



**CORRECTIONAL PROGRAM ASSESSMENT INVENTORY – 2010
(CPAI-2010)©**

**Conducted on Jersey Probation and Aftercare Service's Community
Supervision service**

**Report prepared by CPAI-2010 accredited evaluator Bridget Kerr,
Swansea Service Evaluation Team (SSET)
Bridget.Kerr@Swansea.ac.uk**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary.....	p.3
Introduction.....	p.4
Description of the Correctional Program Assessment Inventory – 2010 (CPAI-2010).....	p.4
Methodology.....	p.6
Results.....	p.8
A. Programme demographic.....	p.8
B. Organisational culture.....	p.10
C. Programme implementation/maintenance.....	p.12
D. Management/staff characteristics.....	p.14
E. Client risk/need practices.....	p.16
F. Programme characteristics.....	p.18
G. Core correctional practice.....	p.22
H. Inter-agency communication.....	p.24
I. Evaluation.....	p.25
Scoring Summary.....	p.27
Conclusions.....	p.27
References.....	p.29

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In September 2016 Jersey Probation and Aftercare Service (JPACS) was the subject of an evaluation to assess the extent to which its community supervision services adhere to principles of effective practice. The aims of this study were congruent with the Service's intentions to reduce re-offending and produce reports to assist with policy formation. The CPAI-2010 (Gendreau, Andrews & Thériault, 2010) was used to assess nine domains of service delivery (eight of which are scored). The evaluation identified JPACS as having a number of strengths, achieving the highest possible rating of very satisfactory in every domain relating to effective practice and 100% scores in domains relating to the characteristics of management and staff, inter-agency communication and evaluation practices. This indicates that JPACS is currently well placed to deliver effective intervention services that reduce the reoffending of clients and, as a strong, professionalised service, to continue to develop these in response to the recommendations outlined in this report.

INTRODUCTION

This evaluation was undertaken as part of Swansea Service Evaluation Team's (SSET) project piloting use of the CPAI-2010 in the British Isles. Jersey represents a very different jurisdictional context from the services in Wales that have thus far participated in evaluation as part of this pilot. Autonomous from the legal systems of England and Wales and France, the States of Jersey legislate for the island and JPACS is under the governance of a Probation Board consisting of five Jurats (lay elected judges). Probation Officers, or Delegués, have a number of responsibilities across the Courts and States of Jersey, including the management of Probation Orders (a form of provisional release comparable to the former Probation Orders of England and Wales).

Independent from strategic and political developments in probation in England and Wales, JPACS has developed longstanding relationships with academics, researchers and professionals in the criminological field, which has shaped the development of the Service. This includes the delivery of community supervision for offenders sentenced to Probation Orders, as well as offenders released from custody. It is this aspect of service that was evaluated using the CPAI-2010.

DESCRIPTION OF THE CORRECTIONAL PROGRAM ASSESSMENT INVENTORY (CPAI-2010)

The CPAI-2010 (Gendreau, Andrews & Thériault, 2010) was designed to measure how closely offender intervention services adhere to the principles of effective

practice that have been developed based on meta-analytical research (Andrews & Bonta, 2010). The CPAI-2010 has been used extensively in the United States and Canada where studies have found that services with the highest degree of integrity have greater measured effect in terms of reducing re-offending (Andrews & Dowden, 2005, Gray, 1997, Holsinger, 1999, Nesovic, 2003 & Lowenkamp, 2004).

Using interviews with practitioners and offenders, review of agency documents (including case files) and direct observation of agency activity and core correctional practice in supervision and programme sessions, CPAI-trained evaluators undertake a detailed assessment of intervention services. The nine domains of the CPAI-2010 include 143 items, 133 of which are scored 'yes', 'no' or 'not applicable' according to whether different aspects of practice adhere to the principles of effective practice (Gendreau, French and Taylor, 2002):

A. Programme demographics	10 items (none scored)
B. Organisational culture	9 items
C. Programme implementation/maintenance	10 items
D. Management/staff characteristics	18 items
E. Client risk/need practices	13 items
F. Programme characteristics	25 items
G. Core correctional practice	45 items
H. Inter-agency communication	5 items
I. Evaluation	8 items

To enhance reliability and reduce subjective scoring, there is a confidence rating for each scored item that requires the scorer to indicate the reliability of their assessment on a five-point scale according to the evidence available to support the score. An overall score is calculated by collating the scores in each domain and dividing the sum of these scores by the total number of applicable items. The overall score is attributed a classification of programme integrity. These range from 'very

satisfactory' (70% and above) to 'unsatisfactory' (below 50%). The average confidence scores for each section are used to ascertain the reliability and validity of the evaluation's conclusions. The results of the CPAI-2010 evaluation are given in the form of an in-depth report, which includes the scoring summary, overall classification, qualitative evidence and recommendations. This enables services to articulate the work they do in terms of evidence based practice, identify the strengths and weaknesses of programmes and develop strategies to improve their service.

METHODOLOGY

An initial orientation meeting regarding this evaluation was held on 10th May 2016 to provide an overview of the CPAI-2010 to JPACS's Chief Probation Officer, Assistant Chief Probation Officer and Probation Team Leader. A timescale for the evaluation was agreed following this meeting and on-site data collection took place during the week commencing 12th September 2016, though key interviews with the Chief Probation Officer and Probation Team Leader were undertaken over the telephone on 2nd August and 23rd August 2016 to accommodate conflicting schedules. On-site data collection included observation of group sessions of the Adapt Domestic Abuse Prevention Training (ADAPT) and Emotional Coping Skills programmes as well as live and video-recorded supervision sessions. Interviews were also conducted with the Assistant Chief Probation Officer; five probation officers; research and information officer; practitioners in substance misuse, restorative justice, etc; six service-users and one magistrate.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

- Adapt Domestic Abuse Prevention Training programme manual
- Emotional Coping Skills programme delivery materials
- Aggression Control Training manual
- Core programme manual
- Focus on People – Effect Change training materials
- Jersey Supervision Interview Checklist
- Observing Interview Skills: a manual for users of the Jersey Supervision Interview Checklist
- Journal articles including The Jersey Supervision Skills Study: outcomes and reconvictions (Raynor et al, 2012); Skills and Training in British Probation: A tale of neglect and possible revival (Raynor & Ugwudike, 2013); The Impact of Skills in Probation Work: A reconviction study (Raynor et al, 2014) and Moving Away from Social Work and Half Way Back Again: New research on skills in probation (Raynor & Vanstone, 2015).
- Jersey Probation and After-Care Service Annual Report for 2015 and Business Plan for 2016
- Community Sentences and their Outcomes in Jersey: the fourth report
- Summary of Three-quarter Year Stats, September 2015
- Probation Information leaflet
- Online resources at probation.je
- Probation Client Feedback leaflets
- Probation Client Feedback Questionnaire Results 2015
- Level of Service Inventory-Revised
- Risk Matrix 2000
- Spousal Abuse Risk Assessment
- HCR20
- Policy Book
- Code of Practice
- Probation Standards document
- Referral forms
- Psychometric Testing reports for the Sex Offender Treatment Programme
- Performance Review and Appraisal documents

RESULTS

A. PROGRAMME DEMOGRAPHICS

This section is descriptive only and does not contribute to the scoring of the CPAI-2010.

JPACS is co-located with the Magistrates' Court in a purpose-built building, central to the town of St Helier, and provides a number of services across the courts and States of Jersey including representation in Parish Enquiries, provision of a community service scheme, probation, restorative justice, prisoner through-care and the preparation of Social Enquiry Reports. Under the auspices of the courts, JPACS's remit extends to the Jersey Family Court Advisory Service (JFCAS), which has the stated intention of looking after the interests of children involved in family court proceedings. Most recently, Independent Domestic Violence Advisors (IDVAs) have moved from their previous location in Police HQ to the JPACS building. The differing needs, risks and vulnerabilities of clients in these different services are addressed through careful design including separate, secure entrances and rooms for JFCAS, viewing windows in doors and location of IDVA interview rooms in the Magistrates' Court building, etc.

This evaluation focuses exclusively on probation services offered by JPACS, and specifically the provision of community supervision in the management of Probation Orders and prisoner aftercare. These services are largely delivered in the JPACS building, which is easily accessible from the city centre, though elements, such as group programmes, are sometimes delivered in other local venues. Accommodation in

the JPACS building is arranged over three floors. The reception and waiting area are on the ground floor with access by elevator and stairs to the first and second floors, where practitioners' offices are used for supervision sessions with the majority of clients. There are also meeting rooms which are used for group-work sessions and staff meetings. All rooms are comfortable, light and clean and the JFCAS facilities can be used should clients have particular vulnerabilities or needs. These include child-friendly rooms with toys.

JPACS is funded by the States of Jersey on an annual basis and the current financial settlement has been agreed until 2019. Some elements of service are delivered in partnership with community and third-sector agencies through arrangements such as the Building a Safer Society strategy (BASS). The ADAPT programme, for example, is delivered by the Jersey Domestic Violence Forum under BASS. JPACS also works closely with Guernsey Probation Service to reduce costs and maximise efficiency relating to the development of ICT systems, accessing and providing training, etc.

At the time of this evaluation, the number of offenders served by JPACS totalled 390 adults and 26 youths, 91% of whom were male. The predominant presenting problems amongst those receiving community supervision were alcohol and substance misuse, aggression and emotional instability, relationship issues and, to a lesser extent, financial issues, deficits in employment, negative peer groups and health-related issues.

B. ORGANISATIONAL CULTURE

Strengths:

JPACS's goals and mandate are clearly laid out in the Annual Report and Business Plan. The report is reviewed by the Probation Board, ensuring accountability, and is also made available to the public through JPACS's website, reflecting an embedded organisational commitment to transparency. The website, probation.je, is accessible, comprehensive and offers a number of resources including a summary of the Service's remit and the specific standards and practice issues relating to probation supervision.

There is a strong managerial commitment to the development of initiatives to improve services and, where opportunities have been identified, JPACS has responded within a reasonable period of time. For example, interventions were put in place to address the emergent issue of internet sexual offences in consultation with a specialist forensic psychologist and the Jersey Supervision Interview Checklist has been embedded into the clinical supervision of probation officers following recommendations from the Jersey Supervision Skills Study (JS3).

There are clear procedures for responding to problems within the team, which are routinely dealt with using a non-confrontational, non-crisis approach. In general, problems are dealt with through discussion and mediation, enabled by a supportive and hands-on managerial approach by all members of senior staff, whose offices share corridors with practitioners, operating an open-door policy. In interview, all staff were aware of the formal procedures for grievance and disciplinaries, etc, and relevant documents are readily available, though at the time of the evaluation there had been

no formal grievance for a number of years. There is a collegiate atmosphere in staff meetings and day-to-day practices. A number of practitioners identified the support, knowledge and experience of their colleagues as crucial resources in their daily work. They pointed out that, whilst staff may have philosophical differences, they are united by their common objective to, in the words of one, “do our best rehabilitating people back into the community”. To facilitate constructive communication, information is frequently shared throughout JPACS in meetings and through the use of email, workshops, reports and the Service’s electronic policy book.

High levels of organisational harmony are reflected in extremely high levels of staff retention, with 100% of staff surveyed having remained with JPACS for more than two years. In fact, over 70% of staff members involved in the evaluation had worked in the Service for over ten years.

In its self-evaluation and research involvement practices, Jersey has gained international recognition as an exemplar of learning organisations. This evaluation found evidence to support this reputation. The team takes a conscientious and methodical approach to the collection and recording of data, enabling the Service to undertake internal quantitative assessments of different areas of service delivery, largely facilitated by the research and information officer working in collaboration with external researchers. Additionally, JPACS makes use of a number of eminent external consultants to advise on several aspects of service delivery.

Areas for improvement:

Those members of staff who are registered social workers are governed by the Health & Care Professions Council (HCPC) standards of conduct, performance and ethics.

However, the standards relating to probation supervision make no provision for ethical conduct and there is no documented code of ethics specific to JPACS, but for a brief statement in the Annual Report that “In all its work the Probation and After Care Service promotes respect and dignity for all.” Whilst this statement is undoubtedly worthy, it lacks the detail and description of responsibilities that would make it functional as policy.

Recommendations:

1. A document detailing the ethics of intervention would consolidate the shared vision expressed by practitioners and management and would provide guidance and accountability for all staff working within, or in partnership with, JPACS in the delivery of services. Staff should be trained to ensure that the ethical code is inculcated in every aspect of services.

Rating: 8/9 (89%) Very Satisfactory CR: 4.6

C. PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION/MAINTENANCE**Strengths:**

JPACS’s service is congruent with the values and practices of the courts. Whilst they describe conflicting perspectives at times regarding individual cases or practice issues, interviews with both the magistrate and JPACS managers and practitioners revealed mutual respect and a shared philosophy regarding the rehabilitation of

offenders. The benefits of co-location in enabling a high level of responsiveness to the needs and wishes of the Court and meeting the demands of case management during court procedures were clear throughout the evaluation period, as practitioners and magistrates are able to cross to each other's buildings and discuss issues *ad hoc*. JPACS's governance by a Probation Board consisting of five Jurats ensures that the interests of the courts are considered in all aspects of service delivery and that the Service is accountable to its stakeholders in terms of its fiscal responsibility. The fact that JPACS is governed by its "principle customer" was repeatedly identified in interview as responsible for the Service's success.

Stakeholder investment and stability are key to providing effective services. The current Chief Probation Officer has been instrumental in establishing JPACS, which, due to its autonomy, has developed a culturally-responsive range of services based on consultation with community agencies and statutory bodies in Jersey as well as on review of the international literature relating to effective practices. The staffing levels of probation officers have been prioritised and made resilient to recent funding cuts and the current annual budget has been agreed until 2019. The professional credentials of staff are also maintained and enhanced through continuing professional development practices.

Areas for improvement:

Perhaps the greatest issue currently facing JPACS is a proposal that the Service should be brought under the jurisdiction of Jersey's Community and Constitutional Affairs Department. Evidence shows that it is detrimental to the effectiveness of services when they are faced by far-reaching, contentious issues, and it is clear that

JPACS's development and administration of services is inextricably linked to its governance by the courts. The proposed change would, at the very least, result in upheaval and disruption for an extended period. It is difficult to predict what features of its services JPACS may retain or lose in a move away from the courts.

To ensure that JPACS continues to develop services that meet the needs of the community and to evidence this need for its services, it may benefit from taking a more structured approach to identifying gaps in service provision and/or emerging issues through the use of, for example, focus groups and/or surveys.

Recommendations:

1. The use of focus groups and/or surveys would provide JPACS with on-going documentation of the need for its services.
2. It is a recommendation of this evaluation that JPACS remains under its current governance structure to maintain the organisational stability necessary to develop and deliver effective services.

Rating: 8/10 (80%) Very Satisfactory CR: 4.3

D. MANAGEMENT/STAFF CHARACTERISTICS

Strengths:

JPACS has a committed, professionalised, highly-qualified and experienced staff team. All staff members delivering interventions have relevant undergraduate degrees and years of experience in probation and related fields. A large percentage of staff, including the Chief and Assistant Chief Probation Officers, have relevant advanced

postgraduate qualification. All staff are Disclosure and Barring Service checked and are selected for employment based on assessment of their relationship skills and skills specific to evidence-based practice (eg, pro-social modelling) using vignettes.

JPACS provides a comprehensive programme of training to its staff, with training in the theory and practice of effective interventions being delivered two-three times annually by a consultant forensic psychologist. Additional training is sourced through JPACS's research relationships with criminologists in Swansea University and the Cognitive Centre Foundation as well as links with eminent academics who provide specialist training in specific skills. Training in pro-social modelling and problem-solving is delivered to all members of staff, including the administration team and all members of senior management, demonstrating JPACS's considerable commitment to evidence-based practice throughout the Service. There is an annual Performance Review and Appraisal process and monthly supervision of probation officers. In recent months, JPACS has implemented use of the Jersey Interview Skills Checklist to undertake a structured assessment of practitioner skills in video-recorded intervention sessions as part of the clinical supervision process.

The Chief and Assistant Chief Probation Officers and Team Leader all have an intimate knowledge of the Service and staff and are involved in the supervision of practitioners and direct service delivery, for example, covering office duty on occasion. The managerial style is supportive and reciprocal rather than top-down. Though practitioners described their complex workloads and the high expectations of the organisation as stressful at times, they all expressed confidence in their skills, knowledge, resources and ability to run services effectively. Staff have the

opportunity to identify issues with, and propose modifications to, the Service through discussion with managers or during staff 'away-days'. There is a high level of staff investment and a shared belief in rehabilitation is evident at every level and in every aspect of practice.

Areas for improvement:

The Service requires a high level of skill and commitment and it may be beneficial for practitioners' morale to formalise recognition of positive practice in team meetings over and above the current level of support. Additionally, some practitioners feel that a more transparent case allocation process (ie, discussing the reasons for each allocation with probation officers) may help to prevent them feeling overburdened.

Recommendations:

1. JPACS should continue seeking to recognise, acknowledge, develop and support the skills and commitment of its staff, and enhance the areas of case allocation and positive reinforcement of good practice.

Rating: 18/18 (100%) Very Satisfactory CR: 4.7

E. CLIENT RISK/NEED PRACTICES

Strengths:

There are clear and appropriate selection criteria for the various offender programmes and services that JPACS delivers (eg, Offending Is Not The Only Choice, Self Management And Rational Thinking, Sex Offender Treatment Programme, etc) and

the exclusion criteria for each are entirely relevant, relating to risk levels, criminogenic needs and ability to engage.

All clients are assessed using a valid instrument (LSI-R), which summarises clients' personal characteristics as to the level of risk they present. Additional risk assessment tools are used to assess specific risks of sexual offending, domestic abuse and violence where appropriate (eg, Risk Matrix 2000; SARA; HCR-20). Assessment of dynamic needs is undertaken periodically and the LSI-R is re-administered following completion of interventions and at end of Order, with clients re-classified as appropriate. Clients are also screened to identify any literacy or numeracy needs and language issues that may impact upon their engagement with the Service.

Areas for improvement:

Whilst some responsivity assessment tools are available to assess factors such as depression through referral to specialist agencies, JPACS does not routinely conduct structured assessments of the responsivity of offenders to different styles and modes of service. Staff members are informed instead by their experience and perception of a client's engagement with interventions when determining the way in which they are delivered. Practitioners are assigned to service activities and clients to staff according to caseload capacity and availability; or using experience, intuition and perception of skill and need rather than any formal assessment of staff skills and matching process.

Recommendations:

1. Actuarial measures used to assess responsivity factors including cognitive ability, psychopathy, anxiety and depression (eg, General Aptitude Test

Battery; PCL-R factor 1; Spielberger-State-Trait Anxiety; Beck Depression Inventory) should be available to JPACS staff to inform their assessments.

2. Where possible, staff should routinely be assigned to activities best matching their skills (as assessed through staff selection and supervision processes) and should also be assigned to clients with whom they can work effectively (based on assessment of participant and staff characteristics – eg, staff would be assigned to clients with a similar conceptual level). The mode and style of service delivery should also be adjusted in response to key offender characteristics (eg, low conceptual offenders respond better to higher levels of programme structure).
3. The LSI-R should be re-administered at least every 6 months as well as at end of engagement with interventions.

Rating: 10/13 (77%) Very Satisfactory CR: 4.2

F. PROGRAMME CHARACTERISTICS

Strengths:

JPACS primarily targets criminogenic needs such as addressing pro-criminal attitudes, reducing negative peer associations, enhancing constructive use of leisure time, reducing substance misuse, promoting family affection, communication and problem solving and increasing Education, Training and Employment (ETE)-related performance. Non-criminogenic targets, such as decreasing anxiety and increasing self-esteem, are given less attention, though are accounted for as important

responsivity issues, specific to each case and catered to by interventions such as the 'opt-in' Emotional Coping Skills group.

To address offending behaviour, the Service adopts social-learning and cognitive-behavioural treatment strategies through the delivery of evidence-based manualised programmes and the use of external consultants. Through their engagement with manualised work in group programmes or 1:1 supervision sessions, clients are trained to observe and anticipate problem situations, plan and rehearse alternative pro-social responses, practice new pro-social behaviours in increasingly difficult situations and are trained to monitor and cope with high risk situations, developing relapse prevention plans. Positive feedback is routinely used to reinforce clients' pro-social behaviours. There is also evidence of clients' family and friends being trained to provide support through family problem-solving sessions for young people and home visits/supervision sessions including significant others for adults. Clients are also given the opportunity to engage in further work with JPACS to relearn/reinforce pro-social behaviour, following completion of their statutory engagement.

Practitioners monitor closely the whereabouts and peer associations of clients through information-sharing and recording of contacts. There is an expectation that clients will spend a large proportion of their week in pro-social tasks. Where a client is unemployed, their job-searching activities are monitored as part of their contact with practitioners and interventions are suggested for pro-social use of leisure time, including provision of an Active Card to some clients, enabling their use of local gym facilities.

In line with the evidence regarding effective practice, JPACS predominantly targets higher-risk offenders, with approximately 80% of clients being assessed as presenting a moderate to high risk of re-offending. Programmes with the highest intensity and duration are reserved for higher-risk offenders. For example, the Self Management and Rational Thinking programme targeting high-risk offenders runs for thirty-five sessions, whilst the Offending Is Not The Only Choice programme for medium-risk offenders comprises twenty. Where a client subject to a Probation Order makes good progress, completes interventions successfully and their risk of reoffending is reduced, there is an opportunity for the Order to be returned to the Court for early discharge with the support of JPACS.

Areas for improvement:

Whilst the treatment dosage of programmes delivered to offenders varies by risk, with higher-risk offenders receiving the highest intensity or duration of service, practitioners appear resistant to using risk classification to prioritise resources such as their time and level of investment in case management. A number of practitioners described struggling to manage workloads of chaotic and “needy” cases. It may be beneficial for practitioners to re-frame their prioritisation of cases around risk and to deal with non-criminogenic needs through referral and delegation where possible.

JPACS may also benefit from the use of an operant programme (eg, a token economy) to motivate clients’ compliance through the use of tangible reinforcers and punishers. Appropriate reinforcers must be meaningful to clients and administered immediately, consistently, and made contingent upon performance of pro-social behaviours.

Appropriate punishers should be individualised to ensure that they are meaningful to

clients in order to suppress behaviour and should be brief, immediate, consistent and high-intensity.

Whilst clients have some input into the delivery of interventions at the sentence-planning stage and on an informal basis throughout their engagement with JPACS, the only formal mechanism for them to modify the structure and rules of the services provided is through their completion of a feedback questionnaire at the end of their engagement.

Recommendations:

1. Clients should spend at least 40% of their time (or 50 hrs per week) in pro-social tasks. Development and maintenance of a personal weekly timetable would enable practitioners to assist clients in monitoring and achieving this.
2. Treatment dosage of supervision as well as programmes should vary by risk and practitioners should receive periodic training, support and guidance to ensure that their management of cases is commensurate with the level of risk. The evidence suggests that engagement in interventions should total 100 hours for moderate-risk and at least double that for higher-risk offenders.
3. To motivate behaviour-change effectively JPACS could develop a menu of reinforcers (eg, leisure activities, recreational equipment, social reinforcers such as praise, etc) and punishers (eg, withdrawal of privileges, expressions of disapproval, etc). Clients should be given the opportunity to nominate and approve reinforcers and punishers to ensure that they are

meaningful to them individually. Reinforcers must outnumber punishers by a ratio of at least 4:1. Staff also need to be trained to assess whether the punishment is appropriate or produces negative reactions.

4. An additional formal mechanism for clients to provide input to the Service, such as a service-user focus group, would be beneficial in developing client investment in JPACS and improving services.

Rating: 20/24 (83%) Very Satisfactory CR: 4

G. CORE CORRECTIONAL PRACTICE

Strengths:

The evaluator observed a number of positive strategies employed by staff members, particularly in their use of authority and relationship practices. They focused on behaviour rather than the individual, gave specific directions, used their normal (not raised) voices, informed clients of the choices and attendant consequences regarding compliance/non-compliance, gave encouraging messages, supported their words with action, were 'firm but fair', and were generally positive regarding a client's engagement, providing respectful guidance towards, and praising, compliance. They were open, warm, respectful, non-blaming, genuine, flexible, enthusiastic, optimistic, solution-focused and motivational in their work with clients, avoiding argumentation, developing discrepancy gently and supporting self-efficacy. In view of the foregoing, it is unsurprising that all clients identified JPACS as a supportive environment, with the majority describing "having someone to talk to" as the most important element of the Service.

Practitioners positively reinforced pro-social behaviour, explaining why they liked the behaviour exhibited by the client and encouraging clients to consider the benefits of continued use of this behaviour. They also engaged clients in some problem-solving techniques including focusing on the antecedents, behaviour and consequences of their offending, clarifying goals that could resolve or prevent future negative consequences and generating alternative solutions. The evaluator also observed a number of practitioners, including the ADAPT programme facilitators, using elements of cognitive restructuring by developing descriptions of problematic situations, generating descriptions of thoughts and feelings, generating discussions and identifying risky thinking, establishing alternatives and setting up additional practice opportunities.

Areas for improvement:

There was some disparity in delivery, with some practitioners utilising more components of effective treatment interventions than others. There was inconsistency, for example, in the disapproval given to clients regarding anti-social behaviour, which should be immediate and detailed in order to provide the foundation for anti-criminal modelling. Whilst the skill-building procedures of modelling, role-play and practice were referred to in programme manuals and interviews with practitioners and clients, the evaluator observed no practitioner using skill-building techniques with clients and it does appear that this element of effective practice may be somewhat underused.

Clients recalling their involvement in role-play did not understand it as a skill-building technique but as a way of illustrating or 'playing-out' offending behaviour to increase understanding. It is possible that practitioners are under-confident in using these techniques.

Recommendations:

1. All staff delivering interventions would benefit from continued training in the core correctional practices with a focus on effective disapproval and structured learning procedures for skills-building.
2. It is encouraging that JPACS has recently initiated use of video-recording of intervention sessions and use of the Jersey Supervision Interview Checklist in clinical supervision. These should be used to provide feedback to staff to improve their therapeutic skills.

Rating: 35/45 (78%) Very Satisfactory CR: 3.5

H. INTER-AGENCY COMMUNICATION**Strengths:**

JPACS works in a multi-agency context, including involvement in JMAPPA and RAMAS processes for the multi-agency management of risk and Child Protection processes alongside Social Services. Additionally, JPACS is formally linked to a number of agencies that offer services relevant to the needs of offenders, some of which (eg, victim support, mental health, substance misuse, etc) are represented amongst the staff team at JPACS. Staff routinely advocate with outside agencies on behalf of their clients, and the evaluator observed several examples of this as well as evidence of effective inter-agency communication, including telephone conversations, email correspondence and meetings with staff from other organisations. Leaflets and posters in the waiting room and practitioners' offices provide clients with links to other organisations and the community, and referral documents in JPACS's policy

book are easily accessible to staff members. Staff also have the opportunity to engage in multi-agency training across the various organisations (eg, Child Protection training delivered by Social Services), which enables effective co-ordination between JPACS and other agencies in regards to shared clients.

Areas for improvement:

One client mentioned the embarrassment associated with being seen to pick up certain leaflets or read certain posters (eg, substance misuse support, sexual health, etc) in the communal waiting area.

Recommendations:

1. For greater confidentiality, it might be useful for JPACS to maintain a comprehensive, regularly updated handbook or folder of links to community resources, which could be made available in the waiting room for ease of reference.

Rating: 5/5 (100%) Very Satisfactory CR: 4.8

I. EVALUATION

Strengths:

JPACS takes a conscientious and rigorous approach to evaluation, involving: quarterly checks reviewing files and monitoring treatment progress; video-tapes of programme sessions being sent to the Cognitive Centre Foundation to ensure adherence to the manual; use of the Jersey Supervision Interview Checklist to evaluate the integrity of probation supervision sessions; the distribution of client

feedback questionnaires, with results published annually; the standardised re-assessment of clients on target behaviours; and the gathering of follow-up reconviction data.

The fourth of a series of reports evaluating the effectiveness of JPACS's community supervision services was published in November 2015 and the Service has also been the subject of a number of peer-reviewed journal articles regarding the Jersey Supervision Skills Study (JS3).

Recommendations:

1. The addition of structured measures such as psychometric assessments of attitudes and skills may be of benefit in providing a more in-depth and accurate measure of progress than analysis of changes in the LSI-R scores alone.

Rating: 8/8 (100%) Very Satisfactory CR: 5

SCORING SUMMARY

Category	Points	# of points	N/A	% Score	CR
A. Programme demographics	no scoring				
B. Organisational culture	09	08	0	89%	4.6
C. Programme implementation/maintenance	10	08	0	80%	4.3
D. Management/staff characteristics	18	18	0	100%	4.7
E. Client risk/need practices	13	10	0	77%	4.2
F. Programme characteristics	25	20	1	83%	4
G. Core correctional practice	45	35	0	78%	3.5
H. Inter-agency communication	05	05	0	100%	4.8
I. Evaluation	08	08	0	100%	5
Treatment sub-total (E and F)	38	30	1	81%	4.1
Total	133	112	1	85%	4.4

Very satisfactory	70%+
Satisfactory	50-69%
Unsatisfactory	below 50%

CONCLUSIONS

Overall, Jersey Probation and Aftercare Service received a very satisfactory rating on the CPAI-2010 for its community supervision services. The total score of 85% compares extremely favourably with other published CPAI-2010 scores. It was evident in interviews for this assessment that JPACS's staff are committed, enthusiastic, knowledgeable and skilled.

In the scoring of the CPAI-2010, particular attention is paid to section E (client risk/need practices) and section F (programme characteristics), because the evidence base suggests that both items indicate the strongest validity for intervention success. The combined score of E and F for JPACS is 81% and rated very satisfactory, reflecting the Service's considerable investment in the adoption of evidence-based

approaches to risk assessment and intervention practices, though the evaluation did identify some areas for improvement here, including the need for a more structured approach to assessing and accommodating responsivity issues; and the opportunity to increase effectiveness of services through the use of an operant programme, such as a token economy. It is hoped that these and other recommendations made in this report will contribute to JPACS's ongoing efforts to improve and develop services in line with the evidence base.

REFERENCES

The following reference list contains articles cited in the text of this report as well as significant works on offender rehabilitation and key documents influencing the development of the CPAI. The report author recommends two texts in particular as a starting point for a review of the literature. *The Psychology of Criminal Conduct*, 5th ed. (Andrews & Bonta, 2010 – a sixth edition is forthcoming at the time of writing) gives a comprehensive overview of the extensive research and evidence base for rehabilitative endeavours. *Contemporary Behaviour Therapy*, 5th ed. (Spiegler & Guevremont, 2009) details effective treatment modalities for programme delivery and is an excellent resource for programme development and staff training.

* Cited in the text

Andrews, D. A. (2006). Ensuring Adherence to Risk-Need Responsivity: Making Quality a Matter of Policy. *Criminology and Public Policy*, 5, 595-602.

Andrews, D. A., & Bonta, J. (2010). Rehabilitating Criminal Justice Policy and Practice. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 16, 39-55.

*Andrews, D. A. & Bonta, J. (2010) *The Psychology of Criminal Conduct*, 5th ed. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.

Andrews, D. A., Bonta, J. & Hoge, R. D. (1990). Classification for effective rehabilitation: rediscovering psychology. *Criminal Justice and Behaviour*, 17, 19-52.

Andrews, D. A. & Carvell, C. (1998). *Core Correctional Treatment: Core Correctional Supervision and Counseling: Theory, Research, Assessment and Practice*. Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario.

* Andrews, D. A. And Dowden, C. (2005). Managing Correctional Treatment for Reduced Recidivism: A Meta-Analytic Review of Programme Integrity. , 10, 173–187.

Andrews, D. A., Zinger, I., Hoge, R. D., Bonta, J., Gendreau, P., et al. (1990). Does correctional treatment work? A clinically relevant and psychologically informed meta-analysis. *Criminology*, 28, 369-404.

Bernfield, G., Farrington, P. & Leschied, (Eds.) (2001). *Offender Rehabilitation in Practice*. Chichester, Wiley.

Bonta, J. (2001). Offender Assessment: General Issues and Considerations. In L. L. Motiuk, & R. C. Serin (Eds.), *Compendium 2000 on Effective Correctional Programming* (pp. 22-29). Ottawa, Canada: Correctional Service of Canada.

Bonta, J., Bourgon, G. & Rugge, T. (2011). *Strategic Training Initiative in Community Supervision (STICS)*. Public Safety of Canada.

Chapman, T. & Hough, M. (1998) *Evidence Based Practice: A Guide to Effective Practice* London: HMIP

Cullen, F. T. (2002) Rehabilitation and Treatment Programs in Wilon, J. Q. & Petersilia, J. (Eds.) *Crime and Public Policy, 2nd ed.* Pp. 253-289 San Francisco, CA: ICS Press.

Cullen, F. T., & Gendreau, P. (2000). Assessing Correctional Rehabilitation: Policy, Practice, and Prospects. In J. Horney (Ed.), *National Institute of Justice Criminal Justice 2000: Changes in Decision Making and Discretion in the Criminal Justice System*. (pp. 109-175). Washington, DC: Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.

Cullen, F. T. & Gilbert, K. E. (1982). *Reaffirming Rehabilitation*. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishing Company.

French, S. A. & Gendreau, P. (2006) Reducing Prison Misconducts: What Works! *Criminal Justice and Behaviour, 33*, 185-218 DOI: 10.1177/0093854805284406

Gendreau, P. (1996). The Rehabilitation of Offenders: What We Know and What Has To Be Done. *Criminal Justice and Behaviour, 23*, 144-161.

Gendreau, P. (1996). The Principles of Effective Intervention with Offenders. In A.T. Harland (Ed.), *Choosing Correctional Options that Work: Defining the Demand and Evaluating the Supply* (pp. 117-130). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gendreau, P. & Andrews, D. A. (1990). Tertiary prevention: what the meta-analyses of the offender treatment literature tell us about 'what works'. *Canadian Journal of Criminology, 32*, 173-84.

*Gendreau, P., Andrews, D. A. & Thériault, Y. (2010). *Correctional Program Assessment Inventory – 2010. (CPAI-2010)*. Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.

*Gendreau, P., French, S., & Taylor, A. (2002). *What Works (What Doesn't Work)- Revised 2002: The Principles of Effective Correctional Treatment*. University of New Brunswick at Saint John: Unpublished Manuscript.

Gendreau, P., Goggin, C., Cullen, F. T. & Pappozzi, M. (2002). The common-sense revolution and correctional policy. In J. McGuire (Ed.) *Offender Rehabilitation and*

Treatment: Effective Programmes and Policies to Reduce Re-Offending. Chichester: Wiley.

Gendreau, P., Goggin, C., French, S., & Smith, P. (2006). Practicing Psychology in Correctional Settings. In I. B. Weiner & A. K. Hess (Eds.), *The Handbook of Forensic Psychology, 3rd ed.* (pp. 722-750). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley & Sons. (Gendreau & Goggin's contribution to the 4th edition is currently in press).

Gendreau, P., Goggin, C. & Fulton, B. (2000). Intensive Supervision in Probation and Parole Settings. In C. R. Hollin (Ed.) *Handbook of Offender Assessment and Treatment* (pp. 195-204). Chichester: Wiley.

Gendreau, P., Goggin, C. & Smith, P. (2000). Implementation Guidelines for Correctional Programs in the "Real World". In G. Bernfield, D. P. Farrington & A. W. Leschied (Eds.) *Offender Rehabilitation in Practice: Implementing and Evaluating Effective Programmes* (pp. 247-268). London: John Wiley & Sons.

Gendreau, P. & Ross, R. R. (1979). Effective Correctional Treatment: Bibliotherapy for Cynics. *Crime & Delinquency*, 25, 463-489.

Gendreau, P. & Smith, P. (2012). Assessment and Treatment Strategies for Correctional Institutions. In J. Dvoskin, J. Skeem, R. Novaco, & K. Douglas (Eds.). *Using Social Science to Reduce Violent Offending* (pp. 157-177). NY: Oxford Press.

Gendreau, P., Smith, P., & French, S. (2006). The Theory of Effective Correctional Intervention: Empirical Status and Future Direction. In F. Cullen, J. Wright, & M. Coleman (Eds.) *Taking Stock: The Status of Criminological Theory* (pp. 419-446). Piscataway, NJ: Transaction Press.

Gendreau, P., Smith, P., & Theriault, Y. L. (2009). Chaos Theory and Correctional Treatment: Common Sense, Correctional Quackery and the Law of Fartcatchers. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 25, 384-396.

Goggin, C., & Gendreau, P. (2006). The Implementation and Maintenance of Quality Services in Offender Rehabilitation Programs. In C. R. Hollin, & E. J. Palmer (Eds.) *Offending Behaviour Programmes: Development, Application, and Controversies* (pp.209-246). Chichester: John Wiley.

Goldblatt, P. & Lewis, C. (1998) *Reducing Offending: An Assessment of Research Evidence on Ways of Dealing with Offending Behaviour* Home Office Research Study 187. London: Home Office.

*Gray, G. A. (1997). *Does coercion play a significant role in community treatment programs that reduce offender recidivism?* University of New Brunswick. Unpublished Master Thesis.

*Holsinger, A. M. (1999). *Opening the 'black box': Assessing the relationship between program integrity and recidivism.* University of Cincinnati. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation.

Latessa, E. J. (1999). What Works in Correctional Intervention. *Southern Illinois University Law Journal*, 23, 415-425.

Latessa, E. J., Cullen, F. T. & Gendreau, P. (2002). Beyond Correctional Quackery – Professionalism and the Possibility of Effective Treatment. *Federal Probation*, 66, 43-49.

Latessa, E. J. & Holsinger, A. (1998). The Importance of Evaluating Correctional Programs: Assessing Outcome and Quality. *Corrections Management Quarterly*, 2, 22-29.

*Lowenkamp, C. T. (2004) *Correctional Program Integrity and Treatment Effectiveness: A Multi-site, Program-level Analysis*. University of Cincinnati. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation.

Lowenkamp, C. T., Latessa, E. J., & Smith, P. (2006). Does Correctional Program Quality Really Matter? The Impact of Adhering to the Principles of Effective Intervention. *Criminology and Public Policy*, 5, 575-594.

Matthews, B., Hubbard, D. J. & Latessa, E. (2001). Making the Next Step: Using Evaluability Assessment to Improve Correctional Programming. *The Prison Journal*, 81, 454-472.

McGuire, J. (1995) *What Works: Reducing Re-offending* Chichester: Wiley Press.

McGuire, J. (2000) *Cognitive-behavioural Approaches: An Introduction to the Theory and Research* London: Home Office.

McGuire, J. (2002) Integrated Findings from Research Reviews in McGuire, J. (Ed.) *Offender Rehabilitation and Treatment: Effective Programmes and Policies to Reduce Re-offending* pp. 3-38. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.

McGuire, J. (2004). *Understanding Psychology and Crime: Perspectives on Theory and Action*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

McGuire, J. (2007) Programmes for Probationers in McIvor, G. & Raynor, P. (Eds.) *Developments in Social Work with Offenders* London: Jessica Kingsley.

*Nesovic, A. (2003). *Psychometric Evaluation of the Correctional Program Assessment Inventory (CPAI)*. Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation.

Posavac, E. J., & Carey, R. G. (2010). *Program Evaluation: Methods and Case Studies, 8th ed.* Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

Raynor, P. & Vanstone, M. (1996) Reasoning and Rehabilitation in Britain: The Results of the Straight Thinking on Probation (STOP) Programme. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 40, 272-284 DOI: 10.1177/0306624X96404003

Smith, P., Gendreau, P., & Swartz, K., (2009). Validating the Principles of Effective Intervention: A Systematic Review of the Contributions of Meta-analysis in the Field of Corrections. *Victims and Offenders*, 4, 1-22.

*Spiegler, M. D. & Guevremont, D. C. (2009). *Contemporary Behaviour Therapy*, 5th ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.