

Article Tools [Sign in to Email a Friend](#) | [Print This Page](#) | [Comments\(0\)](#) | [Suggest a Story](#)

Corrections 101: Jailhouse Cleaning

By *Matt Morrison*

Published: 01/12/2009



Earlier last year in Florida's Pinellas County Jail, a female inmate unexpectedly died. At first, investigators were confounded as to the exact cause of the woman's death.

An autopsy was performed and other than being slightly overweight and having minor coronary artery disease, the procedure found no serious health problems. However, a closer investigation determined the inmate had contracted methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA).

MRSA is a bacteria that normally causes skin infections, but has become

increasingly resistant to penicillin and other antibiotics, which have traditionally terminated any threat. Typically, MRSA invades the system through a cut on the skin, but it can also be transmitted by sharing personal items, such as razors, towels, and even clothing.

Although most people can make a full recovery with treatment—often involving a rigorous treatment of various powerful antibiotics—MRSA can lead to death. Furthermore, the infection is a real threat to everyone, regardless of age, race, location, or gender.

In October 2007, for example, a healthy and active seventh grade male in a New York City school died as a result of MRSA. And, the young man's death comes after numerous reports have surfaced throughout the U.S. of students infected with MRSA. In 2007, it is believed that three student deaths could be attributed to MRSA.

This appears to be a big and growing concern in schools, hospitals, and nursing homes. However, the concern is now widespread with the emergence of community-acquired MRSA (CA-MRSA). Today, all facilities, including dormitories, military barracks, and correctional buildings, need to be aware and prepared for an outbreak.

Not only is this a health concern serious enough to cause death, but it is also a costly legal and liability problem as well. For instance, the family of the female jail inmate mentioned earlier has hired an attorney with the intent of suing the Pinellas County Sheriff's Office for providing inadequate conditions and medical care.

The More You Know About MRSA

Before finding ways to prevent the spread of MRSA, you should know more information about the disease. Scientists first identified the bacterium *Staphylococcus* as far back as the 19th century. Early cases of MRSA, caused by a bacteria called *Staphylococcus*, were discovered in the early 1950s.

Most of these cases were reported in British medical facilities. However, there was little concern at the time because the infection was easily treated with penicillin, the wonder drug of mid-20th century.

But, within a few years, the bacterium causing the disease adapted to penicillin, and doctors began to recognize that *Staphylococcus* had an uncanny talent of rapidly changing to resist and overcome drug treatment.

In 1959, a new antibiotic, methicillin, was developed and successfully used to fight this new form of *Staphylococcus*. But, within a few years, methicillin also became ineffective. Since then, doctors have referred to the disease as methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*.

The 5 Cs

Since MRSA is a skin disease, it can actually be contracted just about anywhere. However, there are five factors that appear to increase the likelihood of transmission known as the 5 Cs:

- Crowding, such as in a school, hospital, or corrections facility
- Contact with the bacteria causing the infection
- Compromised skin - in most cases, for the infection to be transmitted, there must be a cut, sore, or opening on the skin
- Contaminated items or surfaces

Cleanliness - often, MRSA is contracted in facilities that are not properly or as frequently cleaned as necessary.

-

Personal Responsibility

The first step in preventing the spread of MRSA in a correctional facility is education, which will help encourage inmates and staff to take more personal responsibility. Inmates, staff, and others working in the facility should know how the disease is spread, the seriousness of the illness, how it can be treated, and the likely outcomes as well as steps they can take on their own to prevent cross-contamination.

For instance, proper hand hygiene is essential. Washing hands frequently with warm soap water for approximately 20 seconds and drying properly are crucial. Additionally, an alcohol-based hand sanitizer with at least 60 percent alcohol can be effective.

Other steps that can be incorporated in a correctional facility include:

- Encouraging inmates and staff to clean and treat skin abrasions and cuts—regardless of severity—with a topical antibiotic and keep covered until healed.
- Avoid sharing any items that can come into contact with bare skin; this can even apply to weight training equipment and benches.
- Maintain a clean environment by establishing proper cleaning procedures for frequently touched surfaces and surfaces that come into direct contact with the skin.

Although these steps can considerably help prevent the spread of MRSA in a correctional facility, without the fifth “C”—proper and effective cleaning, often referred to as hygienic cleaning—MRSA can be difficult to maintain. Often when MRSA is detected in a school or hospital, the entire facility or sections of the facility are closed for a very thorough cleaning.

In the short-term, this cleaning can prove to be effective. However, this bacteria and several others are resilient so a potential outbreak is always looming. Reasonably, in addition to needing the most effective products, today’s facility managers also require ongoing cleaning solutions and systems.

A Closer Look at the Cleaning Component

Historically, cleaning a large, crowded facility, such as a corrections center, has involved the use of mops, buckets, various chemicals, cloths, and scrub brushes. Although these tools have served us well, new studies suggest that they may not be as effective as previously believed.

For instance, Dr. Charles Gerba, a microbiologist at the University of Arizona, has determined that some cleaning cloths actually spread contaminants as they are used and become soiled. Aware of this problem, one manufacturer recently introduced a “smart towel,” which can be folded into marked quadrants on both sides. This way a fresh, not soiled, section of the towel can always be used.

Additionally, cleaners have used these traditional tools to clean only for appearance. Today, we now know that potentially harmful contaminants are not always visible.

Dr. Elizabeth Scott, a U.K. microbiologist and last year’s Cleaning Industry Research Institute (CIRI) keynote speaker, addressed this directly at the CIRI symposium.

“Microbiological contamination on surfaces cannot be observed by visual inspection,” said Dr. Scott. “It has been shown many times that surfaces can look visually clean and yet be heavily contaminated with microbes.”

Dr. Scott’s assessment is reinforced in the advances in ATP (adenosine triphosphate bioluminescence) rapid-monitoring technology. These systems are now replacing swabs and Petri dishes when it comes to detecting surface contaminants.

A handheld ATP system can detect microorganisms and contaminants on surfaces within 15 seconds or less—days faster than a Petri dish. When it comes to cleaning, ATP provides “proof of service” that an area has

been properly cleaned. Workers can test an area before cleaning to determine the ATP count and then afterwards to evaluate the effectiveness of the cleaning process.

Many facilities, especially schools, are turning away from the old cleaning standards mentioned earlier and adopting new technologies. One such system that can work well in a correctional facility is referred to as “no-touch” or high-flow fluid extraction. With this system, the cleaning professional never touches the surfaces to be cleaned.

Instead, the machine applies a properly diluted cleaning solution or disinfectant to surfaces. Proper dwell time is needed, allowing the solution to work. The areas are then high pressure rinsed, which looses and removes soils so they can be flushed down drains.

More advanced machines include a vacuum system to more thoroughly remove the contaminants. These vacuum-equipped systems also include a recovery/holding tank where the contaminants are contained and quarantined for proper disposal.

As referenced earlier, the professional cleaning industry is shifting away from cleaning for appearance to cleaning for the health of a facility. Hygienic cleaning helps ensure that surfaces are free of contaminants, stopping the spread of diseases like MRSA.

Interestingly, the cleaning industry is finding that when a surface is hygienically cleaned to protect health, its appearance is also nearly always improved as well—a situation that serves well for any correctional facility.

Matt Morrison is communications manager for Kaivac, Inc., a leading manufacturer of professional no-touch cleaning products and related equipment.

Comments:

No comments have been posted for this article.

Login to add a comment

User Name:

Password:

Remember me:

[Forgot password?](#)

MARKETPLACE [search vendors](#) | [advanced search](#)



IN CASE YOU MISSED IT

- 02/16/2009 [Easy as 1-2-3](#)
 - 02/16/2009 [Reducing recidivism - an exploration of one county's effort, Part III](#)

 - 02/16/2009 [What's so funny?](#)
 - 02/09/2009 [Reducing recidivism - an exploration of one county's effort, Part II](#)
-
-

Article Tools [Sign in to Email a Friend](#) | [Print This Page](#) | [Comments\(1\)](#) | [Suggest a Story](#)

Easy as 1-2-3

By *Marvin Preston*

Published: 02/16/2009



Supervising today's correctional staff seems as easy as 1-2-3, so why does it seem so many of today's leaders don't get it? I believe it's due to the lack of training we provide our supervisors.

Becoming a successful corrections leader requires learning the basics and applying them in a firm, consistent and caring manner. Too many times I've witnessed fellow supervisors failing to properly blend those attributes and falling short with either their managers or their subordinates.

As a retired Marine Gunnery Sergeant, I've always remembered what I was told

by a battle tested Master Gunnery Sergeant when I was stationed at a small detachment in Subic Bay, Philippines. He told me;

“When you're leading troops, remember to keep it simple, 1-2-3!!”

First, take care of the mission. No matter what, the mission has to be your first priority.

Ordered to take the hill? Take the hill then, at all costs. Ordered to clean the squad bay? Clean the squad bay then.

This means that no matter what mission you've been given, you must complete it. That's why you've been selected for the position you're in.

You've been given a great deal of trust and confidence when you were promoted into it. Don't let anyone down.

Next, care for those that do the mission for you. This means ensuring their welfare.

Keep track of what's going on in their lives. Help them out and be compassionate.

Try to understand their outside problems and stressors. If you can lesson them, it will help them concentrate more on completing your mission.

Third-, take care of yourself last - if you take care of number one and two, they'll take care of you.

If there's 20 Marines in your unit and you have 19 sleeping bags, you're the one that sleeps without one. When you go to chow with your Marines, make sure the junior Marine eats first and you eat last.

When they run out of something, you go without it, not your troops. If you competently handle the mission and take care of your Marines, your boss will notice what you've done and your troops will never let you down.

If more correctional supervisors would follow that lead, they'd find themselves with more officers following them.

Although there are many differences in leading Marines and supervising corrections officers, there are also many similarities. So let's take a look at applying the 1-2-3-step process to our field.

Step one - taking care of the mission. As a supervisor in a jail or prison it's imperative we take care of the mission. No riots, no escapes, and everyone goes home safe.

This means we have to ensure that all of the posts are manned and all of the procedures are followed with no short cuts. As a supervisor, we must be vigilant to make sure all of our policies and procedures are followed.

These are in place to help with the orderly flow of operations. When looking back at past incidents where disruptions or injuries have occurred, there is usually a policy or procedure that wasn't followed. When making our decisions, we should always make sure the mission is our first priority.

Step two, take care of those that do the mission for us. When an officer approaches you to ask for the day off, is it your first reaction to take a look at whom it is asking for the day off?

Does this affect the outcome of whether or not you try to make it happen? Do you take into consideration who they hang around with? Who they're related to?

If so, it's time for some self-reflection. You have to be a team builder to be successful in our line of work. And that would mean treating everyone that works for you like their all members of your team.

Every officer should be given the same treatment when coming to you for something entitled to them or something they're asking for. I've witnessed too many supervisors that build their "own team" and then treat everyone else like outsiders.

This usually gets the small group identified as the "boss's team" to probably outperform most other officers due to the greater rewards they receive on a more regular basis. But it also gets the rest of the shift to harbor resentment towards the supervisor and his group.

This is the cancer that starts to build up and become poison in many of our facilities. Special treatment or identifiable negative treatment toward any single individual or groups of workers in correctional facilities only hurt the overall operation.

If someone comes to you with a request to take a day off, your only concern should be whether or not you can afford to let someone go, not who it is. And if you can't, try to see how you can make it happen.

Step three, take care of yourself last- This is where I've seen most supervisors fail. Too many times, it's the captain at the front of the line during the cookout at employee appreciation week.

When it's the nice sunny day, we watch the sergeant leaving early to take the day off, when one of his officers asked to do the same earlier.

If there's a warmer watch cap and coat in your supply, make sure the officer that walks the outside post is the one to get it, not the senior sergeant or lieutenant. In my time with corrections, I've watched one of my colleagues who the officers kindly called "Captain No". Whenever a subordinate went to him for a day off or some type of deviation of schedule they could be certain what the outcome would be before they even asked.

His normal response to the let down officer was "How does your problem affect me?" He even seemed to wear it as a badge of honor, at times telling newer officers "Not too many people around hear like me, but that's ok".

If you show your officers you truly care about their welfare and they know you're watching out for them, they too won't let you down. If you show them the opposite, you too can predict the outcome.

In closing, I hope this information will help either some of today's leaders or those aspiring to move up the promotional ladder. If we can get more of us in leadership roles to remember 1-2-3, we'll all get better from it.

Lt. Marvin Preston works at the New Hampshire Department of Corrections. He has been in corrections for more than 17 years, and also is a retired Marine.

Comments:

1. **lino tenorio** on 02/19/2009:

Thank you very much for such a very simple reminder of what it takes to be a leader in running an organization such as the Department of Corrections. I too practice that very same principle day in and day out at our adult correctional facility here in Saipan, CNMI. To many a time supervisors tend to think that they are the only ones doing the job and not the subordinates when in reality it is the subordinates that do the job for us in the workplace.

Without practicing the 1, 2, and 3's in that order, the organization is most likely to fall apart. Again, I wholeheartedly agree with you on that..... the mission first at all costs, then second, take care of the welfare of your troops and third, always come last yet be sure to be compassionate to your staff because when you need them most, I can assure you, they'll be there for you! I tell you what, the reward I get is when officers come into your office every once in a while and tell you that most of the officers in the department are now taking their

job more seriously and have pride in what they do because of the level of understanding and compassion that is afforded to them. We run a very tight twelve hour shift yet when their request for leave is must, I make sure they get it and give em even more if i can help it. We have to remember that we are only humans and sooner or later these guys will eventually fall apart if we don't take care of them. I know for a fact that i can't run it myself..... got me? Oooowah! Am a retired cop for 20 years, been with the reserves infantry unit for 16 years and now serving as the appointed commissioner for the department of corrections here on Saipan.

Login to add a comment

User Name:

Password:

Remember me:

[**Forgot password?**](#)

MARKETPLACE [search vendors](#) | [advanced search](#)



IN CASE YOU MISSED IT

- 02/16/2009 [Easy as 1-2-3](#)
 - 02/16/2009 [Reducing recidivism - an exploration of one county's effort, Part III](#)
 - 02/16/2009 [What's so funny?](#)
 - 02/09/2009 [Reducing recidivism - an exploration of one county's effort, Part II](#)
-
-

Article Tools [Sign in to Email a Friend](#) | [Print This Page](#) | [Comments\(0\)](#) | [Suggest a Story](#)

Reducing recidivism - an exploration of one county's effort, Part III

By Aaron M. Henderson and Deb Perry

Published: 02/16/2009



Editor's note: Last week, [part two](#) of this three-part series discussed the study's assessment tools and the Risk/Need Principle. The series concludes this week with a look at the data and individuals of the study and the conclusions reached by the researchers.

Data Sets

The first comparative data set included those individuals who attended and successfully completed the "Thinking for a Change Program" and their activities the following three-year period. A rate of recidivism was established and compared to those who did not receive the

programming.

While it is the goal to look at the entire change in programming within the Blackford County Judicial System, the common notable difference in data sets is the Thinking for a Change Program. In most cases, this program was implemented in addition to other previously required programs, (i.e. Counseling, Electronic Home Detention, GED, etc.).

For the purpose of this study recidivism is defined as:

“an individual who, within a three year period of time commits additional criminal acts similar in nature to the originating offense within Blackford County and the contiguous counties of Jay, Grant, Wells and Delaware . “

Lastly a comparative study will further analyze the client's criminal activities as they pertain to other offenses which are not similar in nature. It is the goal of this study to provide meaningful results based on four years of change and evolution for the Blackford County Community Corrections and Blackford County Probation Departments; the cohesive working environment, and the efforts of the departments to identify and utilize programs that can and do make changes in individual's behaviors.

Evaluation

Individuals referred to evidence based practice programs within the past four years have been included in this study and tracked for a period of three years to determine the effectiveness of the programming and methods of supervision. The basis of the study included individuals who successfully completed programs to individuals who did not complete similar programming.

Primary areas of concern for this study are to measure the effectiveness of programs which are matched to the offender's criminogenic needs. This study has measured success based on offenders who do not re-offend with similar offense for which they have received treatment.

For those individuals who commit subsequent offenses different in nature to the initial offense, may not have received programs or treatment matching that particular need.

For the purpose of establishing a baseline of recidivism in Blackford County a random draw of 100 clients was pulled and evaluated on a one and three year interval. This baseline can then be compared to the current statistics of those individuals (55) who have been ordered to participate in evidence-based programming, specifically the Thinking for a Change Program.

An additional 55 clients were then selected based on similar offenses and similar risks assessment scores who were not required to participate in the programming. It was necessary to develop these three groups of individuals to further examine the impact of new policies and individualized case planning regardless of evidence based practice programs.

Results

At the local level, comparisons have been made with current evidence based practices compared to those prior to the implementation of these practices. For the purpose of understanding the outlying impact of the programs, data has been collected and measured to include cross comparisons for offenses of any type as well as offenses committed that are similar in nature.

As noted the data has been closely matched based on offense and risk and whether or not they completed the Thinking for a Change Program, an identified Evidence Based Program.

This is independent of any additional Court sanctions and is the leading differentiating practice at this time relative to the Evidence Based Practice programming changes. The initial set of comparison data represents those clients served prior to the implementation of any Evidence Based Programming and individualized service programming.

Committed new offense regardless of type:

Prior to Implementation (100 random clients):

Within 1 year: 34.4% committed a new criminal offense.

Within 3 years: 50.5% committed a new criminal offense.

Since Implementation (55 clients):

Within 1 year w/o evidence based programs: 29.1% Committed new offense.

Within 1 year with evidence based programs: 14.5%

Within 3 years w/o EBP: 45.5%

Within 3 years with EBP: 20.0%

Committed new offense of like kind:

Prior to Implementation (100 random clients):

Within 1 year: 21.5% committed a new criminal offense.

Within 3 years: 32.25% committed a new criminal offense.

Since Implementation (55 clients):

Within 1 year w/o evidence based programs: 16.4% Committed new offense.

Within 1 year with evidence based programs: 5.45%

Within 3 years w/o EBP: 18.1%

Within 3 years with EBP: 9.1%

Conclusion

In short, the programs and tools implemented within the Blackford County Judicial System are working. The results noted above speak for themselves and are now a solid basis and justification for continued work in the area of Evidence Based Programming.

Ensuring that programs meet the need of the individual is critical to the continued success of the judicial system.

The potential exists to decrease expenses associated with incarceration of these individuals over a substantial period of time due to their decreased patterns of criminal behavior. These results also show that the mere changes of individualized case management for these individuals can slightly reduce the likelihood that they will reoffend, but not to the significance of implementing evidence based practices.

Efforts continue to be made in the area of additional program implementation. At the time of this writing, steps are being made to implement Prime for Life as well as other individualized case management programs to ensure that the dynamic risk factors are being addressed to further support and reduce the rates of recidivism.

Clients are now being evaluated utilizing the LSI-R assessment tool to prepare and utilize individualized case management protocol in an effort to identify the most critical areas of need for the individual. Addressing these critical needs first is now a top priority in an effort to continue the reduction of recidivism rates for Blackford County.

Works Cited

(2007). 2007 Annual Report . Indianapolis: Indiana Department of Correction.

Andrews, D., & Bonta, J. (1994). *The Psychology of Criminal Conduct*. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.

Andrews, D., Zinger, I., Hoge, R., Bonta, J., Gendreau, P., & Cullen, F. (1990). Does Correctional Treatment Work? A Clinically Relevant and Psychologically Informed Meta-Analysis. *Criminology*, 28(3) , 369-404.

Andrews, D., Zinger, I., Hoge, R., Bonta, J., Gendreau, P., & Cullen, F. (1990). Does Correctional Treatment Work? A clinically relevant and psychologically informed meta-analysis. *Criminology*, 28(3) , 369-404.

Aos, S., Miller, M., & Drake, E. (January, 2006). Evidence-Based Adult Corrections Programs: What Works and What Does Not. Washington State Institute for Public Policy , 1-19.

Dennehy, K. M. (2006, December). Offender Programming: A Smart Investment for Society. Corrections Today , 8.

Garner, A. (2008). Recidivism Rates Compared 2005-2007. Indianapolis: Indiana Department of Correction.

Menken, A. D. (1924). The Rehabilitation of the Morally Handicapped. Journal of the American Institute of Criminal Law & Criminology , 147-154.

Moll, R. (2006). Rx for recidivism. Christianity Today, 50(11) , 70-74.

Rhine, E. (2002). Why 'What Works' Matters Under the 'Broken Windows Model' of Supervision. Federal Probation, 66(2) , 38.

Stephan, J. J. (June 2004). State Prison Expenditures, 2001. Bureau of Justice Statistics , 1-9.

Aaron M. Henderson is the Chief Probation Officer for the Blackford County Courts in Hartford City, Indiana

Comments:

No comments have been posted for this article.

Login to add a comment

User Name:

Password:

Remember me:

[**Forgot password?**](#)

MARKETPLACE [search vendors](#) | [advanced search](#)

IN CASE YOU MISSED IT

- 02/16/2009 [Easy as 1-2-3](#)
 - 02/16/2009 [Reducing recidivism - an exploration of one county's effort, Part III](#)
 - 02/16/2009 [What's so funny?](#)
 - 02/09/2009 [Reducing recidivism - an exploration of one county's effort, Part II](#)
-
-

Article Tools [Sign in to Email a Friend](#) | [Print This Page](#) | [Comments\(0\)](#) | [Suggest a Story](#)

What's so funny?

By *Joe Bouchard*

Published: 02/16/2009



“Why do croutons come in airtight packages? It's just stale bread to begin with.”

George Carlin

In my personal opinion, George Carlin was the funniest person on the planet. I appreciate his blend of intellect, shock, and analytic iconoclasm. His observations are amazing. Others may see him as base or profane or angry. Let's face it, comedy is subjective.

No one can nail down what is universally funny. The undisputed king or queen of comedy quite simply does not exist in the same form for everybody. Our

perspectives are too different. This is a good thing, as this allows us to enjoy variety.

Corrections needs humor. Without it, many of us would implode, burn out, or leave the profession. Levity in grave situations permits us to utilize an occasionally necessary pressure valve. Both staff and offenders use a large range of jesting to alleviate the demands of the environment.

At work, have you ever felt the victim of ill-placed humor? Or have you ever delivered a well-intended joke in an inappropriate manner only to find that your wit was misconstrued as harassment? Do all of your work colleagues joke in the same manner?

Unfortunately, poorly transmitted humor can lead to bad feelings between colleagues. Without a doubt, humor on the job can convey many different messages, even some unintended. Have you ever considered the communication value of humor?

Sadly, comedy can be potentially very hurtful. This is an irony considering that the emotion is predicated on mirth. And what is funny to some is unacceptably offensive to others.

Sometimes the content of a funny story is appropriate, but the delivery is off-putting. The comedian may have good intention to spread happiness. However, through any combination of interpersonal factors, the joke may come off as creepy, threatening, or deeply offensive.

As always, clear communication between all parties is crucial to smooth operations. When something is misconstrued inside the walls, calamity is brewing. Granted, this could be a long chain of events, but it is possible.

Through misapplied humor, staff may view each other with renewed caution and contempt. Failed humor communication may lead to deep discord and lack of cooperation.

Bad feelings can produce a gaping hole in our vocational armor of unity. From there, some enterprising and unscrupulous individuals can leverage distance between colleagues.

This leads to compromised security. It may seem tenuous. But it is all possible from a miscommunication based on a joke.

Recognizing this can mean the difference between good staff harmony and feelings of resentment, discord, and its many ill effects.

There are many styles of humor that we employ. Wit is so much more than the knock-knock joke. It is important to identify the many styles in order to make sense of possible differences of meaning in the mind of both the deliverer and recipient.

How do you make jokes? Are you self-deprecating? Can you deliver material in a stone face manner? Do you use scatology, high brow or slapstick methods?

Some of us in corrections use gallows humor as a way to cut through the stress. This is definitely a hurtful humor. Others resort to bitter sarcasm, abusive physical humor, or discriminatory or sexual-based jokes.

You do not have to be lost in a dense, tangled forest of varying tastes and ambiguity. There are a few basic guidelines to filter out hurtful humor in the workplace.

Work within professional guidelines. As always, it is important to know your agency's discriminatory harassment policy and operating procedure. Certain utterances or actions could not only be offensive to some but also illegal.

Work within your environment. Know your audience. Be aware of how others spread mirth and merriment through comedy. How does your administration regard/convey humor? Does the executive staff set a tone of pure professionalism, mixed levity? Or is it always open mike night at the comedy club?

Know your limitations. How are you regarded? Do you have the rapport necessary to joke comfortably with colleagues? Perhaps it is best to err on the side of caution. When in doubt about a bit of humor, don't say it.

The corrections profession is a serious place. Yet, it does not need to be a solemn place all of the time. There is a proper time and place for humor. Most importantly, occasional absurdity is a necessary release for an often somber backdrop. When done correctly, it strengthens our vocation.

About the Author – Joe Bouchard is a Librarian at Baraga Maximum Correctional Facility within the Michigan Department of Corrections. He is also a member of the Board of Experts for The Corrections Professional and an instructor of Corrections and Psychology for Gogebic Community College. You can reach him at (906) 353-7070 ext 1321

These are the opinions of Joe Bouchard, a librarian employed with the Michigan Department of Corrections. These are not necessarily the opinions of the Department. The MDOC is not responsible for the content or accuracy.

Comments:

No comments have been posted for this article.

Login to add a comment

User Name:

Password:

Remember me:

[**Forgot password?**](#)

MARKETPLACE [search vendors](#) | [advanced search](#)



IN CASE YOU MISSED IT

- 02/16/2009 [Easy as 1-2-3](#)
 - 02/16/2009 [Reducing recidivism - an exploration of one county's effort, Part III](#)

 - 02/16/2009 [What's so funny?](#)
 - 02/09/2009 [Reducing recidivism - an exploration of one county's effort, Part II](#)
-
-

Article Tools [Sign in to Email a Friend](#) | [Print This Page](#) | [Comments\(0\)](#) | [Suggest a Story](#)

Reducing recidivism - an exploration of one county's effort, Part II

By *Aaron M. Henderson and Deb Perry*

Published: 02/09/2009



Editor's note: Part one of this three-part series [Part one of this three-part series](#) discussed the background behind a three-year study that monitored the effectiveness of an Indiana county's efforts to reduce recidivism rates on individuals assigned to probation and/or community corrections programs. This week, part two discusses the study's assessment tools and the Risk/Need Principle.

Risk/Need Principle

Much research and discussion has been conducted in the field of criminal justice to determine the best method for determining the appropriate levels of

supervision and programming for offenders. Most notably, Andrews (1990) notes, "the risk principle suggests that higher levels of service are best reserved for higher risk cases and that low-risk cases are best assigned to minimal service," (Andrews D. , Zinger, Hoge, Bonta, Gendreau, & Cullen, 1990).

Furthering this assumption, these factors are classified into two sub-categories; static and dynamic. Dynamic risk factors, those we can change, are outlined as an individual's criminogenic needs. Since a person's dynamic risk factors can be changed, the assumption remains that risk can be lowered by correction those dynamic factors which increase risk.

Conversely, static factors are those which we cannot change. As noted, "static factors, (i.e., age, previous convictions) are aspects of the offender's past that are predictive of recidivism but cannot be changed," (Andrews & Bonta, *The Psychology of Criminal Conduct*, 1994). Finding the dynamic factors and associating them with the needs of the individual has proved to be successful in reducing rates of recidivism by correcting potentially damaging behaviors that increase risk.

"The most effective programs target such dynamic risk factors as antisocial attitudes, values and beliefs, delinquent and criminal peers, self-control, self-management, and problem solving skills," (Rhine, 2002).

While it is necessary to classify individuals into categories based on risk, it is inherently important to associate the risk based on an individual's need as outlined. Otherwise, the risk classification is meaningless.

Many of these dynamic factors help uncover certain social deficiencies that offenders possess. Simply incarcerating or programming individuals without addressing these social deficiencies will ensure their return to the criminal justice system.

The revolving pattern of behaviors can closely be tied to their antisocial activities. Basing a risk assessment with the inclusion of these dynamic factors has proven to be successful in rehabilitation for these offenders.

Assessment Tools

Presently two forms of assessments are conducted in Blackford County with offenders. The Indiana Judicial Center Caseload and Classification System of risk is utilized and reported through the Blackford County Probation Department as required by the Indiana Judicial Center.

However, this assessment alone provides little measurable support of an individual's dynamic risk factors as noted. In addition, recent changes in policy and procedure utilize the Level of Service Inventory, Revised (LSI-R) assessment on all criminal cases wherein the defendant is sentenced to a term of probation and/or placement in the community corrections programs.

This step allows the probation officers and the community corrections officers the ability to tailor programming to the individual needs of the client and thus matching their risks to programs available thereby identifying and addressing their social deficiencies.

The LSI-R tool was developed based on the research noted herein and is now a standard tool in the criminal justice sector to classify risk and needs of offenders. A basic comparison indicates that the two tools utilized presently in Blackford County are similar in risk result levels based on categories of high, medium, low, but are administered differently and measure different risk factors.

Specifically, the LSI-R assessment provides more of the dynamic risk factors of the individual and is more detailed in the results found. However, the basic evaluations yield similar results and have been determined to be acceptable for their use in this study.

Cost/Benefit Factor

"It is smart to prepare offenders to return to society as law-abiding citizens. If they do not, we all pay, either directly as victims or indirectly as taxpayers," (Dennehy, 2006, December).

In 2001 the Bureau of Justice Statistics notes that "the average annual operating cost per State inmate was \$22,650, or \$62.50 per day," (Stephan, June 2004). The average cost in the State of Indiana in 2007 is \$52.61 per day. (2007 Annual Report , 2007). The daily cost associated inmates at the Blackford County Security Center is estimated to be \$32.24 per day.

It is therefore, necessary to provide services and support to individuals to reduce the likelihood that they will return to incarceration, thereby increasing the costs associated with their incarceration. Based on average daily populations of clients in community correction programs and probation supervision, the average daily cost is \$7.33 per day per client for Community Corrections programs and \$0.87 per day for probation services.

This clearly outlines the up-front cost savings to local taxpayers by utilizing alternative sentencing options and providing evidence based practice services outside the confines of the Blackford County Security Center and/or

the Indiana Department of Corrections.

Next week, the series concludes with a look at data sets used, evaluations of individuals in the study, and conclusions reached by the researchers.

Comments:

No comments have been posted for this article.

Login to add a comment

User Name:

Password:

Remember me:

[**Forgot password?**](#)

MARKETPLACE [search vendors](#) | [advanced search](#)



IN CASE YOU MISSED IT

- 02/16/2009 [Easy as 1-2-3](#)
 - 02/16/2009 [Reducing recidivism - an exploration of one county's effort, Part III](#)

 - 02/16/2009 [What's so funny?](#)
 - 02/09/2009 [Reducing recidivism - an exploration of one county's effort, Part II](#)
-

