

COGNITIVE BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTIONS (CBI)

Standard Operating Procedures

December 2001



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) Manual for CBI has been evolving for several years. It is not intended as the definitive policy manual for CBI. Rather, it is intended to provide information and assistance. Many people, too numerous to mention, participated in the initial organization of the document, drafting sections, and providing constant guidance and support towards this version's conclusion. I am sure that it will need updates and revisions as soon as it is distributed. However, I think it is important that we start somewhere, and this is our beginning.

I would like to thank the initial group of *Thinking for a Change* Master Trainers including Charla Suggs, Kim (Russell) Mason, Kathy Karr, Marion Moss, Jessica Wagner, and Bobby Cagle and the *Choices and Changes* guru, Nancy Boling, for their thoughtful input to this project. In addition, special thanks to Sherry Norman who completed the first round of edits, wrote several of the latter sections of this document including Quality Assurance and Aftercare, and gathered the materials for the appendices. Without the help all these folks, and many others, I would not be able to distribute what I believe is simply the first version of the CBI SOP Manual.

Thanks again for your hard work and assistance with this project and the overall development and implementation of CBI within the North Carolina Department of Correction.

Nicole E. Sullivan
CBI Project Director
December 10, 2001

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	4
DESCRIPTION OF GRANT PROJECT	5
CBI FACILITATOR SELECTION AND TRAINING	8
EFFECTIVE FACILITATION OF CBI	10
STAFF ORIENTATION	11
CBI CURRICULA	13
PARTICIPANT CRITERIA	16
REFERRAL GUIDELINES	17
REFERRAL PROCEDURE	17
SCREENING	18
PARTICIPANT CONDUCT	18
QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEM	19
AFTERCARE	20
APPENDIX FORMS SUMMARY	24
APPENDIX 1: INTERVIEW FORM – PRISONS	25
APPENDIX 2: INTERVIEW FORM – COMMUNITY	27
APPENDIX 3: PROGRAM PARTICIPANT EVALUATION FORM	29
APPENDIX 4: ESSAY QUESTION FORM	31
APPENDIX 5: NORTH CAROLINA MONITORING TOOL	33
APPENDIX 6: MID-YEAR PARTICIPANT EVALUATION FORM	39
APPENDIX 7: FINAL PARTICIPANT EVALUATION	42
APPENDIX 8: AFTERCARE GUIDELINES	46
APPENDIX 9: PRE & POST COVER SHEET	47
APPENDIX 10: CBI TRACKING SYSTEM MANUAL	49

INTRODUCTION

Purpose

The purpose of Cognitive Behavioral Interventions (CBI) is to assist the Department of Correction (DOC) in reducing recidivism through the implementation of effective correctional interventions that work with offenders. The CBI Policy and Procedure manual provides information and guidance to all Department of Correction (DOC) staff and other criminal justice professionals facilitating a CBI curriculum in a prison facility or community corrections setting. This manual will cover topics such as Facilitator Selection and Training, Curricula, Participant Criteria, Quality Assurance/Improvement/Support, Program Assessment/Evaluation, Documentation, and Aftercare guidelines.

Concept

In 1987, Robert Ross and Paul Gendreau published an article entitled *Revivification of Rehabilitation: Evidence from the 1980's*, which analyzed and discussed the characteristics of effective programs that reduce recidivism. According to this research study, one common characteristic that exists among highly successful programs is a technique, component, or approach that has an impact on the offender's cognition or thinking. Effective programs not only target the offender's environment, behavioral responses and skill development, they also seek to increase the offender's reasoning skills, problem-solving abilities, and expand the offender's empathy toward others. Since the late 1980's and early 1990's, offender programs that incorporate a cognitive behavioral approach are fast becoming the core component of effective rehabilitative programs.

National research indicates that cognitive behavioral approaches, in comparison to all types of rehabilitative programs and services, have a positive impact in reducing measurable intermediate outcomes such as prison infractions and probation violations, and long-term outcomes such as recidivism. Thus, the North Carolina Department of Correction has adopted cognitive behavioral interventions (CBI) as the underlying philosophy of rehabilitative programs and services within the agency.

Definition of Cognitive Behavioral Interventions

Cognitive behavioral interventions (CBI) are based on the simple principle that thinking (an internal behavior) controls overt actions (external behavior). Therefore, through CBI programs (or curricula), offenders learn new skills and new ways of thinking that can lead to changes in their behavior and actions, and ultimately affect their criminal conduct. CBI programs use a combination of approaches to increase an offender's awareness of self and others. This awareness is coupled with the teaching of social skills to assist the offender with intrapersonal and interpersonal problems. In other words, these specific types of intervention programs assist an offender in **restructuring** the thought process and teach **cognitive skills** to assist in basic decision-making and problem solving.

There are a number of theories developed by researchers including Bandura, Beck, Ellis, Yochelson, and Samenow describing cognitive structures or thinking frameworks that lead to troubled behavior or criminal actions. According to Taymans and Parese (1998), these theories

suggest that how an individual thinks about an external event, not the event itself, triggers feelings that can lead to criminal acts. The premise of a *cognitive restructuring* program is that offenders hold antisocial beliefs, attitudes and mental habits that lead them to criminal offenses. The goal of *cognitive restructuring* is to teach offenders how to change their antisocial beliefs to prosocial ones with the change process focusing on the content of their thinking. *Cognitive restructuring* guides offenders through a process of consciously examining their thoughts, and then making connections between their thoughts, related emotions and the crimes they commit.

Taymans and Parese (1998) discuss other researchers such as Ross and Fabiano who identified social skills that offenders need to learn to become more prosocial people. *Cognitive skills* enable offenders to modify their cognitive processes to control themselves and interact positively with others. The goal of *cognitive skills* is to teach offenders to manage their own behavior by engaging in processes that develop self-control, making them responsible for and in charge of their actions no matter how stressful the situation. These specific skills include problem solving, social skills training (learned behaviors that enable one to interact with others in ways that elicit positive responses), anger management, and empathy training.

DESCRIPTION OF GRANT PROJECT

History

Cognitive behavioral approaches have existed within the correctional programming framework of the department, and specifically within the Division of Prisons since the sex offender program was established at Harnett Correctional Institution. After the SOAR program model had proven its effectiveness, another CBI program was established at Caswell Correctional Center. The General Recidivism Intervention Program or GRIP targeted medium custody inmates regardless of the crime that resulted in incarceration. The basic premise of GRIP is that inmates can learn new thinking skills and restructure distorted patterns of thought while in prison, helping them become productive citizens upon release.

The Division of Alcoholism and Chemical Dependency Programs (DACDP) uses general cognitive behavioral principles in providing substance abuse treatment services for inmates. Although these services are based on the 12-step Minnesota model, inmates learn about ways to change behavior using new thinking skills. Emphasizing changes in habits and lifestyle to bring about abstinence requires an inmate to be aware of the events and situations that trigger substance use and abuse. It requires the inmate to think about when he uses so he can change that behavior.

As these examples continued to show promise for correctional rehabilitation, department officials began thinking about ways to expand these opportunities to other DOC offenders, particularly as new programs were implemented. By this time, the Cognitive Behavioral Training (CBT) Task Force, an ad-hoc committee composed of DOC staff from the operational divisions, the Parole Commission, Treatment Alternatives to Street Crime (TASC) Program, the Administrative Office of the Courts, and other state agency representatives, began meeting regularly. The task force reviewed programs from other states. The group then requested technical assistance from the National Institute of Corrections (NIC) to financially support North

Carolina staff visiting the Wisconsin Department of Correction (DOC) and learning about their cognitive behavioral program.

The Wisconsin DOC developed a CBI curriculum, “Cognitive Intervention Program” or CIP. The program is available in prison facilities and community correction sites such as probation offices and halfway houses. During the visit North Carolina representatives had an opportunity to observe groups, talk to staff, and talk to offenders about the CIP. Not only did staff and offenders alike talk very positively about the program, but also what we observed demonstrated the enormous impact that this type of program can have on offenders.

After the Wisconsin visit, departmental officials were convinced that implementing a widespread cognitive behavioral effort would better serve the offender population in North Carolina. The next step was to identify an initial pilot site where a CBI curriculum could be implemented. The IMPACT Boot Camp Program in Hoffman, NC, was the first group to express interest in implementing a CBI curriculum recognizing that the “trainees” lacked decision-making, coping, and problem-solving skills. In August 1998, through technical assistance from the NIC, the IMPACT staff and teams of probation and TASC staff from the Post-Boot Camp Aftercare sites, received facilitator training for the **Problem Solving Skills for Offenders (PSSO)** recently renamed **Problem Solving Skills in Action (PSSA)** curriculum. The training was the department’s first effort towards integrating a nationally recognized cognitive behavioral intervention into an existing DOC program or sanction.

After this successful training effort, department officials recognized the need for more resources to support the implementation of CBI curricula throughout the agency. The Task Force decided to apply for and was later awarded a Governor’s Crime Commission grant to support the expansion of CBI within the Department of Correction. In September 1998, the CBI Grant Project began operation with the following major objectives:

- To train DOC staff to deliver CBI curricula to offenders;
- To provide effective rehabilitative programs and services to offenders;
- To teach offenders cognitive skills and restructuring techniques;
- To improve communication and coordination among the operational divisions of the department as well as sister criminal justice, education, and treatment agencies, and
- To increase staff knowledge about CBI as an effective approach to dealing with offenders’ behavior.

Grant Overview

As a component of a vision-oriented, strategic planning effort, the North Carolina Department of Correction adopted the cognitive behavioral approach as the cornerstone of rehabilitative programs and services. The Department, committed to this philosophy, obtained funding through the Governor’s Crime Commission to support a grant in this area. The main focus of the Cognitive Behavioral Interventions (CBI) Grant Project is:

- to educate departmental staff and other service providers (working with DOC offenders) about CBI programs; and
- to provide technical assistance and training for the implementation of these programs.

To implement the project, grant staff developed an application process which enabled prisons, probation offices, DART programs, Criminal Justice Partnership Programs, and TASC programs (or combinations of these groups) to volunteer to start a CBI pilot site. Staff chosen for training generally demonstrated a belief that the cognitive behavioral approach could work with offenders and ultimately change behavior. In addition, they were enthusiastic about teaching offenders new skills in a group setting, and they were willing to participate in a new initiative that was strongly supported by agency management.

Sites chosen for CBI implementation sent staff to a weeklong facilitator training. During facilitator training, participants learned about aggressive behavior, group dynamics and the specific components of the curriculum chosen for their site. Participants had an opportunity to prepare and teach lessons thus gaining hands-on experience and familiarity with the organization of the curriculum and its components.

After completing the weeklong facilitator training, CBI pilot site staff organized and conducted a practice group, commonly referred to as a “sweetheart group.” This group enables newly trained facilitators to practice delivering the curriculum, thus becoming more familiar and comfortable with the overall curriculum. After completing the “sweetheart group,” facilitators would begin delivering the CBI curriculum to offenders based on the operational goals established by the pilot site. Materials (i.e. overhead transparencies, facilitator manual, and student workbooks) are provided by the grant to all pilot site staff. Acquiring the necessary equipment such as an overhead projector, flipchart stands, paper, and flipchart markers and a copy of the “Breakfast Club” videotape (needed only for the Thinking for a Change curriculum) is the responsibility of the pilot site.

Grant Project Highlights

- ❑ More than 350 DOC staff and other criminal justice professionals were trained to facilitate a CBI curriculum such as **Thinking for a Change**, **Problem Solving Skills in Action**, and **Choices & Changes**.
- ❑ Approximately 4,843 offenders have been assigned to a CBI program in a prison facility or community corrections setting.
- ❑ 23 Division of Prisons’ facilities are currently using **Thinking for a Change** and **Choices & Changes**, facilitated by either prison staff, contractual employees, or community college instructors.
- ❑ 5 Division of Prisons’ facilities are currently using **Reasoning & Rehabilitation**, facilitated by contractual staff.
- ❑ 42 Division of Community Corrections and/or Criminal Justice Partnership Programs are currently using **Thinking for a Change** or **Problem Solving Skills in Action**.
- ❑ 29 Community College instructors representing 16 campuses have attended **Thinking for a Change** Facilitator Training. These instructors are facilitating a CBI group in prison and community corrections settings.
- ❑ North Carolina was one of four states in FY 1999-2000 to receive technical assistance from the National Institute of Corrections (NIC) for **Thinking for a Change**, the Master Training Seminar. North Carolina currently has 23 certified **Thinking for a Change** Master Trainers.
- ❑ Expanding the Department’s relationship with the Community College System **Thinking for a Change** (in its entirety) can be offered under the Human Resource Development (HRD)

program and the Employment Readiness (PRE) program on the Continuing Education Master Course List.

- The GRIP Program at Caswell Correctional Center and CBI programs at Craven Correctional Institution and the Iredell Day Reporting Center and Probation Office were highlighted in the August 2000 issue of Correction News, the North Carolina Department of Correction newsletter.

CBI Expansion Plans

The success of the CBI Grant Project suggests that this approach should expand to all aspects of the Department of Correction. The CBI Expansion plan includes additional facilitator and master training opportunities for DOC staff and other criminal justice professionals and cognitive behavioral principles will be incorporated into staff development through in-service training and basic training. Finally, the Department will continue working with community colleges and contractual employees to increase the agency's capacity to reach offenders under the Department's supervision.

CBI FACILITATOR SELECTION AND TRAINING

Purpose

This policy provides information and guidance for choosing and assigning the best candidates to deliver CBI to the offender population. The classification of Master Trainer and Facilitator will be separated, although many responsibilities will overlap.

Master Trainer

Master Trainers are those individuals who will assist with and be actively involved in the training of facilitators, including initial in-depth training and refresher courses.

The major duties of a CBI Master Trainer are outlined below:

1. Master Trainers will deliver initial facilitator training and/or refreshers training at designated locations, usually based on assigned regional responsibilities.
2. Master Trainers will provide technical assistance onsite at least one time after an initial training, or within forty-five (45) days from such training. Otherwise technical assistance can be as frequent as deemed necessary.
3. Master Trainers will conduct quarterly divisional meetings in order to promote continuity, consistent service delivery, support, and assist with any implementation problems as afforded by opportunity and/or resources.
4. Master Trainers will also facilitate CBI groups to the offender population of the North Carolina Department of Correction as needed.
5. Master Trainers will conduct quality assurance activities in regions where assigned by the CBI Project Director or program coordinator/supervisor.

The qualifications of a CBI Master Trainer are as follows:

- Two years or more experience in cognitive behavioral-based group instruction/intervention and possession of current CBI certification. Demonstration of a keen knowledge of cognitive behavioral theoretical background.

- Experience preferred in training and supervision of staff.
- Excellent oral and written communication skills.
- Ability to work effectively with diverse populations.
- Good planning and organizational skills.
- Experience working in the criminal justice system.
- The CBI Project Director or designee can grant an exception to any person deemed appropriate.

To become a certified Master Trainer, one must attend at least one of the Master Trainer Seminars for the state approved CBI curriculum in which they will be facilitating. Currently, there are four (4)-approved curricula: **Thinking for a Change, Choices & Changes, Reasoning & Rehabilitation**, and **Problem Solving Skills in Action**. At this juncture, Master Training is only available for the Thinking for a Change curriculum. The Master Trainer Seminars will vary with each particular program and will be coordinated by the CBI Project Director or designee. As a prerequisite, a Master Trainer must complete the facilitator training for the specified curriculum and facilitate at least two complete cycles of the curriculum. The “sweetheart” group does count towards the two-group requirement. Finally, the CBI Project Director or designee shall develop, approve, and coordinate a re-certification process for all Master Trainers to include refresher training sessions, other CBI training seminars and/or conference participation, and any other requirements deemed necessary for a Master Trainer.

Facilitator

The major duties of a CBI Facilitator include: 1) coordinating and conducting CBI groups directly for the offender population (see later section on participant and curriculum site criteria); and 2) conducting a staff orientation for a prison facility and/or community corrections site where a CBI group will be held. Additional responsibilities may include entering attendance and participation data into OPUS or a data collection system approved by the CBI Project Director or designee. In some instances, other DOC staff in accordance with departmental policy and procedures will enter attendance and participation data.

The qualifications for a CBI Facilitator are as follows:

- Experience working with the offender population in a classroom or similar setting.
- Strong oral and written communication skills are essential.
- Strong desire to conduct CBI groups within the correctional environment.
- Specific knowledge of the CBI curriculum to be implemented is essential.
- Ability to work well with diverse populations demonstrating organizational skills, flexibility, a non-judgmental demeanor, and the ability to be personable.

A CBI facilitator will be certified based on attending and completing all training for the curriculum that will be implemented. The CBI Project Director or designee shall coordinate the training. In addition, certified facilitators will participate in quarterly and/or annual meetings to maintain facilitator certification. Each curriculum will vary in terms of how many hours are necessary for certification on an annual basis. The CBI Project Director or designee will develop standards of certification for CBI Facilitators and Master Trainers.

EFFECTIVE FACILITATION OF CBI

Purpose

This policy describes the characteristics of effective CBI facilitation by examining content areas for delivering a cognitive restructuring and/or skills program: 1) group/class setup; 2) specific skills development; 3) classroom management; 4) participant involvement; and 5) documentation and accountability.

Group/Class Setup

1. The facilitator is present; with the necessary materials adequately organized, and prepared to greet arriving participants several minutes ahead of the scheduled group time.
2. Attendance and tardiness are accurately and efficiently documented.
3. Homework (as required by specific programs) is reviewed, checked, and appropriately reinforced.
4. Each lesson is introduced so participants have an overview of the session.
5. The introduction of each lesson should include reasons why content or process should be valued by the participants and should be tailored to address each participant's perspective.

Specific Skill Development

1. The facilitator should define the skill or concept being introduced.
2. The facilitator should explain why the skill or concept is important and how it is related to other material previously covered.
3. The facilitator should present the thinking and actions that make up the specific skill.
4. The facilitator should model the skill correctly.
5. The facilitator should ask questions and make sure all participants understand the specific skill before moving on to a new skill.
6. The facilitator should use examples and scenarios that are simple and easy to follow and directly relevant to the criminogenic (crime-producing behavior) needs of participants.
7. The facilitator should allow participants to practice skills as much as possible and devote a significant portion (at least two-thirds) of a session to practice and exercises.
8. The facilitator should provide feedback to participants with at least 80% being positive and reaffirming.
9. During the summary session, the facilitator should include a review of what the group is learning, why the information is important to participants, and in what specific situations the skills can be used.
10. The facilitator should always follow the lesson plan and assign homework as directed by the curriculum.

Classroom Management

1. The facilitator should start the session precisely on time.
2. The facilitator should identify and address (but not judge) any pro-criminal responses and behaviors (allowing these responses and behaviors to go on without addressing them undermines the intent of the curriculum).

3. The facilitator should maintain a clearly defined set of group participation rules with simple, specific consequences for violation.
4. The facilitator should enforce class rules and boundaries.
5. The facilitator should acknowledge the need for and expect a different level of performance based on the individual skills and abilities of the participants.
6. The facilitator should take the necessary steps (both structural and situational) to insure each participant is involved in each session.
7. The facilitator should use humor appropriately throughout each session.
8. The facilitator should use the necessary equipment and materials (i.e., flipcharts, chalkboards, overheads, TV/VCR, and workbook) appropriately throughout each session.

Participant Involvement

1. Participants should be actively and voluntarily engaged and paying attention throughout each session.
2. Participants should be able to demonstrate their understanding of the content and processes used throughout each session.
3. Participants should provide positive and innovative input to the session.
4. Participants should adequately complete class activities and homework assignments.
5. Participants should demonstrate some understanding of their individual risk factors.

Documentation and Accountability

The facilitator should have a clear and effective system to document the following items:

- Intake interview process (in addition to pre-testing instrument)
- Attendance
- Tardiness
- Homework (as required by specific programs)
- Session participation levels
- Ongoing motivation, skill and participation issues
- Exit interview process (in addition to post-testing instrument).

In most instances, this information can be entered into OPUS in accordance with existing policies and procedures. In other situations, this information should be entered into the CBI Tracking System that is available through the Internet. Appendix 11 includes the user manual for this system as well as instructions for gaining initial access.

STAFF ORIENTATION

Purpose

This policy presents a sample outline and lesson plan for providing a comprehensive orientation to correctional staff and criminal justice professionals in preparation for the implementation of a CBI program. During the staff orientation, CBI concepts and principles will be explained and staff will learn ways to support the implementation of the program at their facility or community

corrections site. It is recommended that an orientation be conducted prior to the implementation of CBI at a facility or community corrections site.

Sample Lesson Plan

Lesson Title: Cognitive Behavioral Interventions (CBI) Orientation

Preparation of the Lesson:

Lesson Objective: To provide correctional staff and criminal justice professionals with a comprehensive orientation to Cognitive Behavioral Interventions (CBI).

Learner Objectives:

1. Describe the basic underlying premise of CBI
2. Understand the foundation and research that supports using CBI with offenders
3. Recognize the major components of the CBI curriculum and related activities
4. Understand ways to externally support the CBI program through positive reinforcement and using cognitive reflective communication techniques

Time Required for Lesson: Six (6) hours

Instructional Methods: Lecture, Small Group Discussion, and Practical Exercises

Equipment: Flipchart, lectern, overhead, transparencies

Sample Orientation Outline

- I. Introduction
 - A. Awareness exercise (participants describe on paper their most distressing interaction that had a negative outcome)
 - B. Theoretical Foundation – Research & Benefits (support for cognitive behavioral programs in general, emphasize lower recidivism findings)
 - C. Objective of orientation session
- II. Overview of CBI Curriculum
 - A. Definition of Terms
 - B. Major components and concepts
 - C. Thinking Reports
- III. Curriculum Objectives
 - A. Educational advantages
 - B. Psychological advantages
 - C. Thinking Report Exercise – participants share a situation where they made a good decision)
 - D. Purpose

- IV. Presentation of Curriculum Components
 - A. Cognitive Restructuring
 - B. Social Skills
 - C. Problem Solving
- V. Modeling and Role Plays
 - A. Trainers model practical use of CBI
 - B. Participant role plays
- VI. External Support
 - A. How to be supportive?
 - B. How to reinforce concepts?
 - C. Integrating thinking reports and concepts into routine duties
 - D. Cognitive Reflective Communication
- VII. Wrap Up

CBI CURRICULA

Purpose

This policy explains the general standards for delivering and implementing a CBI program and describes the menu of choices currently available.

Standards

1. The specific CBI curriculum must be followed exactly within the guidelines of that individual program.
 - a. There will be no addition or deletion of content materials.
 - b. The program time frame will be adhered to: e.g., number of sessions suggested completing the program, and time frame regarding the specific amount of time to complete each session. If the program suggests twenty-two sessions at 1 1/2 to 2 hours per session, then it shall be delivered in that manner.
 - c. A CBI curriculum cannot be condensed unless approved by the CBI Project Director or designee.
 - d. Two trained instructors are required to facilitate a CBI group. However, an untrained staff member may serve as an apprentice (under the guidance and supervision of a trained facilitator) until a training slot is available.

Implementation Steps

1. Conduct an orientation for administrative and program staff members of the facility/location in which you intend to provide services.
2. Secure approval of both administrative, custody, and/or program staff of the

specific facility/location in which you plan to facilitate your CBI program.

3. Determine whom, at the facility/location will be your contact person to ask questions, report problems, and in some cases bring the offenders to the group room.
4. Secure a room for holding the group, per facility/location procedures.
5. Gain approval of a start date for the group (see Referral Procedure):
 - a. send written notification to administrative, custody, and/or program staff of start date; and
 - b. notify participants of program start date
6. Class size: the class size will be limited to no more than fifteen participants, due to the nature of the protocol which encourages class discussion and requires participant role play. The ideal class size is between 8-10 participants.

The following conditions should exist for a CBI program classroom:

1. The classroom needs to have proper ventilation and lighting.
2. The room dimensions should be large enough to accommodate chairs and desks, or one large table for the group, and work table for the facilitator, and a chalkboard, white board, or flipchart stand, paper, and markers. Other room setups include chairs for participants and facilitators arranged in a circle or u-shape.
3. Proper classroom acoustics are necessary, free from outside noise that could be considered distracting. The classroom should be private, however safety precautions for the facilitators and participants should be considered.
4. The room should have proper climate control comfortable for a learning environment.

The following supplies should be available for each group:

1. The facilitator should have access to a copy machine.
2. An overhead projector, screen (if necessary), chalkboard, white board, or flipchart stands, paper, and markers, and TV-VCR system are the basic supplies needed to offer a CBI group. The TV-VCR system is not needed every session, but will be needed during the problem-solving segment of the “Thinking for a Change” curriculum.
3. A stapler, paper clips, pens, pencils, and paper should be provided for each facilitator.

The following supplies should be available for each participant:

1. Each participant should have a workbook or folder to hold loose workbook pages or additional information.
2. Each participant should have additional paper for note taking.

Each student should be provided with a pen or pencil.

Approved Curricula Descriptions

Thinking for a Change (TFAC) – The TFAC curriculum uses problem solving as its core enhanced by cognitive restructuring and social skill interventions. This curriculum is 22 lessons, offered 1-2 times per week for 1 1/2 to 2 hour sessions. The curriculum is appropriate for adult

and/or youthful offenders. The cognitive restructuring concepts are introduced and emphasized during the initial eleven lessons, interspersed with critical social skills, which support the cognitive restructuring process. Then, in lessons 16-21, problem-solving techniques are taught, supported by cognitive self-change and social skill development. This is a new curriculum presented by the National Institute of Corrections (NIC); therefore research data are not available.

OPUS Program Code: C52009

Problem Solving Skills in Action (PSSA) – The PSSA curriculum teaches offenders basic social skills critical to effective problem solving. The curriculum is 8 lessons, and is ideally taught for one hour per session. It is recommended that the entire curriculum is taught within a 3-4 week time frame and each session is no more than 3-4 days apart. Problem Solving is appropriate for adult and/or youthful offenders. This curriculum was developed to meet the need for a short term training experience offered to relatively large groups of offenders (16-20 offenders). The scripted instructional unit (8 sessions) focuses upon skill acquisition while the transfer training (transfer coaching) component (6-10 weeks after completing instructional unit) emphasizes the importance of skill application. Research studies are ongoing, and results are available from the authors, Dr. Juliana Taymans or Dr. Steve Parese.

OPUS Program Code: C52010

Reasoning and Rehabilitation (R&R)– The R&R curriculum was developed in 1989 by Ross, Fabiano, and Diemer-Ewies of Canada and is widely used throughout the Canadian correctional system, as well as in a number of states in the US. This curriculum follows a psycho-educational approach using a variety of techniques such as role-playing, case studies, modeling demonstration, overviews and reading. The program schedule is 18 weeks and is offered 2 days a week for 2 hours each session. This curriculum is appropriate for adults and/or youthful offenders. There are a total of 39 sessions in the R&R program. The curriculum includes 9 modules: Problem Solving, Social Skills, Negotiation Skills, Managing Emotions, Creative Thinking, Values Enhancement, Critical Reasoning, Skills in Review, and Cognitive Exercises. Empirical research studies on the R&R program are widely available.

OPUS Program Code: C52011

Choices and Changes– The **Choices and Changes** curricula are based on the adult version of the Wisconsin THINK program. Choices and Changes use realistic stories, interactive exercises and role-plays to help offenders gain insight regarding their thinking, and practice pro-social skills. Both curricula are appropriate for offenders between 16-19 years old. The Choices curriculum is 15 lessons, offered 2-3 times per week for 1 ½ hours each session. The Choices curriculum helps offenders recognize and begin to challenge thoughts and beliefs that lead them to incarceration and/or probation supervision. The Changes curriculum is 12 lessons, offered 2-3 times per week for 1 ½ hours each session. The Changes curriculum helps offenders develop pro-social skills in goal setting, anger management and social problem solving—skills that support the positive change begun in the Choices curriculum. These are new curricula, therefore research data are not yet available. A female version is currently under development.

OPUS Program Codes: Choices C52012 Changes C52013

Approval Process for New Curricula

The CBI Project Director or designee will periodically review approved CBI curricula to ensure compliance with standards, policies, and procedures. In addition, the Project Director or designee will continue to review new curricula for inclusion in the department's menu of CBI choices. To get a new curriculum approved, a written proposal requesting approval should be sent to the CBI Project Director.

The proposal should describe the following about the curriculum:

- Name and description of intended audience (i.e. age, gender, reading level, etc.)
- Credentials and experience of the author(s)
- Brief description of the curriculum and its contents and layout
- Summary of research findings
- Steps to implementing the curriculum
- Training needs for facilitators
- Costs for training and materials
- Sustainability of curriculum

PARTICIPANT CRITERIA

Purpose

This policy will provide guidance to CBI facilitators when choosing appropriate candidates for participation in CBI groups. As a general rule, potential candidates for any CBI group should be screened for participation and inclusion based on the rules and regulations of the sponsoring facility or location as well as by the CBI Facilitator conducting the group. Ideally, the CBI Facilitator will be able to select from a group of potential participants to ensure an appropriate balance to maintain group integrity.

Policy

CBI is an effective intervention for youthful and adult offenders. One of the most attractive aspects of this intervention is that various populations can be mixed with successful outcomes. For example, violent and nonviolent offenders, substance abusing and non-substance abusing offenders can be successfully mixed while providing successful outcomes.

However, there is strong evidence to suggest that CBI increase recidivism among psychopaths. CBI facilitators should not make any non-clinical diagnosis based on this presumed condition, but should refer offenders for clinical screening and assessment. In the event that an offender is clinically identified as a psychopath, the offender should be prohibited from all CBI activities and programs unless under the direct supervision of a licensed, clinical psychologist.

There are no strict criteria at this time that would preclude any offender from participation in CBI. However, the following represents a set of guidelines that will assist instructors in selecting populations that may benefit the most.

REFERRAL GUIDELINES

Each referral source and CBI facilitator will use the following as guidelines to make decisions regarding offender inclusion in CBI groups. Exceptions to these guidelines or questions regarding participation should be discussed with the CBI Project Director or a Master Trainer.

1. **Criminal offenses:** All offenders can be included in the group with the exception of sex offenders. These offenders should be included only in a CBI series where all participants are sex offenders.
2. **Intellectual level:** Low borderline or mentally retarded offenders are usually incapable of abstract reasoning/thinking and may be unable to grasp the important concepts. Generally an IQ of 80 and above would provide the most chance of success.
3. **Academic level:** A participant should have at least a fifth grade reading level. However, this criteria alone should not preclude participation. The facilitator can make special arrangements for another participant to assist or provide direct assistance to someone reading below the fifth grade level.
4. **Sentence Length:** Participants should have enough time remaining on their sentence or probationary period to complete the respective program. (This is a general guideline to insure program completion).
5. **Infraction History:** Generally unless the facilitator has vast experience with group dynamics, inmates with several Class A assaultive infractions occurring within the past year are usually poor candidates for successful program completion. Once they have demonstrated conscious efforts at controlling these aggressive impulses, they may be reconsidered for participation. This criterion does not apply to probationers, although offenders with criminal histories that include assaultive behavior or crimes should be screened carefully before inclusion in a CBI group.
6. **Motivation:** Ideally, facilitators and the group as a whole will benefit from motivated participants. Motivation is most beneficial if a result of intrinsic factors, such as having a goal of improving oneself. However, extrinsically motivated individuals may also benefit. For example, an offender participating in CBI to avoid consequences such as probation revocation or being demoted to a higher security level may be an ideal candidate. (The goal in such cases would be to have the offender eventually develop some intrinsic motivation by seeing some meaningful benefit in the curriculum).

REFERRAL PROCEDURE

The referral procedure designated by the hosting facility should be followed. DOC program staff will be responsible for providing referrals for inmates; community referrals could come from DCC, TASC or CJPP. Each facility will keep a list of all referrals whether enrolled in CBI groups or not. The list shall include offender name and OPUS number. Those offenders who

were referred but did not participate will be used as a comparison (control) group in future evaluation efforts.

SCREENING

Referrals should be screened prior to start of each CBI group session. The facilitator should screen all potential CBI group participants by completing the appropriate interview form. During the screening interview, all questions should refer to current term of incarceration or probation supervision. “Length served” or “Probation/Parole Period” refers to the total amount of time served or supervised as of the interview date. “Length of Sentence Remaining” or “Length of Probation/Parole Remaining” refers to earliest date of projected prison release or probation termination.

For DOP referrals, the CBI interview form in Appendix 1 will be completed. See section on Referral Guidelines for appropriate referral criteria. Referrals for community groups will be screened using the interview form in Appendix 2. Maintain all interview forms whether the offender is admitted into the CBI group as a means of documenting referrals for evaluation purposes.

The screening interview provides demographic information, education/employment history, marital status, and number of dependents (if applicable). It also assesses an offender’s willingness to participate with CBI group requirements, provides criminal history to determine aggressive behavior or other criteria that may cause the referral to be screened out (i.e., sexual offender or low borderline or mentally retarded offenders). A decision to screen out a referral should be discussed and agreed upon by the referral agency. Critical information should be verified.

PARTICIPANT CONDUCT

Once participant selection has been completed, the following conditions will be maintained:

- 1) Absences:
 - Curricula consisting of fewer than ten (10) sessions will allow no more than two (2) excused absences and no unexcused absences.
 - Curricula consisting of 11-22 sessions will allow 2 unexcused absences and 2 excused for a total of 4 absences per participant.
 - Curricula with 23 lessons or more will allow up to 3 excused and 4 unexcused absences, with no more than 7 total absences per participant.
- 2) Excused Absences: Each host facility/location should define excused absences based on existing policies and procedures. In general, reasons for excused absences can be defined as court appointments, medical appointments or visits, disciplinary, and other types of verifiable appointments. CBI facilitators will not be responsible for making the decision of whether an offender can miss group. Permission for an “excused absence” shall be granted by the referral agency.

- 3) Confidentiality within the group will be emphasized and maintained by facilitators and participants. However, facilitators should clearly explain that any disclosures that identify a verifiable victim, indicate a conspiracy or intent to commit unlawful acts such as prison escape or riot, absconding supervision, or harming others or self will be reported according to the policies and procedures of the host facility/location.
- 4) Disruptive behavior should be handled based on established policy and procedure of the host facility/location.
- 5) Participants will be included in developing the general guidelines for group conduct, management and organization, which will be followed throughout the sessions.
- 6) Successful completion will be defined as a participant completing the program and satisfying established attendance requirements. Completion with honors will include meeting attendance guidelines as well as scoring average or above on the program participant evaluation form (Appendix 3). Successful completion should be documented in OPUS or the CBI Tracking System.

QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEM

Purpose

This policy will ensure the maintenance of program integrity for CBI through implementation of the standard operating procedures and continuous feedback and assistance for facilitators. The quality assurance system will include a monitoring protocol and pre and post testing procedures.

Master Trainers will conduct quality assurance with CBI facilitators. Sites will be assigned to Master Trainers on a regional basis. Master Trainers will visit assigned regions 1-2 times during each curriculum cycle located in that region. A standardized form, the North Carolina Monitoring Tool (Appendix 5), will be completed and shared with each group facilitator. The form consists of five areas with a checklist of questions in each to be completed by Master Trainers. Areas identified as opportunities for improvement will be addressed with CBI facilitators and technical assistance will be available when needed.

During the first quality assurance visit, group participants will be given a two page, 20 question mid-term evaluation (Appendix 6) to evaluate group progress and facilitation skills by the Master Trainer. Each group member will complete the form by rating questions on a Likert scale of 1 which means strongly agree to 5 which means strongly disagree. Master Trainers will review these evaluations with the CBI facilitator and then keep these forms until completion of the group cycle.

At the end of a group cycle, the Master Trainer will administer a three-page final evaluation form (Appendix 7) to group participants. The 33-question form is an extended version of the mid-term evaluation and is structured with the same 1 to 5 rating scale. The final evaluation form is

given to measure overall improvement of facilitators and offenders, as well as identify areas of weakness in the group process. Master Trainers will review these evaluations with the CBI facilitator and make recommendations to improve the group process and/or delivery techniques.

Pre & Post Testing

The basic purpose of this process is to begin collecting data that can be used in either a process or outcome evaluation of CBI. At a minimum, CBI facilitators should administer a pre- and post-test using Lesson 22 from Thinking for a Change (Appendix 9). The procedure for administering these tests is described below.

Administer Lesson 22 (Appendix 9) as the pre-test prior to the start of group instruction. Make sure that the following information is completed on all pre-test: the offender's name, OPUS number, and the date of the pre-test. Keep all completed pre-tests, even if the offender does not successfully complete the group. After completing group instruction, facilitators should re-administer Lesson 22 and include the offender's name, OPUS number, and date on each post-test. Once completed, these tests should be mailed to: **NC Department of Correction, Office of Research & Planning, 2020 Yonkers Road, 4221 MSC, Raleigh, NC 27699-4221.**

AFTERCARE

Purpose

The purpose of this policy is to provide guidance in the development of CBI aftercare planning. Aftercare planning prevents future criminogenic behavior by providing a continuum of mutual support and continued practice of skills learned in CBI. Thus, through aftercare, offenders receive both the intensity of services and continuity of care that is essential for successful outcomes.

Research indicates that the longer an offender is engaged in treatment, the better the expected outcome. This is true for all treatment modalities or interventions including CBI. After completing treatment, many offenders have trouble transferring learning from one setting to another, so the gains made in treatment are lost unless there is continuity of care.

Aftercare is crucial for any offender leaving a highly structured correctional environment such as prison or probation supervision. The offender may be so acclimated to the structure that everyday decision-making and personal responsibility is overwhelming. Aftercare, or relapse prevention, is a strategy to help the offender identify the triggers in their daily lives that may lead to future problems and to train them to cope more effectively with these situations and become more comfortable in overcoming these triggers.

Implementation

Aftercare groups are recommended to be at least 6 months in duration, meeting bi-weekly for 1½ hours. Open-ended groups are best, allowing recent graduates to enter the Aftercare group as they complete a CBI curriculum. Group members with varying lengths of time in the aftercare group can then mentor, as well as hold accountable, the newer members. Group size should be limited to a maximum of 15 offenders. Only one trained CBI facilitator is required for conducting aftercare sessions, and it is not necessary to have the same facilitator from the instructional segment of the CBI class. A thoroughly oriented, untrained staff member can assist the trained facilitator to conduct Aftercare if needed and appropriate.

Appendix 8 offers suggestions for starting an aftercare group. Lesson 22 post-test is one tool that can be used to assess areas that need further improvement or skill development. Facilitators can determine areas that need further training by noting skills or skill clusters rated almost never (1) or “seldom”(2). Lesson 22 Skill Checklist can also be given to others such as a prison case manager, supervising probation officer, treatment providers, family members, fellow group members to assist in the identification of skill deficits for further training.

Aftercare Group Activity

Thinking Reports are the best activity for Aftercare groups or CBI clubs. Group members are responsible for bringing a Thinking Report to group each week describing a “risky situation” or a situation he/she wants help with from the group, such as an offender preparing to return to the community from an institution, a group member wanting to ask his Probation Officer to raise his curfew, or how to stay away from friends who might be involved in drug use or illegal activity. If an offender cannot come up with situations on his own, the group facilitator can assign topics, or have other group members suggest situations or social skills they feel the person might benefit from as a homework assignment.

Thinking Reports can also be used as a correctional counseling tool by probation officers, case managers or anyone involved with the offender in the criminal justice setting. Thinking Reports can be completed by offenders prior to meeting with staff, on topics assigned ahead of time or on situations currently causing problems for the offender. These reports will provide a format to discuss behavior problems or begin the problem solving process. Accountability for behavior will be increased when everyone dealing with an offender is using Thinking Reports to examine problem or risky behavior.

Skill Maintenance Training (Thinking Reports)

1. Skill maintenance training sessions should begin as soon as possible following completion of a CBI curriculum.
2. The focus of each session should be offenders becoming more aware of mental traps and reinforcing “new” thinking strategies and alternative behaviors.
3. The principle activity in skill maintenance should be completing Thinking Reports.
4. If possible, allow offenders to do “journalizing” in a pocket-notebook by recording basic notes of applicable occurrences to be reported in skill-maintenance sessions.

5. One trained facilitator is required for conducting maintenance sessions, and the facilitator does not have to be the same person who facilitated the program for the skill-maintenance participants.
6. A thoroughly oriented, untrained staff person can assist the facilitator as needed and is appropriate.
7. The schedule for skill-maintenance training should be open-ended, evolving into a support group (e.g., AA/NA) or CBI club.
8. If ongoing skill-maintenance is not possible, trained facilitators should provide periodic “booster” sessions to assist in retaining acquired skills. Booster sessions should occur at least once a month after completion of a CBI program.

Journalizing (see article “Promoting Change in a Group Setting)

In general, journals are the offenders’ vehicle for self-discovery, self-awareness, self-evaluation, and self-change. They are a tool for independent study and often become a “safe place” for offenders to first expose some of their antisocial thoughts, feelings, attitudes, and beliefs before exposing them in a group setting. For example, we can compare the process of journalizing to the process of putting a jigsaw puzzle together. Both processes occur in stages and require a lot of hard, tedious work.

Staff must supervise, monitor, and evaluate journal work by conducting scheduled reviews, usually weekly. Reviews should ensure that offenders are doing the work and recognize the accountability factor necessary. During reviews, a staff person and the offender should review and discuss the completed work and establish new territory of exploration. Journal reviews should not become problem solving or counseling sessions. It is better to leave them questioning than to try to provide complete answers. The focus of the process is always self-discovery.

The basic attributes of journals are listed below:

1. Journals should be task specific;
2. Journals should be a daily record that:
 - a. track effort over time,
 - b. are objective records of thoughts, feelings, and actions,
 - c. focus effort, and
 - d. viewed as a tool to honestly communicate with self, others, and change agent;
3. Initial usage should include at a minimum, a record of situations encountered and a record of corresponding thoughts and feelings;
4. Advanced usage should include pattern identification, intervention development and progress monitoring and assessment; and
5. Journals should depersonalize conflict while defining direction and upholding rules.

For more information on using journals as an aftercare component, please review the group dynamics article distributed during facilitator training. If you need a copy of this article, “Promoting Change in a Group Setting,” you may request a copy from the Office of Research & Planning of the North Carolina Department of Correction, (919) 716-3080.

Videos

The Commitment to Change video series, developed by Dr. Stanton Samenow, has six parts in the series. The first three parts of the series were developed in 1994 and emphasize the value of looking at one's own thinking and opens the door to developing responsible thinking. Part I helps to define and identify thinking errors. Part II addresses two specific thinking errors that are crucial in problem solving. And Part III presents various methods of overcoming errors in thinking. This series is also available in Spanish.

In 2000, Dr. Samenow developed parts IV, V, and VI in the series, which explore the ways of resisting change: thoughts trigger actions, errors in thinking trigger tactics. Tactics are ways of acting that block communication and allow offenders (and others) to hide. Both series (I-III and IV-VI) are available from FMS Productions (800-421-4609) and cost approximately \$1,000 per set, which includes 3 videos, lessons plans, reproducible worksheets, a leader's guide, instructional overhead transparencies, and skill cards for participants.

Additional resources include The Prepare Curriculum, Arnold P. Goldstein, Research Press, www.researchpress.com, or 2612 North Mattis Avenue, Champaign, Illinois 61822. To order information, resource materials, or catalogues on the Corrective Thinking Process, call toll-free at (877-548-7884) or the Internet at www.truthought.com.

APPENDIX FORMS SUMMARY

APPENDIX	DESCRIPTION
1. Interview Form – Prisons	To be completed by Facilitator(s) with all referred offenders prior to start of CBI group
2. Interview Form - Community	To be completed by Facilitator(s) with all referred offenders prior to start of CBI group
3. Program Participant Evaluation Form	To be completed at end of group cycle by Facilitators to rate offender's participation in-group, homework, and thinking cycle
4. Essay Question Form	To be completed by offenders at the end of the group cycle
5. North Carolina Monitoring Tool	To be completed by Master Trainers conducting Quality Assurance visits to CBI groups
6. Mid-Cycle Participant Evaluation Form	To be completed by offenders (administered by Master Trainers) participating in a CBI group when Quality Assurance visit is in progress
7. Final Participant Evaluation Form	To be completed by offenders (administered by Master Trainers) participating in a CBI group when a Quality Assurance visit is in progress at the end of the group cycle OR to be completed by offenders at the end of the group cycle and administered by Facilitators
8. Aftercare Guidelines	General guidelines for developing aftercare groups for CBI graduates
9. Pre & Post Test: Cover Sheet	The facilitator should complete the cover sheet when a pre or posttest is administered. Offenders will complete Lesson 22 before and after CBI instruction to measure skill deficits and improvements
10. CBI Tracking System Manual	This manual provides specific instructions for Community sites using the Internet application (designed by the Office of Research & Planning) to track CBI participation and attendance

APPENDIX 1: INTERVIEW FORM – PRISONS

INTERVIEW FORM - PRISONS

NAME: _____ **OPUS NUMBER:** _____ **AGE:** _____

OFFENSE: _____ **LENGTH SERVED:** _____

LENGTH OF SENTENCE REMAINING: _____

NUMBER OF INFRACTIONS: _____ **INFRACTION CLASS:** _____

PREVIOUS INCARCERATIONS (number, offense, and sentence duration): _____

AGE OF FIRST CONTACT WITH LAW (offense, sentence): _____

EDUCATION COMPLETED (if quit, why; academic difficulties, suspensions/expulsions, why): _____

EMPLOYMENT HISTORY (longest job outside prison, type of job): _____

MARITAL STATUS: _____

CHILDREN (number, number of mothers, does he have contact with children): _____

CURRENT ASSIGNMENT: _____

PLANS UPON RELEASE: _____

COMMENTS: _____

VERBAL COMMITMENT: _____ **ASSIGNED:** _____ **INTERVIEWER**

INITIALS: _____ **DATE:** _____ **START DATE:** _____

APPENDIX 2: INTERVIEW FORM – COMMUNITY

INTERVIEW FORM - COMMUNITY

NAME: _____ **OPUS NUMBER:** _____ **AGE:** _____

OFFENSE: _____ **PROBATION/PAROLE PERIOD:** _____

LENGTH OF PROBATION/PAROLE REMAINING: _____

PREVIOUS INCARCERATIONS (number, offense, and sentence duration): _____

AGE OF FIRST CONTACT WITH LAW (offense, sentence): _____

EDUCATION COMPLETED (if quit, why; academic difficulties, suspensions/ expulsions, why): _____

EMPLOYMENT HISTORY (longest job outside prison, type of job): _____

MARITAL STATUS: _____

CHILDREN (number, number of mothers, does he have contact with children): _____

CURRENT EMPLOYMENT: _____

FUTURE PLANS: _____

COMMENTS: _____

VERBAL COMMITMENT: _____ **ASSIGNED:** _____ **INTERVIEWER**

INITIALS: _____ **DATE:** _____ **START DATE:** _____

APPENDIX 3: PROGRAM PARTICIPANT EVALUATION FORM

PROGRAM PARTICIPANT EVALUATION

Overall Group Participation (check one)

- Very Poor - Closed channel of communication, anti-social influence on group
- Poor
- Average
- Good
- Excellent – Contributes openly about own issues, helps others in-group, active, and productive input, participates in role-plays.

Comments:

Homework Assignment Completion (check one)

- Very Poor – Poor thinking reports and homework that reflect little effort, very limited disclosure, limited motivation, gives very little information about thinking patterns
- Poor
- Average
- Good
- Excellent – Thinking reports and homework reflect effort, willingness to disclose and provide extensive information about thinking patterns

Comments:

Awareness of Cycle of Thinking and Feeling that support Criminal Behaviors (check one)

- Very Poor – Fails to specify target behaviors for change and/or thinking that lies behind these criminal behaviors; continues to be in denial about present offenses and past criminal behaviors
- Poor
- Average
- Good
- Excellent – Demonstrates willingness to disclose and provide information about criminal behaviors and to examine attitudes, beliefs, and thought patterns which support these behaviors; uncovers similar, non-criminal behaviors which are supported by the same cycle of thinking and feeling

Comments:

APPENDIX 4: ESSAY QUESTION FORM

ESSAY QUESTIONS FORM

1. What changes do I see in myself as a result of the CBI program?

2. How do I plan on using what I have learned in the CBI program in the future?

Appendix 5: North Carolina Monitoring Tool

<p>North Carolina CBI Monitoring Tool Quality Assurance Checklist</p>
--

This instrument is based on the Wisconsin Cognitive Interventions Program Monitoring Tool. We appreciate the assistance of the Wisconsin Department of Corrections, with special thanks to Sandy Reno, in this effort to implement cognitive behavioral approaches with the offender population.

Program Site:	
Lead Facilitator:	
Co-Facilitator:	
Group Size:	
Curriculum Name:	
Lesson Topic & Brief Description	
QA Visit Number:	
Observer:	
Date:	

DIRECTIONS: This Monitoring Tool is designed to assess adherence to the objectives and process of the North Carolina CBI effort. The attached pages should be completed based on observation of one group session in its entirety. Place a check mark in front of the statements that most accurately describe the characteristics of the staff and/or group. If neither item is appropriate due to a lack of observable information, check Not Applicable in the space provided.

Items checked should reflect actual group events. If, for example, the group leader reads from the manual because it is his/her first time teaching, this item should be checked. Observer responses should reflect the experience of being in a particular group. In this way, qualitative differences will be noted even though there may be good reasons for those differences. Explanations for specific ratings may be recorded under the “Comments” section.

At the end, complete the summary section, which should include constructive feedback and recommendations for the facilitators. Also, obtain signatures to indicate that the summary has been reviewed and discussed with the facilitators. Signature by the facilitators only means that the summary was provided to them and discussed. It is an acknowledgment rather than agreement or acceptance.

Please note the following:

- * denotes **Not Applicable** to the Reasoning & Rehabilitation curriculum, and
- ** denotes that Reasoning & Rehabilitation staff do not determine sanctions and therefore the statements do not apply to that curriculum.

1. Maintain Clear Focus on Basic Steps of Cognitive Change (Lesson Presentation)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Staff worked together in cooperative manner to deliver material.	<input type="checkbox"/> All staff was not actively in presentation of materials and/or group discussions/activities; staff provided conflicting information or answers.	<input type="checkbox"/> NOT APPLICABLE
<input type="checkbox"/> Staff displayed knowledge of lesson content; provided personal examples and illustrations to explain concepts.	<input type="checkbox"/> Staff did not appear prepared to present lesson (i.e., read from manual, failed to provide personal examples and illustrations, could not answer participant questions).	<input type="checkbox"/> NOT APPLICABLE
<input type="checkbox"/> Staff proceeded slowly and systematically; modified lesson presentation to accommodate level of participants understanding.	<input type="checkbox"/> Staff presented lesson materials in a haphazard or hurried manner; failed to recognize/respond to signs that participants misunderstood concepts or purpose of tasks and activities.	<input type="checkbox"/> NOT APPLICABLE
<input type="checkbox"/> Staff discussed key issues and concluded lesson in timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/> Staff skipped key issues, left matters "in the air" at conclusion of lesson; failed to complete lesson on time.	<input type="checkbox"/> NOT APPLICABLE
<input type="checkbox"/> Staff reviewed information from previous lesson.	<input type="checkbox"/> Staff failed to review information from previous lesson.	<input type="checkbox"/> NOT APPLICABLE
* <input type="checkbox"/> Staff corrected previous homework assignment, feedback addressed skill deficits and completeness.	* <input type="checkbox"/> Staff did not correct previous homework or failed to provide feedback about skill deficits or completeness.	<input type="checkbox"/> NOT APPLICABLE
* <input type="checkbox"/> Staff discussed problems evidenced in homework.	* <input type="checkbox"/> Staff failed to discuss problems evidenced in homework.	<input type="checkbox"/> NOT APPLICABLE
* <input type="checkbox"/> Staff monitored participant completion of current homework assignment, required all participants to discuss answers.	* <input type="checkbox"/> Staff failed to monitor participant completion of current homework, allowed participants to complete work in class, did not require all participants to discuss answers.	<input type="checkbox"/> NOT APPLICABLE
<input type="checkbox"/> Staff provided additional group instruction to address skill deficits or unclear concepts before proceeding to new lesson materials.	<input type="checkbox"/> Staff failed to address skill deficiencies or clarify misunderstandings before proceeding to new lesson materials.	<input type="checkbox"/> NOT APPLICABLE
<input type="checkbox"/> Staff related lesson lecture, discussions and activities to lesson objectives and program goals.	<input type="checkbox"/> Staff failed to relate lesson lecture, discussions and activities to lesson objectives.	<input type="checkbox"/> NOT APPLICABLE
<input type="checkbox"/> Staff provided instruction, modeling and skill practice in identifying thoughts (thinking patterns and beliefs), feelings, behaviors and consequences.	<input type="checkbox"/> Staff failed to provide adequate instruction, modeling or skill practice in identifying thoughts, feelings, behaviors and consequences.	<input type="checkbox"/> NOT APPLICABLE
<input type="checkbox"/> Staff provided instruction, modeling and skill practice in alternative thinking (problem solving, coping and social skills).	<input type="checkbox"/> Staff failed to provide instruction, modeling and skill practice in alternative thinking.	<input type="checkbox"/> NOT APPLICABLE
* <input type="checkbox"/> Staff reviewed current homework assignment, related it to lesson objectives, clarified questions.	* <input type="checkbox"/> Staff did not review current homework assignment, relate it to lesson objectives, or respond to questions or confusion about assignment.	<input type="checkbox"/> NOT APPLICABLE
Comments:		

2. Depersonalize Use of Staff Authority While Maintaining Group Process and Upholding Rules.		
<input type="checkbox"/> Staff maintained group control, directed or redirected as necessary to stay on track.	<input type="checkbox"/> Staff failed to maintain group direction; staff or participants were off task for substantial periods of time.	<input type="checkbox"/> NOT APPLICABLE
** <input type="checkbox"/> Staff established clear guidelines for program participation and appropriate sanctions for violations	<input type="checkbox"/> Staff failed to establish clear guidelines for program participation and appropriate sanctions for violations.	<input type="checkbox"/> NOT APPLICABLE
<input type="checkbox"/> Staff communicated consequences as facts.	<input type="checkbox"/> Staff communicated consequences as threats.	<input type="checkbox"/> NOT APPLICABLE
** <input type="checkbox"/> Staff enforced group rules (attendance, punctuality, and homework) and imposed sanctions for violations.	** <input type="checkbox"/> Staff failed to enforce group rules or impose sanctions for violations.	<input type="checkbox"/> NOT APPLICABLE
<input type="checkbox"/> Staff displayed professional detachment; depersonalized conflict that occurred.	<input type="checkbox"/> Staff addressed conflict by expressing intention to do things "my way".	<input type="checkbox"/> NOT APPLICABLE
<input type="checkbox"/> Staff conveyed that disruptive behavior interferes with the task at hand.	<input type="checkbox"/> Staff took personal offense at behavior of group members.	<input type="checkbox"/> NOT APPLICABLE
<input type="checkbox"/> Staff assisted group members in accepting behavioral limits and conditions without personal resentment.	<input type="checkbox"/> Staff responses to behavior problems escalated resistance to behavioral limits and increased personal resentment.	<input type="checkbox"/> NOT APPLICABLE
<input type="checkbox"/> Staff communicated in a courteous and respectful manner and required that group members do the same.	<input type="checkbox"/> Staff belittled participants, responded with sarcasm; allowed group members to interrupt, distract or harass each other.	<input type="checkbox"/> NOT APPLICABLE
<input type="checkbox"/> Staff encouraged group members to speak for themselves and express their opinions.	<input type="checkbox"/> Staff used their status and power to silence opinions of group members.	<input type="checkbox"/> NOT APPLICABLE
Staff diffused arguments and debates by focusing discussion on CBI process.	<input type="checkbox"/> Staff attempted to "crush" problems with their authority; conveyed intention to dominate will of participants.	<input type="checkbox"/> NOT APPLICABLE
Comments:		

3. Allow Group Members To Be Their Own Personal Experts on How They Think and How They Should Think.		
<input type="checkbox"/> Staff communicated that group members are responsible for identifying their patterns of thinking and choosing whether they will change these patterns.	<input type="checkbox"/> Staff presented themselves as having the authority to determine how members think or how they should think.	<input type="checkbox"/> NOT APPLICABLE
<input type="checkbox"/> Staff modeled techniques of guided discovery to assist offenders in thought identification.	<input type="checkbox"/> Staff presented their "expert" interpretations of thinking of group members; provided the "answers" for participants.	<input type="checkbox"/> NOT APPLICABLE
<input type="checkbox"/> Staff elicited participants' opinions and points of view.	<input type="checkbox"/> Staff failed to elicit or censored participants' opinions and points of view.	<input type="checkbox"/> NOT APPLICABLE
<input type="checkbox"/> Staff modeled a non-judgmental attitude and open-mindedness.	<input type="checkbox"/> Staff presented their opinions as "correct/right" and/or offender opinions as "incorrect/wrong".	<input type="checkbox"/> NOT APPLICABLE

<input type="checkbox"/> Staff promoted independent thinking.	<input type="checkbox"/> Staff tried to convince offenders to accept their opinions.	<input type="checkbox"/> NOT APPLICABLE
<input type="checkbox"/> Staff asked participants to verify staff perceptions of offender thinking when presented.	<input type="checkbox"/> Staff presented stereotypes of offender thinking or did not verify staff perceptions.	<input type="checkbox"/> NOT APPLICABLE
Comments:		

4. Consciously Work to Achieve Cooperation Between Group Members and Staff.		
<input type="checkbox"/> Staff displayed efforts to work together with participants toward a common goal.	<input type="checkbox"/> Staff displayed hostility or indifference toward group members.	<input type="checkbox"/> NOT APPLICABLE
<input type="checkbox"/> Staff asked group members to assist them and another in meeting lesson objectives and program goals.	<input type="checkbox"/> Staff failed to convey group members' responsibility to assist one another in acquiring program skills.	<input type="checkbox"/> NOT APPLICABLE
<input type="checkbox"/> Staff addressed group member concerns about the value of their participation in the program.	<input type="checkbox"/> Staff members failed to address group members' doubts that it is worth their trouble to take part in the program.	<input type="checkbox"/> NOT APPLICABLE
<input type="checkbox"/> Staff modeled a non-judgmental attitude and open-mindedness.	<input type="checkbox"/> Staff displayed judgmental attitudes or failed to encourage open-mindedness.	<input type="checkbox"/> NOT APPLICABLE
<input type="checkbox"/> Staff rewarded cooperation.	<input type="checkbox"/> Staff failed to reward cooperative behaviors.	<input type="checkbox"/> NOT APPLICABLE
<input type="checkbox"/> Staff attempted to minimize conflict and competition.	<input type="checkbox"/> Staff allowed group members to criticize, ridicule or interrupt one another.	<input type="checkbox"/> NOT APPLICABLE
<input type="checkbox"/> Staff remained neutral and objective toward group members.	<input type="checkbox"/> Staff allowed cliques to form/supported opinions of certain cliques.	<input type="checkbox"/> NOT APPLICABLE
Comments:		

5. Engage all participants in the group process.		
<input type="checkbox"/> Staff attended to verbal interactions and behaviors of whole group.	<input type="checkbox"/> Staff limited their focus to one individual or part of the group.	<input type="checkbox"/> NOT APPLICABLE
<input type="checkbox"/> Staff fostered an exchange of ideas between themselves and all group members.	<input type="checkbox"/> Staff monopolized conversations or discussions.	<input type="checkbox"/> NOT APPLICABLE
<input type="checkbox"/> Staff supported independent thinking.	<input type="checkbox"/> Staff discouraged participant questions and comments.	<input type="checkbox"/> NOT APPLICABLE
<input type="checkbox"/> Staff called upon each group member to participate in discussions and activities.	<input type="checkbox"/> Staff failed to elicit responses from all group members.	<input type="checkbox"/> NOT APPLICABLE
<input type="checkbox"/> Staff rewarded class participation.	<input type="checkbox"/> Staff failed to reward participation.	<input type="checkbox"/> NOT APPLICABLE
<input type="checkbox"/> Staff made statements emphasizing the importance of input from all group members.	<input type="checkbox"/> Staff allowed particular group members to monopolize discussions.	<input type="checkbox"/> NOT APPLICABLE

<input type="checkbox"/> Staff required that all participants contribute to the group process.	<input type="checkbox"/> Staff permitted some group members to consistently decline to answer questions or participate in-group activities.	<input type="checkbox"/> NOT APPLICABLE
<input type="checkbox"/> Staff addressed signs of group boredom or disinterest by varying delivery style, introducing training aids and creative learning experiences.	<input type="checkbox"/> Staff failed to address signs of boredom or disinterest on the part of group members.	<input type="checkbox"/> NOT APPLICABLE
Comments:		

QUALITY ASSURANCE SUMMARY

Recommendations _____

 Monitor's signature & date

 Facilitator's signature & date

 Co-facilitator's signature & date

APPENDIX 6: MID-YEAR PARTICIPANT EVALUATION FORM

Program Site: _____

MID-TERM PARTICIPANT EVALUATION FORM

DIRECTIONS: Please read each statement carefully and circle the number of the response that most accurately explains your reaction to that statement. Circle “1” if you strongly agree; “2” if you agree; “3” if you have no opinion; “4” if you disagree; and “5” if you strongly disagree. There are no right or wrong answers, your reaction to each statement is the correct answer. Please read and respond to all the statements. Your responses will be kept confidential.

1	2	3	4	5
STRONGLY	AGREE	NO	DISAGREE	STRONGLY
AGREE		OPINION		DISAGREE

1. I feel comfortable stating my own opinions in this group.

1 2 3 4 5

2. Other group members do not seem to respect what I have to say.

1 2 3 4 5

3. Staff presents examples (videos, pictures, or practice sessions) to help us understand the lessons.

1 2 3 4 5

4. Group members often don't cooperate well with the staff.

1 2 3 4 5

5. Staff seems to respect what people have to say.

1 2 3 4 5

6. The staff is supportive of me.

1 2 3 4 5

7. In this group, members sometimes tease other group members and the staff does not do anything about it.

1 2 3 4 5

8. Staff read from the manual most of the time.

1 2 3 4 5

9. Sometimes, we engage in really interesting discussions.

1 2 3 4 5

1	2	3	4	5
STRONGLY	AGREE	NO	DISAGREE	STRONGLY
AGREE		OPINION		DISAGREE

10. People seem to have trouble understanding the lessons.

1 2 3 4 5

11. I have had several chances to practice these lessons during group meetings.

1 2 3 4 5

17. I practice our lessons between meetings.

1 2 3 4 5

12. At least one of the group leaders seems really bored with this group.

1 2 3 4 5

13. I receive comments from the leaders about how I am doing and whether or not I understood the lessons.

1 2 3 4 5

14. The lessons and examples seem pretty realistic.

1 2 3 4 5

15. Sometimes we participate in a “role play” as part of the lessons.

1 2 3 4 5

16. Most of my offenses have been “triggered” by the way I think.

1 2 3 4 5

17. When we had trouble understanding parts of a lesson, the staff did a pretty good job of giving us examples and showing us what they meant.

1 2 3 4 5

18. I do not feel that I can be totally honest in my thinking reports.

1 2 3 4 5

19. The staff presented the rule and guidelines for group.

1 2 3 4 5

20. Just a few people seem to do most of the talking in this group.

1 2 3 4 5

APPENDIX 7: FINAL PARTICIPANT EVALUATION

Program Site: _____

FINAL PARTICIPANT EVALUATION FORM

DIRECTIONS: Please read each statement carefully and circle the number of the response that most accurately explains your reaction to that statement. Circle “1” if you strongly agree; “2” if you agree; “3” if you have no opinion; “4” if you disagree; and “5” if you strongly disagree. There are no right or wrong answers, your reaction to each statement is the correct answer. Please read and respond to all the statements. Your responses will be kept confidential.

1	2	3	4	5
STRONGLY	AGREE	NO	DISAGREE	STRONGLY
AGREE		OPINION		DISAGREE

1. My thoughts and feelings seem clearer to me now, than they were before I participated in this group.

1 2 3 4 5

2. I felt comfortable stating my own opinions in this group.

1 2 3 4 5

3. Other group members did not seem to respect what I have to say.

1 2 3 4 5

4. At least two times, I did not have my homework done in time for group meetings.

1 2 3 4 5

5. Sometimes I had trouble understanding the homework assignments.

1 2 3 4 5

6. Staff presented examples (videos, pictures, or practice sessions) to help us understand the lessons.

1 2 3 4 5

7. Group members often didn't cooperate well with the staff.

1 2 3 4 5

8. I participate in a lot in these group meetings.

1 2 3 4 5

9. Staff seemed to respect what people had to say.

1 2 3 4 5

10. The staff was supportive of me.

1 2 3 4 5

1	2	3	4	5
STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NO OPINION	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE

11. In this group, members sometimes teased other group members and the staff didn't do anything about it.

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

12. Staff read from the manual most of the time.

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

13. Sometimes, we engaged in really interesting discussions.

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

14. People seemed to have trouble understanding the lessons.

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

15. In my case, my thoughts and beliefs had nothing to do with my offense.

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

16. I had several chances to practice these lessons during group meetings.

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

17. I practiced our lessons between meetings.

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

18. Things could be different for me, if I could change some of my thoughts and beliefs.

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

19. At least one of the group leaders seemed really bored with this group.

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

20. I received comments from the leaders about how I was doing and whether or not I understood the lessons.

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

21. Most group members didn't seem to be taking these meetings seriously.

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

22. The staff gave me suggestions for how to change some of my negative thinking.

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

1	2	3	4	5
STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NO OPINION	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE

23. Many of the events in my life are too difficult for me to control how I think about them.

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

24. At least one of the group leaders seemed to take our comments too personally.

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

25. The lessons and examples seemed pretty realistic.

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

26. Sometimes we “role played” parts of the lessons.

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

27. Most of my offenses have been “triggered” by the way I think.

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

28. In this group we must choose for ourselves whether we want to change our thinking and our behavior.

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

29. I attended these meetings regularly.

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

30. When we had trouble understanding parts of a lesson, the staff did a pretty good job of giving us examples and showing us what they meant.

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

31. I did not feel that I could be totally honest in my thinking reports.

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

32. The staff presented the rule and guidelines for group.

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

33. Just a few people seem to do most of the talking in this group.

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

APPENDIX 8: AFTERCARE GUIDELINES

AFTERCARE PROPOSAL

Objective: Skills maintenance, to begin at the successful completion of a CBI curriculum.

Frequency: Six months in duration, meetings occur bi-weekly, sessions last 1 1/2-2 hours, open ended group.

Facilitator: Case manager, with skills in Group Dynamics and CBI

Sub-components:

- ✓ Thinking Reports: to be completed in group aftercare sessions documenting current situations
- ✓ Journalizing: Recording of situations that are high risk/CBI related situations(a journalizing booklet will be provided to aftercare participants).
- ✓ Autobiographical videos: watch the videos followed by a group discussion regarding the high-risk situations noted, and behavioral patterns noted.

APPENDIX 9: PRE & POST COVER SHEET

**CBI Participant
Pre-test / Post-test Questionnaire**

PRE-TEST _____

POST-TEST _____

NAME _____

OPUS NUMBER _____

DATE _____

APPENDIX 10: CBI TRACKING SYSTEM MANUAL

* THIS IS NOT AVAILABLE ON-LINE. FOR MORE INFORMATION, PLEASE CONTACT:

RICHARD BURKHART
NC DOC OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND PLANNING
EMAIL: rburkhart@doc.state.nc.us
PHONE: 919-716-3099