

Allen County Community Corrections

2004-2005 Fiscal Year Annual Report

**Presented to the Allen County Community Corrections
Advisory Board on September 22, 2005**

by

**Sheila Hudson, Executive Director
Allen County Community Corrections
201 West Superior Street
Fort Wayne, IN 46802**

Coordinated and Compiled by:

Stan Pflueger, ReEntry Director

**With assistance from the following Allen County Community
Corrections staff persons:**

**Lisa Cain
Anthony Hudson
Kalie Krouse
Klint Krouse
Ken Scheele**

Section 1: Introduction and Statement of Purpose

Part A: Introduction

Allen County Community Corrections recognizes the importance of establishing the practice of producing and distributing an annual report, not only for the exercise of reporting on performance in and of itself, but also because of the implications that an annual report has on the effective administration of the agency. An annual report provides crucial feedback to Allen County Community Corrections staff regarding the performance of programs and systems and progress toward satisfying previously stated goals and objectives. What is learned during the analytical process of completing the report may then be incorporated into the goals and objectives in the planning process involved in developing operations strategy for the following year. The strategy is incorporated into the Allen County Community Corrections funding grant application submitted to the Indiana Department of Correction and guides Allen County Community Corrections actions during the ensuing year. The cycle is completed as the agency's performance is reviewed in an annual report. It is in this type of synergistic approach that Allen County Community Corrections hopes to impress on the reader the level of dedication Allen County Community Corrections has in serving its community and to quality assurance.

Part B: Statement of Purpose

Allen County Community Corrections exists to promote public safety; provide opportunities for behavior change of the offenders under its supervision, and decrease criminal behavior.

Active Cases By Component as of July 1, 2004*

Component	Misd. / Fel. Home Det.	Forensic Diversion	ReEntry Court	Parole	Community Transitions	Comm. Service	Total
# Active Cases	277	0**	38	81	19	351	766

*These numbers do not include individuals who were active in specific programs such as the Employment Academy, Intensive Outpatient Treatment, Choices, etc.

** The number of active cases on the Forensic Diversion Program is zero due to the fact that the program had not been initiated as of July 1, 2004.

Section 2: Identification of an Offender's Risk to the Community

Public Safety is promoted by using a comprehensive assessment that includes mental health instruments and prior history to identify the offender's risk to the community and by monitoring the offender population according to that risk level.

Part A: Referrals July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2005

	Misd. Home Det.	Felony Home Det.	Forensic Diversion	ReEntry Court	Comm. Trans.	Total Referrals
# Referrals	1639	1252	161	332	190	3574

Part B: Intakes July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2005

	Misd. Home Det.	Felony Home Det.	Forensic Diversion	ReEntry Court	Comm. Trans.	Total Intakes
# Intakes	533	461	62	177	73	1306

Misdemeanor Home Detention Intakes

	10-Day Sentence	11-89 Day Sentence	90+ Day Sentence	Total
# Intakes	108	380	45	533

Part C: Participant Profile (Intaked July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2005)*

*Of the 533 Misdemeanor Home Detention individuals, 45 of them were under supervision for 90 days or more, and demographic information is only kept on individuals sentenced to 90 days or more on home detention. No demographic information was kept on the 488 misdemeanor home detention referrals who were sentenced to less than 90 days.

Gender

	Misd. Home Det.	Felony Home Det.	Forensic Diversion	ReEntry Court	Comm. Trans.
Male	37 82 %	376 82 %	49 79%	154 87%	65 89%
Female	8 18 %	85 18 %	13 21%	23 13%	8 11%

Race

	Misd. Home Det.	Felony Home Det.	Forensic Diversion	ReEntry Court	Comm. Trans.
African American	21 47 %	188 41 %	18 29%	116 66%	47 64%
Caucasian	20 44 %	244 53 %	40 65%	54 31%	24 33%
Hispanic	4 9 %	27 6 %	4 6%	6 3%	2 3%
Asian/ Pac. Islander	0 0%	1 1 %	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
American Indian	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	1 5%	0 0%
Other	0 0%	1 1 %	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%

Age

	Misd. Home Det.	Felony Home Det.	Forensic Diversion	ReEntry Court	Comm. Trans.
16-17	1 2 %	2 1 %	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
18-20	7 16 %	51 11 %	1 2 %	14 8 %	2 3%
21-30	17 38 %	188 41 %	12 19 %	75 42 %	28 38%
31-40	14 31 %	124 27 %	25 40 %	45 25 %	25 34 %
41-50	4 9 %	79 17 %	19 31 %	35 20 %	13 18%
51-60	1 2 %	12 3 %	4 6 %	6 3 %	5 7%
61+	1 2%	5 1 %	1 2%	2 1 %	0 0%

Education Level at Intake

	Misd. Home Det.	Felony Home Det.	Forensic Diversion	ReEntry Court	Comm. Trans.
High School Graduate	16 36 %	185 40 %	25 40%	48 27 %	24 33%
GED	10 22 %	84 18 %	12 19%	60 34 %	26 36%
None Complete	12 27 %	136 30 %	14 23%	26 15 %	11 15%
Associate Degree	1 2 %	1 1 %	0 0%	3 2 %	0 0%
Bachelor Degree	0 0%	2 1 %	1 2%	0 0%	0 0%
Master's Degree	0 0%	1 1 %	2 3%	0 0%	0 0%
Business/ Trade School	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	1 1 %	0 0%
Grade School	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	2 1 %	0 0%
Unknown	6 13 %	52 11 %	8 13%	37 21%	12 16%

Employment Status at Intake

	Misd. Home Det.	Felony Home Det.	Forensic Diversion	ReEntry Court	Comm. Trans.
Not Employed	14 64 %	119 52 %	21 68 %	60 80 %	30 91 %

Most Serious Instant Offense

	Misd. Home Det.	Felony Home Det.	Forensic Diversion	ReEntry Court	Comm. Trans.
Violent Offenses	2 4%	33 7%	0 0%	43 24%	7 10%
Property Offenses	0 0%	122 26%	0 0%	39 22%	13 18%
Drug Offenses	4 9%	106 23%	1 2%	74 42%	20 27%
Public Order Offenses	34 76%	163 35%	61 98%	16 9%	30 41%
Other Offenses	5 11%	20 4%	0 0%	2 1%	3 4%
Sexual Offenses	0 0%	17 4%	0 0%	3 2%	0 0%

Classified as Violent Offender

	Misd. * Home Det.	Felony Home Det.	Forensic Diversion	ReEntry Court	Comm. Trans.
Violent	149 28 %	307 67 %	23 37 %	151 85 %	57 78%
Not Violent	384 72%	154 33%	39 63%	26 15%	16 22%

* The violent classification totals 533 because it includes all of the misdemeanor home detention referrals regardless of length of time on the program.

Part D: Participant Mental Health Assessment Information

Psychopathy (PCL-R Score)*

	Misd. Home Det.		Felony Home Det.		Forensic Diversion		ReEntry Court		Comm. Trans.	
Gender	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Very Low	N/A	N/A	6.7%	21.4%	11.9%	0.0%	4.9%	20.0%	N/A	N/A
Low	N/A	N/A	46.7%	50.0%	45.2%	69.2%	34.0%	45.0%	N/A	N/A
Moderate	N/A	N/A	33.3%	28.6%	35.7%	23.0%	34.7%	15.0%	N/A	N/A
High	N/A	N/A	11.7%	0.0%	7.1%	7.7%	24.3%	20.0%	N/A	N/A
Very High	N/A	N/A	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	N/A	N/A

***Psychopathy (Robert Hare)** is a personality pattern characterized by manipulative behavior, a lack of empathy, very difficult in programs with others. Strategy is selective program placement with intense supervision.

- **Shaded area designates individuals classified as psychopathic (PCL-R score of 25 or more)**

Violence Risk Assessment Guide (VRAG Score)

	Misd. Home Det.	Felony Home Det.	Forensic Diversion	ReEntry Court	Comm. Trans.
Low Risk	N/A	65.2%	80.0%	55.8%	N/A
High Risk	N/A	34.8%	20.0%	44.2%	N/A

- **Administered to any male offender who has a history of some violent act.**
- **Shaded area indicates a 55% to 100% probability of violence within 7 years and 64% to 100% within 10 years.**

Sex Offender Risk Assessment Guide (SORAG Score)

	Misd. Home Det.	Felony Home Det.	Forensic Diversion	ReEntry Court	Comm. Trans.
Low Risk	N/A	75.0%	0	20.0%	N/A
High Risk	N/A	25.0%	0	80.0%	N/A

- Administered only to male offenders who have a history sex-offending behavior.
- No Forensic Diversion Participants were Sexual Offenders.
- Shaded area indicates a 58% to 100% probability of sexual violence within 7 years and 76% to 100% within 10 years.

Spousal Abuse Risk Assessment (SARA)

	Misd. Home Det.	Felony Home Det.	Forensic Diversion	ReEntry Court	Comm. Trans.
Low Risk	N/A	91.6%	0	95.4%	N/A
High Risk	N/A	8.3%	0	4.5%	N/A

- Administered only to male offenders who have a current or previous charge of domestic battery.
- No Forensic Diversion participants were charged with Domestic Battery.
- Shaded area indicates a high risk of spousal abuse.
- Small number of subjects may skew percentages.

Axis I Diagnoses

	Misd. Home Det.	Felony Home Det.	Forensic Diversion	ReEntry Court	Comm. Trans.
Alcohol* Disorder	N/A	50	72	97	N/A
Other Drug* Disorder	N/A	58	72	173	N/A
Depressive* Disorder	N/A	20	15	20	N/A
Anxiety* Disorder	N/A	17	10	10	N/A
Conduct* Disorder	N/A	3	3	6	N/A
Thought* Disorder	N/A	3	5	6	N/A

Axis I Diagnoses – Refers to disorders or conditions that are, for the most part, treatable. The strategy is to alleviate the condition through treatment.

Axis II Diagnoses

	Misd. Home Det.	Felony Home Det.	Forensic Diversion	ReEntry Court	Comm. Trans.
Antisocial* Personality Disorder	N/A	21	17	79	N/A
Borderline* Personality Disorder	N/A	4	7	8	N/A
Other* Personality Disorder	N/A	3	4	10	N/A
Borderline* Intellect Function	N/A	0	2	9	N/A

Axis II Diagnoses – Refers to disorders that are long-term, chronic conditions. Strategy is to manage the condition to keep it from deteriorating.

*Categories may total more than the number of individuals intaked on that program during the year due to the fact that categories contain multiple diagnoses.

Comparison of Prevalence to General Population

The following chart compares the percentages of individuals diagnosed with selected diagnoses with the percentage of the general population being diagnosed with that same disorder. No comparison is made with individuals participating in the Community Transition or Misdemeanor Home Detention programs due to the fact that they do not typically receive a full mental health assessment since they will only be on the program for a short time.

	General Population	Home Detention	Forensic Diversion	ReEntry Court
Antisocial Personality Disorder	1-3%	9.25%	27.42%	44.63%
Borderline Personality Disorder	2%	1.76%	11.29%	4.51%
Depressive Disorders	.4 to 9%	7.0%	20.9%	10.2%
Thought Disorders	.5 to 2%	1.3%	8.1%	2.8%
Other Disorders	.5 to 3%	0.0%	2.17%	1.12%

Section 3: Program Completion Data and Evaluation of Program Effectiveness

Part A: Program Completion Status

	Misd. Home Det.	Felony Home Det.	Forensic Diversion	ReEntry Court	Community Transitions
Active as of 06/30/05	10	198	44	130	6
Satisfactorily Released	20	146	8	15	57
Terminated Tech. Viol. Only	11	96	9	27	9
Terminated New Charge Only	1	6	0	2	0
Terminated Tech. Viol. & New Charge	1	0	0	3	0
Escaped	2	15	1	0	1

Part B: Evaluation of Program Effectiveness

The dataset will include all offenders in programming through Allen County Community Corrections from July 1, 2003 through October 1, 2005. Only partial data will be available for the Forensic Diversion Program since it was initiated after July 1, 2003.

The overall effectiveness for Allen County Community Corrections' programming will be assessed by reviewing the recidivism rate for all individuals on home detention programs. The definition for recidivism for these analyses will be re-arrest for a felony or misdemeanor offense. As a process variable, technical violations while under supervision will also be utilized as in major outcome variable for these analyses. All of the analyses detailed below will be run on re-arrest and technical violation data.

1. An analysis will be conducted of all of the subjects the Allen County Community Corrections dataset regardless of what program they were in. This level of analysis will offer an overall estimation of the effectiveness of Allen County Community Corrections program efforts.
2. The second level of analysis will be by program type. The following programs will be reviewed as separate groups to determine each program's effectiveness. The programs include ReEntry Court, Forensic Diversion, Home Detention, and Community Transitions.

3. A third level of analysis will look at how effective the programs have been based on offender type. The five major categories of offender type will be used to separate the data populations for comparison. The five groupings are based on prior national methods for summarizing type of offenders into major categories. Those five categories include violent offenses, property offenses, drug offenses, public order offenses, and other offenses.
4. A fourth level of analysis will look at a multiple regression model for determining which specific programs were most effective for which type of offender. As offenders had different needs they were enrolled in different programs based on those needs. Therefore, not all offenders received the same programming during their time at Allen County Community Corrections. Therefore, multiple regression methodology will be used to determine which programs or sets of programs were most effective for what types of offender based on the five types offender detailed above. These analyses will be done within each of the supervision groups. The multiple regression analysis will be done across all offender types within the type of supervision program they were in at Allen County Community Corrections.
5. In the fifth level of analysis, multiple regression analyses will use to determine if the intake variables predicted programming effectiveness regardless of their offense type. For example, multiple regression analysis will determine whether the programs were more effective based on education level, employment status, gender, race, or mental health conditions of the offenders.
6. The next level of analysis will look at the length of time to re-offense. This type of analysis is called survival analysis. Each program will be examined using survival analysis to determine each program's effectiveness at delaying or preventing recidivism. Survival analysis will indicate specific times risk times when offenders are most likely to re-offend. For example, the analysis may indicate that re-entry violent offenders may have a spike in risk at the four-month mark. If such a result were found it would indicate that specific programming at the four month would be critical for that sub population. Survival analysis and the resulting hazard functions are extremely helpful in determining risk points in behavior change programs.
7. The final level of analysis will examine the path to successful rehabilitation using Path analysis. Path analysis statistically examines the sequence of events that preceded a certain outcome. Path analysis uses the information learned in the multiple regression analyses to map out potential paths to the target outcome. For these analyses, the outcome of interest will be no new arrests. Path analysis will not only determine which programs were most effective (substance abuse treatment, job training, etc) but it will also determine the optimal order of program implementation. For example, Path analysis will determine if the offenders who completed job training before substance abuse treatment were more successful than those offenders who completed the programs in a different order. Path analysis will be done across the dataset as a whole (all offenders), across supervision group type, and across offender type.

Section 4: Introduction and Implementation of the Motivational Intervention Philosophy

Part A: Introduction of the Motivational Intervention Philosophy

Previous analysis of all ReEntry Program participants intaked from July 1, 2001 to June 30, 2003 found that approximately thirty-three (33%) percent were returned to incarceration due to technical violations alone. These technical violations included procedural violations, noncompliance, drug/alcohol usage and serious violations. The greatest number of individuals returned to prison for violating the program were returned for technical violations of noncompliance and drug/alcohol usage. A review of participants under supervision of other home detention programs revealed that a significant proportion of program participants were being terminated for these same types of violations. The questions that arose from these observations were: “Is the currently used case management system providing participants with the information and help with motivation to affect changes in the participants’ behavior?” and “Will a new system of case management lead to the desired outcomes of minimal technical violations and elimination of returns to incarceration due to technical violations?”

In their book, *Motivational Interviewing 2nd Edition: Preparing People for Change*, William Miller and Stephen Rollnick observe that often people become interested in the topic of motivation when questioning why people do not change. They point out that this questioning leads with the words, “You would think that...” (Pg. 3), because of the obvious consequences, participants would change their behavior.

As an agency it was determined, like the authors note, that the more important question that needed to be asked was, “Why do people change?” (Miller and Rollnick, 4)

Both Motivational Interviewing and Cognitive Motivational Case Management have their roots in Prochaska and DeClemente’s “Transtheoretical Therapy” model. For the context of motivation for change, this model suggests that there are five dynamic, yet continuous stages of change. They are:

Pre-contemplation: the person is not currently considering change;

Contemplation: the person is seriously considering change;

Preparation: the person plans and commits to change;

Action: the person has successfully accomplished the initial stages and makes the change;

Maintenance: the person works to maintain and sustain long-term change.

All people move dynamically between these discrete stages. For example, one day a person can be in preparation and then have a death in the family that can make them move back to contemplation or to move forward to action. (Miller and Rollnick, 201-202)

Although Cognitive Motivational Intervention has been used in the medical field, mental health field, and in counseling, the concept is in its infancy of use in the adult correctional system. At Allen County Community Corrections, 80% of the case management staff has been operating according to the authoritarian containment and control model for in excess of two (2) years. Case managers, for example, must alter participant strategies from one in which the case manager defines the problem that the participant has and instruct the participant on the solution that the participant must make to a strategy that requires the case manager to allow the participant to define his or her own problem, exercise reflective listening and reflect the participant's feelings. The case manager can no longer force the participant to make changes and instead must guide the participant through a process in which the participant determines on his or her own what and when to make behavioral changes. Strategy transformations as drastic as those that have been proposed by this project may take more time and more effort than originally expected. New estimates have been cited that indicate that a complete transition may not occur until over a two (2) to three (3) year period.

Part B: Implementation of the Motivational Intervention Philosophy

Liz Fabiano, senior partner of T3 Associates, has provided three onsite training installments since beginning the project.

Between August 9, 2004 and August 10, 2004, training was provided to all staff members who have some contact with participants in basic Cognitive Motivational Tools (CMT). Skills obtained during this session included methods in reflective listening, Recognition of the stages of change that an individual may encounter and experiencing the use of some cognitive motivational methods through role-playing exercises.

During this same visit, during the dates of August 11, 2004 and August 12, 2004, Liz Fabiano provided advanced training in Cognitive Motivational Case Management (CMCM) to core case management staff that had already completed CMT training during a session that occurred prior to the beginning of the project. Case managers improved the application of skills involved in motivational intervention techniques. This included such activities as case studies and role-playing.

Liz Fabiano returned during the dates September 6, 2004 through September 10, 2004 to provide training on Focusing On Reentry (F.O.R.) classes for a number of Allen County Community Corrections staff and Allen County Adult Probation staff to facilitate the class locally. F.O.R. classes are designed to provide an intense regimen to bring participants from a state of pre-contemplation of change to a state in which change is being contemplated. The class also assists participants in a planning process used to make changes. The class is implemented in conjunction with CMCM in order to enhance CMCM.

The last training visit Liz Fabiano made occurred between January 12, 2005 and January 14, 2005. Liz Fabiano analyzed and provided feedback on a review of a F.O.R.: A Change class session. She also provided these services for preliminary efforts by case managers to implement motivational intervention techniques.

Initial CMT and CMCM training is considered to be complete. This is not the benchmark for measurable proficiency in application of motivational intervention. A process for certification of skills was developed for this purpose and a design had been put into place to accomplish proficiency. A senior level case manager has been reassigned for the exclusive purpose of facilitating this transition.

The original plan for certification included three (3) levels to be successfully completed by each case manager.

Level 1 status in Cognitive Motivational Case Management (CMCM) included a content and knowledge test, completion and review of a transcribed audiotape of practitioner/participant interaction, and a review and assessment of a completed case file. The case file includes a video recording of a participant interview. Each case manager is required to be proficient in attending behaviors as well as reflective listening/reflection of feelings.

Level 2 status in Cognitive Motivational Case Management (CMCM) included a case manager's demonstration of knowledge through describing strategies he or she would follow in a selected case by the T3 Associates consultant. The case manager is required to play both the parts of the interviewer and the interviewee to demonstrate completing the decisional balance and a case plan.

Level 3 status in Cognitive Motivational Case Management (CMCM) entailed the case manager's submission of one (1) full, transcribed audio and or videotape demonstrating successful completion of a Cognitive Motivational Case Management session with an offender. The case manager was to provide an analysis of what techniques and/or methods/tools were employed and why. The case manager would have continued to review prior tests, role-playing, case conferencing, and group reviews of the total CMCM process on a bi-weekly basis.

In addition to the three (3) levels, the previously noted reassigned case manager will be required to complete an additional level of training to become a Master Practitioner. As a Master Practitioner, this case manager was to be responsible for filling the role of the motivational intervention consultant onsite, on a continuing basis. As the onsite consultant, the case manager would provide training for new employees, continuous in-service training and case review support for case management staff. The Master Practitioner would also conduct case conferencing sessions with case management staff so that staff may continue to learn ways to refine technique through the experiences of others.

Master Practitioner Level (Level 4) of Cognitive Motivational Case Management qualifications include the submission of two (2) full, transcribed audio tapes demonstrating the best practice application of Cognitive Motivational Case Management, and submission of notes and case material for one case managed with Cognitive Motivational Case Management. The case manager would also be required to submit three (3) reviews of other staff CMCM transcribed interviews.

As noted previously, case managers have only reached Level 1. Continuing efforts to progress to Level 2, Level 3 have been suspended as well as developing the Master Practitioner Level as originally planned. Skills exercising drill through mock interviews are to be conducted on a weekly basis with each case manager. On March 28, 2005, an interactive DVD on reflective listening was acquired for case managers to use in assisting in reaching Level 2 certification.

In addition, <http://motivationalinterview.org/clinical/interaction> has been accessed to provide case managers with examples to reference in the use of motivational intervention technique.

In April 2005, a review of this training process determined that the case management staff had not produced the necessary audio and visual material for an assessment of the level of skill acquisition in motivational intervention. Furthermore, audits that were conducted of written records, at the point of service, and of existing audio recordings of interviews revealed that very few, if any, of the skills taught during training were actually being applied. Discussions with case management staff in group settings revealed that these individuals were concerned with the impact that applying the motivational intervention techniques would have on their productivity. At the skill level that the majority of the case managers were, these techniques took a significantly longer amount of time to complete each participant contact. This reduced the total amount of participants that case managers were able to interact with. This, they reported, caused problems for being able to enforce rules and court orders.

The outcome of this review was the realization that the transition between case management systems was going to require more effort and take longer than originally anticipated. In response to this outcome, the training strategy was changed. The ongoing support that T3 associates were providing was problematic, and distance and money became the barriers. Therefore, the business agreement between Allen County Community Corrections and T3 associates was amicably suspended. Efforts in pursuing level certifications were indefinitely suspended in favor of providing case managers with an opportunity to learn the components that made up the foundation of motivational intervention in greater detail. The theory is that in knowing the foundations and developing a proficiency in application, the case managers will develop a corresponding proficiency in the motivational intervention as well and understand in what manner and why productive interactions with participants occur. A new training regimen was proposed and a current employee who is a mental health professional was assigned to develop and deliver this new training.

The training sessions are one hour in duration and the dates and descriptions are listed as follows:

May 4, 2005: Cognitive Motivational Case Management written materials that were provided as part of the training by T3 Senior Partner, Liz Fabiano, were reviewed as a contextual introduction to this new training series.

Case managers were introduced to the application of communication skills called micro skills for use in intentional interviewing. The micro skills model has been validated by several studies. Use of the micro skills hierarchy will improve listening skills and control of the interview structure.

May 11, 2005: This training session was used to complete the lecture of the reference material from the meeting on May 4, 2005. Discussion continued regarding learning how to understand the way a participant experiences and makes sense of the world – learning how to be empathetic instead of being sympathetic. Understanding how cultural differences influence perceptions. The micro skills hierarchy was described as including attending behavior (patterns of eye contact, body language, vocal qualities, and verbal tracking). Also, within the next level are, questioning skills, observation skills, skills including encouraging, paraphrasing, and summarization, and reflection of feeling. These skills are all included in the basic listening sequence.

May 25, 2005: The focus of this session was the attending behaviors. Case managers reviewed the four dimensions of attending: 1. Eye contact; 2. Attentive body Language; 3. Vocal qualities (tone, speech rate); 4. Verbal tracking (maintain subject focus). These four dimensions are used for increasing participant talk time in order to learn more about the participant. The instructor provided the group with some demonstrations of the attending skills by using these skills with individual case managers in mock interviews.

June 15, 2005: Attending behavior micro skills were revisited. Written instructions for practice exercises were distributed to the case managers. All the session attendants engaged in role-playing to learn and exercise micro skills learned earlier. Practice interviews were conducted and those group members who were not role-playing provided feedback on the interview based on the knowledge of the four dimensions of attending behavior. The basic goals of the exercise were to stay on the interviewee's topic instead of introducing a new topic of the interviewers, thus increasing the interviewee's talk time. This will lead the interviewer to be able to control the directions of interviews as well as the content.

June 29, 2005: At the request of the case managers, the instructor inserted an introductory lesson regarding personality theory and diagnostics for personality disorders. This session's lecture focused on Antisocial Personality Disorder as defined by the DSM-IV. A large percentage of participants display characteristic behaviors of this profile. Case managers learned methods for interactions with these participants and techniques for intentional interviewing these participants.

In continued development of motivational intervention at Allen County Community Corrections, two staff members who are F.O.R. : A Change facilitators and who will be positioned to return to coordinating the implementation of the Cognitive Motivational Case Management project will be sent to advanced training. These individuals will be traveling to Duke University for training provided by Cathy Cole in October of 2005. Ms. Cole is a trainer certified by William Miller and Stephen Rollnick to provide instruction according to their research and work on Motivational Interviewing.

Part C: Description of Motivational Intervention Programs

Total Program Referrals and Intakes

	Internal	External	Total
Referrals	1338	4468	5806
Intakes	984	2750	3734

Individual Program Descriptions and Statistics

Choices

	Internal	External	Total
Referrals	298	848	1146
Intakes	195	552	747

Choices is a program which uses material from select cognitive interventions manuals including the following: Options: A Cognitive Change Program (Bush, 1993), the State of Wisconsin’s Think (1997), Reasoning and Rehabilitation (Ross, Fabiano & Diemer-Ewles, 1986; 1988) and Thinking for a Change (Glick, Taymons, & Bush, 1997). The creators of Choices have been personally trained and certified by Elizabeth Fabiano, Dr. Frank Porporino, Dr. Jack Bush, and Dr. Barry Glick.

As a hybrid of Cognitive-Behavioral programs listed above, Choices is a six (6)-week training that facilitates cognitive skills for adequate social adjustment to those individuals who tend to be under-socialized and need skills to lower frustration and negative behavior. Rather than viewing the students’ anti-social behavior as a reflection of some underlying psychopathology, cognitive skills focuses on those individuals who tend to be under-socialized, meaning they lack adequate values, attitudes, reasoning, and social skills required for pro-social development and/or adjustment, success in any aspect of life. This is taught on the premise that such skills can be acquired or learned. Choices provides the environment to negate what is going wrong in offenders lives, but providing alternatives on how to do right in their own circumstances.

Community Fathers

	Internal	External	Total
Referrals	N/A	27	27
Intakes	N/A	16	16

In September 2004, Allen County Community Corrections partnered with the Allen County Prosecuting Attorney’s Office, Allen County Adult Probation, and Allen County Circuit Court to provide services to parents with child support obligations with high arrears and inadequate means for payment. Many of these non-custodial parents ended up in the Criminal Justice system without the motivation and/or ability to pay, leaving the State of Indiana with the bill for support because of a state law that warranted a Felony Conviction of “Nonsupport of a Dependent” to those in noncompliance with their support order.

The Community Fathers Program targeted parenting and increased involvement with children while supplying secondary barrier reduction with coordinating employment, education, and housing assistance. The basic premise of Community Fathers Program was to provide an opportunity for the 60 non-custodial parents to take an active role in their children’s lives while basic needs of employment were met. Community Action of Northeast Indiana (CANI) was to provide a family caseworker for basic remediation and child support payment assistance and Stop Child Abuse and Neglect (SCAN) was to provide remediation and visitation to reinstate fathers into their children’s lives.

Attendance in the Employment Academy and FOR a Change offered those non-custodial parents with a firm direction and career-based mechanism to make payments through employment obtained with matching by job developers on staff and placements at area employers willing to hire. The project used wage subsidies from the grant, tax credits and leverage from the resources provided at Allen County Community Corrections.

On June 30, 2005 the project was dismantled based on low referral numbers.

Community Service

	Internal	External	Total
Referrals	N/A	1436	1436
Intakes	N/A	927	927

The Community Service division protects Allen County citizens by ensuring appropriate monitoring of adult offenders within the community. In most cases, the focus of community service is not on punishment; rather, it is on accountability. In addition, Community Service provides visible evidence to citizens that offenders are held accountable.

Community Service restitution at Allen County Community Corrections was created in 1985 as an alternative to prison or jail time. As part of the offender’s process, the sentence may include a requirement that the offender perform a specified number of hours of labor for local government, nonprofit agencies and/or private entities. Currently, there are three different types of crews working at ACCC. The first crew is used as a resource for indigent Home Detention participants while utilizing a business model to keep afloat. The second crew is for those who have gone through the Program Identification and Placement (PIP) process and selected community service as their sanction. The third crew is more of a punitive-styled approach that involves highway cleanup for participants who have violated Home Detention regulations. The crews are supervised by one of four community service supervisors who have extensive law enforcement training. ACCC understands the hectic schedule that some participants deal with and as a result are given the option to work first, second, and, at times, even third shift; Additionally, Community Service crews run seven days a week to cater to those who are full-time employed.

The sanction can be a positive influence that evokes accountability from the offender for his/her actions while reducing the burden on the jails or prison system.

Employment Academy

	Internal	External	Total
Referrals	433	332	765
Intakes	364	239	603

Allen County Community Corrections realized in 2001 that 60% of the ex-inmates returning from prison remained unemployed as long as six weeks after release. The likelihood was high that many would return to prison by committing new crimes, with new victims. As an answer to the problem, the Employment Academy was created in August of 2002 to address this issue, and to help the clients gain the soft skills desired in today’s workforce. An overwhelming amount of research demonstrates that ex-offenders with employment are far less likely to re-offend, but at the same time, this population lacks the basic skills necessary to obtain and keep a job. Much still had to be done to compliment this job-readiness training.

The National Institute of Corrections provided a satellite distance learning for Offender Workforce Development Specialists with ACCC as a location; this was used as a foundation for job development. STRIVE New York, the Safer Foundation and Center

for Employment Opportunities provided a foundation for the job-readiness training and job placement services offered at ACCC. As a result of the networking opportunities and workforce development research, the Employment Academy was created.

The intensive 30-hour job-readiness training focuses on an attitudinal shift towards the workplace and it's expectations and requires a number of modifications in (workplace) behavior. With the urgency to secure employment quickly upon reentering society from jail or prison, the training was created to be just two weeks in duration, every morning or afternoon. The training teaches soft skills needed to obtain a job such as well as skills needed to keep the job. At graduation, a Job Developer will assist in matching the skills and interest with open positions at area employers and provide support services such as completing tax credits, training reimbursements and bonds to employers as well as continual follow-up. Volunteer mock interviewers assist in developing the confidence needed to sell oneself including the felony conviction. By September 2005, the Employment Academy is anticipated to assist over 700 offenders with an average of 75% securing employment within three weeks of graduating the training. Partners like JobWorks and Ivy Tech State College provide ongoing training and schooling.

English as a Second Language

	Internal	External	Total
Referrals	N/A	6	6
Intakes	N/A	3	3

In July 2005, Allen County Community Corrections responded to the requests from the Superior Court Magistrates to create an English as a Second Language (ESL) course to assist the large number of Spanish and Burmese speaking populations entering the criminal justice system. With the influx of Immigrants, many do not understand the culture and language and become repeat offenders when their sentences become jail time or community service. As a response to this high need, Allen County Community Corrections created an ESL course so that non-English speaking people will become more self-sufficient in the American culture.

The ESL class operates with an average of 20 students at any one time. It is an Immersion-Based philosophy which means that students can seldom speak their native tongue. The curriculum is based on the English Structure Practices Workbook from (Keith Folse) from the University of Michigan. Pre and Post Assessments are conducted via the Adult Language Assessment Scale (LAS) and skills are gauged.

Indiana Purdue University Fort Wayne (IPFW) Teaching English as a New Language TENL Certificate Program is providing graduate students to observe and review facilitation and curriculum. Altogether, the students are expected to attend the class for fifty (50) hours and may continue to reach full English Literacy indefinitely.

For A Change

	Internal	External	Total
Referrals	155	294	449
Intakes	113	232	345

As exhibited in a two-year study of the ReEntry Court Initiative, Allen County Community Corrections realized a high rate of technical violations even though crime and recidivism lowered significantly in participants. To deal with this issue, along with the ongoing thirty percent attrition rate in programming, Community Corrections had to come up with something that dealt with offender's motivation to attend to and deal with their problems and match it to programming that the agency had to offer. Offenders needed to have their own buy-in for change and programming, or making referrals and placements were pointless. FOR a Change is a program that compliments a new approach to case management where offenders become their own agents of change through practices more often used in the mental health field. As case managers are working towards a realized change plan that the offender derived, many times the length of time sentenced to the program precluded any real work to be done between the two. FOR a Change is a program that derives abilities to deal with core criminogenic issues that prevents the offender from realizing his or her own potential which is essential; so that program acceptance could assist case managers in moving offenders quickly into a more contemplative state of changing behavior.

The Concept of FOR a Change was derived from the research of Stephen Rollnick, PhD. & William Miller, PHD, Behavioral and Cognitive Psychotherapy and Reasoning and Rehabilitation (R&R). T3 Associates facilitated the training of facilitators in the introduction to Cognitive Motivational Case Management and FOR a Change Facilitation.

FOR A Change is 12-session cognitive-behavioral intervention aimed at assisting individuals in personal goal setting and life planning. The primary objective in the program is to increase motivation and commitment of offenders in setting their own agenda for change. Appropriately looking from the inside out, while deriving what thinking roadblocks prevented success in the past, enables offenders to take a hold of the trajectory in their lives by realizing the core issues that have inhibited them thus far. But preparing oneself for a change in behavior is just as hard, creating skills to cope and deal with a new way of acting and interacting with others is an important component to the training.

Offenders produce a personal change plan in a workbook provided and interview with facilitators one-on-one halfway through the training to target core areas of change.

Adult Basic Skills

	Internal	External	Total
Referrals	90	69	159
Intakes	40	53	93

A cross section of Allen County’s adult felony population would reveal that over 50% did not receive a diploma or GED, with an average of an 6th grade reading level and the likelihood of up to 30% possessing a reading, writing or learning disability. Another probable reason that an offender has not worked toward a GED while in the community; a diploma equals a time cut in prison.

The Adult Basic Skills program exercises Literacy tutoring, Adult Education, and GED preparation all in the same classroom. This means that adults do not need to test in at a specific level prior to enrollment to participate. Pre and Post TABE examinations (administered every 12 weeks) gauge skills in reading, math, and language arts.

A Cooperative Learning environment, as demonstrated at the Safer Foundation located in Chicago, IL with a twenty year track record of success, is integrated within the learning environment where tasks are often given to a table of students that have comparable abilities, teaching and tutoring each other, with relevant material to their respective lives, which builds a stronger foundation for ability.

KeyTrain Software, administered through WorkKeys, was purchased and provided by the Northeast Indiana Workforce Investment Board. This is an individually paced instructional program that gauges reading, math and writing and associates it to the GED or any career position desired with matching levels of skill. In turn, offenders have the ability to gauge what skills need worked on to get a specific job, but how close they are in passing the GED as well.

Fifty (50) hours is committed by the student, however a lifelong commitment is made by staff or until they receive a GED or diploma.

Intensive Out Patient Substance Abuse Treatment

	Internal	External	Total
Referrals	362	533	895
Intakes	272	325	597

In 2002, SAMSHA provided a report to Congress that clarified the need for a multi-faceted approach to addiction treatment. It demonstrated that no one approach is sufficient for treatment. Individuals starting out on a new abstinent based lifestyle have varying needs and different motivating factors for change. The SAMSHA report did identify several scientifically documented approaches for working with Substance Abuse

clients. These are Cognitive-Behavioral Therapy, Motivational-Enhancement Therapy, Social Skill Training, Family Therapy, and Vocational Skills Enhancement.

Also, the National Institute on Drug Abuse/ National Institutes of Health released a comprehensive guide on the principles of Drug Addiction Treatment based on three decades of scientific research and clinical practice. There are thirteen listed principles that reinforce the need for matching treatment interventions to the individual client. Other important conclusions from this study are that treatment need not be voluntary to be effective, that participants should be regularly screened for chemical use, self help groups can complement and extend the benefits of the treatment process, Counseling (Individual and/or Group) and other Behavior Therapies are critical components of effective treatment for addiction, and that recovery from addiction is a long-term process.

Based on this information, the Substance Abuse Program at Allen County Community Corrections has evolved in many ways to be responsive both to the safety of the public and to the needs of individuals participating in the program.

The program is certified by the Division of Mental Health and Addiction as an Addiction Services Provider-Outpatient Certification. Facilitators of the program are certified by Indiana Counselor Association on Alcohol and Drug Abuse Inc. and/or hold Bachelor degrees related to social service. All are familiar and trained in Cognitive-Behavioral Therapy and Motivational Enhancement Therapy which are both applied to the program.

The Allen County Community Corrections Substance Abuse Division has implemented a multi-phase program which can be individually tailored based on a client’s diagnosis and individual needs. The program offers Substance Abuse Education, Group therapy, Continuing Care Groups, and Individual sessions. Currently materials are research-based the Interactive Journaling© workbooks developed by the Change Companies. Participants are referred to community based support meetings to augment their abstinence plans for the long term as well as to increase their support base. Participants are regularly reviewed by the treatment team to examine progress and/or concerns with treatment plan progress.

PIP (Program Identification and Placement)

	Internal	External	Total
Referrals	N/A	923	923
Intakes	N/A	403	403

In November 2004, Allen County Community Corrections proposed to the Allen Superior Court Magistrates, Prosecuting Attorney’s Office, and Public Defender’s Office that a new mechanism for assessing and referring misdemeanants be created to deter the high attrition and low completion rates for referrals. More important, Community Corrections staff wanted to provide alternatives to those traditionally referred to the Community

Service Division who may need another form of remediation as work crews offer little rehabilitative affect on those with resistive and often recalcitrant social patterns with the criminal justice system.

Through research and training provided by certified trainers of Miller and Rollnick's Motivational Interviewing and Prochaska and Diclimenti's Transtheoretical Model; Community Corrections' staff realized that those wanting to change their behavior would only change if they so desire and are at a point of contemplating ways to do so. Otherwise, mandating programs or sentences to those not aware, or even care, about the specific behavior that got them into trouble, will not accept nor absorb treatment and programming and will end up in the criminal justice system more often than not.

The Program Identification and Placement (PIP) was created to provide the offender with an opportunity to choose a program by which to participate after a half-hour presentation by Allen County Community Corrections staff. Once chosen it becomes their sentence and endorsed by the Magistrates, Prosecutor, Defense and Community Corrections as recommended treatment. The choices for programming include the 1) Employment Academy, 2) Adult Basic Skills Program, 3) Substance Abuse (Education) Discovery, 4) Choices, 5) FOR a Change, 6) Community Service, 7) English as a Second Language.

Section 5: Management and Control of Offenders

Urine Drug Testing

	Negative	Positive	Adulterated	Dilute	Other
Number	5146	942	2	163	72
% of Total	81.36	14.89	0.03	2.58	1.14

Arrests for New Charges

Description	# Charges
Alcohol Offense	14
Warrant Arrest	12
Child Abuse or Neglect	3
Criminal Mischief	1
Computer Crimes	1
Controlled Substance/Possession by Subterfuge	1
Controlled Substance/Possession of Cocaine	3
Controlled Substance/Possession of Marijuana	11
Controlled Substance/Possession	2
Controlled Substance/Possession of Paraphernalia	9
Controlled Substance/Sale of Cocaine	1
Driving While Suspended	16
Escape	47
Family Fight (non violent)	1
False Information or Report	1
Failure to Return to Lawful Detention	5
Intoxicated Person	19
Minor Consuming	4
DUI Alcohol or Drugs	1
Pornography/Obscene Material	6
Probation/Parole Violation	25
Resisting/Interfering with Police	1
Sex Offense	1
Search Warrant	1
Suicide/Attempted Suicide	1
Traffic Offense	5
Unauthorized Absence from Home Detention	24
Violation of a Restraining Order	3
Violation of Executed Order of Home Detention	174
Weapons Offense	2
Total Offenses Charged	395

Officer Assignments

Description	FY 03-04	FY 04-05
Meet	12	3
Pick-up Prisoner	289	261
Cage Transport Prisoner	39	69
Warrant	5	2
Warrant Service	27	55
Assist	36	52
Pick-up Item	49	48
Escort	0	2
Juvenile Neglect/Abuse Investigation	0	2
Vandalism	0	2
Traffic Accident	1	1
Special Assignment	14	6
Traffic Stop	14	16
Disabled Vehicle/Traffic Hazard	2	2
Party Locked Out	1	0
Parked Vehicle Occupied	1	2
Parking Violation	0	1
Audible Alarm	2	0
Man-Down	0	1
Intoxicated Person	16	16
Disturbance	3	3
Disturbance/Party Armed	0	1
Nuisance (Noise, Smoke, etc)	1	0
Domestic Disturbance/Battery	3	7
Removal of Articles	0	2
Suspicious Person	6	4
Theft	3	2
Attempt to Contact	415	728
Suicide Threats	0	1
Mentally Ill	1	3
Unruly Crowd	1	0
Pursuit	1	0
Battery	2	0
Found Items	1	0
Narcotics Investigation	3	9
Threats	4	4
Unwanted Person	0	1
Follow-up Investigation	46	89
Home Detention Assignment	7964	8403
Total Assignments	8962	9798

Communications Division

The Communications Division logs on average 21,711 contacts per month from participants. These contacts are logged into the case management software. There are many different reasons that participants need to contact the communications staff. The majority of these are telephone calls to inform Communications Staff that a participant's schedule has changed from what had been on file. (Clients are required to submit a schedule in writing prior to the week, informing staff of their working hours and appointments) Every participant that comes to the Daily Reporting Center is logged in and out by Communications Staff. Some telephone contacts are questions that participants have about the program. Some of the contacts are concerning domestic problems that the individual may be having. The Communications Staff are trained to handle any type of contact that they may receive.

The Communications Division processes on average each month 32,490 "alerts" from the BI Incorporated Guardserver. This is the server that communicates with the electronic monitoring equipment in the field. Communications staff receives these alerts at three computer stations. Every time an individual leaves or enters his home an "alert" is generated. The staff then determines whether this "leave" or "enter" is approved using the participant's weekly schedule. If no schedule exists, then attempts are made to locate the participant by telephone. If the phone calls placed do not locate the client then Home Detention Officers are dispatched to attempt to locate the individual. Communications staff members receive alerts when the power or phone is disrupted to the field unit. In cases where field equipment is tampered, officers are dispatch to the residence to assess the situation.

Section 6: Budget Summary

Fiscal Year 2003-2004

First year of biennium

Program: Allen County Community Corrections

	A State <u>Funds</u>	B User <u>Fees</u>	C Matching <u>Funds</u>	D <u>Total</u>
I. <u>100 Series</u>				
Salary & Wages	11000	0	21000	32000
Fringe Benefits	1529	0	4737	6266
II. <u>200 Series</u>				
Supplies	2500	0	0	2500
III. <u>300 Series</u>				
Building Rental	0	0	0	0
Professional Contracts	3000	0	0	3000
Travel	2800	0	5000	7800
Other Services	6510	0	533	7043
IV. <u>400 Series</u>				
Equipment	4500	0	1500	6000
V. <u>Total Proposed Budget</u>	31839	0	32770	64609

VI. COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS GRANT BUDGET SUMMARIZED BY PROGRAM COMPONENT

<u>Component</u>	<u>A State Funds</u>	<u>B User Fees</u>	<u>C Matching Funds</u>	<u>D Total</u>
<u>Administrative</u>	<u>318855</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>318855</u>
<u>Day Reporting Ctr.</u>	<u>481508</u>	<u>1548349</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2029857</u>
<u>Community Transition Program</u>	<u>526774</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>526774</u>
<u>Prevention</u>	<u>19178</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>19178</u>
<u>Forensic Diversion</u>	<u>31839</u>		<u>32770</u>	<u>64609</u>
TOTAL REQUEST:	<u>1378154</u>	<u>1548349</u>	<u>32770</u>	<u>2959273</u>

VII. ESTIMATED CASH POSITION
PROJECT INCOME/USER FEE FUND

A.	Account Balance as of December 31, 2002.	<u>51569</u>
B.	Projected receipts between January 1, 2003 and June 30, 2003.	<u>504000</u>
C.	Projected funds to be raised during fiscal year of application	<u>1536000</u>
D.	TOTAL FUNDS	<u>2091569</u>
E.	Projected expenditures from January 1 to June 30	<u>385329</u>
F.	Projected expenditures during fiscal year of application	<u>1682109</u>
G.	TOTAL PROJECTED EXPENDITURES	<u>2067438</u>
H.	PROJECTED NET FUND BALANCE	<u>24131</u>