td>To motivate inmate to address causes of offending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERVENTION</strong></td>
<td>Higher risk, Motivated, ≥ 13 weeks to serve</td>
<td>To maintain motivation and address causes of offending</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sentence Plans are an outcome of the ROC/ROI and CNI. They are the pivotal document created through the assessment process. A well-developed Sentence Plan is a strategic map that defines the best professional opinion on how the agency intends to manage its offenders' sentence and what expectation the agency has for the offender. It includes long term, time referenced objectives (particularly with respect to important sentence milestones), activities, program requirements and their sequence, offender specific supervision techniques, and behavioral indicators related to the offender’s crime cycle.

Each Sentence Plan contains a cover page briefing that outlines the demographics of the offender, his/her offence, sentence length, security rating, category (e.g. Motivation etc). The plan itself indicates the Criminogenic Needs to concentrate on as assessed by the CNI (OCN and PCN), a set of objectives for the offender to meet and activities to be completed.

The set of objectives on each plan are determined from both the offender’s category as well as from his assessment. The activities relate to the objectives and range from how the offender is to spend their time with his/her case officer and the type of intervention programs to be completed. An example of a “Motivation” inmate’s objectives might include the following:
Table 2: Typical Objectives and Activities for a Motivation category inmate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Objective Number</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motivation category inmate</td>
<td>1.1.1</td>
<td>Address motivational barriers to intervention</td>
<td>Work with Case Officer to address motivational barriers (mandatory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illiterate (CNI)</td>
<td>1.5.1</td>
<td>Develop basic literacy skills</td>
<td>Attend literacy course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor work history</td>
<td>1.6.3</td>
<td>Gain/improve employment skills</td>
<td>Work in joinery to improve carpentry skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Copies of categories, objectives and some examples of Sentence Plans are available (see list of resources, section 6).

Remand Sentence Plans are based on the LNA (Living Needs Assessment) to uncover their needs, including coping needs. These are conducted after seven weeks on remand and are converted into a remand plan.

2.1.4 NZ Assessment Centres
All assessments are carried out in specialist units or wings of a regional or busy reception prison, known as Assessment Centres. They are able to hold offenders until all the required assessments and Sentence Plans are completed after which time the offenders are placed in the appropriate security level prison which best meets their program needs.

Figure 2: A typical structure of a Sentence Planning unit
2.1.5 NZ Scheduling for Sentence Plans

A regional based “Scheduler” sequences the activities and programs on the IOMS electronic platform. IOMS can allocate offenders instantly into known courses and programs based on the needs, objectives activities of the offender. As one program officer told me he already knows who has been allocated to be in his 2006 course! If there are insufficient program vacancies (or no program exists at all yet), waiting lists are created which drives program planning decisions.

An enormous benefit of this is that the offender and his/her Case Officer are provided with a “map” for the sentence. This builds in accountability and quality assurance for the process.

A typical Schedule looks similar to a Gantt Chart as outlined below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLAN ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2 Work with Case Officer to maintain motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1 Attend 100 hour violence prevention program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.2 Prepare Relapse Prevention plan and work with case officer to implement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.1 Work with Case Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.1 Attend Straight Thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5.3 Complete NCES modules as agreed with tutor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.1 Work on farm to improve work habits of time management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.3 Work on farm to improve farm based skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2 Achieve/maintain minimum security classification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2 Participate in constructive activity as outlined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.2 Work with Case Officer to obtain employment on release</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objectives not being met: __________________________________________________________
Reason:  Adam Sessler

Inmate Signature:____________________  Case Planner Signature:____________________
2.2 ASSESSMENT – CANADA

In Canada The Offender Intake Assessment (OIA) is carried out on all offenders entering the Canadian Federal System, which deals with inmates serving sentences of over 2 years or more. The OIA is comprised of several assessments which measure security (Custody Rating Scale or CRS), risk of reoffending (Statistical Information on Recidivism – Revised or SIR-R1) and the Criminogenic Needs (Dynamic Factor Indicator and Analysis – DFIA). With 344 questions the OIA also provides a measure of responsivity, motivation and contains supplementary assessment in the areas of psychology, education and drug and alcohol misuse.

The OIA and its sub indicators are probably the best known throughout the world, partly due to the prolific writings and publication of the Canadian research department. It also is the most researched and is constantly being evaluated for its validity – predictive validity in particular. As a result of recent research the SIR-R1 is now used exclusively for men only and has been discontinued for measuring recidivism risk in women and Canadian aboriginals. The Dynamic Factor Indicators are currently being streamlined by analysing the predictive power of its items.

Seven dynamic factors and eleven static factors have been identified by the Canadians to be the most relevant in assessing offenders. A shorter version of the OIA (known as the “7/11”) has been produced by the research department and is currently being tested and sold to other countries. At the time of my visit the 7/11 was in use in Hong Kong as a very quick risk/needs measure (similar to the LSI-R short version) and data was being collected to test its validity. This computerised program also provided a simple correctional plan.

Assessment is conducted pre and post sentence. Information containing pre sentence information from the Provincial systems is obtained and Probation Officers in the Assessment Prisons take up to 4 days to compete the OIA.

2.2.1 Specialist Assessments
Corrective Services of Canada (CSC) also use specialist assessments in a similar way to NZ. The criteria for assessment are tight so that assessment is neither over nor under utilised. Notably many of the specialist assessments were CSC’s own instruments such as the SARA (Spousal Assault Risk Assessment), the CASA (Computerised Assessment of Substance Abuse), and the CLAI (Computerised Lifestyle Assessment Inventory).

2.2.3 Information Retrieval Unit
Another good idea in Canada was the setting up of the Information Retrieval Unit. This is a group of people who obtain collateral information from different sources such as the Police, Judiciary etc and quickly scan and send electronically to the assessment centres to enable assessors (known as Probation Officers in Canada) to validate and verify information contained in the OIA.

2.2.4 Canadian Reintegration Potential
Another important product of the OIA is the Reintegration Potential (RP) rating. The service assigns an admission RP level based on the combined results of three separate objective measures (SIR-R1 score, CRS levels and the static and dynamic
factors. This rating provides a useful reference point (or anchor) for clinical assessment and quality control. It has the further advantage of allowing the Service to profile its offender population for planning, Case Management and program delivery and for appropriately targeting offenders for intensive release preparation.

Table 3 outlines how an “A”, “B” or “C” rating is assigned to each of the objective measurement outcomes to provide a Reintegration Potential.

The CRS measures 12 variables and focuses on escapes, security risk, and placement options. The outcome of the CRS is a Minimum, Medium or Maximum Security Rating.

The SIR-R1 measures reoffence within 3 years of release and focuses on post release success. Results of the SIR are Low, Medium or High Risk.

The OIA static and dynamic factors measure the needs in the 7 domains and offenders end up with a score of Low, Medium or High Needs.

**Table 3: Measures producing an offender’s Reintegration Potential**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CRS (security)</th>
<th>SIR (risk)</th>
<th>OIA (needs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>Mod</td>
<td>Mod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen, an offender with low security, low risk of reoffending and low needs is given the profile “AAA” and has the highest potential for reintegration where a “CCC” (maximum security, high risk and needs) is considered to fall into the least likely category for reintegration. See Motiuk and Nafekh (2001)\(^3\) for more information on Reintegration Potential

2.3 ASSESSMENT – ENGLAND/WALES

Years in its development, the OASys (Offender Assessment System) is the online approach for measuring risk and needs in the UK. In addition, OASys measures a further risk – of harm (to self, to others, to children, to staff and to the community).

Conducted only on those serving sentences of 12 months or longer, the OASys links assessment, case supervision and Sentence Plans on an integrated electronic platform which is currently being rolled out in both community and custodial settings.

OASys provides Her Majesty’s Prison Service (HMPS) with a more thorough, victim focused assessment. Offender information including Victim Impact Statements are checked before interviewing the offender and targets are discussed with offenders.

The first section of the OASys, the needs section, includes personal social and Criminogenic Needs. These needs were the results that emerged from the Home Office Research Unit. It is a mixture of self-report and collateral information and in interview.

The following diagram reflects the flow of information:

![Diagram of OASys assessment and Sentence Planning process]

**Figure 3: Conducting the OASys assessment and Sentence Planning**

The Sentence Planning section of OASys contains S.M.A.R.T. objectives. Programs are prioritised on a basis that literacy is given first priority followed by drug treatments and then other intervention.

Unfortunately, at this point there is no one to make sure that the plan happens, however, after Case Management is fully introduced the offenders case officer will be responsible with the offender to make sure the plan is followed.

2.3.1 England/Wales Case Management
HMPS will be introducing a new Case Management system with the risk/needs framework by separating out its offenders into risk and harm categories. In Australia we are yet to align Case Management to a risk/needs framework, however, as the following table demonstrates, matching the type of supervision to the level of risk,
needs and harm potential of an offender has considerable merit for managing offenders.

Table 4: Aligning Case Management to the Risk/Needs Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>CASE DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>CASE MANAGEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| IV    | High and very high risk of harm cases  
– public protection priorities  
· Cases requiring the highest level of skill, qualification and organisational authority  
· Cases requiring unusual or exceptional resource allocation  
· Cases requiring high levels of inter-agency work  
· Cases in which mishandling would have serious organisational consequences | Higher grade case manager  
· Intrusive, assertive, intensive supervision programme  
· Program Officer in partnership with other agency staff delivering interventions or integrative work in tight teamwork arrangements with high levels of communication  
· Frequent line management monitoring and guidance; high resource levels |
| III   | High risk of re-offending cases with complex intervention plans  
· High profile cases  
· Cases with rehabilitation as the primary objective  
· Cases requiring high levels of integrative work  
· High local and national priority cases (prolific and/or persistent offenders) | Higher grade case manager overseeing multi-factor supervision plan  
· Good communication and integration  
· Higher or middle grade integrative work or interventions  
· Key workers delivering interventions |
| II    | Rehabilitation cases with less complex intervention plans  
· Rehabilitation cases where the main rehabilitative work has been completed  
· Reasonably motivated, reasonably compliant offenders  
· Medium or low risk of harm  
· Cases with punishment or practical help as the priority objective | Lower grade case manager  
· Lower number and scale of interventions  
· Some partnership or in-house contribution  
· Routine communication for monitoring progress and review  
· Case Manager with access to higher grade consultant or Supervisor for boundary decisions between level II and III |
| I     | Medium or low risk of harm cases  
· Low risk of re-offending cases  
· Compliant offenders with priority objectives for punishment or practical help | Lower grade case manager  
· Low levels of intervention and intrusion  
· Administrative/monitoring mode |

Copies of the OASys can be arranged from Sarah Mann, National Probation Directorate, Horseferry, Dean Rile Street. London SW1P 2AW or Sarah.Mann@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk
2.4 CRIMINOGENIC NEEDS

Whilst Andrews and Bonta (1994)⁴ outline a major set and a minor set of Criminogenic Needs, there is no agreed-to set throughout the literature, and in practice each jurisdiction makes a decision about what needs domains it will assess offenders against. The following table provides the range of Criminogenic Needs that are assessed in NZ, Canada and England.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEW ZEALAND</th>
<th>CANADA</th>
<th>ENGLAND/WALES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol and Drug</td>
<td>Personal/Emotional</td>
<td>Accommodation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Associates</td>
<td>Substance Abuse</td>
<td>Education, training &amp; employability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotions</td>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>Financial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle Balance</td>
<td>Associates</td>
<td>Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence Propensity</td>
<td>Marital/Family</td>
<td>Lifestyle and associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Drug and Alcohol misuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offence related cognitions and emotions</td>
<td>Community Functioning</td>
<td>Cognitive Style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impulsivity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambling</td>
<td></td>
<td>Attitudes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4.1 Canadian Criminogenic Needs

In Canada the OIA breaks up the seven domains into principle components and sub components. Indicators for these subcategories make up the 344 items. The following table outlines the seven domains, their principal and sub components.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 5: CANADIAN DOMAINS, PRINCIPAL AND SUB COMPONENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DOMAIN</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPLOYMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARITAL/FAMILY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOMAIN</th>
<th>PRINCIPAL COMPONENT</th>
<th>SUB-COMPONENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marital Relation</td>
<td>Maternal Relations, Paternal Relations, Parental Inter-Relations, Sibling Relations, Other relative(s), Criminality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parenting Responsibility</td>
<td>Dependants, Parenting Skills, Child Abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interventions</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSOCIATES/ SOCIAL INTERATION</td>
<td>Attachments</td>
<td>Status, Substance Abusers, Pro-criminal, Pro-social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpersonal Relations</td>
<td>Style, Influence, Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBSTANCE ABUSE</td>
<td>Alcohol Abuse</td>
<td>Pattern, Situations, Interference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drug Abuse</td>
<td>Pattern, Situations, Interference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interventions</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY FUNCTIONING</td>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>Stability, Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Self-presentation, Hygiene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Physical, Dental, Nutritional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>Budgeting, Accounts, Credit, Collateral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Written, Verbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leisure</td>
<td>Hobbies, Organised activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Social Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONAL/</td>
<td>Self concept</td>
<td>Personal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOMAIN</td>
<td>PRINCIPAL COMPONENT</td>
<td>SUB-COMPONENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EMOTIONAL ORIENTATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cognition</td>
<td>Social-Cultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Behavioural</td>
<td>Cognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sexual Behaviour</td>
<td>Aggression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assertion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gambling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frustration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hostility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Risk Taking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sensation seeking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dysfunction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Preference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mental Ability</td>
<td>Functioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mental Health</td>
<td>Disordered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interventions</td>
<td>Assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Psychological/Psychiatric Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ATTITUDE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>Laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Judicial System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Corrections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Society</td>
<td>Convention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Women/Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Property</td>
<td>Personal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Communal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td>Goal Directed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conforming</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.4.2 Severity of Criminogenic Needs

As mentioned, Criminogenic Needs are also known as dynamic risk factors for their changeability. Hopefully, the result of completing a program is that the severity of the risk factor is reduced.

In both New Zealand and Canada these are given a “severity” rating, assessed along a continuum ranging from being a significant contributor reoffending risk, through to it being an asset for the offender. The following a Canadian example of the different ways that the Employment domain is rated:

- "Factor seen as an asset to community adjustment" means that there is evidence that employment has been very satisfying for the offender and is a stabilizing influence.

- "No immediate need for improvement" indicates that neither employment, underemployment, sporadic employment, nor chronic unemployment have interfered with the offender's daily functioning.

- "Some need for improvement" means that one of these conditions has caused the offender minor adjustment problems in the community, and

- "Considerable need for improvement" rating means that the offender's employment situation has caused them serious adjustment problems and has contributed markedly to their offending.
3 Rehabilitative Intervention Programs

From the findings in NZ, Canada and the UK, the following process appears to elicit the most effective results in reducing reoffending:

**Table 5: Steps from Assessment to Programming**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessments</th>
<th>Risk first, then needs and responsivity such as learning ability and motivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correctional Planning</td>
<td>Completed by Sentence Planners, negotiated with inmates to secure ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Scheduling</td>
<td>Addressing responsivity issues (e.g. Literacy) first, cognitive skills next then most potent Criminogenic Needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivational programs, work and education</td>
<td>To build up interest in programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Skills Programs</td>
<td>To address irrational, antisocial thinking patterns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primers</td>
<td>To motivate further interest in specialised programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminogenic Programs</td>
<td>Specialist assessment to draw up treatment plans and objectives. Multimodal high, moderate &amp; low intensity programs to match risk level. Most severe Criminogenic Needs addressed first</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance/Booster Programs</td>
<td>Such as relapse prevention, to boost and reinforce skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reintegration Programs</td>
<td>Such as day leave, works release, resettlement passports to increase potential for successful reintegration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In NZ it was pointed out that corrections has changed focus in the past 5 years from a “personal distress” model which paid most of its non-security attention to minimizing the effects of imprisonment through social welfare assistance (addressing self esteem, anxiety, depression etc) to a focus on rehabilitation through psychological group programs which draws on cognitive behavioural and social learning methodology. This seems to have happened about 15 years ago in Canada and is still in the process in the UK.

In each country I felt like I was walking into the textbook on “What Works” where the agencies practiced what they preach and preach what they practice – i.e. targeting moderate to high-risk behaviours and focusing on improving skills. Each program I encountered was well structured, approved or accredited and centrally coordinated. Canada has up to five manuals per program. Each jurisdiction has very carefully considered motivation programs ranging from motivational interactions through to Cognitive Skills programs.

Cognitive Skills programs form the basis of effective interventions. They attempt to address the criminal attitudes, personal and emotional criminogenic by attempting to modify the impulsive, egocentric, illogical, rigid and anti-social thinking patterns common in offenders. Cognitive Skills programs typically use a Cognitive Behavioural Therapeutic approach in group settings as the most effective and efficient vehicle for change.

The main specialist/high intensity intervention programs were consistently for (1) Drug Offenders, (2) Sex Offenders and (3) Violent Offenders. All systems utilize accreditation as the main method of ensuring the highest quality content and delivery. All programs are research driven. Measuring the effectiveness of each program is now integral to its future development to ensure they operate at their most effective level. Staff training and supervision is fundamental.
3.1 PROGRAMS - NEW ZEALAND

Programs in New Zealand have changed dramatically over the last few years as a result of the Integrated Offender Management (IOM) framework and the adaptation of the What Works literature and research. A centralised Program structure was redesigned by a National Project Team and installed on a region-by-region basis. Much unlearning had to take place, especially by social workers who had been working under a “personal distress” model and had to learn many new skills to adjust to a reducing reoffending model.

The IOM Framework was developed and articulated throughout the service first, then the strategies were developed which contained a set of new programs and a rewriting of existing programs to match the What Works literature. Other new strategies were also developed including the IOM strategies for Female, Maori and Pacific Island offenders. Budgets had to incorporate the new changes and each region had its own project team linked to the national project group. Subject matter experts were brought in as well as process experts to assist with the Change Management.

Of particular note the senior management had to drive these changes that included extensive training of all staff to saturate the workforce in theories such as the Psychology of Criminal Conduct (see Andrews and Bonta (1994)\(^5\) and McGuire (1995)\(^6\)) implementation of new programs and thinking, monitoring compliance and ensuring integrity through quality assurance processes. One thing was made very clear to me, that amidst all the turmoil and uncertainty of the changes, where 10-15% of the workforce was lost, perseverance and repetition of the new messages through constant communication with staff was the key. The message that “we wont back off from this” was reinforced time and time again, so much so that by 2003 all staff in the prisons that I interviewed were able to recite the new practice and justify using the theory. What the new programs would be and where they would be delivered was driven by the National Office.

3.1.1 NZ Cognitive Skills Program
New Zealand has adopted the McGuire Cognitive Skills program known as “Straight Thinking” This is an 80-hour program based on the Rational Emotive Therapy and Cognitive Behavioural Therapy approaches. It is available for Intervention, Motivation and Short-serving inmates.

Just prior to visiting New Zealand a new piece of research was released from the UK that countered previous research about the effectiveness of Cognitive Skills program\(^7\). This stated that Cognitive Skills were not producing the results (measured in terms of reduction in reoffending) that had previously been thought. This was seen as faulty in its methodology, and that new studies were needed to support this research in order for changes to be made. In the meantime some adjustment to the

thinking about Cog Skills programs indicates that programmers are now considering these as having more of a motivating effect rather than meeting Criminogenic Needs

3.1.2 NZ Criminogenic Needs Programs

Three 100-hour criminogenic programs were introduced at the moderate intensity level. These are the Violence Prevention Program, the Alcohol and Drug program and the mixed program. Programs in New Zealand are somewhat like a McDonalds menu – you can go anywhere with the same order and you will receive the same product.

Education programs focus initially on literacy, numeracy and ESOL for Pacific Islanders. Core education programs aim toward moving offenders to the National Certificate of Employment skills whilst there are a limited number of students enrolled in TAFE and University correspondence courses.

Among the high intensity programs were specific units set up for young adult offenders, Maori offenders, sex offenders, alcohol and drug offenders and violent offenders. These units use both an intensive Case Management approach to enhance the positive outcomes from a social learning model alongside the cognitive behavioural programs. Recent research into the Tia Marama Sex Offender program has cut sexual reoffending in half. A living skills program is conducted under the term “Reintegration Programs”.

3.1.3 NZ - Other Programs

Constructive Activity funds are also available regionally for various non-criminogenic programs for the constructive use of inmate time. These include programs such as library services, recreational programs, art and cultural programs.

Maintenance inmates (low risk inmates with greater than 3 months to serve) are involved mainly in work and constructive activity with Reintegration programs towards the end of their sentence. Surprisingly, given the many other aspects of the What Works framework employed, they are accommodated with high-risk inmates in the same units and prisons

3.1.4 NZ Program Staffing

Programs are rarely delivered outside of a group setting; in fact only one program is delivered on a one to one basis.

Programs are conducted by Intervention staff who are separate to Sentence Planning staff (who conduct assessments and create the Sentence Plans). Intervention staff do not have a caseload. Interestingly, the newly formed “Intervention Services” Unit plans to remove all intervention staff from prisons as they can be working in both custodial and community settings. Program Managers have also been removed from prisons and now only Regional Program Managers exist.

Training for program facilitators usually take approximately two weeks per program. To ensure the quality of their work they are videoed whilst presenting to groups, have monthly supervision by Psychologists or external supervisors. Facilitators keep notes, put in reports half way through a course and evaluate it at the end.
3.2 PROGRAMS - CANADA

The Correctional Service of Canada (CSC) offers five groupings of programs:

- Correctional Programs (Accredited and approved)
- Mental Health Programs
- Education Programs
- Employability Programs
- Social Programs (not targeting criminogenic factors, but helping to reintegrate)

3.2.1 Canada – Correctional Programs

The Reintegration Programs Division centrally controls all Correctional Programs in Canada. This division is charged with (a) the writing and development of all intervention programs, (b) their training (c) their implementation into chosen prisons and penitentiaries and (d) their evaluation.

Canada truly recognises that incarceration alone provides little (if any) difference to recidivism reduction and that there are some types of programs do have an effect. All correctional programs are based in Cognitive Behavioural theory, target Criminogenic Needs, match intensity to risk levels and are responsive to the individual needs and learning style of inmates. All attempt to develop skills in the inmate.

The following list outlines both accredited and non-accredited correctional programs, their intensity and the Criminogenic Needs (as assessed by the OIA) they target.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>PROGRAM NAME</th>
<th>RISK/ INTENSITY MATCH</th>
<th>DYNAMIC RISK FACTORS TARGETED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex Offender Programs</td>
<td>High intensity sex offender program</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Personal/ Emotional Orientation, Attitude, Social Interaction &amp; Community Functioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National moderate intensity sex offender program</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National low intensity sex offender program</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Violence Programs</td>
<td>High Intensity Family Violence Program</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Family/Marital Relationships, Personal Emotional Orientation &amp; General Attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate intensity Family Violence Program</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYPE</td>
<td>PROGRAM NAME</td>
<td>RISK/ INTENSITY MATCH</td>
<td>DYNAMIC RISK FACTORS TARGETED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Skills</td>
<td>Cognitive Skills Program</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boosting Cognitive Skills Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anger and Emotions Management Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boosting Anger and Emotions Management Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Living Without Violence in the Family Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parenting Skills Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Leisure Skills Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Community Integration Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence Prevention</td>
<td>Violence Prevention Program (VPP)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Personal/ Emotional Orientation, General Attitude, Social Interaction &amp; Community Functioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aggressive Behaviour Control (ABC)</td>
<td>Mod – High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anger and Emotions Management Program</td>
<td>Mod – High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Counter-Point</td>
<td>Low – Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse</td>
<td>High Intensity Substance Abuse Program (HISAP)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Substance Abuse, Personal/Emotional Orientation, General Attitude, Social Interaction &amp; Community Functioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Offender Substance Abuse Program (OSAP)</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHOICES</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYPE</td>
<td>PROGRAM NAME</td>
<td>RISK/INTENSITY MATCH</td>
<td>DYNAMIC RISK FACTORS TARGETED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segregation Programs</td>
<td>Motivation Based Intervention Strategy</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Attitude, Personal/Emotional Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Adult Basic Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>Employment &amp; Community Functioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vocational Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-secondary Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Mainly low to moderate</td>
<td>Employment, &amp; Community Functioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal Programs</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women Offender Programs</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Various</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.2.2 Canada – Description of Correctional Programs

The following outlines detailed information on the key correctional programs offered by CSC. I have chosen to provide this detail because of the quality of programming, the fact that they are all research driven and all meet the international best practice standards. Further information is available on the Internet, copies of some program manuals are available – see 6. List of resources (Section 6)

#### 3.2.2.1 Sexual Offender Programs

The following offenders are provided with an opportunity to participate in sexual offender programs:

- Offenders whose current offence is a sexual offence;
- Offenders who have a history of sexual offences;
- Offenders whose current or past offences involved a sexual offence, whether or not the latter resulted in conviction.

---

8 Elicited from Reintegration Division Internet site. More information than is currently listed here is placed on the internet.
The assessment and treatment of sexual offenders focus on identifying the nature and pattern of behaviour and developing strategies that may be influential in reducing the risk for reoffending.

The treatment of sexual offenders is a therapeutic and semi-structured intervention aimed at reducing the risk of recidivism through the use of effective self-management. It deals with cognitive distortions, deviant arousal and fantasy, social competence, anger and emotion management, empathy, and victim awareness.

Sexual offender programs tend to have a cognitive-behavioural approach and are delivered in groups with individual intervention when required. The programs emphasise the need for offenders to take responsibility for their actions, recognise the behavioural progression that preceded and followed sexual offences, identify situations which place them at risk to re-offend, and assist them to develop strategies to prevent recidivism.

Sexual offender programs usually include components dealing with attitudes towards sexuality and relationships, empathy enhancement and victim awareness, anger and emotion management, techniques to reduce or control deviant arousal, and healthy self-management skills. Emphasis is placed on reducing the risk of sexual offending through a combination of self-management and external control.

Program intensity is linked to offender risk need. Moderate to high needs are usually met in institutional settings where programs are generally longer and more intensive. Offenders who are identified as lower risk and/or need are matched with lower intensity, shorter duration programs either in minimum-security settings or in the community.

All offenders who have participated in a sexual offender program, regardless of intensity level, may participate in a follow-up maintenance program. The maintenance programs are offered in both institutional and community settings. The goal of this program is to maintain the gains that were made in the sexual offender programs, to monitor risk level, and to further develop skills that will enhance effective self-management.

### 3.2.2.2 Family Violence Programs

Family Violence Programs are primarily focused on male offenders who have been abusive in their family relationships, have a history of committing assaults, or have been identified at high risk of being perpetrators of abuse. Programs are also available for CSC staff, Aboriginal offenders, and federally sentenced women. In the case of the latter, the emphasis is placed on issues related to victims of sexual abuse.

Family Violence Programs focus on teaching offenders that violence is a response learned through direct experience or modeling. Program content is primarily psycho-educational, providing information while teaching specific skills. It may consist of three elements: education, skill development and relapse prevention. Low intensity program contain only the educational component, while moderate and high-intensity program contain all three elements. Because attitudinal change requires considerable time, a continuum of treatment, from the institution to the community, is a necessity. Therefore, the high-intensity program for offenders, the longest in
duration, include additional monitoring, before and after treatment, to allow for observation, particularly in the community setting.

3.2.2.3 Living Skills suite of Programs
The living skills program suite consists of the following programs
- Cognitive Skills Program
- Boosting Cognitive Skills Program
- Anger and Emotions Management Program
- Boosting Anger and Emotions Management Program
- The Living Without Violence in the Family Program
- Parenting Skills Program
- The Leisure Skills Program
- The Community Integration Program

3.2.2.3.1 Cognitive Skills Program (Living Skills)
The Cognitive Skills Program, core component of Living Skills Programming, consists of 36 sessions that focus on the development of interpersonal reasoning skills for effective life management. Its goal is to modify the impulsive, egocentric, illogical and rigid thinking of offenders.

The Program targets the following specifically identified cognitive deficit areas:
- Self-control,
- Interpersonal Problem Solving,
- Cognitive Style,
- Social Perspective-taking,
- Values,
- Critical Reasoning.

3.2.2.3.2 Boosting Cognitive Skills Program (Living Skills)
Boosting Cognitive Skills Program is a 10-session programme designed to assist participants in reviewing and maintaining the use of skills taught in the Cognitive Skills Program. Most offenders are motivated to use their newly acquired skills upon completion of the programme and as they prepare themselves for release. However, as time progresses, some forget how to use those skills or start thinking that they no longer work for them. These sessions will remind them of what they have learned, and show them how to use the knowledge.

3.2.2.3.3 Anger and Emotions Management Program (Living Skills)
As part of the larger Living Skills programming strategy, the Anger and Emotions Management Program complements the other five existing components that were developed to address needs that are common to most offenders.

The Anger and Emotions Management Program consists of 25, two-hour group sessions, structured into six sections. It is not a psychotherapy programme but is based on a cognitive-behavioural approach to anger reduction. It is meant to train offenders in skills needed to manage anger and other emotions associated with the occurrence of aggression and antisocial behaviour. Although the primary focus of the programme is the management of anger, it contains a section on the management of other negative emotions, especially aggressive behaviour.
3.2.2.3.4 Boosting Anger and Emotions Management Program (Living Skills)
The Boosting Anger and Emotions Management Program runs for 8 sessions. It was developed so that participants would have the chance to review and practise the skills learned in the Anger and Emotions Management Program (AEMP). It focuses the offender on keeping anger or other emotions under control. By teaching new ways to think about and respond to tough situations, the Program reinforces the offenders' understanding of the feelings that ultimately keep bringing them into contact with the criminal justice system.

3.2.2.3.5 The Living Without Violence in the Family Program (Living Skills)
Living Without Violence in the Family is a 10 session (20 hours) programme of prevention and awareness for offenders. It targets values, attitudes and behaviours related to family violence.

The definition of "violence", within the Program and for the purpose of offender selection, is very broad. It includes economic abuse, threats and coercion, intimidation, emotional abuse and isolation, among others. Because many offenders experience family lives that do not conform to the traditional nuclear family concept (married, mother, father and children living together), the definition used for "family" is also very broad. It includes intimate and common-law relationships.

Living Without Violence is intended to introduce offenders to a broader understanding of what constitutes violence, and what are its causes and impact. As a prevention programme, it may encourage participants to adopt attitudes and beliefs to prevent future violence. It may also indirectly encourage those who are abusive in their relationships to seek treatment. It is part of an overall strategy to reduce or prevent family violence among federal offenders. This is not a therapy programme, nor is it appropriate for sex offenders who have not received previous sex offender treatment.

The course is designed to provide information and understanding on the topic of family violence. There is no discussion of personal experiences. Rather, the focus is on "third person" situations. Offenders are not asked to disclose personal information regarding their family situations nor are they challenged on their offences.

3.2.2.3.6 Parenting Skills Program (Living Skills)
The Parenting Skills Program consists of 18 group sessions and two workshops. Each session is approximately 2 hours in length, but in cases of high group interest, may extend to 2½ hours. The workshop on Reproductive Health is split by gender. The Community Resources Fair Workshop is co-educational.

The Program is intended to foster and support offenders who show a commitment to developing or improving a healthy family relationship while incarcerated, and upon release. It is designed to help offenders to develop and improve the understanding and skills that are required to successfully relate to their families, and particularly to their children. This programme is based on the cognitive development model; it strives to improve participants' cognitive functioning, while imparting parenting skills.

The Parenting Skills Program is not based on any "typical" family structure. It accommodates a wide range of structures, including single parent homes,
stepfamilies, and blended families. It is recognized that children who are raised in unhealthy family situations risk suffering from serious behavioural and emotional problems that may result in poor social adjustment, poor educational performance, delinquency, running away, and suicide. At the extreme end of the continuum, one of the most tragic results is that these children reproduce parental actions, or inaction, when they become parents themselves. Therefore, this Program also contributes to breaking a tragic cycle that places future generations of children at risk.

3.2.2.3.7 The Leisure Skills Program (Living Skills)
The Leisure Skills Program is for offenders who have a criminal history related to their inappropriate use of leisure time and/or whose current leisure pursuits are not conducive to coping or adapting, either inside the institution or in the community. The Program consists of 11 two-hour sessions.

Of particular concern are offenders who are involved in leisure activities that are related to antisocial or other behavioural problems, e.g. substance abuse, compulsive gambling, membership in antisocial gangs. This Program may serve as a useful adjunct to treatment programmes that specifically target such behaviours.

While it would be beneficial for offenders to have taken the Cognitive Skills Training Program, it is not a prerequisite to the Leisure Skills Program unless it is the consensus of the Case Management team that a particular offender's cognitive deficits are so great that he would not otherwise benefit from the Program.

3.2.2.3.8 The Community Integration Program (Living Skills)
The Community Integration Program was designed to provide offenders with critical information to assist in their transition to the community. It is run on the basis of continuous intake and is made up of modules or subject areas that may vary in number. Not all of the modules may be appropriate for, or required by, all offenders; each one is independent from the other, and the information and knowledge it provides can stand-alone.

This Program has been structured around Offender Intake Assessment indicators that recognize various areas of living that are typically problematic for offenders, for example, money management and finding a job. Returning to the community is often challenging, eventful, and stressful for offenders. The Program recognizes the areas of living that are often associated with stress, such as finding an affordable place to stay, making new friends, and re-establishing ties with family. It provides offenders with knowledge and skills to better equip themselves for their re-entry into society.

3.2.2.4 Violence Prevention Programs
The Violence Prevention Program is an intensive cognitive-behavioural reintegration program for incarcerated federal offenders. It is grounded in contemporary theory and research, and delivered by a mental health professional and a program officer.

The Violence Prevention Program is intended to help offenders who have already committed at least two violent offences or who are considered at high risk to commit violent crimes (based on the Statistical Information on Recidivism scale [SIR]).
Aggression and violent behavioural problems are multidimensional. Because the targets of change are usually complex and multiple, the Violence Prevention Program integrates a variety of rehabilitative approaches. The conceptual model integrates theories of social learning and social information processing. The program focuses on violent criminal activity and interpersonal aggression that are not exclusively based on anger or emotional control problems. The primary intervention approach is cognitive behavioural and skills-based, with an emphasis on violence (relapse) prevention. These intervention techniques are reinforced by a consistent strategy emphasizing self-control, social problem solving, education, self-management, role-playing, and homework assignments. The goal of the program is to improve the skills of the participants, and subsequently, to reduce the risk of future violence.

The Violence Prevention Program consists of 120 two-hour sessions. The program also includes at least three individual sessions that vary according to the needs of the participants, and two testing sessions. The program (excluding assessment sessions) is delivered in four months. Group sessions are two hours in length. Each group is formed of a maximum of 12 participants.

The principal interventions (modules) include:

1. Making Change: Orientation and the process of change;
2. Violence Awareness: Examining the personal origins of violence;
3. Anger Control: Basic skills of anger and stress management;
4. Solving Problems: Social problem-solving and information-processing skills;
5. Social Attitudes: Examining and reformulating the beliefs supporting violence;
6. Positive Relationships: Reducing victimization and intimate violence;
7. Resolving Conflicts: Communication and negotiation skills;
8. Positive Lifestyles: Restructuring the lifestyle triggers of violence;
9. Self Control: Developing short-term and long-term direction;

3.2.2.5 Substance Abuse Programs

Research in Canada and in the USA consistently indicates that about 70% of offenders have alcohol and other drug-related problems that warrant treatment. Over 50% of offenders report that substance abuse was associated with their criminal behaviour. CSC data indicates that while about 30% of offenders do not have a substance abuse problem, another 30% have low severity problems, 30% have a moderate substance Abuse problem and the remaining 10% have serious substance abuse problems. The relationship between substance abuse, past criminal behaviour and risk for future criminal behaviour, increases dramatically with the severity of offenders' substance abuse problems.

CSC's current regimen of core substance abuse programs includes:

- An induction and orientation program for all newly-admitted offenders;
- An intermediate intensity program for offenders with serious problems;
- An intermediate intensity program for long-term offenders;
Developing a program to address the specific needs of female offenders;
A community-based relapse prevention program with extended maintenance;
Developing Aboriginal-specific treatment programs.

Preliminary analysis of the intermediate intensity program (the Offender Substance Abuse Pre-Release Program [OSAPP]) has demonstrated that improvements in participants' knowledge, attitudes and skills were predictive of success on release as measured by significant reductions in readmission and recidivism rates.

3.2.2.6 Segregation Program
An experienced mental health professional and a program officer deliver the Segregation Program. It is being implemented and evaluated in one institution in each of the five Correctional Service Regions.

The overriding legislative principle of the segregation pilot program is that the placement of offenders in the general population is the norm, as is the provision of adequate protection, control, programs, and services to offenders who cannot be maintained in this population. In practical terms, this means that the goal is to assist the offender in returning to the general population as early as possible, while providing rehabilitative program opportunities to offenders who have no short-term alternatives to segregation. To accomplish this goal, the segregation program operates in three distinct phases:

**Phase 1: The Assessment Phase**
The participant is introduced to the segregation program. This phase identifies the reason why an offender was segregated, and results in an individualized program plan to return the offender to a less restrictive setting. It also provides mechanisms for appropriate referrals to mental health specialists and Case Management officers.

**Phase 2: The Segregation Problem-solving Phase**
Designed to occur within the first month of segregation, this second phase provides motivational and social problem-solving strategies to assist the return to a less restrictive environment. It is a brief (10 session) crisis-oriented intervention that engages the participant in developing strategies to recognize and change the behaviour that prompted segregation. This phase may involve active mediation on the part of the program officer to negotiate with offender representatives, transfer boards, and existing institutional services. A session-limited, structured, social, problem-solving intervention is delivered to individual offenders or to small groups. The basic techniques of cognitive change and self-monitoring are introduced at this phase.

**Phase 3: The Cognitive Change Phase**
This third and last phase was designed as a follow-up to the motivational and problem-solving techniques introduced in the previous one. It is an open-ended program that can be delivered to individual offenders, but is more effective in small groups. Participants are instructed in basic cognitive change processes and relapse prevention techniques. Sessions occur regularly, and participants can maintain involvement until transfer to a less restrictive environment is facilitated.
3.2.2.7 Education

CSC is determined to succeed in its goal of educating inmates so that they may compete lawfully in the community. Each program component provides offenders with opportunities to acquire education appropriate to their needs, achievement and ability.

3.2.2.7.1 Adult Basic Education

The ABE program is the education priority of the CSC. It maintains the highest enrollment (approximately 40%) of all education programs. It has been enhanced to the Grade 10 level for the completion of the academic components in areas such as math, language and science. Successful completion provides a basis from which offenders can further their education in other areas where literacy is essential.

3.2.2.7.2 Secondary Education

The secondary education program leads to graduation at the Grade 12 level; it comprises approximately 25% of the participation in all of the education programs. Inmates in Canada's federal correctional facilities are well aware that a secondary school diploma has become a prerequisite for securing lasting employment and for entry into a variety of training opportunities. In increasing numbers, they are making personal commitments to this program. Accreditation received upon successful course completion fulfills provincial secondary school diploma requirements.

3.2.2.7.3 Vocational Education

Vocational programs are the choice of approximately 25% of all inmate students. They provide training in a wide range of job-related skills that are relevant to employment opportunities that exist in the institutions as well as in the community. Some of the subjects currently taught by CSC's vocational programs are:

- welding and metal trades,
- hairdressing,
- small engine repair,
- auto mechanics and auto body repair,
- electronics,
- carpentry and cabinet making,
- upholstery,
- plumbing,
- cooking,
- computer programming.

The vocational education programs include a generic skills component that is applicable to a number of vocational fields. This component addresses, at a minimum, the subjects of industrial and shop safety as well as personal and interpersonal skills for success in the work place.

3.2.2.7.4 Post-secondary Education

Post-secondary education offers offenders the opportunity to acquire a trade or profession, as well as to update trade qualifications prior to their release. Fewer than 10% of participants in education programs opt for post-secondary education. Offenders generally pay for their own post-secondary studies, unless it can be demonstrated that the education addresses a very specific need.
3.2.3 Employment - Canada
All correctional programs call for group interaction through which offenders learn and practice skills that they will need to draw upon to facilitate reintegration and to adapt to private sector work settings. These important skills are central to the core employability program CSC intended to develop and implement. More specifically, they include problem solving, critical thinking, punctuality, interacting with coworkers, being respectful of other people's opinions and feelings, and dealing with authority figures.

3.2.4 Staffing of Programs – Canada
Correctional Program Officers (CPO’s) must hold a university degree in criminology or a behavioural/social science. They, along with Psychologists conduct the programs for CSC. These staff, who do not manage a case load, nor are they involved in assessment (other than treatment assessment for their particular programs), are trained extensively and supervised regularly to carry out programs.

Typically, each CPO and Psychologist are all trained in the Cognitive Skills Program (Reasoning and Rehabilitation) as well as in one or two Correctional Programs.

The following table outlines the responsibilities of line staff as they relate to Assessment, Case Management and Programs

Table 7: Canadian staffing responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROLE</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parole Officers</td>
<td>· Risk and needs Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Release planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Monitor compliance with correctional plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Report writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· 1:25 Caseload</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional Program Officers (CPO’s)</td>
<td>· Facilitate Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Write Program assessment Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Help develop relapse prevention programs for offenders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· No Case Load</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychologists</td>
<td>· Facilitate Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Conduct Clinical Assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Write program assessment reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional Officers</td>
<td>· Input into release recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Small caseload</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Monitor inmates application of skills learned in programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Documents interactions on a monthly basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator, Case Management</td>
<td>· Provide advice and guidance to Parole Officers and Unit managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victim information coordinator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ROLE RESPONSIBILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROLE</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior Parole Officer</td>
<td>· Similar to CCMs with more line supervision over Parole Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Manager</td>
<td>· Can have custodial or Parole Officer background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Line supervision of Parole Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Quality controller of all reports completed by Pos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Ensure legal and policy compliance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.2.5 Canadian Programs – “Dosage”

The following table outlines how program intensity is designed to address the Criminogenic Needs of those participating. Remember that high-risk inmates attend high intensity programs, moderate risk inmates attend moderate intensity programs and so on.

**Table 8: Program Dosage**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Hours per week</th>
<th>Facilitators</th>
<th>Type of Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOW INTENSITY</td>
<td>1 – 16 weeks</td>
<td>2 – 6 hours/week</td>
<td>1 CPO</td>
<td>Closed or Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODERATE INTENSITY</td>
<td>5 – 25 weeks</td>
<td>5 – 15 hours/week</td>
<td>1 – 2 (1 CPO &amp; 1 Psych)</td>
<td>Closed or Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH INTENSITY</td>
<td>15 – 36 weeks</td>
<td>Min 10 – 15 hours/week</td>
<td>2 – At least one Psych</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.2.6 Canadian Programs - Primers

Canada is aware that in some cases they need to sell their programs to inmates even to the point of marketing them. To improve motivation for commencing programs a number of “Primers” have been written and developed for inmates. These often take the shape of “information sessions”, one-to one sessions with targeted inmates are held, workbooks are handed out and follow-up sessions occur to entice an inmate into particular programs. This motivational approach increases the likelihood that an offender will respond to the program in a more positive way.

### 3.2.7 Canadian Programs - Accreditation

For the last several years, CSC has been actively involved in a review process to ensure that its programs are designed to maximize effectiveness and that they embrace the latest treatment techniques and delivery standards for each specific program area (e.g., sex offender treatment, violence prevention, etc.).

Programs are presented to review panels that consist of internationally recognised experts in the field who assess the program in relation to specific criteria. The panel
then recommends those programs that are rated as fulfilling the required criteria to the Commissioner for accreditation. In turn, the quality of the delivery of accredited programs in the field (institutions and community) is then assessed through a process of site accreditation. The Performance Assurance Sector is primarily responsible for coordinating the overall accreditation process, however, the Reintegration Programs Division assists in the process of identifying suitable programs for review. In addition, the Reintegration Programs Division provides team leaders to lead the site review process.

Accreditation is valid for 5 years. Criteria for accreditation is outlined in the Standards for Correctional Programs and Standard Operations Procedures 726 – Management of Correctional Programs, both available on the CSC website.
3.3 PROGRAMS - ENGLAND/WALES

As time was limited in the UK (2 weeks) most of my time was involved in the investigation of the OASys assessment and Sentence Planning system and attending the national What Works Conference in Nottingham. This left little time for investigations into the intervention programs in England and Wales. What follows are pieces of information gleaned through various interviews and visits.

3.3.1 Program Development

The following steps are the recommended method taken by HMPS in the development of a suite of programs. Keep in mind that a lot of programs run in England/Wales are run by the Voluntary Sector and these steps reflect that. Further development of these steps would be required to fit the Australian models.

1. Analysis/mapping exercise to determine what is currently in use or being developed
2. Evaluation of programs worth pursuing
3. Consultation with internal or external providers. Tender process if external
4. Develop the program over a period of months/years towards accreditation. Fund to run program
5. Bid for accreditation – internal and external. HMPS owns rights to the program
6. Evaluate one year after implementation
7. HMPS submits to accreditation panel for advice
8. If not accredited to redevelop e.g. Manuals, training, continuity, approach
9. 2nd/3rd attempts
10. Adopt or abandon if not accredited after third attempt.

3.3.2 Parameters for programs

Each jurisdiction struggles with how the information about programs, especially new programs, should be disseminated to ensure that its workforce is aware of what programs are running, where, when and what is involved. The following parameters are used by HMPS to provide Governors, Managers, Case Management Staff and Inmates with information about each program.
**Table 9: Program Parameters**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARAMETERS</th>
<th>EXAMPLE “FOCUS” (HMPS Drug and Alcohol Program)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description of Program</td>
<td>High intensity Cognitive Behavioural program. Teaches offenders a range of social and cognitive skills to address drug use and offending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Accredited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td><em>Outlines the prisons in which the program operates</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Group</td>
<td>Male, medium to high risk or reconviction (score of &gt; 31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection Criteria</td>
<td>Men aged 21 and over serving minimum of 4 years. High/severe drug or drug and alcohol dependence linked to offending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusion Criteria</td>
<td>IQ below 80 and score of over 30 on PCL-R psychopathy test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Sessions</td>
<td>62 sessions over 18 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-program</td>
<td>1½ hour assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-program</td>
<td>Post program relapse prevention work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program length</td>
<td>62 x 2-hour sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group size</td>
<td>10 participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing requirements</td>
<td>2 facilitators per session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start dates</td>
<td>1 June, 1 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roll out/impact</td>
<td>Delivered only in high security institutions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.3.3 Bristol Prison Programs

The following programs are among those currently being run at Bristol High Security Prison. It holds approximately 500 maximum-security inmates.

- **Think First**
  - Cognitive Skills Program, run mainly in the community, this program is also being phased out

- **ETS (Enhanced Thinking Skills) and R&R (Reasoning and Rehabilitation)**
  - Both these programs are now being used as the key Cognitive Skills programs in the UK. ETS runs for 31 sessions over 3 months and includes problem solving strategies, social skills, responding to help/failure and coping skills

- **SOTP**
  - Sex Offender Treatment Program. High intensity Cognitive Behavioural program
CALM  Controlling Anger and Learning to Manage it. Moderate intensity Cognitive Behavioural Treatment. Offence specific looking at the emotions in an offence cycle. Looks at pre-offence feelings, precursors, beliefs, triggers, motivations

CSCP  Targeting high-risk volatile offenders. 2 years durations in 5 modules/blocks. Includes a therapeutic Community environment

FOCUS  High intensity Cognitive Behavioural Program teaching offenders a range of social and cognitive skills to address drug use and offending

Domestic Violence Program  No information available

Psychopaths course  No information available

3.3.4 Prison Structures
To support changes in assessment and programming as well as the whole of the What Works ideology the following structure indicates how major prisons in England and Wales have been set up:

**Figure 4: Prison staffing structure**
3.4 PAYMENT FOR PROGRAMS

In each country I queried whether offenders are paid to complete programs. This has been controversial in NSW and seems to be a legacy of the Nothing Works time. By this it is meant that there seems to be an opinion that it is not worth paying inmates for programs, that by attending programs they are not really contributing. Another argument for not paying inmates comes from the point of view that society may not appreciate it if we were to pay inmates for attending programs – that they are in gaol to pay their debt to society. Of course there needs to be some research into public opinion before this is used as an argument.

If the community were informed that they can potentially benefit enormously from the participation in programs then I suspect they may agree.

My experience overseas when I asked the question “Do you pay inmates for completing programs?” was that of shock. Of course they pay their inmates for doing programs! How else can you motivate them to attend if you pay for work and not programs! As they put it, it is a key to motivating them to attend.

In Canada offenders who work while in an institution may earn between $5.25 and $6.90 daily, depending on their performance. Unemployed offenders are given a daily allowance of $1.00. Those who are unemployed through no fault of their own receive up a $2.50 allowance per day. Pay may be suspended for offenders who refuse to work or to participate in institutional programs.

A similar pay scale is provided as incentives to attend intervention programs. The following daily rates indicate a similar scale for programs in Canada.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>$6.90</td>
<td>excellent participation in programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>$6.30</td>
<td>Good participation in programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>$5.85</td>
<td>Participates in one program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>$5.25</td>
<td>will accept work, refuses programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>can’t participate for reasons beyond his/her control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>Will not participate in programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.6 THE COST OF CRIME 

vs. 

THE COST OF REDUCING REOFFENDING

Of the countless people I met whilst on this fellowship and the 60 or so people I interviewed, there were many who were outstanding and memorable. One interview, however, stands out as the most influential for its potential to attract more resources for our work. The following information (3.6.1 – 3.6.3) are my notes from an interview with Graham Scott, an economist working within the NZ Department of Corrections. He outlined to me that whilst the cost of reducing reoffending is high, the benefits far outweigh it economically.

3.6.1 Economic Reasons for Reducing Reoffending

The Australian Institute of Criminology issues a “Counting the Costs of Crime in Australia” paper annually. In its latest issue it advances the social costs of $19 billion per year, and does not include costs such as policing, prisons and the security industry (estimated to be another $13 billion). Therefore it must be said that the Australian figures are grossly under estimated.

The New Zealand Dept of Corrections estimates that costs of crime to all of society are much higher than officially projected and that other figures must include those that the AIC do not, even if they are estimates.

Scott outlines that reducing reoffending can result in significant and social and economic savings, that:

- Preventing one murder saves $4,700,000
- Preventing one manslaughter - $2,500,000
- Preventing one rape - $1,600,000
- Average saving of preventing an offence is - $40,000

He estimates that a typical minor offence costs society approximately $10,000 whereas a major offence costs on average $50,000.

With these figures and others produced by NZ, it becomes possible to allocate costs to individual offenders.

Taking into account the risk of reoffending projections which are possible through the various risk predictor assessments (ROC/ROI, SIR-R1, OASys, LSI-R etc.) it is possible to see the effect of this using the following graph:

According to the New Zealand research, approximately 10% of the low risk group reoffend within 5 years (see figure 5) – and based on the types of crime they commit, will cost the government approximately $50,000 in that time.

This contrasts with the high-risk offenders, who tend to commit more serious crimes more often, who represent a societal cost of approximately $560,000 in a 5-year period.

Given that putting a high risk and a low risk inmate through the same program (as occurs in NSW) costs approximately the same, it makes sense to focus the attention and resources, on higher risk offenders.

**3.6.2 Cost-benefit of programs for high risk offenders**

According to Scott there is a 90% chance that a high-risk offender will be convicted and imprisoned within 5 years of finishing a sentence. (see figure 5)

Say we are able to reduce the reoffending of this group by a conservative 5% (worlds best practice is approximately 25%). This would mean a reoffending rate of 85%.

If we had 100 high risk offenders and rehabilitate 5 of them (5% effectiveness) then the savings to society would be 5 x $560,000 – or $2.3 million savings.

This benefit, of course, comes at a cost. Effective treatment programs are not cheap. However, even with this modest rehabilitation quotient of 5% the cost would be well worth the effort.

At a benefit:cost ratio of 10:1 the savings of $2.3m over 5 years by treating these 100 offenders would be at a cost of $230,000 – or $2,300 per individual. This is
extraordinary value similar to interest rates on a savings account of approximately 59%!

If we aimed higher, for example at a 10% reduction in recidivism, then the benefit of treating 100 inmates would be to produce a return of $5.6 million over 5 years at a cost of $560,000 (also 10:1).

In fact the social benefits of effective rehabilitation that investment in effective programs (those that have been trialed and shown to work) is very good business. What is doubtful, and therefore a risk in itself, is that we don’t know exactly what we are buying – that is, there is no proof, and it takes a long time to gamble this – one that we need to persuade treasuries to take.

### 3.6.3 Economics of treating Young Offenders

By far the most expensive group in terms of cost to society for crimes are Young Offenders. High Risk Young Offenders typically start their criminal behaviour between the ages of 10-12 and make it to prison by the time they are 20. Scott estimates that those who are now 16-18 year olds who are heading for chronic offending are the most expensive, costing society between $1 million to $6.1 million (median of $3 million) during their offending life.

His figures estimate that 70% of all crime is conducted by 10% of all criminals and these young offenders make up a large part of the 10%.

Again, if we take 100 Young Offenders (who he calls “the $3 million cases”) and are able to reduce their lifetime offending by 25% (best practice), we will have 25 successes at $3 million each – or $75 million.

If we could treat them for less than $75 million then society is better off. Again, at a benefit:cost ratio of 10:1 the cost is $75,000 per individual.

The bottom line of course is not just about money. It is about you and me not having our cars broken into, the prevention of domestic violence, armed robberies, child abuse, rape, murder etc.
4 Conclusions

In Australia we are geographically a long way from most advanced practices in the corrections world – particularly North America. We rely on texts, research articles and reports and the occasional guest lecturer from countries we know to be effectively reducing recidivism. I had the great honour of being able to walk into these textbooks and seeing “What Works” in a very real way.

If 70% of all crime is conducted by 10% of all criminals, as it has been reported, then we must assess all criminals to see who pose the highest risk. We must find out which criminogenic factors contribute most to their offending behaviours – especially those at work during the offending cycle. We must assess the responsivity of offenders and move them towards readiness to engage in effective programs.

We must use the most effective therapeutic techniques such as CBT and Social Learning Theory as the basis for our interventions. We must share the responsibility of planning sentences with offenders in our institutions and we must make the transition back in to the community one that supports not only the skills they have learnt, but the offenders themselves – through proper resettlement plans and structured follow up.

The three countries I visited are models to us here and we should make every effort in finding out exactly what works, for whom, when and how.

The information contained in this report will be disseminated to my colleagues throughout Australia in the following ways:

- Feb 2004 – Presentations to correctional staff from NSW, Victoria, SA, WA, Tas at the Case Management Society of Australia Conference
- August 2004, Presentations to the 1st National “What Works” Forum (organised by NSW Corrections)
- Printing of report and sending it to state Ministers for Justice and CEOs of various departments of Corrective Services
- Sending the report to my network of colleagues and contacts throughout Australia
- Placement of the report into the NSW Correctional Services Academy Library at Eastwood, NSW
- Presentations to key departmental staff in NSW, with offers to other states for similar presentations
- Offer to share the resources (see section 6) which were brought back from overseas
5 Recommendations

Based on this Fellowship and the visits to correctional jurisdictions in NZ, Canada and England/Wales and the information contained in this report I am able to offer a number of recommendations to state jurisdictions in Australia. In general, I believe Australian Corrective Services should adopt the Risk/Needs Assessments similar to those carried out in New Zealand, a program structure similar to Canada and the alignment of Case Management to the Risk/Needs framework as proposed by HMPS in England.

Specifically, I recommend that, if not already adopted, Australian jurisdictions:

1. Take up the Risk/Needs and “What Works” framework, place this in their missions, strategies and business plans in order to educate the workforce of its philosophies and practices,

2. Develop a culturally sensitive “Australian Risk & Needs Inventory” Assessment rather than attempt to provide these (purchase or design) on an individual state basis,

3. Conduct research into the Criminogenic Needs of Australian offenders

4. Record data from assessments electronically in a format where all data could be pooled across the country,

5. Perform basic risk/needs assessment with offenders serving sentences of greater than 6 months,

6. Conduct assessments on both pre-disposing needs and offence cycle needs to ensure specific programming addresses both of these issues

7. Ensure integrity of assessment data through extensive training, certification of assessors, close supervision and audit systems,

8. Employ Assessors from either the custodial or non-custodial ranks for the tasks of assessing offenders and creating sentence/correctional/case plans

9. Separate the workload of Assessment Officers from Intervention Officers rather than attempt to have all staff become experts in both functions,

10. Adopt a system of categorising offenders in order that they be better targeted for effective programs,

11. Set up an Assessment Pathway of tiered assessments that connect basic risk/needs assessment with specialist and clinical assessments to ensure best practice

12. Create centralised or regionalised Assessment Centres where risk/needs and specialist assessments can be carried out,
13. Ensure that Assessors receive collateral information in a timely fashion to increase the validity of assessments. This could be through the use of an Information Retrieval Unit placed in other departments,

14. Develop a severity rating for each criminogenic need so that the more serious needs are addressed,

15. Develop a system of Sentence Planning to ensure that criminogenic (and other) needs are addressed through clear structured objectives and activities, and that inmates and Case Management staff are accountable for these case plans,

16. Develop a Scheduling system which connect the objectives and activities needed to programs and services provided,

17. Provide programs and services on a Sentence Plan demand basis,

18. Develop, implement and evaluate programs which meet world's best practice and to increase effectiveness,

19. Develop programs at different intensity levels to match offenders risks of reoffending

20. Develop booster/maintenance programs for ongoing skill conglomeration

21. Centralise program management across the state,

22. Develop and articulate a program matrix for all Case Management and program staff which matches the Criminogenic Needs of offenders,

23. Develop a National Accreditation Panel for programs with input from international experts,

24. Increase minimum education for staff conducting programs to tertiary level, preferably a university degree

25. Establish a system of equal payment for participation in correctional programs in the same way as payment for employment programs

26. Calculate the economic costs and benefits of effective programming for each jurisdiction as arguments for future funding
6  LIST OF RESOURCES

The following resources that were provided to me during the fellowship evidence the generosity of our counterparts in NZ, Canada and England. Where reasonable (and legal!), I am happy to have you copy of any of the following. Please check the Internet first, however, as some of these will be available under the respective websites:

www.corrections.govt.nz,
www.hmprisonservice.gov.uk, or
www.csc-scc.gov.ca

If you are unable to locate what you are after on the Internet, please email me at ross.feenan@dcs.nsw.gov.au with the name of the article, policy etc.

6.1  RESOURCES FROM NEW ZEALAND

Policies, strategies, frameworks etc.
- Department of Corrections – Annual Report 2002-2003
- Department of Corrections – Census of Prison Inmates and Home Detainees
- Department of Corrections – Maori Strategic Plan
- Department of Corrections – Strategic Business Plan 2003-2008
- Department of Corrections – Strategic Business Plan 2003-2008 – highlights
- Fremo – Framework for Reducing Maori offending
- Inmate Security Classification – national policy
- Integrated Offender Management – an explanation
- Integrated Offender Management – Policy Overview
- IOM process overview
- Managing Offenders
- National program guidelines
- PPS Sentence Management – Continuous improvement in our approach to working with offenders
- Quality checklist – post sentence assessment and Sentence Plan
- Quality checklist for the preparation of the full pre-release report
- Quality checklist for the preparation of the pre release addendum report
- Reducing Youth Offending Program – brochure
- Sentence Management Procedures Manual
- The Pacific Strategy 2002-2005

Assessment
- A Seein “I” to the future – the Criminogenic Needs inventory
- Assessment system – flowcharts
- Between the ROC and a hard place: the dilemma of predicting the unpredictable
- CNI – overview
- CNI Assessment Training
- CPS Pre-sentencing assessment training – participant notes
- Criminal Needs Inventory – reference manual
- Offending Period Criminogenic Needs (OCN) Assessment Booklet
• Offending Period Criminogenic Needs (OCN) Resource Booklet
• Post sentencing assessments – Inmate Education and Employment assessments (IEEA), Living Needs Assessment (LNA) and Reintegration Needs Assessment (RNA)
• Pre release report – training example
• Predisposing Criminogenic Needs (PCN) Assessment
• Predisposing Criminogenic Needs (PCN) Assessment – Resource Booklet
• Quality Assurance and Risk Assessment
• ROC – statistical models predicting four types of reoffending
• ROC/ROI cutoff scores
• Sentence Management Procedures Manual
• Sentence planning for the existing inmate muster

Treatment
• And then there was light – Evaluating Kia Marama Treatment program for NZ Sex offenders
• Bicultural Therapy Model - brochure
• Description of interventions in NZ
• Functional Support Inmates
• IOM case officer coaching session
• Kia Marama – Special Treatment Unit
• Kia Marama – A description of the treatment program
• National program guidelines
• Project plan – Violence Prevention Unit
• Te Whatakotahitanga – An evaluation of the Te Piriti Special Treatment Programme for child sex offenders in NZ

Case Management
• Active Management with inmates
• Consent to contact others
• Consent to take part in assessment
• Formative Assessment – examples
• Inmate briefing note and Sentence Plan
• Sentence Management Process
• Sentence Plan Progress Reports and file notes – examples
• Sentence Plan Review Worksheet

Research
• Corrections New Zealand: A reading list
• Statistical models for recidivism – James O’Malley 1996
• Talking about sentences and crime: the views of people on periodic detention

6.2 RESOURCES FROM CANADA
Policies, procedures, strategies, frameworks etc
• Basic facts about federal corrections – 2001 edition
• Corrections and Conditional Release Act, 1996
• Corrections Population Growth
Assessment and Treatment
• Correctional Programs – Commissioners Directive
• Drug treatment – key statistics, November 2003
• From research to action – a consumer’s guide: Powerpoint presentation by Shelly Brown
• Intake Guidelines – PowerPoint presentation
• Management of Correctional Programs – SOP 726
• National Family Violence prevention programs (powerpoint hardcopy)
• Offender Intake Assessment and Correctional Planning – SOP 700-04
• Offender Intake Assessment Process (flowchart)
• Offender Programs and Reintegration Branch – Organisation chart
• Offender weekly schedule – printout of example
• Program Inventory – lists all programs offered in Canada corrections including selection criteria, Criminogenic Needs, program objectives, program performance measures and length of programs
• Program Matrix, 2003
• Roadways to change, a guide for improving relationships and staying violence free – Primer for the Moderate intensity Family Violence Program
• Standards for Correctional Programs
• The cognitive self-change program – brochure
• Violence Prevention Program – brochure

Research Reports
• An examination of youth and gang affiliation within the federally sentenced affiliation within the federally sentenced aboriginal population
• A meta-analytic examination of risk, need and responsivity principles and their importance within the rehabilitation debate, Dowden C, 1998
• Anger Management program for federal male inmates: an effective intervention – Dowden, C, Blanchette, K, & Serin, R 1999
• An operational review of the Custody Rating Scale: Reliability, validity and practical utility
• A review of the literature on Personal/Emotional Need Factors
• Assessing treatment change among violent offenders: Reliability and Validity of a Family Violence Treatment Assessment Battery
• Attitudes of Federal Correctional Officers towards offenders
• Case Needs Review: Associates/Social Interaction Domain
• Case Needs Review: Employment Domain
• Case Needs Review: Substance Abuse Domain
• Climate Indicator and Profile System (CIPS) – Field trial users guide
• Compendium on Effective correctional Programming, 2000 – CD ROM & Manuals – provides research reports on program design, effectiveness implementation and evaluation
• Day parole outcome, criminal history and other predictors of successful sentence completion
• Development of a reliable self-report instrument for the assessment of Criminogenic Needs
• Institutional Methadone Maintenance Treatment: Impact on Release Outcome and institutional behaviour
• Pilot implementation of a Custody Rating Scale – interim report
• Prison work programs and post-release outcome: A preliminary investigation
• Risk and need among federally-sentenced female offenders: A comparison of minimum, medium and maximum security inmates
• Security Classification using the custody rating scale
• Selected Annotated Bibliography: Restorative Justice
• Streamlining the substance abuse domain of the DFIA instrument
• The Custody Rating Scale, Initial Security Level Placement, and Women Offenders

• The Dynamic Factor Identification and Analysis Instrument (DFIA). What does research say – Shelly Brown et. Al.
• The effect of family disruption on Aboriginal and non-aboriginal inmates
• The High Intensity Substance Abuse Program (HISAP): Results from the pilot programs
• The relevance of a cultural adaptation for aboriginals of the Reintegration Potential Reassessment Scale (RPRS)
• The Statistical Information on Recidivism – Revised 1 (SIR-R1): A psychometric examination
• Towards a just, peaceful and safe society – consolidated report
• Towards a just, peaceful and safe society – consultation paper
• Treatment readiness and responsivity: contributing to effective correctional programming
• Treatment responsivity in criminal psychopaths
• Women Offenders who engage in Self-harm: A comparative Investigation

FORUM ON CORRECTIONAL RESEARCH

Forum - Vol 1, No. 2 1989
- Using risk assessments to reduce recidivism
- Research in Brief
- Management focus – the challenge of change
- Legal Perspectives
- International Overview - Corrections Research in Australia
Forum - Vol 5, No. 1 February 1993
- Evaluating Anger Management Programs
- How does Criminal Activity Stop?
- The issue of suicide
- Life expectancy of staff
- Developing Offender Typologies
- AIDS knowledge among inmates
- Research Across the Correctional Service of Canada

Forum - Vol 5, No. 3 September 1993
- Aboriginal Recidivists
- Recidivism among female offenders
- Are mentally disordered offenders more likely to reoffend?
- Recidivism among male offenders: What do we know?
- Recidivism and Dynamic Factors
- How do inmates view recidivism?
- Does Intensive Supervision work?

Forum - Vol 6, No. 2 May 1994 – Special Needs Offenders
- Older offenders in CSC Canada
- Under-identification of hearing loss in the Canadian federal inmate population
- A centralized approach to managing special needs offenders
- Training staff to work with special needs offenders
- Incarceration alternatives: a special unit for elderly offenders and offenders with disabilities

Forum - Vol. 7 No. 1 – Jan 1995 Young offenders
- Early substance use and its impact on adult offender alcohol and drug problems
- Young sex offenders
- Psychopathy and young offenders: rates of childhood maltreatment
- The Youth Management Assessment: Assessment of young offenders at risk of serious reoffending
- Secure detention and short-term custody youth centres: A social service perspective
- Correctional psychology with young offenders in the community: Philosophical musings
- The psychology of criminal conduct and principles of effective prevention and rehabilitation

Forum - Vol 8, No. 3 September 1996 – Effective correctional Programming
- Reducing recidivism through institutional treatment programs
- Factors influencing the effectiveness of cognitive skills training
- Intensive programming for violent offenders: a comparative investigation
- Effective sex offender treatment: the Warkworth Sexual behaviour clinic
- The Cyan Method: Using theatre in offender treatment
- Gradual release programs: Day parole performance and subsequent release outcome
- Effective correctional programming: What empirical research tells us and what it doesn’t
- Principles of effective correctional programming
- Criminal recidivism is predictable and can be influenced: An update
Strategies for enhancing the treatment of violent offenders
Factors associated with successful reintegration of Aboriginal offenders into the community

Forum - Vol. 10, No. 3 September 1998 – Dynamic Factors
Offender needs – providing the focus for our correctional interventions
The case Needs Review Project: Background and research strategy
Using dynamic factors to better predict post-release outcome
Case Needs Domain: Employment
Case Needs Domain: Marital and Family
Case Needs Domain: Associates and Social Interaction
Case Needs Domain: Substance Abuse
Case Needs Domain: Substance abuse assessment review
Case Needs Domain: Community functioning
Case Needs Domain: Personal and emotional orientation
Case Needs Domain: Attitude
Dynamic factors and recidivism: What have we learned from the Case Needs Review Project

Forum - Vol 11, No. 1 January 1999
Countercoups: A program of therapy for spousal and family violence
Evidence of the effectives of current treatments for sex offenders
A descriptive profile of incarcerated sex offenders
The impact of empathy training on offender treatment
Family violence risk assessment: evaluating its importance
Using psychological testing to predict institutional misconduct
The impact of violent acts on prison staff

Vol 11 No. 2 May 1999 Youth and Corrections
A profile of the adolescent sex offender
Young adult offenders in federal corrections: A profile
Young offenders in the federal correctional system
What works in young offender treatment: a meta-analysis
A community based alternatives for high-risk young adults
Early intervention for sexual behaviour problems among young offenders
Recent trends in youth crime

Forum - Vol 11, No. 3 September 1999 Women Offenders
Effective corrections for women offenders
The processing of adult females though the police and court stages of the Canadian criminal justice system
Women in federal and provincial based correctional facilities
Reintegration potential profiles for federally sentence women
A meta-analytic investigation into effective correctional intervention for female offenders
Gender-responsive programming for women offenders
The peer support program at Edmonton Institutior for women
Mentoring program at Edmonton Institution for women
Solutions: An intensive substance abuse program
Forum - Vol 12, no. 2 May 2000 “What Works”?  
- Defining correctional programs  
- Offender assessment: general issues and considerations  
- Treatment responsivity: reducing recidivism by enhancing treatment effectiveness  
- Treatment resistance in corrections  
- Education programming for offenders  
- Reconceptualising offender employment  
- Informing young offender policy in current research: what the future holds  
- Assessment and treatment of sexual offenders  
- Programming for violent offenders  
- Problems of self-regulation among adult offenders  
- Program evaluation: Guidelines for asking the right questions and communicating results

Forum - Vol 12, No. 3 September 2000 Managing long-term offenders  
- Residential programs for lifers: six keys to success  
- In-reach workers: the foundation of Life Line  
- The long-term offender in federal corrections: A profile  
- Release outcomes of long-term offenders  
- Classifying offenders serving life sentences  
- Women offenders serving long sentences in custody  
- Population aging and the federal inmate profile of 2010!  
- The reintegration effort for long-term infirm and elderly federal offenders program  
- The effective management of women serving life sentences

Forum - Vol 13, No. 1 January 2001 Reintegration Levers  
- The safe return of offenders through selection, intervention and supervision  
- Initiating safe reintegration: A decade of Custodial Rating Scale results  
- Using reintegration potential at intake to better identify safe release candidates  
- The importance of developing correctional plans for offenders  
- Improving offender motivation for programming  
- Increasing offender participation in programs  
- Improving program performance among offenders  
- Moderating segregation as a means to reintegration  
- Increasing reintegration potential through inmate security reclassification  
- Enhancing case preparation for release decision making  
- Managing offender risk through revocations  
- Offender reintegration monitoring tools  
- New directions in effective correctional treatment  
- Group versus individual treatment of sex offenders: A comparison

Forum - Vol 13, No. 3 September 2001 Alcohol and Drugs  
- Drugs in federal corrections – the issues and challenges  
- Alcohol and drugs: a perspective from New Zealand  
- Drugs, alcohol and criminal behaviour  
- Profiling the drug offender in Canadian federal corrections  
- Correctional Service of Canada’s core substance abuse programs: OSAPP, ALTO & Choices  
- High intensity substance abuse programming for offenders  
- Programming for substance abuse women offenders  
- Random Urinalysis Program: Policy, practice and research
· Programs for substance abusing offenders in Canada: A national survey

Forum - Vol 14, No. 1 January 2002 Academic Contributions
· Phallometric testing with sexual offenders against female victims
· Vicitisation, fear and coping in prison
· Antecedents and outcomes of correctional officers attitudes towards federal inmates: An exploration of person-organisation fit
· The dynamic prediction of criminal recidivism: A three-wave prospective study
· Classifying female offenders for effective intervention: Application of the case-based principles of risk and need
· Predictors of work stress among correctional officers
· Evaluation of the Living Without Family Violence program

Forum - Vol 15, Number 1 Community Engagement
· Issues affecting halfway houses
· A profile of offenders serving time in the community
· Participation of federal offenders in community based programs
· Halfway houses for federal offenders: What do we know about them?
· The Community Maintenance Program: A new strategy for providing treatment follow-up in the community
· Managing addictions in the community
· Restorative justice in corrections
· Offenders as resources in crime prevention
· Community outreach by the Correctional Service of Canada: Engagement activities and initiatives

6.3 RESOURCES FORM ENGLAND AND WALES
Policies, procedures, strategies & frameworks etc
· Annual Report & Accounts 2002-2003
· An introduction to working with the Prison Service – guidelines for voluntary and community sector staff and volunteers
· Improving Offenders’ Learning and Skills Delivery plan 2003-2006
· Making a difference – Scottish Prison Service
· Prisons and the Voluntary and community based sector – good practice guide
· Quality Assuring Learning and Skills Provision – A guidance document for staff working prisons and young offender institutions
· Restorative Justice: the Government’s strategy
· Sentence Planning and Management
· Strategy for working with the voluntary and community sector
· What Works in Prison: Delivering the strategy
· What Works in prison: Strategy

Assessment
· An evaluation and Validation of the Offender Assessment System
· Cell Sharing Risk Assessment and Operational Instructions
· Classification and Reclassification Assessments
· Inmate Medical File and Screening forms
· OASys – Implementation Manager’s Handbook
· OASys – Policy, Procedures, Users Manual
• Offender Assessment System (OASys) – Complete manual
• Reception and Screening documents
• Scottish Sentence Management
• Self-harm at-risk form

Programs and Treatment
• A national Correctional Services CASE MANAGEMENT MODEL Dec 2003 – powerpoint presentation
• Controlling Anger and Learning to Manage it (CALM) – brochure
• Correctional Services Accreditation Panel – Brochure
• Counselling Assessment Referral Advice Treatment (CARAT) program assessment
• Criminal Justice Intervention Program (CJIP) – Guidance for prison staff
• Emerging evidence on what works: implications for the national parole service – Dec 2003 powerpoint presentation
• Enhanced Thinking Skills – what is it? Handout
• HM Prison High Down “Insiders” scheme (peer support) operational instruction
• HMP High Down – Drug services leaflet
• Induction Handbook – HM Prison Highdown
• Information booklet for prisoners by prisoners – HM Prison Bristol
• Prison Addressing Substance Related Offending (P-ASRO) – information for establishments
• Prison Addressing Substance Related Offending (P-ASRO) – Selection Manual
• Sentence Management – program descriptions (Scotland)
• SOTP: the sex offender treatment program – a brief guide for prisoners
• Therapeutic Communities - brochure
• Women Offending Program – Powerpoint presentation (hardcopy)

Research, Reports
• Aggregated Criminogenic Needs – Scotland (table)
• An evaluation of cognitive behavioural treatment for prisoners – Home Office Findings no. 161
• Prison population in 2002 – a statistical review
• Prisoners drug use & treatment: seven research studies – Home Office
• Reducing Reoffending by ex-prisoners – Report by the Social Exclusion Unit of the Home Office
• The Correctional Services Accreditation Panel Report – 2002-2003 (includes criteria for accreditation of a program)
• The impact of prison sentences on reoffending