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• The CPC was developed by UCCI in 2005 by Drs. Latessa and Lowenkamp
  – Version 2.0 was introduced in September 2015

• Special recognition is provided to Drs. Gendreau and Andrews as the CPC is modeled after the Correctional Program Assessment Inventory (CPAI)
Purpose of the CPC

• To evaluate the extent to which correctional programs adhere to the principles of effective interventions

• To assist agencies with developing and improving the services provided to offender populations

• To assess funding proposals and external service contracts

• To stimulate research on the effectiveness of correctional treatment programs
Development of the Original CPC

• CPC is a checklist of indicators linked with reductions in recidivism
• CPAI forms the base of the instrument
• Other items were added from:
  – Meta-analytic reviews
  – Collective experience of authors
• All indicators were then tested via three large outcome studies conducted by UCCI
Development of the Original CPC

• 2002 study of residential facilities – over 13,000 offenders, 50+ programs

• 2005 study of non-residential programs – over 13,000 offenders, 66 programs

• 2005 study of juvenile programs: community, residential, and institutional – nearly 15,000 offenders, 350 programs


Program Integrity and Treatment Effect for Adult Residential Programs

Change in Recidivism Rates

As Scores for Integrity Rise Recidivism Rates Decrease

Program Percentage Score
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Program Integrity and Treatment Effect for Adult Non-Residential Programs

As Scores for Integrity Rise, Recidivism Rates Decrease

Program Percentage Score
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Program Integrity and Treatment Effect for Juvenile Programs

As Scores for Integrity Rise Recidivism Rates Decrease

Change in Recidivism Rates vs. Program Percentage Score
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Development of the Original CPC

- The three studies showed that integrity could be measured, that it mattered, and that programs with higher integrity reduced recidivism.

- Item level analyses conducted to develop the CPC
  - Items not significant in at least one study were dropped.
  - Items significant in at least one study were retained.
  - Items significant in two or more studies were weighted.

- Domains and overall instrument correlated with recidivism reduction between a .38 and .60.
Areas of the CPC

CAPACITY ➔ Evaluates the ability of the program to consistently deliver effective programming

CONTENT ➔ Assesses the degree to which a program adheres to the principles of effective intervention
Domains of the CPC

CAPACITY
1. Leadership and Development
2. Staff Characteristics
3. Quality Assurance

CONTENT
4. Offender Assessment
5. Treatment Characteristics
Scoring

73 items (some items are weighted; a total of 79 possible points)

• To calculate the final score, sum the items and divide by the total number of possible points for each domain

• Occasionally some items are not applicable

• If n/a is assigned for a particular item, then the total score for that section, and the overall assessment, would exclude that item
Scoring Categories

- Very High Adherence to EBP 65% or more
- High Adherence to EBP 55% - 64%
- Moderate Adherence to EBP 46% - 54%
- Low Adherence to EBP 45% or less

*This scale is used for each of the domains as well as the total score.
Updated Scoring Norms*

*The average scores are based on 318 CPC results across a wide range of programs. Very High Adherence to EBP = 65% or higher, High Adherence to EBP = 55-64%; Moderate Adherence to EBP = 46-54%; Low Adherence to EBP= 45% or less.
Original Scores vs. CPC 2.0 Scores

*The original scores are based on 500+ evaluations completed using both the CPAI and the original version of the CPC.

*The average scores of the CPC 2.0 are based on 318 results across a wide range of programs. Very High Adherence to EBP = 65% or higher, High Adherence to EBP = 55-64%; Moderate Adherence to EBP = 46-54%; Low Adherence to EBP = 45% or less.
Percentage of Programs in Each Category*

*The average scores are based on 318 CPC results across a wide range of programs. Very High Adherence to EBP = 65% or higher, High Adherence to EBP = 55-64%; Moderate Adherence to EBP = 46-54%; Low Adherence to EBP= 45% or less.
Sample of Items in Leadership and Development

- Program Director (PD) qualified
- PD experienced
- PD selects staff
- PD trains staff
- PD supervises staff
- PD conducts program
- Literature review
- Piloting of changes
- Valued by CJ community
- Valued by at-large community
- Funding adequate
- Funding stable
- Program age
- Gender of groups
Sample of Items in Staff Characteristics

- Staff education
- Staff experience
- Staff selection
- Staff meetings
- Annual evaluation
- Clinical supervision

- Initial training
- Ongoing training
- Staff input
- Staff support
- Ethical guidelines
Sample of Items in Offender Assessment

• Appropriate clients
• Exclusionary criteria
• Risk assessment
• Need assessment
• Responsivity assessment
• Targets higher risk offenders
• Validated risk/needs instruments
Sample of Items in Treatment Characteristics

- Criminogenic targets
- Use of CBT
- Length of treatment
- Manual developed and followed
- Structured activities
- Dosage
- Low risk separated
- Match on responsivity
- Offender input
- Rewards and punishers
- Completion criteria and rate
- Group format
- Significant others trained
- Aftercare
Sample of Items in Quality Assurance

• Internal QA processes (e.g., file review)
• Monitoring of contractors
• Client satisfaction
• Offender reassessment
• Recidivism tracking
• Program formally evaluated/effective
• Evaluator working with the program
Collecting the Program Traces

- Staff interviews
- Offender interviews
- Documentation
- Group observations
- Casual interactions/observations
Interviews

- Executive director
- Program director
- Clinical supervisor
- Supervisors
- Treatment staff
- Security staff
- Clients
- Others (e.g., community stakeholders) as relevant or necessary
Documentation

- Client files (10 open and 10 closed)
- Program manuals
- Meeting minutes
- Policy and procedure manual
- Training materials
- Assessments
- Previous evaluations of the program
- Personnel evaluations
- Client Handbook
- Staff Handbook
Direct Observation

• Interventions in progress
• Casual contact/communication
Report Writing

- Background
- Site visit process
- Rating for each domain
- Strengths
- Areas that need improvement
- Recommendations
- Graph with scores for each domain, content and capacity areas, and overall score
- Graph with comparison of program’s scores to average CPC scores
Limitations of the CPC

- Easier to administer to a self-contained program
- Based on “ideal” type and this is impossible to achieve
- Objectivity is critical
- Extensive knowledge of correctional treatment is needed
- Reliability needs to be considered
- Time-specific (i.e., based on program at the time of assessment)
- Does not take into account “system” issues or “why” a problem exists within a program
Advantages of the CPC

• Applicable to a wide range of programs
• Based on empirically achieved principles
• Provides a measure of program integrity and program quality
• Results can be obtained quickly
• Identifies strengths and weaknesses of program
• Provides recommendations for program improvement
• Can be used for “benchmarking”
• Serves as a blueprint for program improvement
Variations of the CPC

• CPC – Group Assessment (CPC-GA)
• CPC – Drug Court (CPC-DC)
• CPC – Community Supervision Agency (CPC-CSA)
• CPC – Vocation/Education Program (CPC-VEP)
• CPC – Mental Health Court (CPC-MH)
CPC-GA

• Designed to assess stand-alone groups
• Created using the same data as the CPC
• 48 items worth 50 points
• 2 areas, 4 domains:

  **CAPACITY**
  1. Program Staff and Support
  2. Quality Assurance

  **CONTENT**
  3. Offender Assessment
  4. Treatment Characteristics
CPC-DC

- Designed to assess drug treatment courts
- Has not been validated
- Includes two units of analysis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DRUG COURT</th>
<th>REFERRAL AGENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAPACITY</strong></td>
<td><strong>CAPACITY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Development,</td>
<td>1. Leadership, Staff,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination,</td>
<td>and Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff and Support</td>
<td>2. Quality Assurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Quality</td>
<td>2. Quality Assurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONTENT</strong></td>
<td><strong>CONTENT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Offender</td>
<td>3. Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>4. Treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Treatment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

41 indicators, 43 points

49 Indicators, 51 points
CPC-CSA

- Designed to assess probation and parole agencies
- Has not been validated
- Includes two units of analysis:
  
  **PROBATION/PAROLE**
  
  **CAPACITY**
  1. Leadership, Management, and Support
  2. Staff Characteristics
  3. Quality Assurance

  **CONTENT**
  3. Offender Assessment
  4. Evidence-Based Practices

  56 indicators, 60 points

  **REFERRAL AGENCY**
  
  **CAPACITY**
  1. Leadership, Staff, and Support
  2. Quality Assurance

  **CONTENT**
  3. Offender Assessment
  4. Treatment

  49 Indicators, 51 points

Copyright © 2015, University of Cincinnati, Corrections Institute, Ohio. All Rights reserved
CPC-VEP

• Designed to assess correctional vocational and educational programs

• Is still in development and is expected to be available in the Fall of 2016

• Focuses on key educational practices
CPC-MH

• Designed to assess mental health courts

• The tool has been piloted on two courts in North Carolina

• The tool is in early phases of development and we do not have an estimated date for use of the tool
CPC Availability

Two options for CPC Assessments:

• UCCI can conduct CPC assessments as needed

• UCCI can train governmental agencies to conduct their own assessments
UCCI Completed Assessments

• Across the different CPC variations, UCCI has assessed over 500 different programs across the country and internationally

• Examples of recent assessments:
  – Federal Probation Southern District of Iowa (CPC-CSA)
  – 13 substance abuse programs contracted by Kansas DOC (through JRI initiatives; CPC)
  – 4 programs used in the Dosage Probation Study for Center for Effective Public Policy in Milwaukee WI (CPC)
**UCCI Trained Agencies**

- Across the different variations, UCCI trained agencies have assessed another 200 programs across the country and internationally.
- Examples of trained agencies:
  - California Bureau of State and Community Corrections (CPC)
  - Minnesota CPC Collaborative (DOC and 6 partner counties; CPC, CPC-GA, and CPC-CSA)
  - Singapore Prison Service (CPC and CPC-GA)
  - Wisconsin DOC (CPC and CPC-GA)
  - Oregon DOC and Multnomah County (CPC and CPC-DC)
  - Ohio DRC and DYS (CPC)
  - San Diego County California Probation Department (CPC)
CPC Training Process

- Staff must be trained and certified in the full CPC before training on other variations can take place.

- CPC Certification involves:
  - 4 day training with satisfactory participation during training
  - Written test with a score of 80% or higher
  - Conduct an independent evaluation and be rated as satisfactory on program scoring and report writing

- Certification in CPC variations involves:
  - 2.5 – 3 day training in each variation
  - Rating as satisfactory on program scoring and report writing

- Assistance from UCCI is provided along the way.
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