



Office of
RESEARCH &
STRATEGIC PLANNING

ENSURING THE FIDELITY OF OFFENDER RISK ASSESSMENT IN LARGE-SCALE CORRECTIONAL SETTINGS: THE QUALITY ASSURANCE-TREATMENT INTERVENTION PROGRAMS AND SUPERVISION INITIATIVE (QA-TIPS)

Stephen M. Haas, Ph.D., Director
Leighann J. Davidson, M.S., Research Analyst
Justice Center for Evidence Based Practice

December 10, 2014

JRSA Research and Training Webinar Series



Webinar

Moderator/discussant:

- J. Stephen Wormith, Ph.D., Director
 - Co-developer, Level of Service/Case Management Inventory
 - Centre for Forensic Behavioural Science and Justice Studies
 - University of Saskatchewan

Overview: Purpose and goals

- ❑ Describe WV's Statewide Implementation of the LS/CMI
- ❑ Highlight the importance of assessing the accuracy of offender assessment and the quality of case plans and interviews
- ❑ Discuss the challenge of monitoring RNR adherence and best practices in large-scale implementations
- ❑ Illustrate WV's approach for monitoring the quality assessment of offenders, and generating feedback to the field
 - ❑ Peer-to-peer approach with supervisory oversight
 - ❑ Electronic submissions from the field
 - ❑ Feedback loop to the field offering information on agency and individual performance, with comparison to state and other agency/facility performance

WV Office of Research and Strategic Planning (ORSP)

- **Comprised of two units:**
 - Criminal Justice Statistical Analysis Centers
 - Justice Center for Evidence Based Practice



- **Criminal Justice Statistical Analysis Center (CJSAC)**
 - Collect, analyze, and disseminate justice data in WV
 - Contribute to effective state policy through statistical services, research, evaluation, and policy analysis
 - Provides data for sound policy and practical decisions for the justice system

WV Office of Research and Strategic Planning (ORSP)

- **Justice Center for Evidence Based Practice (JCEBP)**
 - Synthesize current research on EBP, translate to policymakers and system administrators
 - Aide in the development of a comprehensive, statewide strategic plan aligned with EBP

- **Services related to Level of Service/Case Management Inventory (LS/CMI)**
 - Ensure LS/CMI is implemented properly across the justice system
 - Establish minimum standards for training and certification
 - Develop quality assurance policies/procedures in conjunction with programs/agencies
 - Manage online LS/CMI – data and access

JCEBP: Statewide Implementation Activities

- Conduct LS/CMI User and User Trainer workshops
- Manage LS/CMI certification database and processes
- Develop policy/procedures and monitor for quality assurance
- Manage LS/CMI online system and accounts
- Manage on Online Learning Management System (OLMS)
- Develop courses on EBP and effective correctional practices
- Conduct Motivational Interviewing User and Trainer workshops

WV Statewide LS/CMI Implementation

- Applied in WV for several years:
 - ▣ Day report centers since 2006
 - ▣ DJS since 2008
 - ▣ DOC since 2010 (parole 2011)
 - ▣ Probation and drug courts (2013)

- Tool is used by all sectors of the justice system, and help to inform front-end and back-end decisions!

- Can help to resolve offender “sorting” issue, and improve offender outcomes.

Importance of Offender Assessment

- **Purpose:** To promote public safety through the accurate assessment of offender level of risk for reoffending and criminogenic needs (i.e., dynamic risk factors associated with the likelihood of reoffending, if not addressed).
- Research consistently shows that objective, actuarial assessment tools are better than clinical judgment alone in making case management decisions.
- Without assessment, cannot adhere to “what works” in offender management or evidence-based sentencing practices – ASSESSMENT IS FIRST STEP TOWARD ACHIEVING EBP AND EFFECTIVE INTEVENTIONS!

Importance of “Risk Assessment” Accuracy

- Inaccurate risk scores WILL negatively impact decision-making throughout the system;
- AND result in invalid information being shared across agencies via the LS/CMI Online System

Falsely **high** risk score = violates risk principle, diminishing impact on recidivism, has potential impact on civil liberties, wastes resources, jeopardizes public safety

Falsely **low** risk scores = violates risk principle, results in poor targeting of risk factors diminishing impact on recidivism, and jeopardizes public safety

Large-Scale Implementation and Effect Sizes

- Meta-analytic reviews of the offender rehabilitation literature have consistently demonstrated that treatment can reduce recidivism.
- The majority of the treatment programs in these reviews consist of small-scale demonstration projects ($N < 100$).
- Larger interventions, although effective in reducing recidivism, do not produce as robust effects as the smaller demonstration projects.
- The reasons for this may have to do more with quality implementation issues rather than with the treatment itself.

Challenges of Statewide Implementation in WV

- Multiple agencies and hundreds of users
 - Division of Juvenile Services; Division of Corrections, Parole Services, Adult and Juvenile Day Report Centers, Bureau for Behavioral Health and Health Facilities, and private treatment providers.
 - Need for minimum standards or guidance, with standardized procedures
- Direct observation by ORSP/JCEBP not practical/feasible
- ORSP/JCEBP is an “external agency” with QA oversight responsibilities for other agencies
- Various sources of “resistance” to new assessment and quality assurance procedures

Multiple Methods for Assessing Risk Assessment Quality and WV's Approach

- Multiple, valid methods for monitoring assessment quality
 - ▣ Assessment Checklist/Matrices, Random Case Assessment/ File Reviews, Taped/Video Interview Critiques, etc.

- WV's approach: Peer-to-peer assessments, with supervisory oversight
 - ▣ Intended to be “bottom-up” rather than “top-down”
 - ▣ Effort to create “culture of quality or learning”
 - ▣ Designed to minimize resistance, and create ownership over the quality of assessments, case plans, and interviews

WV's Statewide QA Infrastructure

- Statewide policies, procedures, and data collection infrastructure are in place to ensure the quality use of the LS/CMI.

- **Goal:** To create confidence among all decision-makers that LS/CMI results are accurate, assessors are qualified, and ample oversight is in place.
 - ▣ Involves a series of quality checks
 - ▣ Statewide certification and recertification standards
 - ▣ An electronic system of monitoring/reporting QA results on a statewide basis
 - ▣ Efficient and reliable sharing of assessment information via the LS/CMI Online System

Quality Assurance Treatment Intervention Programs & Supervision (QA-TIPS)

- All Users and Trainers are adhering to statewide minimum standards

- Policies have statewide coverage, and do not apply to a single agency, to ensure consistency in professional standards, scoring accuracy, and valid data input into the LS/CMI Online System
 - LS/CMI User and User Trainer Certification
 - LS/CMI Online Security Policy
 - LS/CMI Quality Assurance Standards and Procedures Policy

LS/CMI User and User Trainer Certification Requirements

- Certification table

LS/CMI User and User Trainer Recertification Requirements

- Recertification table

QA-TIPS: Four LS/CMI-Related Priority Areas

- **1) Quality of instrument completion**
 - Quantitative measure assessment accuracy
 - Inter-rater reliability assessments

- **2) Quality of case management plan**
 - Congruence between assessment and case plans
 - Quantitative measure for supervision/treatment matching, intervention goals, and activities

- **3) Motivational interviewing and 4) Relationship skills**
 - Target skill balance/active listening skills
 - Use of core correctional supervision practices

Quality versus Quantity in Performance Monitoring

- ❑ Quality = how well?; Quantity = how many?
- ❑ Field is supplied with examples of over-reliance on quantity measures over quality, which results in a lack of understanding for why programs fail to achieve goals
- ❑ Examples:
 1. Quantity = Percentage of clients that received an LS/CMI Assessment; Quality = Percentage of inter-rater agreement in LS/CMI item, domain, and total risk scores
 2. Quantity = Percentage of staff who submit MI audio tapes for review and feedback; Quality = Percentage of staff who achieve “proficiency” in MI skills (based on MITI 3.1)

QA-TIPS Policies and Procedures

- ❑ Centered on peer-to-peer, with supervisor oversight
 - ❑ Provides immediate feedback and training to the Reviewed User as well as the Reviewer.
 - ❑ Helps to identify service needs and training gaps at facility and state level

- ❑ Each LS/CMI certified User must undergo inter-rater reliability, case plan, and MI review twice per year (due **June 30th** and **December 31st**), but can be submitted at any time in each 6 month window

- ❑ Relationship skills are assessed once a year by LS/CMI certified supervisor during annual employee appraisal and submitted accordingly

Specific Procedure: Peer-to-Peer Reviews

1. Reviewed User collects collateral information and schedules an interview
2. The Reviewed User conducts an LS/CMI interview with the Reviewer present, and/or records (audio or video) the interview
3. The Reviewer and Reviewed User score the assessment independently and the Reviewer completes the Assessment Review Form
4. The Reviewer and Reviewed User review independent results and reconcile any discrepancies
5. The Reviewed User enters the “agreed upon” LS/CMI in the Online System as official assessment
6. The Reviewed User shares the results with the offender, creates the case plan
7. The Reviewer completes the Case Management Review form and MI form independently and reconciles discrepancies with the Reviewed User
8. The Reviewer submits the all three forms to the JCEBP via the electronic system
9. JCEBP analyzes data and reports both agent and state results back to field

Assessment Review: Inter-rater agreement

- ❑ Limit score discrepancies and to help build consensus (within agents and with the LS/CMI Scoring Guide) about how to score items
- ❑ Assesses “inter-rater reliability” by asking the Reviewer to note and describe any discrepancies
- ❑ Reviewer has access to the same information as the Reviewed User, by observing the interview and reviewing the collateral information

LS/CMI Assessment Review (AR) Form

Reviewer/User Information

Please supply the following information:

Full Name of Reviewer (person reviewing assessment): Reviewer Registered Email:

Agent Type: (select one)
 DOC DRC Parole Probation Jails Other:

Reviewer Facility:

This form is used to assess the complete, accurate, and timely submission of LS/CMI Assessments completed and submitted by individual Users. Mark the appropriate response or fill in the space provided with appropriate detail. For items to be complete ALL responses must be filled out by the User on the assessment. Use the assessment interview, collateral information, interview notes, recordings, and any other case file information to INDEPENDENTLY complete the LS/CMI and verify accuracy.

Full Name of Reviewed User (person being assessed): Reviewed User Registered Email:

Reviewed User Facility:

Full Name of Interviewed Offender/Client:

Interviewed Offender/Client ID (if your Agent does not provide ID use offender/client DOB):

Date of Intake:  Date of Last LS/CMI: 

Date of Interview: Date Entered Online System:

Assessment Review: Inter-rater agreement

- Assessment Review Form, media clip

Case Management Review: Assessment-Case Plan Congruence

- ❑ Assess the quality of the case plan
- ❑ Examines whether the case plan is complete and is congruent with assessment results
- ❑ Matching criminogenic and noncriminogenic needs while addressing responsivity factors
- ❑ Reviewers review assessment information to help determine the quality of the case management plan

LS/CMI Case Management Review (CMR) Form

Reviewer/User Information

Please supply the following information:

Full Name of Reviewer (person reviewing assessment): Reviewer Registered Email:

Agent Type: (select one)
 DOC DRC Parole Probation Jails Other:

Reviewer Facility:

The CMR is designed to assess the quality of the case management plan of the LS/CMI that are completed and submitted by Users. Only LS/CMI sections 9 and 10 are assessed using this form. Select the appropriate response or fill in the space provided with appropriate detail. Use assessment, collateral information, interview notes, recordings, other QA forms, and any other case file information to aid in your INDEPENDENT review.

Full Name of Reviewed User (person being assessed): * Reviewed User Facility: *

Reviewed User Registered Email: *

Full Name of Interviewed Offender/Client: *

Interviewed Offender/Client ID (if your Agent does not provide ID use offender/client DOB): *

Date of Intake: *  Date of Last LS/CMI: * 

Date of Interview: * Date Entered Online System: *

Case Management Review: Assessment-Case Plan Congruence

- Case Management Review Form, media clip

MI Skills Review: Spirit, Active Listening, and Change Talk

- ❑ Provides feedback on the quality of the interview.
- ❑ Measures MI Spirit, Active Listening Skills (OARS), and Change Talk
- ❑ Direct observation or review recorded interview. Recording the interview is recommended, but not necessary, given that it will allow for repeated listens and has been linked to greater accuracy in scoring.

Quality of Motivational Interviewing Skills

Reviewer/User Information

Please supply the following information:

Full Name of Reviewer (person reviewing assessment): Reviewer Registered Email:

Agent Type: (select one)
 DOC DRC Parole Probation Jails Other:

Reviewer Facility:

This form is used to assess the quality of motivational interviews/interactions on three key areas: MI spirit, active listening skills, and change talk. Reviewer should observe MI skills in the context of the LS/CMI assessment or case planning/management activity. Observations should be at least 20 minutes in length and can be live or videotape.

Full Name of Reviewed User (person being assessed): Reviewed User Registered Email:

Reviewed User Facility:

Full Name of Interviewed Offender/Client:

Interviewed Offender/Client ID (if your Agent does not provide ID use offender/client DOB):

Date of Intake:  Date of Interview: 

..

MI Skills Review: Spirit, Active Listening, and Change Talk

- MI Skills Review, media clip

LS/CMI Supervisor Annual Review: Assessment of Relationship Skills (CCP)

- ❑ Supervisors report annually on the quality of relationship skills used by subordinates.
- ❑ Rooted in Core Correctional Practice areas
- ❑ LS/CMI “Supervisors” must have at minimum LS/CMI User certification and can otherwise be defined by the Agent

LS/CMI Supervisor Annual Review

Reviewer/User Information

Please complete the following information:

Supervisor: Supervisor Email:

Agent Type: (select one)
 DOC DRC Parole Probation Jails Other:

Facility:

Reviewed User: Reviewed User Registered Email:

Date Range Encompassed by this Report: Date Submitted:

This form is for LS/CMI certified (User or User Trainer) Supervisors to review their subordinates annually on their performance of various skills used during an LS/CMI assessment. An LS/CMI Supervisor can be defined and designated by each Agent. An LS/CMI certified Supervisor will provide feedback on general performance of the LS/CMI process (interview, online submission, and case plan) per User once a year. The LS/CMI Supervisor rates the Users' performance on the following scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2= Disagree; 3= Neutral; 4= Agree; 5= Strongly Agree

Interpersonal Skills:

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Treats clients with respect	<input type="radio"/>				
2. Recognizes and encourages clients' self-efficacy	<input type="radio"/>				
3. Does NOT dismiss clients' thoughts and opinions	<input type="radio"/>				
4. Listens attentively to clients	<input type="radio"/>				
5. Maintains professional boundaries, rapport, and trust	<input type="radio"/>				
6. Maintains confidentiality of clients	<input type="radio"/>				

LS/CMI Supervisor Annual Review: Assessment of Relationship Skills (CCP)

- Supervisor Annual Review, media clip

Reporting and Feedback Processes

- ❑ Once the QA forms are submitted by the Users, the JCEBP prepares a QA report
- ❑ Occurs once every six months
- ❑ Standardized measures allowing for comparisons over time AND across agencies or facilities
- ❑ Provides statistics for each individual facility or center, and normative comparison
 - ❑ **Example:** A single day report center receives its results, compared to all day report centers operating in the state
 - ❑ Individual user performance can also be provided upon request from agency administrators

Reporting and Feedback Processes

- Review examples of statistical reports

Success Story in DOC

- We set minimum standards = DOC goes extra mile
 - ▣ Evidence that peer-to-peer process is working

- DOC examined feedback supplied and policies implemented by JCEBP
 - ▣ Discovered discrepancies within LS/CMI Assessments among facilities and users
 - ▣ Initialized direct observation by LS/CMI Trainers
 - ▣ Revealed discrepancies occurred within certain facilities
 - ▣ Mandated additional policy directives
 - ▣ Conducted additional training

Closing: Q and A

- ❑ Closing comments by J. Stephen Wormith
- ❑ Question and answer session

Contact Information

Stephen M. Haas, Ph.D.

- Stephen.M.Haas@wv.gov
- 304.558.8814 ext. 53338

Leighann J. Davidson, M.S.

- Leighann.J.Davidson@wv.gov
- 304.558.8814 ext. 53348

Important links:

<http://www.djcs.wv.gov/SAC/>

<http://www.facebook.com/wvorsp>

<http://www.twitter.com/wvorsp>



Office of
RESEARCH &
STRATEGIC PLANNING