2009

Orbis Partners Inc.

Bart Millson, MA
Dave Robinson, Ph.D
Mark Rubin, MA
Marilyn Van Dieten, Ph.D

A Process Evaluation Of The Women Offender Case Management Model, Implemented By The Connecticut Court Support Services Division

A Process Evaluation Of The Women Offender Case Management Model, Implemented By The Connecticut Court Support Services Division

Submitted to NIC by:

Orbis Partners, Inc.
1143 Clapp Lane, Box 520
Ottawa, Ontario
K4M 1A5

613-236-0773

Executive Summary

This process evaluation examines the implementation of the Women Offender Case Management Model (WOCMM) by the Court Support Services Division (CSSD) in four probation supervision offices across Connecticut. The report covers the period from early 2007 until June 2009 when the model was implemented in the Bridgeport, Hartford, New Britain and New Haven probation offices. Initiated by the National Institute of Corrections (NIC), WOCMM was a response to growing demands from the field as well as an emerging body of literature on women offenders. The aim of WOCCM was to develop and evaluate gender responsive services and supervision practices such as assessment, classification, and case planning. The NIC funding of the WOCMM implementation for The Connecticut Court Support Services Division (CSSD) was awarded funding from after an RFP process was issued in 2006 by NIC.

The methodology for the process evaluation included a series of information gathering activities including interviews, focus groups, and document review. Site visits were completed during the third week of June 2009 with interviews and focus groups conducted with women participants, WOCMM team members and managers, and the CSSD Implementation Committee. Two teams of evaluator pairs conducted full-day site visits at the four sites. Semi-structured interview guides were developed for the interviews and focus groups. However considerable latitude was given to the evaluators in order to explore and discuss particular issues as needed.

Introduction to the Model

Orbis Partners, Inc. led the development of the model with input from a national advisory committee coordinated by NIC.   Nine WOCMM principles were elaborated and operationalized in a model of practice:

1. Gender Responsive – *relational, strengths-based, trauma-informed and culturally competent.*

2. Individualized Service – *the principles of risk and need are applied to develop individualized case plans.*

3. Team Approach – *case management services are extended through a multi-disciplinary team.*

4. Collaborative - *mutuality of purpose and inclusion of the women's voice on the team.*

5. Comprehensive – *services address the complex of multiple needs presented by the women.*

6. Continuity of Care – *direct service provision by the team whenever possible.*

7. Enhance Motivation – *the team works intentionly to engage the women in the change process.*

8. Committed to Program Integrity – *focus on quality assurance in the delivery of service.*

9. Committed to Process and Outcome Evaluation – *the implementation includes the objective of increasing knowledge about promising practices.*

Startup

The CSSD Implementation Committee included membership with expertise in a number of areas including gender service, program development, project management, probation services and research operations. The committee acted early to choose probation sites based on the composition of the offender population and to share information about the project with managers and supervisors.   Eligibility criteria for the program was set to include women who were 18 years at probation start, probation terms of at least one year, no sex offenses, and LSI-R scores of 22 and above (moderate and higher).

A statistical profile of the probationers selected for participation indicates that WOCCM successfully drew women offenders with high risk characteristics and possessing multiple needs. In 61% of cases alcohol and/or drugs resulted in a disruption in life functioning or was directly involved in the criminal behavior in which the women were involved. Slightly more than half of the women (50.6%) had current mental health conditions and 69.6% had suffered abuse in the past (including physical, sexual or emotional). In 16.2% of the cases, the women had reported self-injurious behavior. About one-quarter of the women reported that they were currently in relationships with a high degree of conflict and instability.   In total 73.5% of the women had to rely on social assistance and 65.6% were unemployed at the time of the current offense.

The Implementation Committee established a recruitment process for the selection of probation officers in each of the four sites that included criteria related to motivation to participate, willingness to learn, ability to develop a positive working relationship with women offenders, and commitment to WOCMM for an extended period. The committee used existing contracted service agreements with local community agencies to provide additional resources to the probation officer case management team, including a resource advocate (to coordinate access to community services) and an intervention specialist (to deliver gender responsive interventions). There were some early difficulties in establishing the roles of the resource advocate and intervention specialists. The committee learned that formalization of team roles and responsibilities was critical to the formation of a well-functioning team.

Training was an important vehicle for introducing the model to the teams. Core teams were exposed to a common training curriculum for implementation of the model. The five day training included effective strategies and interventions for working with women, gender responsive assessment, relational interviewing, motivational interviewing, reviewing process, and implementation basics. Participants found the training helpful, particularly with respect to developing relational skills for working with the women and developed an understanding of how the gender responsive model differed in practice from traditional training. As a result of feedback from participants, in future the five-day training will be broken into smaller segments with time for practice of skills between segments. In addition to core team member training, a one-day orientation to the model was presented for community service providers who would collaborate in the delivery of services.

Gender responsive assessment and case planning are critical components of WOCMM and essential for achieving progress on most of the principles of the model. Assessment is the critical first step in the case management process. SPIn-W, A comprehensive gender-based instrument tool that includes risk, needs and strengths assessment was implemented as the major vehicle for assessment and case planning. The introduction of the tool was included in the core team training series. The web-based computerized assessment includes items that are of special relevance to gender response programming including child custody issues, parenting, domestic violence, mental health and social support.

Given the scope of the WOCMM implementation, a number of challenges were encountered early in the project roll out and subsequently addressed as the project progressed. Among the challenges were initial startup delays related to reassignment of WOCMM officers' existing caseloads. In addition, at the early stages there were insufficient coaching resources available for motivational interviewing and relational skills. Quality assurance assessment was difficult at the outset because staff were reluctant to provide audio tapes of their work. With respect to team development issues, early meetings were inconsistent and at times ineffective and there were more changes in the resource advocates than was ideal. Some challenges were encountered with respect to the probation culture and lack of trust with respect to the relational methods and female directed skill set. On a more technical level, there were some adjustments related to the implementation of the SPIn-W software, pre-test/post-test measures for the evaluation, and the inconvenience of maintaining separate databases for CCSD and specific evaluation data. As the project evolved, these challenges were addressed or became less disruptive for the implementation of the project.

Implementation

The WOCMM probation officers reported favorably about their experience in delivering services to women using the model. Overall, as the project matured the officers viewed the move from a more traditional authoritarian style to a relational and strength-based

orientation to supervision as highly positive. Officers who were initially sceptical about the prospect of committing to WOCMM reported very positively about how the model impacted their work. Generally, the officers acknowledged a considerable increase in job involvement and satisfaction with the move to WOCMM. The officers believed that the model helped them become more effective in addressing the needs of the women and contributing toward greater success on probation.

In contrasting their traditional supervision work to WOCMM, some of the officers indicated that they had initial struggles in setting boundaries with the women using the new relational approach. However, as they applied the model they learned how to use the relational methods more effectively. Another challenge that emerged concerned the process around violations and returns to custody. Officers indicated that the investment in working with the women is considerable and filing a violation for non-compliance (or even committing a new offense) often felt like 'giving-up' and seemed inconsistent with WOCMM. The new assessment process introduced with SPIn-W proved to be a challenge for the officers in that it involved a much greater effort in comparison to the existing assessment method. The challenges were related to the fact that the assessment was more comprehensive and involved a learning curve with respect to software.   Another enduring challenge related to questions of how to effectively transition women to greater independence, especially at the end of the probation. Reducing the frequency of contacts to the lower levels was not always easy, some women who were doing well continued to report in-person voluntarily on a regular basis. However, in order for the women to achieve continued success, all of the WOCMM team members recognized that developing reliance on alternative resources outside of probation was essential.

Resource Advocates (RA) described successes in their work with many examples of service linkages and advocacy efforts that resulted in tangible benefits for the women. The successes included securing housing, reconnecting women with children and families, participating in needed skill-based programs, and education/employment achievements. Others described successes in securing critical services and developing relationships with agencies to provide necessary services. RA's agreed that their positions involved multiple components including, continually searching for community resources, expanding service relationships, assisting women with service referrals, and advocating on behalf of women (e.g., DCFS, housing, etc.). The RA's argued that a certain "personality" was required to be successful in the position. Being out-going, assertive, innovative, resourceful, passionate, and having the ability to connect with the women probationers were critical.

Although the challenge was addressed as the implementation effort proceeded, some RA's indicated that there was an initial lack of clarity about their job roles.   However, in all of the sites, consensus emerged as to the importance and effectiveness of the role of the RA. A common challenge voiced by the RA's was the constant juggling of competing priorities, including finding enough time to meet with the women, making referrals, advocating, participating in meetings with the WOCMM officers and team, and liaising with community

service providers. A second challenge concerned the persistent lack of necessary services. These included housing, childcare, employment and financial resources were most often noted as continually in need. Moreover, when services were available, required paperwork and limited funding rules could still hamper access to some services.

The agencies for which CSSD held contracted service agreements provided the RA resource and supervision for the RA. However, a number of services such as substance abuse treatment, cognitive skills programming, abuse and trauma, mental health, children and families, employment, education, and financial support were also delivered by these agencies. Each agency instituted a protocol to ensure referrals for WOCMM participants are acted on quickly and waiting times are minimal. In some sites, the contract agencies played a direct role in supporting and coaching the WOCMM officers and RA's to "staff" cases. Generally, there was satisfaction with the services provided by the contracted agencies although there was a perception that services could be improved in some sites.

In each office a single probation supervisor was responsible for supervising WOCMM officers. From the perspective of supervisors, the initiative has met with substantial success according to a number of indicators. While supervisors could not participate in all elements of the training package, special sessions were held to help supervisors gain an understanding of the model and learn how they could support the project. The probation officers selected were considered a good fit for the positions, the major tenets of the model (e.g., relational style, increased contact hours, team service delivery) were being honored, and WOCMM was becoming understood and respected by other staff in the probation offices. Focus groups with non-WOCMM officers suggested that most of the probation officers in the offices were aware of the goals and general principles of WOCMM. Most believed that the program responded to a specific need within the probation sub-populations in their offices and the work of the WOCMM officers was valuable in dealing with the special needs of women.

The perspectives of the WOCMM participants represented a revealing source of information for the process evaluation. Through focus group sessions it became clear that the women evaluated their experience of probation under the WOCMM condition as highly positive. Most of the women had been exposed to a traditional style of probation under previous periods of supervision and they offered striking contrasts between WOCMM and their earlier probation experience. Without prompting, the women described their experience of many of the principles of the model, including relational styles of interacting with their probation officer, motivational and strength-based components, and greater introduction to community-based services that were coordinated through the WOCMM team. The women also indicated that they felt a sense of inclusion in the development of their case plans. A number of the women indicated that the nature of their relationships with their WOCMM officers allowed them to learn to trust their probation officers and to approach them in times of crisis or when they had violated conditions.

The CSSD Implementation Committee played a key role in the areas of planning, support, and quality assurance monitoring throughout the period of implementation examined by the process evaluation. In addition to the important role the committee played in the startup of the initiative, CSSD conducted ongoing monitoring of progress and troubleshooting where problems emerged. The role of CSSD in the provision of support and coaching to four offices was well recognized and it was clear that the Implementation Committee was essential to the apparent success of the initiative. In addition to regular onsite support and coaching, CSSD also introduced additional support services as required to assist the sites sustain and extend their achievements.

Recommendations

The process evaluation led to the formulation of a number of recommendations aimed and ensuring that WOCCM continued to succeed and meet existing implementation challenges. In the report, the recommendations are described in relation to the nine principles of WOCMM. With regard to the foundational principle of gender responsiveness, it is recommended that CSSD continue to monitor the implementation of WOCMM and to make necessary adjustments to ensure that the integrity of the program is sustained. Efforts in this area include continuing to formalize and expand community resources for justice involved women.

In order to further the principle of individualized service, it is recommended that monitoring of assessment completion and ongoing coaching on the case planning components be continued as a priority of program maintenance activities offered. CSSD has very effectively fostered WOCMM team development in the four offices, and it is recommended that the Implementation Committee continues to monitor team functioning and where necessary provide assistance. In addition, it is recommended that CSSD continue to assist the teams in contributing to the collaborative principle of WOCMM by providing technical support for Motivational Interviewing.

The principle related to comprehensive service delivery can be enhanced through further monitoring and goal setting with the agencies that maintain contracted service agreements. The principle refers to the requirement to address a variety of needs presented by the women. It is recommended that CSSD continue to monitor service provision and also to develop objective protocol for transitioning women from more intensive to less intensive service through discharge planning.   The principle of continuity of care can be reinforced and maintained through current supervisory practices to ensure that the WOCMM team plays a key role in providing services and introducing the women to community resources.
A number of recommendations were advanced regarding the principle of program integrity. Support sessions should be continually reviewed to ensure that the needs of WOCMM team members are addressed. Given the demands of the WOCMM caseloads, a workshop on preventing burnout should be delivered to the teams. In order to ensure that high risk women are being given priority placement to limited WOCMM spaces, it is recommended that CSSD consider raising the minimum LSI risk score for program eligibility. It is also

ORBIS
partners inc.

suggested that the current cap of 35 women on WOCMM caseloads could be raised now that the model had achieved implementation stability.   The related principle of commitment to evaluation can be strengthened through CSSD's efforts to monitor completeness of evaluation data and reinforce the importance of this component.

Conclusion

 Viewed from a number of perspectives, the implementation of WOCMM in four probation offices in the State of Connecticut has been very successful. Although there were many initial startup obstacles, with the assistance of CSSD the WOCMM teams were able to address the issues and move forward to operationalize the principles of the model.

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

This report provides a summary of a process evaluation completed for the Women Offender Case Management Model (WOCMM) implemented by the Court Support Services Division (CSSD) in four probation supervision offices across Connecticut, including Bridgeport, Hartford, New Britain and New Haven. The reporting period covers close to two-and-a-half years, from early 2007 until June 2009. A description of WOCMM, the implementation process in Connecticut including start-up and follow-up activities, as well as a summary of the challenges and successes to date will be highlighted in this report. A subsequent report will focus on model impact and outcome measures.

We begin with a brief description of the history and development of the Women Offender Case Management Model.

The History and Development of WOCMM

The development of WOCMM was inspired by two major initiatives undertaken by the National Institute of Corrections (NIC) over the last decade. First, since the late nineties, NIC has devoted resources toward the development of a seamless, system-wide model for offenders transitioning from prison. Formerly known as the Transition from Prison to Community Initiative (TPCI), this project provides a framework designed to improve re-entry outcomes for offenders. Integral to the implementation of TPCI was an integrated and evidence-based case management model.

The second initiative that has been instrumental in shaping this project is concerned with addressing the needs of women entering the criminal justice system. Influenced by growing demands from the field and an emerging body of literature, the National Institute of Corrections has been instrumental in establishing the rationale for a gender-responsive approach. Bloom, Owen & Covington (2004) have formulated six guiding principles to facilitate the delivery of correctional interventions with women. These principles provide a framework for effective practice when working with women. However, the development and evaluation of specific gender-responsive services and supervision practices such as assessment, classification, and case planning has not been undertaken.

In September of 2005, Orbis Partners, Inc. submitted a proposal to the National Institute of Corrections (NIC) to design, implement and evaluate a case management model for women who are incarcerated and /or under probation/parole supervision. The draft of the model was developed in January 2006 and submitted for review to a national advisory committee that included:

- Julie Boehm, Missouri Department of Corrections
- Maureen Buell, National Institute of Corrections
- Yolanda Johnson-Peterkin, Women's Prison Association

- Georgia Lerner, Women's Prison Association
- Phyllis Modley, National Institute of Corrections
- Carol Shapiro, Family Justice
- Mary Scully Whitaker, Private Consultant
- Pat Van Voorhis, University of Cincinnati

In October 2006 the model was completed and state agencies from across the US were invited to respond to a request for proposals to test the efficacy of the model. Initially, the Connecticut Court Services Division and the Utah Department of Corrections were selected from among the respondents to implement the model. Since that time, WOCMM has been implemented in Iowa and Maine. Each of these sites demonstrated a strong commitment toward the development, implementation and evaluation of gender-responsive services.

Description of WOCMM

The development of WOCMM was guided by our review of the mental health, criminal justice, and child welfare literatures. Similarities in findings across studies suggested that the efficacy of case management is enhanced when specific components or core practices are implemented[1].

We have identified nine core practices as the defining features of this model. These are listed below and described in more detail in **Table 1**:

10. Gender Responsive
11. Individualized Service
12. Team Approach
13. Collaborative
14. Comprehensive
15. Continuity of Care
16. Enhance Motivation
17. Committed to Program Integrity
18. Committed to Process and Outcome Evaluation

---

[1] For a comprehensive review of the literature see- Van Dieten, M. and Robinson, D. (2008). Case management: A response paper. International Community Corrections Association.

Table 1: Guiding Practices to Implement WOCMM

Critical Components	Description
1. Gender-Responsive	Professionals will be trained to use a gender-responsive approach when interacting with the woman. This means that staff will use an approach that is: relational, strengths-based, trauma-informed, and culturally competent.
2. Individualized Service	Consistent with evidence-based practice, the risk and need principles are applied to determine the intensity of services required as well as the need areas that will be targeted. This means that SPIn-W, a standardized assessment, will be administered with each woman. To ensure that the needs of women are addressed, the assessment will include traditional correctional measures as well as those that are gender-responsive.
3. Team Approach	The "team" approach to case management is essential to the delivery of this model. Team members consist of the "woman" and possibly family members, who work in conjunction with available representatives from a variety of disciplines that might include correctional, health professionals, Clergy, and other supports. Formation of the case management team is a critical first step in the implementation. Once team members are identified they should develop a mission statement and operating procedures including a policy outlining role and responsibilities, limits to confidentiality and information sharing, etc.
4. Collaborative	Collaboration refers to mutuality of purpose and intent among team members. This means that the woman, as part of the team has a voice with respect to the targets and ultimate outcomes of the case management process.
5. Continuous Service	The central importance of relationships in the lives of women argues strongly for continuity in services. This means that whenever appropriate the case manager and members of the team are encouraged to offer direct services, including assessment, treatment and mentoring. When services cannot be provided directly by a team member then someone within the team should be present to introduce the woman to the outside professional.

ORBIS
partners inc.

6.Comprehensive	The model recognizes that women often present with complex needs and face multiple challenges. Therefore, a critical element of WOCMM is to ensure that services are designed to help women build personal resources as well as social capital[2]. Services may include, information, advice, treatment, assessment, brokerage and referral across an array of need areas including, vocational, family/social, personal, and life needs. The need to provide comprehensive services requires partnerships with service providers across institutional and community settings. Many women transitioning from prison or who are supervised in the community reside in neighborhoods that elevate risk to their personal safety as well as, expose them to situations that may contribute to future criminal justice involvement. Often communities lack basic resources or women no longer qualify for services. To address these challenges WOCMM should work to organize stakeholders and to build partnerships with service providers who wish to work more effectively with women. The WOCMM team works to build relationships with the women and agencies in the community to provide holistic services including: ▪ Individual supportive therapy ▪ Medical services ▪ Child-Care ▪ Housing ▪ Family Reintegration/Parenting/ Domestic Violence ▪ Substance abuse services ▪ Work-related services ▪ Social, interpersonal relationship, and leisure skills training ▪ Vocational supports ▪ Other support services
7. Enhance Motivation	The team works intentionally and strategically to engage the woman in the change process while respecting the woman's right to choose what and when to address needs and challenges.

[2] Social capital refers to connections among individuals – social networks and the norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness that arise from them. In that sense social capital is closely related to what some have called "civic virtue." The difference is that "social capital" calls attention to the fact that civic virtue is most powerful when embedded in a sense network of reciprocal social relations.

ORBIS
partners inc.

8. Program Integrity	The safe and effective delivery of services to women requires attention to program integrity and quality assurance. Team members are cross-trained and provided with formal training, access to clinical supervision, and the resources necessary to ensure adherence to the model.
9. Program Evaluation	Evaluation is critical to the implementation of this model. This means that a number of measurement and case management tools are used to monitor the woman's progress throughout her involvement in the case management process. In addition to process information, WOCMM was designed to contribute to the outcome literature and to increase knowledge about promising practices.

These areas were identified as critical components of WOCMM and by having more structured involvement (including training) of community-based agency staff, it was hypothesized that consistency of approach and model fidelity would be greatly improved.

Consistent with the philosophy of gender-responsive services, WOCMM was designed to be a dynamic, seamless process that commences at the time of sentencing and continues beyond discharge from prison and/or community supervision until the woman is stabilized in her community.

> *The professional team should work collaboratively with the woman (and her family) in an effort to define individual needs and strengths in order to establish mutually agreed upon outcomes…*

ORBIS
partners inc.

WOCMM consists of four distinct but overlapping core elements that are consistently reviewed as new priority targets and incorporated into the Case Plan. Ideally goals are achieved by moving through the core elements in a sequential fashion. However it is anticipated that as women transition through the system or face alternate life circumstances, priority targets will change and/or shift necessitating movement forward or backward.

Core Element #1: Engage and Assess. A comprehensive assessment is a critical first step in the case management process. The goal of the assessment is to provide women and members of the Case Management Team with a complete picture of strengths and risk factors that might mediate or contribute to future criminal justice involvement and impact on survival, stability and self-sufficiency.

Core Element #2: Enhance Motivation. The case management team works intentionally to build intrinsic motivation. Two complementary modalities that capture the "spirit" of a women-centered approach while intentionally working to increase motivation, are Relational Theory and Motivational Interviewing (MI). These approaches are used throughout WOCMM to assist professionals to work safely, thoughtfully and collaboratively with the woman.

Core Element #3: Implement the Case Plan. When the woman indicates readiness and commitment to develop a Case Plan the team must be prepared to deliver and/or broker an array of services. To mobilize and expand existing resources it is critical that women be presented with a variety of service options and opportunities in four primary areas: vocational, personal, social and life needs.

Core Element #4: Monitor Progress. This stage is the core of WOCMM because it ensures that the Case Plan is constantly monitored and updated. Essentially the Case Management Team uses the Case Plan as a dynamic tool to work with the woman to: (1) develop new short-term goals or action steps; (2) to review barriers to success and introduce problem-solving strategies when actions steps have not been completed; and, (3) to develop new goals and action steps.

CHAPTER 2: CSSD AND THE IMPLEMENTATION OF WOCMM

NIC Request for Proposal

As indicated above, the National Institute of Corrections (NIC) issued a Request for Proposal (RFP) in late 2006 for demonstration sites to implement and pilot WOCMM. The application submitted by Connecticut Court Support Services Division (CSSD) indicated a strong commitment to the implementation of evidence-based practices. In addition, CSSD had a history of implementing gender responsive services for girls in juvenile probation.

CSSD felt that WOCMM would provide a natural progression to offer a similar model for women under community supervision. The implementation of WOCMM provided CSSD with the opportunity to achieve the following goals. First, WOCMM assisted CSSD to align standards and supervision practices for women offenders with the juvenile model. Second, because WOCMM merges evidence-based principles with the research on women – it is designed to advance the "what works" research while improving capacity to work more effectively with women. Finally, WOCMM was designed as a multi-year initiative and thus provided CSSD with sufficient time to sustain the project beyond the pilot period.

The CSSD Implementation Committee

A number of CSSD staff with expertise in various areas including gender services, program development, project management, probation services, research and operations, and implementation of evidence-based practices, were identified to be members of the implementation committee.

The first planning meeting was held in January 2007 with the implementation team and representatives from both Orbis Partners and the National Institute of Corrections.   Initial discussions focused on selection of a gender responsive assessment [described below] and setting of eligibility participation criteria. Decisions were made regarding the maximum caseload of WOCMM clients and the number of WOCMM officer positions to establish in each supervising office.

Discussions also focused on the range of likely service needs that the women participating in WOCMM would present. It was acknowledged that the ability to deal with such needs would extend beyond the scope of what probation officers traditionally address. Accordingly, decisions were made to identify staff from the contracted treatment and day reporting network of community-based agencies [described below] to contribute to the project in each supervising office.

Following the initial planning meetings, the implementation team met with managers and field supervisors at the four supervising offices in February/March of 2007 to explain the initiative. Information was presented about WOCMM, and included an overview of national and Connecticut statewide data on needs of women offenders. The strategy was designed

to generate support for the project. It was also an opportunity to address real concerns of management in terms of officers with large caseloads (sometimes as many as 200 probationers) that may move to a WOCMM position, thereby leading to a redistribution of cases.

Lessons Learned

Feedback from the implementation team indicated that the planning efforts at start-up were crucial for laying the groundwork for the project to be successful. In addition, sharing information early in the process with the field managers and supervisors helped to create "buy-in" and allay concerns that WOCMM was just another "boutique" probation model that would disappear as quickly as it was introduced.

The CSSD Implementation Process

Prior to the implementation of WOCMM a number of activities were undertaken. These are briefly described below.

Selection of Probation Sites and Eligibility Criteria for WOCMM: CSSD has a research division that monitors and manages offender information. An examination of the demographic and assessment information for women on probation identified four probation office sites that would provide an adequate number of participants while also providing a mix of urban and suburban clients. These included the cities of Bridgeport, Hartford, New Britain and New Haven. After reviewing existing information it was decided that women probationers from these areas who met the following criteria would be eligible for WOCMM:

- Minimum 18 years of age at probation start
- Probation term of one year or more (including split-sentence cases released from corrections/parole and commencing probation supervision)
- Not a sex offender
- LSI-R assessment score 22 and above for active supervision cases
- Availability of a caseload 'spot' (maximum caseload size is 35 women per officer)

Table 2 provides demographic information and Table 3 shows intake assessment information for 465 women who entered WOCMM caseloads in the four Connecticut probation offices since the inception of the project in 2007. The data was derived from the offender information systems maintained by CSSD as well as data collected through the SPIn-W assessment tool used by WOCMM probation officers. As shown in Table 2 About one-third (32.1%) of the women fell within the age range of 25 to 34 years and an additional third (31.4%) fell within the range of 35 to 44 with an average age of 34 years. About 41% (40.9%) of the women were African American and 27.3% were of Hispanic origins. Only 25% (24.8%) of the women were serving probation sentences of less than two years duration.

Over half of the women had LSI-R scores within the Moderate range and 25.1% fell within the moderate-high risk or above range.

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION ON THE WOCMM SAMPLE	Table 2
	WOCMM Sample (n=465)
Age (years) 18 - 24 25 - 34 35 - 44 45+	19.1% 32.1% 31.4% 17.4%
Average Age (years)	34.3 (SD=9.5)
Ethnicity African-American Caucasian Hispanic Other	40.9% 31.8% 27.3% 0.0%
Probation Length (years) 1 - < 2 2 - < 3 3+	24.8% 40.0% 35.2%
Average Probation (years)	2.3 (SD=0.97)
LSI-R Score Levels* Low (0-13) Low - Moderate (14-23) Moderate (24-33) Moderate - High (34-40) High (41-54)	(n=449) 0.0% 21.2% 53.7% 21.8% 3.3%
Average LSI-R Score	29.4 (SD=5.7)
Average ASUS-R Scales Involvement Disruptive Social Non-Conforming Legal Non-Conforming Mood Adjustment	(n=428) 8.6 (7.4) 16.9 (19.4) 8.9 (5.0) 11.4 (6.3) 9.9 (6.7)

* MHS guidelines

Table 3 shows information related to the needs of the women who were assigned to the WOCMM caseload. The data suggests that WOCCM was successful in drawing women offenders who showed high risk characteristics and demonstratd multiple needs. In 61% of cases use of alcohol and/or drugs resulted in a disruption in life functioning or was directly involved in the criminal behavior in which the women were involved. Slightly more than

ORBIS
partners inc.

WOCMM Sample – Profile of SPIn-W Item Results*	Table 3
	WOCMM Sample (n=427)
Criminal History	
1+ Incarcerations as an Adult	52.0%
Offense History:	
- Violent	50.4%
- Property	23.2%
- Drug/DWI	54.1%
- Prostitution	12.4%
- Other	57.6%
Response to Supervision	
Technical Violations of Supervision	37.5%
Family and Children	
Marital/Intimate Relationships:	
- High degree of instability and conflict	24.8%
- Conflict and dissatisfaction evident	22.3%
Relationship Risk Factors:	
- Victim of domestic violence	56.4%
- Victimization with current partner or recent ex-partner	29.7%
- On-going conflict with ex-partner	23.4%
Dissatisfied/Stressed with Custody Arrangements	32.7%
No/Minimal Contact with Children	20.9%
Abuse in Family of Origin:	36.3%
- Victim of physical abuse	28.1%
- Victim of sexual abuse	23.7%
Supportive/Positive Relationships with Family of Origin	46.6%
Accessible/Attachment to Pro-social Models in Family	59.0%
Social Network	
1+ Friends with Positive Pro-social Influence	40.5%
Substance Use	
Frequent Alcohol Use	20.9%
Alcohol Use Disrupts Functioning or Contributes to Criminal Behavior	44.0%
Frequent Drug Use	43.0%
Drug Use Disrupts Functioning or Contributes to Criminal Behavior	61.0%
Vocational/Employment	
Less than 12th Grade Education	40.5%
Employment History:	
- Unemployed at time of current offense	65.6%
- Never employed more than six months	15.0%

* Results represent intake SPIn-W assessment administered at WOCMM start.

ORBIS
partners inc.

WOCMM SAMPLE – PROFILE OF SPIN-W ITEM RESULTS*	Table 3 cont'd
	WOCMM Sample (n=427)
Mental Health	
Current Mental Health Condition	50.6%
Medication Prescribed for Mental Health Condition	47.5%
History of Abuse:	69.6%
- Physical Abuse	57.6%
- Sexual Abuse	37.7%
- Emotional Abuse	58.3%
Other Mental Health Indicators:	
- Self-injurious behavior	16.2%
Suicidal Ideation (thoughts/attempts)	29.3%
Violence	
1+ Previous Violent Behavior/Convictions	53.6%
Community Living	
Must Rely on Social Assistance	73.5%
Accommodation:	
- History of homelessness	27.6%
- Temporary/unstable accommodation arrangements	38.2%
Current Medical Conditions:	
- HIV	4.2%
- Hepatitis	9.4%

* Results represent intake SPIn-W assessment administered at WOCMM start.

half of the women (50.6%) had current mental health conditions and 69.6% had suffered abuse in the past (including physical, sexual or emotional). In 16.2% of the cases, the women had reported self-injurious behavior. About one-quarter of the women reported that they were currently in relationships with a high degree of conflict and instability.   In total 73.5% of the women had to rely on social assistance and 65.6% were unemployed at the time of the current offense.

Selection of WOCMM Probation Officers: Representatives from the CSSD implementation team conducted site visits at the four probation offices to explain the project and solicit interest from existing staff to participate as specialized probation officers. The informal recruitment process involved presenting information on the characteristics of officers that CSSD desired for participating in the initiative:

- Motivated to participate.
- Willing to learn.
- Ability to develop a positive working relationship with women offenders.

ORBIS
partners inc.

- Commitment to WOCMM for an extended period of time.

After the site visits, local managers and supervisors worked to identify staff interested in the WOCMM officer positions. Each of the candidates were then interviewed by the implementation team and were rated according to the selection criteria identified above.

Core Team Members: CSSD maintains a number of contracted service agreements with local community agencies in various geographical regions throughout the State. On a maximum of a five-year renewal basis, RFP's are issued for agencies to provide an array of services to offenders under probation supervision. While each community agency may differ in terms of specific services extended, the intent is to have available mainstream services and supports most typically needed by probationers (e.g., housing, employment, mental health, substance abuse, etc.). The goal is to have individuals receive necessary services during supervision and to provide offenders with an on-going resource if needed once the formal probation period ends.

At the time of project start-up, contracts had been in place with the following local service providers at each WOCMM site:

- Bridgeport – STARS (Striving Toward Achievement, Renewal and Success)
- Hartford – CPA (Community Partners in Action)
- New Britain – Wheeler Clinic
- New Haven – Project M.O.R.E.

All the agencies were classified as Alternative to Incarceration Centers (i.e., day reporting centers) within the CSSD network of service providers. Each agency provides a menu of intervention services which include substance abuse education/awareness, case management, employment services, referrals as needed to community human services (including intensive outpatient mental health and substance abuse treatment), benefits programs, anger management programming, and cognitive behavioral programming.

Central to WOCMM is the need to provide comprehensive services through a multi-disciplinary team approach. To achieve this goal, CSSD identified a number of core positions from the contract service agreements described above. Initially the implementation team proposed two positions unique to WOCMM. The first position was a full-time Resource Advocate, whose role was to address basic needs such as housing, education, finances, employment, child care, etc. The second position was identified as an Intervention Specialist who would conduct gender specific treatment groups at their agencies for WOCMM women, but also continue to work with non-WOCMM clients as well. In addition to the two positions, an agency program director contact was also established to oversee their staff involvement in the WOCMM project.

The Resource Advocate - Within current contract arrangements, each agency was asked to formalize a Resource Advocate (RA) position to work specifically with WOCMM caseloads. The RA position was created to address both the multiple needs of women and to assist the WOCMM officers to manage new demands posed by WOCMM. The Resource Advocate would be required to provide knowledge of community resources and the ability to connect with mainstream service providers in a more focused manner. It was felt that a dedicated resource working in collaboration with the WOCMM officers would alleviate some of the pressures while, at the same time, identify and effectively link the women with community services.

The Intervention Specialist - Another change in working with the community providers was the commitment of CSSD to train an Intervention Specialist (IS) employed in each agency. It was anticipated that the IS would continue to work at the agency site but the role of each IS would be expanded to offer gender specific treatment groups and assist in the team case review process with their knowledge of interventions and specific needs of women. For example, the IS and other WOCMM team members were exposed to training in gender-responsive strategies and interventions [described below] and in Moving On. Moving On (Van Dieten, 2001) is a cognitive behavioral program designed specifically for criminal justice involved women. The program assists women to develop personal strategies for change and to build natural supports that contribute to reductions in recidivism (Gehring and Van Voorhis, 2009).

Despite efforts to cross-train and support the IS to become an active member of the team, competing demands made it difficult for them to participate on a consistent basis. It was hoped that they would be able to offer the team recommendations as women progressed through Moving On or other treatment programs. However, the implementation of Moving On was delayed until recently and thus a formal mechanism to provide feedback has not been established.

Lessons Learned:

There is a need to formalize roles and responsibilities as well as provide team building activities that are critical to the formation of a well-functioning team.

The implementation team reported that although the RA position made sense in principle, implementing this position at the field level involved challenges. For instance, most sites struggled with defining the role of the RA, and with the willingness of WOCMM officers to share the work of advocacy and brokering services. Two sites in particular experienced a number of turnovers in the RA position, extending the difficulty of solidifying the role and normalizing the position. A second challenge noted was the cultural shift of working with the RA in a team environment. Probation officers rarely have the opportunity to work as part of a team to develop case plans and conference with non probation staff regarding client needs and strengths on a regular ongoing bases. (Probation officers do review cases with treatment providers but not as consistently as the WOCMM process called for.) Not

surprisingly it took time for the core team members to work in a collaborative and cohesive way that permitted them to share responsibility for the case.

Cross-Training the Core WOCMM Team

In accordance with the principles and practices of WOCMM, the core team members were invited to participate in intensive training. Formal training was scheduled for the summer of 2007. Eight WOCMM officers as well as 16 representatives from the contracted community service providers were cross trained. The training was delivered in two sessions of 4.5 days duration. An outline of the training modules is listed below.

The curriculum included the following ten modules:

- Module 1 - Introduction to the Model
- Module 2 - What Do We Know About Women
- Module 3 – Working with Women – Effective Strategies and Interventions
- Module 4 – Gender Responsive Assessment
- Module 5 – Relational Interviewing
- Module 6 – Motivational Interviewing
- Module 7 – Applying Motivational Strategies
- Module 8 – Effective Treatment Strategies
- Module 9 – Reviewing Process
- Module 10 – Implementation

Prior to formal classroom training community providers, probation managers, and other leaders were invited to participate in a one-day orientation to WOCMM and introduction of the core team members.

A Collaboration Workshop facilitated by Becki Ney form the Center for Effective Public Policy was also scheduled. The primary goal of this workshop was to introduce community providers to the research on women and to begin the process of developing a community action plan to address the needs of criminal justice involved women.

Lessons Learned:

Feedback provided by the CSSD team members influenced the redesign of WOCMM training which is now offered over in smaller segments with enough time between trainings for behavioral rehearsal.

Officers reported that the formal training was helpful to facilitate their work with women. The relational skills component was particularly well-received, and provided a context to compare traditional probation styles with a gender-responsive approach. However, there were some concerns regarding the amount of training. The majority of officers felt the trainings, particularly the five day training, was simply "too much" to digest and comprehend in a short amount of time. Looking back, a better approach would have been to stagger the training sessions over a longer period of time. This would have allowed for practicing of various techniques and future trainings would have provided the opportunity for feedback, additional modeling, and reinforcement.

Gender Responsive Assessment and Case Planning

A critical component of WOCMM is the provision of an individualized case plan that is monitored throughout the intervention process. Assessment is used to guide the identification of priority targets and to develop the case plan.

The Level of Service Inventory – Revised (LSI-R) and the Adult Substance Use Survey – Revised (ASUS-R) is completed by Intake/Assessment/Referral probation officers for each probationer referred to CSSD. As indicated earlier, the LSI-R is also used to determine determining eligibility to participate in WOCMM.

Although the LSI-R is a well-validated tool for assessing risk of recidivism, use of a gender-responsive assessment tool was an enhancement introduced as a component of WOCMM. The Service Planning Instrument for Women (SPIn-W) was selected by CSSD to inform supervision decisions and case planning practices. Spin-W is a gender-specific assessment and case planning tool that was developed from research and field practice with criminal justice involved women. SPIn-W assesses risk, need and protective factors using measures that are sensitive to issues experienced by women receiving justice services. The assessment contains 100-items that have demonstrated relevance for increasing responsivity in case work with justice involved women. While the content of SPIn-W overlaps with traditional risk/need assessment in general populations of men and women, SPIn-W items related to child custody and parenting issues, domestic violence, mental health, social support, and community living are also included. Items in assessment domains related to attitudes, aggression, interpersonal skills, and cognitive skills have been tailored to take into account how these areas of risk are manifested in female offender populations.

WOCMM Evaluation and Data Collection

Evaluation is critical to the implementation of this model. To augment the evaluation process, a number of measurement and case management tools were introduced and implemented by the core team members. The evaluation framework outlines data

collection efforts required at the field level for the WOCMM initiative with two specific tasks completed on an on-going basis.   First, a comprehensive pre-/re-test battery of measures is administered to women at the start of WOCMM and then every six-month period thereafter. The battery consists of six pre-test measures and eight re-test measures. Second, contacts with service providers are recorded on a quarterly basis including name and type of service, date started/completed and number of sessions attended. Both the measures and contact information are entered in a separate component of the software that contains the SPIn-W assessment. Finally, CSSD provides Orbis with a variety of additional data that will used to facilitate the outcome evaluation. For example, case notes, arrest reports, a comparison sample, additional assessment data and other information is provided.

A Summary of Start-Up Challenges

Once the WOCMM officers had been selected and the initial trainings completed, next steps focused on implementation of WOCMM in the four probation sites. Not surprising given the scope of the initiative, there were a number of challenges that initially hampered implementation.   The implementation team described the challenges as twofold: operational and technical.

Initial Operational Challenges:
- Delays in reassigning officers' existing caseloads due to staff shortages.
- Due to other operational considerations, the CSSD implementation team was not able to provide the amount of coaching in motivational interviewing and relational skills as originally planned for. This posed a barrier to staff learning and improving skills.
- Learning to administer the SPIn-W assessment tool was far more involved for officers to learn than anticipated.
- Officers were initially reluctant to be audio taped as originally planned so that quality assurance efforts and feedback coaching were limited, a situation that made early learning more difficult and time consuming.
- The local team meetings were inconsistent, and at times, ineffective. Local supervisors were not equally adept at facilitating these meetings.
- There were more frequent than anticipated changes in the Resource Advocate position at some locations. This also impacted the process of "teaming" and burdened WOCMM officers making for uneven implementation activities.
- Changing the prevailing probation "culture" to understand and accept relational, female directed skills set that was different from what had traditionally prevailed and creating trust among officers to try these new ways. It took many months for officers to become comfortable with the new balance between helpfulness and accountability.

Technical Challenges:

- SPIn-W software was not fully functionally at project start and "hands on" training to learn how to use the software was limited.

- Committing to a schedule for administering the pre-/re-test measures and entering in the software. There was also a challenge for officers to understand how to enter quarterly service contacts in the software.

- Maintaining separate databases for CSSD and the project software resulted in duplicate data entry and the lack of an integrated approach.

Implementation team members were asked to describe how the various challenges were addressed and eventually overcome. All agreed that patience with the process was important. It was acknowledged that implementation simply took longer than initially planned. The implementation team continued to address the challenges as they arose and eventually issues were resolved successfully. The various coaching and support resources [described in detail below] were identified as critical for continuing to overcome the operational and technical challenges. As well, the implementation team members represented various skill sets necessary for implementation that helped to address many of the issues.

In hindsight, the extended implementation time was not necessarily surprising given that it was not a specific or single program that was being introduced. Rather, WOCMM was an entire new approach to case management and supervision for women offenders. Most agreed that because of the various challenges and time to address them, full implementation of WOCMM was not achieved until the fall of 2008.

CHAPTER 3: PROCESS EVALUATION

Methodology and Information Sources

The methodology for the process evaluation included a number of activities. Information was collected through a combination of interviews, focus groups, and document review activities. Evaluators conducted interviews and focus groups with:

- 8 WOCMM Probation Officers
- 4 WOCMM Probation Supervisors
- 4 WOCMM Resource Advocates
- ~40 WOCMM Participants
- ~30 Regular (i.e., non-WOCMM) Probation Officers
- 4 Contracted Service Providers
- CSSD WOCMM Implementation Team

Site visits were completed during the third week of June 2009. Two teams of two evaluators each conducted the full-day site visits – one team at New Britain and Bridgeport and the second team at Hartford and New Haven. Semi-structured interview guides were developed for each set of interviews/focus groups. However considerable latitude was given to the evaluators in order to explore and discuss particular issues as needed.

A wide cross-section of WOCMM women were encouraged to attend the focus group sessions. Women who had recently began WOCMM, were mid-way in the supervision process, and those who were close to completing WOCMM attended the sessions. Accordingly, feedback was collected from a range of perspectives informed by varied exposure to WOCMM.

In addition to the site visits, the evaluators conducted a half-day meeting with the CSSD WOCMM Implementation Team. The meeting provided the opportunity to debrief on site visit findings and further discuss specific issues that arose. Broader issues regarding initial and on-going implementation efforts were also reviewed.

Findings

Results from the interviews are summarized below:

WOCMM Officers – Participating in the Initiative

Interviews were held with the WOCMM officers during the site visits. When asked about their motivation to participate, most indicated they were drawn to the opportunity as it offered a better alignment with their educational backgrounds (e.g. social work, psychology, etc.) and their interest in working with an all-female caseload. Other reasons involved the opportunity to simply "do something different"; receive specialized training not normally available to probation staff; and work with much smaller caseloads.

All of the officers possessed front-line experience working with probationers before participating in WOCMM. Most had served as supervision probation officers and two were intake/assessment/referral officers. All of the officers worked in various capacities in the correctional and/or broader criminal justice field, ranging from two years experience to over twenty years. While the WOCMM officers all felt that they made the right decision to participate, a few admitted they were initially skeptical about their suitability. For instance, it was understood that officers would be trained in a more relational manner of interacting with the women probationers and more intensive one-on-one time would be required. These officers questioned their ability to change from the entrenched authoritative style of supervision to a more relational style as expected within WOCMM. As explained by these officers, once training was completed and they began working with the women, initial skepticism soon disappeared and was replaced with enthusiasm to contribute to the project.

WOCMM Officers – SPIn-W Assessment

Feedback regarding the use of the SPIn-W assessment was generally positive. The assessment tool was described as more thorough and appropriate for criminal justice-involved women, and provided more structure for reviewing key criminogenic areas such as relationships, family, abuse and trauma. The dynamic nature of the tool was also described as beneficial for identifying needs that can be addressed through interventions and changes in the various domain areas can be measured over time.

Despite the appeal of a gender-responsive assessment the officers expressed some frustration in implementing this tool as well as supplemental measures. The assessment tool is a more comprehensive measure than the LSI-R with twice the number of items and therefore takes longer to complete [interviewing woman plus collateral contacts]. Because the tool cannot be scored "by hand", the information must be entered in the SPIn-W software to produce the assessment results. The time required to complete the software data entry was also noted as a concern. Finally, in the early stages of the project, officers

---

ORBIS
partners inc.

discovered a number of software issues that compounded the time taken to enter the assessment data.

WOCMM Officers – Other Challenges and Successes

In addition to the issues examined earlier, officers were asked to describe specific challenges and successes since becoming involved in WOCMM. One of the initial challenges was learning to establish appropriate boundaries when working with the women probationers, particularly at the start of supervision. As described by a few of the officers, the relational style of the model is very helpful and important but the relationship could sometimes be interpreted by the women as less professional and more as a friendship. The concern was that some would be less inclined to take necessary direction (e.g., referrals, case planning decisions, etc.) and make the progress required to address needs, achieve goals and complete probation successfully. This was particularly a challenge for women who were less motivated. There was a struggle of where to 'draw the line' between being supportive while not overlooking the authoritative component inherent in the role of a probation officer. Again, while this was expressed by some officers, it was not a majority concern. Below are some of the comments made by officers to describe the issue:

- *The biggest challenge I faced initially, is that they see me as a therapist… when am I supposed to be more authoritative… I was concerned about interacting in a way that would not make her feel bad… I wanted her to comply but I also wanted to be considerate to her situation. Eventually I realized that you could be both- and I became more confident in presenting a balanced approach.*

Upon reflection, most of the officers admitted the issue of establishing appropriate boundaries was a learning experience. The on-going coaching and support has been very useful for addressing challenges in this area. It was acknowledged that as the women begin to achieve goals and build confidence in their successes, the risk of blurring the relationship boundaries is usually less problematic. The women are more intrinsically motivated and progress is apparent, lessening the concern that the relationship could be hampering success.

A second challenge described by the WOCMM officers was the personal conflict that could be encountered when making a decision to file a violation for return to custody. As explained, the investment in working with the women is considerable and filing a violation for non-compliance (or even committing a new offense) could feel like 'giving-up' and seemed inconsistent with WOCMM. Often the officers expressed the desire to continue working with the women to address the reason(s) for filing the violation even though it was apparent the effort was having little, if any, positive result. One officer described the inherent conflict that violations evoked for them: "understanding that it takes women a year to stabilize … and even then they might relapse"

Officers acknowledged that the support and direction of the implementation team was extremely helpful in addressing the issue of when it is appropriate, and required, to file a violation. The critical determinant was the risk to community safety or the risk to the women themselves. If either were considered unmanageable in the community, the decision to file the violation was appropriate and necessary. Rather than viewing the violation as a failure, it was explained that for some women it was part of the process. When possible, it was recommended to try to stay connected with the woman through-out the violation process given that continuing in WOCMM was a possibility the court would consider.

The implementation team also provided useful direction for understanding and addressing problematic behavior before it reached the stage of considering a violation. Many officers had examples of how this approach was beneficial. For instance, one officer described the challenge of a woman repeatedly testing positive for PCP use. Instead of pursuing a violation, additional effort was directed at learning the reasons underlying the use and then taking the necessary steps to address the reasons and work toward abstinence.

A third challenge elucidated by officers was adjusting to the latitude available to spend more time with the women. This allowed them the time to test different strategies of supervision. As a regular officer, the parameters of interacting with probationers were confined. Typically officers only had a few minutes to review core factors (e.g., following conditions, current address, contact information, employment, etc.). If a need for service arose, a referral was most often made immediately (normally to a waiting list) and there was little time for exploring issues surrounding the need area.

Under WOCMM, smaller caseloads and ability to spend more time with the women is described as one of the greatest positives that have lead to success. There is opportunity to do more work with the women and greater flexibility in terms of how best to supervise the cases. Instead of making referrals and hoping the women receive services in a timely manner, time is available to ask more questions, delve further into issues, and better understand challenges that in the past may have been viewed as "just working the system". The extra time also allows for follow-up to determine whether further support or direction is needed. This luxury was simply not available within the context of a regular probation officer role.

A final challenge described by many of the WOCMM officers was the difficulty in understanding how to effectively transition women to greater independence, particularly as the end of the probation period approaches. While the typical strategy is to reduce the frequency of supervision contacts to the lowest level (i.e., administrative level which requires only phone contact once per month), many women who are doing well continue to report in-person on a regular basis even though they are not required to do so. Many officers explained the on-going contact was less concerned about official reporting and

more about sharing further successes and maintaining contact with people (i.e., WOCMM officer and RA) with whom they have developed positive relationships.

While the officers appreciated the relational aspect, many felt that for the women to be ultimately successful, reliance on probation as a resource and support must be steadily reduced and replaced with services available in the broader community that can be accessed on an on-going basis, if and when required. Admittedly, none of the officers would refuse to meet or have a phone conversation with the women after probation ends. However, they explain the reality to do so is limited since time and energy needs to be directed to women probationers on active caseload. At the same time, they appreciated the contact as a reminder of the success of the model.

The consensus of officers was that policy needs to be further developed to guide transitioning of WOCMM clients to lower supervision levels and encourage early termination for those that continue to function well. Strategies to assess and develop the women's ability to access services after probation would also be beneficial for this process. In summary, there needs to be a way to ensure the transition from probation is optimal for the women, and that they take the responsibility necessary to function independent of WOCMM

Perspectives of the Contract Service Providers

At the time of the site visits, each probation office had a dedicated Resource Advocate (RA) that had been in the position for at least six months or more (one site had the original RA from the start of the project). Interviews were held with the RA's to discuss job responsibilities, challenges and successes. RA's from all sites admitted the role evolved over the initial months in the job and indeed required time to delineate specific responsibilities. Consensus from the RA's was that the position had multiple components: continually seek out community services and resources; build on and expand service relationships; assist women with service referrals; and advocate on behalf of women (e.g., DCFS, housing, etc.). Most RA's agreed that a certain "personality" was required for the position to be successful. Being out-going, assertive, innovative, resourceful, and having the ability to connect with the women probationers were viewed as critical. More than one noted the role required a certain degree of "passion" to be effective.

RA's meet individually with women on a regular basis during supervision and more frequently at probation start. It was noted that the meetings are particularly critical early in probation to address stability issues. Most agreed that the ability of women to engage in longer-term services (e.g., substance abuse treatment, cognitive programs, etc.) was limited until stability issues were addressed or at least until a plan was in place to address such basic needs. For many women, the RA becomes less involved as issues stabilize and the women become connected to services. RA's also meet regularly (most weekly) with the

WOCMM officers during case conferences to become up-to-date on issues and needs affecting the women.

A common challenge noted by RA's was the constant juggling of competing priorities. These included finding enough time to meet with the women; making referrals and advocating; participating in meetings with the WOCMM officers and team; and liaising with community service providers. Two of the RA's openly questioned the frequency and variety of meetings they were required to attend and felt time may be better spent working directly with the women. A second challenge is the on-going lack of necessary services – housing, childcare, employment and financial resources were most often noted as continually in need. Parallel to this issue was the challenge that even when services are available, required paperwork and limited funding rules can still hamper access to services. This was noted particularly for substance abuse and mental health services.

At the same time, RA's were able to articulate a number of successes. For instance, many had countless examples of service linkages and advocacy efforts that resulted in tangible benefits for the women. Examples included secured housing, reconnecting with children and families, participating in needed skill-based programs, and education/employment achievements. Others described successes in securing critical services and facilitating relationships with agencies to provide necessary services. The freedom to be innovative in their roles was described as leading to further successes. For example, one RA developed a voluntary "Skills to Advocate Effectively" group, consisting of seven sessions. The goal is to teach and empower women to advocate effectively on their own. Started in the spring of 2009, the group has been well-attended to date. Interest continues to grow and program delivery is planned to be expanded in the summer of 2009. In another site, the RA responded to the expressed desire of the women clients to develop a support group where they could discuss their needs and develop advocacy strategies.

Interviews with administrators and managers from the contracted agencies revealed that they continue to support WOCMM staff and to provide a myriad of services in the areas of substance abuse treatment, cognitive skills programming, abuse and trauma, mental health, children and families, employment, education, and financial support. Each site has a protocol in place to ensure that referrals for the WOCMM participants are acted on quickly and waiting times are minimal.

In several sites, the contract agencies play a direct role in supporting and coaching the WOCMM officers and RA's to "staff" cases. Essentially, this involves WOCMM officers and RAs presenting challenging case scenarios in agency team meetings with one or more of their service staff (e.g., psychologist, social worker, counselor, etc.). Expert input is solicited in order to generate the best solution and to sharpen the skills of staff to increase the likelihood of positive outcomes for their clients. Not all contracted agencies are able to provide this support.

The WOCMM teams at each office were asked to describe the nature and benefit of the working relationships established with their specific community service provider regarding the WOCMM initiative. While most viewed the relationship as positive and valuable, some staff did indicate they felt the services provided by the agencies could be improved. Examples were provided where some of the agencies did not appear as motivated to assist in providing structure and services to the WOCMM women. Others indicated that some agency staff already felt they "knew everything there is to know" about working with criminal justice involved high-risk women and were somewhat passive regarding new ideas and strategies.

There was a discussion of one community agency that had worked quite closely with the WOCMM staff from project start and had developed a very positive, reciprocal working relationship. The probation office site is in New Britain and the service provider is Wheeler Clinic. Interviews with WOCMM team members and Wheeler staff revealed similar struggles with defining roles and processes. However, representatives from both sites realized this was surmountable and viewed the opportunity as a chance to refine and improve practices for providing services to the women clients.

Specific discussions focused on the willingness of Wheeler program staff to critically review available services and make changes where required. For instance, one program stream called Lifeline was used to treat and support pregnant and parenting women experiencing substance abuse and psychiatric disorders. With the WOCMM initiative, a decision was made to expand the intake criteria so that a larger group of WOCMM women could participate and benefit from the program. Another example is that an agreement is in place that allows for women to be re-offered treatment programs when they were discharged or dropped-out. As well, processes are in place for the WOCMM women to have ready access to all available services that the Wheeler Clinic has to offer including other treatment programs such as trauma counseling and family services, psychiatric and mental health treatment, and basic medical support. In essence, the agency represents a "one-stop-shop" of services that meet the identified needs of the WOCMM clients.

Perspectives of Probation Supervisors at WOCMM Sites

A single supervisor in each probation office supervises the WOCMM officers. The implementation team recognized that it would be difficult, if not impossible, for these supervisors to become as fully acquainted with the model as their officers. At the same time it was considered critical that they possessed a general understanding of WOCMM. In addition to the supervisor meetings described earlier, a decision was made by the implementation team to include the supervisors in targeted trainings and provide updates in order to keep them involved in the process and aware of the various WOCMM activities.

Supervisors were interviewed to gather their perspectives on the WOCMM initiative. All felt the officers assigned to WOCMM were a "good fit" and were well invested in the model.

At the time of start-up, it was observed the team concept represented a struggle for some of the officers, but as time went on the cohesiveness of the team became evident. More than one supervisor commented that a well functioning team appeared to provide the officer with the support necessary to work more effectively with their clients and be more successful in providing good support to officers in working with clients.

Supervisors admitted to spending a lot of time with officers initially to assist in addressing challenges and particularly to help the officers work through the decision process for filing violations. Time spent supervising officers was considerably less now that the program had matured, and generally involved meeting with officers to review cases.

None of the supervisors listed current concerns with staff or any components of the model. Challenges regarding WOCMM were more specific to operating within an office with non-WOCMM officers. For example, some of the supervisors explained they initially received complaints regarding the stipulation that WOCMM officers only supervised a maximum of 35 probationers. Others complained that interview rooms were booked too long by WOCMM officers, hampering the ability of non-WOCMM officers to complete the number of interviews required given the size of their caseloads. For many non-WOCMM officers, there was also frustration with keeping a woman on regular probation caseloads who could clearly benefit from WOCMM but could not be accommodated because of lack of availability of WOCMM caseload spots.

In addressing these issues, supervisors believed that the concerns of non-WOCMM officers frequently developed as a result of a lack of knowledge of the model. Once explained, most non-WOCMM officers better understood the parameters of the model and how certain components functioned. Over time, the initiative was accepted as important for the subgroup of women being served and supervisors have not had any complaints or frustrations to address for some time.

Supervisors were asked if any improvements could be made to WOCMM. They reiterated the need to lessen the burden of collecting and entering the evaluation research data and felt it took important time away from working with the women. Two supervisors felt the cap of 35 women should be revisited now that most implementation challenges had been addressed. Given that the initiative was functioning smoothly, some believed the cap could safely be moved up to accommodate 50 women. It was cautioned that caseloads would have to be reviewed on a regular basis to determine if an increase was reasonable. For instance, if a certain proportion of women were on administrative supervision, it might be possible to accept additional women on caseload. Alternatively, if most women were still being actively supervised an increase beyond 35 might not be feasible.

Overall, supervisors felt components of WOCMM should be expanded and integrated into general probation practices. The structure for collaboration and team input would be beneficial. A resource coordinator identified in each office to serve the general population

would also be helpful for probation staff. However, it was also recognized that wider expansion of the model across probation would require considerably more resources.

WOCMM Clients – Challenges and Successes

Focus groups were held with women probationers participating in WOCMM at each site. Attendance was voluntary and ranged from women just beginning probation to those that were close to being finished. In total, about 40 women across the four sites eagerly participated in the focus groups.

Most of the women had prior involvement in the criminal justice system, some having served periods of incarceration and most had been on one or more types of community supervision. When asked to compare their previous experiences to being on a WOCMM caseload, the vast majority of women commented the differences were profound. Most expressed that the WOCMM officers appeared interested and concerned. They were willing to listen, learn and understand and did not pass judgment on the women's situation or circumstances. Many of the women were very emphatic in describing the positive components of their WOCMM experience.

Most of the women admitted that their current experience was in stark contrast to their previous probation experiences. They described routine probation as an assembly line with probation officer contacts that were normally very brief and not considered beneficial. Many of the women felt the officers simply didn't care, and used strategies of intimidation and fear to coerce compliance with conditions. They felt that they were always on a course toward being violated without any help to avoid the behavior that would lead to a warrant. Most explained feeling a great deal of stress and apprehension when meeting with a probation officer. Others indicated that they had been refused help and were not treated with respect when they presented problems or issues to their officers.

The women referred to their participation in WOCMM as involving a different mode of supervision. Several comments repeatedly emerged in their description of WOCMM and characterize the supervision process. First, they indicated that they were provided with personal support. Second they were provided with ongoing and positive feedback. Third, the women indicated that they felt part of the case planning process. They reported that case plans were continually reviewed and updated and the women were able to describe short and long-term goals as well as anticipated outcomes.

Fourth, the women indicated that they learned to "trust" their WOCMM officers. This provided them with a professional who they could turn to when in crisis and also someone they could openly confide in when they had "messed up". This was something they had never contemplated in the past with previous probation officers. The most common issue reported to probation officers was drug use, but some described violations of other standard conditions (e.g., curfew, non-association, etc.). Finally, the women learned that by

being honest with the probation officer and acknowledging problems as they arise, they were able to address problems and challenges before they became unmanageable.

The women also talked about the benefits of the Resource Advocate and having access to needed services and resources. Most struggled with housing and financial needs, particularly at probation start. They believed it was very valuable having a dedicated resource that was well-informed of available services and could provide the necessary support and direction required. Others talked about the struggle they had re-establishing or maintaining contact with their children. The Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) were involved for most of the cases and having someone that could assist in the various processes to reconnect and visit with their children was significant. This was something very important for the women to address early on in their probation term so they could focus on other areas such as participating in needed programs and services.

While the discussions during the focus groups were overwhelmingly positive, there were comments suggesting that some women initially struggled with being on a WOCMM caseload. For example, a minority explained they were skeptical of the officer's willingness to help and were reserved in sharing too much information as it could somehow be used against them in the future. It took time to gain confidence that the WOCMM officer was sincere and the risks of sharing information, particularly problems and challenges, were minimal. Comments from two women interviewed during the focus group are presented below.

> *I call her [probation officer] even when I don't have to see her… I let her know what is happening – good or bad. The difference is the connection; I felt it immediately… I saw her[probation officer] once and then the next time I opened up and I don't do this. My Probation Officer said- "when you are ready- you can talk to me"- the next week I did. I trusted her… she is not going to down me…*

> *I hear from other women – I got it good… They have a different PO- and they don't care. It's the way they act and how they are… I would not want to be treated that way. I am the kind of person who has anger issues and if you talk down to me I am going to lose it. I am proud of my probation officer… I talk about her –*

A small number explained they initially found the desire of the WOCMM officers to help was simply "too much" and felt they were required to participate in an excessive number of services. They just wanted to "do their time". They were overwhelmed by the process, having to discuss so many issues and challenges.   However, as the women became more comfortable with the new supervision style and began having successes, these initial frustrations soon dissipated.

- *"The training PO's are getting now is working… 20 odd years in and out of the system and now I am doing really well… the new resources, training, female-to-female officer… it's great"*
- *"They are more understanding, listen to you, work in a group and can consult each other, how can we help, what resources do we need, …. At the end it's all up to me…*
- *The difference- is very profound*
- *Fact that it is all female- is great for me… love it because of my street life; love men but when it comes to help... I prefer females because there is not sexual tension and I think she will call me out. Requires me to use different tactics, feel respected and I can't manipulate them… very comfortable.*

Regular (non-WOCMM) Probation

Focus groups were held with non-WOCMM probation officers at each site to gain a better understanding of how probation functioned on a broader level in Connecticut probation and their understanding and perceptions regarding the implementation of WOCMM. Initial discussions examined characteristics of caseloads and typical activities with probationers. Most officers had varying caseload sizes with supervision standards established by the LSI-R assessment results. For those with only moderate risk probationers on caseload, numbers ranged from 150-200 and for those with only high risk probationers numbers ranged from 70-100. Specialized caseloads of mental health or sex offenders were lower, averaging around 25-40 probationers. Caseloads with the lowest risk offenders who report only by phone are supervised by a small unit of officers working from a non reporting probation office. A contracted service administers the non reporting checks under supervision by officers from this unit so caseloads are not assigned by officer

Most officers agreed they did not have as much time to spend with the probationers as they would prefer. Particularly for those with larger caseloads, it was admitted that available time amounted to about five minutes to perform the perfunctory checks of verifying current address, phone number, finances, employment (if need be) and to ask if any behavior has occurred that could be considered as violation of conditions. Many admitted they would willingly spend additional time if needed to address particular challenges or issues raised during the initial brief interview. While many recognized that additional time with the probationers in general would be beneficial, such decisions had to consider others waiting to be seen and the responsibilities of meeting accountability requirements.

Officers were asked about the availability of services for offenders with identified needs. Consensus amongst officers was that services were lacking, particularly for those with mental health needs. When a service need is identified, often the only option is to make a referral. However, in most referral cases individuals are placed on a waiting list that could span months before the client actually received services. For officers with specialized

caseloads, challenges of securing services are more pronounced – mental health was listed as a common challenge for addressing needs that are sometimes acute and require crisis intervention.

Staff were also asked about professional development and opportunities to participate in training events. While most were supportive of the idea of receiving training to help them perform their jobs, very few could identify training opportunities that were available in the recent past. Staff who worked with specialized caseloads, particularly mental health and sex offenders, openly admitted they would "love" to receive training to gain greater knowledge to work more efficiently with special needs probationers.

During the focus groups inquiries were made about the proportion of women on their caseloads and how females compared to males with respect to service needs and styles of supervision. Some officers did have mixed caseloads, some had only a few women while others indicated 15-20% of their caseloads were women probationers. In contrast to men, the majority indicated that women had relationship issues, struggles with family issues, and challenges with caring for their children. Any progress on probation required a strategy for addressing such issues. As one officer explained, if left unaddressed, it is a "constant barrier" to performing well on probation. Officers indicated that women were more willing to talk about their situation and usually appeared to be more passionate about problems they are experiencing. Male probationers, on the other hand, are normally less willing to share and discuss issues.

The officers were asked what they do differently when supervising females. Most of the comments focused on the need to respond differently to women because of life circumstances and needs. Responses from seven officers are listed below. Central to the responses are four core themes: women have different responsibilities than men with respect to child-care; women experience trauma and victimization and this is often germane to their problems; women are more open and want help from the officers; women have more complex needs.

> *-I look at the context of what the woman is doing… child-care takes up a lot of time… so I have to be realistic with the woman.*
>
> *-Have to look at whether she is a victim or not- some are there because of the men.*
>
> *-I don't feel my mind set is any different working with males and females- but I always take into account the child-care responsibilities; don't really change my mindset. Work with them on a case-by-case basis;*
>
> *-You have to deal with issues around family and children; 9 times out of 10 the men are the absent fathers; nearly all the women have children and the children are*

dominant in their life… this is a huge barrier for women; only one program provides child-care while they are in group;

-Women are more open; needy; dependent; look for help; many are trauma victims-which means that they used to self-medicate and if women aren't willing to work on this then we can't help them; many are DCF involved, homeless, and have a laundry list of services;

-Women dump it all and want us to fix it… women are more open and put the trauma on the table; more receptive about problems; some are very manipulative-tell you the story and want you to decide for them

-Females are a different breed- more receptive to treatment; simple gender difference- put children first; when you establish rapport with them they dump it all; once they get comfortable; they tell you everything; have to be careful- that you don't order them but empower them

There was also discussion about the WOCMM project and questions were posed regarding the officer's knowledge and understanding of the initiative. Most were generally uninformed about WOCMM. Essentially, they reported their understanding that caseloads were specialized to high-risk women and capped at 35 cases. It was also generally known that WOCMM officers had the opportunity to participate in a number of different trainings and supports were in place to receive assistance working with cases and to draw on other resources to address service needs.

Although knowledge of WOCMM was limited, officers were asked about their perceptions of the initiative. In most cases, feedback was positive. Given earlier discussions about different needs and supervision practices for women, most felt a caseload that focused on this specific group of probationers was required. Others admitted these women can be difficult to work with and the WOCMM project has limited their numbers on regular caseloads. At the same time, there was a common frustration noted that women must start probation with WOCMM and can not be transferred from an existing caseload. The frustration emanated from the realization that some women could truly benefit from WOCMM participation but were not allowed to transfer. Officers explained the irony that involved some women on regular caseloads becoming eligible for WOCMM only after the commission of new offenses. However, it seemed counter-productive that they could not become eligible for WOCMM until they had failed and were sentenced to a new term of probation. Shouldn't there be some explanation that this was due to the constraints of this as an evaluation project? If WOCMM is institutionalized in CT, I believe that it may be possible to have cases transferred but CT's Risk Reduction initiative also recognizes the importance of not having cases transferred – of making that initial original engagement last throughout the term. We have even recently implemented a merge of our regular assessment and supervision services so that instead of assessment being done by one

officer and then having the case transferred and assigned to a different supervision officer, assessment and supervision are now being done by the same officer (this applies to sentenced individuals). WOCMM officers are currently not being placed on this rotation so they will not be performing anything other than the SPIN assessment as has been the practice for the demonstration.

Additional Comments and Observations

1. Data Collection

WOCMM officers were asked about administration of the evaluation measures, tracking of service contacts, and data entry of both in the software. Although the intent of collecting the data was understood, most readily admitted it was a time consuming and burdensome process to explain to the women and coordinate the administration. Some mentioned the WOCMM participants were also resistant to completing the measures given the time required and perceived lack of benefit for doing so.

The challenge of completing SPIn-W assessments, administering the evaluation measures, and recording service contacts was discussed with the implementation team. It was acknowledged that the assessments were not always completed within the expected timeframe (30 days from program start) and some women can be enrolled in WOCMM for two to three months or longer before a SPIn-W assessment is administered. The difficulties in administering and entering the pre-test/re-test and service contact data were similarly acknowledged.

To address some of the difficulties and potential impediments, the implementation team has been proactive in assisting officers to complete the assessments in a timelier manner by offering on-site coaching and providing strategies to reduce completion and data entry time. As well, quality assurance procedures were put in place in the first quarter of 2008 to monitor completion and data entry of both the SPIn-W assessment and evaluation measures. Updated every six to eight weeks, the quality assurance report lists the assessment records [date and completion status] completed for each woman and the number that are overdue for a three month reassessment. The report also identifies those WOCMM women that have not received an initial assessment. The same information is prepared for the pre-test/re-test and service contact information. Individualized reports are then completed for each WOCMM officer and forwarded to them for action.

Another strategy involved the organization of "data entry days". Essentially, the implementation team identified specific dates when WOCMM officers would assemble and make a concerted effort to update their recording for the assessment and evaluation requirements. It also provided the ability of the implementation team to

ascertain whether any additional software training was required. Two data entry days have been conducted to date.

Feedback from the implementation team suggested that the assistance and quality assurance monitoring has a positive impact on increasing completion rates. The quality assurance reports have shown an increase in the percentage of assessments and pre-/re-test measures completed. However, it was noted that improvement is still required and monitoring will be on-going.

2. Training, Coaching and Support

Coaching and support of WOCMM team members was a core component of implementation and had been identified as a necessary on-going task from project start. Soon after the initial trainings in the summer of 2007, one-on-one meetings were held between members of the implementation team and WOCMM officers to emphasize the transition to the new approach and provide skills reinforcements. Feedback from officers about these initial coaching and support sessions was positive. Given the breadth and scope of training concepts, officers explained they needed time to first practice before they could articulate the particular areas where they could benefit from coaching. Follow-up training that was provided several months after the formal training was useful as team members had field experience in WOCMM and could then provide "real life" examples for coaching and support.

While CSSD implementation team members were always available as a resource for WOCMM team members, more formal coaching and support strategies were put in place as implementation proceeded.

- Site WOCMM Team Meetings – implementation team members visited each WOCMM site on a weekly and/or bi weekly basis to review progress and provide assistance and direction where required.

- All WOCMM Team Meetings – directed by members of the implementation team, all WOCMM staff assembled for peer coaching and mentoring. The forum is informal and open-ended. The meetings were held monthly until the summer of 2008, and then moved to every three months as implementation proceeded.

- All WOCMM RA Team Meetings – also directed by the implementation team, RA's at each supervising office are brought together on a quarterly basis to review issues pertinent to their work and ensure consistency of practices across offices.

- Interview Tapings – started in early 2008, WOCMM officers taped interviews with women clients. The tapes were reviewed and feedback was provided to officers describing strengths of the interviewing style and areas in need of improvement.

- Booster Sessions – two separate "booster" sessions were held at each office by Orbis Partners team members to review assessment results, case planning strategies and address challenges raised by WOCMM team members.

- "What Works" Retreat – all WOCMM team members participated in a "what works" retreat to be mentored on effective services and addressing difficulties in working with high-risk women.

- Quality Assurance Coaching – In 2009, CSSD contracted staff from Community Solutions Inc., a large non-profit organization recognized for their work with at-risk populations that attended initial WOCMM trainings and have been certified to conduct tape reviews. These staff provide monthly quality assurance coaching to WOCMM officers and RA's. Coaching involves one-on-one analysis of client tapes. Areas of focus primarily address motivational interviewing styles, case planning, client feedback, and SPIn-W assessments.

- WOCMM Supervisor Meetings – meetings with WOCMM supervisors and the implementation team are held on an ad hoc basis to gain feedback on program functioning and challenges that have been experienced at the supervisory level.

In addition, in January 2008 CSSD also arranged for CSI staff to provide additional coaching and support for the WOCMM teams in each supervising office. CSI staff met with WOCMM staff on a monthly basis. Similar to the "staffings" described earlier, the format is open-ended and officers presented challenges and difficulties experienced over the past month and receive feedback and direction for successful resolution. This was replaced with the QA Coaching mentioned above.

Given the scope of coaching and support available, WOCMM staff were asked to comment on the usefulness of the various activities and feedback was overwhelmingly positive. Staff commented that the initial work of learning and applying the WOCMM principles was more daunting than anticipated. The coaching and support was critical to address issues and prevent "drift" from program fidelity. The on-going nature of the coaching and support was also described as very useful. As new issues arose it was comforting for team members to know that assistance would be received on a recurring basis.

The various forums of support were also identified as beneficial. Many commented the combination of site level and state level support opportunities were complementary. For instance, while the site level sessions were necessary to address specific challenges, the all staff meetings were also beneficial to hear about issues and successes at other WOCMM sites. The information was important to share and provided the opportunity to ensure consistency of the model across the four probation offices.

ORBIS
partners inc.

3. Site Team Meetings

In each probation office, WOCMM team meetings are held on a weekly basis between the officer(s) and RA. In addition, officers and the RA are in frequent contact during the week on a regular basis. In two of the four offices, the probation supervisor also participates in the weekly meetings. Each was asked about the benefits of the team meetings and if the format could be improved.

The team meetings were viewed as valuable opportunities to share information and brainstorm solutions for clients. They were also an important forum for providing an update on referrals and services being received in the community. In all team meetings, WOCMM officers present a current and/or new case to the team for feedback on a weekly basis and updates on clients are also provided. In addition, RAs use the team meeting as an opportunity to update their records on the WOCMM specific evaluation measures that are required. During the meeting results of the SPIn-W assessments, case planning decisions, referrals, community services, challenges and successes are reviewed. The benefit of this exercise is to invite feedback from others and frequently spark ideas and strategies that might be beneficial for other women probationers. Team members also recognized that getting to know their caseloads through team meetings had the added benefit of equipping the team with the ability to provide services to the WOCMM cases when assigned case workers were absent.

In addition to the weekly meetings, in one site a monthly team meeting is held with the WOCMM officer(s), RA, contracted service program director and one or more staff from this provider as well as other community agencies who work with women. The goals of this monthly meeting are similar to the weekly meetings – to share information and solicit input on particular issues and challenges. The meeting also affords an opportunity to have the community provider bring team members up-to-date on services women are receiving.

Most team members felt the weekly and monthly meetings were beneficial for achieving the desired goals. Many commented that being able to work as a team was one of the 'most positive elements of WOCMM'. It was agreed the issues being discussed were appropriate and the forum was positive and encouraging. The only comment noted was that all participants should be optimally prepared in order to ensure the meetings stay on-track and do not take longer than necessary.

Summary and Recommendations

Viewed from a number of perspectives, the adoption of WOCMM by Connecticut CSSD has been a successful approach to addressing the needs of high risk women on probation. The model, now in full implementation in four larger probation units in the state, has been progressing over a period of two years. There was considerable evidence that WOCMM probation officers have successfully transitioned to a new style of probation service delivery for women offenders. Women who have been exposed to the gender responsive model have reported in highly positive ways regarding their contacts with probation officers, services received from local communities, and the pro-social change achieved as a result of their participation in WOCMM. While introduction of all facets of the model progressed over time, at this stage it appears that the implementation has achieved high fidelity to the principles of the model. In this summary and recommendations section, we examine the Connecticut WOCMM initiative from the perspective of conformity to the nine core principles of implementation. The extent to which each principle is being followed is reviewed along with recommendations for improvement.

Guiding Practice #1: Gender Responsive

Gender responsiveness has been defined as… '*Creating an environment through site selection, staff selection, program development, content, and material that reflects an understanding of the realities of the lives of women and that addresses and responds to their strengths and challenges*' (Covington & Bloom, 2004).

The design of WOCMM was influenced by the existing research on women and girls and an approach which attends to 5 core practices- relational, strengths-based, trauma-informed, culturally competent and holistic. This means that all interventions and interactions with the woman are carefully and intentionally crafted to fully engage and support women as they transition through the criminal justice system and stabilize in the community.

CSSD has worked diligently to implement a gender responsive approach by providing staff with tools, training, resources, and ongoing supervision and support to promote adherence to the model. Some of the major initiatives undertaken by CSSD include: (1) formation of a fully participatory and responsive implementation committee[3]; (2) recruitment of WOCMM staff on a voluntary basis. After a recruitment process, candidates were selected based on their abilities, interest and commitment to work with women offenders; (3) reduction of case load sizes and creation of new positions to support the model. As part of the WOCMM model, a maximum of 35 women are on a specialized caseload from the beginning to end of probation supervision in the four probation offices practicing the model. Probation officers

---

[3] Members of the CSSD implementation committee play an active role with the team members. They attended the field training, supervisory training and have participated fully in the implementation of the model. This provides them with a very clear perspective of what WOCMM team members experience, the roles and responsibilities they have and the challenges they face.

were also provided with direct support from the resource advocate contracted staff person; (4) implementation of a gender responsive assessment that includes risk items of relevance to women and that assesses not only challenges but strengths. The SPIn-W, a gender specific assessment tool, is used to guide decisions regarding case planning and supervision practices; (5) members of the core team including the probation officers and contracted service providers were cross-trained to ensure continuity and consistency of the model in the services they provide to the women; (6) formal training and ongoing technical supervision to build competencies and support adherence to the gender-responsive practices, and; (7) finally CSSD has started to work toward building formal connections with other service providers to expand resources available to criminal justice involved women across the State.

Recommendations:

CSSD demonstrated a full commitment to implement WOCMM and to monitor the integrity of this model. Operational changes have been made at the supervision level to support and encourage the use of a gender-responsive approach. To sustain progress made to date – policy will have to be reviewed and modified to reflect experiences in delivering the model. For example, case load sizes, use of technical violations, supervision standards, the use of incentives, staff performance outcomes, etc. In addition, the development of formal relationships with local and statewide agencies should be enhanced to expand available resources for criminal justice involved women.

Guiding Practice #2: Individualized Service

Consistent with evidence-based practice- WOCMM places an emphasis on the development of an individualized case plan. WOCMM officers administer the SPIn-W assessment to identify the particular constellation of risk, need and strength factors presented by each woman. Based on this information, a case plan and supervision approach is developed to address the identified issues. WOCMM officers were provided special training in the use and interpretation of SPIn-W assessment results to generate individualized case plans. A major objective of the case planning training was to help officers integrate formal assessment findings (including the LSI-R and ASUS-R), information about the women's motivation levels, and other critical sources of information that emerged through the assessment process. As a result, the officers have learned to be strategic, and sometimes creative, about the delivery and sequencing of services in a way that truly individualizes the case plan for each WOCMM participant.

The model also requires that the SPIn-W assessment be re-administered on a recurring 90-day basis through-out the full period of probation supervision. The WOCMM team then reviews the updated assessments and case plans are changed and updated accordingly. As women progress through WOCMM, the individualized case plans are adjusted to reflect the changing need profiles.

Overall, the SPIn-W assessment has been a challenging component of the WOCMM implementation. This can be explained in part by the lack of experience that the initial WOCMM officers had with interviewing and the administration of assessments. CSSD has a probation intake/assessment/referral unit that administers the standardized assessments and therefore WOCMM officers were relatively inexperienced and unfamiliar with assuming responsibility for the implementation of the SPIN-W and assessment battery. Secondly, the SPIn-W is a more thorough and comprehensive approach to gathering and analyzing assessment data than was previously used. It requires considerably more time to implement and touches upon extremely sensitive issues that can trigger a strong emotional response from the women. Finally, the SPIn-W requires the entry of electronic data. Initially, several software issues emerged that created some frustration for users. Several of the officers struggled to acquire data entry and analysis skills demanded by the software.

Another challenge for the officers is related to the development of the case plan. Some of the officers struggled with developing the initial goals, recording information and also updating the case plan. CSSD provided additional coaching support for these skills supported through the technical assistance of this project.

Recommendations:

CSSD has worked diligently to provide officers and team members with training and support in the administration and use of the assessment and individualized case plans. We strongly encourage CSSD to continue to provide support and to monitor that assessments and reassessments are completed in a timely manner. Ongoing coaching in case analysis, developing goals, setting targets, and updating the case plan will increase comfort in using this process to guide supervision sessions and team meetings.

Guiding Principle #3: Team Approach

WOCMM supports a collaborative and dynamic team approach in working with women offenders. The model underlines the importance of the woman being central to the team rather than case management decision-making occurring only at the probation officer level. In working with the woman, the WOCMM officer identifies other relevant "team" members based on the woman's particular needs. Team members might include one or more family members, various service providers and agencies in the community, mental health providers, medical professionals and other supports.

CSSD facilitated the creation of teams in each of the WOCMM sites by identifying a resource advocate and intervention specialist from the contracted service providers in that region. The principle role of the resource advocate was to identify and mobilize resources from the community.   The intervention specialist was trained and certified to deliver gender-

responsive programs such as, Seeking Saftey, Moving On and Trauma and Recovery. In all sites regular meetings were held with the WOCMM team members to ensure that up-to-date information is shared for each woman. However, the intervention specialist was not fully integrated into any of the teams.

The benefits of a team approach were repeatedly identified and acknowledged during our interviews with the women, service providers, and probation officers. However, establishing a cohesive and fully functioning team was reported to be one of the most challenging aspects of the model. Initially there was considerable confusion regarding roles and responsibilities and many of the officers had difficulty working collaboratively with team members. Additional training in team building and team conferencing were identified as critical to address these issues.

Recommendations:

The CSSD implementation committee is extremely responsive to the needs of the WOCMM teams. When difficulties with team formation and cohesion emerged at several of the pilot sites, CSSD worked closely with core team members to clarify roles and responsibilities and to identify a number of supplemental training and coaching opportunities. Given the fluid nature of teams- including staff turn-over, it is inevitable that new threats and challenges to the integrity of the team process will emerge. We strongly recommend that CSSD continue to monitor team functioning and provide support to both the probation officers and service providers. The implementation of a Team Conferencing Observation Checklist (completed by supervisors) and Team Conferencing Evaluation Form (completed by all team members) might be helpful in identifying and circumventing challenges to the teams before they become too large. For a copy of the forms see Appendix A.

Guiding Practice #4: Collaborative

The team approach described above requires that team members work collaboratively to identify the targets of intervention and move toward successful goal attainment. Women offenders are a central part of the team and must be heard and respected regarding the development of the case plan and the approach taken to address their needs.

Feedback from the women probationers confirmed that collaboration on decisions and service plans occur on a regular basis. Many of the women reported feeling a sense of empowerment when considered to be in part of the decision-making process. WOCMM officers and other members of the team also confirmed the spirit of collaboration – not only is the woman key to the process, other members such as the Resource Advocate and those from the contracted service providers readily collaborate in making decisions that best benefit the participants.

Recommendations:

One of the greatest challenges faced by members of the professional team was to ensure that women were included in the decision-making process. Early in the WOCMM implementation, the officers reported that they struggled with letting the women have a voice in determining the targets of intervention. It was difficult for many of the officers to move from a position of enforcing the court order to a collaborative team approach.

CSSD has been addressing this concern through ongoing discussion, formal training in Motivational Interviewing and coaching. Success in implementing a collaborative process can also be attributed to the fact that supervisors of the WOCMM officers endorse and encourage this aspect of the model. We strongly recommend that CSSD continue to provide both WOCMM team members and supervisors with the support necessary to implement this guiding principle.

Guiding Practice #5: Comprehensive

One of the eligibility criteria for participating in WOCMM is a LSI-R score of 22 or higher. While this score represents the cut-off for moderate risk and need, many women that participate in WOCMM score higher with the majority falling within the high risk range for recidivism. This suggests that women entering WOCMM have complex and multiple needs that require an array of intervention options.

One of the primary outcomes associated with the implementation of WOCMM was the opportunity to expand existing resources for women. This was realized through an extended relationship with contracted service providers – several of which developed innovative strategies and programs for service delivery. These were delivered in the form of information, advice, brokerage and referral and treatment. In addition, the resource advocates have served to mobilize mainstream agencies and to increase awareness in their local communities of the needs of women in the criminal justice system.

While the implementation of the model has been successful in expanding services, all sites acknowledged that the range and accessibility of resources is incomplete. Perhaps the greatest gap in resources experienced by the WOCMM teams occurred with respect to mental health and housing. Greater access to safe and affordable housing as well as psychiatric and counseling services to address an array of mental health issues were the most frequently identified service needs.

There were also lessons learned with respect to the sequencing of services to address multiple needs. First, WOCMM team members learned that it was important to address basic or stability issue needs (e.g., housing, childcare, mental health services) early in the probation sentence before other personal development needs are addressed (e.g., cognitive skills, substance abuse, etc.). Second, some of the women expressed hesitations

about terminating their probation because they did not feel ready to withdraw from regular contact with their probation team. This suggests that in some instances there may be a greater need to transition the women away from probation toward community services. It was also acknowledged that some of the women continued to receive frequent or intensive contact with the team despite the fact that they had made significant progress and their need levels may not have justified the service intensity.

Recommendations:

The quality and comprehensiveness of gender-responsive services delivered by the contracted community service agencies varied across the four sites. Some of the sites have developed innovative practices and linkages with community agencies. It is strongly recommended that CSSD review the range of gender responsive services available to WOCMM women at each site to determine whether improvement is needed in some sites. Improvement may take the form of adjusting existing services or introducing new services.

The WOCMM teams have clearly established the need to address stability issues such as housing, finances, and childcare. Accordingly, WOCMM teams are encouraged to continue to develop and refine their skills for identifying these needs at the initial stages of contact with probation. This process might be enhanced through the timely completion of the SPIn-W assessment and the Eco-Map.

To assist in transitioning women from more intensive to less intensive service it is strongly recommended that: (1) an objective protocol be developed for transitioning women to lower contact/supervision levels and more deliberate discharge planning. The protocol would focus on the transition to community services and helping women move from dependence on WOCMM and, (2) that attempts to develop formal and informal relationships with mainstream service providers continue and be given increased priority.

Guiding Practice #6: Continuity of Care

A critical feature of WOCMM is to provide women with continuity of care throughout the probationary period. Since the launch of the pilot, efforts have been made to ensure consistency in the approach used by team members. Members of the implementation team, as well as identified staff from probation and the contract agencies were cross-trained in using a gender-responsive approach. The goal was to equip all core WOCMM team members with the ability to offer direct services such as assessment, motivation, guidance and mentoring. Where services are not provided directly by the team, WOCMM staff are involved in the process of brokering the services and all efforts are made to introduce the women to the external service providers who can help.

As indicated previously, CSSD committed 8 officers as well as personnel from contract agencies to WOCMM. At the time of the process evaluation, several of the probation

officers had left the project (1 moved, 1 retired, and 1 was encouraged to leave the project) and there was some difficulty in several sites with respect to finding a Resource Advocate who worked well within the team. To ensure consistency in care – considerable effort was made by the implementation committee to prevent staff turn-over. Some of the lessons learned since the inception of the project included- (1) requesting volunteers to participate in the project; (2) requesting candidates to complete an interview process; (3) clearly defining the roles and responsibilities of the various team members; and, (4) providing the team members with considerable assistance in the early stages of the process to develop a mission statement, establish team meetings, create a schedule, and introduce a protocol for feedback. Despite initial difficulties with staff-turnover, the implementation committee has made every effort to ensure that new staff are provided with the training and support to implement the recommended approaches.

In addition to continuity in approach, an important aspect of the model is to ensure that the team works directly with the women from the beginning to the end of probation, and that outside services are accessed as needed. Whenever possible the introduction to an external agency is made by both the woman and a core team member. This helps to ensure that the woman does not encounter practical obstacles in accessing the service, that the service is a good fit, and that she is comfortable with the referral. Focus groups with women probationers revealed a clear understanding of the connection between the core WOCMM team and referrals to the external agencies. The women also reported that for the most part they felt less daunted by the prospect of entering mainstream services and fully supported by the core team.

Recommendation:

A critical aspect of WOCMM is the continuity of care and service delivery. The implementation team has worked diligently to ensure that all core team members, supervisors, and coaches both understand and deliver gender responsive strategies and approaches. Despite some initial difficulty in clarifying the role of the resources specialist and in securing these positions, there has been relatively little turn-over in the team membership over the last year. Reports from the women suggest that they feel comfortable working both within the team and when accessing external agencies. CSSD is encouraged to continue to support this principle through existing supervision practices.

Guiding Practice #7: Enhance Motivation

The application of Motivational Interviewing is a key component of the WOCM model. The WOCMM team members received initial and on-going training to work deliberately to build intrinsic motivation among the women. The team works to engage the woman in the change process by respecting their right to select the targets of change and express preferences regarding when and with whom to address needs and challenges.

Interviews with the WOCMM team revealed that they are using strategies consistent with the spirit of motivational interviewing. This was confirmed in the focus groups with women who provided a number of examples of how the specific team members have worked with them to build commitment, identify strengths and work collaboratively to address problems and challenges.

Recommendation:

CSSD is encouraged to continue to support staff in the use of motivational interviewing through ongoing training and coaching.

Guiding Practice #8: Committed to Program Integrity

The CSSD implementation team and management support were critical to providing support and maintaining fidelity to the model. Early in the implementation of WOCMM, CSSD introduced a number of strategies aimed at increasing the integrity of the model. First, curriculum was developed to train supervisors and others who provide team members with oversight and support. Specifically, supervisors were provided with an overview of the model, a coaching framework and tools to assist in reinforcing adherence to the model. Second, members of the implementation team participated in monthly visits to the WOCMM sites to provide probation officers and core team members with support and additional clinical supervision. Third, quality assurance monitoring and feedback tools were developed to assess adherence to the model. Probation officers were asked to submit audiotapes of their interaction with the women and were provided with feedback about their performance. These strategies were supplemented with a coaching program that was delivered by a contracted agency to extend support on an ongoing basis.

The WOCMM team and contracted service providers acknowledged the abundant support and direction provided by the CSSD implementation team. The initial and on-going support was described as critical to the successful implementation of the model. The model could not have been successful without the multiple inputs through CSSD efforts and the considerable training and technical support initiatives.

Other important program integrity issues concern the appropriate selection of candidates for participation in the program (i.e., eligibility) and the selection of caseload sizes that sustain program impact while maintaining quality of service provision. During the gathering of process evaluation data, there were a number of discussions about the need to include more high risk women into the program in order to maximize the impact. Questions were raised about whether some women who met the eligibility criteria were not sufficiently high risk for the program while other high risk women could not be accommodated. This discussion could lead to the consideration of raising cut-off scores on the risk measure to select a larger proportion of high risk women. With respect to caseload size, some

informants who contributed to the process evaluation believed that a larger number of women could be effectively served in WOCMM. For example, it might be argued that because the implementation of the model is now advanced, WOCMM team members may be able to provide services to larger caseloads.

Recommendations:

Four recommendations are provided for the principle of commitment to program integrity.

First, the coaching and support sessions available to WOCMM officers (currently by Community Solution Inc.) should be reviewed on an ongoing basis to determine if sufficient support is being received by WOCMM team members.

Second, a workshop should be considered for WOCMM officers [and the Resource Advocate] on avoiding "burn-out" in the workplace. While most team members indicated that they enjoyed their work, they also described how the fast pace and demanding schedule can be tiring and could contribute to burn-out. The officers should provide input on the content of the workshops.

Third, it may be advantageous to consider raising the minimum LSI-R cut-off of 22 for WOCMM entry eligibility. The initial outcome report suggested women that scored in this mid-range benefited less by participating in WOCMM than those that scored in the higher risk level.

Fourth, it may also be beneficial to revisit the maximum cap of 35 women now that most implementation challenges have been addressed. For example, as the number of women on a caseload made positive change and warranted a reduction in contact/supervision, new cases could be safely added.

Guiding Practice #9: Committed to Process and Outcome Evaluation

The implementation of WOCMM in Connecticut probation was accompanied by a comprehensive evaluation framework. The framework outlines the process and outcome evaluation initiatives that will be conducted during the pilot implementation period. (See Appendix B for a copy of the Logic Model). A brief outcome report was completed in January 2009 to examine initial outcomes of WOCMM participants over a six-month follow-up period. Results are preliminary, however they revealed that moderate to higher risk women participating in WOCCM demonstrate more favorable outcomes.

The CSSD implementation team is clearly committed to supporting the requirements of the evaluation framework. Quality assurance mechanisms are in place to monitor the completion of process and outcome requirements. As indicated previously, some of the

WOCMM officers have had difficulty in administering and entering the assessment and case management data. Support is provided to officers to ensure the necessary intermediate measures are administered in a timely manner and entered in the software. Finally, the research division of CSSD has ongoing contact with Orbis Partners to ensure that all aspects of data collection are reviewed and updated to augment the evaluation process.

Recommendation:

CSSD is encouraged to continue to monitor WOCMM officers in an effort to ensure that the required data collection activities are completed in a timely way. The quality assurance monitoring is a useful practice and should be updated on a regular basis to identify the officers most in need of support. Finally, ongoing communication between Orbis Partners and the research division will help to ensure a more comprehensive and robust evaluation process.

Appendix A:

Interview Guides
Team Conferencing Observation Checklist
Team Conferencing Evaluation Form

Focus Group Questions for Probation Officers and Treatment Providers:

1. *Background of focus group members*: Explore background and experience in working with criminal justice involved women.

2. *Motivation to participate in WOCMM*: Why were they willing to participate in WOCMM?

3. *What is different for any/all stakeholders participating in WOCMM?*
   o Elicit concrete examples of differences/similarities with respect to their role within the organization?
   o Discuss changes in specific tasks, responsibilities…
   o How has this impacted other staff, supervisors, others in the immediate work place?
   o Explore concrete examples of impact on women…
   o Explore concrete examples of impact on other stakeholders (children, family members, community agencies, etc.)
   o What do they feel accounts for perceived differences in attitudes/behavior of any/all stakeholders (eg. Women, self, other officers, treatment providers, etc.)
   o Once they complete WOCMM and have finished probation, what will be different for women in terms of not reoffending?
   o What will be the greatest challenges to staying out of the system? What strengths, resources can they tap into that will help them?
   o For women that have been revoked and/or committed a new offense, why did this occur? What do they believe would be necessary to ensure a more favorable outcome.
   o <u>For women that dropped-out or were discharged, what were their main challenges that eventually lead to leaving WOCMM? Were the services/resources available (as part of WOCMM) to address the challenges were they beyond what WOCMM could reasonably impact?</u>
   o <u>For staff that attended court to request one or more women be allowed to stay in WOCMM after being revoked or committing a new offense, describe the motivation to advocate and the types of arguments presented. Were they successful in having the court agree? Why or why not?</u>

4. *Participation on a Team*: Focus on the experiences related to being a WOCMM team member
   o How often did you participate in team meetings
   o How would you describe the team meetings? General impressions, tone…
   o How was the agenda for team meetings determined?
   o How did you decide roles and responsibilities of team members?
   o Who was the lead?
   o Who made decisions about how best to address challenges faced by the woman?
   o What about follow through… who was responsible for follow through?
   o What was the greatest challenge with respect to being part of a team?
   o What was the most favorable aspect of being part of a team?
   o Did you like other team members?

o   How did you let women know you liked what they were doing?

5. *Support*: How much support did you have as a participant in this project?
    o   Immediate supervisors
    o   Central office
    o   Training and other opportunities
    o   Peers, etc.

6. *Focus on Services:*
    o   Did you feel you had options to address the concerns faced by women on your caseload?
    o   How helpful were the services to you and your clients?
    o   What types of services did you refer too?
    o   What were the most helpful services and why? Would you refer women again?
        i.   Education/Vocational
        ii.   Religious
        iii. Substance Use
        iv.   Psychologist
        v.   Psychiatrist
        vi.   Counselor
        vii. Group program for anger
        viii. Group program for stress
        ix.   Parenting program
        x.   Employment
        xi.   Accommodation
        xii. Family reintegration

    o   Did the women make use of services? IF yes, why… If no, why not.
    o   What other services/supports do they feel would be helpful that perhaps aren't currently available as part of WOCMM?

Focus Group Questions for Women:
General Impressions of WOCMM:

1. Discuss previous involvement in CJS and challenges experienced during incarceration and/or supervision.
2. General impressions of being on probation. What is it like?
3. General impressions of WOCMM...
   - What were they expecting would be different?
   - Why were they willing to participate in WOCMM?
   - For those that had previous involvement, ask for concrete examples of differences (and possible similarities)?
   - What accounts for perceived improvements – focus on probation officers, treatment providers – using different approaches? More tolerant?
   - What other services/supports do they feel would be helpful that perhaps aren't currently available as part of WOCMM?
   - For those that have been revoked and/or committed a new offense while WOCMM participant, why did this occur? Could it happen again?
4. Once they complete WOCMM and are clear of the CJS, what will be different for them in terms of not reoffending? What will be the greatest challenges to staying out of the system? What strengths, resources can they tap into that will help them?

Specific Questions- (OPTIONAL) …Impressions- Probation Officer

1. How would you describe your probation officer?
2. Did your probation officer focus on issues that were of concern to you?
3. Do you think your probation officer had a good understanding of your problems?
4. Who made decisions about how best to address your problems?
5. What about follow through… did your probation officer follow through with promises made?
6. Did she help with practical things?
7. Did she appear concerned about your feelings- and understand your behavior?
8. Did she express optimism that you could succeed (believe in you)? Believe you would not re-offend?
9. Did you like her? Was she friendly? Sense of humour? How did she let you know she liked what you were doing?
10. Did she reinforce you when things went well?
11. Was she punctual?
12. How did she introduce the conditions of probation?
13. Was she consistent? Did you know what was expected of you?
14. Did you have any difficulties with probation conditions? How did your probation officer respond when you did not follow through with court conditions?

Impressions- Team Members

1. How would you describe the team meetings?
2. Did the team focus on what was important to you?
3. Do you think your team had a good understanding of your problems?
4. Who made decisions about how best to address your problems?
5. What about follow through… did team members follow through with promises made?
6. Did team members help with practical things?
7. Did team members appear concerned about your feelings- and understand your behavior?
8. Did team members express optimism that you could succeed (believe in you)? Believe you would not re-offend?
9. Did you like team members? Friendly? Sense of humour? How did team let you know they liked what you were doing?
10. Did they reinforce you when things went well?
11. Were they punctual?

Impressions- Services

2. What types of services were you referred too?
    a.   Education/Vocational
    b.   Religious
    c.   Substance Use
    d.   Psychologist
    e.   Psychiatrist
    f.   Counselor
    g.   Group program for anger
    h.   Group program for stress
    i.   Parenting program
    j.   Employment
    k.   Accommodation
    l.   Family reintegration

3. How helpful were the services to you? Did you feel you had options to address your concerns?
    Did you make use of services? IF yes, why… If no, why not.
4. Purpose of service was clear.
5. What was most helpful about the service?
6. Would you go again? Refer others?

Focus Group Questions for Supervisors:

1. *Background of focus group members*: Explore background and experience in working with criminal justice involved women.

2. *Motivation to participate in WOCMM*: Why were they willing to participate in WOCMM?

3. *What is different for any/all stakeholders participating in WOCMM?*
    o Elicit concrete examples of differences/similarities with respect to their role within the organization?
    o Discuss changes in specific tasks, responsibilities…
    o How has this impacted other staff, supervisors, others in the immediate work place?
    o Explore concrete examples of impact on women…
    o Explore concrete examples of impact on other stakeholders (children, family members, community agencies, etc.)
    o What do they feel accounts for perceived differences in attitudes/behavior of any/all stakeholders (eg. Women, self, other officers, treatment providers, etc.)
    o Once they complete WOCMM and have finished probation, what will be different for women in terms of not reoffending?
    o What will be the greatest challenges to staying out of the system? What strengths, resources can they tap into that will help them?
    o For women that have been revoked and/or committed a new offense, why did this occur? What do they believe would be necessary to ensure a more favorable outcome.

4. *Participation on a Team*: Focus on the experiences of their staff related to being a WOCMM team member
    o How often did your staff participate in team meetings?
    o Have you ever attended a team meeting?
    o How would you describe the team meetings? General impressions, tone…
    o How was the agenda for team meetings determined?
    o How did you decide roles and responsibilities of team members?
    o Who was the lead?
    o Who made decisions about how best to address challenges faced by the woman?
    o What about follow through… who was responsible for follow through?
    o What was the greatest challenge with respect to being part of a team?
    o What was the most favorable aspect of being part of a team?
    o Did you like other team members?
    o How did you let women know you liked what they were doing?

5. *Experience as a supervisor: Focus on the experiences of the supervisor in working with WOCMM staff*
    o How clearly did your staff understand the principles behind the implementation of WOCMM?
    o What types of questions did you receive from your staff with respect to the implementation of WOCMM?
    o What supervision methods have you used to examine the ability of your staff to employ WOCMM in day-to-day practice (e.g., observation, interviews with staff, performance appraisal, survey, etc.)?
    o <u>What are the apparent differences in work/responsibilities for staff trained in WOCMM compared to before WOCMM was implemented?</u>

6. *General experience implementing WOCMM:*

    o How were case load sizes affected by the implementation of WOCMM?
    o What support did you receive for the implementation of WOCMM from your local administration and state administration?
    o What support did you receive from the local service network in providing the necessary services for WOCMM clients?
    o What were the major challenges for you as a supervisor to implement WOCMM?
    o What were the major challenges of your staff?
    o What was the most significant obstacle to implementation from the perspective of staff.
    o What types of support/training do your staff require to improve the implementation process?

Focus Group Questions for Non-WOCMM Probation Officers with Mixed Caseloads:

- o Gain context – how many females versus males supervised on caseload? Describe general characteristics of females vs males in terms of offenses committed, length of supervision, etc.

- o What are the main supervision needs/resources for overall caseload and does it differ between female and male probationers?

- o Are different supervision practices employed (formal or informal) for female offenders compared to males? If so, describe.

- o Are there specific challenges in supervision that are more apparent for females than males and vice-versa? If so, what are they?

- o What resources/services are available to meet the needs of women (and men) on caseload?

- o What resources/services would be useful for women (and men) that are not available (or readily available)?

- o Compare and contrast the last few revocations that occurred for women and men on caseload – generally describe the context and reason(s) for proceeding with revocation. If for new offense committed while under supervision, what "went wrong" for the person in terms of decision to commit a new offense?

- o If you had the opportunity to make one significant change (e.g., system level, policy, etc.) in supervision practices for females, what would that be?   Repeat question for males.

Team Conferencing- Observation Checklist

Team Members Present:
Length of Session:
Rater:
Method of Observation: Tape   In Vivo
Date Reviewed:

Before the meeting…	Not at all		Somewhat		A Great Extent
1. Facilitator prepared the woman and other team members for the meeting.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Facilitator invited all appropriate natural and professional supports (e.g. professionals are there address the target need areas)	1	2	3	4	5
3. Facilitator collected appropriate information from team members (e.g., services offered, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
During the meeting… **Tasks:**					
1. Facilitator reviewed the ground-rules	1	2	3	4	5
2. Facilitator guided discussion of client strengths	1	2	3	4	5
3. Facilitator assisted in discussion of priority target (e.g. identify new targets, review progress)	1	2	3	4	5
4. Facilitator and team members agree on new strategies and action steps (e.g. change that is SMART)	1	2	3	4	5
5. Facilitator scheduled follow-up meetings	1	2	3	4	5
During the meeting… **Spirit:**					
1. Facilitator honors the values of WOCMM	1	2	3	4	5
2. Facilitator used relational language skills	1	2	3	4	5
3. Facilitator is strengths based	1	2	3	4	5
4. Team members work together as a group to brainstorm ideas in response to a worker seeking input on a case?	1	2	3	4	5
5. Atmosphere of the meeting is supportive?	1	2	3	4	5
6. Team members provide support to each other between meetings?	1	2	3	4	5

ORBIS
partners inc.

7. Team helps maintain and increase knowledge and skills (i.e., MI and relational language skills?)	1	2	3	4	5
8. Team members help each other adhere to the guiding practices of WOCMM?	1	2	3	4	5
After the meeting…					
1. Facilitator elicited feedback from participants to discuss if meeting met stated goals and objectives.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Facilitator reviewed and recorded outcome of meeting .	1	2	3	4	5
3. Facilitator follows up with all team members as needed.	1	2	3	4	5

ORBIS
partners inc.

WOCMM Team Conferencing Evaluation

Facilitator: _____

Please fill in the circle that most closely describes your experience with the WOCMM team.
All surveys are strictly confidential.

Your role on the team:

Community Agency Service Provider	Corrections Department	Individual/Family Member	Other
O	O	O	O

How much do you agree with these statements?	DOES NOT APPLY	Not At All				Very Much
1. Family/Individual strengths were identified, shared with the team, and used to create a comprehensive plan:	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. My family's/my own/my organization's priorities and needs were included during the planning process of this meeting.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. I felt safe throughout the team process.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. Both the team planning purpose and process were clearly explained to team members.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. The planning process of this team meeting was respectful to those involved.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. People listened to me.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. Services were coordinated and I understood the plan and the next steps.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. Challenges, barriers, and needs specific to you/your family/your agency were identified.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
9.. Challenges, barriers, and limitations between departments and/or agencies, if identified, were resolved.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
10. The time and location of the meeting(s) were convenient for me.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
11. The facilitation of the team was effective.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
12. I know who to contact for follow up to the plan.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

13. Do you have any additional comments regarding the team process?

ORBIS
partners inc.

Appendix B:

WOCMM Logic Model

WOCMM Diagram – LOGIC MODEL

Guiding Practices	Core Elements	Intermediate Outcomes	Long Term Outcomes
Gender-Responsive Consistent Approach Delivered within a team Continuous Service Individualized Collaboration Enhance Motivation Program Integrity Program Evaluation	**Engage and Assess** • Build rapport • Conduct assessment (Identify needs and strengths) • Map priority targets • Coordinate professional team **. Enhance Motivation** • Provide feedback • Specify target behavior with woman • Build commitment to alter behavior • Identify incentives and obstacles **Implement the Case Plan** • Formalize action steps • Identify natural resources • Explore service and treatment options: Personal, Vocational, Family and Community **Review Progress** • Review/update progress • Reinforce success • Introduce problem-solving strategies • Develop maintenance strategies	**Organizational Support** • Administration is familiar with and supports WOCMM • WOCMM staff provided with resources and support including reduced case loads • Efforts are made to provide stable and ongoing funding • Effort to build community partnerships • Performance outcomes altered to reflect guiding practices of WOCMM **Assessment** • LSI-R used as screen for eligibility (medium to high risk- >21) • Gender-responsive assessment completed within 30 days, every 3-months and then at case closure. • Supplemental assessments completed at intake and case closure. • Assessment data is entered into data base • Client Satisfaction questionnaires are completed at case closure and entered into data base • Timely completion of assessments and reassessments is monitored • Inter-rater reliability assessed • Relational interview assessed **Team Approach** • Efforts are made to ensure continuity of care by developing a core team • Core team members are cross-trained in WOCMM model • Team leader (case manager is identified) • Team meets on a regular basis to review progress • Team roles and responsibilities clarified • Team adheres to protocol for team meeting • Women are introduced to service providers • Woman reports positive relationship with team members **Individualized Case Plan** • Collaboration with woman to create case plan • Gender-responsive assessment is used to target needs, guide service delivery, develop the case plan, identify services and team members • Woman follow case plan • Team leader and team members consistently reviews progress (each session) • Team leader records outcome in data base **Program Integrity** • Case management meetings are supervised • Team conferences are supervised • Quality assurance reports are generated and reviewed with team members • Adherence to guiding practices is constantly reviewed and supported **Program Evaluation** • Intermediate outcomes • Long-term outcomes	WOCCM clients decrease in dynamic risk, increase in dynamic protective across targeted domains 6, 12, 18 month recidivism rates among WOCMM clients reduced 6, 12, 18 month technical violation rates among WOCMM clients reduced Positive Client Satisfaction Surveys Positive Staff Satisfaction Surveys Enhance knowledge and skills of staff working directly and indirectly with women. Expand knowledge of the needs of women offenders as well as increase formal supports and access to resources.

ORBIS *partners inc.*