

Effectiveness of Community Supervision: Incorporating Evidence-Based Practices into a Nation's Obsession with Supervision

by Haley Tiernan and April N. Terry*

Introduction

In the United States, community-based supervision is a regularly used alternative to incarceration, and in the past several decades, the community corrections population has experienced major growth (DeMichele & Payne, 2007). Probation has been one of the fastest growing practices in the criminal justice system, with 3,053,700 people being on probation at the end of 2020 (U.S. Department of Justice, 2021). Probation may be offered if the instant offense, coupled with the offending party's criminal history, does not warrant incarceration.

cognitive behavioral therapies, and attention to compliance issues through sanctions and rewards (Blasko et al., 2022).

Literature Review

From Nothing Works to What Works. Much like knowledge in other disciplines, research in the field of corrections has evolved over the past several decades. Historically, some officers have supported more emphasis on monitoring and enforcement rather than on attempts to change the probationer's behavior (Viglione, 2019). In 1974, Robert Martinson produced a provocative

to reduce recidivism (Labrecque & Smith, 2017). The risk principle measures the chances or prediction that a person will commit another offense; the need principle suggests that programs should target criminogenic needs to reduce the risk of reoffense; and the responsivity principle offers guidance on how to provide the treatment or programming within the need principle to reduce risk (Viglione, 2019). The RNR model is used to guide the findings of an actuarial assessment to appropriately match the treatment for the probationer (Viglione, 2019). For the risk principle, one should use a reliable and validated risk assessment instrument to assess the probability of future criminal behavior. Next, the risk principle says that the assessed risk level should be matched to the appropriate dosage of treatment/programming (Viglione, 2019). Moderate- and high-risk clients should receive more treatment and services than low-risk clients (Labrecque & Smith, 2017).

This model's approach is to rehabilitate the client rather than use a punishment-oriented response (Viglione, 2019). Case plans that adhere to this model show lower recidivism rates in all types of offending populations, with some studies finding reductions of 10% to 50% (Dyck, Campbell & Wershler, 2018). Although failure to use the RNR model for moderate- and high-risk caseloads can result in increased recidivism for these clients (Labrecque & Viglione, 2021), research has also shown that providing a high level of treatment to low-risk clients can increase recidivism for this specific group (Viglione, 2019)—that is, more harm can be done by issuing too much treatment/programming to low-risk clients (Andrews, Bonta & Hoge, 1990; Andrews, Bonta & Wormith, 2011). The third RNR principle, the need principle, focuses on the identification of, and targeted intervention toward, criminogenic dynamic needs driving criminal behavior (Dyck, Campbell & Wershler, 2018).

Dynamic risk factors are areas of one's life that can change. Andrews, Bonta & Hoge (1990)—the scholars who (along with others) initially created the RNR model—identified

See *SUPERVISION*, page 19

Probation has been one of the fastest growing practices in the criminal justice system, with 3,053,700 people being on probation at the end of 2020.

In other cases, probation may be granted because of outside variables, such as prison overcrowding (Hyatt & Barnes, 2017). Scholars have attempted to understand the relative effectiveness of community supervision (Bonta et al., 2008), which is usually measured as an individual's completion of probation without reoffending. This definition alone, however, cannot account for variables such as the probationer's motivation or personality, for individual characteristics of the probation officer such as training, expertise, and use and adherence to evidence-based practices, or even for an agency's practice of specialized caseloads (Blasko et al., 2016). Evidence-based practices are formed by rigorous research that should then guide policy and practice decisions (Blasko et al., 2016). Evidence-based supervision typically includes the use of a risk and needs assessment, case planning,

correctional piece claiming that prison reform, specifically correctional programming, was grossly unproductive and did not result in the rehabilitation of the offending population. For example, Martinson (1974) said that even if providing education and vocational training could help incarcerated populations upon release, there was little empirical evidence to show that it affected recidivism. Similar claims were made regarding the impact of counseling, and the reviewed studies were said to lack support for the rehabilitative method. Martinson believed that sanctioning behavior would markedly reduce criminal behavior and suggested that time and money be spent on methods of deterrence (Martinson, 1974). Later scholars who attempted to replicate his work, however, found that the studies he reviewed were flawed, with, for example, incomplete theory and a lack of credible data (Sarre, 2001). Consequently, researchers began to isolate programs and to identify those that were effective if delivered as intended.

Although punishment-based supervision lacks consideration for addressing the needs of the client, the risk-need-responsivity (RNR) model seeks to provide interventions

*Haley Tiernan, B.S., graduated with honors from the Criminal Justice Department at Fort Hays State University, in Hays, Kansas. April N. Terry, Ph.D., is an associate professor in the Criminal Justice Department at Fort Hays State University. She can be reached by email at anterry2@fhsu.edu.

the “Central Eight” risk factors most predictive of reoffending. These risk factors are:

1. A history of antisocial/criminal behavior;
2. Antisocial personality;
3. Antisocial cognition;
4. Antisocial associates;
5. Problematic family/marital circumstances;
6. Problems at school/work;
7. Problematic leisure/recreation activities; and
8. Substance use (Dyck, Campbell & Wershler, 2018; Viglione, 2019).

The first four of these risk factors (the “Big Four”) are most predictive of criminal behavior: antisocial/criminal behavior, antisocial personality, antisocial cognition, and antisocial associates). The Big Four should drive the focus of probation appointments and correctional interventions because focusing on these risk factors has been shown to provide the greatest reduction in recidivism (Andrews, Bonta & Hoge, 1990; Bonta et al., 2011).

As noted above, the responsivity principle gives guidance on how to overcome barriers to increase the likelihood that treatment/programming will be successful (Dyck, Campbell & Wershler, 2018). This principle is broken down into general and specific responsivity (Viglione, 2019). General responsivity suggests that cognitive behavioral therapy and social learning techniques are most effective in causing behavioral change for individuals in the aggregate (Chadwick, Dewolf & Serin, 2015; Dyck, Campbell & Wershler, 2018; Viglione, 2019). The responsivity principle also encourages providers to consider the learning styles and abilities of the client to determine the best treatment style and delivery (Viglione, 2019). In specific responsivity, it is recommended that staff adapt treatments to fit the client’s specific and/or unique characteristics and needs (e.g., addressing mental illness) (Viglione, 2019).

Although the responsivity principle is important within the RNR model, it has received the least empirical attention (Dyck, Campbell & Wershler, 2018). However, being mindful of the responsivity principle can help providers engage difficult-to-reach clients (e.g., those with developmental delays or cognitive impairments) in meaningful supervision appointments. Overall, adhering to the RNR model in case planning results in reductions in recidivism (Dyck, Campbell & Wershler, 2018; Viglione, 2019).

A final component included in the RNR model is the notion of fidelity. Fidelity seeks

to ensure that implementation of evidence-based practices is conducted as supported in the research (Sperber, 2020). In other words, these principles call attention to the importance of implementing programs in the manner in which they were designed (Sperber, 2020). Research shows that programs and staff lacking the fidelity principle produce inferior results compared to those that have strong fidelity (Sperber, 2020). For example, Lowenkamp, Latessa, and Smith (2006) examined data from residential correctional programs for adults and found a relationship between poor program fidelity and reincarceration after program release. Similar results have also been found for the juvenile justice system. Schoenwald et al. (2003), studying youth and their families served by different therapists, found that therapist adherence to the model predicted successful completion of treatment as well

models found that supervision guided by the RNR model showed a 16% reduction in recidivism compared to supervision not adhering to the RNR model (Blasko et al., 2022). These findings also suggested that the characteristics of the probation officer influenced recidivism. Another meta-analysis found that when officers are trained on core correctional practices—a set of skills that are shown to increase community supervision efficacy—their clients demonstrate reductions in recidivism (Chadwick, Dewolf & Serin, 2015).

Effective Supervision Practices.

Historically, community supervision adhered to a more law enforcement-centered approach focused on compliance conditions only, an approach that was shown to be ineffective at reducing recidivism (Labrecque & Smith, 2017). Community supervision can be a complex task, based on the unique characteristics

When officers are trained on core correctional practices—a set of skills that are shown to increase community supervision efficacy—their clients demonstrate reductions in recidivism.

as reductions in negative behaviors both immediately following treatment as well as four years post-treatment (Schoenwald et al., 2003, 2010). In other words, recidivism is higher when there is low fidelity.

Recidivism for Probationers.

Supervision is extremely complex because it can focus on monitoring individuals, enforcing court requirements, ensuring public safety, and reducing recidivism (Smith et al., 2018). If individuals are on intensive supervision probation (ISP), they will likely experience more contact visits with their officer, increased drug testing, more stringent curfew requirements, and a zero-tolerance policy toward minor infractions (e.g., visiting an establishment that sells alcohol) (Hyatt & Barnes, 2017). These conditions result in more technical violations and increased levels of incarceration (Hyatt & Barnes, 2017). A technical violation occurs when a client does not comply with the conditions of supervision (e.g., failing a drug test) (National Conference of State Legislatures, 2023).

Trotter (2013) found that when probation officers used evidence-based practices, recidivism rates declined. Trotter’s (2013) definition of recidivism included rearrest, reconviction, further offense, or failing to abide by the conditions of the court order. A meta-analysis of effective supervision

of each client (Smith et al., 2018). Therefore, using actuarial risk assessments and adhering to the RNR model with a focus on criminogenic risk factors is the best approach (Smith et al., 2018). In addition to addressing the “Central Eight” criminogenic risk factors, core correctional practices can also lead to a reduction in recidivism. These practices include:

- Relationship skills;
- Anticriminal (prosocial) modeling;
- Structured learning;
- Cognitive restructuring;
- Problem solving;
- Effective reinforcement;
- Effective disapproval; and
- Effective use of authority (Dowden & Andrews, 2000; Trotter, 2013).

Prosocial modeling and reinforcement are skills that are consistently related to reducing recidivism in the offending population (Trotter, 2013). Research suggests that use of these skills is the most frequently used method of change in clients and is related to reductions in recidivism and sustained change (Bonta et al., 2008; Trotter, 2013). Anticriminal modeling focuses on fairness, reliability, and a noncriminal lifestyle and supports activities that reflect those principles (Trotter, 2013).

See *SUPERVISION*, next page

This approach also challenges the individual's comments and actions, changing antisocial mindsets into prosocial ones (Trotter, 2013). Doing this provides a concrete direction for change, and having probation officers who are trained in prosocial modeling can make a difference in client probation outcomes (Bonta et al., 2008).

Evidence-Based Programs.

Research has found that probation officers rarely use assessment information for their clients and generally make mostly restrictive decisions (Labrecque & Viglione, 2021). In response to this research, some community supervision programs have implemented core correctional practices and other evidence-based programs (Labrecque & Viglione, 2021). Some of these programs include the Proactive Community Supervision model (PCS), the Strategic Training Initiative in Community Supervision model (STICS), the Effective Practices in Community Supervision model (EPICS), and the Staff Training Aimed at Reducing Rearrest (STARR) model (Labrecque & Smith, 2017; Labrecque & Viglione, 2021). The content of these programs varies, but all are built on the same learning theories and cognitive behavioral programming and have relatively the same goals. The goals are to increase the officer's adherence to the principles of effective intervention to reduce recidivism for clients (Labrecque & Viglione, 2021). Officers should also apply the RNR principles (Labrecque & Smith, 2017). After the initial training, many programs include coaching sessions where the officers are encouraged to talk about the concepts and skills to further reinforce learning (Labrecque & Smith, 2017). This is helpful because learned skills may diminish when the knowledge learned is transferred into the "real world" of their job (Labrecque & Smith, 2017). Additionally, training alone may not change staff attitudes and behavior, but coaching and feedback might. The results of these coaching sessions lead to the sustained use of effective supervision skills that will enhance the quality of service, improve client motivation, help develop a strong client relationship, and use resources for the improvement of structured supervision sessions (Chadwick, Dewolf & Serin, 2015).

Training Supervision Officers.

Training staff and ensuring that they maintain fidelity affects probationers' outcomes (Trotter, 2013). Probation officers often have full and demanding caseloads, and there may not be enough resources for officers to effectively supervise each client (Chadwick, Dewolf & Serin, 2015).

Failure to have an organized structure for each meeting can result in a reduction in the success rates for supervision completion (Chadwick, Dewolf & Serin, 2015). Building and maintaining a collaborative relationship is pivotal for probationers and probation staff (Smith et al., 2018). Focusing on collaboration, client goals, and strengths, and having a sense of meaning is more important than focusing on compliance conditions alone (Trotter, 2013).

Key positive officer characteristics include warmth, empathy, likability, and respect (Smith et al., 2018). These characteristics can help form a connection in the client-officer relationship and make a strong bond (Smith et al., 2018). Because probation officers' caseloads are so full, they often focus only on the conditions of each client's probation, rather than on trying to form a relationship (Chadwick, Dewolf & Serin, 2015). It is essential to promote communication and motivational interviewing in contact with their clients (Blasko et al., 2022). While forming a quality relationship with the client, officers still need to balance the goals of care and control (Labrecque & Smith, 2017). Staff may believe they cannot serve in both the helper role and the accountability role at the same time, but research finds that they are most effective when moving between these roles (Skeem et al., 2007). This balancing approach, or "dual role," can also be seen in programs noted above, such as EPICS.

Policy Suggestions

Policy One Implication. When the "get tough" movement emerged in the criminal justice system, probation shifted toward a more punitive, control-oriented model of supervision (Viglione, 2019). Within this model, probation officers focused more on monitoring and enforcement in their supervision strategies rather than on attempting to influence behavioral change in probationers (Viglione, 2019). After several decades of using this model of supervision, increased attention focused on the ineffectiveness of this approach led to a resurgence in rehabilitative practices for probation (Viglione, 2019). Throughout the last decade, there have been several approaches to improve probation effectiveness that focus on using the principles of effective intervention (Labrecque & Smith, 2017).

Research suggests that probation officers do not always use risk assessments at the beginning of a client's probation sentence (Labrecque & Viglione, 2021). The risk assessments are based on the RNR model, which is used to generate effective interventions for those on supervision, with the goal

of aligning evidence-based treatment with criminogenic risk and the need to reduce recidivism (Viglione, 2019). Using the RNR model to create and execute a case plan for clients is in line with established evidence-based practices. A major aim of using this model to conduct assessments is to understand a client's needs, concerns, and attitudes that may negatively influence his or her behavior (Smith et al., 2018). Once the officer knows those criminogenic needs, evidence-based practices can be used to help rehabilitate the client and reduce recidivism.

Probationers make up the largest share of the correctional population in the United States (Turner, Scheyett & Allen, 2022), with 3.5 million people on probation in any given year. Therefore, many officers have high caseloads (DeMichele & Payne, 2007; Turner, Scheyett & Allen, 2022). Reducing caseloads for officers, as well as implementing evidence-based practices, can reduce recidivism (Turner, Scheyett & Allen, 2022). Although reducing caseloads may be a challenge, agencies could hire more officers, reduce probation lengths for clients, require fewer conditions of clients, have risk-based caseloads, and have alternative sanctions for low-risk clients. Using evidence-based practices for clients will increase their success during supervision and enable them to stay out of the criminal justice system in the future (Turner, Scheyett & Allen, 2022).

Policy One Strengths and Limitations. There are many strengths in using evidence-based practices for probationers. Adhering to the RNR model and core correctional practices has been shown to have the greatest impact on recidivism (Sperber, 2020). Using evidence-based practices for probationers can produce better outcomes, which may keep clients from being reincarcerated. This can lead to fiscal savings for stakeholders (Chadwick, Dewolf & Serin, 2015). In sum, if probation is successfully completed, communities will be safer, and a reduction in the overcrowding in jails and prison will save money.

Although using evidence-based practices is advantageous, some limitations may exist. To ensure fidelity to these practices, agencies need systems and procedures to code, store, analyze, and report fidelity data, but they may not have such systems or trained and available staff in place (Sperber, 2020). Evidence-based practices also take time to create a widespread routine (Prendergast, 2011). In addition, it takes time to discard discredited treatments, and the transition to using evidence-based practices requires significant adjustments, such as changing

See *SUPERVISION*, next page

the agency's mission and goals and changing staff members' daily routines (Boppre, Sundt & Salisbury, 2018). Probation officers might not be ready for change, and it will also take time for the officers to learn evidence-based practices and implement them in their work with their clients.

Policy Two Implication. In addition to structuring supervision around the RNR model, officers should also be trained in core correctional practices. There is a growing body of research showing that having officers trained in correctional supervision programs is associated with the increased use of evidence-based practices and lower rates of recidivism (Labrecque & Viglione, 2021). Community supervision officer training programs generally focus on three outcome categories: client interactions, officer use of core correctional practices, and recidivism (Labrecque & Viglione, 2021). It is the officers' job to achieve more than compliance-based conversations and responses by also helping to rehabilitate clients as much as they can, so that clients can successfully complete supervision.

Specific community supervision models such as STICS, EPICS, PCS, and STARR should be required for probation officers (Labrecque & Smith, 2017; Labrecque & Viglione, 2021). Each program applies the principles of the RNR model within the context of the individual case management meeting between the officer and probationer (Labrecque & Smith, 2017). These programs also help to improve the relationship between the officer and client and have been shown to reduce recidivism.

Community supervision programs work to manage the dual roles of the probation officer of balancing the needs of rehabilitating the client while protecting the community (Labrecque & Smith, 2017). These community supervision models help officers build quality relationships with their clients as well as balance the goals of care and control (Labrecque & Smith, 2017). Officers who go through these trainings must pay attention to how these programs are implemented in the real world (Labrecque & Smith, 2017). To ensure effectiveness, coaching sessions should be included after the initial trainings are done (Labrecque & Smith, 2017).

Studies on the effectiveness of such programs have included comparisons of those who are trained in the curriculum and those who are not. Trained officers are more likely than untrained officers to talk about criminogenic needs and less likely to talk about noncriminogenic needs (Labrecque & Viglione, 2021). As Bonta et al. (2008)

found, probation staff who spent too much time on the enforcement of compliance conditions had clients with higher recidivism rates than those who focused on criminogenic needs (Bonta et al., 2008). Additionally, after being trained, officers do not focus on the conditions of probation for their clients as much as they focus on areas of need. Trained officers are more likely to effectively structure their meetings with their clients using bridging skills, applying relationship-building strategies, and implementing cognitive behavioral techniques (Labrecque & Viglione, 2021).

Clients of officers trained in the PCS model had lower rates of rearrest (30% vs. 42%) and fewer technical violations (35% vs. 40%) (Labrecque & Viglione, 2021). In one study, officers who were trained in the STICS model showed a 16% reduction in new conviction rates for their clients (Labrecque & Viglione, 2021). Clients who were supervised by officers trained in the EPICS model were also less likely to be reincarcerated or arrested for a new offense (Labrecque & Viglione, 2021). Finally, officers who were trained in the STARR model showed an 8% decrease in one-year recidivism rates among their clients. The clients were also less likely to have their probation revoked for a new crime (Labrecque & Viglione, 2021). A meta-analysis concluded that, on average, officer training in these programs was associated with a 14% reduction in client recidivism (Chadwick, Dewolf & Serin, 2015; Labrecque & Viglione, 2021).

Policy Two Strengths and Limitations. There are many strengths to requiring that probation officers be trained in core correctional practices. One strength is that research has indicated that when probation officers are trained in core correctional practices, the clients reoffend at lower rates (Chadwick, Dewolf & Serin, 2015; Labrecque & Viglione, 2021). Research also shows that those who implement any of these training programs are better equipped to handle higher risk clients (Chadwick, Dewolf & Serin, 2015). If officers can successfully handle higher risk clients, more people might be released from correctional institutions. This could help reduce the overcrowding issue in jails and prisons as well as result in substantial fiscal savings (Chadwick, Dewolf & Serin, 2015).

Although it may seem that utilizing community supervision officer training programs is an effective approach to reducing recidivism, there are some limitations. One challenge is that trained officers might apply the skills to all, some, or none of their client interactions, and that there may be variation in the quality of their skill usage (Labrecque

& Viglione, 2021). Another related challenge is figuring out how to increase officer adherence to the core correctional practices beyond what is attained through the training programs alone (Labrecque & Viglione, 2021). A supervisor, director, another officer, and so forth, will not be able to attend each supervision meeting to ensure fidelity to the core correctional practices; however, some cognitive behavioral programs (e.g., EPICS) offer options such as video/audio recording sessions that then provide feedback. Another weakness is time and money. It has already been established that most probation officers have very high caseloads, and additional training means officers must find time both to meet with clients and to be out of their offices for training (DeMichele & Payne, 2007).

Conclusion

The roots of community corrections can be traced back to the 1850s (Labrecque & Smith, 2017) and an initial intent to bring a "new spirit of humanitarianism and a new capacity for rehabilitation to every stage of the post-conviction process" (Labrecque & Smith, 2017, p. 233). Through the years of building community supervision, questions have been raised about its effectiveness (Turner, Scheyett & Allen, 2022). Research produced in the 1970s suggested that it had a minimal impact for any rehabilitative efforts (Martinson, 1974), and the research of this time was labeled "Nothing Works." In the decades that followed, the community corrections industry sought ways to identify and implement programs that work in reducing recidivism. This era of research is still known as the "What Works" body of literature. The What Works literature was guided by the findings of the RNR model whereby matching an individual's risk to the level of need, while being mindful of responsivity factors, did result in promising reductions to recidivism. Matching risks and needs should result in appropriate placement and programming recommendations. However, the U.S. criminal justice system has continued to show waves of punitive action by seeking incapacitation for offending populations even when this may go against the RNR model.

Probation may be a better alternative for certain offenses than being incarcerated because it is more cost-effective and rehabilitation-oriented (Turner, Scheyett & Allen, 2022). However, one might question why it is an ideal alternative if probationers are frequently unsuccessful in complying with the terms of their supervision (Turner, Scheyett & Allen, 2022). Case plans that adhere to the RNR model show lower recidivism rates in

See *SUPERVISION*, next page

SUBSCRIPTION INFORMATION

Journal of Community Justice is published quarterly. A basic one-year subscription to **Journal of Community Justice** is \$179.95 for individuals and \$279.95 for institutional subscribers. Canadian orders add \$20 for first class postage; orders outside North America add \$40 postage.

TO ORDER

Complete the information below and mail to: Civic Research Institute
4478 U.S. Route 27 • P.O. Box 585
Kingston, NJ 08528. Or e-mail your order to: order@civicrosearchinstitute.com

- Enter my one-year individual subscription to **Journal of Community Justice** at \$179.95 (plus additional postage for Canadian and foreign orders).
- Enter my one-year institutional subscription to **Journal of Community Justice** at \$279.95 (plus additional postage for Canadian and foreign orders).
- Enter my one-year subscription to **Probation & Parole Law Reports** at \$179.95.
- Enter my order for **Cognitive Behavioral Interventions for At-Risk Youth Two-Volume Set**, by Barry Glick, Ph.D., at \$237.50.

Name _____

Title _____

Agency _____

Address _____

City _____

State Zip Code _____

Phone Number _____

E-Mail Address _____

Purchase Order # _____

Missing or damaged issues?

Call Customer Service at 609-683-4450.

Reprints: Parties wishing to copy, reprint, distribute or adapt any material appearing in *Journal of Community Justice* must obtain written permission from Civic Research Institute, Inc. For information on permissions and fees, call 609-683-4450. Any unauthorized use of material appearing in *Journal of Community Justice* is a violation of CRI's copyright and will be prosecuted to the full extent provided by law.

SUPERVISION, from page 21

all types of clients, with reductions of 10% to 50% (Dyck, Campbell & Wershler, 2018). RNR approaches have been found to be effective in increasing officer use of core correctional practices (Labrecque & Smith, 2017), and when all three principles of the RNR model are in operation, reductions in recidivism are clearly evident (Bonta et al., 2008).

References

Andrews, D.A., Bonta, J., & Hoge, R.D. (1990). Classification for effective rehabilitation: Rediscovering psychology. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 17(1)*, 19–52.

Andrews, D.A., Bonta, J., & Wormith, J.S. (2011). The risk-need-responsivity (RNR) model: Does adding the good lives model contribute to effective crime prevention? *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 38(7)*, 735–755.

Blasko, B., Souza, K., Via, B., & Taxman, F. (2016). Performance measures in community corrections: Measuring effective supervision practices with existing agency data. *Federal Probation, 80(3)*, 26–32.

Blasko, B.L., Viglione, J., Taylor, L.R., & Taxman, F.S. (2022). Sorting through the evidence: A step toward prioritization of evidence-based community supervision practices. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 49(6)*, 817–837.

Bonta, J., Bourgon, G., Ruge, T., Scott, T.L., Yessine, A. K., Gutierrez, L., & Li, J. (2011). An experimental demonstration of training probation officers in evidence-based community supervision. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 38(11)*, 1127–1148.

Bonta, J., Ruge, T., Scott, T., Bourgon, G., & Yessine, A.K. (2008). Exploring the black box of community supervision. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 47(3)*, 248–270.

Boppre, B., Sundt, J., & Salisbury, E.J. (2018). The limitations and strengths of the evidence-based practice attitude scale as a measure of correctional employees' attitudes: A psychometric evaluation. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 62(12)*, 3947–3964.

Chadwick, N., Dewolf, A., & Serin, R. (2015). Effectively training community supervision officers: A meta-analytic review of the impact on offender outcome. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 42(10)*, 977–989.

DeMichele, M., & Payne, B.K. (2007). Probation and parole officers speak out—Caseload and workload allocation. *Federal Probation, 71(3)*, 30–35.

Dowden, C., & Andrews, D.A. (2000). Effective correctional treatment and violent reoffending: A meta-analysis. *Canadian Journal of Criminology, 42(4)*, 449–467.

Dyck, H.L., Campbell, M.A., & Wershler, J.L. (2018). Real-world use of the risk-need-responsivity model and the level of service/case management inventory with community-supervised offenders. *Law and Human Behavior, 42(3)*, 258–268.

Gendreau, P., & Goggin, C. (1996). *Principles of effective correctional programming*. Forum on Corrections, 8, 38–41.

Hyatt, J.M., & Barnes, G.C. (2017). An experimental evaluation of the impact of intensive supervision on the recidivism of high-risk probationers. *Crime & Delinquency, 63(1)*, 3–38.

Labrecque, R.M., & Smith, P. (2017). Does training and coaching matter? An 18-month evaluation of a community supervision model. *Victims & Offenders, 12(2)*, 233–252.

Labrecque, R.M., & Viglione, J. (2021). The impact of a community supervision officer training program on client outcomes: A propensity score modeling analysis by officer training dosage. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 48(3)*, 315–331.

Lowenkamp, C.T., Latessa, E.J., & Smith, P. (2006). Does correctional program quality really matter? The impact of adhering to the principles of effective intervention. *Criminology & Public Policy, 5(3)*, 575–594.

Martinson, R. (1974). What works? Questions and answers about prison reform. *The Public Interest, 35*, 22–54.

National Conference of State Legislatures (2023). Limiting incarceration for technical violations of probation and parole. Retrieved from <https://www.ncsl.org/civil-and-criminal-justice/limiting-incarceration-for-technical-violations-of-probation-and-parole#:~:text=States%20have%20limited%20the%20use,states%20have%20caps%20for%20parole>.

Prendergast, M.L. (2011). Issues in defining and applying evidence-based practices criteria for treatment of criminal-justice involved clients. *Journal of Psychoactive Drugs, 7*, 10–18.

Sarre, R. (2001). Beyond 'what works?' A 25-year jubilee retrospective of Robert Martinson's famous article. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology, 34(1)*, 38–46.

Schoenwald, S.K., Chapman, J.E., Sheidow, A.J., & Carter, R.E. (2010). Long-term youth criminal outcomes in MST transport: The impact of therapist adherence and organizational climate and structure. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology, 38(1)*, 91–105.

Schoenwald, S.K., Sheidow, A.J., Letourneau, E.J., & Liao, J.G. (2003). Transportability of multisystemic therapy: Evidence for multilevel influences. *Mental Health Services Research, 5(4)*, 223–239.

Skeem, J.L., Louden, J.E., Polaschek, D. & Camp, J. (2007). Assessing relationship quality in mandated community treatment: Blending care with control. *Psychological Assessment, 19(4)*, 397–410.

Smith, A., Heyes, K., Fox, C., Harrison, J., Kiss, Z., & Bradbury, A. (2018). The effectiveness of probation supervision towards reducing reoffending: A rapid evidence assessment. *Probation Journal, 65(4)*, 407–428.

Sperber, K.G. (2020). Fidelity to evidence-based practice: Our obligation to effective supervision and service delivery. *Federal Probation, 84(2)*, 5–10.

Trotter, C. (2013). Reducing recidivism through probation supervision: What we know and don't know from four decades of research. *Federal Probation, 77(2)*, 43–48.

Turner, H., Scheyett, A., & Allen, L. (2022). Legal and extralegal factors associated with success on misdemeanor probation. *Open Journal of Social Sciences, 10(3)*, 257–272.

U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs (2021). *Probation and Parole in the United States, 2020*. Bureau of Justice Statistics. Retrieved from <https://bjs.ojp.gov/content/pub/pdf/ppus20.pdf>.

Viglione, J. (2019). The risk-need-responsivity model: How do probation officers implement the principles of effective intervention? *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 46(5)*, 655–673. ■



Authorized Electronic Copy

This electronic copy was prepared for and is authorized solely for the use of the purchaser/subscriber. This material may not be photocopied, e-mailed, or otherwise reproduced or distributed without permission, and any such reproduction or redistribution is a violation of copyright law.

For permissions, contact the [Copyright Clearance Center](http://www.copyright.com/) at <http://www.copyright.com/>

You may also fax your request to 1-978-646-8700 or contact CCC with your permission request via email at info@copyright.com. If you have any questions or concerns about this process you can reach a customer relations representative at 1-978-646-2600 from the hours of 8:00 - 5:30 eastern time.