

**Piloting Utah's
Response and Incentive Matrix:
Results from Staff and
Stakeholder Surveys**

September 2015



THE UNIVERSITY OF UTAH

Utah Criminal Justice Center

COLLEGE OF SOCIAL WORK
COLLEGE OF SOCIAL & BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES
UTAH COMMISSION ON CRIMINAL & JUVENILE JUSTICE
S.J. QUINNEY COLLEGE OF LAW

**Piloting Utah's
Response and Incentive Matrix: Results from Staff and Stakeholder
Surveys**

**Christian M. Sarver, M.S., M.S.W.
Jessica Seawright, M.S.W.
Robert P. Butters, Ph.D.**

September 2015

Utah Criminal Justice Center, University of Utah

In 2013, the Utah Sentencing Commission appointed a committee to develop a sanction and incentive matrix for Utah probationers and parolees. Members participating in this committee included representatives of the Utah Sentencing Commission, Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC), Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice (CCJJ), Utah Department of Corrections (UDC), specifically the Adult Probation and Parole (AP&P) division, and the Board of Pardons and Parole (BP&P). The resulting tool, called the Response and Incentive Matrix (RIM), integrates behavioral principles into a graduated response tool for responding to both compliance with, and violations of, the conditions of supervision. RIM was piloted in AP&P offices in the Northern Region from April through June 2015. At the end of the pilot period, the Utah Criminal Justice Center (UCJC) conducted a survey with AP&P staff, offenders on supervision, and community stakeholders in order to provide feedback on the tool prior to statewide implementation.

Methods

Underlying goals of the RIM include: 1) standardizing AP&P's response to offender violations; 2) giving agents the latitude to respond immediately to more violations; and 3) incorporating the principles of behavior modification, including a structured response to both negative and positive behavior, into the goals and practices of supervision¹. Given these changes, survey questions were designed to identify barriers to implementation, including those related to resources, training, and support for the philosophical orientation of RIM. Survey questions were developed by the UCJC research team in conjunction with representatives from the Sentencing Commission, CCJJ, AOC, UDC, and AP&P. Feedback on RIM was sought from a range of stakeholders who may be impacted by RIM; giving differing roles and perspectives with respect to the tool, however, four separate surveys were developed (see Appendix A; surveys were created for offenders, criminal justice stakeholders, and AP&P staff).

Surveys were converted to an online format to facilitate distribution and participation. Representatives from AP&P Northern Region provided an email distribution list for each survey; an email explaining the purpose of the research, as well as a link to the survey, was sent to all addresses on the distribution list. To increase participation, offenders were emailed an invitation and also invited by their supervising agent to complete the survey in-person, using an AP&P computer. Respondents were given nine days to complete the survey and a reminder email was sent four days prior to the survey closing.

Results

In total, 211 emails inviting participation were sent and 51 individuals completed the survey, for an overall response rate of 24%. Response rate by respondent type is presented in Table 1; judges and AP&P staff had the highest response rates (50% and 35% respectively).

¹ For more information, including references, on the philosophy of RIM and evidence supporting the efficacy of those principles, see: Hickert, A. O., Prince, K. C., Worwood, E. B., & Butters, R. P. (2014). *Development of Utah's Incentive and Response Matrix: Year One Report*. Salt Lake City, UT: Utah Criminal Justice Center.

Table 1 Response Rate

Respondent	Invitations Sent (#)	Response Rate (%)
Agents	57	35
Offenders	83	17
Judges	14	50
Stakeholders	57	16

The results for each survey are presented separately in the following sections.

Agents

The survey sent to AP&P agents and supervisors was designed to assess support for the philosophical orientation of RIM, the impact of RIM on agents' work, and agents' use of RIM to respond to offenders' behavior.

Demographics. One third (33%) of respondents worked in the Davis County office, 33% worked in the Weber County office, and 29% worked elsewhere in the Northern Region. Of the respondents, 43% primarily supervised probationers, 29% primarily supervised parolees, and 29% supervised both probationers and parolees. RIM was piloted with probationers throughout the Northern Region and with both probationers and parolees in Davis County.

Fairness of RIM. RIM structures the type and magnitude of the sanction that an agent issues in response to a violation, taking into account offender risk level, severity of the violation, and number of previous violations. As such, agents might be guided by RIM to issue a sanction that is comparatively less severe than their pre-RIM response to the same behavior would have been (e.g., issuing a verbal warning rather than a curfew). RIM also instructs agents to reward positive behavior more frequently than they sanction negative behavior. While many agents, no doubt, were acknowledging and encouraging positive behavior prior to RIM, when compared to pre-RIM agents may find themselves responding to a violation by issuing a less severe sanction and also issuing an incentive. In order to assess agents' response to this difference, respondents were asked to rate RIM's fairness with respect to offenders. Almost three-quarters (71%) rated it as lenient, with the majority of those rating it as too lenient. In particular, respondents expressed concern that RIM was not appropriate for high-risk and chronic offenders because offenders were allowed too many violations before receiving a substantial sanction, such as jail or revocation.

Familiarity with the principles of behavior modification. Successful implementation of evidence-based practices in correctional settings requires that staff is trained on, and supportive of, new practices. In order to assess agents' endorsement of the principles of behavior modification, respondents were asked questions regarding their

belief that RIM would facilitate positive behavioral change with offenders. The results (Table 2) show respondents expressed some resistance to the philosophical principles on which RIM is based. Fewer than one-quarter (17%) believed that sanctions issued according to RIM would reduce negative behaviors and less than half (35%) believed that issuing incentives would increase positive behavior. In comments, respondents questioned the efficacy of RIM and requested an instrument that was “evidence-based.” In part, this resistance may stem from the fact that RIM is replacing some locally-created sanctioning models; several respondents expressed preference for matrices that had been developed in other counties.

Almost no respondents (6%) felt that RIM was an improvement over professional judgment alone in terms of shaping offending behavior. This apparent lack of support for RIM may also stem from a lack of familiarity with the principles of behavior modification. In another question, respondents were asked if there was any additional training that would help them feel better prepared to supervise offenders using the matrix. The most common answer, given by almost half of respondents (45%), was additional training on the effective use of approval and discipline.

Table 2 Do Respondents Believe RIM Facilitates Positive Behavioral Change?

Statement	% Agree
Issuing sanctions according to RIM will change antisocial behavior	17
Issuing incentives will reinforce positive behavior	35
RIM increases agent’s ability to respond appropriately to offender behavior	13
Using RIM rather than professional judgment alone will improve offenders' outcomes	6

Impact of RIM on interactions with offenders. In keeping with the principles of behavior modification, RIM is intended to reduce the amount of time that transpires between an offender’s behavior (e.g., a violation or goal attainment) and the agent’s response (e.g., issuing a sanction or incentive). Very few respondents (7%, Table 3) felt RIM allowed them to respond more quickly to offender behavior. In part, this may be a function of the additional burden incurred by agents when learning a new system: almost half (47%) of respondents indicated that use of RIM increased the amount of time it took to evaluate a violation and issue a sanction. Forty-two percent (42%, not in table) of respondents reported that it took 10-15 minutes to evaluate and issue a sanction using RIM. Respondents reported taking as long as 60 minutes to evaluate and issue a sanction using RIM, a fact that several attributed to learning to use a new tool. Similarly, over half (59%) of respondents reported that it took approximately 15 minutes to evaluate and issue an incentive. Given that RIM requires agents to respond to both positive and negative behaviors, using the instrument may result in agents spending substantially more time with offenders than previously, especially at first. Increasing the amount of time agents need to spend with each offender may have implications in terms of their caseload.

As noted earlier, agents were likely acknowledging and responding to offenders' accomplishments prior to RIM; however, one would expect the creation of a structured response to positive behavior, as well as the identification of many new incentives, to result in an increase in the number of incentives issued. Respondents were asked whether they issued more incentives using RIM than they had prior to the pilot. Only one-third (29%) indicated using more rewards with RIM. In the pilot version, RIM instructed agents to issue incentives at a ratio of 4:1 when compared to sanctions; if this ratio were reached by every agent, likely all agents would have issued more incentives during RIM. This relatively small change in the number of agents issuing more incentives may be due to the aforementioned need for additional training with respect to the principles of behavior modification. For example, research shows that sanctions are more effective when issued in conjunction with incentives; however, several respondents expressed the belief that they could not issue incentives in the case of an offender who was continuing to commit violations.

Half (53%) of respondents indicated that they sometimes skip part of RIM and comments indicated that was most commonly due to time constraints and lack of belief in the efficacy of RIM.

Table 3 Impact of RIM on Interactions with Offenders

Statement	% Agree
RIM increases time agent spends responding to offender behavior	47
RIM allows agent to respond more quickly to offender behavior	7
RIM increases agent's use of incentives	29
Agent sometimes skips parts of RIM	53

Agent responses to offender behavior. Respondents were asked to identify the types of violations and behaviors they were most commonly issuing sanctions for, as well as the sanctions they were using most frequently. Table 4 describes the most and least commonly identified violations, behaviors, and sanctions.

Table 4 Issuing Sanctions

Most Common Violation Type
1. Moderate Severity Technical Violation
2. Medium Severity Technical Violation
Least Common Violation Type
1. New Criminal Conduct
2. High Severity Technical Violation
Behaviors Most Commonly Sanctioned
1. Problems with Substance Use/Treatment
2. Problems with Reporting Requirements
Behaviors Least Commonly Sanctioned
1. Problems with Restitution, Fees, and Community Service

Most Common Sanctions

1. Treatment/Classes
 2. Increased Supervision
-

Respondents were also asked to rank behaviors they were rewarding most commonly, as well as the incentives they used most frequently. Most commonly, agents were issuing incentives related to compliance and negative substance-use tests. Given the short timeframe of the pilot (less than three months), one would not expect agents to see or respond to changes in risk level or completion of time and dosage requirements; however, progress with prosocial skills or peers were not identified as commonly rewarded behaviors. Because these are characterized as two of the four criminogenic needs with the biggest potential impact on recidivism, these are needs that agents should be specifically encouraged to target.

Table 5 Issuing Incentives

Accomplishments Most Commonly Rewarded

1. Compliance with Conditions of Supervision
2. Negative Results-Substance Use Testing

Accomplishments Least Commonly Rewarded

1. Risk Reduction
2. Time & Dosage Requirements

Most Common Incentives

1. Recognition
 2. Other Tangible/Monetary Rewards
-

Offenders

The offender survey asked questions related to offenders' experience of supervision on RIM and the impact of incentives and sanctions on motivation and behavioral change. While the survey included questions regarding the specific impact of sanctions, too few respondents had ever received a sanction at the time of the survey to allow for a meaningful discussion of sanctions. As such, the following section will describe respondent characteristics and their experiences with respect to incentives.

Demographics. All respondents were on probation (no parolees responded to the survey) and 93% had been on supervision for more than one month (Table 6). More than half (57%) were on probation for a drug offense and 36% were on probation for a person offense.

Behavior modification research indicates that rewards and sanctions should be certain: offenders should know what will happen in response to their behavior. In order to assess offenders' perception of certainty with respect to receiving rewards and sanctions, they were asked to rate their familiarity with RIM. More than half (64%) reported being familiar with RIM, which suggests that agents, in most cases, are discussing with offenders the consequences of their behavior, as described in RIM.

Table 6 Demographics

	% of Offenders
Probation	100
Probation more than 1 month	93
Drug Offense	57
Person Offense	36
Familiarity with RIM	64

Incentives. The majority of respondents (83%) had received an incentive for at least one accomplishment, most commonly in the form of verbal praise or recognition (70%). Fewer respondents reported that they had received other tangible rewards including travel passes and tokens to redeem for items (this may be due to the relatively short timeframe of the pilot). Respondents were asked to rate their top preference with respect to incentives; the majority listed a reduction in sentence or other requirements. Forty percent, however, listed other types of rewards (respondents were only allowed to choose one option). Nearly three-fourths (70%) indicated that incentives motivated them to do better, which contradicted the perception among some AP&P respondents that incentives were not valued by offenders.

Table 7 How do Offenders Value Incentives?

Reward	% Ranked Top Preference
Recognition	20
Reduction in Requirements, Time, etc.	60
Tangible/Monetary Rewards	10
Serve as Peer Mentor	10

Criminal Justice Stakeholders

Surveys were sent to a range of criminal justice stakeholders, including those who had been involved in discussions during the design of RIM and those whose work may be impacted by the matrix. Email invitations were sent to judges, defense attorneys, prosecutors, and jail commanders (as noted earlier, a separate survey was designed specifically for judges). Both surveys (judge and stakeholder) asked questions related to familiarity and experience with RIM. Judges were also asked questions related to their belief in the potential for criminal justice system responses that were based on the principles of behavior modification to positively impact offender behavior. The results from both surveys are presented below.

Demographics. Of the non-judge stakeholder respondents, 67% were prosecutors and 33% were defense attorneys. More than half (67%) rated themselves as somewhat or very familiar with RIM (Table 8). The majority of judges (86%) rated themselves as

familiar or very familiar with RIM. Despite this reported familiarity with RIM, several judge respondents indicated that they had not seen any indication, at the time of the survey, that RIM was currently being piloted.

Table 8 Criminal Justice Stakeholder familiarity with RIM

Respondent	Familiarity RIM (%)
Judges	86
Stakeholders	67

Fairness of RIM. The majority of judges (83%) rated RIM as fair to offenders, while the majority of other stakeholders (67%) rated RIM as lenient or too lenient (Table 9). When compared to AP&P respondents, stakeholders expressed similar concerns regarding the appropriateness of RIM for use with high risk and chronic offenders.

Table 9 Fairness of RIM

Respondent	Perception^a	
	<i>Fair (%)</i>	<i>Lenient (%)</i>
Judges ^b	83	17
Stakeholders ^b	33	67

^a Lenient includes those rating RIM as both Lenient and Too Lenient

^b Average scores (scale 1-3, with 1=Too Lenient): Judges=2.8; Stakeholders=1.9.

Familiarity with the principles of behavior modification. Judges (but not other stakeholders) were asked to rate their agreement with a series of statements related to the principles of behavior modification (Table 10). The majority of respondents (71%) expressed agreement (rated agree or strongly agree) with statements related to the importance of incentives in shaping offender behavior and the need to respond as quickly as possible to offender behavior. Almost half (43%) agreed that sanctions that were too severe could have a negative impact on offender behavior. The vast majority (83%) also agreed that sanctions could work as well as incarceration in terms of shaping offender behavior (not in table).

Table 10 Perceptions of Sanctions and Incentives

Statement	% Agreed
Sanctions should be administered as quickly as possible after a violation	71
Sanctions that are too weak will have no impact on offender behavior	71
Sanctions that are too severe can have a negative impact on offender behavior	43
Incentives and sanctions are equally important in changing offender behavior	71

Stakeholders (not including judges) were asked to compare RIM to professional judgment in terms of its potential impact on positively shaping offender behavior. The majority (56%) did not believe RIM would improve offenders' outcomes when compared to professional judgment alone. Of note, 44% did believe RIM would improve offender

outcomes, which is higher than the number of AP&P respondents who agreed with that statement.

None of the stakeholders felt that RIM had changed their workload.

Discussion

RIM had been piloted for approximately two months at the time of the surveys. As such, this report is not intended as an assessment of RIM, but as a means of providing feedback to stakeholders prior to statewide implementation. The results presented here suggest several possible barriers to successful implementation of RIM, which can broadly be classified into two categories: 1) resistance to the philosophical underpinnings of RIM, and 2) systemic issues, such as lack of sufficient resources to implement the tool as designed.

With respect to the former, a portion of AP&P respondents expressed some resistance to the principles of behavior modification upon which RIM is based. In part, this is an issue of training and supervision. For example, many respondents expressed the belief that incentives would not have a positive impact on offenders' behavior, despite research indicating that sanctions are more effective when used in conjunction with incentives. Agents' perceptions about the impact of incentives are further contradicted by the opinions of offenders who completed the survey, many of whom indicated that the incentives they had received had motivated them to do better. AP&P conducted training on RIM prior to its implementation, but additional, and ongoing, training may enhance the effectiveness of the program. Research on effective correctional programs indicates that interventions have a bigger impact on offenders' behavior when staff receives regular and ongoing training, supervision, and feedback regarding staff's skills when interacting with offenders.

With respect to systemic issues, AP&P respondents indicated that, at least in the beginning, RIM took longer than previous methods for supervising offenders. While some of the additional time spent responding to offender behavior may be a product of the newness of the instrument, respondents also indicated that RIM was simply too large and unwieldy to use easily. AP&P is currently making modifications to RIM, including attempts to automate the instrument, which may facilitate ease of use. Future evaluations should continue to monitor the impact of RIM on agents' workload.

Both AP&P respondents and other stakeholders articulated some concern related to communication between criminal justice entities when responding to offenders' behavior. Results from this survey suggest that judges are supportive of the principles of RIM, which is important in terms of the courts' response to violations and accomplishments. Respondents expressed concern, however, that there was no clear mechanism for communicating how a defendant had performed under supervision to the court or other relevant stakeholders.

Appendix A Surveys

Agent Survey

The Utah Criminal Justice Center (UCJC) at the University of Utah has developed this survey to evaluate implementation of the Response and Incentive Matrix (RIM) being piloted by the Utah Department of Corrections, Division of Adult Probation and Parole (AP&P). The survey is intended to be completed by AP&P agents who supervised probationers and parolees using RIM. Your participation is critical to the success of the study. Please answer the questions based on your experience on supervision during the RIM pilot. The survey should take approximately 10-15 minutes to complete.

Participation in this survey is completely voluntary. Your anonymity will be maintained and all data will be aggregated and reported as a whole. Information obtained by the researchers will be recorded in such a manner that participants CANNOT be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to participants. The University of Utah team will analyze the survey data and create a full report of the findings. Regardless of your participation in this survey, the final report will be distributed through the same channels as this survey invitation.

If you have questions or concerns, or if you feel you have been harmed by this research, please feel free to contact, Rob Butters, Director of the Utah Criminal Justice Center at the University of Utah at (801) 585-3246. Contact the Institutional Review Board (IRB) if you have questions regarding your rights as a research participant. Also, contact the IRB if you have questions or concerns that you do not feel you can discuss with the principal investigator. The University of Utah IRB may be reached by phone at (801) 581-3655 or by e-mail at irb@hsc.utah.edu.

Welcome

1. By selecting yes below, you are giving consent to participate in the survey. Thank you for your participation and insight.*

Yes

No

2. In which county do you work?

Weber

Davis

Other

3. Do you primarily supervise?

Probationers

Parolees

Both

Using the Matrix to Sanction Behavior

4. How long does it take, when using the matrix, to evaluate an incident warranting a sanction and to issue an appropriate sanction (in minutes)?

5. How long does it take to evaluate and sanction an incident now compared to how long it took before the matrix?

Using the matrix takes more time

Using the matrix takes the same amount of time

Using the matrix takes less time

Other (describe)

6. Rank the types of violations in order of what you are most commonly issuing a sanction for. (1 being the most common)

Low Severity Technical Violations

Moderate Severity Technical Violations

Medium Severity Technical Violations

High Severity Technical Violations

New Criminal Conduct

7. Rank the types of behaviors in the order you are most commonly issuing a sanction for. (1 being the most common)

Problems with substance use

Problems with education or employment

Problems with restitution, fees, community service

Problems with reporting

Other

8. If you ranked Other as 1 or 2, please describe.

9. What is the most common sanction you have issued? (check one)

Assignments

Community (Service, CAB)

Family Meeting

Increase (reporting, supervision, structured living, day reporting)

Jail

Plan/Program

Restriction (travel, home)

Treatment (class, workshops, carey-BITS, cognitive restructuring-MRT)

Verbal Warning

Other (please specify)

10. When you impose sanctions using the matrix, how frequently do probationers/parolees challenge the sanction as inappropriate, excessive, or not warranted?

Almost all of the time

More than half of the time
Less than half of the time
Rarely/Almost Never

11. When compared to pre-RIM supervision, do you think issuing sanctions according to the matrix will change antisocial behavior?

The matrix will have a bigger impact on antisocial behavior
The matrix will have the same impact on antisocial behavior
The matrix will have less impact on antisocial behavior
Other (describe)

Using the Matrix to Reward Behavior

12. How long does it take you to use the matrix to evaluate and issue an incentive (check only one)

15 minutes or less
30 minutes or less
30-60 minutes
1 hour or more
Other (describe)

13. Rank the types of behaviors in the order you are most commonly issuing an incentive for. (1 being the most common-please rank all choices)

Compliance with standard & special conditions
Engagement & maintenance with family and associations
Negative results for substance testing
Progress with prosocial skills
Progress with classes, treatments, programs
Progress with mental health treatment
Progress with residence
Progress with transportation
Progress with education or employment
Progress with restitution or community service
Progress with risk reduction
Progress with time & dosage
Other

14. If you ranked Other as 1 or 2, please describe.

15. What is the most common incentive you have used? (check 1)

Engagement (peer mentor)
Recognition (verbal, written, public)
Reduction/Elimination (curfew length, community service hours, substance screening, fines)
Deseret Industries (DI) Vouchers
Other Tangible/Monetary (headphones, water bottles, or other items)

Other (describe)

16. Compared to pre-RIM supervision, how often do you use incentives when using the matrix?

More often

As often

Less often

Other (describe)

17. Do you think issuing incentives will reinforce positive behavior?

Incentives will have little impact on reinforcing positive behavior

Incentives and sanctions are equally important in reinforcing positive behavior

Incentives are more important than sanctions in reinforcing positive behavior

Other (describe)

Feedback on the Matrix

18. Is there a part of the matrix that you sometimes skip or ignore?

Yes

No

If yes, please describe which sections and why.

19. How would you rate the matrix in terms of fairness to offenders? (select one answer)

Too Lenient

Lenient

Fair

Strict

Too Strict

20. The matrix allows me to respond:

Closer to the event than pre-RIM supervision

Equally close to the event than pre-RIM supervision

Farther from the event than pre-RIM supervision

21. How would you rate the matrix in terms of your ability to respond appropriately to offender behavior?

Easier to respond in a way that will create positive behavior change

Not easier or more difficult to respond in a way that will create positive behavior change

Harder to respond in a way that will create positive behavior change

Other (describe)

22. I think using the matrix rather than professional judgment alone will improve offenders' outcome.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Undecided
Agree
Strongly Agree

Stakeholders & Further Training

23. How would you rate the following criminal justice stakeholders (Judges, Defense Attorneys, Prosecutors) in terms of how well they are following the matrix?

Poor
Below Average
Average
Above Average
Excellent

24. Is there any training that would help you feel better prepared to supervise offenders using the matrix (check all that apply)?

Motivational Interviewing
Modeling pro-social behaviors
Effective use of approval and discipline
Social learning theories
Other (describe)

25. Do you have any additional comments?

Thank you for completing this survey. Please feel free to contact UCJC if you have any questions about the survey or results.

The End

Offender Survey

The Utah Criminal Justice Center (UCJC) at the University of Utah has developed this survey to evaluate your supervision by the Utah Department of Corrections, Division of Adult Probation and Parole (AP&P). The survey is intended to be completed by probationers or parolees who are supervised by an agent. Your participation is critical to the success of the study. Please answer the questions based on your experience with supervision. The survey should take approximately 10-15 minutes to complete.

Participation in this survey is completely voluntary. Your anonymity will be maintained and all data will be aggregated and reported as a whole. Information obtained by the researchers will be recorded in such a manner that participants CANNOT be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to participants. The University of Utah team will analyze the survey data and create a full report of the findings.

If you have questions or concerns, or if you feel you have been harmed by this research, please feel free to contact, Rob Butters, Director of the Utah Criminal Justice Center at the University of Utah at (801) 585-3246. Contact the Institutional Review Board (IRB) if you have questions regarding your rights as a research participant. Also, contact the IRB if you have questions or concerns that you do not feel you can discuss with the principal investigator. The University of Utah IRB may be reached by phone at (801) 581-3655 or by e-mail at irb@hsc.utah.edu.

Welcome

1. By selecting yes below, you are giving consent to participate in the survey. Thank you for your participation and insight.*

Yes

No

2. Are you currently on?

Probation

Parole

Probation

3. How long have you been on probation (if more than once, current time only)?

Less than one week

More than one week but less than one month

More than one month

Other (describe)

4. For what type of offense(s) are you currently on probation? (check all that apply)

Person

Property

Drug

Other (describe)

5. Have you heard of the Response & Incentive Matrix (RIM)?

Yes

No

6. Has your probation agent (PO) ever given you a sanction for something you did?

Yes

No

7. On average, how much time was there between the behavior you were sanctioned for and your PO giving the sanction?

Less than one day

More than one day but less than three days

More than three days but less than one week

More than one week

Other (describe)

8. Typically, do you think the sanctions you have been given are?

Too harsh

Fair

Too lenient

Not as harsh as I expected

Other (describe)

9. Which statement best describes your response to the sanction(s) your PO has used?

Makes me feel discouraged

Does not have any impact on my behavior

Helps keep me on track

Other (describe)

10. Which statement best describes your expectations for how your PO will respond if you violate a condition of your probation?

I feel sure that they will respond with a sanction

I am not sure what they will do

I am pretty sure nothing will happen

I do not think that they will find out

Other (describe)

11. Has your PO ever rewarded you for something you did?

Yes

No

12. What types of rewards have you received? (check all that apply)

Recognition

Deseret Industries (DI) Voucher

Other Tangible Rewards (headphones, water bottle)

Reduction or Elimination (fines, substance screening, community service hours, curfew length)

Participation (peer mentor)

Other (describe)

13. If you did receive a DI voucher, please describe what were you able to purchase with it.

14. Rank the following rewards in order of your preference (1 being your most preferred).

Recognition

Deseret Industries (DI) Voucher

Other Tangible Rewards (headphones, water bottle)

Reduction or Elimination (fines, substance screening, community service hours, curfew length)

Participation (peer mentor)

15. Which statement best describes your response to the rewards your PO has used?

Motivates me to do better

Does not matter to me

Other (describe)

16. Do you have any additional comments?

Parole

17. How long have you been on parole (if more than once, current time only)?

Less than one week

More than one week but less than one month

More than one month

Other (describe)

18. For what type of offense(s) are you currently on parole? (check all that apply)

Person

Property

Drug

Other (describe)

19. Have you heard of the Response & Incentive Matrix (RIM)?

Yes

No

20. Has your parole agent (PO) ever given you a sanction for something you did?

Yes

No

21. On average, how much time was there between the behavior you were sanctioned for

and your PO giving the sanction?

Less than one day

More than one day but less than three days

More than three days but less than one week

More than one week

Other (describe)

22. Typically, do you think the sanctions you have been given are?

Too harsh

Fair

Not as harsh as I expected

Other (describe)

23. Which statement best describes your response to the sanction(s) your PO has used?

Helps keep me on track

Does not have any impact on my behavior

Discourages me

Other (describe)

24. Which statement best describes your expectations for how your PO will respond if you violate a condition of your parole?

I feel sure that they will respond with a sanction

I am not sure what they will do

I am pretty sure nothing will happen

I do not think that they will find out

Other (describe)

25. Has your PO ever rewarded you for something you did?

Yes

No

26. What types of rewards have you received? (check all that apply)

Recognition

Deseret Industries (DI) Voucher

Other Tangible Rewards (earbuds, water bottle)

Reduction or Elimination (fines, substance screening, community service hours, curfew length)

Participation (peer mentor)

Other (describe)

27. If you did receive a DI voucher, please describe what were you able to purchase with it.

28. Rank the following rewards in order of your preference (1 being the most preferred).

Recognition

Deseret Industries (DI) Voucher

Other Tangible Rewards (earbuds, water bottle)

Reduction or Elimination (fines, substance screening, community service hours, curfew length)

Participation (peer mentor)

29. Which statement best describes your response to the rewards your PO has used?

Motivates me to do better

Does not matter to me

Other (describe)

30. Do you have any additional comments?

Thank you for completing this survey. Please feel free to contact UCJC if you have any questions about the survey or results.

The End

Judge Survey

The Utah Criminal Justice Center (UCJC) at the University of Utah has developed this survey to evaluate implementation of the Response and Incentive Matrix (RIM) being piloted by the Utah Department of Corrections, Division of Adult Probation and Parole (AP&P). The survey is intended to be completed by judges who work with probationers and parolees who were supervised by an agent using RIM. Your participation is critical to the success of the study. Please answer the questions based on your experience on supervision during the RIM pilot. The survey should take approximately 10-15 minutes to complete.

Participation in this survey is completely voluntary. Your anonymity will be maintained and all data will be aggregated and reported as a whole. Information obtained by the researchers will be recorded in such a manner that participants CANNOT be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to participants. The University of Utah team will analyze the survey data and create a full report of the findings. Regardless of your participation in this survey, the final report will be distributed through the same channels as this survey invitation.

If you have questions or concerns, or if you feel you have been harmed by this research, please feel free to contact, Rob Butters, Director of the Utah Criminal Justice Center at the University of Utah at (801) 585-3246. Contact the Institutional Review Board (IRB) if you have questions regarding your rights as a research participant. Also, contact the IRB if you have questions or concerns that you do not feel you can discuss with the principal investigator. The University of Utah IRB may be reached by phone at (801) 581-3655 or by e-mail at irb@hsc.utah.edu.

Welcome

1. By selecting yes below, you are giving consent to participate in the survey. Thank you for your participation and insight.*

Yes

No

2. Please rate your familiarity with Adult Probation & Parole's Response and Incentive Matrix (RIM):

Not Familiar

Somewhat Familiar

Moderately Familiar

Familiar

Very Familiar

3. How would you rate the following criminal justice stakeholders in terms of how well they are following the matrix?

Poor

Below Average

Average
Above Average
Excellent

--

Adult Probation and Parole
Defense Attorneys
Prosecutors

4. If you rated any stakeholders as poor or below average in the previous question, please explain.

5. How would you rate the matrix in terms of fairness to offenders?

Too Lenient
Lenient
Fair
Strict
Too Strict

6. Please rate the following statements in terms of their importance in responding to violations in a manner that will positively impact offenders' long-term behavior.

Strongly Disagree
Disagree
Undecided
Agree
Strongly Agree

--

Sanctions should be administered as quickly as possible after a violation
Sanctions that are too weak will have no impact on offender behavior
Sanctions that are too severe can have a negative impact on offender behavior
Sanctions do not work as well as incarceration in changing offender behavior
Incentives are more important than sanctions in changing offender behavior
Incentives and sanctions are equally important in changing offender behavior

7. When an AP&P agent makes a matrix-based recommendation for responding to a violation of the conditions of supervision, how common is it for you to accept the recommendation?

Almost Never
Less than half of the time
More than half of the time
Nearly all of the time
All of the time

8. Under what circumstances are you most likely to reject the matrix-based suggestion:

Matrix suggestion is too harsh a response to the violation
Matrix suggestion is too lenient a response to the violation

Matrix response is appropriate to the violation but inappropriate given the offender's history

Other (describe)

9. When considering your experience to date, how would you rate the RIM?

Poor

Acceptable

Good

Excellent

10. Do you have any additional comments?

Thank you for completing this survey. Please feel free to contact UCJC if you have any questions about the survey or results.

The End

Stakeholder Survey

The Utah Criminal Justice Center (UCJC) at the University of Utah has developed this survey to evaluate implementation of the Response and Incentive Matrix (RIM) being piloted by the Utah Department of Corrections, Division of Adult Probation and Parole (AP&P). The survey is intended to be completed by criminal justice stakeholders who work with probationers and parolees who were supervised by an agent using RIM. Your participation is critical to the success of the study. Please answer the questions based on your experience on supervision during the RIM pilot. The survey should take approximately 10-15 minutes to complete.

Participation in this survey is completely voluntary. Your anonymity will be maintained and all data will be aggregated and reported as a whole. Information obtained by the researchers will be recorded in such a manner that participants CANNOT be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to participants. The University of Utah team will analyze the survey data and create a full report of the findings. Regardless of your participation in this survey, the final report will be distributed through the same channels as this survey invitation.

If you have questions or concerns, or if you feel you have been harmed by this research, please feel free to contact, Rob Butters, Director of the Utah Criminal Justice Center at the University of Utah at (801) 585-3246. Contact the Institutional Review Board (IRB) if you have questions regarding your rights as a research participant. Also, contact the IRB if you have questions or concerns that you do not feel you can discuss with the principal investigator. The University of Utah IRB may be reached by phone at (801) 581-3655 or by e-mail at irb@hsc.utah.edu.

Welcome

1. By selecting yes below, you are giving consent to participate in the survey. Thank you for your participation and insight.*

Yes

No

2. Which of the following best describes your position:

Defense Attorney

Prosecutor

Work for the courts (not an Attorney)

Work at the jail

3. Please rate your familiarity with Adult Probation & Parole's Response and Incentive Matrix (RIM).

Not Familiar

Somewhat Familiar

Moderately Familiar

Familiar

Very Familiar

4. How would you rate the matrix in terms of fairness to offenders?

Too Lenient

Lenient

Fair

Strict

Too Strict

5. How would you rate the matrix in terms of your workload when working with probationers/parolees?

Has created a lot more work

Has created some additional work

Has not changed my work load

Has reduced my workload

6. How would you rate the following criminal justice stakeholders in terms of how well they are following the matrix?

Poor

Below Average

Average

Above Average

Excellent

--

Adult Probation and Parole

Defense Attorneys

Judges

Prosecutors

7. Utilizing the matrix rather than professional judgment alone will improve offenders' outcomes.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Undecided

Agree

Strongly Agree

8. When considering your experience to date, how would you rate the RIM?

Poor

Acceptable

Good

Excellent

9. Do you have any additional comments about the matrix?

10. Do you have any additional comments?

Thank you for completing this survey. Please feel free to contact UCJC if you have any questions about the survey or results.

The End