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Objectives

- Describe principles of the RNR Model for Workforce Development
- Identify two effective evidence-based practices
- Review ERI validation findings
- Discuss ERI next steps
REALITY OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE

- Supervising 6+ million justice involved adults
  - 12+ million adults processed through jails
  - 1 in 50 adults on probation or parole
  - More than 50% of released prisoners back in prison within 3 years
Population Trends

- 500% increase in the number of people in U.S. prisons and jails
- Federal level: 1/2 of the population due to drug conviction
- State level: drug conviction has increased ten-fold since 1980
- Population is aging
- Disproportionate number of inmates suffer from infectious diseases, chronic diseases, and mental illness when compared with the general population
- African Americans and Hispanics disproportionately represented
- Number of women in prison increasing at a rate 50% higher than men since 1980
- Incarcerated women have different needs than incarcerated men; they are likely to be solely responsible for their children

Source:
BJS – 12/14: NCJ 248479
The Brookings Institution – 5/14: The Hamilton Project
American Bar Foundation – Researching Law, Vol. 21, No. 3
Lessons Learned

- Target criminogenic needs
- Tailor interventions to the individual
- Include accurate assessment
- Use cognitive behavioral approaches
- Provide structured learning opportunities
- Apply a triage approach
Evidence-based Practices

Definition:

Mental or behavior health interventions that have been proven to be effective through rigorous, systematic, empirical research.
RNR Model

Triage approach:
- Risk
- Needs
- Responsivity
RNR Model

Triage approach:
- Risk
- Needs
- Responsivity
Risk principle

- Programs should target high risk offenders
  - Greater need for positive thinking strategies
  - More room to show improvement
Needs principle

• Target behaviors that reduce crime
  • Identify static predictors
  • Focus on the dynamic predictors
Types of Risk Factors

- Static
- Dynamic
STATIC RISK FACTORS

- Age at first offense
- Escape history
- Prior criminal history
DYNAMIC PREDICTORS

• Self Control
• Circle of Caring
• Pro-social Values
• Pro-social “faces and places”
• Substance Abuse Treatment
• Reconnection with healthy relationships
Responsivity principle

- Target interventions to the specific need of the individual
  - Readiness to change
  - Desire to change
  - Ability to change
PRINCIPLES OF SUCCESSFUL INTERVENTIONS

• **RISK** - Direct program toward high-risk offenders.

• **NEEDS** – Target risk factors directly linked to criminal behavior.

• **RESPONSIVITY** – Be responsive to the individual’s style.
ACHIEVING REENTRY SUCCESS

• Who am I?
  ▫ Self concept

• What type of job/career goal should I consider?
  ▫ Skills/abilities

• How do I get a job....get into a training program, etc.?
  ▫ Tasks/steps

• How do I keep my job...maintain my attachment to the workforce?
  ▫ Problem Solving
Motivational Interviewing

Cognitive Behavioral Interventions

Reentry Success
Cognitive-Behavioral Interventions

- Impact/challenge values, attitudes and expectations
- Change thinking to change behavior
- Emphasize problem solving and decision making
- Homework is important
MOTIVATIONAL INTERVIEWING

A collaborative, client-centered form of guidance used to elicit and strengthen motivation for change.
MOTIVATIONAL INTERVIEWING

• PRINCIPLES
  ▫ Express empathy
  ▫ Develop discrepancy
  ▫ Roll with resistance
  ▫ Support offender strengths

• SPIRIT
  ▫ Autonomy/Support
  ▫ Collaboration
  ▫ Evocation
BASIC TECHNIQUES

- Open-ended questions
- Affirmations
- Reflections
- Summaries
MI Processes

Planning

Evoking

Focusing

Engaging
Multi-generational Workforce

- Traditionalists: 25%
- Baby Boomers: 38%
- Generation X: 32%
- Generation Y: 5%
Multi-generational Workforce

**TRADITIONALISTS**
1922-1945
Grew up in a “do-without” era
Believes in hard work and sacrifice
Uncomfortable with change
Dedicated

**BABY BOOMERS**
1946-1964
Grew up in a healthy economic era
Tend to be optimistic
Often defined by job
Team-Oriented

**GENERATION X**
1965-1978
Grew up in an era of distrust for national institutions
Tend to be cynical, pessimistic
Comfortable with change
Self-Reliant

**GENERATION Y**
1979-1997
Grew up in an era of financial boom
Used to instant gratification
Comfortable with multitasking
Tech-Savvy
Outline

- **Why** is employment retention important?
- **What** is NIC’s Employment Retention Inventory?
- **How** did we go about validating it?
- **Who** participated in the validation?
- **What** were the key findings?
- **Where** do we go from here?
Why Is Employment Retention Important?
Importance of Employment Retention

- Employment can provide financial stability and positive social support
- Employment is critical to those transitioning back into community after justice involvement
- Unemployment often a predictor of recidivism risk
- Gainful attachment to workforce may lower recidivism risk
What Is NIC’s Employment Retention Inventory (ERI)?
ERI = 40 questions on job loss risks

1. Barriers to Employment incl. Discrimination
2. Negative Family & Friend Influences
3. Stress at Work
4. Substance Use Issues
5. Mental Health Issues
6. Time Management
7. Perceived Job Loss

Also importance & confidence in keeping job
How Did We Validate the ERI?
Goals:
(1) Measure ERI’s effectiveness at identifying job loss risks
(2) Assess relationship between employment and recidivism
Time 1 Online Survey including ERI

- Completed by 400+ individuals on probation or parole
- 253 employed
- 159 unemployed
- Surveyed May to November 2014
Time 2 Employment Tracking

- Tracked follow-up employment for 82% of those employed at Time 1
  - Follow-up survey
  - Probation/parole records
- Yielded “snapshot” of employment status 8 months after Time 1
Who Participated in the Validation Study?
Two Sites

Jackson County, OR: Rural, includes Medford

Allegheny County, PA: Urban, includes Pittsburgh
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>PA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>79% male</td>
<td>81% male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (range 19-62)</td>
<td>33 years</td>
<td>33 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time on Probation or Parole</td>
<td>1½ years</td>
<td>1½ years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race*</td>
<td>4% Black</td>
<td>34% Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10% Hispanic</td>
<td>2% Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>89% White</td>
<td>63% White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Assistance*</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live with Family*</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant difference (p<.001)
Characteristics of Employed

- Most worked full-time (78%)
- Average wage $13/hour
- Most common jobs
  - Food service (30%), construction (20%), sales (19%)
- 8 in 10 had no employment benefits
- OR folks were unemployed longer & more likely to work “under the table” than PA
What Were the Key Findings?
Key Finding #1
Online ERI was easily accessible to clients and readable at 6th grade level.

9 in 10 said the survey was “very easy”, and
8 in 10 felt “very comfortable” answering questions.

Most of the correctional population has 8th grade or higher education (86%, according to BJS 2003).
Key Finding #2
ERI covered key employment domains supported by literature and had strong face & content validity.

Does ERI appear “on its face” to measure precursors to job loss & cover all relevant content?
✓ Yes, items accord with prior research on job retention and recidivism
✓ Urban added items to assess prior job training & experience, plus discrimination on criminal record and sexual orientation
ERI’s “Barriers” domain covers problems with transportation, poor health, and perceived discrimination

Current research shows each of these is correlated with leaving the workforce

Studies: Corcoran, Danziger & Tolman 2004; Danziger 1999; Harris 1996; Hershey & Pavetti 1997; Hoffert and Collins 2000
## Full Picture - Reliability & Factor Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ERI Domain</th>
<th># Questions</th>
<th>Reliability (&gt;.7 good)</th>
<th>Factor Loadings (&gt;.4 good)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barriers and Perceived Discrimination</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.25 (race); .35 to .53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Family/Friends</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.44 to .79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.40 to .76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Use</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.39 to .76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.45 to .85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Management</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.19 to .95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of Job Loss</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.06 (easy find job);</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Finding #3
ERI performed fairly well at predicting 8-month out "snapshot" of employment.

Employed at Time 1 | Unemployed at Time 1
--- | ---
78% | 48%
Sensitivity and Specificity

➤ Sensitivity = True Positive Rate
  • Rate at which ERI identifies those at high-risk of job loss
    • Allegheny County PA = 83% = Excellent
    • Jackson County OR = 65% = Fair

➤ Specificity = True Negative Rate
  • Rate at which ERI identifies those at low-risk of job loss
    • Allegheny County PA = 43% = Insufficient
    • Jackson County OR = 82% = Excellent
Area Under the Curve (AUC)

- Another way of assessing predictive validity
- Combines info from sensitivity & specificity
  - Above .6 = Fair
  - Above .7 = Good
  - Above .8 = Excellent
- Allegheny County PA = .70 = Good
- Jackson County OR = .84 = Excellent
Key Finding #4
Being employed at baseline and retaining employment were significantly related to recidivism.

Definition of Recidivism
- Reincarcerated (Jackson County OR)
- Rearrested or Reconvicted (Allegheny County PA)
- Both covered 1 year after Time 1 baseline survey
Crosstabs of Recidivism by Employment***

- Unemployed at Baseline and Follow-up: 33%
- Employed at Baseline Only: 30%
- Employed at Follow-up Only: 8%
- Employed at Baseline and Follow-up: 13%

Legend: Recidivated excl. technical violations

Employment Retention
Comments from ERI Participants
“I look forward to somebody actually helping those of us who have difficulties obtaining the things we need in order to be a successful and positive member of the community. Thank you for taking the time out to show there is somebody who cares.”

—24-year-old Multiracial male in Jackson County OR
“There was no question on whether I was underemployed. I've taken a nearly tenfold pay reduction and have no reasonable hope of ever returning to my profession.”

—47-year-old White male in Allegheny County PA
“I think it would help if probation and parole had a component that specialized in helping us find jobs with employers who are willing to hire and pay a livable wage.”

—45-year-old Black male in Allegheny County PA
Where Do We Go From Here?
Next Steps

- We’ve revised ERI to measure full continuum of employment attachment
- NIC/Urban launching replication validation in 3 sites nationwide
  - First validation was “blind” to practitioners
  - Second validation tests ERI’s implementation by those trained in NIC’s employment retention curriculum (e.g., motivational interviewing & cognitive behavioral techniques)
More Information

NIC Offender Employment Retention Initiative
http://nicic.gov/oeretentionresearch

Urban Institute ERI Final Report
http://www.urban.org/research/publication/validation-employment-retention-inventory
Challenges and Lessons Learned

Data challenges

- **Accessing** individual-level employment records from reliable sources is difficult.

- Both self-reported and administrative data can have questionable **accuracy**.
What does it mean to validate the ERI & why does it matter?

Assessment tools used more and more to guide practice, but need to ensure tool is accurate

**Validation**: Analyses that help you get best prediction for the time and effort you put into a tool

- Make sure each item matters and different items work well **together**
- Take out items that don’t matter (no one likes a long survey!)

Data and Methods (cont.)

Collected employment & criminal records

- Electronically consented to allow records’ access
- Data collected from:
  - Probation & Parole
  - Department of Corrections
  - Department of Labor (pending)
Receipt of employment and/or financial services:

- Most (80%) had received no employment services in previous 6 months

- Half had received financial assistance (e.g., food stamps)
Cited Research


Do the ERI’s groupings of questions into 7 domains (or factors) make sense? Do questions within each domain “load” highly at a value of 0.4 and above?

- Yes, confirmatory factory analysis showed a 7-domain structure explained 52% of the variation in the data
- Most ERI questions had factor loadings of 0.4 or above
- *Time Management* domain had weakest factorial validity
Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ERI Domain</th>
<th># Questions</th>
<th>Factor Loadings (&gt;.4 good)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.45 to .85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Questions grouped in ERI’s *Mental Health* domain had factor loadings between .45 and .85
- Factor loadings greater than .4 indicate a question is a good indicator of that factor
Reliability

Cronbach’s Alpha:
Are the ERI questions internally consistent within each domain (alpha 0.7 and above)?

✓ Yes, reliability analyses showed Cronbach’s alphas rounding to 0.7 and above for all but the Time Management and Perceptions of Job Loss domains
**Example**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ERI Domain</th>
<th># Questions</th>
<th>Reliability (&gt; .7 good)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Substance Use</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- ERI’s *Substance Use* domain had a Cronbach’s alpha reliability of .71
- Reliabilities greater than .7 indicate questions in a domain are internally consistent
Are the ERI domain scores highly correlated with one another?

✓ Yes, most Pearson correlations were 0.4 or above and statistically significant (p<.001)
✓ Pearson correlations greater than 0.4 that are statistically significant (p<.05) indicate strong convergent validity
What’s most correlated? Least?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Barriers &amp; Discr</th>
<th>Family/Friends</th>
<th>Stress</th>
<th>Substance Use</th>
<th>Mental Health</th>
<th>Time Mgt</th>
<th>Job Loss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barriers &amp; Discr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/Friends</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Use</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Mgt.</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Loss</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance * p<.01 **p<.001
Concurrent Validity

Are participants’ ERI scores correlated with other risk assessment scores?

- Could only assess in Pennsylvania, who provided LSI-R
  - LSI-R was significantly correlated with two ERI domains—Negative Family & Friends (.22*) and Substance Use (.17†)
  - Correlations are statistically significant but low/moderate
- LSI-R is designed to predict recidivism, not job retention

Significance † p<.10 *p<.05
Two Strengths-Focused ERI Items

- How Important to Keep Your Job: 9.78
- How Confident You Can Keep Job: 9.77