Appendix E: Resource and Guide to Terms and Concepts of the Pre-Sentence or Post-Sentence Evaluation Standards

Please Note: This document is designed to be a resource guide for working with, assessing, and evaluating offenders. It is intended that approved providers will utilize their expertise along with this guide in working with offenders. Approved providers will make their own decisions regarding the degree of information that needs to be gathered for each offender and how to collect that information.

Table of Contents

Resource and Guide to Terms and Concepts of the
Pre-Sentence or Post-Sentence Evaluation Standards

I. Accountability

A. Definition

Accountability refers to “taking full responsibility for the effects of one’s actions.” In domestic violence intervention there are many aspects of accountability to consider and there are many ways to assess or measure it at various points of treatment. For example, accountability includes individual and unilateral responsibility (i.e., taking full unilateral responsibility for the effects of one’s own words or actions regardless of the influence of anyone else’s words or actions). Accountability can be diminished by unhealthy and self-limiting shame as differentiated from appropriate guilt. Low or limited levels of offender accountability can be correlated to high or extensive risks of offender reoffense. Low levels of empathy for the victim can also be correlated to high incidence of recidivism by the offender (Bancroft, 2002).

B. Assessment

Accountability can be assessed by considering the following:

1. Does the offender take responsibility for his/her abusive actions in the police report of the incident? In the victim report? In the other witness report(s)?
2. Does the offender take responsibility for his/her own actions regardless of the actions of the victim or witness(es)?
3. Does the offender take responsibility for any other reports of abuse in the relationship? In other relationships?
4. Is the offender willing to talk in treatment about his/her acts of abuse? Patterns of abuse?
5. Is the offender willing to write about his/her abusiveness?
6. Is the offender willing to receive input/feedback/confrontations from the therapist about the abuse? From the group?
7. Can the offender identify personal deficiencies/challenges/struggles that have played a role in his/her abusiveness?
8. Can the offender identify and describe personal tools/strategies/ interventions to be used to prevent future abusiveness?
9. Is the offender willing to commit to ceasing the abuse?

C. Measurement

Accountability can be measured by the following:

1. Offender verbal statement of accountability
2. Offender written statement of accountability

3. Offender written "as-if" letter of accountability to the victim. **This letter is intended to be a therapeutic exercise and shall not be shared with the victim.**

Accountability should be assessed continually**:**

1. At intake
2. Prior to any change in level of treatment
3. Following any change in risk of reoffense
4. Prior to discharge from treatment

II. Motivation for Treatment

A. Definition

Motivation or "readiness" for treatment refers to the degree to which an offender engages in the process of change. It includes considerations of how receptive the offender is to learning new information and receiving feedback about his/her behavior. Utilizing concepts from the Stages of Change model (Prochaska *et al*., 1994), the process of change occurs through several "stages" involving different thought processes, emotional responses, and behaviors. Though originally applied to substance abuse treatment, the Stages of Change model has since been applied to domestic violence treatment (Levesque *et al*, 2000; Eckhardt *et al*, 2004).

In domestic violence offender treatment the motivation for change refers to an individual's "contemplation" of problematic or abusive behaviors, his/her receptivity toward this self-reflection, and the acknowledgement of the benefits of changing behaviors. Thus, self-awareness will increase motivation to change. Conversely, the tendency to blame others for one's actions will decrease motivation for change, as others are seen as the "real" problem.

B. Assessment and Measurement

The following are considerations for assessing an offender's level of motivation:

1. What is the offender's attitude toward treatment? Is he/she compliant? Resistant? Open? Defensive? Dismissing?
2. How receptive is he/she to learning new information and receiving feedback about his/her behavior?
3. How willing is he/she to acknowledging and examining the effects of his/her behavior on others?
4. What is his/her level of personal insight?
5. Does he/she tend to externalize or blame others for his/her behavior?
6. Are there factors, such as a significant lack of empathy, which might interfere with a treatment alliance or engagement in the treatment process?

Consider the following for assessing motivation for change:

1. The Transtheoretical Model (TTM) and the Stages of Change (DiClemente *et al*., 1992).
2. URICA-DV developed by Levesque utilizes the Stages of Change with domestic violence offenders (Levesque *et al.*, 2000).

C. Treatment Considerations

1. Motivational Interviewing Model (Rollnick & Miller, 1995) has demonstrated utility with resistant clients.
2. The Transtheoretical Model (TTM) and the Stages of Change (DiClemente *et al*., 1992).

III. Amenability to Treatment

Please Note: This document is designed to be a resource guide for working with, assessing, and evaluating offenders. It is intended that approved providers will utilize their expertise along with this guide in working with offenders. Approved providers will make their own decisions regarding the degree of information that needs to be gathered for each offender and how to collect that information.

A. Definition

Amenability to domestic violence treatment refers to the offender's capacity to effectively participate, function, and understand treatment concepts. Significant cognitive (e.g., thinking) impairments can preclude an individual's ability to sufficiently pay attention during treatment sessions, learn new information, and/or self-reflect. Similarly, some cases of acute mental illness may interfere with participation due to the presence of impaired reality testing (e.g., delusions or hallucinations).

While some impairments may be the transient effects of medications or some other treatable physiological condition or disease process including mental illness, other conditions may be more longstanding or identified as permanent deficits. Examples of permanent deficits may include mental retardation, dementia, severe learning disabilities, or acquired brain dysfunction. The role of the approved provider is to assess whether the individual has the current capacity to effectively participate in, and benefit from treatment considering these deficits.

Additionally, the approved provider should identify what limitations exist and distinguish those that require accommodation and those that would indicate a lack of amenability. If the approved provider can accommodate, or refer to an approved provider who can accommodate limitations, the offender is expected to participate in treatment.

B. Assessment

1. Amenability to treatment can be assessed as part of the mental health assessment, though a more in-depth and specific evaluation may be warranted in some cases.
2. Various cognitive abilities should be assessed and accommodated (where appropriate) relative to the ability of the offender to effectively participate in treatment, including:
   a. Attention
   b. Memory (i.e., the ability to learn new information and/or to recall previously learned information)
   c. Language comprehension
   d. Reading comprehension
   e. Verbal reasoning and abstract thinking or the ability to understand similarities between events and to learn from past experience
   f. Executive functioning (e.g., planning, organizing, sequencing)
3. Cognitive impairment that should be assessed and accommodated (where appropriate) relative to effective offender participation includes, but is not limited to:
   a. Mental retardation (i.e., significantly sub-average intellectual functioning with concurrent deficits in present adaptive functioning)
   b. Dementia (i.e., a progressive decline in cognitive functioning)
   c. Acquired brain dysfunction (e.g., traumatic brain injury)
   d. Effects of medications and/or other physical conditions and treatments
4. Acute untreated or poorly managed mental health disorders may also interfere with an offender's capacity to participate in domestic violence treatment, particularly in a group setting. Approved providers need to assess whether these disorders can be accommodated in treatment. Some examples include, but are not limited to:
   a. Schizophrenia with prominent symptoms of hallucinations, delusions, or disorganization
   b. Bipolar disorder with acute mania
   c. Major depressive disorders with the significant suicidal ideation
   d. Social phobias that interfere with group treatment
   e. Post traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) with severe symptoms of dissociation and/or intrusive re-experiencing
   f. Significant psychopathy or antisocial personality features

C. Measurement

Cognitive screenings may be conducted as part of a mental health evaluation using well-known assessment instruments including but not limited to:

- The Mini Mental Status Examination (MMSE)
- The Galveston Orientation Assessment Test (GOAT)

The more detailed assessment of cognitive status often involves neuropsychological tests, IQ tests, and/or achievement tests, which evaluate specific clinical questions and abilities. Such evaluations are typically completed only by professionals with specialized training in the assessment of cognition; such as neuropsychologists, developmental or educational psychologists, and/or speech-language pathologists.

Mental disorders may be measured using the same instruments used during a mental health status assessment (e.g., Beck Depression Inventory, MMPI-2, MCMI-3), though psychopathy is commonly measured using the Hare Psychopathy Checklist (PCL-R) requiring specialized training.

D. Treatment Considerations
   1. Accommodations for illiterate, hearing, or visually impaired offenders
   2. Mental health and/or monitoring of medication management
   3. In cases where the approved provider determines that an offender is not amenable to treatment, according to these guidelines, then the approved provider shall refer the offender back to the court with an alternative recommendation for treatment. The approved provider shall provide verifiable documentation to support the findings.
   4. Though research varies on the effectiveness of treatment of psychopathy (Gacono, 2000; Skeem *et al*., 2003; Vien & Beech, 2006), a number of studies have identified various nonspecific treatments that are considered inappropriate with psychopathic offenders, and may even contribute to an increase in violent recidivism following treatment (Hare *et al*., 2000; Rice *et al*., 1992). Generally, many psychopathic offenders may be considered inappropriate for domestic violence interventions as they tend to be disruptive during the treatment process in the absence of very highly structured treatment settings, and may be more likely to learn more effective ways to manipulate, deceive, and use others rather than change their violent-prone behaviors.
   5. Regarding offenders with disabilities, Reference Standard 10.10 Offenders with Disabilities or Special Needs.

IV. Criminogenic Needs

A. Definition

Criminogenic needs is a term used to reference offender dynamic factors such as substance abuse (alcohol and other drugs), antisocial attitudes, personality traits, associates, employment, marital and family relationships, and other dynamic variables statistically shown to be correlated with criminal conduct and amenability to change (Andrews & Bonta, 1994). Criminogenic needs are aspects of an offender's situation that when changed are associated with changes in criminal behavior (Bonta, 2002). As dynamic risk factors, criminogenic needs may contribute towards criminal behavior (e.g., domestic

violence), and if effectively addressed, should decrease level of risk (Andrews, 1989, Andrews & Bonta, 1994; Bonta, 2002).

Non-criminogenic needs are factors that may change but are not empirically related to a reduction in recidivism. Some examples are weight problems, self esteem issues, or witnessing domestic violence as a child.

B. Assessment

There are assessment instruments that capture information about these dynamic factors. An example is the Level of Service Inventory (LSI) that is often utilized by probation. The Spousal Assault Risk Assessment (SARA) is another example of a validated reliable instrument that is designed to be used as a clinical guide.

Various areas may be assessed to identify an offender's criminogenic needs, including:

1. Substance abuse
2. Antisocial attitudes (e.g., minimization, denial, or blaming)
3. Low levels of satisfaction in marital and family relationships
4. Antisocial peer associations
5. Identification and association with antisocial role models
6. Poor self-control and self-management
7. Poor problem solving skills
8. Poor social skills
9. Unstable living environments
10. Financial problems
11. Unemployment
12. Social isolation
13. Mental health

C. Measurement

A variety of measures have been created to assess criminogenic needs. Some are broader (e.g., risk-needs classification instruments such as the LSI-R), while others are more specific (e.g., measures of substance abuse, anger and hostility, antisocial attitudes). Examples of more specific measures include:

1. Addiction Severity Index
2. Simple Screening Inventory (SSI)
3. Aggression Questionnaire
4. Criminal Sentiments Scale (CSS)

D. Treatment Considerations

1. Substance abuse assessment and treatment

2. Development of pro-social attitudes
3. Development of a pro-social support system
4. Monitoring of employment status in collaboration with probation
5. Mental health assessment and treatment

V. Risk Principle and Needs Principle

A. Definition

The risk principle is an endorsement of the premise that criminal behavior is predictable and that treatment services need to be matched to an offender's level of risk. Thus, offenders who present a high risk are those who are targeted for the greatest number of interventions. When offenders are properly screened and matched to appropriate levels of treatment, recidivism is reduced by an average of 25 to 50 percent (Carey, 1997).

The needs principle pertains to the importance of targeting criminogenic needs and providing treatment to reduce recidivism. Criminogenic needs/dynamics risk factors are rehabilitative targets for treatment (Andrews & Bonta, 1994).

B. Treatment Considerations

Under treatment of high risk offenders and over treatment of low risk offenders is not effective. Therefore, offender risk needs to be matched to the level of treatment interventions. Additionally, when criminogenic needs are addressed in treatment, there is a likelihood of reduction in recidivism.

VI. Responsivity Principle and Factors

A. Definition

Responsivity factors are those factors that may influence an individual's responsiveness to efforts that assist in changing his/her attitudes, thoughts, and behaviors. These factors may or may not be offender risk factors or criminogenic needs. These factors play an important role in choosing the type and style of treatment that would be most effective in bringing about change for offenders (Andrews & Bonta, 1994).

B. Assessment (Bonta, 2000*)*

Thinking style: It is beneficial to gather information regarding offenders' thinking styles. Consider the following questions in your assessment:

1. Are they more verbally skilled and quick to comprehend complex ideas or are they more concrete and straightforward in their thought processes?

2. Will they be more responsive to treatment that requires abstract reasoning skills, or will they be more responsive to more straightforward and direct treatment modalities?

Anxiety regarding treatment: Evaluate whether offenders are anxious about treatment. Consider the following questions:

1. Are they more likely to better respond initially to individualize versus group treatment?
2. Is there some type of acute mental disorder such as delusions or a thought disorder, which may need to be managed in order for offenders to respond to treatment?

Personality dynamics: Consider whether there are personality dynamics that might influence the offender's response to treatment.

1. For example, many individuals with antisocial personality features tend to be more responsive to treatment that is highly structured as opposed to a more process-oriented style. Given a chronic level of low stimulation, such individuals may need a treatment style that is more active and stimulating as opposed to open discussion and quiet readings.
2. For offenders with various personality clusters, consider how these features can be utilized in treatment to assist the offender in engaging in treatment. For example, can reinforcement of changes be emphasized with the narcissistic offender to focus on his/her successes in treatment? Can the dependent offender learn to depend more on strategies learned in treatment and depend less on the victim?

Learning style: Consider the offender's learning style:

1. Is the offender an auditory, visual, or kinesthetic (experiential) learner?
2. Would the offender benefit more from a role play exercise or a reading assignment?

Personal and demographic: Consider whether the offender will respond better to treatment when other personal and demographic factors are considered and addressed. This might include geography, gender, ethnicity, language, sexual orientation, age, and/or other cultural factors.

VII. Lethality Assessment

This section is for informational purposes and is not synonymous with the term risk assessment. Lethality assessment is a subset of risk assessment.

A. Definition

Lethality assessment is the identification of risk factors that may be linked to intimate partner homicide (Jurik & Winn, 1990). Although there are overlapping concerns, risk assessment, lethality assessment, and safety planning are not the same. Victims may or may not be aware of their level of risk. This information can be used to identify potential risk in an offender and for safety planning for

victims. Assessment of dangerousness or lethality risk of the offender is recommended by most experts (Ganley, 1989; Hart, 1988, Campbell, 2001). Research studies suggest that there are differences in the reasons why men and women kill their intimate partners. There is considerable support for the gender role and self-protection models.

These models suggest that "women's violence is often an outgrowth of the structural inequalities between men and women, and the resulting threat of men's violence against women (Dobash & Dobash, 2000). When women kill, it is often in response to physical threat from their male victims (Browne, 1987). Such defensive reactions may be especially common among individuals who lack resources and access to legal responses (Black, 1983; also Williams & Flewelling, 1987:423). Compared to men, women more frequently kill in situations in which their victim initiated the physical aggression."

"The most dramatic differences between homicides by men and women are found when examining the relationship history and situational dynamics leading up to the victim's death. Women typically kill intimates-especially male partners-with whom they have experienced a long history of violent conflict (Chimbos, 1978; Totman, 1978; Silver & Kates, 1979; Daniel & Harris, 1982).

B. Assessment and Measurement

The Danger Assessment Instrument created specifically for female victims (Campbell *et al.*, 2003) or Barbara Hart's assessment of whether batterers will kill (1990), in addition to other information from multiple sources should be reviewed.

C. Treatment Considerations

1. Safety planning and education regarding risk factors and lethality factors with victims
2. Ongoing risk assessment from multiple sources
3. Monitoring for indicators that offender is escalating/de-escalating, decompensating, or becoming more stable

VIII. Mental Health Assessment

Please Note: This document is designed to be a resource guide for working with, assessing, and evaluating offenders. It is intended that Approved Providers will utilize their expertise along with this guide. Approved providers will make their own decisions regarding the degree of information that needs to be gathered for each offender and how to collect that information.

A. Definition

In the context of domestic violence offender treatment, mental health "assessment" refers to the process of assessing an offender's current mental health status and identifying any factors that might directly impact level of risk for future violence or for re-offense. Some mental health conditions (e.g., social anxiety) may also indirectly increase level of risk by interfering with effective involvement in interventions.

Whereas a mental health assessment tends to cover a fairly broad domain, a mental health "evaluation" refers to a more formal procedure, normally requested by the court or other referral source. This evaluation normally targets a specific clinical question or issue (e.g., capacity to participate in treatment). A mental health evaluation may incorporate various sources of information, including psychological testing, into a written report that details significant findings.

B. Assessment

Consideration should be given to whether or not there are contributing factors to the offender's mental health history or to his/her current status that may increase level of risk. Various aspects of an offender's mental health history or current status that should be assessed include, but are not limited to the following:

1. Psychotic disorders (e.g., schizophrenia, schizoaffective disorder, delusional disorder)
2. Mood disorders (e.g., bipolar disorder, major depression)
3. Anxiety disorders (e.g., post-traumatic stress disorder, panic disorder, obsessive compulsive disorder)
4. Personality disorders with anger, impulsivity, and poor behavioral controls (e.g., DSM –IV-R Cluster B personality disorders, or psychopathic/antisocial, borderline, narcissistic, or histrionic personality features).

   *Personality disorders have also been identified as a risk factor for spousal assault (*Magdol*, et al.,* 1997*). Further, personality disorders have been associated with increased risk for criminal behavior, including violence and violent recidivism (*Hare*,* 1991*;* Harris *et al.,* 1993*;* Sonkin*,* 1987*), and recidivistic spousal assault (*Bodnarchuk, *et al.,*1995*;* Gondolf*,* 1998*).*
5. Past neurological trauma and/or current neurological symptoms

When mental health factors are identified in the assessment, a variety of issues should be considered:

1. What is the severity of the mental health condition?
2. Are symptoms current or historical?
3. Have symptoms ever resulted in psychiatric hospitalization?

4. Has an aspect of the mental health disorder (i.e., a delusion or hallucination) motivated or triggered past violence toward others?
5. Has an aspect of the mental disorder (i.e., a delusion or hallucination) motivated or triggered past suicide attempts or threats?
6. To what extent do symptoms disrupt or interfere with aspects of the offender's everyday life? (e.g., work, relationships)
7. Is there a concurrent substance abuse disorder that contributes toward an increase or worsening of symptoms?
8. Is the offender actively compliant with medication management?

> *The empirical literature suggests a positive correlation between psychosis and past violence (Swanson, Holzer, Ganju, & Jono, 1990; Monahan, 1992), and that treated psychosis is associated with a decreased risk for violent recidivism (Rice, Harris, & Cormier, 1992). Psychotic and/or manic symptoms are associated with an increased short-term risk for violence (Binder & McNeil, 1988; Link & Stueve, 1994), and that these symptoms may be associated specifically with spousal assault (Magdol, et al., 1997). Additionally, certain anxiety disorders may interfere with effective participation in treatment (Reference Section III.)*

Most, if not all DSM-IV-R Axis I disorders can now be effectively treated with medication, psychotherapy, or both. Therefore, treatment becomes a significant mediating factor in the degree to which the disorder contributes toward ongoing risk of future violence or re-offense. Intervention is likely to be effective, though in some cases long-term treatment is the only effective intervention. Assessment questions related to mental health treatment may include the following:

1. Is the offender currently in treatment? (e.g., medications, psychotherapy)
2. How long has the offender been in treatment?
3. Is the offender compliant with treatment?
4. Has treatment been effective or helpful?
5. Has the offender been involved in any violent or abusive behavior while in treatment?
6. Are offender symptoms currently being managed?

C. Measurement

All approved providers should perform an initial screening or preliminary assessment. When further assessment is needed, the approved provider will perform this if he/she has the appropriate qualifications, or he/she will refer the offender to an approved provider who is qualified.

> *A variety of psychometric instruments or tests may be useful in assessing an offender's mental health status. Some advanced*

and lengthy instruments, such as the MMPI-2, are restricted in their use based upon clinical training qualifications or specific coursework involving a given instrument. Other brief instruments, such as the Beck Depression Inventory, have less specialized training requirements. Such instruments are typically used to supplement or augment collateral information, such as the clinical interview.

A few possible instruments that may be used to assess mental health status include, but are not limited to the following:

1. Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI-2)
2. Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory (MCMI-3)
3. Personality Assessment Inventory(PAI-2)
4. Mini Mental Status Exam (MMSE)
5. Beck Depression Inventory (BDI-2)
6. Beck Anxiety Inventory (BAI)

D. Other Considerations:

1. Personality Clusters

Research studies (Hamburger & Hastings, 1986) have indicated that domestic violence offenders tend to possess several types of personality clusters when tested utilizing the MCMI-3. The main clusters exhibited by domestic violence offenders include the following:
a) Dependent, which constitutes about 35 percent of the offender population
b) Narcissistic, which constitutes about 50 percent of the offender population
c) Antisocial, which involves a multitude of various associated personality elevations and constitutes about 15 percent of the offender population

Research (Gondolf, 2001) *has suggested that personality disorders are not correlated with risk of reoffense. However, clinical expertise sometimes reveals that offenders with certain personality elevations respond better to treatment when the clinical interventions are presented in a manner consistent with their specific personality.*

2. A history of significant central nervous system trauma (e.g., traumatic brain injury, seizures or epilepsy, brain disease) has been identified as other factors that can contribute toward impulsive violence or aggressive behavior (Meloy, 2000). More specifically, frontal and/or temporal lobe dysfunction has been shown to be associated with various types of violent offending (Raine & Buchsbaum, 1996).

IX. Principles for Differentiating Treatment

A. Theories and Examples

There are a variety of constructs described below that can be used for differentiating offender treatment. The following principles may be applied to more broadly differentiated groups of offenders (e.g., offenders differentiated by language, male or female GLBT offenders, or male or female heterosexual offenders).

1. The first principle for differentiating treatment, repeatedly found to be valid in criminal justice interventions, is that higher and lower risk offenders should not be treated together (Lowencamp & Latessa, 2004).
   a. "Lower risk offenders" can be more reliably identified with the use of researched risk assessment procedures (e.g., SARA) than by clinical judgment alone.
   b. Efforts should be made to accentuate the natural strengths of lower risk offender groups. This includes avoiding overly intensive and costly intervention, avoiding exposure to more anti-social or violent associates, and/or utilizing overly remedial programming. It is also important to promote and to strengthen natural pro-social networks.
2. A second principle for differentiating treatment is that anti-social offenders need different programming from moderate and higher risk offenders.
   a. Anti-social offenders should be treated in a separate group because they will contaminate other more pro-social members by interfering with the group process.
   b. Anti-social offenders need a different treatment approach that focuses on their self-interest. Treatment should be more didactic and less process-oriented than other groups. Treatment should continue to be strongly oriented towards a containment model and strive to disrupt anti-social support networks. Treatment should not include victim empathy content that may be used against victims by these offenders.
3. A third principle for differentiating treatment for other moderate and higher risk offenders involves the differentiation of offender treatment based on criminogenic needs. Offenders with severe substance abuse problems, problematic personality traits, entrenched power and control issues, mental health disorders, etc., could be placed in different programming based on the resources and/or numbers of offenders in any given district. Examples include the following:
   a. A domestic violence/substance abuse program for offenders with prominent substance abuse involvement and resulting lifestyle instability.
   b. An "enhanced domestic violence treatment program", which is a group for moderate and higher risk offenders who are not highly anti-social.
   c. A review of offender criminogenic needs will guide decision making regarding ancillary or adjunctive treatment recommendations. For

example, an offender with bipolar disorder may need to be medically stabilized prior to participating in domestic violence treatment. An unemployed offender may need vocational assistance in addition to domestic violence treatment.

4. While offender responsivity issues should be considered in regard to making decisions about treatment for all offenders, when possible, responsivity can also guide differentiation in treatment programs (Reference Section VI). Examples include the following:
   a. A cognitive/behavioral approach utilized regardless of other responsivity factors.
   b. Staff expertise, strengths, and/or approach matched with client needs. For example, anxious clients do poorly with highly confrontational therapists; less experienced therapists may be more easily manipulated by anti-social offenders.
   c. Accommodation for intellectual levels/learning styles

X. Multi-disciplinary Treatment Team (MTT)

A. Definition, Purpose, Function,

The Multi-disciplinary Treatment Team (MTT) includes, at a minimum, three members: the supervising criminal justice agency (e.g., probation officer, the court), the approved provider, and the treatment victim advocate. The treatment victim advocate working with the approved provider is a critical member of the MTT. Whether or not the victim has been contacted, the victim advocate still has expertise and perspectives that are valuable to the MTT related to offender treatment planning and management. Other professionals relevant to a particular case may also be a part of the MTT.

The MTT's purpose is to review and consult on offender cases as a team. Each member's expertise and knowledge contributes something of value to the case coordination.

Where and when the MTT meets, and how the MTT functions are at the discretion of the MTT. This is purposefully designed to be flexible so that each community can determine how to best review cases.

Overview of the Multi-disciplinary Treatment Team (MTT)

1. MTT Membership: The MTT consists of approved provider, responsible criminal justice agency and treatment agency victim advocate at a minimum. Other professionals relevant to a particular case may also be a part of the MTT.

2. MTT Purpose: The MTT is designed to collaborate and coordinate offender treatment. Therefore the work of the MTT needs to include staffing cases, sharing information, and making informed decisions related

to risk assessment, treatment, behavioral monitoring, and management of offenders. The MTT by design may prevent offender triangulation and promote containment.

3. MTT Consensus: Consensus is defined as the agreement of the majority of the team members. The MTT shall have consensus as its goal in managing offenders. The MTT shall attempt to reach consensus for the following phases of treatment, at a minimum: initial placement in treatment, when treatment planning indicates a change in level of offender treatment and discharge. The supervising agent for the court will have the ability to overrule the decision of the team.

4. Potential conflict within the MTT: MTT members have the goal of settling conflicts and differences of opinion among themselves, which assists in presenting a unified response. The MTT may also request a meeting with a probation supervisor to review recommendations. In cases where consensus cannot be reached, the other team members may choose to justify in writing, utilizing offender competencies and risk markers, the reason for their recommendations for treatment.