



Center for Evidence Based Practice
Center for Adolescent and Family Studies
Indiana University

**Protocols for Effective Interventions:
Moving Towards Greater Specificity
in Community Corrections
Programming**



Table of Contents

Introduction

Evidence-based Practice in Indiana Community Corrections: The Center for Evidence-Based Practice-Indiana University Introduction	3
---	---

The Defining Elements of Indiana Community Corrections Program Components

Research Questions	6
Procedures.....	6
Survey of Community Corrections Programs	6
Results	7
Summary.....	13
Discussion & Recommendations	13
Limitations	16

References.....	17
-----------------	----

Appendix.....	19
---------------	----

Evidence-Based Practice in Indiana Community Corrections: Introduction

In the past decade, community corrections have become a core component of criminal justice systems, as they provide a useful and less costly alternative to incarceration for state and local governments (Andrews & Bonta, 2010; McGuire, 2002). Community corrections (CC) have involved a shift in focus from sanction and deterrence to rehabilitation, with an emphasis on assessment and intervention strategies that serve to identify and address offenders' risk and protective factors. This shift in focus has resulted in the expansion and diversification of community corrections programming. In order to improve practice and to respond to the imperative of fiscal responsibility, criminal justice systems and community corrections in particular have had to answer the perennial question of "what works?"

In the past decade, the Indiana Department of Correction (IDOC) developed a "what works" approach to the funding and implementation of the community corrections program, thus encouraging local community corrections agencies to apply the Crime and Justice Institute's principles of effective interventions and to identify and deliver evidence-based services. The

IDOC has emphasized the importance of assessing both program outcomes and program integrity and quality, using the Correctional Program Assessment Inventory (CPAI) developed by Paul Gendreau and Don Andrews. The CPAI is an assessment tool designed to measure the degree to which a program integrates the principles of effective interventions and the degree to which a program is implemented in a systematic and consistent manner. Yet, the overall effectiveness of CC or CC components and services has yet to be established. Indiana Community Corrections have made noticeable efforts to adopt and implement the Crime & Justice Institute's principles of effective interventions. However, these principles are broad guidelines for the delivery of the community corrections program; they are not intended to promote the development of protocols for specific interventions. Knowing more about the common and unique elements of community corrections components will allow independent researchers to evaluate the relative effectiveness of these components and to identify a specific set of best practices.

Community Corrections involve a shift in focus from sanction and deterrence to rehabilitation.

The systematic evaluation of community corrections depends on the development of specific program definitions.

The Center for Evidence-Based Practice-Indiana University

In 2009, the Indiana Department of Correction and the Center for Adolescent and Family Studies (CAFS) founded the Center for Evidence-Based Practice (CEBP), an independent research group whose purpose is to describe community corrections practices, evaluate the effectiveness of community corrections, and provide specific recommendations, guidelines and training designed to enhance the delivery, quality, and success of community corrections interventions. The CEBP designs research projects, collects and interprets data that are relevant to evidence-based programming, and translate findings into technical aid. All activities of the CEBP occur under the guidance of an advisory board that is composed of three community corrections directors and among them a representative of the Indiana Association of Community Corrections Act Counties, three IDOC staff and high officials, an IDOC training contractor, and CAFS researchers. The CEBP Advisory Board functions to support the collaborative nature of the Center's projects by facilitating communication between practitioners and researchers in an effort to bridge the gap between science and practice.

The Center for Evidence-Based Practice at Indiana University (2009) conducted a survey of current community corrections practices with the goal of determining the extent to which these practices integrated the core principles of evidence-based practice. The CEBP looked at existing mechanisms for measuring outcomes as well as information about the community corrections program, including program components, population served, goals, interventions, and outcomes. In particular, it examined the definitions of community corrections components described in grant applications for IDOC funding, and

found little information about the unique elements that distinguish these components from one another. The results of the CEBP survey highlighted the need to develop a standardized data gathering system that would make it possible to collect information essential to the evaluation of community corrections' effectiveness. They also suggested the need to better articulate program protocols and procedures as well as standards that inform the referral of specific populations to specific components or services in the state of Indiana. Specific definitions and procedures for each component and service in Indiana Community Corrections is among the first steps in preparing to systematically evaluate the effectiveness of CC programs.

The Defining Elements of Indiana Community Corrections Program Components

The present study is a survey of the community corrections program for adult offenders in Indiana. Its goal is to: (1) specify the common and unique elements of the different program components; and (2) compare these elements to national definitions and guidelines. This study is part of a research project that builds upon the findings of the CEBP survey of current community corrections practices (CEBP, August 2009). This research project seeks to describe in detail the program and clients of community corrections as well as the effectiveness of community corrections components and services in four counties of the state of Indiana. Having common definitions for CC services and programs in Indiana is one of the first steps in understanding “what works”. Common definitions will make it possible to analyze individual components. Finally these definitions will help establish core evidence-based elements that can be adopted across different community corrections programs.

Indiana’s community corrections are a widespread and comprehensive program implemented at the level of the county with financial support from the Indiana

Department of Correction. Indiana is made up of 92 counties, 78 of which offer community corrections programming either individually or in collaboration. In total, there are 66 community corrections sites. Under Indiana Code 11-12-1, community corrections is defined as a program composed of seven elements or *components* which correspond to different levels of community-based supervision. Within each component, individual offenders receive different types of services that are categorized by function: (1) *Assessment* services whose purpose is to identify the mental health, criminogenic, vocational and other needs of individual offenders; (2) *Monitoring* services such as drug testing, electronic monitoring; and (3) *Intervention* services such as drug and alcohol treatment.

The participants in this research project are four community corrections agencies located in four different counties of the state of Indiana. They were selected based on their representativity and the quality of the data they collected in the year 2009, including demographic and outcome information. These four agencies are representative of the various settings in which

community corrections operates: Two of these agencies are situated in counties of less than 100,000 inhabitants with a predominantly white population (92.8% and 98.6%); the other two are located in more densely populated and racially diverse areas of over 300,000 inhabitants, with white people making up 68.9% and 84.3% of the county population. On average, white persons account for 87.8% of the state population.

Three of the research participants completed a survey of community corrections program in Indiana. Their responses point to similarities and differences between the different CC organizations:

The three agencies differ in the number of staff they employ: 7, 70 and 94 respectively. This difference suggests important disparities in resources that may be proportional to the county population and the number of offenders under some form of community-based supervision.

All three agencies are independent from the local probation department; however, they work in partnership with the latter, namely, they receive referrals for the supervision of offenders, share information and collaborate on various aspects of court services.

Research Questions

The present study was designed to answer the following questions regarding community corrections program components:

1. What are the defining elements of each component in each site?
2. Which defining elements are common to all sites?
3. What variations are there in the definitions of each component in each site?
4. How do the definitions of each component compare to the definitions provided by major institutions of criminal justice?

Procedures

To accomplish the goals of this study, the CEBP sent, through the Indiana Department of Corrections, an email invitation to the four research participants. The email contained a description of the nature and purpose of the study as well as a web link to the survey questionnaire. No identifying information was required to answer the survey questions. The participants received two additional email reminders inviting them to complete the survey if they had not already done so.

Survey of Community Corrections Programs

The CEBP developed the survey of the community corrections program using a structured and multiple response format. The survey is composed of eight questions about the defining elements of each program component: (1) Work release; (2) house arrest, home detention, and electronic monitoring; (3) community service restitution; (4) victim offender reconciliation; (5) community work crew; (6) day reporting; (7) community transition program; and (8) forensic diversion. The participants were asked to choose from a list of responses the items that best described the implementation of the components in their agency. These lists of responses were derived from model program guides available online at the National Institute of Corrections (NIC), the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), and the National Registry of Evidence-Based Programs and Practices (NREPP). These guides include a description of the elements that define community-based justice programming and provide a standard for the evaluation of community corrections components in the state of Indiana.

Results

Survey responses were organized to identify similarities and differences in the definition of each community corrections component at the level of the agency. The definitions were then compared to model program criteria proposed by the NIC, the OJJDP, and the NREPP. This section does not include information about the *Victim Offender Reconciliation Program*, because this program component is not delivered in any of the three agencies that completed the survey. In addition, only one agency indicated that they offered *Day Reporting*, making it impossible to identify the common elements that define this component in the state of Indiana. Two agencies reported that *Community Work Crew* was a component of their community corrections program; however, they did not select any of the items on the response list (see Appendix), thus suggesting that their implementation of *Community Work Crew* differs from national standards. Likewise, all three participants indicated that *Community Service* is a component of their community corrections program, and only one participant selected items on the response list that best described the implementation of the component in the agency. This may be a

sign of variability in the local delivery of *Community Service* across agencies and compared to other states.

There were a range of components and services offered. There were also a number of common elements that defined *Work Release*, *Home Detention*, *Community Transition*, and *Forensic Diversion* in the three agencies that completed the survey (see **Table 1**). For comparison sake, program elements were categorized by domain of activity: (1) assessment; (2) monitoring; and (3) intervention. *Work Release*, *Home Detention*, and *Community Transition* are components of the community corrections program in all three agencies.

- *Work Release* is delivered in two types of setting: (1) Jail (n = 2); and (2) community (n =1).
- *Home Detention* is implemented in conjunction with electronic monitoring using radio frequency (n = 2) or GPS (n =1).
- *Home Detention* involves different levels of supervision: Home confinement, home detention, and curfew.
- Only two participants reported that *Forensic Diversion* was a component of their program.

Programming elements fall into three domains of activity: Assessment, monitoring, and intervention.

Table 1: Common Defining Elements of Community Corrections Program Components

Program Component (number of agencies)	Assessment	Monitoring	Intervention
Work Release (n= 3)		(1) Ongoing with focus on program compliance (2) Drug and alcohol screening	(1) Offenders are required to seek and obtain employment.

Program Component (number of agencies)	Assessment	Monitoring	Intervention
Home Detention (n= 3)	(1) Risk assessment using the Level Service Inventory-Revised	(1) Ongoing and involving the use of ankle transmitters (2) Random drug and alcohol screening (3) Home inspections	(1) Telephone, home and field contacts (2) Drug/alcohol relapse prevention (3) Case management and individualized case planning (4) Education classes (5) Skill training (employment, living, and social skills)
Community Transition (n= 3)	(1) Risk assessment using the Level Service Inventory-Revised	(1) Home inspections	(1) Home detention (2) Home and field contacts (2) Case management and individualized case planning
Forensic Diversion (n= 3)	(1) Risk assessment using the Level Service Inventory-Revised	(1) Home inspections	(1) Telephone, home, and field contacts (2) Case management and individualized case planning (3) Referral to substance addiction and mental health programming (4) Periodic communication between service providers and court about progress of substance addiction and mental health treatment

The participants' responses indicate that *Home Detention*, *Community Transition* and *Forensic Diversion* involve the formal assessment of offenders' criminogenic risks and needs, case management, and individualized case planning, while *Work Release* does not. *Work Release* is designed to facilitate the transition from

incarceration to life in the community.

All four program components include some form of monitoring, ongoing and/or periodic. Home inspections and random drug and alcohol screening are the two most common forms of monitoring regardless of the program component. Telephone, home and field contacts may

also function to supervise the activities of offenders placed under community corrections; however, they also constitute opportunities for interacting with offenders and for enhancing intrinsic motivation. As such, they are classified under the “intervention” category.

Case management, case planning, and contacts with offenders are common activities of *Home Detention*, *Community Transition*, and *Forensic Diversion*. The participants’ responses show an overlap between *Home Detention* and *Community Transition*, with *Home Detention* being an alternative to incarceration for

prisoners about to reenter the community. It is possible that *Home Detention*, *Community Transition*, and *Work Release*, are implemented in combination with one another, and thus do not represent discrete components of the community corrections program in the state of Indiana.

Two of the three agencies provided additional elements describing the components in *Work Release*, *Home Detention*, and *Community Transition* (see **Table 2**). These elements are delivered in addition to the common defining elements listed in **Table 1**.

Table 2: Additional Elements of Community Corrections Program Components

Program Component (number of agencies)	Assessment	Monitoring	Intervention
Work Release (n= 2)			(1) Telephone and field contacts (2) Case management and individualized case planning (3) Drug and alcohol relapse prevention (4) Group work
Home Detention (n= 2)		(1) Daily check-ins	(1) Positive reinforcement (2) Graduated sanctions (3) Community service
Community Transition (n= 2)			(1) Telephone contacts (2) Offenders are expected to gain employment.

For the most part, the additional elements of community corrections program components fall under the “intervention” category. Together with the common defining elements of the components, they show an effort to integrate treatment into offenders’ sentence requirements through case planning, case management, group work, skill training, and substance addiction and mental health services. They suggest that the agencies participating in

the survey are mindful of the principles of evidence-based practice proposed by the Crime and Justice Institute (CJI, 2004). To varying degrees, the participants seem attentive to four guidelines: (1) Assess offenders’ risks and needs; (2) target interventions; (3) skill train with directed practice; and (4) increase positive reinforcement. However, the participants’ ability to implement evidence-based principles may depend on the resources of their

agency and local community (e.g., number of staff, range of existing community-based mental health services).

There are differences in the protocols for the common CC components. For example, both **Table 2** and **Table 3** show that the implementation of *Work Release*, *Community Transition*, and *Forensic Diversion* differs from one site to another in terms of the number and kind of elements that define these program components. For example, **Table 3** shows that only one agency uses different levels of supervision, skill training, and self-help programming in the implementation of *Work Release*.

That same agency is also the only one that provides alcohol and drug programs as part of *Forensic Diversion*. The size of that agency or the number of staff is 70. We do not have information about the population of the county in which that agency is located. Information about the size of the agency and about the county population may be used to estimate the amount of local resources available for community corrections programming in a particular county. The more resources, the more supervision and treatment interventions the agency is able to deliver.

Table 3: Unique Elements of Community Corrections Program Components

Program Component (number of agencies)	Unique Elements	Size of Agency (number of staff)	County Population
Work Release (n= 1)	(1) Different levels of supervision (e.g., weekend and overnight pass) (2) Skill training (social, living) (3) Self-help program	70	NA*
Community Transition (n= 1)	(1) Day reporting	94	356,888
	(2) Work Release	70	NA*
Forensic Diversion (n= 1)	(1) Post-conviction diversion for offenders with substance-related and/or mental disorders (2) Mental health and group treatment (provided by external contractors)	94	94 356,888
	(1) Alcohol and drug programs	70	NA *

*The respondent did not provide this information.

The information in **Table 3** provides some support for the relation between the amount of resources (i.e., high number of staff; higher-density county population) and the number of additional activities that are part of *Work Release* and *Forensic Diversion*. Moreover, it confirms that *Community Transition*, which is not a core component of the CC program, is implemented in combination with *Home Detention* (**Table 1**), and is paired with *Day Reporting* or *Work Release* (**Table 3**). In sum, there is some variability in the local implementation of *Community Transition*. What factors and criteria determine this variability remains to be identified

in order to describe the systematic and specific processes that define the implementation of the community corrections program in Indiana.

While *Community Service* is a component of the community corrections program in all three participating agencies, *Day Reporting* is offered in one site only (see **Table 4**). As previously mentioned, two respondents did not select items that would best represent the implementation of *Community Service* in their agency, although one of them indicated that *Community Service* activities were elements of their *Home Detention* component.

Table 4: Community Service and Day Reporting

Program Component (number of agencies)	Elements	Size of Agency (number of staff)
Community Service (n= 1)	(1) <i>Risk assessment</i> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Target population</u>: Low-risk offenders (2) <i>Monitoring</i> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Random drug and alcohol screening (3) <i>Interventions</i> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Field contacts with offenders 	7
Day Reporting (n= 1)	(1) <i>Risk assessment</i> (LSI-R) (2) <i>Monitoring</i> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Periodic home visits • Employment verification (3) <i>Intervention</i> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offenders are required to secure employment • Telephone contacts with offenders • Assistance with court appearances • Case management and individualized case planning 	94

In many ways, the local definition of community corrections program components deviate from the national standards established by NIC, OJJDP, and NREPP. **Table 5** highlights the defining elements that are part of these national standards, but that do not describe the implementation of the community corrections program in Indiana. For example, *Work Release* in three of the agencies we surveyed does not include a variety of interventions

that define the component at the national level (i.e., home contacts with offenders, the development of a re-entry plan, and opportunities for employment, family, and community relationship building). Likewise, *Forensic Diversion* does not involve the participation of an advisory board and is independent of drug court in the two agencies that offer this program component.

Table 5: Elements that Do Not Define Community Corrections Program Components in Indiana

Program Component (number of agencies)	Assessment	Monitoring	Intervention
Work Release (n= 3)		(1) Home inspections	(1) Home contacts with offenders (2) Development of a re-entry plan (3) Opportunities for employment, family, and community relationship building
Community Service (n= 3)		(1) Continuous monitoring of program compliance	(1) Telephone and home contacts with offenders (2) Case management and individualized case planning
Day Reporting (n= 1)	(1) Risk assessment • <u>Target population:</u> Low-risk offenders	(1) Employment visits (2) Curfew checks (3) Home inspections	(1) Home and field contacts
Forensic Diversion (n= 2)			(1) Advisory board participates in development of treatment plans for offenders with mental illness and/or addictions. (2) Drug court

Summary

The present survey was designed to identify the common and unique elements that define community corrections program components in four different locales of the state of Indiana. These locales were selected based on two criteria: (1) They were representative of the diverse settings where the community corrections program is implemented; and (2) they used a data gathering system that made it possible to describe the population they served and to evaluate the effect of their programming on recidivism and public safety. Three community corrections directors completed the survey of community corrections programming for adult offenders.

The results of the study suggest that the three participating agencies have adopted the principles of evidence-based practice in community corrections (CJI, 2004). In particular, their responses indicate that the following standards guide the delivery of community corrections components: (1) Risk assessment; (2) targeted intervention through case management and individualized case planning; (3) skill training; and (4) use of positive reinforcement. Risk assessment may serve to identify those offenders that are eligible to participate in a specific program component, while case management and individualized case planning involves making decisions about interventions that will best meet the psychological, vocational, and educational needs of the offenders.

Each program component involves some form of ongoing or periodic monitoring and a set of interventions. These two aspects of programming include both common and unique elements. Common elements are shared by all program components, while unique elements are specific to one component only. The most common forms of monitoring in the three agencies that participated in the study are

random drug and alcohol screening and home inspections. Case management, case planning, and telephone, field and home contacts are the most common activities of community corrections program components. Telephone, home and field contacts constitute an opportunity for community corrections staff to provide positive reinforcement and increase offenders' intrinsic motivation and may also serve to monitor offenders' compliance with their individual case plan.

The results also show that the three participating agencies have made an effort to integrate mental health and substance addiction treatment into offenders' sentence requirements. However, the extent to which mental health and substance addiction services have become an integral part of community corrections programming may depend on the local resources available to the agency. In addition, there is little agreement on what actually constitutes useful and effective specialized services. So, while many CC program components utilize drug and alcohol, mental health, and counseling services, there is little attempt to determine what specific programs are actually offered by these local providers.

Last but not least, the participants' responses show a noticeable overlap in the definition of four community corrections program components. The three agencies report that community service is a defining element of *Home Detention*; that *Home Detention* is an integral part of *Community Transition*; and that *Community Transition* is implemented in conjunction with *Day Reporting* or *Work Release*.

Discussion & Recommendations

The findings of this study portray the current way in which local CC programs define the currently mandated require-

There is little agreement on what actually constitutes useful and effective specialized services.

Specific programs must have common and accepted definitions that are operationalized, recognizable, and replicable.

ments of Indiana Code 11-12-1. These findings suggest that there is both common ground and diversity and a lack of agreement with regard to many of the core elements of CC. It is important to note that this diversity in definition is in part by design. The individuality of CC in local counties is a necessary and important feature of the CC endeavor. However, the diversity also represents a lack of common agreement resulting in uneven and different services. That means that offenders who participate in *Work Release* in County A get different services from those offenders that participate in *Work Release* in County B. With diverse definitions and services it is difficult to ensure that the core principles of effective practice are an integral part of the CC program components. In fact, our findings suggest that the current structure of CC as listed in Indiana Code 11-12-1 is confusing and may no longer represent the best way to describe and organize the services provided.

The CC program in Indiana has the opportunity to move beyond the common principles of effective practice, a necessary basis for any good practice, and to include specific programs that are well defined, that can be tested with different levels of offender risk in different contexts. This can only happen if common program definitions are developed. Furthermore, greater specificity is required to evaluate the success of community corrections at the level of components and services. Identifying the elements that distinguish program components will help tease out the unique effects of specific monitoring activities and treatment interventions. Further describing the overlap between program components may help understand the function of each component in relation to one another.

We provide three recommendations based on the findings of this study:

1. Revise the current manner in which CC programs are defined and develop common standards for each of these programs.

Community Corrections in Indiana has successfully incorporated the Principles of Effective Practice into their operational activities. However, these principles are a necessary but not sufficient condition of evidence-based practice. Historically, CC practices have been “individualized” in a way in which programming responds to the needs of their community and offenders. To take the next step toward evidence based practices in Indiana CC, specific programs must have common and accepted definitions that are well defined, operationalized, recognizable, and replicable across counties. Common definitions make it possible to evaluate the individual elements of CC with the intent to adjust and improve these elements based on the results of the evaluation. Without ongoing evaluation of each practice, CC cannot adapt its programming to the needs of their local communities. Standardization does not necessarily imply reduced autonomy and creativity in the local implementation of community corrections. In fact, common standards of practice can be implemented in ways that both match the requirements of EBP and are responsive to local needs. In fact, autonomy and flexibility in Indiana Community Corrections depends on the development of common practice guidelines derived from scientific knowledge.

To establish common evidence-based practice guidelines, we rec-

ommend the formation of a Task Force composed of CC directors, IDOC officials, and CEBP staff that will be responsible for developing common definitions of the CC program. The Task Force could also identify a list of CC practices that have a solid scientific foundation. The work of the Task Force could then become the focus of a future conference where CC and IDOC staff could give their input.

2. The findings of the present survey might be used to develop common definitions of the community corrections program in the state of Indiana. Below we present program definitions that integrate the findings of this study with existing national standards. We recommend these as beginning points for the development of common CC practices.

- **Work Release** allows inmates to maintain employment while living in jail or in a community treatment center. It may be implemented in conjunction with *Community Transition*. At a minimum, this component consists of: (1) ongoing monitoring including drug and alcohol screening; (2) the requirement to seek and obtain employment; (3) individualized case planning and case management; (4) drug and alcohol relapse prevention; and (5) group work.
- **Community Transition** is designed to assist inmates in returning to the community and may be implemented in conjunction with *Day Reporting*, *Home Detention*, and *Work Release*. Offenders in *Community Transition* live in the community under home detention. Some offenders may still reside in jail. At a minimum, *Community Transition* is a referral program that involves the use of home inspections for monitoring purposes; home and field contacts; and individualized case planning and case management. In addition, offenders are expected to gain employment.
- **Day Reporting** targets low to high risk offenders. At a minimum, it consists of: (1) Periodic home visits; (2) telephone contacts; (3) individualized case planning and case management; (4) requirement and verification that the offender is employed.
- **Home Detention** enables those offenders eligible for CC who are of higher risk, to carry on their daily activities under close supervision within a system of pre-approved and scheduled absences. It may be implemented in conjunction with *Community Service*. Offenders are continuously monitored through the use of ankle transmitters, random drug and alcohol screening, and home inspections. At a minimum, **Home Detention** also consists of the following interventions: (1) Telephone, field and home contacts; (2) drug and alcohol relapse prevention; (3) individualized case planning and case management; (4) education classes; and (5) skill training.
- **Forensic Diversion** targets individuals who have been diagnosed with a serious mental illness or/and a co-occurring substance use disorder. It serves to divert these individuals from correctional settings. At a minimum, it consists of: (1) Home inspections; (2) telephone, home, and field contacts; (3) individualized case planning and case management; (4) referral to substance addiction or/and mental health treatment programs.
- **Community Service** is a form of sanction that requires offenders to work without pay for public or not-for-profit organizations. It targets low-risk of-

CC autonomy and flexibility depends on the development of common practice guidelines derived from scientific knowledge.

It is important that a core set of required elements be developed to guide CC staff's selection of referral services.

fenders and involves random drug and alcohol screening and field contacts.

3. Referral services are programs to which CC may refer a participant for specialized help (e.g., alcohol and drug services, mental health, counseling). Not all of them are evidence-based practices. It is important that a core set of required elements be developed to guide CC staff's selection of referral services and service providers in order to enhance the effectiveness of CC referral decisions.

Limitations

There are a number of limitations of the current study. The structured format of the survey limited the participants' capacity to describe how components differed from one another and what other elements characterized their programming. Hence, the findings of this survey may provide partial knowledge about the local definition of community corrections components and its variation across the four sites. In addition, one agency did not participate in the study. This agency is located in a rural area with a county population over 70,000 inhabitants. Thus, it is difficult to draw conclusions about the differential implementation of community corrections in rural and urban settings. Another limitation of the study is the little generalizability of the results given the selection criteria that served to identify the sample. Indeed, there might be important disparities between community corrections sites that have different data collection systems and practices

References

- Center for Evidence-Based Practice. (2009). *A Survey of Current Community Corrections Practices in the Indiana Department of Correction (2007-2009)*. Available at: <http://education.indiana.edu/Portals/418/CEBP%20Survey%20of%20CC%20practices%20in%20IDOC%20%204-8-2010.pdf>
- Crime and Justice Institute. (2004). *Implementing Evidence-Based Practice in Community Corrections: The Principles of Effective Intervention*. Available at: http://www.cj institute.org/files/Community_Corrections_BoxSet_Oct09.pdf
- Center for Effective Public Policy. (2010). *A Framework for Evidence-Based Decision Making in Local Criminal Justice Systems*. Available at: <http://nicic.gov/Library/024372>
- Kazdin, A. E. (1997). A model for developing effective treatments: Progression and interplay of theory, research and practice. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*, 26(2), 114-129.
- Sackett, D. L., Rosenberg, W. M.C., Gray, J. M., A., Haynes, R. B., Richardson, W. S. (1996). Evidence-based medicine: What it is and what it isn't. *BMJ*, 312, 312-371.
- Sexton, T. L., Hanes, C. W., Kinser, J. C. (2010). Translating science into clinical practice. In J. Thomas & M. Hersen (Eds.), *Handbook of Clinical Psychology Competencies* (pp. 153-179). New York: Springer.

Appendix A

Survey of Indiana Community Corrections Adult Community Corrections Programming

This survey is designed to gather information about the programming used by local community corrections agencies for adult offenders. This information will help the Center for Evidence Based Practice to determine the types of adult programming offered by Community Corrections in the state of Indiana.

Please answer the following questions by checking the boxes that apply and by providing additional narrative information if needed. This survey consists of 13 multi-part questions and will take approximately 30 minutes to complete.

AGENCY INFORMATION

Your answers to the questions below will provide information about the characteristics of your agency and will help us better understand the context in which the community corrections program is delivered.

1. Please indicate the approximate population of your county.

2. Please indicate the number of staff employed in your agency.

3. Please indicate how many adult offenders you have served this past fiscal year.

4. In your community, are community corrections and probation independent entities?
 Yes
 No
5. Please briefly describe your relationship with the probation department in your community.

COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS COMPONENTS

1. Residential or Community-based Work Release

***Work Release* allows inmates to maintain employment while living in jail or in a community treatment center.**

- No
- Yes, Residential Jail Based
- Yes, Community-Based

Please indicate below which of these elements are included in your county's *Work Release* Program. Check all boxes that apply.

- Program requires completion of the LSI-R risk assessment
- Program requires completion of a different risk assessment. Please specify:

- Program includes case management and individualized case planning
- Program requires field contacts with offenders
- Program requires home contacts with offenders
- Program requires telephone contacts with offenders
- Program includes continued monitoring of program compliance
- Program requires regular drug and alcohol screening
- Program includes the development of a re-entry plan
- Program includes a group based treatment approach to working with offenders
- Program requires offenders to obtain gainful employment
- Program requires offenders to participate in self-help programs
- Program includes a transition focus with employment, family, and community relationship building opportunities
- Program includes social skills learning activities
- Program includes living skills learning activities
- Program includes drug and/or alcohol relapse prevention programs
- Program includes a level system for supervision of offenders (ex. 12 hour weekend passes, overnight passes)

2. House Arrest, Home Detention, Electronic Monitoring

***Home Detention* permits offenders to carry on their daily activities (e.g., work; school; health and legal appointments; court-ordered obligations) under close supervision. *Electronic Monitoring* involves the use of passive or active supervision systems to ensure offenders' compliance with set limits**

on their location, activities, and communications.

- No
- Yes, with electronic monitoring (Radio Frequency)
- Yes, with electronic monitoring (GPS)
- Yes, without electronic monitoring

Please indicate below which of these elements are included in your county's House Arrest, Home Detention, Electronic Monitoring Programs. Check all boxes that apply.

- Program requires daily check-ins with offenders
- Program requires continuous monitoring of offenders through ankle transmitters
- Program includes multiple levels of home detention (Please specify which level)
 - Home confinement
 - Home detention
 - Curfew
- Program requires completion of the LSI-R risk assessment
- Program requires completion of a different risk assessment. Please specify: _____
- Program includes case management and individualized case planning
- Program requires field contacts with offenders
- Program requires home contacts with offenders
- Program requires home inspections with offenders
- Program requires telephone contacts with offenders
- Program includes social skills learning activities
- Program includes living skills learning activities
- Program includes education classes
- Program includes community service activities
- Program includes employment skills training
- Program includes drug and/or alcohol relapse prevention programs
- Program requires random drug and alcohol screening of offenders
- Program includes graduated sanctions
- Program includes use of positive reinforcement with offenders

3. Community Service

Community Service is used as a form of non-incarcerative sanction. It requires that offenders work without pay for public or not for-profit corporations, associations, institutions or agencies.

- No
- Yes

Please indicate below which of these elements are included in your county's Community Service Program. Check all boxes that apply.

- Program requires completion of the LSI-R risk assessment
- Program requires low risk only offenders as participants
- Program requires completion of a different risk assessment. Please specify: _____
- Program includes case management and individualized case planning
- Program requires field contacts with offenders
- Program requires home contacts with offenders
- Program requires telephone contacts with offenders
- Program requires random drug and alcohol screening of offenders
- Program includes continued monitoring of program compliance

4. Victim Offender Reconciliation Program (VORP)

VORP constitutes a sentencing alternative that involves the offender and the victim in the resolution of the troubles caused by the offender's criminal actions. They provide both parties with the opportunity to develop and agree on a plan for restitution.

- No
 Yes

Please indicate below which of these elements are included in your county's Victim Offender Reconciliation Program. Check all boxes that apply.

- Program is optional for offenders
 Program requires completion of the LSI-R risk assessment

- Program requires low risk only offenders as participants
 Program requires completion of a different risk assessment. Please specify:

 Program includes case management and individualized case planning
 Program requires field contacts with offenders
 Program requires home contacts with offenders
 Program requires telephone contacts with offenders
 Program requires random drug and alcohol screening of offenders
 Program includes continued monitoring of program compliance

5. Community Work Crew

Work Crew Programs give low-risk offenders the option to work to meet court-ordered requirements such as fines and community service.

- No
 Yes

Please indicate below which of these elements are included in your county's Community Work Crew Program. Check all boxes that apply.

- Program requires completion of the LSI-R risk assessment
 Program requires low risk only offenders as participants
 Program requires completion of an intake interview
 Program requires completion of a different risk assessment. Please specify:

 Program includes case management

- and individualized case planning
 Program requires field contacts with offenders
 Program requires home contacts with offenders
 Program requires telephone contacts with offenders
 Program requires random drug and alcohol screening of offenders
 Program includes social skill building activities
 Program includes employment skill building activities (job skills and job search skills)
 Program includes financial skill building activities
 Program includes continued monitoring of program compliance and work hours

5. Community Work Crew

Work Crew Programs give low-risk offenders the option to work to meet court-ordered requirements such as fines and community service.

- No
 Yes

Please indicate below which of these elements are included in your county's Community Work Crew Program. Check all boxes that apply.

- Program requires completion of the LSI-R risk assessment
- Program requires low risk only offenders as participants
- Program requires completion of an intake interview
- Program requires completion of a different risk assessment. Please specify:

- Program includes case management and individualized case planning
- Program requires field contacts with offenders
- Program requires home contacts with offenders
- Program requires telephone contacts with offenders
- Program requires random drug and alcohol screening of offenders
- Program includes social skill building activities
- Program includes employment skill building activities (job skills and job search skills)
- Program includes financial skill building activities
- Program includes continued monitoring of program compliance and work hours

6. Day Reporting

Day Reporting Programs are designed for offenders who require greater surveillance. They provide close supervision as well as referrals and/or treatment services.

- No
 Yes

Please indicate below which of these elements are included in your county's Day Reporting Program. Check all boxes that apply.

- Program requires participants to secure employment.
- Program includes periodic home visits.
- Program includes employment verification.
- Program includes employment visits.
- Program includes curfew checks.
- Program includes assistance with court appearances.
- Program is offender only to low risk offenders.
- Program requires completion of the LSI-R risk assessment
- Program requires completion of a different risk assessment. Please specify:

- Program includes case management and individualized case planning
- Program requires field contacts with offenders
- Program requires home contacts with offenders
- Program requires home inspections with offenders
- Program requires telephone contacts with offenders

7. Community Transition Programs

Community Transition Programs in Indiana are designed to assist inmates in returning to the community. They include supervision by probation or by a local community corrections program as well as other referral services.

- No
 Yes

Please indicate below which of these elements are included in your county's *Community Transition* Program. Check all boxes that apply.

- Program is supervised by Community Corrections.
 Program is supervised by Probation.
 Program includes work release.
 Program includes home detention.
 Program includes day reporting.
 Program uses a criminogenic risk assessment to determine programming for offenders.

- Utilizes a "transition team" to work with participants, parole, and probation.
 Offenders who participate in the program are expected to gain employment.
 Program requires completion of the LSI-R risk assessment. Please specify:

 Program requires completion of a different risk assessment. Please specify:
 Program includes case management and individualized case planning
 Program requires field contacts with offenders
 Program requires home contacts with offenders
 Program requires home inspections with offenders
 Program requires telephone contacts with offenders

8. Forensic Diversion

Forensic Diversion Programs target individuals who have been diagnosed with a serious mental illness and/or a co-occurring substance use disorder, and work to divert offenders from jail. Their main function is to refer offenders with mental health needs to appropriate community-based services

- No
 Yes, with Serious Mental Illness focus only
 Yes, with Substance Abuse focus only
 Yes, with Serious Mental Illness and Substance Abuse focus

Please indicate below which of these elements are included in your county's *Forensic Diversion* Program. Check all boxes that apply.

- Program requires completion of the LSI-R risk assessment
 Program requires completion of a different risk assessment. Please specify:

 Program includes case management and individualized case planning
 Program requires field contacts with offenders
 Program requires home contacts with offenders
 Program requires home inspections with offenders

- Program requires telephone contacts with offenders
 - Provides pre-conviction diversion for offenders with mental illness.
 - Provides pre-conviction diversion for offenders with addictive disorders.
 - Provides post-conviction diversion for offenders with mental illness.
 - Provides post-conviction diversion for offenders with addictive disorders.
 - Uses an advisory board to develop treatment plans for offenders with mental illness.
 - Uses an advisory board to develop treatment plans for offenders with addictive disorders.
 - Contracts with existing public or private agencies to provide services. If so, which services?
-
- Utilizes drug court.
 - Utilizes court alcohol and drug programs.
 - Utilizes treatment providers for mental health.
 - Utilizes treatment providers for substance addiction.
 - Provides periodic progress reports on offenders to court.

