A Review of the Regina Auto Theft Strategy: The Secure Custody Component at Paul Dojack Youth Centre

J. Stephen Wormith, Ph.D., C. Psych

December, 2003

Table of Contents

Section	**Page**

Executive Summary

Context and Scope of this Review

The goal of this exercise was to examine an intervention developed by the Saskatchewan Department of Corrections and Public Safety (CPS) to address the problems and needs associated with serious (high risk) auto theft offenders in the Regina area. The objectives of this project were to conduct a detailed review of specific programs and practices with these youth, to compare them to acknowledged best practices from the offender correctional literature, particularly as they pertains to young offenders (Andrews & Bonta, 2003; Gendreau & Goggin, 1997; Gendreau & Andrews, 1996), and to provide detailed recommendations concerning the delivery of the program and services to these youth.

The Auto Theft Strategy (ATS) is a multi-agency initiative that was designed to address the problem of youth-initiated auto theft in the Regina area, although recently the strategy has been expanded to include adult offenders. It consists of various sub-initiatives, including public education, crime (auto theft) prevention, monitoring and apprehension, institution-based (custody) treatment and community supervision and support. The current review focuses specifically on the *Secure Custody portion of the Regina Auto Theft Strategy* (ATS-SC). However, the ATS-SC represents only one aspect of a broader systemic strategy. For a recent review of the complete ATS, the reader is referred to a recent report by Pfeifer and Skakun (2002).

The ATS-SC is based at Paul Dojack Youth Centre (PDYC). However, most of the youth serving young offender dispositions at this facility are not part of the ATS-SC. The ATS-SC is designed specifically to target serious, high risk, auto theft offenders, designated as *Chronic Repeat Offenders* (CROs) by the Steering Committee for the Regina ATS. The auto theft offenders identified as CROs have made up from 11 % to 22 % of the PDYC young offender population since the program's inception in January, 2002, with an increasing trend in the percentage since that time.

Program Description and Philosophy

The ATS is a comprehensive, multi-disciplinary, multi-agency approach to a well documented problem of a specialized crime (auto theft) in Regina, SK. One component of this program is the Integrated and Intense Supervision and Case Management (IISCM) for an identified group that ranged in size from 20 to 40 high risk, Chronic Repeat (auto theft) Offenders (CROs). Those who are sentenced to secure custody are routinely referred to the ATS-SC. This automatically includes the specialized community (auto theft) case management function and eligibility for the cognitive skills program, called *Thinking for a Change*.

The Regina ATS was conceived in November 2001, and implemented in February 2002, following another substantial increase in auto thefts in 2001 (City of Regina, 2002). Shortly thereafter, a hierarchy of committees was struck and a multi-pronged initiative was underway. By January 2002, a mechanism had been established to identify the most serious CROs. From the initial list of approximately 125 auto theft offenders, 20 young offenders of whom 17 were at PDYC (13 in secure custody and 4 on remand) were identified as CROs.

Programs and services were established for these youth through a system of Integrated and Intensive Supervision and Case Management (IISCP), which included particular services for CROs in secure custody at PDYC. The 'prime therapist' was hired in April 2002, to provide additional services for these youth beginning in April 2002. The Thinking for a Change program began its first group in October, 2002.

Thinking for a Change. The core treatment element of the ATS-SC component at PDYC is the cognitive skills training program called Thinking for a Change. It is a group-based, intervention program that utilizes cognitive-behavioral theories and 'restructures' offenders' pattern of thinking in an attempt to change their actions that, otherwise, would lead to reoffending. The program involves a series of 22 modules in which offenders are challenged to increase their awareness of self and others. The sessions are designed with a general focus on the attitudes and cognitions that are conducive to antisocial, delinquent behaviour and, as such, they pertain to a wide range of offenders. Coupled with teachings of relevant interpersonal skills, participants are taught essential tools to deal with life's challenges in a more effective and prosocial manner.

A second important component of the ATS-SC is the case management process that is common to all youth in CPS, but is augmented for CROs at PDYC. Specifically, the prime therapist and four specially designated community youth workers have an opportunity to work individually with CRO youth at PDYC to address their criminogenic needs through a systematic case plan. These activities are supplemental to the case work that is provided by unit staff to all youth.

The Correctional Program Assessment Inventory

This review of the ATS-SC program relies heavily on a standardized program assessment tool called the *Correctional Program Assessment Inventory* (CPAI: Gendreau & Andrews, 1996). Therefore, it is important that one has a reasonable understanding of this instrument and its methodology.

The CPAI was designed to assess correctional programs, particularly their 'program integrity,' in relation to the empirical literature on effective offender intervention (Andrews, 1995). It was developed based on decades of research and meta-analytic work on effective correctional interventions. Specifically, the CPAI utilizes "the principles of effective correctional treatment" as a template for the ideal program and measures how closely the treatment program under review is to this ideal (Andrews & Bonta, 2003; Gendreau, 1996). It has now been applied to more that 280 correctional programs (Gendreau & Goggin, 1997).

The CPAI is based on empirical research that solidifies the principles of effective programs. Programs with the largest reductions in recidivism tend to be the programs with higher scores on the CPAI (Gendreau & Goggin, 1997). The instrument is applicable to a wide range of programs because it is sufficiently versatile to be used for evaluating community, institutional adult and juvenile programs. Both strengths and weaknesses of a program are determined, thereby indicating what is consistent with previous determined effective programs and what differs from these programs. Therefore, the CPAI is often used as diagnostic tool or audit to assist agencies in becoming aware of the discrepancies in program design and implementation before a potentially expensive outcome evaluation is performed. However, the process is reliant on the reporting accuracy of the programs staff and administrators and efforts must be taken to ensure objectivity and

reliability.

It should also be noted that the CPAI, by quantifying the number of desirable, individual program attributes, sets a very rigorous standard. For example, a review of 135 juvenile programs in Ontario produced a mean CPAI score of 35 % (Hoge, Leschied & Andrews, 1993), while a review 86 correctional treatment programs in the United States, which included both residential and community-based programs offered to juvenile and adult offenders generated a mean overall score of 55 % (Matthews & Hubbard, 2001).

The CPAI is composed of 75 individual items (of which 65 are scored) that are grouped into six sections. It is scored in a 0 (positive feature is absent), 1 (positive feature is present) format. The components of the CPAI and the items that are scored included the following sections:

> A. Program Demographics (9 items, 9 not scored)
> B. Program Implementation (11 items)
> C. Client Pre-Service Assessment (12 items, 1 not scored)
> D. Program Characteristics (22 items)
> E. Staff Characteristics (8 items)
> F. Evaluation (7 items)
> G. Other (6 items)
> Total Score (75 items, 65 scored)
> Correctional Treatment Score: Sections C and D (33 items)

Each of these sections is scored individually and classified as either 'very satisfactory' (70 % to 100 %); 'satisfactory' (60 % to 69 %); 'needs improvement' (50 % to 59 %); or 'unsatisfactory' (less than 50 %). Scores from Sections B to G are totaled resulting in an overall assessment score. A Correctional Treatment Score is based on Sections C and D.

Methodology

The evaluation of the ATS-SC program was undertaken with site visits, interviews, and file reviews (August, 5, 14, and 26, 2003). Interviews were conducted on site with key ATS-SC personnel. The reviewer also sat in on the group program and met individually and confidentially with a random selection of three youths from the Thinking for a Change group (August 14 and 26, 2003). There were many documents provided for this review.

The CPAI was completed independently by the reviewer. Four items were determined Not Applicable and were not scored. As is routinely the case in the administration of the CPAI, the agency (CPS) was given the opportunity to respond to draft versions of this document to correct any factual errors. Individual CPAI item scores for the ATS-SC component of the ATS program are appended to the full report.

Results

A. Program Description

The ATS-CS has been in operation at PDYC for only 1.5 years and its core cognitive skills program component for only one year. The program is delivered by a (designated) Youth Worker, who works under the direction of the program director, four (designated) community youth workers, and their supervisor. At that time, 15 young offenders had participated in the cognitive skills component of the ATS-SC program. At least 33 CROs have been incarcerated at PDYC, at some time since its inception in January, 2002, although four of them were exclusively on remand.

The program is a government-funded service and is offered primarily through internal funding of approximately $47,000 for one dedicated caseworker (the prime therapist). The program does have a specific philosophy, identified in various documents (National Institute of Corrections, 2001). It adheres to the principles of effective correctional intervention (Andrews & Bonta, 2003) and it is consistent with corporate objectives of the organization (CPS).

B. Program Implementation

This section evaluates the contribution of the Program Director to the developmental and implementation process and the manner in which the program was developed and introduced in the facility. Overall, the ATS-SC was implemented in an appropriate fashion and is proceeding quite satisfactorily. The program director received four of five points for her background and expertise in corrections and for her direct involvement with the program. It is anticipated that some of the currently unsatisfied conditions, relating to sustainability and cost-effectiveness will be addressed and met in the future. However, the selection of the next program director will be important to maintain the high standards of the program.

Evaluation of Section B, Program Implementation: 7/11 = 63.6% (Satisfactory).

C. Client Pre-Service Assessment

This section evaluates the extent to which a pre-program assessment is conducted and if so, the relevance of the assessment to appropriate correctional practice. In particular, the extent to which risk, need and responsivity factors are incorporated into the pre-service assessment of the clients is examined. The ATS-SC scores particularly highly on the Pre-service Assessment section. Much of this accomplishment is due to the fact that the LSI-SK Youth Edition, which forms a critical aspect of the ATS-SC assessment process, and the CPAI are both derived from the same empirical literature on the assessment and treatment of offenders. There are only three minor issues here. One, the current assessment protocol should be administered prior to program admission and should be used to inform the client admission decision-making process. Secondly, further attention should be paid to responsivity assessment of responsivity issues with respect to each client, also as part of the selection, admission and program planning process. Third, although it would not likely have changed the youth who have been selected as CROs or for the cognitive skills program, establishing an LSI-SK Youth Edition criterion score for both of these selection processes would provide a safeguard against net widening and the expansion of services to less risky youth.

Evaluation of Section C, Client Pre-Service Assessment: 8/11 = 72.7 % (Very Satisfactory).

D. Program Characteristics

This section evaluates the characteristics and integrity of the program, focusing specifically on the extent to which it addresses criminogenic factors and the means by which it does so. It also examines the manner in which clients and service providers are matched and the extent to which relapse prevention strategies are in evidence. The focus of this section of the CPAI evaluation is on ATS-SC 'add-on' programs and services that are offered to CRO youth at PDYC. These include the cognitive skills program (Thinking for a Change), the specialized (auto theft) case management services provided by the prime therapist and the community youth workers, and the specialized preparation for release and possibility of referral to external programs upon release to the community. The broader PDYC context, including its structure, and routine programs and services are also considered. It was determined that four items relating to the application of punishment were not applicable for this program. Consequently, this section is based on 18 items instead of 22 items.

The ATS-SC program meets many of the program characteristics with ease. This is primarily because of the nature of the Thinking for a Change program. This program was planned, prepared and is delivered with a sound knowledge of the 'what works' literature in corrections and, in fact, is based in large part on that literature. However, given its small, single program format, it is not surprising that the ATS-SC does not meet some of the criteria in this area. As such, it is difficult to offer separate versions of the program for different types of offenders or to assign staff to different aspects of the program. Instead, the service providers must attempt to accommodate the individual characteristics of participants within the confines of a single group. Therefore, it is hampered somewhat by its inability to offer a diversity that is commensurate with the heterogeneity of any offender sample, no matter how it is defined. It is noted that the varying needs of the clientele are addressed by referral of youth to external programs and services. This is also a legitimate way to meet the diverse needs of an offender clientele in the context of a small program. Staff members invariably have different strengths and are likely to be particularly effective with certain youth. Therefore, it is suggested that local management consider various ways in which the individual styles of clients might be matched to the varying skills, abilities, styles and even demographic characteristics (age, gender and ethnicity) of the case workers.

Evaluation of Section D, Program Characteristics: 13/18, 4 not scored, = 72.2 %
(Very Satisfactory).

E. Staff Characteristics/Practices

This section reviews the program staff in terms of individual background, training and education. Program staff for the ATS-SC include the program director, the dedicated prime therapist, the four dedicated community youth workers and their supervisor. The CPAI sets very high standards for direct service providers in these areas. Nonetheless, the ATS-SC program receives five of the eight points in this section. One item, Stability of Staff, requires two years of operation to be scored, but is included regardless, because the criterion cannot be met. This is a relatively new program that is currently run by a group of service providers with an excellent background. Although onsite

supervision is thorough, there is some question about the evaluation of staff clinical skills, the extent to which opportunities for further professional development are available and the amount of turnover among the personnel associated with the ATS-SC.

Evaluation of Section E, Staff Characteristics: 5/8 = 62.5 % (Satisfactory).

F. Evaluation

This section assesses whether the program is evaluated, the type of evaluation being conducted, and the extent to which the evaluation is used to monitor how well the program is functioning. Although the ATS-SC program has not been in operation for a sufficiently long time to have undergone a thorough evaluation, this section is scored based on evidence pertaining to any planning or evaluative efforts that have been undertaken to date. Since it is advisable to establish the mechanism for correctional program evaluation in conjunction with the development and implementation of a program, it is believed that the assessment of this component is not premature.

Although this is still a relatively new program, efforts should be initiated from the outset to establish a high quality evaluation of the ATS-SC, perhaps in the context of a more broadly based evaluation of the ATS program, which may already be underway. Given the nature of the program, 'outcome' may refer to subsequent processing by the criminal justice system (youth or adult) for auto theft specifically, but also for any criminal offenses as the nature of the program provided is as likely to affect general recidivism as it is to impact on auto theft. More consideration might be given to assessing intermediate gain, such as the use of pre- and post-testing of treatment targets and more formal evaluation or rating of client performance in the group program.

Evaluation of Section F, Evaluation: 4/6, 1 not applicable, = 66.7 % (Satisfactory).

G. Other

This section of the CPAI evaluates miscellaneous areas such as the adherence to ethical guidelines, the quality of client files, disruptive changes to the program and issues of administrative support. In terms of these administrative issues, this program is operating in a very satisfactory fashion. It is particularly advantageous that this program is part of a larger strategy that is devoted to the reduction of a particular type of crime in a geographically circumscribed area. Moreover, the development and monitoring of this larger (ATS) strategy, by a multi-agency committee of senior level administrators who represent the major agencies and stakeholders in this enterprise, is consistent with important managerial principles of human service delivery.

Evaluation of Section G, Other: 5/6 = 83.3 7% (Very Satisfactory).

General Comments

Overall, the ATS-SC received a total score of 70 %, which results in an overall ranking of 'very satisfactory.' This compares favourably to many of the programs evaluated on the CPAI to date. For example, in one review, only 39 % of all specialized programs (e.g., substance abuse, sexual offenders) received a satisfactory grade of 50 % (Gendreau & Goggin, 1997). Moreover, it is evident that the ATS-SC has a particular niche in the broader ATS as conceived by a

multidisciplinary and multi-agency committee of criminal justice, health and social service agencies in the Regina area.

It is quite clear that the youth who are referred to the ATS-SC component of the ATS include the most recalcitrant young offenders involved in the auto theft subculture that has emerged in the Regina area. They are identified from a wider network of youth by a group of professionals from diverse criminal justice agencies.

The ATS-SC serves a number of important functions. These include:

- Addressing many key features of the auto theft youth group, including their (antisocial) criminal attitudes and their way of thinking (cognitions) in a criminal manner (criminogenic needs),
- Planning a community based aspect to the youth's plan (advocacy and service), and
- Creating a link to the community in terms of client supervision (continuity).

The ATS-SC team should be complemented for putting together a thorough, evidence-based program for auto theft young offenders at PDYC. In response to a request from the Auto Theft Steering Committee, it did so amidst a high profile community concern. The ATS-SC's cognitive behavioural orientation and program content are appropriate for the target population. Service providers emphasize client responsibility as part of client disclosure and it is evident that the team is very committed to providing a high quality service to its clients.

Program Recommendations

1. The cognitive skills co-facilitators should encourage more (prosocial) cross talk between participants and attempt to reduce the one-to-one, dyadic conversation between therapist and client.

2. More detailed and systematic session notes (possibly on a revised form) should be written by therapists and distributed to other staff. They should include session-by-session descriptions and ratings of each client's participation, as well as individualized comments that may be particularly relevant to unit staff (e.g., difficulties with exercises, homework tasks).

3. It is recommended that co-facilitators work more closely in the actual delivery of the individual sessions as opposed to one facilitator taking the lead for a given session or sessions. This would require some planning on the part of the co-facilitators on a session-by session basis.

Institutional Recommendations

4. As per findings from the CPAI, greater attention should be paid to issues of client responsivity and its assessment. At this point, consideration appears to be focused on ethnic background, which may lead to referrals to the native elder affiliated with the program and speed of learning/literacy, which may lead to supplemental assistance with the content of the cognitive skills program.

5. There is some concern about the number of youth who participate annually in the cognitive skills component of the ATS, with the observation being that some youth who might need or could benefit from this treatment being excluded. Efforts should be taken to ensure as many of the CRO youth who are incarcerated at PDYC have an opportunity to participate in the cognitive skills program.

Organizational Recommendations

6. A permanent funding base should be put in place to ensure the ongoing existence of the ATS-SC component of the Regina ATS. This should be presented both to the Regina ATS Steering Committee and to the CPS hierarchy. Funding should include sufficient resources for in service and external staff training and development activities. Permanent funding may help to maintain staff continuity as well as program stability.

7. A firm research and evaluation component should be built into the ATS-SC component of the Regina ATS. Its impact in the context of the broader ATS should be considered. This must be done by examining potential changes in the participants themselves as opposed to the use of community auto thefts as an outcome measure because of the many different factors that may influence these numbers, not the least of which may be the other three principal components of the Regina ATS.

8. A comprehensive, systematic and coordinated CRO database should be established for all youth included in the Regina ATS, particularly those incarcerated youth in the ATS-SC component of the program and possibly even those referred to the selection committee for consideration. Such as scheme would play a vital role in any empirical evaluation, but would also serve numerous administrative functions by tracking not only individual clients, but changes on the evolution of the program itself.

Conclusion

The assessor is impressed by the efforts of the dedicated core treatment staff of the ATS-SC component of the Regina ATS and their effort to introduce the principles of effective correctional intervention in a secure custody facility. The ATS-SC component, with its ancillary PDYC secure custody programs and its preparatory community linkage through the community youth workers, forms an impressive combination of services. Consequently, all aspects of the program are rated as satisfactory or very satisfactory and the overall ATS-SC component, with its rating of 70.0 %, has achieved a 'very satisfactory' rating.

Program and Context of Review

Contact Persons

The principal contact personnel for this project were the following: Director of Treatment, Paul Dojack Youth Centre, (subsequently referred to as the *program director*), but who is now Manager, Offender Corrections Programs, Central Office, Corrections and Public Safety (CPS); the Specialized Auto Theft worker, Paul Dojack Youth Centre (subsequently referred to as the *prime therapist*); and the Regional Manager, Community Youth Workers, Southern District, Regina, SK. Other staff consulted during the review process included the Specialized Supervisor of Auto Theft Youth Workers in the community and two of the four Community Youth Workers.

Context and Scope

The goal of this exercise was to examine the intervention that has been developed by CPS to address the problems and needs associated with serious (high risk) auto theft offenders in the Regina area and how their difficulties are being addressed, specifically with the youth so identified. The objectives of this project were (1) to conduct a detailed examination of specific programs and practices with these youth, (2) to compare them to acknowledged best practices from the offender correctional literature, particularly as it pertains to young offenders (Andrews & Bonta, 2003; Gendreau & Goggin, 1997; Gendreau & Andrews, 1996) and (3) to provide detailed recommendations concerning the delivery of the program and services to these youth. Recommendations could include suggestions to maintain valuable, well implemented components, to modify or 'fine tune' specific details of delivery and content, and to delete components that might be redundant or counterproductive, all in order to improve the complete program.

The current review focuses specifically on the Secure Custody portion of the Regina Auto Theft Strategy (ATS-SC). In order to assess the ATS-SC properly, it is important to consider the

two simultaneously occurring contexts in which it operates.

First, the secure custody component (ATS-SC) represents only one aspect of a broader systemic strategy that was designed to address the problem of youth-initiated auto theft in the Regina area. The Auto Theft Strategy (ATS) is a multi-agency initiative that includes the Regina Police Services, the Department of Corrections and Public Safety, the Regina office of the Crown Attorney, the Regina School Board, the Department of Community Resources and Employment (DCRE) and the Regina/Qu'Appelle Health Authority. It consists of various sub-initiatives, including public education, crime (auto theft) prevention, monitoring and apprehension, institution-based (custody) treatment and community supervision and support. A portion of this report will address the extent to which the custody-based treatment portion (ATS-SC) relates to the other components of the broader program (ATS).

Secondly, the secure custody portion of the Regina Auto Theft Strategy is based at Paul Dojack Youth Centre (PDYC). Most of the youth serving young offender dispositions at this facility are not part of the program (i.e., ATS-SC), which is under review in this report. Similarly, most of the programs and services provided at PDYC are open to all youths, including youths in the ATS-SC component if they meet the program-specific criteria for admission. For example, sexual offending and other evidence of inappropriate sexual behaviour are criteria for admission to the adolescent sex offender program.

In summary, this report is not meant to review the complete auto theft strategy. It will, however, consider the extent to which the institutional portion is related to and integrated with other offender based portions of the auto theft strategy (e.g., identification of potential candidates, intake, and community supervision). Similarly, although this review is not designed or meant to provide an operational review of Paul Dojack Youth Centre, it will consider aspects of the general institutional

program as they relate to clients of the Regina Auto Theft Strategy. For the purposes of this report, the comprehensive Auto Theft Strategy (ATS) will be differentiated from the Secure Custody portion (ATS-SC) of the Strategy.

Setting

Paul Dojack Youth Centre (PDYC) is a secure custody youth centre that is designed to accommodate 98 male and female young offenders. It is located on the outskirts of Regina, Saskatchewan, on 60 acres of provincial government owned property and is owned and operated by the Department of Corrections and Public Safety (CPS). The facility includes four living units, each of which consists of two dorms that can accommodate 8 to 14 youth, and one small specialized unit that has a capacity of 6 youth. The facility is managed by CPS and operated by its employees. Since the auto theft offenders are distributed through the facility and the auto theft program is integrated with the broader institutional program, this review includes certain aspects of PDYC as the environmental context within which the auto theft program is offered.

The ATS-SC is designed specifically to target serious, high risk, auto theft offenders, designated as Chronic Repeat Offenders (CROs) by the Steering Committee for the Regina ATS. The number of CROs who have resided at PDYC at any given time has ranged from 10 for awhile in 2002 to 19 recently, while the population of PDYC has varied from approximately 88 youth (April, 2002) to 85 (currently). Consequently, the auto theft offenders identified as CROs have constituted from 11 % to 22 % of the PDYC young offender population over the life of the program with a general trend for CROs to make up an increasing proportion of the PDYC population.

Years in Operation

Records of a Vehicles Theft Action Plan in Regina date back at least until 1997 (City of Regina, 1997), at which time there had been a steady and dramatic increase in auto thefts of 50 %

per year for the previous three years (1994 to 1996). However, the current version of the Regina ATS was conceived in November 2001, and implemented in February 2002, following another substantial increase in auto thefts in 2001 (City of Regina, 2002).

Shortly thereafter, a hierarchy of committees was struck and a multipronged initiative was underway. By January 2002, a mechanism had been established to identify the most serious Chronic Repeat (auto theft) Offenders (CROs). From the initial list of approximately 125 auto theft offenders, 23 were identified in the inaugural list. Programs and services were established for these youth through a system of Integrated and Intensive Supervision and Case Management (IISCP), which included particular services for CROs in secure custody. The ATS-SC (institutional) component was initiated for those who were incarcerated at PDYC. On January 30, 2002, the inaugural list was paired down to 20 young offenders of whom 17 were at PDYC (13 in secure custody and 4 on remand).

It should be noted that the prime therapist began her employment in this position at PDYC in April 2002, which consequently is used as the timeframe for the scope of this review. However, a key component of the program, the Thinking for a Change group, was not introduced until October 2002. Therefore, the following analysis of client numbers processed through the program must be considered in the context of these dates.

Number of Participants

As of August 8, 2003, the total number of offenders who had been designated as CROs, regardless of location stood at 38. (This figure has since increased quite dramatically to 50 by November 2003.) A summary of the CRO admissions at different points in time is presented by their location in Table 1. It is unclear exactly how many of these youth have 'graduated' successfully or left the program for other reasons, although it is understood that this does not

constitute a large number (i.e., less than 10). Although the number of designated active CROs has increased since the inception of the ATS, the number of CRO youth at PDYC (in the ATS-SC component) has varied somewhat over time, but has not shown any systematic increase (Table 1).

Table 1

Distribution of Chronic Repeat Offenders (CROs)

and their Location/Status Presented by Year

Date	Total	Secure	Remand	Open	UAL/ELC	Probation	Adult Prison	No Order
Jan. 31 2002	20	13	4	0	0	3	0	0
Jan. 01 2003	33	11	5	5	4	7	0	1
Aug. 08 2003	38	13	5	2	5 (1 adult)	5 (2 adult)	2 (2 adult)	6 (2 adult)
Nov. 10 2003	50 (17 adults)							

From an internal document, *Current List of Regina Chronic Repeat (auto theft) Offenders (CROs).*

Clearly, not all CRO offenders are young offenders and, among those who are, not all are admitted to PDYC. A total of 33 CRO youth have been admitted to PDYC after the introduction of the Thinking for a Change program. However, four of these CROs were exclusively on remand while at PDYC, four were admitted after a program had begun or were determined to be 'not ready,' six were serving sentences that were two short for their inclusion in the group (i.e., less than six months), and three were female young offenders, who were excluded because it was not a co-educational program. These latter two groups would not have been eligible for the core group program, Thinking for a Change. Finally one CRO was admitted after the third program.

Consequently, the Thinking for a Change program has been offered to 15 CROs. These figures are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2

A Description of CRO Admissions to PDYC and their Participation in the

Thinking for A Change Program since the Inception of the ATS-SC Program

Youth Condition	Number of CRO Youth
Never admitted/admitted prior to Thinking for a Change	5
Remand Only	4
Female CRO youth	3
Short Sentence, unable to complete 11-week program	6
Admitted while program in progress or client 'not ready'	4
Participated in Thinking for a Change	15
Admitted after last Thinking for a Change began	1
TOTAL	38

Thinking for a Change is a 'closed' program in that it runs discrete groups of a fixed duration. In August 2003, the program was in the midst of its third group. That program has now been completed and a fourth group has not yet been initiated due to a lack of eligible participants. Enrollment in the first three groups was reported as 6, 7, and 9, respectively. However, these 22 participants included five youth who were not designated as CROs, but had a history of auto theft, three CRO youth who did not complete the program and two other CRO youth who took the program on a second occasion. Therefore, 12 CRO youth have completed the Thinking for a

Change program, two of whom did so twice.

Organizational Responsibility

The program director of the secure custody component of the Regina Auto Theft Strategy (ATS-SC) is the Director of Treatment, PDYC, who reports directly to the Director of the facility as per the organizational chart of PDYC. However, the program director also reports on matters pertaining to ATS-SC to the Auto Theft Rehab committee, which reports to a multi-agency Committee of Community Stakeholders, which in turn reports to the ATS Steering Committee. There are two levels of the Steering Committee, an Executive Committee and an Operational Committee. Both levels include representatives from the Regina Police Services, the Department of Justice, CPS and the Saskatchewan Government Insurance (SGI). The institutional Director of PDYC was a member of the Community Stakeholders Committee in the past, but is now part of a Phase Two Implementation Committee. Although the complete ATS program is under a cooperative organizational responsibility of these committees, the ATS-SC is funded completely by CPS and is managed in-house by local institutional management. The program director is also the immediate supervisor of the prime therapist.

Program Budget

An allotment of $47,000 per year for FY03/04 includes funds for the salary and benefits of one specialized auto theft position. Any incidental requirements and administrative support are absorbed by the existing institutional budget. A native elder has also been hired to provide services to the youth in this program, both in the community and in the institution. However, this contracted position is funded and managed by the community office with an operating budget of $15,000 per year which may be used for this and other operational expenses. Similarly, four community youth

workers and their supervisor contribute to on-site ATS-SC activities, the equivalent of one day per week for the cognitive skills program and a total of 2.5 days per week for case management activities of the CRO youth. These costs are also absorbed by the community corrections office.

Other services available to CRO youth in the ATS-SC component, such as meetings between elders and the family of CRO youth, are offered as part of the general PDYC program and are budgeted accordingly.

Staff

The ATS-SC operates with one full time, dedicated on-site prime therapist, who is employed as a specialized auto theft worker. She is assisted by four community youth workers who contribute twice weekly, on a rotational basis, to the core Cognitive Skills program. These community youth workers also conduct community-centered case work with the ATS youth while they reside at PDYC and provide community supervision to them upon their release from PDYC. These workers are supervised by a Specialized Supervisor of the Auto Theft Youth Workers. In addition, a portion of the program director's time, estimated at 10 to 15 %, is devoted to administrative matters pertaining to the ATS-SC. The commitment of time by the program director was as much as 50 % during the implementation and training phase of the program (February through May 2002).

Program Description and Philosophy

The ATS is a comprehensive, multi-disciplinary, multi-agency approach to a well documented problem of a specialized crime (auto theft) in a particular jurisdiction or location (Regina, SK). Components of this program include the following: Education and Information for youth at risk, those who have not been involved in auto theft but may be at risk to become so; Help Eliminate Auto Theft (HEAT), which is a creative use of alternative measures for first time auto

theft offenders; Coordinated Supervision for repeat auto theft offenders; and Integrated and Intense

Supervision and Case Management (IISCM) for an identified group that ranged in size from 20 to

40 high risk, Chronic Repeat (auto theft) Offenders (CROs). Most of this latter group has received a

Secure Custody disposition at some point in their young criminal careers. Those who are sentenced

to secure custody are routinely referred to the Secure Custody treatment component of the Auto

Theft Strategy Treatment (ATS-SC). This automatically includes the specialized community (auto

theft) case management function and likely, but not necessarily, includes the cognitive skills

program. The ATS-SC is the specific focus of this review, although its context in the larger ATS

must also be considered. For a recent review of the complete ATS, the reader is referred to a recent

report by Pfeifer and Skakun (2002).

An Overview of Thinking for a Change

The core treatment element of the ATS-SC component at PDYC is the cognitive skills

training program called Thinking for a Change.

Evolved from the research and treatment efforts of Ellis (1977, 1980), Goldstein and Glick

(1987, 1989), treatment programs that utilize cognitive behavioral therapies have greatly advanced

over the last three decades. Much of this cognitive behavioral/skills research has influenced the

programming that is now provided in the youth justice system. Specifically, research on 'cognitive

restructuring' (Meichenbaum, 1977) and social learning theory (Bandura, 1973, 1977) views

antisocial thoughts and actions as learned strategies that offenders have acquired in order to cope

with life's challenges. In this perspective, an offender's behavior is seen as being reinforced by the

immediate gratification of pleasure, exhilaration and power that occurs when one offends.

Thinking for a Change is an intervention program that utilizes these cognitive behavioral

theories and restructures offenders' pattern of thinking in an attempt to change their actions that

would, otherwise, lead to reoffending. The program involves a series of 22 modules in which offenders are challenged to increase their awareness of self and others. The sessions are designed with a general focus on the attitudes and cognitions that are conducive to antisocial, delinquent behaviour and, as such, pertain to a wide range of offenders. Coupled with teachings of relevant interpersonal skills, participants are taught the essential tools to deal more effectively with life challenges in a prosocial manner using the following curriculum:

- Lessons 1-4: Overview, Listening and Feedback,

- Lessons 5-9: Thinking,

- Lessons 10-15: Knowing and Understanding Feelings,

- Lessons 16-21: Steps in Problem Solving,

- Lesson 22: Self-Evaluation: What else do I need.

A Review of the Correctional Program Assessment Inventory

This review of the ATS-SC program relies heavily on a standardized program assessment tool called the *Correctional Program Assessment Inventory* (CPAI: Gendreau & Andrews, 1996). Therefore, in order to assess its appropriateness for the current undertaking and to appreciate the validity of any conclusions that might emanate from it its application, it is important that one has a reasonable understanding of this instrument and its methodology.

The CPAI was designed specifically to assess correctional programs and services, particularly their 'program integrity' in relation to the empirical literature on effective offender intervention (Andrews, 1995). The scale was developed based on decades of research and meta-analytic work on effective correctional interventions. Specifically, the CPAI utilizes "the principles of effective correctional treatment" as a template for the ideal program and measures how closely

the treatment program under review is to this ideal. Andrews and Bonta (2003) and Gendreau (1996) have discussed these principles of correctional treatment under the following categories:

1. Treatment is delivered to high risk offenders.

2. Target criminogenic needs/risk factors for change.

3. Match style and mode of treatment to learning style of specific offender.

4. Attend to program integrity.

Similarly, Lipsey and Wilson (1998) assert that effective treatment programs require a match between program concept, host organization and the clientele targeted.

A number of advantages and disadvantages of utilizing the CPAI in evaluating correctional treatment programs have been discussed in the evaluability assessment literature (Latessa & Hoslinger, 1998; Matthews, Hubbard & Latessa, 2001). Regarding advantages, one of the most powerful aspects of the CPAI is that the measure is based on empirical research that solidifies the principles of effective programs. In fact, the programs with the largest reductions in recidivism tend to be the programs with higher scores on various versions of the CPAI (Gendreau & Goggin, 1997). Second, the CPAI is applicable to a wide range of programs because it is sufficiently versatile to be used for evaluating community, institutional adult and juvenile programs. Third, the instrument takes a relatively short amount of time to complete. Fourth, both strengths and weaknesses of a program are determined, thereby indicating what is consistent with previous determined effective programs, what differs and the recommendations for any areas requiring modification. Therefore, the CPAI can be, and often is, used as diagnostic tool to assist agencies in becoming aware of the discrepancies in program design and implementation before a potentially expensive outcome evaluation is performed. Fifth, program integrity can be quantified thereby allowing for benchmarking as well as comparisons between programs, or within a given program over time.

A couple of cautionary notes about the CPAI should also be considered. First, the process is reliant on the reporting accuracy of the program staff and administrators and although every effort is taken to ensure objectivity and reliability, the process is not without flaws. Second, the measure of program integrity is based on the 'ideal' program type. Consequently, as seen below, many programs do not emerge with what would appear to be very impressive scores. However, these scores are determined with reference to the standard of absolute 'best practice.' Although program planners and service providers should always aspire to this level, it is very difficult to achieve. In this regard, the authors have described meeting 70 % of the CPAI criteria as being 'very satisfactory.'

CPAI and Youth Treatment Programs

Matthews, Hubbard & Latessa (2001) reviewed 86 correctional treatment programs in the United States on the extent and nature of their components on the CPAI. Their sample included both residential and nonresidential programs offered to juvenile and adult offenders. The mean overall score was 54.87 %, therefore suggesting that many correctional programs in the U.S. lack sufficient program integrity. Moreover, 34 % of the programs scored in the unsatisfactory range. On the positive side, results from the Other and Program Implementation section presented the most notable outcomes, with mean scores of 83.91 % and 72.99 %, respectively. The high score in the Other section suggests that the assessed programs demonstrated stability in programming, funding, and community support as well as abiding by an appropriate code of ethics. Concerning Program Implementation, the majority of the assessed programs were perceived as cost-effective, having adequate finding and resources, and were led by an experienced director. These programs were assessed less positively in the areas of Program Characteristics and Evaluation and Client Preservice

Assessment. These programs were not utilizing effective treatment models, not adequately assessing risk and need in offenders and not evaluating their performance of themselves or the clients they serve. When differences in the CPAI measures were examined between juvenile and adult treatment programs, Program Implementation and Client Preservice Assessment were significantly lower for juvenile programs. No explanation is given for the discrepancy for Program Implementation but it is suggested that the difference for Client Preserve Assessment is due to juvenile programs only recently implementing standardized assessment methods for risk and need.

In a smaller scale review, Latessa, Jones, Fulton, Stichman, and Moon (1999) evaluated 28 juvenile justice programs in Ohio using the CPAI and found that overall 39 % of the programs scored in the unsatisfactory range, and only 10.7 % in the very satisfactory range. Similar to the results found in previous literature, sections of Program Implementation and Other were rated as very satisfactory, whereas Program Characteristics, Assessment and Evaluation were scored as unsatisfactory. In contrast, there were a great number of programs that were deemed successful as 35 % of them achieved at least 60 % of the items in the CPAI. Of out all the programs evaluated, residential community-based treatment programs were rated the highest, on average the programs had a score of 77 % on the CPAI. Strengths of the community-based programs were in the areas of Assessment, Treatment, Program Implementation and Other. Of particular interest in this study is the evaluation of non-residential boot camp for male and female young offenders. The programs were classified as unsatisfactory in four of the six sections. Having an overall score of 32% categorized the boot camp program as one of the least successful.

In Canada, Hoge, Leschied and Andrews (1993), assessed 135 juvenile programs in Ontario. The mean score on the CPAI was 35%. All sections, except Other, scored less than 50%. In these programs the evaluation section held the lowest position with score of 20%. In general community

based programs scored higher on the CPAI than custody programs. These results reflect a similar trend found in the Latessa et al. (1999).

More recently, Andrews and Carvell, (1999) evaluated a privately operated government funded custody facility in Ontario, called Project Turnaround over a one year period. Commonly described as a 'boot camp' or a 'strict disciplinary facility', Project Turnaround attempts to provide treatment services in a military structure. The program faired well on the CPAI measure, with exceptional results found in the areas of Program Implementation, Client Assessment, Evaluation and Other. It was also noted that with the feedback generated from the CPAI, successive reviews of the program over a one-year period demonstrated further improvement in scores.

Summary of the CPAI

The CPAI (Gendreau & Andrews, 1996; Andrews, 1995) is an instrument that examines program descriptions and operations in relation to what the research literature suggests are more promising as compared to less promising approaches to reducing re-offending. The content of the CPAI is a reflection of the principles of effective correctional treatment as described by Andrews, Bonta and Hoge (1990), Andrews and Bonta (1995), and Andrews, Zinger, et al. (1990). Some CPAI items reflect clinical experience in the context of corrections.

The CPAI has achieved widespread popularity in criminal justice agencies across North America since 1990 because it provides a standardized and systematic method of reviewing correctional programs and is founded on 'evidence based practice' from the correctional treatment literature. It has now been applied to more that 280 correctional programs (Gendreau & Goggin, 1997). It is important to note that the CPAI has become accepted as a tool to evaluate virtually all types of correctional intervention, regardless of the client group or the type of program under review, including young offender treatment. This is easily understood when one compares the

CPAI items to the content of empirically supported treatments for young and adult offenders (e.g., Andrews et al., 1990).

The utilization of the CPAI as a measure of program integrity can assist in program development, program refinement, and staff training. It may also be used to identify program strengths, which then can be capitalized upon to ensure therapeutic success. Therefore, the current review was undertaken with confidence in the appropriateness of the CPAI for the task at hand.

Methodology

Purpose of Report

The purpose of this report is to conduct an assessment of the ATS-SC program with a focus on the rehabilitative potential of the program. The *Correctional Program Assessment Inventory* (CPAI) was utilized in conducting this assessment. All data collection was undertaken by the author. In addition to the CPAI content of this report, other observations, comments and suggestions are offered as appropriate to this review with an aim to improve the delivery of services to youth in the ATS-SC and to further eliminate auto theft and related crime in Regina.

Procedures

The evaluation of the ATS-SC program was undertaken with site visits, interviews, and file reviews (August 5, 14, and 26, 2003). Interviews were conducted with the program director, prime therapist and Regional Manager, Community Youth Workers. The reviewer also sat in on the group program and met individually and confidentially with a random selection of three youths from the Thinking for a Change group (August 14 and 26, 2003).

There were many documents provided for this review. They include, but are not limited to,

the following important reports.

- *Auto Thefts*. Paper presented at Frequent Auto Theft Task Group, November 30, 2001, Regina, SK.

- *Auto Theft Strategy Update: Activity since January 31*. February 8, 2001, Regina, SK.

- *Cognitive/Behavioral Strategies to Changing Offender Behavior.* National Institute of Corrections, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, 1998.

- *Cognitive Techniques Lesson Plan,* Changing Offender Behavior to Promote Public Safety. Unpublished report.

- *Current List of Regina Chronic Repeat (auto theft) Offenders: Youth CROs*. Weekly listings, Regina, SK.

- *Evolution of Classification Lesson Plan,* Changing Offender Behavior to Promote Public Safety. Unpublished report.

- *Program planning forum*. 2001, Regina, SK.

- *Program planning forum*. May 2, 2001, Regina, SK.

- *Program planning forum: Developmental programming*. October 2, 2000, Regina, SK.

- *Program planning forum: Review of best practices*. January 8, 2002, Regina, SK.

- *Program planning forum summary*. June 26, 2003, Regina, SK.

- *Reducing auto theft: A comprehensive strategy to meet the needs of auto owners and young auto theft offenders in Regina.* Saskatchewan, Unpublished report. January 9, 2002. Regina, SK.

- *Regina Auto Theft Strategy Impacts.* Paper presented at Meeting Steering Committee, January 30, 2003, Regina, SK.

- *Regina Auto Theft Strategy - Phase 2 Proposal.* Paper presented at Meeting Steering

Committee, January 30, 2003, Regina, SK.

- *Social Development Division: Vehicle Thefts Action Plan.* City of Regina, SK, 1997.

- *Stolen Auto Activity Report*, Regina Police Service, November 21, 2001.

- *Stolen Auto Activity Report*, Regina Police Service, January 29, 2003.

- *Stolen Auto Statistics for August, 2002.* I. Yanick, Regina Police Service, September 4, 2002.

- *Stolen Auto Statistics for November, 2002.* I. Yanick, Regina Police Service, December 2, 2002.

- *Substance Abuse Treatment Programming for Youth in Custody at the Paul Dojack Youth Centre.* D. Schnell, Social Services: Family and Youth Services, Regina, SK, November 22, 2001.

- *The Regina Crime Prevention Commission: Auto Theft Strategy and Action Plan.* City of Regina, SK, 1998.

- *Thinking for a Change: Facilitator Training.* National Institute of Corrections, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, 2001.

- *Vehicle Theft Strategy Offers Balanced Approach.* City of Regina, SK, 1999.

- *What Works: The Research Lesson Plan,* Changing Offender Behavior to Promote Public Safety. Unpublished report.

Assessment Instrument

The principal evaluation instrument used to conduct the evaluation of the ATS-SC was the *Correctional Program Assessment Inventory, 6th edition* (CPAI; Gendreau & Andrews, 1996). However, the reviewer also considered other relevant issues that pertain to the effective delivery of young offender treatment. The fact that the ATS-SC program is part of a broader institutional

program structure at PDYC and must fit into this structure, accordingly, must be acknowledged. Consequently, some systemic issues in the organizational structure of PDYC and the Youth Services Division of CPS and its policies about the assessment and treatment of young offenders were, necessarily, taken into consideration during the current review.

The CPAI assesses these relationships by gathering information from curriculum and policy manuals and though a series of structured interviews with specific members of the program staff. The CPAI is composed of 75 individual items (of which 65 are scored) that are grouped into six sections. It is scored in a 0 (positive feature is absent), 1 (positive feature is present) format, but also permits the coding of items as NK (not known) in certain instances. However, NK items are scored as '0'. Not all six areas are equally weighted and, depending on the program that is being assessed, some items may be considered 'not applicable' (NA) and therefore are not included in the scoring. The components of the CPAI, the number of scored items and non-scored items, and the final scores include:

A. Program Demographics (9 items, 9 not scored)

B. Program Implementation (11 items)

C. Client Pre-Service Assessment (12 items, 1 not scored)

D. Program Characteristics (22 items)

E. Staff Characteristics (8 items)

F. Evaluation (7 items)

G. Other (6 items)

Total Score (75 items, 65 scored)

Correctional Treatment Score: Sections C and D (33 items)

Each of Sections B through G is scored individually and classified as either 'very satisfactory' (70 % to 100 %); 'satisfactory' (60 % to 69 %); 'needs improvement' (50 % to 59 %); or 'unsatisfactory' (less than 50 %). Scores from all six areas are then totaled resulting in an overall assessment score. The same ratings are used to categorize the final score. Gendreau and Andrews (1996) also suggest deriving a Correctional Treatment Score based on the items in Client Pre-service Assessment (Section C) and Program Characteristics (Section D).

The CPAI was completed independently by the reviewer. Items that are determined to be Not Applicable, in this case, four items (44 through 47) are not scored. However, items that are declared Not Known are scored as '0.' Any question about whether an item was applicable, was discussed with the Director of Treatment after a review of accumulated documentation. As is routinely the case in the administration of the CPAI, the agency (CPS) was given the opportunity to respond to draft versions of this document to correct any factual errors.

Individual CPAI item scores for the ATS-SC component of the ATS program are reported in Appendix A.

Results

A. Program Demographics

This section is purely descriptive and does not contribute to the scoring of the CPAI. Rather, it is designed to capture some general program parameters.

The ATS-CS has been in operation for only 1.5 years and its core cognitive skills program component for only one year. The program operates at Saskatchewan's largest youth centre and is delivered by a (designated) Youth Worker, who works under the direction of the program director, with the support of four (designated) community youth workers and their supervisor. During the site visit, the program was in the midst of processing its third group of youth through its cognitive

skills group (Thinking for a Change), which is a core element of the PDYC-SC program. At that time, 15 young offenders had participated in the cognitive skills component of the ATS-SC program, with at least two youths having successfully completed this phase of the program as well as the larger ATS program by August 30, 2003. It appears that at least 33 CROs have been incarcerated at PDYC, although four of them were exclusively on remand, and taken part in some aspect of the ATS-SC program at some time since its inception in January 2002.

The program is a government-funded service and is offered primarily through internal funding of approximately $47,000 for one dedicated caseworker (the prime therapist). The program does have a specific philosophy, identified in various documents (National Institute of Corrections, 2001). As described below, it adheres to the principles of effective correctional intervention (Andrews & Bonta, 2003) and it is consistent with corporate objectives of the organization (CPS).

B. Program Implementation

This section evaluates the contribution of the Program Director to the developmental and implementation process (Items 10 to 14) and the manner in which the program was developed and introduced in the facility (Items 15 to 20). It should be noted that this portion of the review was conducted in August 2003, while the original was onsite program (i.e., prior to her moving to another position) and therefore, items are scored accordingly. However, it is noted that her departure was imminent and the choice of her successor had not yet been determined. This change in senior supervisory personnel could have an impact on the ATS-SC program's score in the Program Implementation section of the CPAI even though the program is now fully operational.

Items 10 to 14, Program Director

The program director is defined as the individual currently responsible for the overall management of the program. The program director and her role and duties in the program are given

four of five points. The program director has come to the position with professional training (M.A.) and appropriate experience in the treatment of young offenders (i.e. greater than three years), particularly adolescent sexual offenders. She has taken an active role in program development as the principal developer of this particular program. More generally, she has been employed at PDYC for 10 years and been the Director of Treatment at the facility for the last five years. She is directly involved in the ongoing training of program staff through routine supervision sessions and has participated in in-house staff training programs. However, she does not function as an active therapist in this particular program (ATS-SC).

Item 15, Literature Review

It was apparent from the sessions attended by the reviewer and from a review of client files that the program is based on a thorough knowledge and understanding of the young offender treatment literature. There was an abundance of information on file and a substantial collection of relevant youth treatment literature available on site to verify that a comprehensive literature review had been undertaken and that this review was used to assist in the choice of program and in the design and planning of its content prior to program implementation (e.g., National Institute of Corrections, 1998, 2001; Manitoba, 2001; Motiuk & Serin, 2001; T^3 Associates, undated).

Item 16, Pilot

Program implementation did not include a true pilot program of at least one month's duration prior to the first phase of its introduction in April 2002. Records and discussions with staff indicated that there was some pressure on program organizers to begin the program with a minimum of delay. For example, the ATS program actually began before the first dedicated worker, the prime therapist, had been hired into the position at PDYC. Secondly, all auto theft staff participated in the National Institute of Corrections training program for the cognitive skills program in September,

2002, and the program began shortly thereafter in October 2002. However, a number of positive features of program adjustment are noted. When the original program was initiated, the Rehab Committee routinely received reports about how the group was proceeding. Two other Thinking for a Change groups were being offered in the community at the same time as the initial offering at PDYC and all program facilitators convened midway through the program and then again upon its completion to re-evaluate their delivery of the program and to make adjustments as necessary. Moreover, it is currently clear that the program is being routinely monitored and modifications are continually being considered to improve its delivery and effectiveness.

Item 17, Need

There was considerable evidence collected and disseminated to support the need for this particular program. The Regina Auto Theft Strategy Steering Committee was struck and began meeting in November 2001, at which time statistics were compiled about the nature, extent, and severity of auto theft as a problematic youth crime in Regina (City of Regina, 2002). In particular, a core group of potential candidates was identified and appropriate behavioural criteria were established to select them. A number of the youth who were identified as having youth criminal records that included numerous, repeated auto thefts also had a current disposition that included secure custody (13 in secure custody, 4 on remand). Therefore, the need for the program was established *a priori* through a thorough review of high risk youth known to be involved in multiple auto thefts and who had been resistant to previous rehabilitative efforts (City of Regina, 2002).

Item 18, Value Congruence

Direction to establish this particular program component (ATS-SC) originally came from local management after consultation with the Auto Theft Strategy Steering Committee and the Auto Theft Rehabilitation Committee, both of which include senior administrators of CPS. This reporting

structure indicates that there is sufficient 'value congruence' between the program operators, local and corporate administration (City of Regina, 2002). It is also apparent that the values and goals of the program are consistent with the existing values of the local correctional environment at PDYC.

Item 19, Cost-effectiveness

Sufficient evidence has not been developed to demonstrate that the program is operating in a cost-effective manner, vis-à-vis its objectives. Ultimately, it is the responsibility of CPS to determine the cost effectiveness of its program in relation to other alternatives. These calculations have yet to be undertaken. Listed below are some preliminary observations and a description of the issues that should be considered when making such a determination.

The number of offenders who have been treated in each of the program groups offered to date is a factor to consider. However, the determination of cost-effectiveness is complicated by the fact that youth receive, unavoidably, different levels of treatment as illustrated earlier in Table 2 and by the fact that the ATS-SC represents only the institutional component of a program that spans the traditional institution-community dimension. Moreover, it is highly unlikely that any youth will be removed from the CRO list while they remain at PDYC. At the time of writing this review, the number of 'true graduates,' those who have been removed from the CRO list, must be considered small in number (approximately 4 youth). However, the Thinking for a Change group program routinely runs at capacity and the established limit of participants at any one time is within reason.

The program does not appear to be inordinately expensive, with the add-on cost of one full-time contract worker, the prime therapist. However, she is supplemented by community youth workers, contributing the equivalent of approximately one day per week on site at PDYC to assist with the cognitive skills program and 2.5 days per week on case management of the CRO youth at PDYC. There are also a few additional expenses, such as the native elder contract and other minor

expenditures (totaling less than $15,000) and the administrative time of the program director. These costs should be considered in light of the throughput of youth in the program on an annual basis.

Item 20, Sustainable

It is understood that funds are in place at least for the existing fiscal year and there is an implicit assumption that they will be renewed with the budget from the next fiscal year (04/05). However, given the contract nature of the principal therapist's employment status and the vagaries of public service funding of such positions, it cannot be verified that sustaining funds are in place to support the current level of operation for the foreseeable future. Such a determination would require confirmation that the necessary resources have been established permanently in the annual budget of PDYC. It is assumed that funding for the four community youth workers and their supervisors has been established in the permanent budget of the community office with the reassignment of two positions and the creation of two new positions.

Evaluation of Section B, Program Implementation: 7/11 = 63.6% (Satisfactory).

Overall, the ATS-SC was implemented in an appropriate fashion and is proceeding satisfactorily. Four of five items pertaining to the program director were achieved and three of six of the other program implementation items were achieved. It is anticipated that some of the currently unsatisfied conditions will be addressed and met in the future. However, the status of the next (future) program director should also be monitored in accordance with items 10 to 14.

C. Client Pre-Service Assessment

This section evaluates the extent to which a pre-program assessment is conducted and if so, the relevance of the assessment to appropriate correctional practice. In particular, the extent to which risk, need and responsivity factors are incorporated into the pre-service assessment of the

clients is examined.

Item 21, Presenting Problem (not scored)

Clearly, this program targets a very specific segment of the young offender population. Youth who have a well established pattern of serious or 'chronic' auto theft histories are referred to the program, although their offenses are not limited to this particular mode of crime. In fact, most youth in the program have a multitude of offenses. Although most treatment programs for young offenders, with the exception of sexual offenders, do not target the specific nature of the crime, but rather focus on underlying problems, it is legitimate to use 'auto theft' as a common denominator to convene groups of young offenders for treatment. This is because there is an implicit assumption that there are some fairly common underlying criminogenic needs, for which this specific crime type might be considered a proxy. These underlying criminogenic needs are likely to include antisocial attitudes, delinquent peers, and inappropriate use of leisure time, amongst others. However, some non-CRO youth with histories of auto theft are occasionally referred to the Thinking for a Change program in order to fill the group. Caution must be exercised to ensure that this practice does not result in low risk offenders are included in this aspect of the ATS-SC program.

Item 22, Appropriateness

The type of client that is referred to this particular program may be considered highly appropriate. All youths in this program have been very much ingrained in the local (Regina) car theft subculture. There was no evidence of any youth being in the program who did not meet the program selection criteria, as outlined by the program planners. However, it is noted that the criteria for being designated an auto theft CRO are not permanently fixed and appear to becoming more liberal since recently admitted youth do not have as extensive auto theft records as their predecessors. Nonetheless, the LSI-SK remains a formal component of the selection process and is

used to determine whether potential candidates are at high risk to reoffend, generally.

Caution must be exercised in maintaining selection criteria in an objective and well defined manner to ensure that the CRO designation is limited to only the highest risk/highest need auto theft offenders as the pool of candidates becomes increasingly 'picked over'. Program administrators must also be mindful that they avoid 'net widening' to less serious offenders, unless it is the explicit intention of program administrators to extent the program to other youth as part of a systematic strategy that includes offering more varied treatment and processing options.

Item 23, Exclusions

There was no evidence of any inappropriate or unnecessary client exclusionary criteria. Clearly, youth not given a sufficiently long secure custody disposition would not be able to enroll or complete this institution-based program. With a program of 22 weeks duration beginning twice a year, it is conceivable that a sentenced youth who enters PDYC shortly after a group has begun will require a secure custody sentence of 10 months to ensure his completion in the next offering of the cognitive skills group. On at least one occasion, administrative efforts have been successful in having a youth return to the facility from open custody or the community in order to complete the group. The only other solution to ensure eligible and in need clients are afforded an opportunity to participate in and complete this core component of the ATS-SC program would be to offer a parallel program for similar youth (based on the remaining criteria) who are under supervision in the community or are residing for a sufficiently long period of time in open custody. Other eligible and in need youth may not participate because of their mental health condition or their lack of motivation. Efforts are routinely made to minimize these occurrences by means of preparatory work with such clients. However, a substantial portion (17 of 38) of the youth in the ATS-SC program do not have occasion to benefit from the cognitive skills group (Table 2). Further efforts should be

undertaken to minimize these numbers. This may include motivational interviewing strategies (e.g., Miller & Rollnick, 2002), and mental health services to stabilize youth sufficiently in order to participate. It would also appear that the only other barrier to program access is the limited enrollment and capacity of the existing institutional component of this program, which has not presented a problem for any potential participants to date. Females are also excluded from the Thinking for a Change program because of their small numbers and the decision not to make the currently offered version at PDYC 'co-ed'. A community-based group component for females was offered early in the life of the program (October 2002), but it was hampered by a high attrition rate and has not been offered again because of an insufficient number of females to make a group format feasible.

Item 24 and 25, Risk and Method

There is evidence that static risk of recidivism is one of the determinants of program eligibility. The repeat or chronic history of auto theft is itself, a static risk factor. There is no evidence in the cases reviewed of any exemptions to this admission criterion. Moreover, the criminal history section of the LSI-SK Youth Edition provides a systematic review of a variety of static risk items on a single scale. However, there is some question as to when the LSI-SK Youth Edition is administered to young offenders. It would appear that some youth are administered the scale as part of the entry process into the program, while others are administered the risk assessment in the context of the pre-sentence report. It is our view that the risk assessment should be administered prior to youths' being accepted into any aspect of the ATS program.

A suicide and violence screen is also administered to all youth entering the facility, including those in the ATS-SC program. Youth are then referred to specialized services accordingly.

Item 26 and 27, Need and Method

As above, the LSI-SK Youth edition includes seven specific sections that address the criminogenic needs of youth. There is ample evidence that dynamic attributes of the youth are considered in planning their intervention. There is also a behavioural assessment administered to the youths at intake, although it is based on informal observation and is due after three months of program participation. However, the needs portion of a young offender's risk/need assessment is relevant and appropriate as a post intake assessment exercise as the results may be used to tailor specific treatment and case management issues with the client.

Item 28 and 29, Responsivity and Method

Responsivity of offenders refers to the differences between offenders as they respond to different styles and modes of service. Examples include the fact that offenders who are functioning on a low conceptual level respond better to higher levels of program structure, while offenders who are characterized as having a high degree of anxiety respond poorly to confrontational approaches. Aboriginal offenders are more apt to respond more favourably to programs that are culturally sensitive to aboriginal customs and ways of life.

As above, the LSI-SK Youth Edition includes a component that is devoted to responsivity issues of the youths. In particular, aboriginal heritage is given particular consideration, as a majority of admissions to the program to date have been aboriginal. This work is conducted with the assistance of a native elder. Another responsivity issue of interest concerns literacy. Youth who have reading difficulties may be referred for remedial assistance on an individual level. This and other non-ethnic responsivity dimensions are assessed primarily from file material and previous assessments that may have been conducted. However, no specified assessment instruments addressing responsivity issues are routinely administered. This could include routine administration

of a standard assessment of intellectual functioning, language, literacy and other basic academic

skills upon admission to the program. Nonetheless, youth who are identified with learning

difficulties or other personal characteristics which may impact on their capacity to comprehend the

cognitive skills group content or the speed with which they might be expected to do so are provided

supplemental assistance.

Item 30 to 32, Risk, Need and Responsivity Defined

There is indication that the program does include specific classifications of youth to level of

risk based on the formal youth assessment from the overall LSI-SK Youth Edition score. This

instrument has established on a predetermined basis that a score of 20 to 29 constitutes a high risk

young offender and a score of 30 or more constitutes very high risk. The current provisions of the

agency (CPS) do not permit youth workers or other staff to change the results of the LSI-SK Youth

Edition from one risk level to another, although they do permit workers to provide their opinion

about modifying the risk level and the reasons for doing so in the discussion section of their reports.

Similarly, the scale establishes levels of criminogenic need in seven critical areas based on the LSI-

SK Youth Edition profile. They are Employment/Education, Family/Marital, Leisure/Recreation,

Companions, Procriminal Attitudes, Substance Abuse, and Antisocial Pattern. However, the LSI-

SK Youth Edition is nonspecific about what constitutes a responsivity concern and there is no

evidence that any other systematic procedure with *a priori* objective criteria is in place to identify

special responsivity issues for the youth who are referred to this program. Selection of youth into

the cognitive skills program is based partly on his LSI-SK Youth Edition profile. Other criteria

include motivation/willingness and the presence of incompatible youth already designated for the

program. Although an absolute cutoff on the LSI-SK Total Score is not used as a selection criterion,

youth must have high scores on the sections pertaining to Antisocial Attitudes, Antisocial

Associates and Antisocial Pattern. However, there is no *a priori* objective definition of any of the possible responsivity considerations. Consequently, the selected youth routinely score at least in the high risk category and most in the very high risk category. Therefore, the program achieves two of the three points allocated to the use of objectively defined operational criteria for risk, need and responsivity.

It is also noted that occasionally youth who have not been selected into the ATS-SC program are admitted to the cognitive skills group in order to provide a sufficient number of youth in the group. Care must be taken to ensure that these youth, even though there are not formally included in the ATS cohort, are at sufficiently high risk/need to be included in this program, which, otherwise, is made up of exclusively high risk young offenders.

Evaluation of Section C, Client Pre-Service Assessment: 8/11 = 72.7 % (Very Satisfactory).

The ATS-SC scores particularly highly on the Pre-service Assessment section. Much of this accomplishment is due to the fact that the LSI-SK Youth Edition, which forms a critical aspect of the ATS-SC assessment process, and the CPAI are both derived from the same empirical literature on the assessment and treatment of offenders. There are only three minor issues here. One, the current assessment protocol should be administered prior to program admission and should be used to inform the client admission decision-making process. Secondly, further attention should be paid to responsivity assessment of responsivity issues with respect to each client, also as part of the selection, admission and program planning process. Third, although it would not likely have changed the youth who have been selected as CROs or for the cognitive skills program, establishing an LSI-SK Youth Edition criterion score for both of these selection processes would provide a safeguard against net widening and the expansion of services to less risky youth.

D. Program Characteristics

This section evaluates the characteristics and integrity of the program, focusing specifically on the extent to which it addresses criminogenic factors and the means by which it does so. It also examines the manner in which clients and service providers are matched and the extent to which relapse prevention strategies are in evidence. The focus of this section of the CPAI evaluation is on ASTS-SC 'add-on' programs and services that are offered to CRO youth at PDYC. These include the cognitive skills program (Thinking for a Change), the specialized (auto theft) case management services provided by the prime therapist and the community youth workers, and the specialized preparation for release and possibility of referral to external programs upon release to the community. The broader PDYC context, including its structure, and routine programs and services are also considered. It was determined that four items relating to the application of punishment were not applicable for this program. Consequently, this section is based on 18 items instead of 22 items.

Item 33, Program Targets

The program targets are appropriate. They are consistent with the young offender treatment literature and the criminogenic needs of most youth who are convicted of repeat auto theft. There is considerable evidence that attitudes, orientations and values that are favourable to law violation are addressed. The program curriculum shows evidence of a relapse prevention component that is designed to ensure the participant that he is able to recognize high risk situations that lead to law-breaking and that assist him in the preparation of concrete plans to deal with these situations as they arise. The program includes a victim awareness component that is appropriately designed to sensitize the youth to the impact of their criminal (theft) behaviour on their victims. Interestingly, there did not appear to be a great deal of evidence presented in the manual or elsewhere about the

program specifically targeting auto theft behaviour and its precursors, such as the common

circumstances that are likely to elicit auto theft behaviour.

The program is also designed to promote positive attitudes among the participants and to

improve their performance and increase their participation in school or work-related activities. The

program includes components that are designed to improve clients' skills in terms of resolution of

interpersonal conflict. Attention is also given to clients' development of increased self-control and

self-management, as well as improved problem solving skills. There is also some attention paid to

increasing the youths' appropriate recreational interests and positive use of leisure time, and

assisting with individual, specific talents that may be apparent. Communications skills, particularly

at the intra-familial level are addressed. Substance abuse is addressed for those in need of alcohol or

drug counseling through an appropriate referral process to the substance abuse program called

Double Trouble.

Item 34, Treatment

Treatment modalities for the above-noted program targets are appropriate. This is apparent

from observation of the group program and the program manual. The modality is primarily a social

learning theory format, with modeling and role playing and behavioural rehearsal being commonly

used in exercises throughout the program. Participants are encouraged to present their responses to

a variety of questions or scenarios in a role play format. Cognitive-behavioural therapy practices are

also in evidence. It was noted however, that much of the dialogue in sessions was one-to-one

between therapist and client, as opposed to being between two clients. To maximize the benefit of

social learning model, after direction is provided from one of the therapists, it is particularly

beneficial to have the feedback and further modeling of (appropriate, prosocial) responses to the

various tasks being assigned to come from youths' peers. More of this kind of (prosocial) dialogue

and prosocial, supportive (reinforcing) 'cross talk' should be encouraged from the clients.

Item 35, Location

This review is of the institutionally based component of the ATS. The participants in the ATS-SC program and designated as CROs are not routinely separated from other youths at the facility, except when participating in the Thinking for a Change program or involved in individual counseling, both of which would only amount to a few hours per week of the clients' total time in the facility. The CPAI recommends that incarcerated treatment participants be separated from the rest of the institutional population. This is because offenders who are not in the specific, intensive treatment program may have a negative impact on their peers, contaminating the effectiveness of the treatment program. Moreover, staff may treat all incarcerates in the same manner and may not be attuned to the goals, objectives, content and procedures being applied to the clients in treatment. Under such circumstances, they may be working at cross purposes or, at best, not be in synch with the treatment process. It is noted, however, that significant efforts are made by the dedicated ATS-SC staff (the prime therapist and the community auto theft youth workers) to apprise the other youth workers on staff at PDYC of their work with the CRO youth, the content and activities of the cognitive skills program, and the weekly performance of the youth in the program.

After considerable deliberation and a review of research suggesting that high risk youth are vulnerable to peer aggregations (Dishion, McCord & Poulin, 1999), it was a conscious decision by program administrators to disperse the CRO youth throughout the various residential units in the facility. It was apparent, that these youth, not only shared a specific type of criminal activity (auto theft), but many of them came from a small geographic area in Regina and associated with, or at least knew, each other in the community. Therefore, it was anticipated that housing them together would be counterproductive to the goals of the program. By assigning CRO youth to different units,

contact is limited to well controlled and supervised group meetings.

Certainly, the assignment of a relatively homogeneous group of delinquent youth to a common living unit can have 'iatrogenic' effects that are counterproductive to the goals of treatment, particularly when clients are not closely monitored. However, the dispersion of such a group throughout an institution creates a program structure that is likely to lack the intensity that can be offered only in a total treatment milieu.

Item 36, Manual

There is abundant evidence of program manuals for this and related programs available on site for the service providers to use on a daily basis. The manuals are extremely detailed as they need be in order to provide sufficient direction to service providers in order to offer a consistent program. Additional manuals and related literature about similar programs are also on site for program staff to consider.

Item 37, Involvement

Clients must spend at least 40 % of their time during treatment in therapeutic tasks, which may include work, school and leisure activities. Although program youth are in formal treatment for only a few hours per week (one group program for 90 minutes, twice a week) and perhaps one individual session of one hour, on average one hour per week, they are appropriately assigned to other activities, primarily school, for approximately five hours per day, five days per week. A few youth are also assigned to constructive work-related activities.

38, Intensity/risk

The highest risk clients receive the highest intensity and duration of service. It is clear from the selection process that the clients who are admitted to this program are high risk, most of whom participate in a common program (Thinking for a Change) if their secure custody disposition

permitted. Individual case work appears to vary with the individual (criminogenic) needs of the client. Moreover, youth with specific criminogenic needs in the area of substance abuse may be referred to the specialized Double Trouble program for substance abuse and at least one high risk, violent offender has been referred to the Touchstone program for violent behaviour. However, there is no evidence that there is any formal rule that assigns additional (appropriate and client specific) services to clients that are inordinately high in terms of their risk. However, a high scoring youth on the substance abuse section of the LSI-SK is likely to be referred for substance abuse counseling and a youth with deficient academic skills would likely be referred to the appropriate school /tutoring program. CRO youth at PDYC also participate in other treatment programs, but these programs are either offered generically (social skills in the living unit) or are not risk/need based (grief counseling with Child and Youth Services).

Item 39, Treatment/Client

The case management portion of the ATS-SC is highly individualized. The LSI-SK is used to identify each youth's treatment needs. Individual sessions with CRO youth focus on their criminogenic needs, accordingly, and specific referrals are made to address client-specific criminogenic needs. These include substance abuse counseling, mental health problems, family problems, academics/literacy, recreational interests, and ethnic/spirituality concerns. Prerelease planning and referrals to community based programs and services by the community youth workers also constitute part of the AYS-YC program component. Regular, at least weekly, individual sessions are also held with each of the CRO youth.

All CRO youth at PDYC are routinely referred to the Thinking for a Change program if their disposition permits, with only some youth being screened out for reasons of incompatibility or unreadiness to participate. There is not a substitute program for these youth. Consequently, any

variation in treatment between youth occurs at the individual level in terms of case management and possibly supplemental assistance with the material from Thinking for a Change.

Due to the nature of the program and its relative small size, it is unlikely that clients would be assigned to variations in the program in a manner that would best suit their individual style of learning. There are insufficient numbers of clients to permit multiple offerings of the program with variations that would coincide with offender differences.

Overall, this condition is met because of the diversity of services offered to youth on an individual basis, in spite of the fact that the Thinking for a Change program is offered to all CRO youth who are able to attend and is offered in only one format. Further attention might be given to the possibility of variations in this program offering, most likely within the context of a single group, since the numbers preclude multiple versions being offered at PDYC.

Item 40, Staff/Program

Most of the staff members who were assigned to work as the prime therapist and as the community case workers were selected particularly for this program from a larger pool of youth workers through the public service competitive process. Two of the initial community case workers were reassigned from other positions when those positions were moved to the ATS program following a screening process to asses their suitability for this particular position. The remaining workers were selected particularly on their capacity to work both within the institution and the community, in an intensive fashion with a small caseload of high risk youth. Their abilities to work with youth in the group context were also considered.

Item 41, Staff/Client

There is some indication that community youth workers are assigned to work with youth in the ATS-SC program in accordance with the skill sets of the worker and the needs or other personal

characteristics of the client, including gender. Community case workers are also selected to work with these youth in accordance with their knowledge of a youth and his or her family, and whether they have worked with a youth in the past, and whether it has been determined that a worker has proven to be effective with a particular youth in the past. The prime therapist carries clinical responsibility for all of the ATS-SC youth at the facility and therefore does not have any opportunity to match youth to any other institutional workers.

Therefore, there is some evidence that there is an effort to match individual youth with individual workers of a case-by-case basis in order to maximize the likelihood of a good fit between worker and staff. However, aside from the demographic characteristics of the case workers, the specific staff attributes of note and the client characteristics used to match them have not been documented and remain unclear.

Item 42, Client Input

Clients should have an opportunity to modify at least some features of the program with the approval of the program director. Opportunity is afforded clients to provide input about the cognitive skills program at the end of each offering of the program. Appropriate attention is given to their commentary. A standard form has been developed for the youth to provide their feedback in a convenient fashion. An example of client feedback is that youth have reported having difficulty thinking of role play scenarios and suggested that having more examples would be helpful.

Item 43, Ratio of Rewards/Punishers

There is no clear indication that the '4:1 ratio' of rewards to punishers is maintained in the ATS-SC program. Observations from program administration staff suggests that the relative delivery of rewards and punishers varies with the staff on shift at any given time. Clearly, there will always be individual differences between staff as the present with different personalities,

dispositions and styles of supervision of youth on the unit. Nonetheless, efforts should be devoted to a consistency between staff as to when and how to support (reinforce) youth for positive appropriate behaviour and when and in what manner to be critical (informally) or administer an officially sanctioned consequence. The level system, with its accumulation of points is designed to reinforce positive, prosocial behaviour. The fact that most youth at any given time are at the Entry level (Level 3) or one level above (Level 4) of a five level system indicates that the scheme tends to promote changes in youth by emphasizing their positive behaviour.

Routine disciplinary procedures are also in place as per regulations for secure custody facilities in CPS. However, there is no evidence to indicate that these procedures are designed specifically to suppress antisocial behaviour after termination of the program. Rather, there is an implicit assumption that they are designed to maintain institutional management and the maintenance of good order amongst the youth during their incarceration. Therefore, items 44 to 47 are not applicable.

Item 48, Completion Criteria

There are no specific completion criteria for the ATS-SC portion of the program. In fact, CROs who are admitted to the program upon their admission to PDYC remain in the program throughout their incarceration at the facility. Also, the cognitive skills group program is of fixed duration with attendance through the program being the primary indicator of completion, although youths may be re-enrolled in the next cycle of the cognitive skills program if their disposition permits and it is believed they may derive further benefit from repeating it. Regardless, upon completion of the cognitive skills group, clients remain active in the one-to-one component with the prime therapist and their community case worker.

Upon release to the community, clients are routinely referred to their specialized community

youth worker, who are directly linked to the institutional portion of the program and have already begun working with their clients. If a youth does not recidivate upon his/her return to the community during the court assigned period of supervision (typically a period of probation) and/or has been problem-free for a one year period in the community, then he/she may be graduated from the program (reviewed off the CRO list). Minor technical violations that do not create a significant risk to others do not preclude a CRO from graduating. A total of four CRO youth in the community component of the ATS have been graduated in accordance with these criteria since the inception of the program.

It is highly unlikely that a youth would ever be designated as having completed the ATS program while still incarcerated at PDYC. Moreover, there do not appear to be any formal criteria to determine termination of the ATS-SC program component, aside from release to the community. Termination of the ATS-SC program component should be defined by progress in acquiring the targeted skills and not simply by having completed the cognitive skills program or arriving at a release date.

Item 49 to 54, Relapse prevention component

There is clearly a relapse prevention philosophy and practical aspect to the ATS-SC program, particularly in the cognitive skills group. Clients are trained to self-monitor their cognitions and behaviour and to anticipate potential high risk situations. In addition, there is a significant role playing or practice element to the exercises, as well as opportunities to practice skills outside of the group format through homework and feedback from staff on the living unit. Consequently, monitoring ones behaviour (item 49), rehearsal (item 50), and practicing (item 51) appropriate social behaviour are represented in the program. These components were in evidence during the site visit and are found throughout the Instructors Manual of Thinking for a Change.

Participants are also given feedback and are supported for their advances to this end. The program does not include a traditional 'booster' component (item 54), although the prime therapist does offer continued follow-up services to the incarcerated youth. Moreover, clients may be given the opportunity to re-do the program if there is sufficient time remaining on the secure custody portion of the disposition and it is determined that the client did not derive the complete benefit of the program. This may occur for reasons of poor motivation or limited intellectual capacity. However, since all of the community auto theft youth workers are trained cognitive skills program facilitators and they continue to work with CRO youth in the community, it should not be a difficult matter of establishing formal booster sessions, either individually or in small groups, for the youth in the community. Such activity would create yet another link between the institutional programming and community supervision/services for these youth.

There is a strong advocacy/brokerage function played by the dedicated prime therapist and auto theft case workers through their significant input into the assessment, classification, and referral of CROs at PDYC to other programs, both internally and externally, before and after their release from PDYC (item 52). Although this item typically refers to community based client advocacy, the ATS-SC component has strong links with community services through the community case workers who begin to work with the clients while still incarcerated in secure custody. Therefore, advocacy for CROs, begins at the institutional level where there is sufficient documented evidence of youth being successfully referred to supplemental programs designed to address their specific criminogenic needs. These include, but are not limited to, the following: Double Trouble, which is a substance abuse program offered by Child and Youth Services, Regina Health District, and includes both a psycho-educational component and a relapse prevention component for those youth in need and referred to this advanced section; a day program provided by

Addictions Services; mental health services provided by Child and Youth Services; specialized aboriginal programs, such as Red Feather and the Friendship Centre; and Street Culture Kids, which is a community-based, activity program. However, it is noted that there are more youth in need of community referral than there are programs for them in the community. Consequently, some of these programs may have a number of CROs enrolled in them. This limits their opportunity for exposure to nondelinquent, and more importantly, non-CRO youth and to the appropriate kind of modeling that can occur with a more heterogeneous group of peers.

An effective relapse prevention program for adolescent offenders also requires that case workers engage and work with the significant others in the youths' environment. This includes parents, teachers, coaches, instructors and other counselors who may be working with the client. This component requires direct work with the significant others in the offenders community environment and entails the training and coaching of these individuals to work in a supportive manner that is consistent with the goals and strategies of the program. There is evidence to suggest that service providers of the ATS-SC program work with the clients' support networks in the community to reinforce treatment concepts and client gains (item 53). The community caseworkers make a particular effort to engage the immediate family, particularly parents, in their work with CRO youth. This item is made possible, in part, because of the low caseload that is assigned to the community youth workers (i.e., a maximum of 10 youth).

Evaluation of Section D, Program Characteristics: 13/18, 4 not scored, = 72.2 %
(Very Satisfactory).

The ATS-SC program meets many of the program characteristics with ease. This is primarily because of the nature of the Thinking for a Change program. This program was planned, prepared and is delivered with a sound knowledge of the 'what works' literature in corrections and,

in fact, is based in large part on that literature.

However, given its small, single program format, it is not surprising that the ATS-SC does not meet some of the criteria in this area. As such, it is difficult to offer separate versions of the program for different types of offenders or to assign staff to different aspects of the program. Instead, the service providers must attempt to accommodate the individual characteristics of participants within the confines of a single group. Therefore, it is hampered somewhat by its inability to offer a diversity that is commensurate with the heterogeneity of any offender sample, no matter how it is defined. It is noted that the varying needs of the clientele are addressed by referral of youth to external programs and services. This is also a legitimate way to meet the diverse needs of an offender clientele in the context of a small program.

Staff members invariably have different strengths and are likely to be particularly effective with certain youth. Therefore, it is suggested that local management consider various ways in which the individual styles of clients might be matched to the varying skills, abilities, styles and even demographic characteristics (age, gender and ethnicity) of the case workers.

E. Staff Characteristics/Practices

This section reviews the program staff in terms of individual background, training and education. Program staff for the ATS-SC include the program director, the dedicated prime therapist, the four dedicated community youth workers and their supervisor. The CPAI sets very high standards for direct service providers in these areas. Nonetheless, the ATS-SC program receives five of the eight points in this section. One item, Stability of Staff, requires two years of operation to be scored, but is included regardless, because the criterion cannot be met.

Items 55 to 57, Education, Area of Study and Experience

The program director has an M.A. in psychology and has practiced as a clinical psychologist working with youth for more than ten years. The prime therapist has a B. A. Advanced Degree in Psychology and had been working with youth for a number of years at PDYC prior to her current posting. The education, fields of study and experience of the co-therapists/community youth workers and their supervisor all possess BSW's and have from two year to more than ten years experience working in treatment with delinquent youth. Consequently, more that 75 % (i.e., 100 %) have an undergraduate degree and more that 10 % (i.e., 14%) have a graduate degree (item 55), more than 75 % (i.e., 100 %) have training in a related field (item 56), and more than 75 % (i.e., 100 %) have at least one year experience working in treatment with offenders.

Item 58, Personal Qualities

Staff selection has been made on a number of important, clinically relevant qualities. This includes dedication to work with youth, showing a caring attitude towards the youth, capacity to develop rapport with delinquent youth, and clinical skills in both group and individual modalities with clients. This is particularly the case for the prime therapist. Less is known about the selection criteria for the community support/co-therapist positions.

Item 59, Stability

The incumbent of the dedicated prime therapist position has occupied this post since its inception. Although this has not been for a terribly long period of time (17 months), it does indicate some stability and continuity in terms of the primary service provider to the program. However, at the time of writing, the program director was about to move to another position in the agency and a successor had not yet been determined. The original supervisor for the community youth workers has moved to a more senior administrative position and has had two successors. The four

community youth workers have also experienced turnover as two of the original four staff (those transferred from other positions) have since left the program and have been replaced by new staff. Therefore, it is apparent that at least four of the seven positions that are directly affiliated with the ATS-SC program have had changes in personnel over the short life (17 months) of the program.

Since the program is less than two years old, this item is not scored, but caution is suggested that in order to be favourably evaluated on this item, 50 % of the staff must remain on the job for at least two years. Therefore, the program will be unable to achieve this criterion by its second anniversary.

Item 60, Assessment

Although the treatment staff receives regular clinical supervision and is assessed annually as per provincial civil service guidelines, there is insufficient evidence that the dedicated workers are assessed specifically with respect to their clinical skills related to service delivery. Formal documentation of their clinical performance evaluation is required.

Item 61, Training

Cognitive skills training consisted of a video training program through the National Institute of Corrections (NIC), which is a nationally (US) recognized and established leader in the training of correctional staff in empirically demonstrated effective offender intervention programs. All staff, including the program director, prime therapist, community case workers and their supervisor attended this training. The community case workers rotate into the role of co-facilitator for the cognitive skills program, one program at a time. The program director also routinely provides on-site training for the program staff, through periodic supervision meetings. A description of training activities offered to the prime therapist is provided in Appendix B. There is also plenty of training material available at PDYC (videos, manuals and treatment literature, such as research, program

descriptions and program evaluation articles).

However, other points to consider include the following. There are not clear records or minutes of routine in-service training sessions. There is some indication of staff being supported to attend professional development or externally offered training sessions in theory and/or practice of offender treatment, but this may be limited primarily to the prime therapist (see Appendix B). Budgetary restrictions may impede this process since there is no evidence of a training budget specifically for ATS-SC staff. Each core service provider should have one such opportunity per year.

Item 62, Program Input

Program staff has the opportunity to provide input into modifications of the treatment program and these changes must be approved by the program director. Examples include how to combine some of the optional sessions that are included in the Thinking for a Change program curriculum and establishing parameters for the structured family meetings that are required.

The group does not have the authority to make major systemic changes that would affect the larger ATS program. Changes of this magnitude would be required to go to the Auto Theft Rehab Committee or perhaps to the ATS Steering Committee.

Evaluation of Section E, Staff Characteristics/Practices: 5/8 = 62.5 % (Satisfactory).

This is a relatively new program that is currently run by a group of service providers with an excellent background. Although onsite supervision is thorough, there is some question about the evaluation of staff clinical skills, the extent to which opportunities for further professional development are available and the amount of turnover among the personnel associated with the ATS-SC.

F. Evaluation

This section assesses whether the program is evaluated, the type of evaluation being conducted, and the extent to which the evaluation is used to monitor how well the program is functioning. Although the ATS-SC program has not been in operation for a sufficiently long time to have undergone a thorough evaluation, this section is scored based on evidence pertaining to any planning or evaluative efforts that have been undertaken to date. Since it is advisable to establish the mechanism for correctional program evaluation in conjunction with the development and implementation of a program, it is believed that the assessment of this component is not premature.

Item 63, Quality Assurance

A number of quality assurance activities have been initiated to ensure that the program is being delivered as planned and to enhance the overall quality of the ATS-SC program component wherever possible. This includes regular meetings of all ATS-SC community and institutional facilitators, with two such meetings being held to date. Secondly facilitators are invited to meet with the Auto Theft Rehabilitation Committee to discuss and review operational and program content issues of the Thinking for a Change program. This committee is responsible for the quality assurance of all aspects of the ATS program and, it was learned after the site visit, the committee has recently begun a file audit of the case plans for all CRO youth, in accordance with newly developed standards.

The findings from this exercise and recommendations or modifications from it remain to be seen. Upon completion of this review, it is possible that scoring of this item may change. However, it is important that this is not a 'one off' exercise. Rather, it should include the introduction or a routine management audit mechanism that reviews the documentation pertaining to treatment progress (by means of active program checks, file reviews, and program records), clinical

supervision and client feedback to the ATS-SC clients.

Item 64, Consumer Satisfaction

Youth are requested to complete a client evaluation questionnaire upon completion of the

22-week program. In addition, their verbal feedback is also invited at this time and throughout the

cognitive skills program.

Item 65, Within Program

The prime therapist routinely conducts 'self-evaluations' with each member of the cognitive

skills group upon completion of the 22-week program. This consists of a series of questions about

their social skills that is asked of the youth and their primary counselor in the living unit. The

results of these two data sources are then compared. Although there is some question about the

objectivity and standardization of this mechanism, credit is given for this item. Service providers

might consider the addition of other instruments to supplement this evaluation technique. Brief

summaries are also prepared by the co-facilitators of all participants at the end of each cognitive

skill group session.

Item 66, Follow-up

Although there may be informal follow-up of youth when they complete the community

portion of the program and it has been noted that some youth have been reincarcerated, there is no

formal mechanism to monitor the recidivism of youth upon the completion of the program.

However, it is our understanding that an outcome evaluation is in progress and that exercise will

include assessments of client recidivism as recommended by Pfeifer and Skakun (2002).

Item 67, Methodology

The one review conducted to date is a process evaluation of the complete ATS program.

(Pfeifer & Skakun, 2002). Moreover, although released in October, 2002, it appears to have been

written prior to the initiation of the Thinking for Change program as this and other secure custody based aspects of the ATS program are described as having been planned and designed, but not yet implemented. There is no evidence of any effort to make comparisons of outcome to any kind of control or comparison group and it is our understanding that the evaluation in progress does not include data collection on a control or some other kind of comparison group.

Item 68, Unpublished Report

One unpublished report has been completed on the ATS program and some preliminary attention is given to the ATS-SC component as part of the IISCM, which was under development while the report was in preparation. This report has been made available to the public on the CPS website, http://www.cps.gov.sk.ca/

Item 69, Peer Review

There is no evidence that any report has been submitted for external peer review. Since an outcome evaluation is currently in progress, and it is undetermined whether the product will be submitted for independent peer review, this item is not scored.

Evaluation of Section F, Evaluation: 4/6, 1 not applicable, = 66.7 % (Satisfactory).

Although this is still a relatively new program, efforts should be initiated from the outset to establish a high quality evaluation of the ATS-SC, perhaps in the context of a more broadly based evaluation of the ATS program, which may already be underway. Given the nature of the program, 'outcome' may refer to subsequent processing by the criminal justice system (youth or adult) for auto theft specifically, but also for any criminal offenses as the nature of the program provided is as likely to affect general recidivism as it is to impact on auto theft. More consideration might be given to assessing intermediate gain, such as the use of pre- and post-testing of treatment targets and more formal evaluation or rating of client performance in the group program.

G. Other

This section of the CPAI evaluates miscellaneous areas such as the adherence to ethical guidelines, the quality of client files, disruptive changes to the program and issues of administrative support.

Item 70, Client Records

Client records are kept up to date and are maintained in a secure, confidential fashion by the prime therapist and the living unit staff. This includes both in program and administrative records. A random review of a selection of client files revealed the following kinds of documents are routinely filed: very detailed Pre-Disposition Reports; very detailed Custody Progress Reports, standardized Youth Auto Theft Summary records, Anger Management/Prosocial Assignment work sheets completed by clients; summary Discharge Reports; and a variety of other administrative documents including correspondence pertaining to the youth. Some client files also included client ratings on a standardized form and some files included LSI-SK Youth Edition risk assessment forms, with or without a risk assessment report based on the LSI-SK Youth Edition, while others had Criminogenic Factor Evaluation records on file. At the time of the current review, 32 of 39 CRO youth (82 %) had been administered the LSI-SK Youth Edition. Progress notes are also written by co-facilitators at the end of each group session, although they are not in any standardized format and they are not very detailed.

Item 71, Ethical Guidelines

A review of local files and resource material did not reveal any evidence of any code of ethics or guidelines relating to the ethics of treatment or intervention that is maintained on site. There are, however, provincial policies and procedures for all custody facilities that outline the

ethical conduct required of all staff.

Item 72 and 73, Program and Funding Changes

The ATS-SC was reviewed for any substantial changes in operation and funding that could have disrupted the continuity, flow or development of the program. Since the program is only in its second full year of operation and funding, it is clear that the program is still evolving. However, there is no evidence that it has been subject to any dramatic or disruptive programmatic, administrative or funding changes.

Item 74 and 75, Community Support and Advisory Board

Auto theft in Regina has been a high profile community issue for at least the last five years. The ATS-SC is part of the Regina ATS, which is a large multi-agency initiative that is designed to curb the extent of auto theft in Regina. As part of this initiative, the ATS-SC portion enjoys a great deal of support from a variety of community stakeholders. This supportive relationship is formalized through a complex committee structure that ensures that all stakeholder groups are represented at the 'front line,' managerial and senior administrative levels. The ATS Steering Committee functions as an advisory board to the overall program and consists of Deputy Ministers of Justice and Corrections and Public Safety, Chief of Police, Regina Police Services and the Director, Saskatchewan Government Insurance. This overseeing committee is mirrored by a senior management committee that consists of representatives from all of the above-noted agencies and departments. The management group is central to the complete ATS. It is responsible for ensuring the overarching principles of the ATS are being practiced and that the necessary resources are in place, and that organizational issues are addressed. This group makes representation to the senior administrative group on matters pertaining to the implementation and expansion of the program and related budgetary matters. It also oversees an Auto Theft Rehab-Development Group subcommittee

that focuses specifically on the content and quality of all direct service components of the program to the clientele, including the ATS-SC component. A front-line, operational group is responsible for the handling of day to day issues, including the selection of youth to the program and monitoring their progress.

Evaluation of Section G, Other: 5/6 = 83.3 % (Very Satisfactory).

In terms of these administrative issues, this program is operating in a very satisfactory fashion. It is particularly advantageous that this program is part of a larger strategy that is devoted to the reduction of a particular type of crime in a geographically circumscribed area. Moreover, the development and monitoring of this larger (ATS) strategy, by a multi-agency committee of senior level administrators who represent the major agencies and stakeholders in this enterprise, is consistent with important managerial principles of human service delivery.

Discussion

General Comments

Overall, the ATS-SC received a total score of 42/60, or 70.0 %. On the treatment sections of the CPAI (C and D), it received a score of 21/29, or 72.4 %. Both of these scores are in the 'very satisfactory' range of the CPAI. Although not extremely high scores, they do compare quite favourably to many of the programs evaluated on the CPAI to date. For example, in one review, only 39 % of all specialized programs (e.g. substance abuse, sexual offenders) received a 'satisfactory' grade of 50 % (Gendreau & Goggin, 1997). Moreover, it is evident that the ATS-SC has a particular niche in the broader ATS as conceived by a multidisciplinary and multi-agency committee of criminal justice, health and social service agencies in the Regina area.

It is quite clear that the youth who are referred to the ATS-SC component of the ATS

include the most recalcitrant young offenders involved in the auto theft subculture that has emerged

in the Regina area. They are identified from a wider network of youth by a group of professionals

from diverse criminal justice agencies. Consequently, the natural checks and balances inherent in

such a working group operate to ensure only the most problematic youth are admitted into this

group. Moreover, although somewhat confounded by the representation of various parties in this

group who may speak to sentencing, an identified youth must also be given a secure custody

disposition by the youth court judge that is sufficiently long to be admitted into the cognitive skills

group portion of this program. Other youth admitted to the program, however, may still be on

remand and they are included in the institution case management portion of the ATS-SC program

until their disposition becomes known. The design of any formal group process for youth on

remand is difficult because of the uncertainty of their stay in the secure facility.

The ATS-SC serves a number of important functions. These include:

- Addressing many key features of the auto theft youth group, including their (antisocial) criminal

  attitudes and their way of thinking (cognitions) in a criminal manner (criminogenic needs),

- Planning a community based aspect to the youth's plan (advocacy and service), and

- Creating a link to the community in terms of client supervision (continuity).

Even though the overall program rating was very satisfactory, it is clear that a number of

factors may have suppressed the program rating below its true level of functioning. The relative

newness of the program and its small size, consisting of a single therapist who offers a single group,

make some of the CPAI criteria difficult to achieve. Moreover, there are other factors, discussed

below, that are beyond the control of the service providers. Nonetheless, a number of observations

and recommendations can be made at this time. Some of these comments pertain to ATS-SC, the

specific program under review, while others pertain to the local institution and to the broader corporate framework of CPS and PDYC.

To begin, the team should be complemented for putting together a thorough, evidence-based program for auto theft young offenders at PDYC. In response to a request from the Auto Theft Steering Committee, it did so amidst a high profile community concern. The ATS-SC's cognitive behavioural orientation and program content are appropriate for the target population. Service providers emphasize client responsibility as part of client disclosure and it is evident that the team is very committed to providing a high quality service to its clients.

Moreover, the program appears to fit into the broader treatment structure for young offenders at PDYC as there is a significant element of service integration throughout the program in the Regina area (through standardized assessment, classification and referrals). Clearly, the ATS-SC contributes to these linkages and the systemic integration of service delivery.

As is the case in all programs, there is continued room for improvement, both locally and systemically. With the core personnel being limited to a single service provider, there is no doubt that the ATS-SC is hampered by its limited human resources onsite at PDYC. Nonetheless, the treatment team and the CPS community youth workers can be commended for their efforts in working around the physical and cultural limitations of the institutional setting.

The major limitation of the CPAI review is that extended observation of youth-to-youth and youth-to-staff interactions was not part of the assessment plan. Therefore, it remains uncertain as to how successful the treatment plans were in terms of their actual delivery of service to youth. Incidental observations of youth in groups were only partially encouraging, while individual interviews with youth were more so. Similarly, the extent to which intermediate targets have been achieved has not been monitored and the extent to which any such achievements may be related to

outcome has not been explored.

Specific recommendations are made to the ATS-SC service providers, local administration (PDYC) and the Youth Services Division of CPS.

Program Recommendations

1. The cognitive skills co-facilitators should encourage more (prosocial) cross talk between participants and attempt to reduce the one-to-one, dyadic conversation between therapist and client.

2. More detailed and systematic session notes (possibly on a revised form) should be written by therapists and distributed to other staff. They should include session-by-session descriptions and ratings of each client's participation, as well as individualized comments that may be particularly relevant to unit staff (e.g., difficulties with exercises, homework tasks).

3. It is recommended that co-facilitators work more closely in the actual delivery of the individual sessions as opposed to one facilitator taking the lead for a given session or sessions. This would require some planning on the part of the co-facilitators on a session-by session basis.

Institutional Recommendations

4. As per findings from the CPAI, greater attention should be paid to issues of client responsivity and its assessment. At this point, consideration appears to be focused on ethnic background, which may lead to referrals to the native elder affiliated with the program and speed of learning/literacy, which may lead to supplemental assistance with the content of the cognitive skills program.

5. There is some concern about the number of youth who participate annually in the cognitive skills component of the ATS, with the observation being that some youth who might need or

could benefit from this treatment being excluded. Efforts should be taken to ensure as many of the CRO youth who are incarcerated at PDYC have an opportunity to participate in the cognitive skills program.

Organizational Recommendations

6. A permanent funding base should be put in place to ensure the ongoing existence of the ATS-SC component of the Regina ATS. This should be presented both to the Regina ATS Steering Committee and to the CPS hierarchy. Funding should include sufficient resources for in service and external staff training and development activities. Permanent funding may help to maintain staff continuity as well as program stability.

7. A firm research and evaluation component should be built into the ATS-SC component of the Regina ATS. Its impact in the context of the broader ATS should be considered. This must be done by examining potential changes in the participants themselves as opposed to the use of community auto thefts as an outcome measure because of the many different factors that may influence these numbers, not the least of which may be the other three principal components of the Regina ATS.

8. A comprehensive, systematic and coordinated CRO database should be established for all youth included in the Regina ATS, particularly those incarcerated youth in the ATS-SC component of the program and possibly even those referred to the selection committee for consideration. Such a scheme would play a vital role in any empirical evaluation, but would also serve numerous administrative functions by tracking not only individual clients, but changes on the evolution of the program itself.

<u>Conclusion</u>

The assessor is impressed by the efforts of the dedicated core treatment staff of the ATS-SC component of the Regina ATS and their effort to introduce the principles of effective correctional intervention in a secure custody facility. The ATS-SC component, with its ancillary PDYC secure custody programs and its preparatory community linkage through the community youth workers, form an impressive combination of services. Consequently, all aspects of the program are rated as satisfactory or very satisfactory and the overall ATS-SC component, with its rating of 70.0 %, has achieved a 'very satisfactory' rating.

References

Andrews, D.A. (1995). The Psychology of Criminal Conduct and Effective Treatment. In J. Maguire (Ed.). *What works: Reducing Reoffending*. Chichester: Wiley.

Andrews, D.A. (1995). *Assessing program elements for risk reduction: The Correctional Program Assessment Inventory (CPAI).* Paper presented at the "Research to Results" conference of the International Association of Residential and Community Alternatives, (October). Ottawa, Ontario.

Andrews, D.A., & Bonta, J. (1995). *The Level of Service Inventory – Revised: User manual.* Toronto, ON: Multi-Health Systems.

Andrews, D.A., & Bonta, J. (2003). *The Psychology of Criminal Conduct*. (3rd Ed.). Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishing Company.

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

Andrews, D.A., & Carvell, C. (1999). *A CPAI Assessment of Project Turnaround: Report Three*. Toronto, ON: Ministry of the Solicitor General and Correctional Services.

Andrews, D.A., Zinger, I., Hoge, R.D., Bonta, J., Gendreau, P., & Cullen, F.T. (1990). Does correctional treatment work? A clinically relevant and psychologically informed meta-analysis. *Criminology, 28,* 369-404.

Bandura, A. (1973*). Aggression: A social learning analysis.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bandura, A. (1977). *Social Learning Theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

City of Regina (1997). *Social Development Division: Vehicle Thefts Action Plan*. No. 0500 CPC -1597, Regina, SK.

City of Regina (1998). *The Regina Crime Prevention Commission: Auto Theft Strategy and Action Plan*. No. CPC - 015, Regina, SK.

City of Regina (1999). *Vehicle Theft Strategy Offers Balanced Approach*. Regina, SK.

City of Regina (2002). *Reducing auto theft: A comprehensive strategy to needs of auto owners and young auto theft offenders in Regina.* Saskatchewan, Unpublished report, January 9, 2002. Regina, SK.

Cognitive Techniques Lesson Plan, Changing Offender Behavior to Promote Public Safety. Unpublished report.

Cullen, F.T., & Applegate, B.K. (1997). *Offender Rehabilitation: Effective Correctional Intervention*. London: Dartmouth.

Dishion, T.J., McCord, J., & Poulin, F. (1999). When interventions harm: Peer groups and problem behavior. *American Psychologist*, *54*, 755-764.

Ellis, A. (1977). Rational-emotive therapy: Research data that supports the clinical and personality hypotheses of RET and other modes of cognitive-behavior therapy. *Counseling Psychologist, 7*(1), 2-42.

Ellis, A. (1980). Rational-emotive therapy and cognitive behavior therapy: Similarities and differences. *Cognitive-Therapy-and-Research*, *4*(4), 325-340.

Evolution of Classification Lesson Plan, Changing Offender Behavior to Promote Public Safety. Unpublished report.

Gendreau, P., & Andrews, D.A. (1990). Tertiary prevention: What the meta-analyses of the offender treatment literature tell us about "what works". *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, *32*, 173-184.

Gendreau, P., & Andrews, D.A. (1996). *Correctional Program Assessment Inventory (CPAI) Answer Form,* (6th edition). St. John: University of New Brunswick.

Gendreau, P., & Goggin, C. (1997). Correctional treatment: Accomplishments and Realities. In P. Van Voorhis, M. Braswell and D. Lester (Eds.) *Correctional Counseling and Rehabilitation* (3rd Ed). Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.

Goldstein, A.P., & Glick, B. (1987). *Aggression Replacement Training: A comprehensive intervention for aggressive youth.* Champaign, IL: Research Press.

Goldstein, A.P., Glick, B., Irwin, M.J., McCartnew, C., & Rubama, I. (1989). *Reducing delinquency: Intervention in the community.* New York: Pergamon.

Hoge, R.D., Leschied, A.W., & Andrews, D.A (1993). *An investigation of young offender services in the province of Ontario: A report of the repeat offender project*. Ministry of Community and Social Services, Toronto, ON.

Holsinger, A. (1999). *Opening the black box: Assessing the relationship between program integrity and recidivism.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Cincinnati.

Hunter, D. (2001). *Treatment Programming for Youth in Custody Substance Abuse Treatment – Custody to Community.* Regina Health District, September 2001.

Latessa, E.J., & Holsinger, A. (1998). The importance of evaluating correctional programs. Assessing outcome and quality. *Corrections Management Quarterly*, 2(4), 22-29.

Latessa, E.J., & Holsinger, A.M. (1999). *Evaluation of Ohio Department of Youth Services community correctional facilities (CCF's).* Division of Criminal Justice, University of Cincinnati: Cincinnati, OH.

Latessa, E.J., Jones, D., Fulton, B., Stichman, A., & Moon, M. (1999). *An Evaluation of Selected Juvenile Justice Programs in Ohio Using the Correctional Program Assessment Inventory.* Division of Criminal Justice, University of Cincinnati: Cincinnati, OH.

Linden, R., et al. (2002). *National Study of Young Offender Involvement in Motor Vehicle Theft.* National Committee to Reduce Auto Theft, April 4, 2002.

Lipsey, M. (1995). What Do We Learn from 400 Research Studies on the Effectiveness of Treatment with Juvenile Delinquents? In J. Maguire (Ed.). *What works: Reducing Reoffending.* Chichester: Wiley.

Lipsey, M., & Wilson, D. (1998). Effective intervention for serious juvenile offenders: A synthesis of research. In R. Loeber & D.P. Farrington (Eds.), *Serious and violent juvenile offenders: Risk factors and successful interventions* (pp.313-345). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Logan, R. (2000). *Crime Statistics in Canada,* Statistics Canada: Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Ottawa, ON.

Losie, D. (2001) *Auto Thefts.* Paper presented at Frequent Auto Theft Task Group, November 30, 2001, Regina, SK.

Losie, D. (2003). *Regina Auto Theft Strategy Impacts.* Paper presented at Meeting Steering Committee, January 30, 2003, Regina, SK.

Losie, D. (2003). *Regina Auto Theft Strategy - Phase 2 Proposal.* Paper presented at Meeting Steering Committee, January 30, 2003, Regina, SK.

Leschied, A.W. (2000). Informing young offender policy in current research: What the future holds. *Forum on Corrections Research Vol 2*, pp. 36-39.

Manitoba (2001). *Auto Theft Prevention Initiatives Introduced*, May 31, 2001.

http://www.gov.mb.ca/chc/press/top/2001/05/2001-05-31-03.html Winnipeg, MB.

Matthews, B., Hubbard, D.J., & Latessa, E. (2001). Making the Next Step: Using Evaluability Assessment to improve correctional programming. *The Prison Journal, 81*(4), 454-472.

McGuire, J. & Priestley, P. (1995). Reviewing "What Works": Past, Present and Future. In J. Maguire (Ed.) *What Works: Reducing Offending.* Chichester: Wiley.

McGrath, E. (2001). *The Touchstone Program: The Regina Model of Integrated Programming for Seriously Violent Youth.* Regina Health District.

Meichenbaum, D.H. (1977). *Cognitive–behavior modification: An integrative approach.* New York: Plenum.

Motiuk, L.L., & Serin, R.C. (2001). Compendium on "What Works" in Offenders Programming. *Forum on Corrections Research, 2*, 36-39.

Miller, W.R., & Rollnick, S. (2002). *Motivational Interviewing: Preparing people for change,* (2nd edition). New York: Guilford Press.

National Institute of Corrections (1998, September). *Cognitive/Behavioral Strategies to Changing Offender Behavior.* U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC.

National Institute of Corrections (2001). *Thinking for a Change: Facilitator Training* U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC.

Pfeifer, J., & Skakun, K. (2002). *Regina Auto Theft Strategy: Process Evaluation.* Unpublished report. Canadian Institute for Peace, Justice and Security: University of Regina, October 2002.

Paul Dojack Youth Centre (2000). *Program planning forum: Developmental programming.* October 2, 2000, Regina, SK.

Paul Dojack Youth Centre (2000). *Oshihtawin Program Proposal.* July 25, 2000. Regina, SK.

Paul Dojack Youth Centre (2001). *Program planning forum.* Regina, SK.

Paul Dojack Youth Centre (2001). *Program planning forum.* May 2, 2001, Regina, SK.

Paul Dojack Youth Centre (2002). *Program planning forum: Review of best practices.* January 8, 2002, Regina, SK.

Paul Dojack Youth Centre (2003). *Program planning forum summary.* June 26, 2003, Regina, SK.

Regina Auto Theft Committee. (undated). Current *List of Regina Chronic Repeat (auto theft) Offenders: Youth CROs.* Weekly Listings, Unpublished report.

Regina Auto Theft Committee. (2001). *Auto Theft Strategy Update: Activity since January 31.* Unpublished Report. February 8, 2001, Regina SK.

Regina Police Service (2001). *Stolen Auto Activity Report*, November 21, 2001.

Regina Police Service (2003). *Stolen Auto Activity Report*, January 29, 2003.

Saskatchewan. (2002). Instruction and scoring manual for the LSI-SK Youth. Regina, SK: Department of Corrections and Public Safety.

Savoie, J. (2001). *Crime Statistics in Canada,* Statistics Canada: Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics.

Schnell, D. (2001). *Substance Abuse Treatment Programming for Youth in Custody at the Paul Dojack Youth Centre.* Social Services: Family and Youth Services, November 22, 2001. Regina, SK.

Szalavitz, M. (2002). Camp Fear. *Redbook Magazine,* March 2002.

T[3]Associates Inc. *Overview of the Cognitive Skills Reasoning and Rehabilitation Program.* Unpublished report. Ottawa, ON.

Tremblay, S. (1998). *Crime Statistics in Canada,* Statistics Canada: Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics.

Tremblay, S. (1999). *Crime Statistics in Canada,* Statistics Canada: Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics.

U.S. Department of Justice: Office of Justice Programs (2001). *National Institute of Justice: Research in Brief,* August 2001.

Van Voorhis, P., Cullen, F.T., & Applegate, D. (1995). Evaluation intervention with violent offenders. *Federal Probation, 50,* 17-27.

Wallace, M. (2002). *Motor Vehicle Theft in Canada, 2001.* Statistics Canada: Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Ottawa, ON.

What Works: The Research Lesson Plan, Changing Offender Behavior to Promote Public Safety, Unpublished report.

Wormith, S., Wright, J., Sauve, I., & Fleury, P. (1999). *Ontario's strict discipline facility is not just another "boot camp".* Ontario Ministry of the Solicitor General and Correctional Services, Ottawa, ON.

Yanick, I. (2002). *Stolen Auto Statistics for August, 2002.* Regina Police Service, September 4, 2002.

Yanick, I. (2002). *Stolen Auto Statistics for November, 2002.* Regina Police Service, December 2, 2002.

Appendix A

Correctional Program Assessment Inventory (CPAI)

Answer Form

Details of the scoring of the ATS-SC program using the *Correctional Program Assessment Inventory* (CPAI).

Scoring Note: 1 = meets criteria, 0 = does not meet criteria, NA = not applicable (item is ignored), NK = not know (item is scored 0).

A. Program Demographics (not scored)

1. Name of program: Regina Auto Theft Strategy: Secure Custody component (ATS-SC)
2. Name of contact person: Doris Schnell
3. Years in operation: 1.5 years, as marked by the hiring of case worker in March 2002.
4. Setting: Paul Dojack Youth Centre, Regina SK
5. Number of offenders/probationers/residents (currently)

# juvenile	38
# adult	nil
# male/female	33 male, 5 female

6. Number of staff

# full-time	1 dedicated
# part-time	4 community youth workers
	1 supervisor, community youth workers
	1 manager, with other duties
# male/female	2-to-1 (M:F) ratio

7. Program budget $47,000, plus elder contract?
8. Government/private   Government: Corrections and Public Safety, Regina Health District
9. Program philosophy   Developmental
                            Psychology of Criminal Conduct

B. Program Implementation   7/11: 63.6 %.

10. program initiation	1
11. qualifications	1
12. previous experience	1
13. selected/trained staff	1
14. conduct program	0
15. literature review	1
16. pilot study	0
17. need	1
18. value congruency	1
19. cost-effective	NK or 0
20. sustainable	NK or 0

C. Client Pre-Service Assessment   8/11: 72.7 %.

21. presenting problem(s)	multiple auto thefts (not scored)
22. appropriate clients	1
23. exclusions	NK = 0

24. risk	1
25. risk methods	1
26. need	1
27. need method	1
28. responsivity	1
29. responsivity method	0
30. risk level defined	1
31. need areas defined	1
32. responsivity defined	0

D. Program Characteristics	**13/18: 72.2 %.**
33. program targets	1
34. treatment	1
35. location	0
36. manual	1
37. involvement	1
38. intensity/risk	1
39. treatment and client	1
40. staff and program	1
41. staff and clients	0
42. client input	1
43. ratio rewards/punishers	NK = 0
44. theory	NA
45. stimuli	NA
46. procedure	NA
47. negative effects	NA
48. completion criteria	0
49. monitor	1
50. rehearse	1
51. practise	1
52. advocacy/brokerage	1
53. support	1
54. booster	0

E. Staff Characteristics	**5/8: 62.5 %.**
55. education	1
56. area of study	1
57. relative experience	1
58. personal qualities	1
59. stability	0
60. assessment	0
61. training	0
62. program input	1

F. Evaluation **4/6: 66.7 %**

63. quality assurance   0
64. consumer satisfaction   1
65. within program evaluation 1
66. follow-up (recidivism)   1 (evaluation planned to include)
67. methodological quality   0
68. unpublished report   1
69. peer review   NA (evaluation planned, but item unknown)

G. Other   **5/6: 83.3 %**

70. client records   1
71. ethical guidelines   0
72. program change   1
73. program funding   1
74. program community support 1
75. advisory board   1

Total Score: **42/60: 70.0 % (very satisfactory)**

Total Correctional Treatment Score
(Assessment plus Program Characteristics):
                               21/29: 72.4 % (very satisfactory)

Appendix B

Attachments from the

Auto Theft Strategy- Secure Custody

Component at Paul Dojack Youth Centre

Prime Therapist Record of Training Events
from April 29, 2002, (Start of the Position)
Through August 28, 2003

Date   **Training event (duration)**

Date	Training event (duration)
April 29 to May 3	*Level of Service Inventory – SK Edition*
June 7 - (8 week cycle)	*Youth Criminal Justice Act*
June 24 - 26	Violence and Aggression Conference, Saskatoon
September 17 - 20	Thinking For A Change training
(8 week cycle)	Motivational Interviewing (1 day)
	LSI (1 day)
Oct. 1	Stop Teaching our Kids to Kill (1/2 day)
January 16 - 17/03	
(8 week cycle)	*YCJA*
May 9	Human Rights training (1/2 day)
Aug 27	Learning Disabilities