

An Assessment, Monitoring and Outcome Measurement System for Offender Rehabilitation and Reintegration Programmes

A submission to

The Joint Committee on Justice, Defence and Equality

January 10th 2014 on the topic of Community Courts

Summary: Community Courts were originally established to combine punishment and help, sentencing low-level offenders to perform community restitution, to receive onsite social services, including drug treatment, counselling, and other psycho/social supports. There are currently more than 60 community court projects in operation worldwide. In the United States alone there are 33 while there are 17 in South Africa, 13 in England and Wales, and one each in Australia and Canada. A substantial body of evidence now exists to support the efficacy of the Community Courts system. The Cornmarket Project welcomes the current debate on the possibility of introducing the successful aspects of this model into the Irish judicial system. The development of community based services for offenders has not always been marked by adherence to best practice based on empirical evidence. Expediency, personal conviction and a sincere desire to do “something” to respond to anti social behaviour and criminality in our communities are historically more common drivers. This submission to the Joint Committee on Justice, Defence and Equality explores some of the contemporary research and evidence relating to the efficacy of various approaches used in implementing offender rehabilitation programmes. The author outlines a particular model at work in the Cornmarket Project. Mindful of current economic constraints and the increased reporting requirements placed on organisations in receipt of state funds, the submission emphasises the importance of having in place an easy to use, valid and reliable outcome measurement system for programmes dealing with offender reintegration and rehabilitation as part of a support mechanism for the possible development of a Community Courts model.

Key words: Cornmarket, COAIM, functional analysis, logic model, outcomes, rehabilitation, recidivism, criminogenic , behaviour change, efficacy, motivation.

Introduction

The Cornmarket Project was established in 1999 as a multi -agency response to criminality and substance misuse issues. The project is based in the county of Wexford which has a population of 145,000 people and is located in the south east corner of Ireland, about one hundred and twenty kilometres south of Dublin. The project deals with approximately two hundred and fifty individual clients per year, one hundred and seventy of whom on average will be direct referrals from the Probation Service. The project is under the umbrella of Wexford Local Development (WLD)¹, the local development company in Wexford mandated to deliver rural development, social inclusion and community development programmes on behalf of the Irish government.

The Cornmarket project receives core funding from the Department of Justice and Equality, through the Probation Service. Additional funding is provided by the Department of Social Protection, through the Community Employment Programme², Department of Education through the local Training and Education Board³, the Department of Health, through the HSE⁴, the Department of the Environment,

¹ www.wld.ie

² <http://www.fas.ie/en/communities/community+employment/default.htm>

³ www.cowexfordvec.ie

⁴ www.hse.ie

Community and Local Government⁵, through the WLD and other state agencies and departments. The steering committee comprises of representatives from the funders, An Garda Síochána, local authorities and the local community.

Cornmarket has a multi-disciplinary approach in providing a continuum of services for medium to high risk offenders. The programmes delivered include one-to-one behaviour change counselling based on individualised action plans, a targeted offender outreach service, a daily structured open access/drop-in service dealing with advocacy and case work, a six month Behaviour Change and BTEI (back to education initiative⁶) programme and a 12 months training, reintegration and progression programme. The programmes are delivered in the four main urban areas of County Wexford; Wexford Town, Gorey, Enniscorthy and New Ross. The Cornmarket Project operates six days a week and also provides two late night services to facilitate those on probation, in employment or engaged in main stream training or education.

The services are managed by the project coordinator and delivered by a team of twelve qualified staff members with additional support from part time sessional workers recruited on the basis of programme needs. Financial management and governance is provided by WLD. Because Cornmarket is under the aegis of WLD, clients have access to other WLD services such as guidance and employment services, early school leaver supports, traveller community services, further training and education opportunities, grant aid and child care provision.

The Context of the Project

The project has an outcomes focussed, community facing and client centred approach. Cornmarket's primary goal is to work in collaboration with the Courts, Probation Service and other partners to ensure positive change in offenders and a reduction in recidivism. The methodologies used are underpinned by evidence-based behavioural interventions to enhance client motivation for successful participation in the rehabilitation and reintegration programmes delivered by the project. This approach acknowledges individual difference in terms of age, gender, ethnicity and culture, problem severity, recovery stage, and level of supervision needed. Offenders also respond differently to different treatment and rehabilitation approaches.

A review of the first ten years of the project in 2010 (The Cornmarket Project, Ten Years Responding to Drugs and Criminality in Wexford, WLD.) emphasised the importance of a strong professional working relationship between the project and the Probation Service. This relationship is reinforced by regular joint meetings to discuss and monitor each offender's

⁵ www.environ.ie/

⁵ www.welfare.ie

⁶ <http://www.education.ie/home/home.jsp?pcategory=11397&ecategory=14965&language=EN>

progress using a case management approach. Cornmarket adds value to the work of the Probation Service by addressing issues of offender motivation, problem solving and skill-building to diminish criminal behaviour and enhance resistance to substance misuse.

Only a small percentage of those requiring intervention for drug and alcohol related problems seek help voluntarily (Redonna, K, et al. 2009). In light of this, the Criminal Justice System provides a unique opportunity to intervene and disrupt the cycle of substance misuse and crime in a cost effective manner. It is in this context that a Community Courts model with its ability to respond on a case management/services coordination basis, could play a vital role.

Findings (Pearson and Lipton, 1999, Leukefeld et al. 2002, Knight and Farabee, 2004, McCollister et al. 2004) show that providing comprehensive substance misuse treatment and rehabilitation for criminal offenders works; reducing both substance abuse and recidivism.

Given the increasing prison population, attributable in large part (O'Mahony, 2008) to substance misuse related offences accompanied by high rates of recidivism (Wexler and Fletcher, 2007) it is a matter of public health and safety to continue to make substance misuse treatment and rehabilitation a key component of the Criminal Justice System and this can best be accommodate through a Community Courts system. Furthermore, addressing the reintegration needs of substance misusing offenders is critical to reducing overall crime and other drug related societal burdens, such as primary health care costs and dealing with the consequences of anti social behaviour in communities. Research has shown that substance misuse treatment and rehabilitation can be effective even when an individual enters it under legal mandate (National Institute on Drug Abuse, 2007)

Key Operating Principles

The work of the Cornmarket project is underpinned by empirically validated, evidence based methodologies. In particular, the use of Motivational Interviewing (Miller and Rollnick, 2002) Cognitive Behavioural Therapy (Milkman and Wanberg, 2007) the Stages of Change Model (Prochaska and DiClemente, 1984) and Structured Relapse and Recidivism Prevention techniques (adapted from Herrie and Watkin-Merek, 2006) are important in promoting positive behavioural change and reducing recidivism. In their work on effective responses to offending, Brown, et al.(2011) make the point that critiques of recent and past intervention programmes for offenders have repeatedly commented on the uneven and poor quality of implementation, the ambiguity or absence of a theoretical rationale and conceptual base, and flawed evaluations. They further state that the lack of a clear rationale makes it likely that a programme will become a disconnected set of activities, with problems such as:

- services provided, sanctions and incentives used, and community resources tapped, all in an ad hoc and fragmented fashion
- individual staff pursuing their own direction and inclinations
- target-group criteria referrals and selection not matched to the most appropriate programme or person
- a lack of coherence and continuity between programme components, features and processes
- offenders major difficulties or needs not being met, leaving gaps in service or wasted opportunities (Brown et al. 2011)

Brown and her colleagues also identify a series of principles guiding the design of effective programmes and interventions. These are integral to the work of the Cornmarket Project and include:

- 1) that the level of service intervention should match not only the client's risk level i.e. medium to high, but also their stage of readiness and willingness to change.
- 2) interventions should focus on those modifiable aspects that contribute most highly to the client's continued offending behaviour based on the ten criminogenic factors or dynamic risk areas listed later on in this article.
- 3) it is imperative to match programmes to the learning style and capability of the client so as to increase the likelihood that he or she will respond in a positive fashion.
- 4) programmes located in the community yield more effective outcomes. This is not to dismiss institutional or residential based work, but reflects the need to apply the skills learnt in real life.
- 5) programmes should be (a) multimodal – focusing on more than one antecedent to problematic behaviours (b) skills oriented – such as problem solving and developing social and coping skills and (c) utilise approaches which draw on empirically validated research. This is known as the treatment and rehabilitation modality principle,
- 6) programmes should adhere to best practice methods by including monitoring and review during and after programme delivery. This is to ensure consistency, and to maintain quality assurance (the fidelity principle).

Outcome Measurement

Over the past few years there has been an increased emphasis on having effective assessment, monitoring and outcome measurement systems in place for organisations in receipt of state funds. Although these are worthy and necessary, the implementation of such requirements presents a real challenge to many organisations including those delivering rehabilitation and reintegration programmes for offenders. Most organisations, both statutory and non-statutory, are accustomed to evaluating programmes and recording outputs but are relatively new to the concept of outcome measurement. The integration of a workable, valid and reliable system into their current working environment poses a distinct challenge to many services. However, no single assessment or outcome measurement system is universally accepted as the best (Penna, 2011). While acknowledging the need for thorough and accurate information, research literature (Madan, R, 2007) on this topic suggests that comprehensiveness needs to be balanced by brevity to ensure routine application and compliance (Madan, R, 2007)

The literature points out that the process of measurement is as important as the outcome measure itself (Hatry, van Houten, Plantz and Greenway, 1996). In accepting this premise we need to be mindful of:

- a) using an approach that involves clients in a meaningful way in a system that can potentially have a significant impact on their lives
- b) ensuring that the chosen approach can be used in an easy and consistent way by staff and facilitators and
- c) putting in place a system that can be relied on to satisfy the informational needs of funders and a range of other stakeholders (Delaney, 2006)

In considering the overall effectiveness of assessment and outcome measurement systems, we also need to be mindful of the need for the non-statutory sector to integrate their efforts more closely with statutory providers of services. For this to work, we need to develop an integrated case management approach to our work. This presents a particular challenge that must be discussed and overcome at a local level. The COAIM System can help to facilitate this development.

The COAIM System

COAIM is a locally developed assessment and outcome measurement process; the acronym COAIM, stands for Change Outcome and Impact Measurement. CO is a prefix meaning 'with, together, in association', and AIM in this context means 'to achieve something'. The COAIM System emphasises the fostering of a collaborative approach between the facilitator and client. It uses the generic terms "client" to indicate programme participant, service user, substance misuser, customer, offender, drug abuser, alcoholic, patient etc., and "facilitator" to mean key worker, project worker, housing officer,

counsellor, therapist, drugs worker, case manager, probation officer, social worker, doctor, nurse, outreach worker, psychologist etc.

The COAIM System comprises a set of tools for assessment, monitoring and outcome measurement incorporating Theory of Change (McKinnon et al., 2006) and Logic Model (Kellogg Foundation, 2004) methodologies with Motivational Interviewing (Miller and Rollnick, 2002) and the Stages of Change Model (Prochaska and DiClemente, 1984) to provide a user friendly, reliable system. Through the use of motivational interviewing strategies, the COAIM System facilitates and enhances the development of positive change with clients.

One way of describing outcome measurement is as a process that involves: *Who* receives *what* from *whom* at what *cost* and with what *effect*. However, why develop an outcome measurement system that only meets informational needs? Why not ensure that such a system can also be used for assessment and monitoring while enhancing the likelihood of positive change with our clients?

With this challenging brief as the blueprint, the COAIM System was developed in 2006 (Delaney, 2006) based on a set of graphic and easy to use tools to assess, monitor and measure outcomes while enhancing the likelihood of a reduction in recidivism amongst offenders.

A strong driver for reliable assessment, monitoring and outcome measurement systems has been to satisfy funders and other decision makers. The COAIM System also recognises the importance of the client perspective and involvement in the measurement of their participation in rehabilitation and reintegration programmes. It is hard to ignore the issue of system integrity if client input to the measurement of programme efficacy is excluded. Therefore, the COAIM System challenges conventional methods of measuring programme outcomes where the client is the passive recipient of programmes and services and the facilitator decides how beneficial those services are or were for the client! (Delaney, 2006).

The COAIM System ensures consistency and maximises effectiveness, by stipulating the use of motivational interviewing by facilitators, (Delaney and Weir, 2004, McMurrin, 2009,). In addition, all problem areas or antecedents for the client are connected and worked on, ensuring a genuine holistic approach. The COAIM System promotes a case management approach; a “joined up” way of working among the programmes, agencies and departments dealing with offenders.

The COAIM System provides the facilitator with a framework within which to engage the client in a planned, collaborative yet directive manner. This approach optimises the potential for positive outcomes and ensures effective mapping and measurement of programme and service delivery. Properly implemented, using the tools of motivational interviewing, the approach creates the circumstances whereby the client develops the self-efficacy necessary to ultimately take ownership of continuing positive change at an individual level (McMurrin, 2009).

Background to the COAIM System Tools

All organisations in receipt of state funds are now, or will be, required to base their service level agreements and business plans on some version of the logic model approach i.e. they are expected to set out how an intervention such as a project is intended to produce particular results. The development of the COAIM System in 2006 as a way of measuring outcomes was based on the use of a programme theory (Rossi, Lipsey and Freeman, 2004) approach to working with offenders and substance misusers. This theory identifies the link between an intervention and the intended or observed outcomes. (Funnell, S, 2011).

Using programme theory (Rossi, Lipsey and Freeman, 2004) as a way of ensuring effective measurement of outcomes is not a new concept. Programme theory or logic models set out how an intervention (such as a project, a program, or a policy) is understood and is intended to produce particular results.

The United Way, a non-profit organisation in the USA, published a guide to developing and using models for outcome measurement (Hatry, van Houten, Plantz and Greenway) in 1996. Moreover, the Kellogg Foundation produced a logic model guide (W.K.Kellogg Foundation, 2004) in which they expounded a linear template of five components: inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes and impacts. This particular five component logic model provides the framework for the COAIM system approach:

COAIM five stage logic model				
Programme Resources or Inputs	Programme Activities	Programme Outputs	Programme Outcomes	Programme Impact
Resources needed to operate the programme	Processes, tools, events, technology and actions that are an intentional part of the programme implementation	Types, levels and targets of service delivered	Specific changes in programme participants' behaviour, knowledge, skills, status and level of functioning	Changes to organisations, communities, or systems as a result of programme activities within seven to ten years

The COAIM System is particularly effective in mapping and measuring the three stages of the model dealing with Programme Activities, Outputs and Outcomes. The tools of the COAIM System are predicated on assessing, targeting and measuring factors that *can* be changed in the lives of offenders, known as *dynamic factors*. Those that cannot be changed are *static factors* and include prior record or family criminality. Early onset of criminal behaviour is a very good predictor of future behaviour, and it is a risk factor that cannot be changed: if you were first arrested at age ten you will always have been first arrested at age ten.

Synthesising the findings of Lipsey and Wilson's (1998) meta-analysis, the research outcomes of Latessa (2004) and Andrews, Bontà and Gendreau (2006) the COAIM System concentrates on the following known criminogenic or dynamic risk factor areas (Andrews, Bontà & Gendreau, 2006) which are listed as the ten primary areas in the COAIM System that need to be addressed with offenders:

1. Attitudes and Cognitive Style
2. Offending Behaviour
3. Pro-Social Activities
4. Anger and Emotion Management
5. Drug and Alcohol Misuse
6. Lifestyle and Associates
7. Training and Employability
8. Accommodation
9. Financial Issues and Debt
10. Relationships and Family Issues

In supporting the proposal for the development of Community Courts it is useful to look at the research of Andrews and his colleagues. In their research they point out that focus on non-criminogenic factors such as self-esteem, fear of punishment, physical conditioning (such as outdoor pursuits) and developing offender's creative abilities through art and music will not have a significant effect on recidivism rates (Andrews and Bonta 1994, 2006). Studies (Gendreau, French and Taylor, 2002) have shown that programmes that target four to six criminogenic risk factors more than non-criminogenic risk factors can have a thirty percent or more effect on recidivism while programmes that target more non-criminogenic risk factors have virtually no effect (Gendreau, French and Taylor, 2002). A lot of programmes targeting non-criminogenic needs are not producing significant effect on recidivism.

Lipsey and Wilson (1998) conducted a systematic review of the evidence for effective intervention with those whose offending behaviour was deemed to be serious. They reviewed more than 200 studies relating to offenders and looked at the evidence in relation to those who were non-institutionalised and institutionalised. A summary of their findings (Brown, S, et.al. 2011) highlights the most and least effective types of treatment and interventions measured by recidivism rates for non-institutionalised younger people outlined in the table below:

Type of treatment or intervention used with non-institutionalised offenders			
Positive effects- consistent evidence	Positive effects- less consistent evidence	Mixed, but generally positive effects	Weak or no effects
Individual counselling Interpersonal skills: attitudes and cognitive style, pro-social activities, anger and emotion management, relationships and family issues, substance misuse, etc.	Multiple/continuum of services Advocacy casework Restitution/probation	Employment related programmes Academic programmes Group counselling programmes	Outdoor pursuits, physical fitness Deterrence programmes Vocational skills programmes: car fixing, carpentry, artwork, music, painting, gardening etc.

This research suggests that community based programmes that demonstrate good evidence of effectiveness include behavioural therapies, intensive case management, a multi-systemic approach and interpersonal skills training. A properly constituted Community Courts system could play a vital role in ensuring that recidivism is lowered by taking this approach.

Methodology

The COAIM System uses what is referred to as the Functional Analysis instrument which is both a motivational and a measurement tool developed to enhance positive change in collaboration with the client. The facilitator uses this tool to engage with the client in scoring and recording how they experience and see their situation at:

- a) commencement with the service,
- b) during the programme, and
- c) at the conclusion of engagement with the service

This is done by the facilitator and client jointly using the COAIM Rating and Mapping Guide to map progress on the Functional Analysis instrument. At the start of the offender's engagement with the programme or service an assessment with reference to the ten main criminogenic or risk factor areas is carried out by the facilitator with the client. The facilitator uses the Functional Analysis instrument with the COAIM Rating and Mapping Guide to allocate a numerical value or "score" to each of the ten areas or issues and to map the current situation. The completion of this initial Functional Analysis or assessment forms the baseline against which future client progress will be measured.

Following completion of the Functional Analysis instrument the computed scores and indicators are used to inform the offender's individual action plan which looks at each main area or risk factor separately. During the process the facilitator, using the strategies of motivational interviewing, discusses with the client a realistic set of steps to determine what areas need to be worked on first and what activities need to be prioritised.

It is not unusual to have a discrepancy between the client's perception of where they consider themselves to be on the Functional Analysis scale and the reality of their current behaviour and situation as assessed with the facilitator. A facilitator skilled in motivational interviewing will use this situation as an opportunity to further resolve ambivalence, deal with resistance and increase client motivation for positive change.

Where progress already exists in relation to one or more of the ten risk factor areas, the facilitator works with the client to cement and enhance this situation through the use of Structured Relapse and Recidivism Prevention techniques (adapted from Herrie and Watkin-Merek, 2006) During the time that the client is engaged with the programme or service the Functional Analysis is again periodically completed mapping progress towards achieving the overall goals and outcomes. This serves two main purposes. Firstly, as a motivational enhancement tool by showing in a graphic manner the client's progress. Secondly, it enables the facilitator to continue to map and score the various areas and issues and make changes to the offender's Action Plan, if necessary.

At completion or disengagement from the programme or service the Functional Analysis is used as a final or exit assessment. The results of this are compared with the initial baseline and interim assessments. The information derived from this comparison informs the COAIM Data Table Instrument and is then used to compute change across the main areas originally established as priorities at first engagement. In addition, the numerical data concerning the ten risk factor areas is collated and aggregated and used to measure change and progress relative to the overall desired goals and outcomes as established by the client and facilitator. This approach is in contrast to other outcome measurement systems that consider problem areas in isolation and not in this holistic manner. Providing information to a Community Court through the use of the above system could be of great benefit to the court in determining offender sanctions.

Implementing the COAIM System and Improving Practice

The Cornmarket Project has trained and developed facilitators to equip them with the necessary knowledge, skills and attitudes to effectively implement the COAIM System. The training includes:

- Understanding the Change Outcome and Impact Measurement System and an overview of theory of change and logic model approaches.
- Integrating the Stages of Change Model and the COAIM Rating and Mapping Guide
- How to assess, record, map and measure change and outcomes using the various instruments specific to the COAIM System
- Using motivational Interviewing to enhance positive engagement and to ensure uniformity of approach in assessment and outcome measurement with offenders
- Effective use of the tools of Structured Relapse and Recidivism Prevention

Facilitators are guided in practice by the COAIM Implementation Manual (Delaney, 2006). During their training, each facilitator develops the knowledge and skills required to use the manual effectively. The manual (Delaney, 2006) contains all the materials and instruments needed to deliver the programme. It also contains clearly written sections on: Using the COAIM System, developing an Effective Logic Model, the Stages of Change Model, Motivational Interviewing and Relapse and Recidivism Prevention strategies. The manual is used on an ongoing basis post training to ensure consistency and quality control in programme delivery.

Strengths of the COAIM System

The COAIM System is first and foremost a practical, graphic and user friendly method for mapping and measuring the impact of service delivery on clients' i.e. measuring outcomes. Through the use of motivational Interviewing as the medium, the COAIM System facilitates meaningful engagement with clients and enhances motivation for sustained positive change.

The COAIM System enables introduction of monitoring and evaluation considerations at the planning stage of a programme linking them to the implementation and management of the programme. It helps a programme to be specific about the clients it targets, the changes it expects to see, and the strategies it employs and, as a result, be more effective in the results it achieves.

It can be particularly valuable for supporting complex systems such as Community Courts where results and achievements cannot easily be understood with quantitative indicators alone.

Community Courts will benefit from an outcome measuring system that allows for a deeper insight of a qualitative and contextualised account of the change process. Because the COAIM System can extract and compile data on an individual client or whole programme it can also be used to indicate trends and highlight emerging issues. Such data can help inform the Community Court by assisting in identifying priority areas for reducing recidivism.

The COAIM System can also be beneficial at a number of levels in helping to improve practice i.e.

- having more effective interventions and improved interaction with offenders
- improving communication amongst those involved in the delivery of different services
- benchmarking between services and programmes, and
- assisting policy making, enabling research and securing funding

In order to increase the efficacy of the Community Court model, a knowledge of the various antecedents that are involved in an offender's life will be important. The COAIM System provides this information by not stopping at measuring outputs alone. The COAIM System maps an offender's progress from assessment, through engagement, to conclusion on the programme and accurately measures change and outcomes relative to the offender.

Conclusion

Based on the experience of Community Courts in other countries (Henry and Kralstein, 2011) we can assume that in order for such a system to be effective in Ireland, the active collection and analysis of data used to measure outcomes and impact will be required. Typically, Community Courts in other jurisdictions seek to move beyond the standard units of measurement used to assess existing court performance. Traditionally, courts are asked only to report on volume and speed: how many cases were processed and how quickly? While these results are important and should be tracked, Community Courts should also seek to add additional questions including what impact such an approach is having on the quality of community life.

The discussion on Community Courts in Ireland comes at a time when government and other stakeholders are increasingly seeking that creditable and validated outcome measuring systems are in place in relation to the provision of alternatives to custodial sentences. We hope this submission will make a positive contribution to the work of the Joint Committee on Justice, Defence and Equality in their deliberations on Community Courts and to the wider discussion on evidence based best practice rehabilitation programmes for offenders.

Historically the development of services for offenders has not always been marked by adherence to best practice based on empirical evidence. Expediency, personal conviction and a sincere desire to do “something” to respond to anti social behaviour and criminality in our communities have been more common drivers. Policy development in Ireland concerning offender reintegration strategies seeks an increasing use of community options rather than custodial interventions while also seeking a reduction in expenditure. We are now in a new era that presents both challenges and opportunities. We must develop new approaches and ways of working to meet the needs of today for the users of the services, the funders and the communities in which we all live.

Those charged with effecting positive change in areas such as offender reintegration and rehabilitation are asked to demonstrate programme efficacy, value for money and evidence in relation to client outcomes. We suggest that the COAIM System together with its range of tools can assist in meeting these requirements and thus enhance quality of service delivery.

Submitted to the Joint Committee on Justice, Defence and Equality by:

Paul Delaney M.Ed. Dip.Couns. MIAAAC MINT

Coordinator, the Cornmarket Project

Wexford Local Development

Old County Hall

Spawell Road

Wexford

0539155800

0879544697

pdelaney@wld.ie

REFERENCES

- Adler, W, et.al. (1999) *Principles of Drug Addiction Treatment: A Research Based Guide*, National Institute of Drug Abuse, Bethesda, MD, USA.
- Anderson, A, (2008) *Theory of Change*, The Aspen Institute, New York, USA.
- Andrews, D, & Bonta, J. (2006) *Risk-Need-Responsivity Model for Offender Assessment and Rehabilitation*, Multi-Health Systems, Toronto, Canada.
- Andrews, D.A., & Bonta, J. (1994) *The Psychology of Criminal Conduct*. Anderson Publishing, Cincinnati, OH, USA.
- Andrews, D. A., & Bonta, J. (2006). *The Psychology of Criminal Conduct* (4th ed.) LexisNexis, Newark, NJ, USA.
- Arkowitz, H, Westra, H, et.al (2008) *Motivational Interviewing in the Treatment of Psychological Problems*, Guildford Press, New York, USA.
- Austin, K, Williams, W, and Kilgour, G. (2011) *The Effectiveness of Motivational Interviewing With Offenders: An Outcome Evaluation*, Journal of Psychology, 40, 55-67, New Zealand.
- Bakker, L., O'Malley, J., and Riley, D. (1999) *Risk of Reconviction: Statistical Models Predicting Four Types of Re-offending*. New Zealand Department of Corrections Publication, Wellington, New Zealand.
- Brown, S, Giller, H, and Stephenson, M, (2011) *Effective Practice in Youth Justice*, 2nd Edition, Routledge, Oxford, UK.
- Byrne, S, Hillman, K and Stanley, E. (2001) *Offender Risk and Needs Assessment*, Australian Association for Cognitive and Behaviour Therapy, Perth, Australia.
- Clarke, M, Walters, S, Ginerich, R and Metzler, M, (2006) *Motivational Interviewing for Probation Officers: Tipping the Balance Toward Change*, Federal Probation, Washington, USA.
- Comptroller and Auditor General (2004) *The Probation and Welfare Service. Report on Value for Money Examination*, Department of Justice, Equality and Law Reform, Dublin, Ireland.
- Connolly, J. (2006) *Drugs and crime in Ireland. Overview 3*, Health Research Board, Dublin, Ireland.
- Connors, G, Donovan, D, Diclemente, C, (2001) *Substance Abuse Treatment and the Stages Of Change*, Guildford Press, New York, USA.
- Cornmarket Project (2010), *Ten Years Responding to Drugs and Criminality in Wexford*, Wexford Local Development, Wexford, Ireland.
- Davies, P. and Gailey, Y. (2005) *Risk and Need in Offender Populations in Ireland*, Dublin, Probation and Welfare Service.
- Day, A, Casey, S, et.al (2010) *Transitions to Better Lives: Offender Readiness and Rehabilitation*, Willan Publishing, Devon, UK.
- Delaney, P, (2006) *Change Outcome and Indicator Mapping: A Manual for Measuring Outcomes and Improving Case Management*, COAIM, Dublin, Ireland.

- Delaney, P and Weir, M (2004) *Matching Offenders and Programmes, The Responsivity Principle at Work in the Cornmarket Project for Offenders*, Irish Probation Journal.
- Earl, S. and Carden, F. (2002) *Learning from Complexity: the International Development Research Centre's Experience with Outcome Mapping*, International Development Research Centre, Ottawa, Canada.
- Edmunds, et al, (2001) *Doing Justice to Treatment, Referring Offenders to Drug Services*, Criminal Policy Research Unit South Bank University, Home Office, UK.
- Feenan, R. (2003) *Assessment of Offending Behaviour and Rehabilitation of Offenders*, New South Wales Corrective Services, Australia.
- Fuller, C, Taylor, P, (2008) *A Toolkit Of Motivational Skills*, J.Wiley, Sussex, UK.
- Funnell, S, and Rogers, P, (2011) *Purposeful Programme Theory*, J.Wiley, USA.
- Geiran, V., McCarthy, M., Morahan, M. & O'Connell, V. (1999) *Young Offenders in Penal Custody: Contact with the Probation and Welfare Service and Experience of Community Sanctions Prior to Custodial Sentence*, Probation and Welfare Service, Dublin, Ireland.
- Gendreau, P. (1996) *Offender Rehabilitation: What We Know and What Needs to be Done*, Criminal Justice and Behaviour, Sage Journals Online.
- Gendreau, P, French, S, and Taylor, A, (2002) *What Works, What Doesn't Work, Principles of Effective Correctional Treatment*, University of New Brunswick, Saint John, Canada.
- Gorski, T. (1993) *Relapse Prevention Therapy with Chemically Dependent Criminal Offenders*. Herald House Press, MO, USA.
- Harris, R. (2008) *Risk/Needs Assessment and Response to Criminogenic Factors with Young People*, Youth Justice Department of Human Services, Victoria, Australia.
- Hatry, H, van Houten, T, Plantz, M and Greenway, M (1996) *Measuring Programme Outcomes: A Practical Approach*, United Way of America, Alexandria, VA, USA.
- Henry, K and Kralstein, D, (2011) *Community Courts: The Research Literature*, Bureau of Justice Assistance, US Department of Justice, Washington, DC, USA.
- Herrie, M, and Watkin-Merek, L, (2006) *Structured Relapse Prevention Skills*, CAMH, Toronto, Canada.
- Jolliffe, D, and Farrington, D.P. (2009) *The Effects on Offending of the Community Justice Initiatives in Liverpool and Salford*, London, UK: Available on request from the Ministry of Justice.
- Kaufman-Levy, D, et al. (2003) *Evaluability Assessment: Examining the Readiness of a Programme for Evaluation*, Justice Research and Statistics Association, Washington, DC, USA.
- Kilcommins, S., O'Donnell, I., O'Sullivan, E. & Vaughan, B. (2004) *Crime, Punishment and the Search for Order in Ireland*. Dublin: Institute of Public Administration.
- Knight K and Farabee D, editors (2004) *Treating Addicted Offenders: A Continuum of Effective Practices*. Civic Research Institute, Kingston, NJ, USA.

Latessa, E. (2004) *Insights from Evidence Based Corrections*, Centre for Criminal Justice Research, University of Cincinnati, OH, USA.

Leukefeld CG, Tims F, Farabee D, editors (2002) *Treatment of Drug Offenders: Policies and Issues*. Springer, New York, NY, USA.

Lipsey, M. W., & Wilson, D. B. (1993) *The Efficacy of Psychological, Educational, and Behavioural Treatment: Confirmation from Meta-analysis*. American Psychologist, New York, USA.

Lipsey, M, Chapman, G, and Landenberger, M. (2001) *Cognitive Behavioural Programmes for Offenders – A Systematic Review Using Meta-Analytic Techniques*, Sage Publications, New York, USA.

Mackinnon, A, Arnott, N, and McGarvey, C, (2006) *Mapping Change, Using a Theory of Change to Guide Planning and Evaluation*, Grantcraft, European Foundation Centre, Brussels, Belgium.

Madan, R, (2007) *Demystifying Outcome Measurement in Community Development*, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA, USA.

Milkman, H, and Wanberg, K, (2007) *Cognitive Behavioural Treatment – A Review and Discussion for Correctional Professionals*, CARE, Colorado, USA.

Miller, W, and Rollnick, S, (2002) *Motivational Interviewing, Preparing People For Change*, Guilford Press, New York, USA.

Miller, W, and Rose, G, (2009) *Towards a Theory of Motivational Interviewing*, American Psychologist, Vol 64, pp.527-537, Washington, DC, USA.

McCollister KE, French MT, Prendergast ML, Hall E, Sacks S, (2004) *Long-term cost effectiveness of addiction treatment for criminal offenders*, Justice Quarterly, Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, pp.659–679. Routledge Journals, Philadelphia, PA, USA.

McMurrin, M, (2009) *Motivational Interviewing with Offenders, a Systematic Review*, University of Nottingham, Nottingham, UK.

McMurrin, M, Theodosi, E, and Sellan, J. (2006) *Measuring Engagement in Therapy and Motivation to Change in Offenders*, Wiley Publishing, New York, USA.

National Economic and Social Forum, (2002). *"Re-Integration of Prisoners: Forum Report No. 22"*. NESF, Dublin, Ireland.

National Institute on Drug Abuse, (2007) *Principles of Drug Abuse Treatment for Criminal Justice Populations, A Research-Based Guide*, National Institute on Drug Abuse, National Institute of Health, Bethesda, MD, U.S.A.

O'Donnell, I. (2007) *"When Prisoners go Home: Punishment, Social Deprivation and the Geography of Reintegration"* Irish Criminal Law Journal, 17/4, 3-9, Dublin, Ireland.

O'Donnell, I. & Healy, D. (2008) *"Calling time on crime: Motivation, generativity and agency in Irish probationers"* Probation Journal, Irish Probation Service, 55: 25-38.

Ogles, B, Lambert, S, and Fields, S, (2002) *Essentials of Outcome Assessment*, J.Wiley & Sons, New York, USA.

O'Mahony, P, (2008) *Key Issues for Drugs Policy in Irish Prisons*, Drugs Policy Action Group, Dublin, Ireland.

Ongevalle, J and Hearn,S (2010) *Outcome Mapping and Logical Framework, a Community Discussion*, International Development Research Centre, Ottawa, Canada.

Pearson, F, and Lipton, D, (1999) *A Meta-Analytic Review of the Effectiveness of Corrections-Based Treatments for Drug Abuse*, Prison Journal, pp.384–410, Sage Publications, New York, USA.

Penna, R, (2011) *Outcomes Toolbox, A Complete Guide to Programme Effectiveness, Performance Measurement and Results*, John Wiley & Sons, New Jersey, NY, USA.

Plantz, M, Greenway, M, and Hendricks, M, (2006) *Outcome Measurement, Showing Results in the Non-Profit Sector*, United Way of America, Alexandria, VA, USA.

Pratt, T. C., & Cullen, F. T. (2005) *Assessing Macro-level Predictors and Theories of Crime: A Meta-analysis*. In Crime and justice: A review of research. (Vol. 32), pp. 373-450, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL, USA.

Redonna, K, et al. (2009) *Treating Drug Abuse and Addiction in the Criminal Justice System: Improving Public Health and Safety*, Journal of the American Medical Association, pp.183-190. Chicago, IL, USA.

Roland, N and Goss, S, Eds. (2001) *Evidence-Based Counselling and Psychological Therapies*, Routledge, London, UK.

Rossi, P. H., Lipsey, M. W., & Freeman, H. E. (2004). *Evaluation: A systematic approach* (7th Ed.). Thousand Oaks, Sage, CA, USA.

Rubak, S, Sandbæk, A, Lauritzen, T, and Christensen, B. (2005) *Motivational Interviewing: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis*, British Journal of General Practice, London, UK.

Schalock, R, (2001) *Outcome Based Evaluation*, Plenum Publishers, New York, USA.

Seymour, M. (2006) *Alternatives to Custody in Ireland*, Business in the Community and the Irish Penal Reform Trust, Dublin, Ireland.

Springer, D, McNeece, C, Arnold, E, (2010) *Substance Abuse Treatment for Criminal Offenders, An Evidence Based Guide for Practitioners*, American Psychological Association, New York, USA.

Trauer, T, et al. (2010) *Outcome Measurement in Mental Health, Theory and Practice*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.

Villettaz, P, Killias, M, & Zoder, I. (2006) *The Effects of Custodial vs. Non-custodial Sentences on Re-offending: A Systematic Review of the State of the Knowledge*. Institute of Criminology and Criminal

Law, University of Lausanne: Lausanne, Switzerland.

Walters, S, Clarke, M, Gingerich, R, and Meltzer, M. (2007) *Motivating Offenders To Change*, U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections, Washington, USA.

W.K.Kellog Foundation (2004) *Logic Model Development Guide, Using Logic Models to Bring Together Planning, Evaluation, and Action*, Michigan, MI, USA.

Wexler, H and Fletcher, B, (2007) *National Criminal Justice Drug Abuse Treatment Studies Overview*, The Prison Journal, vol. 87, no. 1, pp. 9–24, Sage Publications, New York, USA.

Wyatt-Knowlton, L, and Phillips, C, (2009) *The Logic Model Guidebook*, Sage Publications, California, USA.

