The Colorado State Court Administrator's Office
Division of Probation Services
Cognitive-Behavioral Treatment Program
Annual Evaluation Report
June 2010

Prepared by:
LeCroy & Milligan Associates, Inc.
4911 East Broadway, Suite 100
Tucson, Arizona 85711
(520) 326-5154
FAX (520) 326-5155
www.lecroymilligan.com

Prepared for:
Colorado State Court Administrator's Office
Division of Probation Services
101 West Colfax Avenue
Suite 500
Denver, Colorado 80202

Acknowledgements

LeCroy & Milligan Associates, Inc. gratefully acknowledges the efforts of staff members from the Colorado State Court Administrator's Office, Division of Probation Services for their assistance with this project. Eileen Kinney (Manager, Evaluation Unit), Dana Wilks (Management Analyst), and Susan Jones (Education Specialist) provided leadership, background information, assistance with data collection, and many valuable details about the cognitive-behavioral program for probationers in Colorado. We are appreciative of the Chief Probation Officers and Probation Officers from the probation districts throughout Colorado whose cooperation and efforts in collecting and providing important information for this evaluation were invaluable. Probation clients also gave their time to provide valuable perspectives and information about their experiences with cog groups.

The LeCroy & Milligan Associates, Inc. evaluation team included Jeff Pfeifer, Ph.D., M.Leg.St., Kerry Milligan, MSSW, Craig LeCroy, Ph.D., Darlene Lopez, M.A., Olga Valenzuela, B.A., and Karen Thies, MSW.

Suggested Citation: LeCroy & Milligan Associates, Inc. (2010). *Colorado State Court Administrator's Office – Division of Probation Services: Cognitive-Behavioral Treatment Program Annual Evaluation Report*. LeCroy & Milligan Associates, Inc., Tucson, AZ.

Table of Contents

List of Exhibits

Executive Summary

Introduction

Since the early 1990s the Colorado Division of Probation Services (DPS) has been committed to implementing cognitive-behavioral programming as part of their service delivery to probation clients. In the fall of 2008, the State Court Administrator's Office contracted with LeCroy & Milligan Associates, Inc. (LMA) to conduct a three-year implementation and outcome evaluation of the cognitive-behavioral programs being delivered to probation clients across the state's 22 judicial districts. The first year of the evaluation included a literature review of cognitive-behavioral programs and an implementation analysis. The second and third years of the project involve an evaluation of fidelity and outcomes for the two major cognitive-behavioral treatment programs: *Thinking for a Change* and *Why Try*.

Background Information

This section of the report seeks to provide context by: (1) providing background on the Colorado DPS's adoption of cognitive-behavioral programming, (2) describing the overarching three-year evaluation plan, and (3) summarizing the findings of the 2009 Implementation Study Report provided by LeCroy & Milligan Associates.

- ***Program & Theoretical Context –*** Colorado Probation offers a variety of "cognitive skills training" programs. These programs teach skills such as problem solving, creative reasoning, critical thinking, negotiation, and social skills (e.g., asking for help, responding to anger, dealing with an accusation) using a step-by-step process of demonstration and practice. Cognitive skills programs are based on the idea that offenders lack the thinking skills for effective pro-social living, and that with the acquisition of these skills they will begin to behave pro-socially. Cognitive restructuring programs assume that criminal behavior arises from the content of an offender's thinking, and that change requires a fundamental restructuring of thinking. For the past several years, Colorado's Division of Probation Services has used a wide variety of curricula, including two of the more widely-used programs: *Thinking for a Change* and *Why Try.*
- ***Overview of Evaluation Plan –*** The overarching evaluation plan was established to respond to five research questions developed by the Evaluation Unit of the DPS and designed to investigate a variety of issues surrounding the implementation and impact of the *Thinking for a Change* and *Why Try* programs. The questions were as follows:

Research Questions
Question 1: With what degree of fidelity are *Thinking for a Change* and *Why Try* being implemented in Colorado probation? If modifications are made, the nature of those changes and why they were made will be explored.
Question 2: What are the intermediate and long-term outcomes of those probationers who participate in *Thinking for a Change* or *Why Try* (e.g. attitudinal changes, problem solving skills, increased self-control, recognition of feelings, social cognitive biases, change in risk scores, successful completion rates of probation, recidivism rates during supervision)?
Question 3: What is the level of satisfaction with the programs among probationers who participate in *Thinking for a Change* or *Why Try*?
Question 4: What is the level of satisfaction with the programs among probation officers who facilitate *Thinking for a Change* or *Why Try* groups?
Question 5: What resources are necessary for and what benefits are gained from the implementation of *Thinking for a Change* and *Why Try*?

In order to provide feedback regarding the above research questions, LeCroy & Milligan Associates proposed a three-year strategy which included a literature review, implementation analysis, and outcome evaluation.

- ***Summary of 2009 Implementation Study Report –*** During the first year of the project, a literature review and implementation study was conducted by LeCroy & Milligan Associates and the subsequent results of the analysis were compiled in a report (LeCroy & Milligan Associates, Inc., 2009). The purpose of the study was to determine the extent, type, and characteristics of cognitive-behavioral groups that were being provided by probation departments in Colorado and to obtain basic and essential information that would help the evaluators design the subsequent fidelity and outcome analysis for the second and third years of the project. Both qualitative and quantitative methods were used for the implementation study in order to triangulate information sources with the goal of increasing data validity. Program documents, such as curricula, training manuals, and other supportive materials were reviewed from each judicial district. Surveys and semi-structured interviews were conducted to obtain information not available through documents, or to cross-verify document information. Focus groups were also implemented with both probation officers and probationers who participated in cognitive-behavioral programs. Finally, observations of cognitive-behavioral program leader training sessions were conducted. As detailed in the 2009 Report, the implementation analysis resulted in a number of findings with regard to the program, personnel, and probation clients (see Exhibit 2 on p. 20). A number of the findings related to program structure, groups, curriculum, facilitators, training and post-training support, and stakeholder perceptions have direct implications for the fidelity and outcome evaluations.

Year Two & Three Overview

The overarching goal of the second and third year of this project is to conduct an evaluation of fidelity and outcomes associated with the cognitive-behavioral programs delivered by the staff of Colorado probation departments. To accomplish this, a multi-method/multi-measure quasi-experimental design was implemented to allow for an empirical analysis of program effectiveness on the attitudes, cognitions, and behaviors of probation clients.

- **Framework –** In order to best assess fidelity and outcomes, it was necessary to create a framework to guide the various steps involved in the collection and analysis of data. A number of meetings were held with staff from the Colorado DPS in order to review the findings of the 2009 Implementation Study Report and to address a number of issues regarding the work for the second and third years of the project, including: (1) how data collection might best reflect the Research Questions, (2) the development of assessment tools, (3) the identification of the research sample, and (4) the development of a procedure for data collection. As a result of these meetings, it was agreed that the focus for the remainder of the project would be on addressing Research Questions #1 (program fidelity) and #2 (attitudinal and behavioral impacts) as they relate to the *Thinking for a Change* and *Why Try* programs. In addition, it was agreed that a number of assessment tools would have to be developed in order to empirically document the impact of these programs on probation client attitudes and behaviors. It was also agreed that the research sample would include groups being run in a variety of judicial districts across Colorado and would include both male and female probation clients as well as adult and juvenile probation clients. A work plan was initiated that included the development of assessment tools as well as a process for data collection.

Information was also gathered regarding when groups would begin so that the data collection process could be put in place. By mid-January 2010, the assessment tools and data collection procedures were finalized and the first group began. As of the writing of this report, data collection has been in place for approximately four months and, as such, there is a limited amount of empirical information available.

Fidelity Evaluation

In terms of evaluating the fidelity of the *Thinking for a Change* and *Why Try* programs, based on Research Question #1 it was determined that the focus would be on examining Structure (i.e., recruitment of probation clients, length of sessions, termination guidelines, and use of extra-curricular activities) and Delivery (i.e., examination of the extent and type of modifications being made to lesson plans). After consultations with staff of DPS as well as a number of facilitators, a data collection process was created and implemented in mid-January 2010. This process involved conducting a focus group as well as developing a *Lesson Information Sheet* that would track modifications made to the lesson plans.

- **Fidelity Data Collection –** Fidelity data was collected through a facilitator focus group as well as through completion of *Lesson Information Sheets*. A focus group was organized and attended by nine facilitators who were currently delivering either a *Thinking for a Change* or *Why Try* course. Participants were informed that the purpose of the focus group was to allow them to share their perceptions of the program across a number of areas related to fidelity. In order to provide a framework for the focus group, five points of reference were identified for discussion: (1) course materials (e.g., lesson plans), (2) training, preparation, and post-training support (i.e., any elements related to ensuring that they as facilitators are prepared for running a group), (3) logistical factors impacting the delivery of courses (e.g., resource challenges), (4) modifications to the course (including alterations to the lesson plans and/or the addition of activities to the course), and (5) delivery challenges (including the materials provided for the course). To formally track the modifications being made to the proscribed lesson plans, *Lesson Information Sheets* were developed for facilitators. A separate version of the *Lesson Information Sheet* was needed to track the delivery of *Thinking for a Change* and *Why Try* due to the fact that the *Why Try* program allows facilitators to choose from a menu of options for each lesson while the *Thinking for a Change* program is more structured in terms of lesson content.

Facilitators are asked to complete a *Lesson Information Sheet* after each session. These sheets provide information regarding any modifications that the facilitator is making to a lesson (including providing a rationale for the modification) as well as any additions being made to the lesson in order to enhance the experience of probation clients.

- **Preliminary Fidelity Results –** Data collected regarding fidelity included the results of the focus group as well as the preliminary results from the *Lesson Information Sheets*. The focus group discussion provided a number of interesting and informative insights into all five of the reference points employed as a framework to guide the fidelity evaluation. Specific information provided for each of the reference points included the following:
  - ***Course Materials*** – there were a number of concerns raised with regard to the fact that both the *Thinking for a Change* and *Why Try* materials were "out-dated".
  - ***Training, Preparation, and Post-Training Support*** – facilitators indicated that although the training was comprehensive and effective, there was very little post-training support other than through informal channels (e.g., personally contacting trainers to ask questions). In addition, there was a discussion regarding the extent to which supervision should be mandated for facilitators running their first course. Some individuals believed that at the very least the first course should be taught with a co-facilitator. Other participants pointed to the fact that although it would be useful to co-facilitate the first group, there were often resource issues to be considered, especially for the smaller offices (e.g., number of probation officers in the office).
  - ***Logistic Factors Impacting the Delivery of Courses*** – participants indicated that they had for the most part been able to secure facilities and equipment for the delivery of courses. In some cases there was difficulty securing some equipment relating to the delivery of materials such as overhead projectors.
  - ***Modifications to the Course*** – it was reported that a number of modifications are made to the *Thinking for a Change* program by facilitators and that these modifications tend to fall into one of two categories: (1) modifications to the lesson plans, and (2) additions to the course that do not directly relate to lesson plans but are implemented in order to enhance the experience of probation clients. For lesson plan modifications, the majority of alterations relate to materials that are out-dated. In terms of the additions to courses,

according to information provided by facilitators, these are made in order to either maintain the interest of probation clients or to enhance retention rates. A number of creative practices have been developed to increase interest. For example, one facilitator has incorporated a drum circle into the group. As for the modifications related to retention rates, six of the nine facilitators reported implementing some sort of incentive program for attendance (e.g., a chance to win a gift card).

- ***Delivery Challenges*** – Apart from the challenges associated with materials being out-dated, facilitators report that one of the greatest challenges is that there are so few individuals willing to run groups and, as such, they are often in a position where they have to run a number of groups every year. This concern was augmented by the fact that there appeared to be very little "reward" for facilitating other than the gratification of assisting probation clients. Specifically, facilitators indicated that the running of a group did not impact their case load or other duties. A number of facilitators indicated that it would be worthwhile to formally investigate why many of those trained to deliver courses do not subsequently conduct a course.

In terms of the *Lesson Information Sheet* data, it is important to note that although the fidelity data collection process has been in place since mid-January 2010, only a small amount of the desired information has been accumulated. As such, though informative, the following observations should be viewed as preliminary.

❖ **Observations –** Although data collection is limited at this point, there are a number of preliminary observations that can be made:

- ***Post-Training Support*** – according to the comments provided by facilitators, there is a need to consider providing a mechanism for post-training support.
- ***Lesson Modification*** – it appears that a significant number of modifications are being made to lesson plans, including some lessons being skipped altogether. Unfortunately, at this point in the data collection, we are unable to identify whether these modifications revolve around similar aspects of lessons or not.

- ***Retention*** – based on the feedback provided by facilitators it is clear that retention is a significant concern. There is some indication that retention rates may be related to the lack of any detailed formal recruitment process, and at least one facilitator is attempting to address this through the implementation of a *Referral Form*. It should be noted that information regarding a client's reason for not completing a course is currently being amassed as part of the data collection process and will be reported in the 2011 Report.

Outcome Evaluation

In order to address the issue of measuring outcomes, the LeCroy & Milligan Associates evaluation team (in consultation with members of DPS) developed and implemented a formalized data collection process that included a number of assessment tools. The process was designed to allow for the collection of data related to specific outcome measures including: cognitive and behavioral changes in probation clients, changes in risk scores, successful completion rates of probation, and recidivism rates during supervision.

❖ **Development of Outcome Measures**

- ***Cognitive Changes in Probation Clients*** – In order to assess the degree of cognitive change in probation clients participating in either the *Thinking for a Change* or *Why Try* programs, it was necessary to first identify the specific cognitive factors that the program should be targeting. The identification of these factors was informed by a number of sources and culminated in the creation of a *Pre/Post-Treatment Client Survey* to assess the impact of programs on five specific cognitive factors: locus of control, problem solving, self-control, recognition of feelings, and cognitive biases/decision-making. These five cognitive factors were tapped through adapted versions of a number of published scales. Adaptations were made based on a variety of factors including: confusing wording, the need to have a standard response format (i.e., 7-point semantic differential scale), and a recognition that standardized scales sometimes need to be modified for use in a corrections environment (see e.g., Delisi, Hochstetler & Murphy, 2003). The final version of the survey contained a total of 71 statements and probation clients were asked to indicate their level of agreement with each statement on a scale of 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 7 (Strongly Agree). Before completing the *Pre-Treatment Client Survey*, all respondents signed a consent form.

- **Behavioral Changes in Probation Clients** – In addition to assessing the cognitive changes in probation clients, it was also deemed useful to attempt to assess the behavioral changes exhibited by those completing *Why Try* or *Thinking for a Change*. In order to do so, a *Post-Treatment Behavioral Assessment Questionnaire* was developed. The instrument was designed to allow Supervising Probation Officers to assess the degree of behavioral change in their clients after completion of the program on five dimensions: locus of control, problem solving abilities, self-control, recognition of feelings, and cognitive biases/decision-making.

- **Changes in Risk Score** – Given that a number of studies indicate that cognitive-behavioral treatments may have an impact on risk scores (see e.g., Friendship, Blud, Erikson, Travers & Thornton, 2003), a *Pre/Post-Treatment Tracking Sheet* was developed in order to record the Level of Supervision Inventory (LSI) and Colorado Young Offender Level of Service Inventory (CYOLSI) scores.

- **Early Exit Information** – Based on the challenges associated with program retention rates, a *Client Exit Survey* and *Facilitator Exit Survey* were developed in order to gain additional insight into the reasons why a probation client does not complete the course. The development of these surveys was informed by the McMurren and McCullogh (2007) study which identified a variety of reasons for client discontinuance in cognitive-behavioral programs.
- **Successful Completion of Probation** – rates of successful completion of probation will be amassed and assessed through the use of DPS records.

- **Recidivism Rates During Supervision** – rates of recidivism during supervision will be amassed and assessed through the use of DPS records.

❖ **Process for Gathering Outcome Data –** The process for gathering outcome data was developed with a number of factors in mind. First, it was recognized that the process must be one that would allow for fidelity of implementation across sites. Second, it was recognized that the process must be both concise and easy to follow in order to not impinge on the time and energies of facilitators. Finally, it was recognized that the process must include a clear administrative aspect, allowing for the effective tracking of data. Based on these factors, an 8-Step Process was developed and implemented. The process outlined all stages of data collection as well as the roles of various individuals with regard to the administration of surveys. A description of the process was distributed to all facilitators in the form of a *Facilitator Handbook*. In addition, a *Survey Administration Protocol* was developed detailing the steps for gathering data from probation clients.

❖ **Preliminary Outcome Results –** The implementation of the data collection process began in mid-January 2010 and, as such, this report includes only the data collected during the first four months of the project. A complete analysis and evaluation of data will be presented in the 2011 Annual Report (including changes in risk scores, successful completion rates of probation, and recidivism rates during probation). The 2011 Annual Report will also include comparison data in order to allow for an assessment of the program's impact across populations. Since mid-January 2010, ten groups (1 *Why Try* and 9 *Thinking for a Change*) have begun delivery of programs to probationers (two of these groups are now completed). Due to the short period of collection, the only outcome data available for presentation at this time is the *Pre-Treatment Client Survey* data. To date a total of 100 probation clients have completed the *Pre-Treatment Client Survey*. Clients include males and females as well as adults and juveniles from four judicial districts. Descriptive analysis of the *Pre-Treatment Client Survey* data indicates a number of interesting trends developing in terms of the cognitive factors being tapped. For example, the findings relating to Locus of Control appear to reflect those in the literature with regard to gender, with female offenders having a more internal locus of control than male offenders. It is also important to note that there are a number of other trends in the data that reflect those found in the literature such as a gender difference in temper, with men being less likely to control their temper than women. Although these findings are preliminary, they warrant a degree of attention in terms of informing a possible need to shift program emphasis based on gender and/or age. That is, if the above trends are confirmed by the collection of additional data, facilitators may want to assess the level of emphasis they place on certain lessons based on whether their group is all male, all juvenile, etc.

Conclusions and Next Steps

The information contained in this report provides a solid starting point for both the fidelity and outcome evaluations, especially in terms of addressing Research Questions 1 and 2. A review of the fidelity data collected to date indicates that there are some emerging trends with regard to the modifications of lesson plans. Subsequent data collection will allow for a detailed examination of these trends in the 2011 Report. Preliminary fidelity data also indicates that retention rates are a significant concern for facilitators and this concern has culminated in the development and implementation of a number of creative responses including the addition of extra-curricular activities (e.g., a drum circle), incentive programs for attendance (e.g., gift card draws), and the use of a *Client Referral Form* (see Appendix B). Although further investigation into this finding is beyond the scope of the current project, subsequent examination of the use of extra-curricular activities should certainly be conducted.

Similarly, the preliminary outcome evaluation data also provides some interesting trends. For example, in addition to providing a baseline, the *Pre-Treatment Client Survey* scores collected to date also appear to parallel a number of research findings related to gender and age, including a higher internal locus of control for female offenders than male offenders and gender difference in temper (i.e., males being less likely to control their tempers than females). The continued collection of data will provide additional support for these findings as well as indicate what specific cognitive and behavioral factors are being impacted by the programs. This impact will be assessed through comparison group data. This data, as well as data relating to risk scores and recidivism will be presented in the 2011 Report.

Introduction

Since the early 1990s the Colorado Division of Probation Services (DPS) has been committed to implementing cognitive-behavioral programming as part of their service delivery to probation clients. This commitment was accompanied by an acknowledgement of the need to provide staff with training and support for the development of an evidence-based cognitive-behavioral treatment model. In the fall of 2008, the State Court Administrator's Office contracted with LeCroy & Milligan Associates to conduct a three-year implementation and outcome evaluation of the cognitive-behavioral programs being delivered to probation clients across the state's 22 judicial districts. The first year of the evaluation included a literature review of cognitive-behavioral programs delivered in correctional settings published separately (LeCroy & Milligan Associates, 2009), and an implementation study designed to provide an in-depth description of the programs being implemented with both adult and juvenile populations. The second and third years of the project involve an evaluation of fidelity and outcomes for the two major cognitive-behavioral treatment programs; *Thinking for a Change* and *Why Try*.

Background Information

This section of the report seeks to provide context by: (1) providing background on the Colorado DPS's adoption of cognitive-behavioral programming, (2) describing the overarching three-year evaluation plan, and (3) summarizing the findings of the 2009 Implementation Study Report provided by LeCroy & Milligan Associates.

Program & Theoretical Context

Cognitive-behavioral interventions are becoming the cornerstone of evidence-based practice across a number of fields and, in particular, within probation departments. Among other things, cognitive-behavioral treatment programs and curricula are designed to help offenders identify thinking patterns that lead to trouble and develop new thinking skills and new behavioral skills. A combination of approaches is used to modify an offender's thinking style in conjunction with teaching new social skills to confront problematic interpersonal encounters. Cognitive-behavioral treatment programs focus on teaching methods of *restructuring* the thought process and using *cognitive skills* to aid in basic decision-making and promote systematic problem solving. Cognitive-behavioral theory comes from a well-developed body of work by researchers who suggest that how an individual thinks about an external event, not the event itself, triggers feelings that can lead to criminal acts. The fundamental premise of a *cognitive restructuring* program is that offenders hold antisocial beliefs, attitudes, and mental habits that lead them to commit criminal offenses. A primary objective of cognitive *restructuring* is to teach offenders how to replace their antisocial beliefs with pro-social beliefs. *Cognitive restructuring* guides offenders through a process of increased awareness of thoughts, as well as the connection between one's thoughts, emotions and criminal acts. Other researchers have identified social skills that offenders need to learn to become more pro-social people and better connected with their communities. The overarching goal of *cognitive skills* is to teach offenders to manage their own behavior by engaging in processes that develop self-control, making them responsible for and in charge of their actions no matter how stressful the situation. These specific skills include problem solving, social skills training (learned behaviors that enable one to interact with others in ways that elicit positive responses), anger management, and empathy training.

Colorado Probation offers a variety of "cognitive skills training" programs that teach skills such as problem solving, creative reasoning, critical thinking, negotiation, and social skills (e.g., asking for help, responding to anger, dealing with an accusation) using a step-by-step process of demonstration and practice. Cognitive skills programs are based on the idea that criminals lack the thinking skills for effective pro-social living, and that with the acquisition of these skills they will begin to behave pro-socially. Cognitive restructuring programs assume that criminal behavior arises from the content of an offender's thinking, and that change requires a fundamental restructuring of thinking. For the past several years, Colorado's Division of Probation Services has used a wide variety of curricula, including two of the more widely-used programs: *Thinking for a Change* and *Why Try* (a description of these programs is provided in Exhibit 1).

Exhibit 1: Description of Thinking for a Change and Why Try

Curricula Name	Number of Sessions/Lessons	Recommended Length (# weeks)
Thinking for a Change	**22 sessions (1-1/2 to 2 hours per session)**	**11 or 22 weeks (once or twice per week)**
Key Concepts ***Thinking for a Change*** **(*T4C*)** (Bush, Glick & Taymans, 1997) – The T4C curriculum uses problem solving as its core, enhanced by cognitive restructuring and social skill interventions. The curriculum is appropriate for adult and youthful offenders. The cognitive restructuring concepts are introduced and emphasized during the initial eleven lessons, interspersed with critical social skills, which support the cognitive restructuring process. Then, in lessons 16-21, problem-solving techniques are taught, supported by cognitive self-change and social skill development.		
Why Try	**Varies**	**Varies**
Key Concepts ***The Why Try*** Program was developed by C. Moore and is a strength-based approach to helping youth overcome their challenges and improve outcomes in the areas of truancy, behavior, and academics. It is based on principles from Solution Focused Brief Therapy, Social and Emotional Intelligence, and multi-sensory learning. The program teaches social and emotional principles to youth using a series of ten pictures (visual analogies). Each visual teaches a discrete principle, such as resisting peer-pressure, obeying laws and rules, and that decisions have consequences. The visual components are then reinforced by music and physical activities. The major learning styles—visual, auditory, and body-kinesthetic are all addressed. The developers have adapted materials for elementary, secondary and adult age groups.		

Overview of Evaluation Plan

The overarching evaluation plan was designed to respond to five research questions developed by DPS. These questions were designed to investigate a variety of issues surrounding the implementation and impact of the *Thinking for a Change* and *Why Try* programs. The questions were as follows:

Research Questions
Question 1: With what degree of fidelity are *Thinking for a Change* and *Why Try* being implemented in Colorado probation? If modifications are made, the nature of those changes and why they were made will be explored.
Question 2: What are the intermediate and long-term outcomes of those probationers who participate in *Thinking for a Change* or *Why Try* (e.g. attitudinal changes, problem solving skills, increased self-control, recognition of feelings, social cognitive biases, change in risk scores, successful completion rates of probation, recidivism rates during supervision)?
Question 3: What is the level of satisfaction with the programs among probationers who participate in *Thinking for a Change* or *Why Try*?
Question 4: What is the level of satisfaction with the programs among probation officers who facilitate *Thinking for a Change* or *Why Try* groups?
Question 5: What resources are necessary for and what benefits are gained from the implementation of *Thinking for a Change* and *Why Try*?

In order to provide feedback regarding the above research questions, LeCroy & Milligan Associates proposed a three-year, four-phase, strategy which included a literature review, implementation analysis, and outcome evaluation. Details regarding the four phases are provided below:

- ***Phase 1: Literature Review of Evidence-Based Practices in Cognitive-Behavioral Treatment Programs with Probationers (Year 1) - Completed***
  This phase consisted of a literature review of the cognitive-behavioral programs designed for delivery by probation or other correctional officers and included a review of: publications from peer-reviewed journals; technical reports from criminal justice reference services and clearing-houses available over the internet, and articles from books.

- ***Phase 2: Assessment of the Implementation of Cognitive-Behavioral Treatment with Both Adult and Juvenile Probationers (Year 1) - Completed***
  This phase consisted of a detailed description and analysis of the cognitive-behavioral treatment programs in each of the 22 judicial districts, including descriptions of: the characteristics of the programs currently offered, the numbers and types of officers and staff who provide the programs, the program referral processes, and the numbers and types (e.g., juvenile or adult, risk and need level) of probationers who participate in the programs. Analysis included specific descriptions, assessments, and recommendations regarding: (a) program implementation, (b) recruitment, referral, and retention, (c) program leader characteristics, (d) chief probation officer perspectives, (e) cognitive group facilitator training, and (f) perspectives from probationers.

- ***Phase 3: Design and Initiate an Evaluation to Determine the Fidelity of the Cognitive-Behavioral Treatment Programs as Implemented in Probation (Year 2 & 3) – In Process***
  This phase consists of evaluating the fidelity of the *Thinking for a Change* and *Why Try* programs with regard to modifications made and the impact of these modifications. In addition to examining the fidelity of the programs, information will also be collected with regard to actual and/or perceived obstructions for attaining fidelity.

- ***Phase 4: Design and Initiate an Evaluation of the Cognitive-Behavioral Treatment Program Outcomes (Year 2 & 3) – In Process***
  This phase consists of designing and initiating an evaluation, using a quasi-experimental framework, to assess the outcomes of the program, especially with regard to: probation clients who have experienced either *Thinking for a Change* or *Why Try* (including those who complete the course as well as those who discontinue before completion), course facilitators, and other stakeholders. The outcome evaluation will include a multi-method/multi-measure approach that will include survey data, data on changes in risk scores, completion rates of probation, recidivism data, interviews, observations, and focus groups.

As indicated above, Phases 1 and 2 were completed during the first year of the project while Phases 3 and 4 represent the focus of this report as well as the Final Report to be completed in 2011. It should be noted that although the evaluation of program fidelity is a significant part of the present report, an abundance of information on this topic was collected as part of the implementation study. Among other things, this information was used to design and implement the subsequent fidelity evaluation as well as to help determine the focus of the fidelity and outcome study (e.g., site selection, etc.). As such, it is important to provide a summary of the 2009 Implementation Study Report and identify how the findings specifically inform the fidelity and outcome evaluations.

Summary of 2009 Implementation Study Report

The implementation study was designed to describe the following aspects of the cognitive-behavioral treatment initiative implemented by the Colorado DPS:

- ***Program Structure*** – a description of the planned and actual structure of cognitive-behavioral treatment programs for probationers in Colorado, including a description of the specific courses implemented (e.g., *Thinking for a Change* and *Why Try*);
- ***Groups*** – a description of the number and characteristics of groups being conducted;
- ***Curriculum*** – a description of all the curricula currently used in Colorado, including *Thinking for a Change* and *Why Try*;
- ***Facilitators*** – a description of the characteristics of program facilitators including their years of experience running cognitive programs, their reasons for becoming a facilitator, and their perceptions of issues such as incentives and supervision;
- ***Training and Post-Training Support*** – a description of facilitator training, including structure and content; and
- ***Stakeholder Perceptions*** – a description of stakeholder (i.e., Chief Probation Officers, Probation Officers, and probation clients) perceptions of programs, including perceptions of satisfaction, delivery challenges, and issues regarding training and supervision.

Methodology – Both qualitative and quantitative methods were used for the implementation study in order to triangulate information sources with the goal of increasing data validity. Program documents, such as curricula, training manuals, and other supportive materials were reviewed from each judicial district. Surveys and semi-structured interviews were conducted to obtain information not available through documents, or to cross-verify document information. Focus groups were also implemented with both probation officers and probationers who participated in cognitive-behavioral programs. Finally, observations of cognitive-behavioral program leader training sessions were conducted.

***Findings, Observations, and Recommendations* –** As detailed in the 2009 Report, the implementation study resulted in a number of findings with regard to the program, personnel, and probation clients. Although a complete summary of the findings goes beyond the scope of this report, it is important to highlight the findings that have a direct relationship to the fidelity and outcome evaluations (see Exhibit 2).

Exhibit 2: 2009 Implementation Study Findings

Area	Key Findings	Relationship to Fidelity & Outcome Evaluation
Program Structure	***Type & Number of Courses*** – Although Colorado Probation has used a total of eight different cognitive-behavioral curricula in the last three years, officers reported that *Thinking for a Change* (n=32) and *Why Try* (n=7) are the most frequently used curricula. *Thinking for a Change* is used the most with different types of caseloads, both for juveniles and adults. The *Why Try* curriculum is used primarily with juvenile intensive and sex offender caseloads. ***Judicial Districts Implementing Programs*** - Thirteen of the 23 departments are implementing cognitive-behavioral groups in Colorado. The judicial districts with the highest number of officers conducting groups are in the Denver metropolitan area (i.e., Districts 1, 2, & 17). ***Barriers to Implementation*** - Lack of staff was the barrier to program implementation most frequently reported by Chief Probation Officers.	Based on this finding, as well as discussions with DPS staff, it was decided to focus on *Thinking for a Change* and *Why Try* for the fidelity and outcome evaluations. Based on this finding, it was decided to concentrate data collection on Districts 1, 2 (adult), 4, 8, 10, 17, & 21. Further investigation of the barriers to program implementation is being conducted as part of the fidelity evaluation.
Groups	***Referral Process*** - Participant referrals primarily originate from the facilitator's own caseload, and secondarily from other probation officers through email correspondence and staff meetings. Referral criteria appear to be unclear and inconsistent across districts. ***Retention*** - It may take up to three months to fill a group. The majority (71%) of facilitators over-enroll to compensate for clients dropping out. Some facilitators expect nearly one-third to one-half of clients to drop out of their group. ***Sanctions & Incentives*** - A mix of sanctions and incentives are employed to increase retention with most groups adhering to an attendance policy that stipulates termination after three absences.	The fidelity outcome will examine the process and provide suggestions for its improvement. Retention is being examined as part of the outcome evaluation through the use of a client exit survey. The use of sanctions and incentives is being examined as part of the fidelity evaluation.

Curriculum	***Facilitator Perceptions of the Curriculum*** - Reported concerns about the curriculum include some lessons being confusing, the length and intensity of the course, and travel (due to budgetary constraints). ***Modifications*** - 22% of officers report modifying the curriculum.	As part of the fidelity evaluation, facilitators are being asked to provide feedback on curriculum. Data is being collected on the number of facilitators making modifications as well as the types of modifications being made.
Training & Post-Training Support	***Facilitator Selection*** - Officers must meet course prerequisites to attend the *Thinking for a Change* course. However, there is no pre-training assessment of officers' training needs, for example in group process and facilitation. ***Post-Training Support*** - Follow-up with new trainees is only done on an ad-hoc basis that is initiated by the new trainee, and no refresher trainings currently exist. Departmental support and feedback appears limited, with only 31% of officers reporting that they received feedback from their department about their performance in running groups.	Information is being collected on the issue of pre-training assessment of officer needs. Information is being collected regarding possible procedural changes to address this issue.
Stakeholder Perceptions	***Positive Impact*** - Probation clients listed a variety of skills learned including thinking before acting, being more positive, managing conflict more calmly, and refusing alcohol and drugs in pressure situations.	Data is being collected examining the impact of the program on probation clients.

Overview of Fidelity and Outcome Studies (Years 2-3)

The overarching goal of the second and third year of this project is to conduct an evaluation of fidelity and outcomes associated with the cognitive-behavioral programs delivered by the Colorado probation departments. In order to accomplish this, a multi-method/multi-measure quasi-experimental design was implemented to allow for an empirical analysis of program effectiveness on a number of levels, including the behavioral and attitudinal impact on probation clients. It was determined that the evaluation of probation client impact would be assessed in accordance with a cognitive-based *theory of change model* that reflects the *stage of change movement philosophy* described in the initial documentation regarding this project. The social-cognitive theory of change model is one of the more current approaches to assessing the impact of a program on attitudes, behaviors, and their inter-relationship. This model suggests that a change in behavior is only possible through a number of linear steps. First, the individual's attitude must be addressed. Once this is accomplished, it is suggested that the next phase revolves around assessing the impact of this attitude change on decision-making (especially with regard to the use of cognitive biases). This model is an especially effective one for this project as it is cognitively–based and, as such, fits in nicely with the cognitive emphasis of programs like *Thinking for a Change* and *Why Try*.

Framework & Methodology

In order to best assess fidelity and outcomes, it was necessary to create a framework to guide the various steps involved in the collection and analysis of data. Meetings were held with staff from the Colorado DPS in order to review the findings of the 2009 Report and to address a number of issues regarding the work for the second and third years of the project, including: (1) how data collection might best reflect the Research Questions, (2) the development of assessment tools, (3) the identification of the research sample, (4) the development of a procedure for data collection, and (5) collection of comparison group data.

As a result of these meetings, it was agreed that the focus for the remainder of the project would be on addressing Research Questions #1 (program fidelity) and #2 (attitudinal and behavioral impacts) as they relate to the *Thinking for a Change* and *Why Try* programs.[1] In addition, it was agreed that a number of assessment tools could

[1] Although the focus will be on addressing Research Questions 1 & 2, data will also be collected to supplement the findings of the Implementation Study with regard to Research Questions 3 & 4 (i.e., satisfaction of probation clients and officers regarding the programs. In addition, the findings and observations will also aid in addressing Research Question 5 (i.e., what resources are necessary to run an effective program and what are the benefits of doing so).

be developed in order to empirically document the impact of these programs on probation client attitudes and behaviors. It was also agreed that the research sample would include groups being run in a variety of judicial districts across Colorado and would include male and female as well as adult and juvenile probation clients.
As a first step toward data collection, staff from LeCroy & Milligan Associates travelled to Colorado and met with DPS representatives as well as a number of facilitators. The purpose of the visit was twofold. First, it was necessary to finalize the data collection plan for years 2 and 3. Second, it was important to meet with facilitators in order to provide them with feedback regarding the results of the 2009 Implementation Study Report as well as provide them with the data collection plan for the next two years. As part of the meeting, facilitators were asked to share any concerns they might have with the evaluation so that these might be addressed by staff from either DPS or LeCroy & Milligan Associates.

Subsequent to the site visit, a work plan was initiated that included the development of assessment tools as well as a process for data collection. In addition, information was gathered regarding when groups would begin so that the data collection process could be put in place. By mid-January 2010, the assessment tools and data collection procedures were finalized and the first group began.

As of the writing of this report, data collection has been in place for approximately four months and, as such, there is a limited amount of empirical information available. The preliminary data is presented below along with a number of observations.

Fidelity Evaluation

Research Question #1 (i.e., with what degree of fidelity is *Thinking for a Change* and *Why Try* being implemented in Colorado probation? If modifications are made, the nature of those changes and why they were made will be explored) provided the focus for the fidelity study. The following specific aspects of the program were examined:

- ***Structure*** – The level of fidelity among factors related to the structure of courses (e.g., recruitment of clients, length of sessions, termination guidelines, and use of extra-curricular activities); and
- ***Delivery*** – The level of fidelity in the delivery of lessons (i.e., examination of the extent and type of modifications being made to lesson plans).

A data-collection plan was developed that allowed facilitators to provide information regarding their courses in a manner that they perceived to be confidential and non-invasive. After consultations with members of the DPS as well as a number of facilitators, a process was created and implemented in mid-January 2010. This process involved conducting a focus group as well as developing a *Lesson Information Sheet* that would track modifications made to lesson plans.

Fidelity Data Collection

The focus of data collection was informed by the observations made in the 2009 LeCroy & Milligan Associates Implementation Study Report (see Exhibit 2). Fidelity data was collected through a facilitator focus group as well as through completion of *Lesson Information Sheets*.

- **Facilitator Focus Group** – A focus group was organized and attended by nine facilitators who were currently delivering either a *Thinking for a Change* or *Why Try* course. The group consisted of five females and four males representing five Judicial Districts. Participants were informed that the purpose of the focus group was to allow them to share their perceptions of the program across a number of areas related to fidelity. In order to provide a framework, five points of reference were identified for discussion: (1) course materials (e.g., lesson plans), (2) training, preparation, and post-training support (i.e., any elements related to ensuring that they as facilitators are prepared for running a group), (3) logistical factors impacting the delivery of courses (e.g., resource challenges), (4) modifications to the course (including alterations to the lesson plans and/or the addition of activities to the course), and (5) delivery challenges (including the materials provided for the course).

- **Lesson Information Sheet** – In order to formally track the modifications being made to the proscribed lesson plans, *Lesson Information Sheets* were developed for facilitators (see Appendix A: Lesson Information Sheets). A separate version of the *Lesson Information Sheet* was needed to track the delivery of *Thinking for a Change* and *Why Try* due to the fact that the *Why Try* program allows facilitators to choose from a menu of options for each lesson while the *Thinking for a Change* program is more structured in terms of lesson content. Facilitators are asked to complete a *Lesson Information Sheet* after each session. These sheets provide information regarding any modifications that the facilitator is making to a lesson (including providing a rationale for the modification) as well as any additions being made to the lesson in order to enhance the experience of probation clients. Once collected, this information will provide data for a number of issues related to fidelity, including:

    - ***Modification of Specific Lessons (Thinking for a Change)*** – an analysis of the data will allow for the identification of specific lessons that are modified across facilitators. This information may be employed to identify specific lessons which may need to be altered or addressed with more emphasis during training. Information collected will also include facilitator feedback regarding the number of lessons delivered (e.g., 11 or 22) and length of lesson (e.g., 1 or 2 hours).
    - ***Selection of Menu Options for Each Lesson (Why Try)*** – an analysis of the data will provide information regarding whether there are certain options that are deemed more effective for use in Colorado.
    - ***Addition of Activities*** – an analysis of the data will allow for the identification of activities that have been developed and implemented by facilitators in order to enhance the experience of probation clients.

Preliminary Fidelity Results

Data collected regarding fidelity included the results of the focus group as well as the preliminary results from the *Lesson Information Sheets*.

- **Facilitator Focus Group** – the focus group was comprised of nine participants (including one facilitator who provided responses to the questions by email and another who was unable to attend was interviewed separately), all of whom were currently facilitating (or co-facilitating) a group. Of the nine facilitators providing information, eight were running *Thinking for a Change* groups while one was running a *Why Try* group. All facilitators appeared comfortable discussing issues relating to the fidelity of the programs and were candid in their responses. The focus group discussion provided a number of interesting and informative insights into all five of the reference points employed as a framework to guide the fidelity evaluation and as a gauge of facilitator satisfaction (i.e., Research Question #4). Specific information provided for each of the reference points included the following:

- ***Course Materials*** – there were a number of concerns raised with regard to the fact that both the *Thinking for a Change* and *Why Try* materials were "out-dated". These concerns included the fact that many of the examples used in the materials relate to events from 10-15 years ago and that activities were still presented via transparencies (rather than through the use of more modern means including PowerPoint). It should be noted that although facilitators reported that some *Why Try* materials were outdated, the situation did not appear to be as problematic due to the fact that each lesson includes a menu of options to choose from.

- ***Training, Preparation, and Post-Training Support*** – facilitators indicated that although the training was comprehensive and effective, there was very little post-training support other than through informal channels (e.g., personally contacting trainers to ask questions). In addition, there was a discussion regarding the extent to which supervision should be mandated for facilitators running their first course. Some individuals believed that at the very least the first course should be taught with a co-facilitator. Other participants pointed to the fact that although it would be useful to co-facilitate the first group, there were often resource issues to be considered, especially for the smaller offices.

- ***Logistic Factors Impacting the Delivery of Courses*** – participants indicated that they had for the most part been able to secure facilities and equipment for the delivery of courses. In some cases there was difficulty securing some equipment relating to the delivery of materials such as overhead projectors.

- ***Modifications to the Course*** – it was suggested that a number of alterations are made to both *Why Try* and *Thinking for a Change* course materials by facilitators and that these tend to fall into one of two categories: (1) modifications to the lesson plans, and (2) additions to the course that do not directly relate to lesson plans but are implemented in order to enhance the experience of probation clients. For lesson plan modifications, the majority of alterations relate to materials that are out-dated.[2] In terms of the additions to both the *Why Try* and *Thinking for a Change* courses, according to information provided by facilitators, these are made in order to either maintain the interest of probation clients or to enhance retention rates. A number of creative practices have been developed to increase interest. For example, one facilitator has incorporated a drum circle into the group as a way of enhancing the experience of probation clients. As for the modifications related to retention rates, six of the nine facilitators reported implementing some sort of incentive program for attendance (e.g., drawings for gift cards).

- ***Delivery Challenges*** – Apart from materials being out-dated, facilitators report that one of the greatest challenges is that there are so few individuals willing to run groups and, as such, they are often in a position where they have to run more than one group per year. This concern was augmented by the fact that there appeared to be very little "reward" for facilitating other than the gratification of assisting probation clients. Specifically, facilitators indicated that the running of a group did not impact their case load or other duties. A number of facilitators indicated that it would be worthwhile to formally investigate why many of those trained to deliver courses do not subsequently conduct a course.

❖ **Lesson Information Sheets** – It is important to note that although the fidelity data collection process has been in place since mid-January 2010, only a small amount of the desired information has been accumulated. For example, although ten courses have begun since mid-January, only two have reached completion (1 *Why Try* and 1 *Thinking for a Change*), providing us with only two full sets of *Lesson Information Sheets*. As such, though informative, the following results and observations should be viewed as preliminary.

[2] It should be noted that the complete analysis of the *Lesson Plan Sheets* for the 2011 Report will provide a significant amount of detail regarding the extent and types of modifications being made.

Exhibit 3: Preliminary Lesson Information Sheet Data

Lesson Number	Total Number of Potential Deliveries[3]	Number of Facilitators Modifying the Lesson N (%)	Number of Facilitators Skipping the Lesson N (%)	Number of Facilitators Delivering the Lesson Unmodified N (%)
1	6	4 (66%)	0	2 (33%)
2	6	3 (50%)	1 (17%)	2 (33%)
3	6	3 (50%)	2 (33%)	1 (17%)
4	6	4 (66%)	1 (17%)	1 (17%)
5	6	3 (50%)	0	3 (50%)
6	6	2 (33%)	0	4 (66%)
7	6	3 (50%)	0	3 (50%)
8	6	1 (17%)	0	5 (83%)
9	6	2 (33%)	0	4 (66%)
10	6	2 (33%)	0	4 (66%)
11	5	1 (20%)	0	4 (80%)
12	4	2 (50%)	0	2 (50%)
13	3	1 (33%)	0	2 (66%)
14	2	1 (50%)	0	1 (50%)
15	2	1 (50%)	0	1 (50%)
16	2	0	0	2 (100%)
17	1	0	0	1 (100%)
18	1	0	0	1 (100%)
19	1	0	0	1 (100%)
20	1	1 (100%)	0	0
21	1	1 (100%)	0	0
22	1	0	1 (100%)	0

Though preliminary, the above data indicates a number of emerging trends that will bear careful consideration for the 2011 Report. For example, it appears that facilitators tend to modify the early lessons more than later lessons (including skipping lessons). It will be interesting to see whether this trend is supported by subsequent data collection and, if so, to investigate why the early lessons are selected more often for modification.

[3] It should be noted that this column represents the total number of times that a lesson could possibly have been delivered given the number of groups running at the time this report was prepared . In addition it should also be noted that there will be a differential in potential total deliveries due to the fact that the *Why Try* program is 11 lessons and the *Thinking for a Change* program is 22 lessons.

Observations

Although data collection is limited at this point, there are a number of preliminary observations that can be made:

- ***Post-Training Support*** – according to the comments provided by facilitators, there is a need to consider providing a mechanism for post-training support. This may be done through either expanding the mandate of training to include post-training support or through the development of a new program to address this issue. Other possibilities include peer-to-peer support and mentoring.

- ***Lesson Modification*** – the above data, though preliminary in nature, indicates a significant amount of modification being made to lesson plans. Unfortunately, at this point in the data collection, we are unable to identify whether these modifications revolve around similar aspects of lessons or not. There is also some indication that certain lessons are skipped, subsequent data will clarify whether this is a trend or not.

- ***Retention*** – based of the feedback provided by facilitators it is clear that retention is a significant concern. For example, a number of facilitators have implemented "extra-curricular" elements (e.g., drum circles) in order to increase retention rates and six of the nine facilitators providing information for the focus group indicated that they had implemented some sort of incentive to attempt to increase retention rates. There is some indication that retention rates may be related to the lack of any detailed formal recruitment process, and at least one facilitator is attempting to address this through the implementation of a *Referral Form* (see Appendix B: Thinking for a Change Referral Form). It should be noted that information regarding a probation client's reason for not completing a course is currently being collected as part of the data collection process and will be reported in the 2011 Report.

Outcome Evaluation

In addition to an evaluation of fidelity, the goal of this report is to also present the preliminary findings related to Research Question #2,

> *What are the intermediate and long-term outcomes of those probationers who participate in Thinking for a Change or Why Try (e.g., attitudinal changes, problem solving skills, assertiveness, increased self-control, recognition of feelings, social cognitive biases, change in risk scores, successful completion rates of probation, recidivism rates during supervision)?*

In order to address this research question, LeCroy & Milligan Associates staff (in consultation with members of DPS) developed a quasi-experimental design similar to other projects evaluating programs such as *Thinking for a Change* (see e.g., Lowenkamp, Hubbard, Makarios & Latessa, 2009). The design included a formalized data collection process with a number of assessment tools related to specific probation client outcomes:

- Cognitive Changes in Probation Clients
- Behavioral Changes in Probation Clients
- Changes in Risk Scores
- Successful Completion Rates of Probation
- Recidivism Rates During Supervision

Development of Outcome Measures

❖ ***Cognitive Changes in Probation Clients*** – In order to assess the degree of cognitive change in probation clients participating in either the *Thinking for a Change* or *Why Try* programs, it was necessary to first identify the specific cognitive factors that the program should be targeting. The identification of these factors was informed by a number of sources, including:

(1) *Thinking for a Change* and *Why Try* program information on the specific cognitive factors targeted by the program,

(2) research identifying specific cognitive factors that are impacted by cognitive-behavioral treatment programs in general, and

(3) input from DPS staff (including those involved in training) as to what cognitive factors are being targeted by the Colorado program.

A review of the *Why Try* and *Thinking for a Change* programs indicated that the targeted core cognitive factors are problem solving, social skills, and recognition of feelings (e.g., resistance to peer pressure) (Bush, Glick & Taymans, 1997; Moore, 1996). A review of the research literature indicated that although the focus for the majority of research studies on cognitive-behavioral programs is on recidivism (see e.g., Hollin, McGuire, Hounsome, Hatcher, Bilby & Palmer, 2008; Lowenkamp, Hubbard, Makarios & Latessa, 2009), a number of other cognitive factors have been identified as being important for the rehabilitation of offenders. For example, Pettit (2007) found that locus of control scores were significantly related to "readiness to change" in both male and female offenders. In addition, DeLisi, et al. (2008) found a relationship between low levels of self-control and an array of negative outcomes (e.g., physical assaults against correctional staff, substance abuse) in male parolees (see also, Delisi, Hochstetler & Murphy, 2003). Finally, a number of recent studies have also begun to examine the role that cognitive biases such as the *fundamental attribution error* (i.e., the belief that the negative actions of others are based on their personality while our own negative actions are based on the situation) play in the decisions of offenders (Maruna & Mann, 2006).

Based on the above information, a *Pre/Post-Treatment Client Survey* was developed to assess the impact of programs on five specific cognitive factors: locus of control, problem solving, self-control, recognition of feelings, and cognitive biases/decision-making (see Appendix C: *Pre/Post-Treatment Client Survey*). These five cognitive factors were tapped through adapted versions of a number of published scales. Adaptations were made based on a variety of factors including: confusing wording, the need to have a standard response format (i.e., 7-point semantic differential scale), and a recognition that standardized scales sometimes need to be modified for use in a corrections environment (see e.g., Delisi, Hochstetler & Murphy, 2003). The final version of the survey contained a total of 71 statements and probation clients were asked to indicate their level of agreement with each statement on a scale of 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 7 (Strongly Agree). Additional information regarding the survey scales is presented below in Exhibit 4. It should be noted that before completing the *Pre-Treatment Client Survey*, all respondents signed a consent form[4] (see Appendix D: DPS Consent Forms).

[4] Juvenile client consent was obtained through the signatures of both the juvenile and his or her parent/guardian.

Exhibit 4: Pre/Post-Treatment Client Survey Scales

Scale	Source	# of Items[5]	Range of Scores	Direction
Locus of Control	Craig, Franklin & Andrews (1984)	17	17-119	Higher score represents a more external locus of control.
Problem Solving	Heppner & Petersen (1982)	11	24-168	Higher scores represent an increased ability to engage in problem solving
Self-Control (Overall Score)	Grasmick, Tittle, Bursick & Arneklev (1993)	24	24-168	Higher scores represent an increase in self-control
Self-Control (Impulsivity)	Grasmick, Tittle, Bursick & Arneklev (1993)	4	4-28	Higher Score represents a tendency to be less impulsive
Self-Control (Avoidance of Challenging Tasks)	Grasmick, Tittle, Bursick & Arneklev (1993)	4	4-28	Higher score represents an increased tendency to take on challenging tasks
Self-Control (Risk-Seeking)	Grasmick, Tittle, Bursick & Arneklev (1993)	4	4-28	Higher score represents a tendency to avoid risky behavior
Self-Control (Preference for Physical Activity)	Grasmick, Tittle, Bursick & Arneklev (1993)	4	4-28	Higher score represents a preference for mental activity over physical activity
Self-Control (Self-Centeredness)	Grasmick, Tittle, Bursick & Arneklev (1993)	4	4-28	Higher score represents a tendency to be less self-centered
Self-Control (Temper)	Grasmick, Tittle, Bursick & Arneklev (1993)	4	4-28	Higher score represents a greater ability to control one's temper
Recognition of Feelings	Scheier & Carver (1985)	9	9-63	Higher scores indicate a greater ability to recognize feelings
Cognitive Biases/Decision-Making	Scale created by LeCroy & Milligan Associates staff based on literature review[6]	13	13-91	Higher score indicates less impact on cognitive biases in decision-making

[5] Note that the total number of items listed below add to more than 71 due to the fact that some items were employed in more than one scale.
[6] Although this scale was created for the purposes of this project specifically, analysis of the data gathered to date (N=100) indicates a high level of reliability (Chronbach's Alpha = .68)

- **Behavioral Changes in Probation Clients** – In addition to assessing the cognitive changes in probation clients, it was also deemed useful to attempt to assess the behavioral changes exhibited by those completing *Why Try* or *Thinking for a Change*. It is important to attempt to gain some type of empirical evidence that any cognitive changes identified in probation clients are transferring into actual behaviors. This is an especially important addition to the project given that the majority of studies conducted on cognitive behavioral programming for offender populations tend to define behavioral change solely in terms of recidivism (Sykes, 2007). In order to assess behavioral change, a *Post-Treatment Behavioral Assessment Questionnaire* was developed (see Appendix E: *Post-Treatment Behavioral Assessment*). The instrument was designed to allow Supervising Probation Officer's to assess the degree of behavioral change in their client after completion of the program on five dimensions: locus of control, problem solving abilities, self-control, recognition of feelings, and cognitive biases/decision-making.

- **Changes in Risk Score** – Given that a number of studies indicate that cognitive-behavioral treatments may have an impact on risk scores (see e.g., Friendship, Blud, Erikson, Travers & Thornton, 2003), a *Pre/Post-Treatment Tracking Sheet* was developed in order to record the Level of Supervision Inventory (LSI) and Colorado Young Offender Level of Service Inventory (CYOLSI) scores (see Appendix F: *Pre/Post-Treatment Tracking Sheets*).

- **Early Exit Information** – Given the challenges associated with program retention rates, a *Client Exit Survey* (see Appendix G: *Client Exit Survey*) and *Facilitator Exit Survey (see* Appendix H: *Facilitator Exit Survey)* was developed in order to gain additional insight into the reasons why a probation client does not complete the course. The development of these surveys was informed by the McMurren and McCullogh (2007) study which identified a variety of reasons for client discontinuance in cognitive-behavioral programs.

- **Successful Completion of Probation** – rates of successful completion of probation will be amassed and assessed through the use of probation records.

- **Recidivism Rates During Supervision** – rates of recidivism during supervision will be amassed and assessed through the use of court records.

Process for Gathering Outcome Data

The process for gathering outcome data was developed with a number of factors in mind. First, it was recognized that the process must be one that would allow for fidelity of implementation across sites. Second, it was recognized that the process must be both concise and easy to follow in order to not impinge on the time and energies of group facilitators. Finally, it was recognized that the process must include a clear administrative aspect, allowing for the effective tracking of data. Based on these factors, an 8-Step Process was developed that outlined all stages of data collection as well as the roles of various individuals with regard to the administration of surveys. A description of the process was distributed to all facilitators in the form of a *Facilitator Handbook* (see Appendix H: *Facilitator Handbook*). A *Survey Administration Protocol* was also developed detailing the steps for gathering data from probation clients (see Appendix I: *Survey Administration Protocol*).

Preliminary Outcome Results

The implementation of the data collection process began in mid-January 2010 and, as such, this report includes only the data collected during the first four months of the project. A complete analysis and evaluation of data will be presented in the 2011 Annual Report (including changes in risk scores, successful completion rates of probation, and recidivism rates during probation). The 2011 Annual Report will also include comparison data in order to allow for an assessment of the program's impact across populations.

Since mid-January 2010, nine *Thinking for a Change* and one *Why Try* groups have begun delivery of programs to probationers (one group from each program has completed delivery). Due to the short period of collection, the only outcome data available for presentation at this time is the *Pre-Treatment Client Survey* data. To date a total of 100 probation clients have completed the *Pre-Treatment Client Survey*. The information presented in Exhibit 5 provides a demographic breakdown of these probation clients.

Exhibit 5: Preliminary Pre-Treatment Client Survey Data Demographics

Demographics	**N**
Gender	
• Male	61
• Female	39
Judicial District[7]	
• 1st (Golden)	32
• 2nd (Denver - Adult)	17
• 4th (Colorado Springs)	19
• 8th (Fort Collins/Loveland)	7
• 17th (Adams County)	25
Program	
• Why Try	6
• Thinking for a Change	94
Age	
• Juvenile	24
• Adult	76
Offense	
• Felony	71
• Misdemeanor	22
• Both	4
• Other	3

Exhibit 6 presents the results of a descriptive analysis of the *Pre-Treatment Client Survey* scores for the 100 probation clients who have completed the survey to date. In addition to collecting the pre/post scores of those completing a course, data will also be collected from those who exit a course before completion. This information should provide insight into the impact of programs by dosage. The following data presents a baseline that will allow for an empirical assessment of program impact on the cognitions of probation clients.

[7] See Appendix K for a diagram of the Colorado Judicial Districts.

Exhibit 6: Preliminary Pre-Treatment Client Survey Data

Scale	Overall Mean	Range of Scores	Males (Mean)	Females (Mean)	Juveniles (Mean)	Adults (Mean)	Direction
Locus of Control	43.14	17-73	44.26	41.45	48.14	41.18	Higher score represents a more external locus of control.
Problem Solving	55.60	32-77	54.77	56.93	51.86	56.99	Higher scores represent an increased ability to engage in problem solving
Self-Control (Overall Score)	116.44	60-160	113.55	120.55	109.85	118.84	Higher scores represent an increase in self-control
Self-Control (Impulsivity)	19.84	4-28	18.88	21.32	19.29	20.03	Higher scores represent an increase in self-control
Self-Control (Avoidance of Challenging Tasks)	19.97	9-28	19.81	20.23	19.09	20.32	Higher score represents an increased tendency to take on challenging tasks
Self-Control (Risk-Seeking)	20.28	6-28	19.06	22.26	19.14	20.71	Higher score represents a tendency to avoid risky behavior
Self-Control (Preference for Physical Activity)	18.29	4-28	19.15	17.03	18.38	18.26	Higher score represents a preference for mental activity over physical activity
Self-Control (Self-Centeredness)	18.69	5-26	18.46	19.06	17.64	19.08	Higher score represents a tendency to be less self-centered
Self-Control (Temper)	19.41	8-28	18.74	20.48	17.32	20.18	Higher score represents a greater ability to control one's temper
Recognition of Feelings	39.58	20-59	38.17	41.93	36.71	40.67	Higher scores indicate a greater ability to recognize feelings
Cognitive Biases/Decision-making	61.85	38-91	59.43	65.52	59.55	62.64	Higher score indicates less impact on cognitive biases in decision-making

Due to the fact that data collection has only been in place for approximately four months, it is difficult to draw any conclusions at this point from the baseline information provided above. There are, however, a number of observations that are worth making. For example, the findings relating to Locus of Control appear to reflect those in the literature with regard to gender. Specifically, like the results above, Pettit (2007) also found that female offenders tend to have a more internal locus of control than male offenders. It is also important to note that there are a number of other trends in the data that reflect those found in the literature such as a gender difference in temper, with men being less likely to control their temper than women. Although these findings are preliminary, they warrant a degree of attention in terms of informing a possible need to shift program emphasis based on gender and/or age. That is, if the above trends are confirmed by the collection of additional data, facilitators may want to assess the level of emphasis they place on certain lessons based on whether their group is all male, all juvenile, etc.

Conclusions and Next Steps

The information contained in this report provides a solid starting point for both the fidelity and outcome evaluations, especially in terms of addressing Research Questions 1 and 2. A review of the fidelity data collected to date indicates that there are some emerging trends with regard to the modifications of lesson plans. Subsequent data collection will allow for a detailed examination of these trends in the 2011 Report. Preliminary fidelity data also indicates that retention rates are a significant concern for facilitators and this concern has culminated in the development and implementation of a number of creative responses including the addition of extra-curricular activities (e.g., a drum circle), incentive programs for attendance (e.g., gift card draws), and the use of a *Client Referral Form* (see Appendix B). Although further investigation into this finding is beyond the scope of the current project, subsequent examination of the use of extra-curricular activities should certainly be conducted.

Similarly, the preliminary outcome evaluation data also provides some interesting trends. For example, in addition to providing a baseline, the *Pre-Treatment Client Survey* scores collected to date also appear to parallel a number of research findings related to gender and age, including a higher internal locus of control for female offenders than male offenders and gender difference in temper (i.e., males being less likely to control their tempers than females). The continued collection of data will provide additional support for these findings as well as indicate what specific cognitive and behavioral factors are being impacted by the programs. This impact will be assessed through comparison group data. This data, as well as data relating to risk scores and recidivism will be presented in the 2011 Report.

References

Bush, J., Glick, B., & Taymans, J. (1997). *Thinking for a change: Integrated cognitive behavior change program*. National Institute of Corrections. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice.

DeLisi, M., Hochstetler, A., Higgins, G.E., Beaver, K.M., & Greave, C.M. (2008). Toward a general theory of criminal justice: Low self-control and offender noncompliance. *Criminal Justice Review, 33*, 141-158.

DeLisi, M., Hochstetler, A., & Murphy, D.S. (2003). Self-control behind bars: A validation study of the Grasnick et al. scale. *Justice Quarterly, 20*, 241-263.

Friendship, C., Blud, L., Erikson, M., Travers, R., & Thornton, D. (2003). Cognitive-behavioral treatment for imprisoned offenders: An evaluation of HM Prison Service's cognitive skills programmes. *Legal and Criminological Psychology, 8*, 103-114.

Hollin, C.R., McGuire, J., Hounsome, J.C., Hatcher, R.M., Bilby, C.A.L., & Palmer, E.J. (2008). Cognitive skills behavior programs for offenders in the community: A reconviction analysis. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 35*, 269-283.

LeCroy & Milligan Associates, Inc. (2009). *Colorado Probation Services Cognitive Behavioral Groups Implementation Study 2009*. LeCroy & Milligan Associates, Inc., Tucson, AZ.

Lowenkamp, C.T., Hubbard, D., Makarios, M., & Latessa, E.J. (2009). A quasi-experimental evaluation of Thinking for a Change: A "real-world" application. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 36*, 137-146.

Maruna, S., & Mann, R.E. (2006). A fundamental attribution error? Rethinking cognitive distortions. *Legal and Criminological Psychology, 11*, 155-177.

McMurren, M., & McCullough, A. (2007). Why don't offenders complete treatment? Prisoners' reasons for non-completion of a cognitive skills program. *Psychology, Crime & Law, 13,* 345-354.

Pettit, J.R. (2007). Readiness to change and locus of control in female offenders. *Dissertation Abstract International – Section B: The Sciences and Engineering, 67*, 7387.

Scheier, M.F., & Carver, C.S. (1985). The self-consciousness scale: A revised version for use with general populations. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 15, 687-699.

Sykes, H.J. (2007). A study to evaluate the efficacy of a cognitive change program, *Thinking for a Change*, on the behavior of adult male offenders incarcerated in Indiana prisons. *Dissertation Abstracts International – Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences, 68*, 50.

Appendix A: Lesson Information Sheets

LeCroy & Milligan Office Use Only:

Facilitator Name: ____________________________ District: _____

LESSON INFORMATION SHEET:
WHY TRY

In order for us to gain the most comprehensive picture possible regarding the delivery of programs, it would be helpful if you would take a few moments to complete the following very brief questions. Responses are anonymous, and the information will only be presented in an aggregate fashion and will not reference any specific groups or facilitators.

Date: __________

Group Composition: ☐ JUVENILE ☐ ADULT

Group Gender: ☐ MALE ☐ FEMALE ☐ CO-ED

Lesson Number: ________

Did you make any modifications to the lesson plan for today? ☐ YES ☐ NO

If YES, please describe the modification as well as the reason you made the change (feel free to use the back of the page, if you run out of space):

____
____
____
____
____
____

As you know, the WHY TRY program provides you with a number of options for most lessons. If this was the case for this lesson, please describe which option(s) you chose and why:

____
____
____
____

Did you do anything in addition to the Lesson Plan in order to enhance the experience of clients (e.g., activities during breaks)? If so, please describe the activity below, as well as what impact you believe it had on the group.

____
____
____

THANK YOU!

LeCroy & Milligan Associates, Inc.

January 2010

LeCroy & Milligan Office Use Only:
Facilitator Name: ______________________________ District: _____

LESSON INFORMATION SHEET: THINKING FOR A CHANGE

In order for us to gain the most comprehensive picture possible regarding the delivery of programs, it would be helpful if you would take a few moments to complete the following very brief questions. Responses are anonymous, and the information will only be presented in an aggregate fashion and will not reference any specific groups or facilitators.

Date: _____________

Group Composition: JUVENILE ADULT

Group Gender: MALE FEMALE CO-ED

Lesson Number: ________

Did you make any modifications to the lesson plan for today? YES NO

If YES, please describe the modification as well as the reason you made the change (feel free to use the back of the page, if you run out of space):

Did you do anything in addition to the Lesson Plan in order to enhance the experience of clients (e.g., activities during breaks)? If so, please describe the activity below, as well as what impact you believe it had on the group.

THANK YOU!

LeCroy & Milligan Associates, Inc.

January 2010

Appendix B: Thinking for a Change Referral Form

PO:________________________

Today's Date:_________

Client's Name:____________________________________Age:________

Phone #:_________________

D/A Use / UAs:____

If the client is not testing, please have them do a UA prior to starting class.

Educational Status:____________________________ Literate?____________________

Employment:______________________ FT______ PT______

Peer Relations: positive_____ negative______

Why do you think this offender is appropriate for Thinking for a Change class?

Any psychiatric diagnosis / mental health issues / medications that could affect participation?

Has this client been kicked out of any other treatment/classes? If yes, why?

Anything else we should know?

Please attach the Client's face sheet.

Appendix C: Pre/Post-Treatment Client Survey

PRE-TREATMENT CLIENT SURVEY

We would appreciate it if you would take a few moments to complete this survey. It will take you approximately 20 minutes to complete. Your answers will help the probation department to evaluate the effectiveness of the program you are participating in. Each item in the survey is written in the form of a statement. You should read each statement and then circle a number from 1 to 7 that shows how much you disagree or agree with the statement. If you have any difficulty understanding a statement, please raise your hand and someone will help you out. It is very important that you take your time and answer every question.

Please print your first and last name. ___________________________ ___________________________

First Name **Last Name**

	***Strongly Disagree* 1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**Strongly Agree 7**
1. When I am stressed out, I can't stop my muscles from tightening up.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. I think that most people would make the same decisions I do.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. I sometimes find it exciting to do things that might get me in trouble.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. I am sure I can successfully deal with any future problems.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. It really bothers me when other people are having problems.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. I often do things that make me feel good right now, even if it means I might pay for it in the future.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. When I make a decision it is important for me to check with other people to see if it was the right decision.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. I will try to get things I want even when I know it's causing problems for other people.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. Sometimes I will take a risk just for the fun of it.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. If things I do upset people, it's their problem not mine.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. When I go into a new situation I am sure that I can handle problems that might come up.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. I think about myself a lot.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. When things get complicated I tend to quit.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14. I often daydream about myself.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

	Strongly Disagree 1	2	3	4	5	6	**Strongly Agree** 7
15. Many of my problems are way too complicated for me to solve.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16. When I'm really angry, other people better stay away from me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17. I trust myself that I can solve new and hard problems.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18. I like to get out and do things more than I like to read or think about things.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19. If someone wants me to do something I don't want to, I will do the opposite.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20. I generally pay attention to my feelings.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21. Excitement and adventure are more important to me than being safe and secure.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22. When I make plans to solve a problem, I am sure I can make them work.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23. The only way I can control my problems is through luck.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24. I try to avoid things that I know will be difficult to do.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25. I'm always trying to figure myself out.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26. When I make a decision I usually go with my gut feelings instead of thinking too much about it.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
27. After I make a decision, things usually turn out the way I thought they would.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28. I believe it is important to think as much as possible before making a decision about something.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29. Most of what happens to me is probably just due to luck.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30. The first thing I do when I run into a problem is try to figure out exactly what the problem is.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
31. I don't like doing hard things.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
32. People are who they are because of things they can't control.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
33. When I make a bad decision I usually think "everyone else is doing it so why shouldn't I?"	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
34. I can usually think up creative ways to solve a problem.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
35. I know the way my mind works when I work through a problem.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

	Strongly Disagree 1	2	3	4	5	6	Strongly Agree 7
36. I can only control my problems if someone else helps me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
37. I like to test myself every now and then by doing something a little risky.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
38. My mistakes and problems are my responsibility to deal with.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
39. I don't understand people who waste a whole bunch of time thinking before making a decision, they should just go with what they already know.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
40. I often do things on the spur of the moment without stopping to think.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
41. My problems will always take up a lot of my time in my life.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
42. I'm constantly thinking about my reasons for doing things.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
43. I can usually solve a problem even if it looks like there is no answer.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
44. When I make decisions, I am usually happy with them later on.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
45. I almost always feel better when I'm on the move than when I am sitting and thinking.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
46. Becoming a success can be done through hard work, luck has nothing to do with it.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
47. I can see when a problem is coming and I can usually find a way to avoid it.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
48. My life is controlled by outside things.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
49. I'm quick to notice changes in my mood.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
50. When I am in a difficult situation I can't stop myself from breathing fast.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
51. I believe that some of the bad decisions I make are due to the hard life I have had.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
52. I believe a person can achieve whatever they want in this world if they try hard enough.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
53. If I had a choice, I would almost always rather do something physical than something mental.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
54. Everyone knows that your future is based on luck.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

	Strongly Disagree 1	2	3	4	5	6	**Strongly Agree** 7
55. The things that are easiest to do bring me the most happiness.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
56. I never take a hard look at myself.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
57. I sometimes reflect or think about who I am.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
58. I lose my temper pretty easily.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
59. When I'm angry at people, I feel more like hurting them than talking to them about why I'm angry.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
60. I think I can solve most of my problems if I have enough time and I try hard enough.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
61. When I make plans, I am sure that I can make them work.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
62. I seem to have more energy and a greater need to do things than most people my age.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
63. I believe that people get what they deserve in this world.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
64. I care more about what happens to me in the short run than in the long run.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
65. When I run into a problem, I am usually not sure whether I can handle the situation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
66. I try to look out for myself first, even if it means making things hard for other people.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
67. I can't help fix my problems without professional help.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
68. When I have an argument with someone it's hard for me to talk calmly about it without getting upset.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
69. I know why I have different problems in different situations.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
70. I don't think much about getting ready for the future.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
71. I try to do the right thing even if I know that my friends would do something different.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Thank you very much for your participation!

POST-TREATMENT CLIENT SURVEY

We would appreciate it if you would take a few moments to complete this survey. It will take you approximately 20 minutes to complete. Your answers will help the probation department to evaluate the effectiveness of the program you are participating in. Each item in the survey is written in the form of a statement. You should read each statement and then circle a number from 1 to 7 that shows how much you disagree or agree with the statement. If you have any difficulty understanding a statement, please raise your hand and someone will help you out. It is very important that you take your time and answer every question.

Please print your first and last name. ___________________________ ___________________________

First Name **Last Name**

	Strongly Disagree **1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**Strongly Agree 7**
1. When I am stressed out, I can't stop my muscles from tightening up.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. I think that most people would make the same decisions I do.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. I sometimes find it exciting to do things that might get me in trouble.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. I am sure I can successfully deal with any future problems.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. It really bothers me when other people are having problems.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. I often do things that make me feel good right now, even if it means I might pay for it in the future.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. When I make a decision it is important for me to check with other people to see if it was the right decision.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. I will try to get things I want even when I know it's causing problems for other people.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. Sometimes I will take a risk just for the fun of it.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. If things I do upset people, it's their problem not mine.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. When I go into a new situation I am sure that I can handle problems that might come up.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. I think about myself a lot.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. When things get complicated I tend to quit.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14. I often daydream about myself.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

	Strongly Disagree **1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**Strongly Agree 7**
15. Many of my problems are way too complicated for me to solve.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16. When I'm really angry, other people better stay away from me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17. I trust myself that I can solve new and hard problems.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18. I like to get out and do things more than I like to read or think about things.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19. If someone wants me to do something I don't want to, I will do the opposite.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20. I generally pay attention to my feelings.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21. Excitement and adventure are more important to me than being safe and secure.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22. When I make plans to solve a problem, I am sure I can make them work.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23. The only way I can control my problems is through luck.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24. I try to avoid things that I know will be difficult to do.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25. I'm always trying to figure myself out.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26. When I make a decision I usually go with my gut feelings instead of thinking too much about it.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
27. After I make a decision, things usually turn out the way I thought they would.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28. I believe it is important to think as much as possible before making a decision about something.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29. Most of what happens to me is probably just due to luck.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30. The first thing I do when I run into a problem is try to figure out exactly what the problem is.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
31. I don't like doing hard things.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
32. People are who they are because of things they can't control.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
33. When I make a bad decision I usually think "everyone else is doing it so why shouldn't I?"	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
34. I can usually think up creative ways to solve a problem.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
35. I know the way my mind works when I work through a problem.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

LeCroy & Milligan Office Use Only: Identification Number: ________ District: _____

	Strongly Disagree **1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**Strongly Agree 7**
36. I can only control my problems if someone else helps me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
37. I like to test myself every now and then by doing something a little risky.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
38. My mistakes and problems are my responsibility to deal with.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
39. I don't understand people who waste a whole bunch of time thinking before making a decision, they should just go with what they already know.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
40. I often do things on the spur of the moment without stopping to think.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
41. My problems will always take up a lot of my time in my life.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
42. I'm constantly thinking about my reasons for doing things.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
43. I can usually solve a problem even if it looks like there is no answer.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
44. When I make decisions, I am usually happy with them later on.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
45. I almost always feel better when I'm on the move than when I am sitting and thinking.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
46. Becoming a success can be done through hard work, luck has nothing to do with it.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
47. I can see when a problem is coming and I can usually find a way to avoid it.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
48. My life is controlled by outside things.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
49. I'm quick to notice changes in my mood.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
50. When I am in a difficult situation I can't stop myself from breathing fast.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
51. I believe that some of the bad decisions I make are due to the hard life I have had.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
52. I believe a person can achieve whatever they want in this world if they try hard enough.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
53. If I had a choice, I would almost always rather do something physical than something mental.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
54. Everyone knows that your future is based on luck.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

	Strongly Disagree **1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**Strongly Agree 7**
55. The things that are easiest to do bring me the most happiness.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
56. I never take a hard look at myself.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
57. I sometimes reflect or think about who I am.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
58. I lose my temper pretty easily.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
59. When I'm angry at people, I feel more like hurting them than talking to them about why I'm angry.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
60. I think I can solve most of my problems if I have enough time and I try hard enough.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
61. When I make plans, I am sure that I can make them work.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
62. I seem to have more energy and a greater need to do things than most people my age.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
63. I believe that people get what they deserve in this world.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
64. I care more about what happens to me in the short run than in the long run.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
65. When I run into a problem, I am usually not sure whether I can handle the situation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
66. I try to look out for myself first, even if it means making things hard for other people.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
67. I can't help fix my problems without professional help.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
68. When I have an argument with someone it's hard for me to talk calmly about it without getting upset.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
69. I know why I have different problems in different situations.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
70. I don't think much about getting ready for the future.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
71. I try to do the right thing even if I know that my friends would do something different.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Thank you very much for your participation!

Appendix D: Consent Forms

Colorado Division of Probation Services
Cognitive Behavioral Group ("COG") Evaluation
Adult Consent Form

Dear COG Group Participant,

Thank you for taking a few moments to read this form. You have been identified as a participant in the probation department's T4C or Why Try program. Under contract with the Colorado State Court Administrator's Office the research firm, LeCroy and Milligan, is conducting an evaluation of these programs to make sure that they are helpful to you, and we are requesting your voluntary assistance in this evaluation.

In order to determine the quality of the programs, we would like for you to complete a survey before the group begins and complete another survey after the group ends. The surveys should take about 15-20 minutes to complete. Your responses on these surveys will not be shared with the probation staff running the group or the probation officer supervising your case. Your answers will be part of a large number of survey results that will be reported as a group, so your individual answers will not be published.

In addition to your survey responses, your probation officer will complete a survey to provide some basic information about your case to the researchers. Again, the information that will be provided to the researchers will be confidential, and the probation officer's answers regarding your progress will not be reported by the researchers in a way that identifies you, individually. The Division of Probation Services will also provide the researchers with information about your current case such as your LSI assessment scores, your gender, your age, your case type, and how you discharge from supervision and, the researchers will be informed if you become involved in a new criminal case within one year after finishing your probation, but no details of the new case will be provided.

The results of all the surveys will help the researchers to determine how beneficial these programs are to the participants. The researchers will write a report after the evaluation is complete and provide the findings to the Division of Probation Services at the State Court Administrator's Office. The report will not have any identifying information about the participants of the evaluation. If you are interested in reading about the results of this evaluation, you can contact the Division of Probation Services at 303-837-2336 after January 2011.

By signing below, you are agreeing that you understand the conditions above, your participation in completing these surveys is voluntary, and you are not receiving anything in return for your participation. Choosing to participate or not to participate will not result in any consequences either negative or positive and will not affect your status on probation.

____________________________ ____________________________

Print Participant Name Participant Signature Date

Colorado Division of Probation Services
Cognitive Behavioral Group ("COG") Evaluation
Juvenile Consent Form

Dear COG Group Participant,

Thank you for taking a few moments to read this form. You have been identified as a participant in the probation department's T4C or Why Try program. Under contract with the Colorado State Court Administrator's Office the research firm, LeCroy and Milligan, is conducting an evaluation of these programs to make sure that they are helpful to you, and we are requesting your voluntary assistance in this evaluation.

In order to determine the quality of the programs, we would like for you to complete a survey before the group begins and complete another survey after the group ends. The surveys should take about 15-20 minutes to complete. Your responses on these surveys will not be shared with the probation staff running the group or the probation officer supervising your case. Your answers will be part of a large number of survey results that will be reported as a group, so your individual answers will not be published.

In addition to your survey responses, your probation officer will complete a survey to provide some basic information about your case to the researchers. Again, the information that will be provided to the researchers will be confidential, and the probation officer's answers regarding your progress will not be reported by the researchers in a way that identifies you, individually. The Division of Probation Services will also provide the researchers with information about your current case such as your CYO-LSI assessment scores, your gender, your age, your case type, and how you discharge from supervision and, the researchers will be informed if you become involved in a new criminal case within one year after finishing your probation, but no details of the new case will be provided.

The results of all the surveys will help the researchers to determine how beneficial these programs are to the participants. The researchers will write a report after the evaluation is complete and provide the findings to the Division of Probation Services at the State Court Administrator's Office. The report will not have any identifying information about the participants of the evaluation. If you are interested in reading about the results of this evaluation, you can contact the Division of Probation Services at 303-837-2336 after January 2011.

By signing below, you are agreeing that you understand the conditions above, your participation in completing these surveys is voluntary, and you are not receiving anything in return for your participation. Choosing to participate or not to participate will not result in any consequences either negative or positive and will not affect your status on probation.

______________________________ ______________________________

Print Participant Name — Participant Signature — Date

______________________________ ______________________________

Print Parent/Custodian/Legal Guardian Name — Parent/Custodian/Legal Guardian Signature — Date

Appendix E: Post Treatment Behavioral Assessment

COLORADO DIVISION OF PROBATION SERVICES: POST-TREATMENT BEHAVIORAL ASSESSMENT SUPERVISING PROBATION OFFICER

Client Name: ___________________________

Instructions:
In order to complete the following scales, you will need to do a retrospective analysis of the client. That is, we will need you to think about how the client was before the onset of the course and compare that to how he or she is now that they have completed the course. We realize that the following questions are somewhat subjective but it is important to provide the most accurate and honest responses possible in order to gain the most complete and comprehensive picture of the impact of the CBT course on clients. We have included a brief description of what each of the following terms refers to. We appreciate your assistance with this. Upon completion, please mail this form to Olga Valenzuela, LeCroy & Milligan Associates, Inc. 4911 East Broadway, Suite 100, Tucson, AZ 85711.

Please rate the degree to which you believe the client has changed on the following dimensions:

1. Problem Solving Abilities (Defined as: A decrease in the tendency to avoid challenging problems and an increase in the ability to independently solve problems).

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
No Change						**Significant Change**

2. Locus of Control (Defined as: Locus of control refers to an individual's belief regarding the degree to which they can control their own destiny and life. By definition it is <u>not</u> healthy to have an extreme external locus of control [i.e., feeling like they have no control over their lives] or an extreme internal locus of control [i.e., feeling like they can control everything in their lives]. As such, a healthy position in terms of the below assessment would be for the client to hold a "middle-ground" belief. Specifically, we are looking for your assessment on the *level of change* regarding whether the client can recognize what aspects of his or her life that they can control [and subsequently control these aspects] and recognize what they cannot control [and accept this]).

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
No Change						**Significant Change**

3. Self Control (Defined as: The ability to identify areas in their lives where they need to work on self-control and then taking steps to attain this).

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
No Change						**Significant Change**

4. Recognition of Feelings (Defined as: The ability to identify and accept how they are feeling).

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
No Change						**Significant Change**

5. Better Decision-Making (Defined as: The ability to make more effective decisions regarding their actions).

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
No Change						**Significant Change**

Appendix F: Pre/Post-Treatment Tracking Sheets

Identification Number: ________ [LeCroy & Milligan Office Use Only]

COLORADO DIVISION OF PROBATION SERVICES CBT EVALUATION: PRE-TREATMENT TRACKING SHEET

Client Name: ____________________ ________________________
First Name **Last Name**

Date of Birth (mm/dd/yyyy): _____/_____/_____

Gender: ☐ MALE ☐ FEMALE

Age Category: ☐ JUVENILE ☐ ADULT

Type of supervision: ☐ Regular ☐ A/JISP ☐ FOP ☐ Other

Offense on Probation for? ☐ Felony ☐ Misdemeanor

If client is on supervision for more than one offense or more than one case, please list only the most serious of conviction/adjudication:____
____

Case Number: __________________ **ML Number:** ___________________

Supervising PO: __________________________ **Group Facilitator:** ______________________

Location of Group (Judicial District): ___________________________

Program Dates: **Start Date for Program (mm/dd/yyyy):** _____/_____/_____

Anticipated End Date for Program (mm/dd/yyyy): _____/_____/_____

Date of most recently completed LSI or CYOLSI (mm/dd/yyyy): _____/_____/_____

Overall Score of most recently completed LSI or CYOLSI: ____________

Adult LSI Subscale Scores

_____ Criminal History
_____ Education/Employment
_____ Financial
_____ Family/Marital
_____ Accommodation
_____ Leisure/Recreation
_____ Companions
_____ Alcohol/Drug Problems
_____ Emotional/Personal
_____ Attitude/Orientation

Juvenile CYOLSI Subscale Scores

_____Criminal History
_____ Substance Abuse
_____ Education/Employment Problems
_____ Family Problems
_____ Peer Relationship Problems
_____ Accommodation Problems
_____ Miscellaneous

LeCroy & Milligan Associates, Inc. January 2010

Identification Number: ________ [LeCroy & Milligan Office Use Only]

COLORADO DIVISION OF PROBATION SERVICES CBT EVALUATION:
POST-TREATMENT TRACKING SHEET

Client Name: ____________________ ________________________
First Name **Last Name**

End Date for Program (mm/dd/yyyy): _____/_____/_____

Did Participant Complete Program? ☐ YES ☐ NO

If NO, (a) What date did they exit (mm/dd/yyyy)? _____/_____/_____

(b) Reason for exit (if known)? ____

(c) What was the last lesson number they completed? __________

Was an EXIT SURVEY administered? ☐ YES ☐ NO

Was an LSI OR CYOLSI conducted since the course began? ☐ YES ☐ NO

If YES, please report scores below as well as the date of the LSI or CYOLSI.

Date of LSI or CYOLSI (mm/dd/yyyy): _____/_____/_____

LSI or CYOLSI Overall Score: _____________

Adult LSI Subscale Scores

_____ Criminal History
_____ Education/Employment
_____ Financial
_____ Family/Marital
_____ Accommodation
_____ Leisure/Recreation
_____ Companions
_____ Alcohol/Drug Problems
_____ Emotional/Personal
_____ Attitude/Orientation

Juvenile CYOLSI Subscale Scores

_____ Criminal History
_____ Substance Abuse
_____ Education/Employment Problems
_____ Family Problems
_____ Peer Relationship Problems
_____ Accommodation Problems
_____ Miscellaneous

LeCroy & Milligan Associates, Inc. January 2010

Appendix G: Client Exit Survey

LeCroy & Milligan Office Use Only:
Identification Number: ________ District: _____

CLIENT EXIT SURVEY

To be completed by CLIENT:

Please print your first and last name. ______________________ ______________________
First Name **Last Name**

1. Please explain why you decided to stop participating in the program:

____
____
____
____
____
____

2. Can you think of anything that might have kept you attending the course?

____
____
____
____

You are done. Thank you very much for your participation!

LeCroy & Milligan Associates, Inc. January 2010

Appendix H: Facilitator Exit Survey

LeCroy & Milligan Office Use Only: Identification Number: ________ District: _____

FACILITATOR EXIT SURVEY

To be completed by COURSE FACILITATOR:

Client Name: ___________________________________

Last Full Lesson Completed: ____________________________

Course (Location): _______________________________

Discontinuance: ☐ **VOLUNTARY** ☐ **INVOLUNTARY**

If discontinuance was INVOLUNTARY, please indicate reason for removal:

____
____
____
____
____

Thank you very much for your participation!

LeCroy & Milligan Associates, Inc. ___________________________________ January 2010

Appendix I: Facilitator Handbook

Colorado Division of Probation Services

CBT Evaluation:

Facilitator Handbook

COLORADO DIVISION OF PROBATION SERVICES:
CBT OUTCOME EVALUATION

Dear Course Facilitator,

First and foremost, on behalf of LeCroy & Milligan Associates Inc., let me express our appreciation to you for agreeing to participate in this project. As you know, the evaluation of any program is an important process for a variety of reasons including ensuring that the positive impact of a program is objectively and empirically demonstrated. LeCroy & Milligan (L&M) has been contracted to conduct the evaluation on behalf of the Colorado Division of Probation Services (DPS).

We are keenly aware that participation in an evaluation brings with it the potential for a modicum of anxiety and a concern for the amount of additional work that participation brings. We at LeCroy & Milligan strive to ensure that the experience of participating in an evaluation is as positive and time-conscious as possible. It is our goal to do our best to ensure that the process you have agreed to participate in is transparent, informative, and does not impose any more work for you than is absolutely necessary.

In order to attain these goals, we have put together this *Facilitator Handbook* which we hope will provide you with very specific and concise information regarding the tasks we would like you to complete for the purposes of the evaluation. The *Handbook* was constructed in a chronological fashion and is marked with tabs in order to ensure that all steps are attended to.

Specifically, the following pages will break down each task in the following manner:

- **WHAT:** this section will identify and describe each specific step
- **GOAL:** this section describes the specific goal of the step
- **WHO:** this section will identify who is responsible for each step (*please note that we have included all the steps and information so you can get a comprehensive picture of the project but that for some steps someone other than you will be responsible for an action. In addition it should also be noted that for some sites there will be alterations regarding responsibilities – these sites will be addressed on an individual basis*)
- **HOW:** this section will describe exactly what should be done for each step
- **TIME:** this section will indicate how much time the step should take
- **DOCUMENTS:** this section identifies the documents that have been included for the step

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me. Again, thank you for your participation in the project.

Jeff Pfeifer
Senior Evaluation Associate, LeCroy & Milligan Associates, Inc.

Phone: 520-326-5154 ext. 111 Email: jeff@lecroymilligan.com

CONTENTS

STEP 1:
CONTACT WITH INDIVIDUALS INVOLVED IN THE PROJECT

WHAT: This step involves ensuring that you are aware of the people who will be contacting you at various stages throughout the project.

GOAL: The goal of this step is to ensure that you are: (1) aware of who each individual is that is involved in the project, (2) aware of each of these individual's roles in the project, and (3) provided with contact details for these individuals.

WHO: The following individuals are among those who you will likely have contact with throughout the project:

Division of Probation Services:

- Eileen Kinney, Evaluation Manager DPS
  - Phone: 303-837-2319
  - Email: eileen.kinney@judicial.state.co.us

- Dana Wilks, Probation Analyst DPS
  - Phone: 303-837-2343
  - Email: dana.wilks@judicial.state.co.us

- Susan Jones, Education Specialist DPS
  - Phone: 303-837-2342
  - Email: susan.jones@judicial.state.co.us

LeCroy & Milligan (L&M) – the company conducting the Evaluation:

- Jeff Pfeifer, Senior Evaluation Associate/Project Lead (L&M)
  - Phone: 520-326-5154 ext. 111
  - Email: jeff@lecroymilligan.com
  - Role: Jeff is the Project Lead for this evaluation and will be coordinating the various phases of the project.

- Olga Valenzuela, Evaluation Associate (L&M)
  - Phone: 520-326-5154 ext. 119
  - Email: olga@lecroymilligan.com
  - Role: Olga is responsible for the day-to-day administration of the project and will spearhead a variety of tasks including arranging for forms to be sent to you as well as being the person you will submit completed forms to.

- Karen Thies-McWilliams, Evaluation Associate (L&M)
  - Phone: 303-880-4967
  - Role: Karen is responsible for administering both the *Pre and Post Treatment Surveys* as well as collecting the completed consent forms.

HOW: Once Dana (DPS) informs us that you will be starting a group, Karen (L&M) will contact you to arrange a date and time to administer the *Pre-Treatment Survey*. Our hope is that the Survey will be administered at the start of the first group meeting. Olga will also contact you periodically throughout the project to remind you of upcoming deadlines for submitting completed forms.

STEP 2:
COMPLETION OF THE PRE-TREATMENT TRACKING SHEET

WHAT: This step involves providing you with enough information to complete a *Pre-Treatment Tracking Sheet* for each client who begins the course.

GOAL: The goal of this step is to ensure that we have a completed *Pre-Treatment Tracking Sheet* for each client in your group. The *Pre-Treatment Tracking Sheet* provides us with important information regarding the client as well as ensuring that we have a full record of the client's participation in the group.

WHO & WHEN: The *Pre-Treatment Tracking Sheet* is to be completed by the Course Facilitator before the first group meeting. We have included a hard copy of the *Pre-Treatment Tracking Sheet* which you may copy and complete for each client. The set of completed *Pre-Treatment Tracking Sheets* can then be given to Karen (L&M) when she arrives at the first meeting to administer the Survey. Please note that we can also send you the *Pre-Treatment Tracking Sheet* as an email attachment if you wish. These can then be filled out and returned to Olga (L&M) by email at: olga@lecroymilligan.com. If you wish to have an electronic version of the *Pre-Treatment Tracking Sheet* sent to you, please contact Olga at the email above.

HOW: Completion of the *Pre-Treatment Tracking Sheet* is self-explanatory and includes an assortment of information about the client including LSI/CYOLSI scores and sub-scale scores.

TIME: It should only take you approximately 5 minutes per client to complete this form using the Case Summary and Assessments screens.

DOCUMENTS:

- ***Pre-Treatment Tracking Sheet***

STEP 3:
COMPLETION AND COLLECTION OF CONSENT FORMS

WHAT: This step involves describing the tasks related to distributing, completing, and collecting *Consent Forms*. There are two important aspects of this step to note:

- The *Consent Form* differs for Adult and Juvenile clients (*see samples*). A *Juvenile Consent Form* requires both the signature of the client as well as the parent/custodian/legal guardian.

- Under no circumstances is a client to complete a survey without having first signed a *Consent Form* (both the client and legal guardian in the case of a juvenile)

GOAL: The goal of this step is to ensure that *Consent Forms* are completed before data collection begins.

WHO, WHEN & HOW: Distribution, completion, and collection of *Consent Forms* varies for Adult and Juvenile clients.

- For Adult clients: Karen (L&M) will have the *Consent Forms* with her when she arrives at the first meeting. She will distribute the forms and explain the purpose of them to the clients before asking them to sign and return them. Karen will then collect the forms and administer the Survey (*see Step 4*).

- For Juvenile clients: If your group includes Juvenile clients, Dana (DPS) will contact you and discuss an action plan for the most efficient way of having both clients and their legal guardians sign the *Consent Form*. It is hoped that this can be accomplished before (or at) the first meeting so that the Survey may be administered then.

DOCUMENTS:

- ***Juvenile Consent Form***
- ***Adult Consent Form***

STEP 4:
ADMINISTRATION OF THE PRE-TREATMENT CLIENT SURVEY

WHAT: This step involves the administration of the *Pre-Treatment Client Survey*. The Survey is a very important component of the evaluation and is an instrument that was designed to assess the client on a number of cognitive and psychological dimensions.

GOAL: The goal of this step is to ensure that we have a completed *Pre-Treatment Client Survey* for every client who begins your course.

WHO, WHEN & HOW: The *Pre-Treatment Client Survey* will be administered by Karen (L&M). Once you have notified DPS that you will be starting a group, Karen will contact you to arrange to come to your first meeting and administer the Survey. We ask that you leave the room while Karen is administering the survey so that we can create an atmosphere of trust and anonymity for the clients while they complete the document. For Adult groups, Karen will also distribute and collect the Consent Forms (for Juvenile Groups see Step 2). Once the Surveys are completed Karen will collect them along with the Consent Forms. She will also ask you for the set of completed *Pre-Treatment Tracking Sheets** (see Step 3). Karen will then return these documents to us at L&M for data entry.

*If you opt to submit your *Pre-Treatment Tracking Sheets* to Olga by email attachment simply inform Karen of this.

TIME: The administration of the survey should take approximately 20 minutes.

DOCUMENTS:

- ***Pre-Treatment Client Survey***

STEP 5:
COMPLETION OF LESSON INFORMATION SHEETS

WHAT: This step involves providing you with enough information for you to complete and submit the *Lesson Information Sheets*.

GOAL: The goal of this step is to ensure that we receive a completed *Lesson Information Sheet* from you after each lesson. The *Lesson Information Sheet* is a very important part of the evaluation for a number of reasons. First, it will provide us with information regarding the fidelity of the delivery aspect of the program. Second, it will also allow us to gain a more detailed insight into how and why you are modifying the lesson materials. It may be that current modifications to lesson plans are promoting a very positive outcome and we definitely want to capture this so that we can suggest future alterations for training and delivery.

WHO, WHEN & TIME: A *Lesson Information Sheet* should be completed by the Course Facilitator following the completion of each lesson. The *Lesson Information Sheet* has been designed in such a way that it should be very quick to complete. We estimate that it should take no more than 5-10 minutes to complete.

HOW: Although the *Lesson Information Sheet* is self-explanatory, the following should be noted:

- There is a different *Lesson Information Sheet* for *T4C* and *Why Try* so it is important that you use the correct one

- A hard copy of the *Lesson Information Sheet* has been included. Before your course commences you will be contacted by Olga (L&M) and she will arrange to send you an email attachment of the *Lesson Information Sheet* which you can complete on your computer after each lesson and then email back to her at: olga@lecroymilligan.com.

DOCUMENTS:

- ***Why Try Lesson Information Sheet***
- ***T4C Lesson Information Sheet***

STEP 6:
REQUIREMENTS FOR CLIENTS WHO DO NOT COMPLETE THE COURSE

WHAT: This step involves providing you with information regarding what needs to be accomplished when a client does not complete the course.

GOAL: The goal of this step is to ensure that we gather as much information as possible about clients who either voluntarily or involuntarily leave the program before its completion. It is important that we track this information so that we can gain a greater insight into why clients leave the program. This information may then be used as a basis for suggestions regarding how the program might be altered to achieve higher retention rates.

WHO, WHEN & WHAT: When a client voluntarily or involuntarily leaves the course before its completion, we would like to capture the following information:

- The Facilitator should complete a *Post-Treatment Tracking Sheet* as well as a *Facilitator Exit Survey* (completion of these forms should take a total of no more than 15 minutes)

- The Facilitator should arrange with Dana (DPS) for the client to complete: (1) a *Post-Treatment Client Survey*, and (2) a *Probation Client Exit Survey*.

HOW: The administration of the *Post-Treatment Client Survey* may be done by the Facilitator if possible; however the administration of the *Probation Client Exit Survey* should be done by someone other than the Facilitator as the client may feel uneasy relating their reasons for leaving the group with the facilitator present. Once these forms are completed, they should be mailed to: Olga Valenzuela, LeCroy & Milligan Associates, 4911 East Broadway, Suite 100, Tucson, AZ 85711.

DOCUMENTS:

- ***Post-Treatment Tracking Sheet***
- ***Client Exit Survey***
- ***Facilitator Exit Survey***
- ***Post-Treatment Client Survey***

STEP 7:
REQUIREMENTS FOR CLIENTS WHO COMPLETE THE COURSE

WHAT: This step involves providing you with enough information to aid us in assessing clients who complete your course.

GOAL: The goal of this step is to ensure that we collect enough information about the client to allow us to examine the impact of the course on his or her cognitions and attitudes. In order to do so, it is important that each client who completes the course be asked to fill-out a *Post-Treatment Client Survey* and that the facilitator completes a *Post-Treatment Tracking Sheet* for each client.

WHO & WHEN: Instructions relating to the Survey and Tracking Sheet are as follows:

- *Post-Treatment Tracking Sheet* - As your course nears its completion, you will be contacted by Olga (L&M) and reminded that we would appreciate your completing a *Post-Treatment Tracking Sheet* for each client when the course ends. As with the Pre-*Treatment Tracking Sheet*, you may complete the form in hard copy or by an email attachment. Should you prefer the email attachment simply let Olga know when she calls you and she will arrange for you to receive it.

- *Post-Treatment Client Survey* – As your course nears its completion you will also receive a call from Karen (L&M) asking if she might arrange a time with you to come in at the end of the last lesson to administer the *Post-Treatment Client Survey*. Karen will administer and collect the Survey and return them to us. Karen will also ask you for the set of completed *Post-Treatment Tracking Sheets* (see above) so she can return those to us as well. If you opted to submit these forms to Olga by email simply let Karen know.

TIME: It should take clients approximately 20 minutes to complete the *Post-Treatment Client Survey*. It should take Facilitators no more than 5 minutes per client to complete the *Post-Treatment Tracking Sheet*.

DOCUMENTS:

- ***Post-Treatment Tracking Sheet***
- ***Post-Treatment Client Survey***

STEP 8:
ADMINISTRATION OF THE POST-TREATMENT BEHAVIORAL ASSESSMENT

WHAT: This step involves providing you with information regarding the *Post-Treatment Behavioral Assessment*.

GOAL: The goal of this step is to ensure that we receive a completed *Post-Treatment Behavioral Assessment* for each client who completes your course.

WHO, WHAT & HOW: The *Post-Treatment Behavioral Assessment* is a brief questionnaire to be completed by the Supervising Probation Officer for each of his or her clients who finishes your course. We realize that, in some cases, the Supervising Probation Officer is also the Facilitator. In these cases we ask you to complete the form. If you are not the Supervising Probation Officer for a client then we ask that you contact the Supervising Probation Officer and ask him or her to complete the form as soon as possible after the completion of the course and return it to us at: LeCroy & Milligan Associates, 4911 East Broadway Suite 100, Tucson AZ, 85711 Attention: Olga Valenzuela.

It is important to note that the *Post-Treatment Behavioral Assessment* is a somewhat subjective judgment. As such, it is vital that you be as honest as possible when completing this form.

TIME: Completion of the *Post-Treatment Behavioral Assessment* should take approximately 5 minutes.

DOCUMENTS:

- ***Post-Treatment Behavioral Assessment***

Appendix J: Survey Administration Protocol

Colorado Department of Probation Services Evaluation

Pre/Post Client Survey

There are 7 steps to the process:

1. **Determine when participants should take the Survey.**
2. **Explain the purpose of the Survey.**
3. **Pass out Survey materials.**
4. **Read the Survey instructions out loud.**
5. **Be available for questions.**
6. **Collect Surveys and Pre-Treatment Participant Tracking Sheets.**
7. **Return the Surveys and the Pre-Treatment Participant Tracking Sheets to Jeff Pfeifer at LeCroy & Milligan Associates, Inc.**

Below, please find detailed instructions for each step.

1. **Determine when participants should take the Survey.**
This survey is designed to assess the impact of exposure to a CBT course (i.e., *Thinking for a Change* or *Why Try*) on the attitudes and cognitions of individuals on probation. The survey should be administered to each individual both before the onset of the program as well as at the conclusion of the program.

- For some programs, all participants will begin the course at the same time and, as such, the pre and post surveys may be administered in a group. It is preferable that, in these situations, the pre survey be administered during the first orientation class – before lessons are delivered.

- For other programs, participants are enrolled on a rolling basis and, as such, administration of the pre and post should be done on an individual basis. Again, it is preferable that, in these situations, the pre survey be administered during the first orientation class – before lessons are delivered.

2. **Explain the purpose of the Survey.**
Participants need to know why we are asking them to take the survey. Explaining the survey's purpose shows respect for the participants' time and thoughts, and also helps ensure that the information we collect is as accurate as possible. It is also important for participants to know that they are free to ask for assistance if they are unsure of what a question is asking. As such, it is imperative that the Administrator understand the goal of each question so that he or she is able to clarify any confusion a participant might have. It is recommended that the Administrator review the Survey questions prior to administration and contact Jeff Pfeifer at LeCroy & Milligan Associates if he or she has any questions (jeff@lecroymilligan.com; 520-326-5154, ext. 111).

Here is a possible script for you to use to introduce the survey:

In a moment, we are going to ask you to fill out a survey. The survey will help us learn more about how you see the world and how your participation in this program has affected you. We will use this information to help us make the program better, and to see if this experience might have changed some of the ways you think about yourself and the world.

The information you share with us will be confidential. That means that the surveys will only be seen by people at a research company who will record the information on a data file using codes instead of names. In a few minutes I will be passing out a survey to each of you. We would appreciate it if you would put your first and last name at the top and then start answering the questions. Each question is in the form of a statement and we would like you to read the statement and then circle the number that represents how much you agree with the statement. For example, if the statement was "I like dogs" then you would circle a number from 1 to 7 that shows how true this is about you. So if you really dislike dogs you would circle 1 and if you really like dogs you would circle 7. If you kind of like dogs you would circle a 5 or 6 and so on. When you finish, raise your hand and I will collect the survey from you.

I want you to know that the information you give us is very important. Please take your time. If you have questions while you are filling out the survey, raise your hand and one of us will come over to answer your questions. If you do not understand what the statement means please feel free to raise your hand and I will come over and try to explain the statement to you. Please be respectful of everyone by keeping quiet until everyone has completed the survey.

I will pass the survey out in a moment. Before I do, please be sure that you are sitting somewhere where you have enough space to work privately. (Wait for students to find a proper space, and help them if needed).

3. Pass out Survey materials.

- Be sure you are passing out the correct version of the survey (i.e., pre-treatment/post-treatment)
- Be sure each student has:
    - One Survey
    - A pen to write with

4. Read the Survey instructions out loud (from the top of the survey).

5. Be available for questions.

Do not leave participants alone to take the survey. Be attentive for participants who raise their hand to ask a question. Feel free to try and explain what a statement is asking if the participant is unsure.

Please make a note if you perceive that a significant number of participants are confused about a specific question(s) and inform Jeff Pfeifer of this.

6. Collect Surveys and Pre-Treatment Participant Tracking Sheets.

Place the completed surveys and Pre-Treatment Participant Tracking Sheets in a large envelope. Record the date, location, and number of surveys on the front of the envelope.

7. Return the Surveys and Pre-Treatment Participant Tracking Sheets.

LeCroy & Milligan Associates, Inc.

Attn: Jeff Pfeifer

4911 E. Broadway, Suite 100

Tucson, AZ 85711

Appendix K: Colorado Judicial Districts

Judicial Districts of Colorado