

Constructing an EBP Post-Conviction Model of Supervision in United States Probation, District of Hawaii: A Case Study

Janet T. Davidson, Ph.D.
Chaminade University of Honolulu

Richard Crawford
Chief U.S. Probation Officer
District of Hawaii

Elizabeth Kerwood
Deputy Chief U.S. Probation Officer
District of Hawaii

CORRECTIONAL POPULATIONS, including jail, prison, probation, and parole, have grown exponentially since the 1970s. Research has generally favored prison populations while community correctional populations have traditionally not proven to be a favorite venue. Probation, in particular, although typically containing the largest population of correctional offenders, has been disproportionately neglected in the area of academic scholarship and related changes to practices that might reduce recidivism (DOJ, 2004a).

However, as research in this area has grown, correctional agencies across the country have begun to look at how their work is carried out and how work might better be directed in an effort to reduce criminal recidivism (DOJ, 2004a). Agencies are increasingly aware of and guided by research-driven, evidence-based practices (EBP), particularly those associated with reduced recidivism (White, 2005) and the need to demonstrate effectiveness with fewer resources (DOJ, 2004b). This marks a definite shift in recent practices that focus on simply managing larger caseloads and placing the onus of change almost entirely on the offender, without significant assistance from the supervising agency (Simon, 1993; DOJ, 2004a).

The move towards EBP comes at an important time within U.S. Probation. As cited in Gregoire (2004), statistics regarding federal probationers give cause for concern. While the federal probation offender population increased 12 percent between fiscal years 2000 and 2005, the criminal history severity score increased by 18 percent and the risk prediction index score increased by 20 percent. The increased risk of the population is also noted in the 38 percent increase in revocations, including a 42 percent increase for new crime versus technical violations (Gregoire, 2004).

In the District of Hawaii, the U.S. Probation Office has committed to evidence-based offender reentry with the intent to reduce recidivism and violence. Additionally, we believe that these evidence-based efforts will also increase and support the pro-social assets of our offenders, increase collaboration with existing local agencies, and raise public awareness of the difficulties that offenders face in the community. This district has committed to moving from compliance-

based supervision toward outcome-based offender reentry, while retaining our focus on public safety.

Indeed, the move towards increased public safety necessarily includes the incorporation of current evidence-based practices, since these demonstrate a scrutinized track record of success. Further, over the past three years, this district has ambitiously developed what is known in-house as the Hawaii Model. The Hawaii Model involves using available resources to align the work of the office with what has also been proven or otherwise theorized to reduce future anti-social and/or offending behavior. This article will outline the Hawaii Model, its major accomplishments, and obstacles yet to overcome.

Prior to the shift toward EBP, work in the U.S. Probation Office, District of Hawaii resembled that of many other jurisdictions, both federal and state, across the country. The work was marked by the traditional management strategies of offender compliance. This method of supervision centers, primarily, on ensuring that offenders abide by an often pre-determined set of requirements (e.g., office visits, urinalysis testing, job obtainment or searches, etc.). Violations of the conditions of supervision are sanctioned, but the underlying issues are left untouched. In this model, little is done to affect long-term public safety.

In early 2005, our district recognized that caseloads here as in other jurisdictions were continuing to grow without a parallel growth in other resources. Considering national trends, the district decided upon a philosophical shift towards EBP in an effort to reduce recidivism rather than merely react to violations of supervision. This district committed to building a model that would most effectively impact public safety while increasing offender accountability. These changes coincided with re-organizational efforts in other jurisdictions and states; in this sense, the decision to look toward research and EBP as guidelines for supervision of our community correctional population came at an opportune time.

As outlined below, our district is aggressively aligning with EBP, hoping to achieve measurable impact on offender change. It is important to note that while the Hawaii Model uses the U.S. Department of Justice's National Institute of Corrections evidence-based practices as the source of its guiding principles, no one model has been deemed as "the best" or most effective (Gregoire, 2004). The Hawaii Model represents one way of "doing" EBP with a community corrections population. Federal probation populations have yet to be included in studies of the impact of EBP (Gregoire, 2004), thus guiding principles rather than "what works" programs must provide the framework for such a model.

The EBP Model

Our district's move involves a commitment to existing research and theory regarding EBP. Joplin et al. (2004) note that the implementation of these EBPs requires agencies to not only shift practices on paper, but also change their work philosophy. Through committed leadership, the organization must devote equal attention to organizational development and collaboration. These components deserve equal attention if an EBP model is to truly affect recidivism reduction in a positive manner.

Specifically, this district is committed to incorporating the following eight principles as they pertain to correctional supervision: assess actuarial risk/needs; enhance intrinsic motivation; target interventions; skill train with directed practice (using cognitive methods); increase positive reinforcement; engage ongoing support in the community; measure relevant processes/practices; and provide measurement feedback. Further, we also understand that the organizational development must support these principles and the district must collaborate with other agencies in order to fully carry out the work. A minority of agencies have tackled all three areas simultaneously in the move toward EBP (Joplin et al., 2004), yet meta-analyses have demonstrated that agencies that follow the specifics of *each* of these three important EBP areas net an average reduction in recidivism of 30 percent (Matthews et al., 2001). Following is a description of the changes that our district has employed in order to fully align with the evidence-based principles, organizational development, and collaboration according to ideal-type

EBP models.

Evidence-Based Principles

Assess Actuarial Risk/Needs

Any move toward EBP must begin with the actuarial assessment of offenders' static and dynamic criminogenic risks and needs (Lowenkamp and Latessa, 2004; Austin, 2003; Latessa et al., 2002; Gardner, 2002). Assessment allows for a better use of resources by more accurately determining risk than through individual judgment alone and via a more effective allocation of increasingly scarce resources (Gottfredson, 2005; Holsinger et al., 2001; Jones et al., 1999).

U.S. Probation, Hawaii chose the Risk Management System (RMS) as the specific tool in the actuarial assessment of offenders, largely based on its sophisticated advanced pattern recognition methodology. Specifically, the RMS is able to discern both a general and violence recidivism score for each offender based on information collected from over 65 static and dynamic items (Modeling Solutions, LLC, 2007). Results are then summarized into four major categories, namely Needs, Risk, Mental Health, and Other-External (Modeling Solutions, LLC, 2007).

By comparing the offender's static behavioral factors (criminal history, age at first arrest, adjustment to previous periods of probation, etc.) and dynamic behavioral factors (substance use/abuse, ongoing family/personal problems, mental health concerns, etc.), the instrument can actuarially predict an offender's likelihood to recidivate, either generally or violently (Modeling Solutions, LLC, 2007). Instruments that include both static and dynamic factors demonstrate greater correlations with outcome than instruments containing static factors alone (Petersilia, 2003). Individual results are compared with those of similarly situated offenders who have had past assessments and were tracked for three years post-supervision to determine the relative risk of recidivism. The model on which the RMS is based has been validated, albeit not on a federal offender population (Dow et al., 2005).

Individual offender RMS assessment results (along with other assessments, such as pretrial and pre-sentence reports, mental health and substance abuse assessments, and level of employment) will be utilized to place offenders into one of four classification levels: intensive, regular, case bank, and administrative. In recognition of the risk principle (Joplin et al., 2004), priority for services will be given to the offender population that poses the greatest risk for re-offending. Higher-risk offenders will receive priority for services in the criminogenic need areas that place them at the greatest risk for reoffending. Further, the results of the RMS, at an aggregate level, can also be utilized to determine the greatest criminogenic needs of the offenders for this district (e.g., employment, substance abuse treatment, etc.).

While the RMS still needs to be validated on the local population in Hawaii, it holds theoretical benefits over existing and widely used risk and need assessment instruments. Namely, the RMS goes beyond using overall risk score as the predictor of future offending. Instead, this tool matches individual offender assessments to past clients who have had RMS assessments and looks for similar scoring on items that make up a client's overall risk score to demonstrate how similarly situated offenders have performed under community supervision.

Quality assurance measures have been incorporated alongside the implementation of this instrument. Supervisors, along with supervising officers, have all been trained in the use of the RMS, so that supervisors are also available to perform periodic checks on inter-rater reliability. While the RMS will still need to be validated on the local population (Mitchel et al., 2002), validity cannot be assumed unless the instrument is reliably used.

Additionally, U.S. Probation, Hawaii needs to review the distribution of the supervised population to determine cutoff scores or other reliable criteria related to appropriate risk levels (e.g., low, medium, high, etc.). It has also been recommended that this district incorporate motivational interviewing into the current assessment of criminogenic risks and needs (Woodward, 2007), as this would increase the validity of the information about the offender.

Protocols concerning re-assessment, such as factors that should trigger a re-assessment, still need to be determined (Latessa et al., 2002).

Enhance Intrinsic Motivation

Supervisors and supervising officers have received initial training in the use of motivational interviewing (MI) from a leading expert in this field. The positive benefit of motivational interviewing has been demonstrated through research, and this recognition has also been a part of the organizational and philosophical change in the U.S. Probation Office, Hawaii . Encouraging offenders to perceive, intrinsically, the need to think about and do things differently (along with plans to help them do so) is key to promoting positive changes.

Beyond initial training, sustainability in the practice of MI is imperative for the long-term success of aggregate level reductions in recidivism and enhanced public safety. Therefore, this district will provide for train-the-trainer sessions so that staff will ultimately be able to conduct initial and refresher trainings with other staff. Potential trainers will need to pass through several outside, objective reviews of taped sessions and reach an accepted level of proficiency prior to training other staff.

While there is anecdotal evidence that many staff are positive about the use of MI, quality assurance measures will need to be finalized to ensure the continued use of this important practice. Supervisors are also being trained to recognize and evaluate the use of MI by staff. Once fully competent in MI, supervisors will be able to periodically audit the staffs' use of MI to determine appropriate usage. At this point, the district will incorporate these quality assurance measures to determine 1) whether staff are using MI in their daily work with offenders, and 2) whether MI is being applied appropriately. It should be noted that many vendors who provide direct services to offenders at a statewide level have not currently been trained on the use of MI.

Target Interventions

In line with EBP, the RMS assessment information will be utilized to determine case planning. Specifically, the top criminogenic need factors from the "Big Six" list (e.g., anti-social values, criminal peers, low self-control, dysfunctional family ties, substance abuse, and criminal personality) will be prioritized for treatment in an effort to net the largest reductions in recidivism (Taxman et al., 2004). This, along with other routinely collected information (e.g., pre-sentence or other relevant assessments, such as mental health assessments) will guide initial casework. Reassessments at regular intervals will also ensure that the best available data are used to continually work toward the best outcomes. The goal is getting the right offenders into the right programs or areas of intervention. Along with cognitive-based programs (described below) and attention to issues of responsibility, this will theoretically demonstrate the greatest net benefits in recidivism reduction (Matthews et al., 2001).

Further, our district is employing a coordinated and integrated system of case planning by creating multi-disciplinary, collaborative case management teams with a shared vision for goals and expected outcomes in offender management and reentry. This is also essential for the long-term success of the offender population, especially for those who may not travel a linear path through the system. For example, if an offender violates a condition of supervision, information related to assessments and work already completed will be shared with the other succeeding appropriate agencies. Further, progress in any institutional-based programs will be disseminated to supervising officers once the offender enters community supervision. This district will also relocate an officer to the Federal Detention Center in Honolulu to work with the institutional case management team toward proactive offender release planning. The move to collaborate and share information with the Federal Detention Center in Honolulu and a local reentry center, Mahoney Hale Residential Reentry Center, is an important step in strengthening efforts to promote greater opportunities for successful release and transition to the community.

U.S. Probation, Hawaii still needs to conduct an assessment of programs currently used in referrals for offenders. This should occur by means of an accepted mechanism such as the

Correctional Program Assessment Inventory or the Correctional Program Checklist (Woodward, 2007). Further, the district should create an inventory of existing programs to ensure that there are diverse levels of outside service referrals for the various levels of offender treatment needs (e.g., ensure that there are options for appropriate dosage and duration).

Skill Train with Directed Practice (COG Methods)

Research demonstrates that correctional practices and/or programs that incorporate cognitive-behavioral interventions as a base of treatment net the greatest overall reductions in recidivism (Gardner, 2002; Pearson et al., 2002). This reduction is best evidenced among the higher-risk populations, and may in fact be detrimental to low-risk offenders (Andrews et al., 1990; Andrews et al., 1986; Matthews et al., 2001; Latessa et al., 2002; Johnson et al., 2002; Lowenkamp and Latessa, 2004). Through work with The Change Companies of Carson City, Nevada, the U.S. Probation Office, District of Hawaii is utilizing an interactive journaling technique as one method for addressing the criminogenic needs of offenders through cognitive behavioral methods. Specifically, the Change Companies custom-designed journals (The Courage to Change Series) that align directly with the “Big Six” criminogenic need areas (identified through the RMS assessment), as well as other areas that have traditionally been associated with success in the community (e.g., group counseling, financial management, workforce development, etc.). Interventions that fail to target these important criminogenic areas are not likely to significantly affect recidivism (Lowenkamp and Latessa, 2004; Gendreau et al., 1996; Matthews et al., 2001; Latessa et al., 2002; Travis, 2000).

Once an offender has been assessed by the RMS, a classification officer will assign the offender to one of the four risk levels mentioned earlier. Upon assignment to a supervising officer, the offender and the officer will jointly view an interactive orientation video (in production) to develop an alliance and to discuss how community supervision will align with EBP. Theoretically, this process, which will also involve interactive journaling exercises between the offenders and their officers, will inform offenders of the necessity to change their biggest criminogenic needs and will advise them of how the supervising officer will work with them to achieve this change.

Once the offender is placed on a caseload, he or she is matched with journals that have been specifically designed to address the top criminogenic needs by the RMS assessment, and the intensity of the work should coincide with the level of risk (Matthews et al., 2001). Journals engage offenders to begin to understand thinking errors and use mental rehearsal and visual imagery to replace thinking errors, elements important for positive offender change and recidivism reduction (Matthews et al., 2001). Staff have also been trained in the use of cognitive behavioral therapy through interactive journaling so that they may better help the offender work through the process (Matthews et al., 2001).

The district is working to ensure that officers are using MI for the RMS assessment and that these results are embedded into case planning. An initial evaluation by Woodward (2007) found that the majority of cases subject to random review did not fully demonstrate the eight principles of EBP for offender supervision. Training for staff should continue until this shift is evidenced in the majority of work by this office.

Increase Positive Reinforcement

Research has demonstrated the value of positive over negative reinforcement in reducing offender recidivism (Joplin et al., 2004). Specifically, offenders should receive a ratio of four positive reinforcements to each negative one for the best results in offender change (Latessa et al., 2002). While staff have yet to formally incorporate this into their practice, they have been introduced to this concept through their initial trainings in MI. The final MI trainings for staff will reinforce the importance of this practice for offender change and will formalize this procedure into the repertoire of supervision practices.

Engage Ongoing Support in the Community

The U.S. Probation Office, District of Hawaii has been actively working on establishing relationships with local business owners and others in an effort to encourage the employment of offenders who are under supervision in the community. Several employers have positively responded to this outreach. To support the effort of increased employment opportunities for offenders, the district created the Ho'olana Offender Employment Program in August 2006. The goal of the program is to provide individual-level guidance and support by officers to assist offenders in pursuing and maintaining meaningful employment. Staff have been involved in referring offenders to the program, participating in an orientation meeting with prospective employers, networking and resource building with potential employers, and referring offenders for employment. Ideally, offenders will be able to obtain meaningful, full-time employment, earn at least \$8 per hour, and gain employment in a job where their interests are matched with their skills. Because of the need to demonstrate program effectiveness, the retention and reasons for attrition will be tracked for Ho'olana participants at regular intervals for one year.

U.S. Probation, Hawaii also collaborated with the local Building Industry Association (BIA) of Hawaii and the Federal Detention Center of Honolulu (Bureau of Prisons) in jointly developing an innovative pre-apprenticeship program. For the first time ever, the agencies mutually entered into a joint relationship and responsibility by implementing the Pre-Apprenticeship Construction Skills (PACS) Program. Under this program, developed by the Construction Training Center of the Pacific (CTC) to provide education and training to support the construction workforce in Hawaii, offenders at the detention center participate in a 150-hour pre-apprenticeship training program for 12 weeks. PACS combines applied mathematics and communication, safety, skills development, and job readiness courses to prepare individuals to enter the construction industry. The program can be conducted either in the Federal Detention Center or in the community.

The basis for the focus on unemployment or under-employment is the existing research that demonstrates that these factors are predictive of increased recidivism rates (Seiter and Kadela, 2003; Sampson and Laub, 2005; Uggen, 2000; Ekstrand, 2001; Gardner, 2002). An impressive amount of progress has been made in this area. However, the district needs to continue working within a broader engagement of community support, particularly support from the communities to which the offender will return and, often, the communities that gave rise to the offending in the first place.

Measure Relevant Processes/Practices

A foundation of evidence-based practices is the commitment to measure relevant processes, including the fidelity of specific programs or practices, as well as outcome measures (Joplin et al., 2001). Although U.S. Probation, Hawaii has not yet fully engaged this part of their model, there is an ongoing commitment to such measurement as part of the overall EBP model of community supervision. Funding is currently being sought to begin developing research methodology and to collect data and move toward the ability to 1) demonstrate the efficacy of this district's model in terms of desired outcomes, and 2) use data to guide current practices.

Part of the research agenda will be the incorporation of both qualitative and quantitative methods so that a broad-based, empirical understanding of both cross-sectional and longitudinal change may be measured. The research methodology will ensure that all relevant variables are both captured and operationalized sufficiently to allow for various types of data analyses relevant to the Hawaii Model.

Provide Measurement Feedback

Measurement feedback will naturally follow the measurement and analysis of relevant processes and practices. As mentioned above, U.S. Probation, Hawaii is currently working to formalize this part of their model. However, noteworthy is that as EBP practices have been incorporated along the way, the district has ensured that quality assurance measures are attached to new practices and trainings.

Organizational Development

Asking any organization to significantly alter the way it has traditionally done its work is a challenge that must be overcome prior to any successful implementation of even the most sound practices (DOJ, 2004a). Further, the move towards EBP requires firm commitment from the leadership of any organization. Without this, it will be difficult to correspondingly alter the manner in which an agency has traditionally functioned. It is important to note that in the U.S. Probation, District of Hawaii, the shift to an EBP model began from the top-down, but was also one in which the agency was doing more than merely imposing changes to current practices. The shift was, from the beginning, marked by a philosophical commitment to change and was one in which all staff, not just upper- or middle-management, were considered key stakeholders. The obvious benefit is that staff buy-in also started from the beginning and decision-making, at many levels, was a shared process.

Once the commitment to change was made, the district took several identifiably important steps. Among the most salient are the following:

- Staff meetings to review how all staff, including clerical, spend their time and how some superfluous duties might be eliminated or otherwise streamlined to make better use of existing resources in anticipation of extra time required to work within an EPB framework;
- Hiring of new staff to support the EBP framework;
- Contracting the services of an expert in correctional evidence-based organizational development;
- Staff performance to be periodically evaluated based on EBP supervision and service delivery;
- Focus on morale through less hierarchical and more inclusive organizational structure, including assigning staff to various projects and providing for staff input;
- Open communication involving information and/or continuing education of staff as to both why and what is being changed; and
- Transparency of the entire shift from traditional compliance-based to EPB, outcome-based supervision.

So far, anecdotal evidence points to an improved level of morale, likely due to the collegiality and teamwork incorporated in the organizational shift. The transparency of the changes also ensures that no one has to speculate regarding what is being changed or *why* it is being changed. Further, measures have been put in place to increase buy-in of more resistant staff (e.g., assignment of projects) and for ambivalent staff (e.g., frequent meetings in which questions and input are encouraged). The district also plans to continue the informational process through such practices as EBP brown bag lunches. These have all been identified as important steps in organizational development and the need to continually manage change (Joplin et al., 2004). The attention to staff has been noted as beneficial to an effective organizational culture (Latessa et al., 2002).

The district has also been engaged in other innovative components likely to positively impact the overall organizational structure. It is in the preliminary stages of developing a sanctions/violations court. Several probation teams comprised of managers, supervisors, and officers traveled to three different states, primarily to gather information on other similar courts. Theoretically, the program would address the offender's likelihood of successful rehabilitation through a comprehensive, judicially supervised program of community supervision, mandatory drug testing, treatment services, program compliance, and immediate and appropriate (graduated) sanctions and incentives. Target offenders will be those who are not performing as expected in the community but who may do well without being revoked and sentenced to a prison term.

Collaboration

The U.S. Probation Office, District of Hawaii has made impressive efforts to collaborate with a broad range of agencies and individuals who have positively supported their evidence-based reentry initiatives. From 2005-2008, the district has focused on forming successful collaborations with federal law enforcement agencies as well as state and local agencies in developing a

coalition of potential stakeholders. Such collaboration can aid in buy-in from both external and internal staff during the organizational development stage (Joplin et al., 2004).

On July 9, 2007, the district hosted the Offender Reentry Pilot Project Stakeholders Meeting. Over 70 representatives from federal, state, county, city, and community agencies participated in the meeting to engage collaboratively to support the establishment of a comprehensive Offender Reentry Pilot Project. At the conclusion of the meeting, stakeholders agreed to identify common goals/principles and desired outcomes for the reentry effort. Since then, there have been ongoing meetings between agencies to develop Memorandums of Understanding and to continue to address and support the identified goals of the reentry initiatives. Future stakeholders meetings are being planned.

Collaboration is also taking place at the national level. The district has collaborated with other districts in sharing information and attending training on use of the Risk Management System (RMS) assessment tool and in developing the Courage to Change Interactive Journaling series. Further, our district hopes that documentation of the current model will help other jurisdictions that also desire to significantly change how they deliver services.

Summary and Discussion

Table 1 summarizes the more salient aspects of the U.S. Probation Office, District of Hawaii EPB Model. Although not yet fully implemented, the district’s EBP program is very close and it must be stressed that these accomplishments have been achieved in a relatively short period, less than three years.

Table 1: Summary of the Hawaii EBP Model

Evidence-Based Principles	
Assess Actuarial Risk/Needs	The Risk Management System (RMS) was chosen as the instrument to assess offenders = static and dynamic criminogenic risks and needs.
Enhance Intrinsic Motivation	Supervisors and supervising officers have received trainings in motivational interviewing.
Target Interventions	Results of the RMS assessment are used to determine intervention areas based on the greatest criminogenic risks and needs. Use of a multi-agency, collaborative case plan approach.
Skill Train with Directed Practice	The RMS assessment identifies the “Big Six” and other criminogenic risk and need factors. These factors are used to target interventions using cognitive-based interactive journaling from the Courage to Change series for all major risk/need categories.
Increase Positive Reinforcement	Staff have been introduced to the 4:1 ratio of positive to negative reinforcement through their initial MI training.
Engage Ongoing Support in the Community	Support in the community has thus far centered on fostering relationships with employment agencies or training centers that are willing to work with the offender population. An intensive employment

	readiness program has also been activated.
Measure Relevant Processes and Practices	Process and outcome measures are being developed and will be incorporated in Change Companies Interactive Journaling System. The district is currently contracting with an outside consultant to help set up a research methodology for all current practices, including process and outcome measures.
Provide Measurement Feedback	Measurement feedback will ultimately follow the measurement of relevant processes and practices and will be part of the overall methodological design. The commitment has been made to not only employ evidence-based practices, but to ensure that practices put in place are data-driven.
Organizational Development	Organizational (re)development has included the following salient practices: shared philosophical change support staff; identification and elimination of unnecessary work to free resources; contract with EBP and organizational development coach; hire new staff; continuing information and educative sessions for staff, and changing performance reviews of existing staff.
Collaboration	Hosted an Offender Reentry Pilot Project Stakeholders Meeting in July 07 with representatives from federal, state, county, city, and community agencies to gain a shared vision and understanding of successful offender reentry. Also collaboration with other jurisdictions, university faculty, and other consultants in the area of EBP.

The work of U.S. Probation in the District of Hawaii, resulting in what we have termed the Hawaii Model, is encouraging and provides a promising model for other districts to follow. A significant amount of work has been accomplished in a period of under three years and the model is very close to full implementation at this time. One of the readily applicable lessons learned from the work in this district is that the move toward EBP can be realistically accomplished when accompanied by a firm and genuine commitment and attention to organizational development and collaboration as key components.

While the level of work is thus far commendable, efforts still need to be centered on the last two of the eight principles, specifically measuring relevant processes and practices and providing measurement feedback. The district is, however, proactively working towards that end and is in the process of contracting services to set up an evaluation plan, including the tracking of both process and outcome measures, and setting up a feedback system whereby relevant outcomes are filtered to staff to further inform their services.

It should be stressed that this article presents a reductionist view of the pervasive changes the district has incorporated thus far. Any change of this magnitude requires significant work and a strong commitment, as noted by the title of an upcoming workshop that several Hawaii staff will be attending, namely, “EBP Ain’t for Sissies” (neither are Performance-Based Measures). This is hard work on many levels, and it should be stressed that this not a “soft on crime” approach. Instead, it is one that seeks to reduce crime by embracing and embedding EBP practices as a

means to meet mission-critical objectives and blend them into a systematic application. At the same time, it honors the principle identified in the U.S. Probation and Pretrial Services Charter for Excellence, i.e., “outcome driven, strive to make our communities safer, and to make a positive difference in the lives of those we serve.”

Notwithstanding that the Hawaii Model is still a work in progress, the district has managed to accomplish major philosophical shifts as well as tangible changes to practice in this short time frame. The changes outlined above can serve as a model to other districts or agencies who also wish to shift to an evidence-based standard of practice. The district has succeeded in crafting a very promising model that has incorporated or is incorporating, at some level, all of the evidence-based practices currently recognized as having the most significant impact on recidivism, including organizational development and collaboration. Since federal corrections populations have typically not been included in the “what works” research and related literature, the work in the U.S. Probation Office, District of Hawaii provides an excellent opportunity to study the efficacy of an EBP model on a community correctional population within the Federal System.

[back to top](#)

[References](#) | [Endnotes](#)

The articles and reviews that appear in *Federal Probation* express the points of view of the persons who wrote them and not necessarily the points of view of the agencies and organizations with which these persons are affiliated. Moreover, *Federal Probation's* publication of the articles and review is not to be taken as an endorsement of the material by the editors, the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, or the Federal Probation and Pretrial Services System.

Published by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts www.uscourts.gov
[Publishing Information](#)

Taxman, F., Shepardson, E., & Byrne, J. (2004). *Tools of the trade: A guide for incorporating science into practice*. Washington, D.C.: Community Corrections Division, National Institute of Corrections.

Walters, S.T., Clark, M.D., Gingerich, R., and Meltzer, M.L. (2006). *Motivating offenders to change: A guide for probation and parole*. National Institute of Corrections.

Constructing an EBP Post-Conviction Model of Supervision in United States Probation, District of Hawaii: A Case Study

Andrews, D.A., Kiessling, J.J., Robinson, D., and Mickus, S. (1986). "The Risk Principle of Case Classification: An Outcome Evaluation with Young Probationers" in *Canadian Journal of Criminology* 36: 377-384.

Andrews, D.A., Bonta, J., and Hoge, R.D. (1990). "Classification for Effective Rehabilitation: Rediscovering Psychology" in *Criminal Justice & Behavior* 17: 19-52. Austin, J. (2003). *Findings in Prison Classification and Risk Assessment*. National Institute of Corrections.

Byrne, J.M. (2006). *Assessing the Role of Clinical and Actuarial Risk Assessment in an Evidence-Based Community Corrections System: Issues to Consider*. Federal Probation Newsletter, September 2006.

Crime and Justice Institute. (2006). *Evidence-Based Practices: A Framework for Sentencing Policy*. Located at:
www.maine.gov/corrections/caac/SupMat/FinalReportSentencingPracticesSubcommitteeForPrinting.pdf

Cullen, F.T., and Gendreau, P. (2001). "From Nothing Works to What Works: Changing Professional Ideology in the 21 st Century" in *The Prison Journal* 81:313-338.

Department of Justice. (2004a). *Implementing Evidence-Based Practice in Community Corrections: The principles of Effective Intervention*. Department of Justice, Crime & Justice Institute. No author listed.

Department of Justice. (2004b). *Implementing Evidence-Based Practice in Community Corrections: Leading Organizational Change and Development*. Department of Justice, Crime & Justice Institute. No author listed.

Department of Justice. (2004c). *Implementing Evidence-Based Practice in Community Corrections: Collaboration for Systemic Change in the Criminal Justice System*. Department of Justice, Crime & Justice Institute. No author listed.

Dow, E., Jones, C., and Mott, J. (2005). "An Empirical Modeling Approach to Recidivism Classification" in *Criminal Justice & Behavior* 32:223-247.

Ekstrand, Laurie E. (2001). *Prisoner Releases:Trends and Information on Reintegration Programs*. United States General Accounting Office.

Gardner, S. (2002). "From Prison to Home: Reentering the Community" in *Research in Review* 5: 4-12. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Department of Corrections.

Gendreau, P., Little, T., Goggin, C. (1996). "A Meta-Analysis of the Predictors of Adult Offender Recidivism: What Works!" in *Criminology* 34:575-607.

Gottfredson, M.R. (2005). "Offender Classifications and Treatment Effects in Developmental Criminology: A Propensity/Event Consideration" in *The Annals of the American Academy* 602:46-56.

Gregoire, N.B. (2006). "Evidence-Based Practices: How Do They Fit in the Federal System?" in *News & Views*, 1-4.

- Holsinger, A.M., Lurigio, A.J., and Latessa E.J. (2001). "Practitioners' Guide to Understanding the Basis of Assessing Offender Risk" in *Federal Probation* 65: 46-51.
- Johnson, K. D., Austin, J., and Davies, G. (2002). *Low-Risk Offenders: Is it a Good Investment?* The Institute on Crime, Justice, and Corrections, Submitted to the National Institute of Justice.
- Jones, D. A., Johnson, S., Latessa, E., and Travis, L.F. (1999). "Case Classification in Community Corrections: Preliminary Findings from a National Survey" in *Topics in Community Corrections*, 4-10. National Institute of Corrections.
- Joplin, L., Bogue, B., Campbell, N., Carey, M., Clawson, E., Faust, D., Florio, K., Wasson, B., and Woodward, W. (2004). "Using an Integrated Model to Implement Evidence-Based Practices in Corrections." Publication of the International Community Corrections Association and American Correctional Association.
- Latessa, E.T., Cullen, F.T., and Gendreau, P. (2002). "Beyond Correctional Quackery-Professionalism and the Possibility of Effective Treatment" in *Federal Probation* 2:43-50.
- Lowenkamp, C. T. and Latessa, E.J. (2004). "Understanding the Risk Principle: How and Why Correctional Interventions Can Harm Low-Risk Offenders" in *Topics in Community Corrections*, 3-8. National Institute of Corrections.
- Matthews, B., Hubbard, D.J., and Latessa, E. (2001). "Making the Next Step: Using Evaluability Assessment to Improve Correctional Programming" in *The Prison Journal* 81:454-472.
- Mitchel, C., Parent, D.G., & Barnett, L. (2002). *Transition from Prison to Community Initiative*. National Institute of Corrections & Abt Associates Inc.
- Modeling Systems, LLC. (2007). Risk Management System Users Manual. Modeling Solutions, LLC.
- Pearson, F.S., Lipton, D.S., Cleland, C.M., and Yee, D.S. (2002). "The Effects of Behavioral/Cognitive-Behavioral Programs on Recidivism" in *Crime & Delinquency* 48: 476-496.
- Petersilia, J. (2003). *When Prisoners Come Home: Parole and Prisoner Reentry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sampson, R.J. and Laub, J.H. (2005). "A Life-Course View of the Development of Crime" in *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* 602:12-45.
- Seiter, R. P., Karen R. Kadela (2003). "Prisoner Reentry: What Works, What Does Not, and What is Promising" in *Crime & Delinquency* 49:360-388.
- Simon, J. (1993). *Poor Discipline: Control of the Underclass*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Taxman, F.S., Shepardson, E.S., and Byrne, J.M. (2004). *Tools of the Trade: A Guide to Incorporating Science into Practice*. National Institute of Corrections, U.S. Department of Justice and Maryland Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services.
- Travis (2000). "But They All Come Back: Rethinking Prisoner Reentry" *Sentencing and Corrections: Issues for the 21 st Century*. National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice.
- Uggen, C. (2000). "Work as a Turning Point in the Life Course of Criminals: A Duration Model of Age, Employment, and Recidivism" in *American Sociological Review* 67:529-546.
- White, T.F. (2005). *Re-Engineering Probation Towards Greater Public Safety: A Framework for Recidivism Reduction Through Evidence-Based Practice*. Court Support Services Division, State

of Connecticut, Judicial Branch.

Woodward, W. (2007). *Report of Evidence-Based Principles: Findings and Recommendations*. William Woodward Associates, LLC, Report to the District of Hawaii United States Probation Office.

Organizational Change in the Heartland of Opportunity

Alston, Kathleen H., Thompson, Michael J., "Adaptability: The Hallmark of a Good Probation/Pretrial Services Supervisor in the 1990s," *Federal Probation*,

Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., March 1996.

Barker, Joel Arthur, *Paradigms - The Business of Discovering the Future*, Harper Collins, New York, NY, 1992.

Block, Peter, *The Empowered Manager*, Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers, San Francisco, CA, 1987.

Block, Peter, *Stewardship*, Berrett-Koehler Publishers, San Francisco, CA, 1993.

Bogue, Campbell, Carey, Clawson, Faust, Florio, Joplin, Keiser, Wasson, Woodward; *Implementing Evidence-Based Principles in Community Corrections: Leading Organizational Change and Development*, National Institute of Corrections, Community Corrections Division; Crime and Justice Institute; 2004.

Charvaria, Frederick R., "Building Synergy in Probation," *Federal Probation*,

Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., September 1994.

Conger, Jay A., "How Generational Shifts Will Transform Organizational Life," in *The Organization of the Future*, The Drucker Foundation Future Series, Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers, San Francisco, CA, 1997.

Covey, Stephen, R., *Principle-Centered Leadership*, Simon & Schuster, New York, NY, 1991.

DePree, Max, *Leadership is an Art*, Dell Publishing, New York, NY, 1989.

Fisher, Kimball, *Leading Self-Directed Work Teams*, McGraw-Hill, New York, NY, 2000.

Gardner, John W., *On Leadership*, The Free Press, New York, NY, 1990.

Hamel, Gary, *The Future of Management*, Harvard Business School Press, Boston, MA, 2007.

Harmon, Frederick G., "Future Present," in *The Organization of the Future*, The Drucker Foundation Future Series, Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers, San Francisco, CA, 1997.

Kotter, John P., "Leading Change: Why Transformation Efforts Fail," *Harvard Business Review*, Harvard Business School Publishing Corporation, Boston, MA, March-April 1995.

Kotter, John P., *The Heart of Change*, Harvard Business School Press, Boston, MA, 2002.

Kouzes, James M.; Posner, Barry Z., *The Leadership Challenge*, Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco, CA, 1987.

Maxwell, John C., *The 21 Irrefutable Laws of Leadership*, Thomas Nelson Publishers,

Nashville, TN, 1998.

Zemke, Ron; Raines, Claire; Filipczak, Bob; *Generations at Work*, AMACOM, New York, NY, 2000.