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CONTINGENCY MANAGEMENT IN A CRIMINAL JUSTICE SETTING

- Evidence-based treatment
- Shape behaviors through rewards
- Focus on a social contract for behavior
- Technique to replace immediate “drug using”; structured rewards

Adaptation
- Fit to Environment
- Include Sanctions
8 MAIN CM PRINCIPLES

- Positive incentives w/ point system
- Clear guidelines about earning points
- Emphasize abstinence
- Early incentives
- Point escalation
- Integrating point system into existing system
- Bonuses
- Focus on no more than 3 behaviors at a time
## SITE OVERVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Added</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>Drug Court</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>Drug Court</td>
<td>Reentry Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>Drug Court</td>
<td>Gang Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>Regular Caseload</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>Halfway House &amp; Drug Court*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Started with one ideas regarding implementing in one location/ program but realized program not far enough along for CM. When program was ready they added it back into JSTEPS.*
**Year 1:** MOU, software design, baseline site visits, org survey

**Year 2:** Adoption & implementation processes moving toward sustainability

---

**JSTEPS Learning Collaborative Session**

**Study Design with Continual Feedback Loops**

Participant teams self-design and finalize CM protocols; TA

Feedback reports, follow-up phone calls & emails; some joint external presentations by researchers and participants

Practitioner teams consider feedback; some revised; follow-up site visits

Feedback reports, on-site coaching and TA
**RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT PHASES**

**Phase 1**
- Adoption

**Phase 2**
- Implementation

**Phase 3**
- Sustainability

*Months*
- Site visits at S1, 2a, 2b, 3a, 4, Learning Meeting & Org survey
- Site visit at S5, follow-up TA, feedback reports & telephone calls
- Follow up site visits at S1, 2a/b, 3a, 4 &5; site visit S3b, TA, feedback reports & follow up phone calls
- 2nd learning meeting
- Follow up phone calls & feedback reports
- Wrap up site visits & phone calls
WHAT WE LEARNED FROM ADOPTION PHASE...

- **Acceptability (unobjectionable) & Feasibility (suitable)**
  - Yes, acceptable/feasible but some challenges include: 1) too many behaviors in CM model; 2) intra-org challenges, and 3) balancing sanctions with rewards
  - *(Rudes et al. (2011) Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment)*

- **Adaptability (understandable)**
  - Mostly acceptable with little difference between social & material rewards. Female and non-PO more accepting.
  - *(Murphy, Rhodes & Taxman (2011) Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment)*
SITE DEVELOPMENT PHASES

IMPLEMENTATION

Months

S1
S2a
S2b
S3a
S3b
S4
S5a
S5b
**WHAT WE LEARNED FROM IMPLEMENTATION PHASE...**

- **Probation Officer Roles**
  - PO roles matter greatly for court and adoption/implementation processes. POs use three types of power:
    1) informational;
    2) technical, and
    3) relational to sway decisions to a certain end.
  - (Rudes & Portillo, R&R, *Law & Policy*)

- **Transportability of EBPs**
  - EBP transportability is processual with front-line CJ workers adapting EBPs by first adopting EBP language (loose coupling) with few adjustments to work activities. These processes have both positive and negative potential/implications.
  - (Portillo, Rudes & Taxman, under review at *Justice Quarterly*)
MORE LEARNING FROM IMPLEMENTATION PHASE...

- **Judicial Roles & Decision Making in PS Courts**
  - Role judges take affect collaboration and decision making regarding court and adoption/implementation processes.
  - Portillo, Rudes, Viglione, Nelson & Taxman, under review at *Victims & Offenders*.

- **Redefining the Win**
  - Problem-solving court attorneys often work to achieve the courts’ collaborative goal using covertly adversarial processes in a therapeutic jurisprudence environment including: 1) battling; 2) insider trading; 3) silent treatment, and 4) evidence as a weapon. This action affects court and adoption/implementation processes.
  - (Rudes & Portillo, in-progress)
**OFFENDER DATA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offenders</th>
<th>JSTEPS (n=166)</th>
<th>Control (n=152)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% White</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (median)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Male</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Level</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of arrests</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>9.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What are the differences in outcomes for JSTEPS versus non-JSTEPS?**
WHAT WE HAVE LEARNED THROUGHOUT JSTEPS...

- **Quant + Qual Design**
  - 24-month longitudinal mixed-method design allows us access and understanding to key contextual factors that affect implementation decisions. It also avoids premature assessments re: organizational change lacking uptake, fidelity, adherence, and transportability.

- **Taxman & Rudes, under review at Implementation Science** (special CJDATS edition)
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