

SANCTIONS

UPDATE

INNOVATIONS IN THE ADMINISTRATION AND DELIVERY OF ALTERNATIVE SANCTIONS

S P R I N G 2 0 0 2

Connecticut's Probation Risk Reduction Program

A BLUEPRINT FOR EVALUATION AND INCREASED EFFECTIVENESS OF COMMUNITY-BASED SERVICES

"Since the formation of CSSD in early 1999, both Adult and Juvenile Probation services have undergone extensive study and review. The components of our Risk Reduction Program are the direct result of these analyses. They represent a multi-pronged effort to overhaul our assessment, classification, program planning, and supervision services. In addition, they include the important components of private-sector service delivery and performance outcome measures so that we can continually evaluate our work.

Our plan builds on national research in this field, and emanates directly from work groups composed of Judicial Branch employees. Moreover, our "Best Practices" project will ensure that we are consistently informed on national research and the effectiveness of our own efforts in Connecticut and that we make changes in our services wherever appropriate."

William H. Carbone
Executive Director

Court Support Services Division
Connecticut Judicial Branch

The Judicial Branch's Court Support Services Division (CSSD) has come into 2002 with an ambitious series of initiatives that will help the Judicial Branch in its ongoing efforts to improve services that address the needs of probationers, their families, their victims and the general public.

*This issue highlights four elements of CSSD's new **Probation Risk Reduction Program**.*

- 1. **Risk/Needs Assessment and Classification System:** CSSD has identified and is implementing new risk/needs assessment tools for adult and juvenile probation along with corresponding probationer classification and supervision standards. Findings from these instruments will provide critical information that will help the Judicial Branch enhance program services that will help to reduce recidivism on the part of both adult and juvenile probationers and increase public safety.*
- 2. **Center for Best Practices:** CSSD has established a Center for Best Practices that is evaluating what has been learned from evidence-based research concerning effective correctional programs and is, in turn, working with private agencies to determine how their program and treatment interventions can be tailored to be increasingly responsive to client and community needs.*
- 3. **Community-Based Probation:** CSSD is committed to the statewide development of community-based probation. Probation officers will be working in the community in close collaboration with community organizations, schools, the court, social service agencies, program providers, neighborhoods, other correctional departments, and law enforcement.*
- 4. **Three-Year Longitudinal Study of Adult and Juvenile Clients:** CSSD has just awarded a contract to evaluate CSSD programming and initiatives that will result from this Probation Risk Reduction Program.*

Implementing this program will require commitment, hard work and patience by everyone involved, but the Judicial Branch is confident that this is the appropriate direction to take. We applaud in advance the cooperation and teamwork of the public/private sector that will be necessary to make this a success.



The Hon Joseph H. Pellegrino, Chief Court Administrator

For further information or to receive a copy of Connecticut's Probation Risk Reduction Program report, contact: William Carbone, Executive Director, Court Support Services Division, 2275 Silas Deane Highway, Rocky Hill, CT 06067, Tel: 860-563-1332

Introduction

In the late 1970s, the proclamation that “*nothing works*” in correctional treatment programming set the stage for and ushered in the “*get tough*” on delinquents and criminals ideology of the 1980s and early ‘90s. Over this period of time, the nation saw the growth of numerous punishment programs and increased sanctions for juvenile and adult offenders. Whether out of frustration or convenience, many criminologists and correctional practitioners quickly jumped on the “*rehabilitation doesn’t work*” bandwagon. They said that correctional treatment was ineffective, recidivism could not be reduced, and crime could not be prevented by correctional interventions that focused on treating individual offenders. They were wrong.

More recently there has been a significant amount of empirically sound research that has established the effectiveness of some treatment programs and correctional interventions for both juveniles and adults. As a result, the following evidence-based conclusions can now be made concerning crime causation and treatment.

What We Know About Recidivism/Risk Reduction

RECIDIVISM CAN BE PREDICTED

Offender recidivism is predictable, and can be reduced by using validated risk assessments to identify and address “*criminogenic needs*” – those needs that we now know lead to or cause crime and delinquency.

RISK FACTORS FOR RE-OFFENDING CAN BE IDENTIFIED

Offender assessment instruments that identify “*criminogenic needs*” are inextricably linked to offender rehabilitation and public protection.

RECIDIVISM CAN BE REDUCED

If an offender’s “*criminogenic needs*” are addressed and positively changed, there is substantial empirical research that indicates that these same offenders will be significantly less likely to recidivate.

APPROPRIATE AND EFFECTIVE PREVENTIVE AND TREATMENT SERVICES CAN BE DESIGNED

Higher-risk offenders as determined by a valid risk assessment tend to respond better to intensive and extensive services, while low-risk offenders respond better to minimal or no intervention. Assessments can help identify the most effective interventions for different types of clients.

RISK REDUCTION RESEARCH

In short, the research on correctional effectiveness has established that program interventions that are targeted to offenders’ “*criminogenic needs*” themselves can substantially reduce recidivism. The research has also determined that with most offenders (especially high-risk offenders), supervision alone, the sanction alone, or punishment in and of itself does not reduce recidivism. Probation agencies must target “*criminogenic needs*” in the risk and need assessment process and translate those risk factors into treatment objectives and, ultimately, into relevant offender interventions.

ELEMENTS OF THE PROBATION RISK REDUCTION PROGRAM

With this in mind, the Judicial Branch in Connecticut has undertaken the development of a comprehensive Risk Reduction Program for Juvenile and Adult Probation. The program comprises three elements that will enable and assure continuous improvement in CSSD’s services to the court and to Connecticut’s communities:

Assessment: A new risk/needs assessment process for adult and juvenile probationers is providing a foundation for new and more carefully targeted program services.

Interventions: A Center for Best Practices group within CSSD is researching and proposing the program models that will most efficiently and appropriately address the needs of the state’s client profile.

Evaluation: Evaluations are being designed to ensure that these styles and modes of treatment are appropriate for the offender and that programs will yield results that provide maximum benefits for the clients, their victims, and the community.

“The Judicial Branch is committed to the principles and components of this Probation Risk Reduction Program. Its implementation will not occur quickly or easily, but through hard work and persistence we will be successful. The ultimate beneficiaries of our efforts will be the citizens of Connecticut, and the adults and juveniles who are placed on probation.”

The Hon. John J. Ronan
Deputy Chief Court Administrator
Judicial Branch

Risk Reduction Program Components

1. Risk/Needs Assessment
2. Probationer Supervision and Program Plan
3. Probationer Categories of Classification
4. Probationer Supervision Standards
5. Program Network that Addresses Criminogenic Needs
6. Community-Based Supervision
7. Performance-Based Measures

The purpose of the Probation Risk Reduction Program is to supervise and treat the offenders under Judicial Branch jurisdiction according to the risk they pose to public safety, matching the degree or level of supervision and treatment to their level of risk (*the risk principle*); choosing appropriate targets of evidence-based rehabilitative programming that address the offender's identified "*criminogenic needs*" (*the need principle*); and employing styles and modes of treatment interventions that are consistent with the ability and developmental level of the offender (*the responsivity principle*).

SEVEN PROGRAM ELEMENTS

In order to accomplish the goals of the programs, the Court Support Services Division (CSSD) has identified and addressed seven program components:

1. Risk/Needs Assessment

Under the guidance of a national expert on risk management programming, probation officers and CSSD managers determined that the most appropriate risk/needs assessment instruments for Connecticut's system were:

Adults: The Level of Service Inventory-Revised (LSI-R) and the Adult Substance Use Survey (ASUS);

Juveniles: the Juvenile Assessment Generic (JAG) and the Substance Use Survey (SUS). The CSSD is in the process of automating these assessment tools.

When fully automated, the LSI and JAG will:

- Generate a tabulation of an offender's current risk situation while simultaneously identifying their most critical needs.
- Establish an individual client Supervision and Program Plan.
- Provide a comprehensive framework to conduct system-wide gap analysis for treatment services.
- Enable probation officers, program staff, and supervisors to easily track changes in a case profile over time.
- Build a system for case prioritization and ongoing adjustments in resource allocations.
- Provide a framework for ongoing system evaluation based on empirically validated profiles of the offender population served.

2. Probationer Supervision and Program Plan

Knowing an offender's risk and needs is essential for effective intervention to be possible, but by itself is not enough. The probation officer must take the information and knowledge obtained through the completed JAG or LSI-R and work with the offender (and when possible the family), to develop an individualized Supervision and Program Plan that is tailored to the offender's risk and needs. The Supervision and Program Plan is a road map that:

A SUPERVISION AND PROGRAM PLAN IS A WRITTEN DOCUMENT THAT PRESENTS ALL THE CRITICAL INFORMATION SUPPORTING A PROBATION OFFICER'S STRATEGY TO INTERVENE IN A PROBATIONER'S LIFE. IT SERVES TO DIRECT THE PROBATIONER AND GUIDE THE PROBATION OFFICER TOWARD TARGETED ACTIVITIES AND OUTCOMES.

- Establishes measurable goals for managing individual probationers.
- Outlines intervention strategies to achieve established goals.
- Identifies and commits resources to support intervention strategies.
- Defines measures that will be used to determine whether intervention strategies are succeeding or failing.
- Assigns responsibility for implementation.

3. Probationer Categories of Classification

The development of a Probation Classification System as part of a Risk Reduction Program recognizes that probation staff cannot spend the same amount of time and resources on every offender under probation supervision. CSSD has developed an offender classification system which includes graduated levels and standards of monitoring and services for risk-based offender supervision.

Adult: There are six (6) supervision categories prescribed for adults placed on probation: Sex Offender; Surveillance; High Supervision; Medium Supervision; Administrative Supervision; Warrant Services.

Juvenile: There are four (4) supervision levels or categories for juveniles placed on probation: Low risk/need; Medium risk/need; High risk/need; Very high risk/need.

continued on page 4

4. Probationer Supervision Standards

Although an individual Supervision and Program Plan needs to be tailored to the risk and needs of each offender under supervision, the Risk Reduction Program establishes consistent standards of practice for frequency of contacts and caseload maximums. CSSD has determined supervision standards and contact levels based on the JAG and LSI-R derived classification categories. As illustrated in the example below, the assessment tools will help determine the level of supervision and identify minimum contacts that the probation officer must have for each case. This is a framework for supervision and will be augmented by the Supervision and Program Plan that is customized for each probationer. Case notes will document that these standards have been met and Quality Control measures will be instituted to ensure compliance.

ADULT PROBATION SUPERVISION STANDARDS (EXAMPLE)		
Supervision Categories	Officer Case Monitoring Standards	Recommended Caseload
High Supervision	Standards <ul style="list-style-type: none">✧ Two face-to-face contacts with probationer per month, at least one of which must take place in the field.✧ Minimum of one home visit every three months.✧ One collateral contact per month (e.g., family, employer, police).✧ One contact with treatment provider per month.✧ Respond to condition violation on the day of detection.	65 cases per officer

JUVENILE PROBATION SUPERVISION STANDARDS (EXAMPLE)		
Supervision Categories	Officer Case Monitoring Standards	Recommended Caseload
Very High Supervision	Standards <ul style="list-style-type: none">✧ Four face-to-face contacts with probationer per month, at least two of which must take place in the field.✧ Minimum of one home visit each month.✧ One contact with treatment provider per week.✧ One contact with family per week.✧ One contact with school per week.✧ Respond to condition violation on the day of detection.	30 cases per officer

5. Program Network that Addresses Criminogenic Needs

No matter how well an offender’s level of risk and needs are identified, or how accurate and comprehensive the individualized Supervision and Program Plan is, unless the appropriate treatment intervention is identified and effectively delivered, offenders will be less likely to stop their criminal behavior. There are remarkable differences in the effectiveness of different types of treatment programming. Interventions based on empirically valid theories of criminal behavior that address criminogenic needs and account for offender learning styles and characteristics have been shown to produce greater results.

6. Community-Based Probation

The way that probation services have been organized and implemented is being questioned and examined throughout the United States and other countries. A number of problems with our traditional approach to probation have been identified to include the following:

- Lack of public confidence in making communities and neighborhoods safe
- Probation services taking place in offices and not being visible to the community
- Probation conditions not being enforced
- Limited interagency and community cooperation and collaboration

To address these concerns, the Judicial Branch has undertaken a major initiative to implement a community-based supervision model of probation services. Two primary principles and strategies are serving as the foundation and framework for this initiative: 1) neighborhood supervision; and 2) development of partnerships in the community.

Neighborhood supervision: In addition to just being in the community, probation should be highly visible, and this visibility must be positive in nature. In practice, this means that probation officers will be assigned to geographical areas / neighborhoods, places that have an identity, instead of being assigned to caseloads scattered around a region. When probationers enter the system they will be assigned to a probation officer according to the location of their residence. Linking officers to geographical areas is intended to enhance networking and community-building efforts within local neighborhoods.

Most importantly, the officer must see the community as well as the probationer as a client, the consumer of the services that the officer provides. The location of supervision will change from the office visit to the neighborhood, as the officer will be directed to the resolution of community problems, both because it is what the community desires and because it is a method for invoking the community’s help in the “supervision of probationers.”

Development of partnerships in the community: To be effective, probation cannot remain only case-oriented and office-based. It needs to be part of a dynamic process within

the community and to become a true partner with law enforcement, local social service agencies and programs, schools, and most importantly, local community groups and families. The involvement of other agencies, organizations, and interest groups is critical to the success of probation. In essence, the community needs to play a vital and participatory role in probation.

7. Performance-Based Measures

The results of an ongoing self-evaluation process will help chart the course for the CSSD in implementing and refining this Risk Reduction Program. Ongoing organizational assessment, and improvement derived from evidence-based program results are essential for services to remain effective.

“In the final analysis, it is understood that if this Risk Reduction Program is the key to the future of probation services in Connecticut, it is the hand that turns the key that will ultimately open the door to its successful implementation. Our staff is the hand that turns the key and they will continue to be our most important and valuable resource.”

Thomas White
Director of Operations
Court Support Services Division
Judicial Branch

“These approaches enhance both the effectiveness of supervision as well as public confidence in diversionary sentencing. I believe these innovations represent a dramatic improvement in Connecticut’s Probation system.”

The Hon. Susan B. Handy
Chief Administrative Judge, Criminal
Judicial Branch

Implementation Vehicles

1. Policy and Procedures
2. Automated Case Management Information System
3. Staff Training
4. Staff Supervision

There are four primary vehicles that comprise the implementation strategy for the Probation Risk Reduction Program:

1. Policy and Procedures

The CSSD has developed more than 125 written policies which establish operational standards and delineate the procedures to be followed by staff to ensure proper and consistent implementation. Detailed policy is being written for each component of the Probation Risk Reduction Program

2. Automated Case Management Information System

The CSSD is in the process of developing an automated Case Management Information System (CMIS). This project which began nearly a year ago, will be completed this year. For the first time, all CSSD offender service functions will be fully automated and integrated into a single database. This system will not only help probation officers in carrying out their job responsibilities, but will also enable the CSSD to evaluate its effectiveness and make changes and operational adjustments as a result of evidence-based outcomes.

3. Staff Training

An extensive staff training effort is underway that will include:

Risk/Needs Assessment: Risk assessment (LSI-R or JAG) implementation, motivational interviewing, supervision and program planning, and quality assurance.

Client Intervention: Short-term client intervention FRAMES model (Feedback, Responsibility, Advice, Menu, Empathy, Self-efficacy), case planning, and cognitive skills training.

Community Interaction: Community-based supervision, development of community collaboratives, and officer safety.

Service Provider Training: Risk assessment tools, case planning, and client intervention models.

4. Staff Supervision

For any new program to be implemented and staff training to be effective, it must be supported and reinforced by field supervisors. Field supervisors will be trained on how to provide support to their probation officers in implementing the Risk Reduction Program. In addition, a team of probation officers has been appointed full time to provide ongoing quality assurance to the CSSD field office staff. The Quality Assurance Team will assist Field Supervisors to:

Assess: Assess Probation Officer knowledge and skills in completing the LSI-R or the JAG, and in developing a Supervision and Program Plan.

Provide Feedback: Provide specific feedback to line officers on their Motivational Interviewing skills and the quality of their completed assessments and Supervision and Program Plans.

Coach: Conduct staff coaching and booster training sessions to improve performance.

Consult: Provide consultation to supervisors and line staff on implementing the Risk Reduction Program.

Train: Conduct initial training for new employees and refresher training for existing employees in Motivational Interviewing, Risk Assessment and Case Planning.

“As this process unfolds, and as we learn more from the findings of the risk/needs assessment tools, CSSD will be working in close partnership with its private providers to identify and integrate best practices in ways that will provide the greatest benefit for offenders, their families, victims, and our communities.”

James Greene
Deputy Director of Program and Staff Development
Court Support Services Division, Judicial Branch

Center For Best Practices

At the present time, CSSD spends over \$60 million annually on contracted treatment services for juveniles and adults under CSSD supervision. This extensive service delivery network has been developed over the past ten years. With the goal of establishing empirically validated and evidence-based treatment practices, CSSD has recently established a team of employees to research and implement “Best Practices” program interventions.

Research: The Center is in the process of conducting a review of research on what works and developing a summary of findings

and conclusions. Staff are identifying specific programmatic interventions and curricula that have been effective in addressing specific criminogenic needs for juveniles, adults and females; in addition they are obtaining copies of curricula, visiting programs, and attending training.

Identify “Best Practices” program models: The Center is: (1) developing a core set of program curricula of different intensities to address the “Big Six” criminogenic needs; (2) identifying characteristics of effective programs; (3) developing a statewide program continuum of “Best Practices” programs; and (4) developing a plan to integrate “Best Practices” into the present program network.

“BIG SIX” CRIMINOGENIC NEEDS

- ✂ Anti-social personality
- ✂ Anti-social behavior (low self-control)
- ✂ Anti-social values
- ✂ Anti-social peers
- ✂ Substance Abuse
- ✂ Dysfunctional Family

Training: The Center will train: (1) CSSD staff and program providers as trainers in selected “Best Practices” program curricula; (2) identified program providers and CSSD staff in the delivery of “Best Practices” program curricula; and (3) network providers’ program directors and coordinators in “Best Practices” program models and principles.

Monitoring: The Center will develop a Quality Assurance Program for ongoing support of the “Best Practices” curricula, and will develop program process and outcome measures, as well as an auditing and monitoring system for “Best Practices” program models.

What We Know About Effective Correctional Programs

1. *Client criminogenic needs are identified and targeted for appropriate interventions.*
2. *Individual client treatment plans are developed that include intermediate treatment goals and outcomes.*
3. *The program offers cognitive-behavioral programming that focuses on how an offender thinks and acts based on empirically valid theories of criminal behavior and that addresses criminogenic needs.*
4. *There are detailed program manuals that outline treatment objectives, content, and activities.*
5. *Clients are placed in services and programming that provide the appropriate level of intensity based upon their level of risk and need.*
6. *Programming is developed and delivered in a way that accounts for client learning styles, cognitive functioning, developmental level, and responsivity.*
7. *The program identifies and assesses the client’s protective factors that support pro-social behaviors, and individual strategies are developed to strengthen these factors.*
8. *The program establishes client activities and develops individual client strategies to neutralize criminogenic social networks.*
9. *Principles of positive reinforcement are applied through a structured client behavior management system that encourages program participation and compliance.*
10. *Staff are trained in all program components and receive annual refresher and recertification training.*
11. *Program staff adhere to the principles and model the techniques that they teach and expect from the clients.*
12. *Staff are positive, highly motivated, and receive ongoing supervision and coaching, including periodic monitoring of client group sessions.*
13. *The client’s family members are given an opportunity to obtain the knowledge and skills to provide support and reinforcement to the client.*
14. *The program provides relapse prevention training and aftercare planning.*
15. *The program’s services and treatment curricula are formally reviewed annually, and updated based on current research and “best practices”.*
16. *The program tests clients to assess change in cognitive and skill development.*
17. *The program has identified outcome measures that are monitored to assess program effectiveness and client behavioral change.*

“The private sector service delivery network has done an outstanding job in developing a continuum of programs and client interventions that have responded to the expressed needs of the Judicial Branch and the clients we serve. However, we now have reached a point in correctional program development, where we know we can do better. The evidence is clear that the establishment of client interventions that embody evidence-based principles of effective correctional services can reduce client recidivism and enhance public safety.”

Cynthia Theran
Program Manager,
Center for Best Practices
Court Support Services Division,
Connecticut Judicial Branch

Three-Year Longitudinal Study of Adult and Juvenile Clients

COURT SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION

With the Judicial Branch reorganization already three years old, Executive Director William H. Carbone and the Executive Management Team have determined that a new study of client outcomes is in order. The study will prove valuable in providing both a baseline of information on existing levels of service delivery and a system for benchmarking future organizational changes, some of which are already underway. This information will prove invaluable in guiding CSSD's decision-making well into the future.

EVALUATIVE QUESTIONS

A large piece of this evaluation will focus on the use of valid and reliable risk/needs instruments and the establishment of "best practices" in service delivery to clients around identified areas of criminogenic needs. Within this context, the study will ask three main questions.

1. **Assessment of Risk/Needs:** To what extent do the interventions received by clients through the service delivery system address the risk/needs goal areas established by the initial risk/needs assessment tools?

2. **Service delivery:** How effective is the service delivery in addressing and achieving individual service plan goals, as developed through the risk/needs assessment process?

3. **Outcome measures:** What has been the impact of meeting various levels of individual service plan goals on long-term outcomes such as improving educational achievement, remaining drug-free, and reducing recidivism?

Conclusion

WHAT THIS PROBATION RISK REDUCTION PROGRAM WILL ACCOMPLISH

As the CSSD Risk Reduction Program report states, "Probation in Connecticut has been fortunate to be staffed by a group of dedicated and talented individuals. The Risk Reduction Program in Probation has been developed through the hard work and commitment of CSSD managers and line staff." When fully operational, the following will be descriptive of what is happening within Juvenile and Adult Probation in the State of Connecticut:

CSSD Probation Risk Reduction Process Outcomes

- ✧ *A validated assessment and classification system will provide probation officers with the ability to adjust the level of supervision and treatment to the risk and needs of each probationer.*
- ✧ *Empirically supported treatment services and programs will be available to address the identified criminogenic needs of offenders under supervision, reducing the probability of future criminal behavior.*
- ✧ *Probation officers and service providers will be skilled in motivational interviewing and will use the skills when interacting with clients and peers.*
- ✧ *Probation officers will be trained in cognitive-behavioral interventions and in conducting treatment groups for targeted offenders under supervision.*
- ✧ *Teams of probation officers will be assigned geographically to serve specific neighborhoods and communities.*
- ✧ *Probation teams will be working in collaboration with each other and will develop partnerships with community-based police units, neighborhoods, service providers, and community institutions and associations.*
- ✧ *Cooperative programs with schools will be in place with probationers contacted in schools, individually and in groups.*
- ✧ *The role of the probation officer will be expanded to encompass both case management services and community mobilization activities.*
- ✧ *Regular report days and report nights will be based in the field in homes, schools, and community organizations.*
- ✧ *Information will be widely shared among all members of the justice and social services system.*
- ✧ *Staff training will be provided to ensure probation officers have the knowledge and skills essential to do risk management and community-based probation.*
- ✧ *An automated case management information system linked to law enforcement agencies and service providers will be in place.*
- ✧ *A comprehensive quality assurance program to improve supervision and treatment services will be in place.*

REFERENCES

- Andrews, D.A., "Recidivism is Predictable and Can Be Influenced: Using Risk Assessments to Reduce Recidivism." FORUM on Correctional Research. Vol. 1, No. 2, pp.11-18. 1989.
- "Broken Windows' Probation: The Next Step in Fighting Crime." New York: Center for Civic Innovation at the Manhattan Institute. August 1999.
- Gendreau, P., and Goggin, C., "Principles of Effective Correctional Programming." FORUM on Correctional Research. Vol 8, No. 3, pp. 38-41. 1996.
- Losel, F., "Effective Correctional Programming: What Empirical Research Tells Us and What it Doesn't." FORUM on Correctional Research. Vol. 8, No. 3, pp. 33-37. 1996.
- Van Voorhis, P. and K. Brown, "Risk Classification in the 1990's." Washington: National Institute of Corrections. 1996.

ANYONE WISHING TO CONTRIBUTE ARTICLES OR IDEAS FOR ARTICLES TO THE *SANCTIONS UPDATE* ARE INVITED TO CONTACT JIM GREENE AT THE COURT SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION. 860-529-1316.

ALTERNATIVE SANCTIONS PROGRAMS AND PROVIDERS IN CONNECTICUT

ADULT PROGRAMS

Adult Drug Session

LMG Programs, Inc.
Project More
Wheeler Clinic

Adult Services

Associated Psychotherapists of
Western Connecticut
Barbara Grover
Community Partners in Action
Community Prevention and Addiction
Services, Inc.
Connecticut Renaissance, Inc.
Connection, Inc.
Council of Churches of
Greater Bridgeport
CSI Connecticut, Inc.
Danbury Youth Services, Inc.
Families in Crisis
Family Re-Entry
Mandel Mellow and Went (dba: N.A.)
Morris Foundation, Inc.
Network Connecticut, Inc.
New Opportunities for Waterbury, Inc.
Norwalk Economic
Opportunity Now, Inc.
Opportunities Industrialization Center
of New London County, Inc.
Paces Counseling Associates, Inc.
Perception Programs, Inc.
Regional Network of Programs
Stafford Family Services
Wheeler Clinic, Inc.

**Alternative Incarceration
Center Services**

Community Partners in Action
Community Renewal Team
of Greater Hartford
Corporation for Public Management
CSI Connecticut, Inc.
CTE, Inc.
New Opportunities for Waterbury, Inc.
Norwalk Economic
Opportunity Now, Inc.
Perception Programs, Inc.
Project More
The Connection, Inc.

Art Program Service

Community Partners in Action

Community Court - Hartford

Community Partners in Action

Day Incarceration Center Services

Community Partners in Action
CSI Connecticut, Inc.

Domestic Violence

Assoc. of Religious Communities, Inc.
Community Consultation Board, Inc.
Families in Crisis

Family Services

Assoc. of Religious Communities, Inc.
Behavioral Health of
Waterbury Hospital
Catholic Charities/
Catholic Family Services
Community Consultation Board, Inc.
CSI Connecticut, Inc.
Greater Bridgeport Community
Mental Health Center
Hartford Hospital
Mandel Mellow and Went (dba: N.A.)
Marianne Cristiano
Maxine L. Varanko (dba: FMHS)
North Central Counseling
Services, Inc.
Stevens and Anderson (dba: NCS)
United Services Inc.
Wheeler Clinic, Inc.
YWCA, Inc. - Greenwich

Intensive Youth Services

Career Resources, Inc.

Latino Treatment Track

Catholic Charities/
Catholic Family Services

Latino Youth Offender Services

Catholic Charities/
Catholic Family Services

Mediation Services

Community Mediation, Inc.
Community Partners in Action
Dispute Settlement Center, Inc.

Mental Health Services

Bridges A Community
Support System, Inc.

Parole Services

LMG Programs, Inc.
UConn Health Center

Residential Services - Halfway House

CSI Connecticut, Inc.

Residential Services - Jail Reinterview

CSI Connecticut, Inc.

Residential Services -

Medical Detoxification

Morris Foundation, Inc.
Rushford Center, Inc.

Residential Services -

Project GREEN

Community Resources for Justice
CSI Connecticut, Inc.

Residential Services -

Substance Abuse Intermediate

McCall Foundation
Morris Foundation, Inc. -
Morris House
Perception Programs, Inc.
Vitam Center, Inc.

Residential Services -

Substance Abuse Long Term

APT Foundation, Inc.
Central Naugatuck Valley Help, Inc.
Connecticut Renaissance, Inc.
Crossroads, Inc.
Open Hearth Association
LMG Programs, Inc.

Residential Services -

Youthful Offender

CSI Connecticut, Inc.

Sex Offender Services

The Connection, Inc.

Women and Children Services

Community Renewal Team
of Greater Hartford
CSI Connecticut, Inc.
LMG Programs, Inc.
The Connection, Inc.

**Zero Tolerance Drug
Supervision Program**

Project More

JUVENILE PROGRAMS

**Alternative to Juvenile
Detention Program**

Community Renewal Team
of Greater Hartford
Corporation for Public Management
CSI Connecticut, Inc.
Youth Continuum, Inc.

Community Detention for Girls

Community Partners in Action
CSI Connecticut, Inc.
Juvenile Forensic Service, LLP

**Court Based Juvenile
Assessment Services**

Campagna Associates, LLP
Clinical Consultants of Connecticut
Connecticut Renaissance, Inc.
Natchaug Hospital
Wheeler Clinic, Inc.

Gateway Offender Program -

Academic Support

City of New Britain
Connecticut Junior Republic
North Central Counseling
Services, Inc.

Gateway Offender Program - Girls

Catholic Charities/
Catholic Family Services
City of Meriden
Connecticut Hospital Management
Corporation, (dba: S.I.)
Connecticut Junior Republic
CSI Connecticut, Inc.
Dixwell Community House, Inc.

Gateway Offender Program - General

Connecticut Junior Republic
Community Renewal Team
of Greater Hartford
New Haven Family Alliance, Inc.

Intensive Outreach and

Monitoring Services

Network Connecticut, Inc.
North American Family Institute, Inc.

Juvenile Detention Recreation Services

Community Partners in Action

Juvenile Diversion Program Services

The Connection, Inc.
Family & Children's Agency, Inc.

Juvenile Drug Session

Connecticut Junior Republic

Juvenile Justice Centers

Child and Family Agency of
Southeastern Conn., Inc
City of New Britain
City of Meriden
City of Stamford
City of West Haven
Community Renewal Team
of Greater Hartford
CSI Connecticut, Inc.
Rushford Center, Inc.
Town of Windham
United Services Inc.
Waterbury Youth Service System, Inc.

**Juvenile Outpatient Mental Health and
Substance Abuse Treatment Services**

Catholic Charities/
Catholic Family Services
Child Guidance Center
of Greater Bridgeport, Inc.
Clinical Consultants of Connecticut
Connecticut Renaissance, Inc.
Family & Children's Aid, Inc.
Natchaug Hospital
New Haven Family Alliance, Inc.
Village for Families and Children, Inc.
Wheeler Clinic, Inc.

**Juvenile Supervision and Reporting
Center Program**

Connecticut Junior Republic
Corporation for Public Management
CSI Connecticut, Inc.
Perception Programs, Inc.
Vitam Center, Inc./Substance Abuse
Youth Continuum, Inc.

Parent Child Relationship Counseling

Village for Families and Children, Inc.

Supervised Visitation Services

AMPS, Inc.