



Best Practices for Reinforcements and Responses to Noncompliance

Prepared by Carey Group for the Pennsylvania Partnership for Criminal Justice Improvement

June 2024

Project Funding

This project was paid for by federal funds from the Bureau of Justice Assistance, through subgrant number 2021-SP-01 36758 from the PA Commission on Crime and Delinquency.

Table of Contents

- Foreword** 1
- Acknowledgments** 2
- Introduction** 3
- Behavior Management** 3
 - Reinforcing Prosocial Behavior..... 4
 - Addressing Noncompliance..... 6
- Implementation** 8
 - Structured Decision-Making Tools..... 8
- Next Steps** 10
- Appendix A: Examples of Prosocial Behavior**..... 11
- Appendix B: Reinforcements in Pennsylvania** 13
- Appendix C: Examples of Noncompliance** 15
- Appendix D: Responses to Noncompliance in Pennsylvania** 17
- References**..... 19



Foreword

The Pennsylvania Partnership for Criminal Justice Improvement (PPCJI) is pleased to present *Best Practices for Reinforcements and Responses to Noncompliance*. This monograph is designed to assist adult probation and parole departments in Pennsylvania with the implementation of evidence-based practices (EBP). It is the result of collaborative work that began in 2016 between the County Chief Adult Probation and Parole Officers Association of Pennsylvania (CCAPPOAP) and the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency (PCCD). From these groups emerged the Statewide EBP Leadership Team, which was renamed PPCJI. PPCJI continued the work, with a goal of helping each county implement EBP while taking into account its readiness, capabilities, and available resources. Five workgroups focus on implementation, effective interventions, training, communications, and data and quality assurance.

This monograph explores the concepts of reinforcing prosocial behavior and addressing noncompliant behavior and attitudes. Our field has traditionally focused on addressing noncompliance; however, research shows that it is the combination of reinforcements and responses to noncompliance, applied in a ratio of at least 4:1, that is most effective in influencing long-term behavior change. Keeping this information front and center, this monograph will help counties begin to move down a new behavior management path.

We want to express our appreciation to the Implementation Workgroup for their contributions to this document. Additionally, we extend our thanks to our EBP leadership partners for their ongoing commitment to supporting these transformative efforts: CCAPPOAP, PCCD, the Department of Corrections, the Administrative Office of Pennsylvania Courts, the Commission on Sentencing, the County Commissioners Association of Pennsylvania, the Pennsylvania Pretrial Services Association, and the Pennsylvania Office of Victim Advocate. We hope that you will find this monograph informative and valuable.



Douglas J. Wilburne, President, CCAPPOAP



Christopher Pawlowski, Vice President, CCAPPOAP



Acknowledgments

CCAPPOAP wishes to express their deepest appreciation to the professionals who provided the leadership for the creation of this monograph:

- Douglas Ritson (Co-chair), Chief, Butler County Probation
- Ashlee Lynn (Co-chair), Deputy Director, Allegheny County Adult Probation
- Alex DeFord, Supervisor, Lancaster County Adult Probation
- Renawn Harris, Supervisor, Allegheny County Adult Probation
- Pennie Hockenberry, Director of Policy, Office of Victim Advocate
- Amanda Jackson, Deputy Chief, Butler County Probation
- Chadwick Libby, Director, Dauphin County Probation
- Jeanette Palmer-Briscoe, Chief, Philadelphia County Adult Probation
- Sarah St. Jacques, Probation Officer, Allegheny County Adult Probation
- Nicole Warren, Supervisor, Cumberland County Adult Probation

Consulting Team

Carey Group, a national justice consulting firm, assisted in the research, development, and writing of this manual. Their expertise has supported CCAPPOAP's EBP implementation efforts.

- Susan Burke, Executive Director
- Rick Parsons, Deputy Director
- Hope Cooper, Subject Matter Expert



Introduction

Corrections professionals play two main roles: an **accountability role** and a **behavior-change role**. In their accountability role, they hold people responsible for following their conditions of supervision, including drug screens, no-contact orders, curfews, treatment programs, or others. These conditions aim to provide clear guidelines and expectations for the successful completion of supervision, help prevent people from engaging in further illegal activity, encourage prosocial activities and behavior change, and engage people in restoring their victim(s) or community.¹

In their behavior-change role, corrections professionals help people reshape harmful attitudes and behaviors which have been learned and reinforced over the course of their life. The change process is an iterative one that takes time and consistent effort.

Research shows that following the risk-need-responsivity (RNR) model² is an effective way to facilitate behavior change:

- The **risk principle** tells us to match the intensity of supervision and intervention to a person's likelihood of recidivism based on an actuarial assessment.
- The **need principle** tells us to focus interventions on a person's criminogenic needs, as determined by the assessment.
- The **responsivity principle** tells us to match programming and program delivery to people's unique characteristics, and it highlights the effectiveness of cognitive behavioral interventions.

Key to corrections professionals' accountability and behavior-change roles is effective behavior management: reinforcing positive behavior and responding to noncompliance.

Behavior Management

Behavior management is used in various fields, such as psychology, education, medicine, and organizational management. It is informed by the theory of operant conditioning, which suggests that if consequences are reinforcing, behavior is more likely to be repeated, and if consequences are negative, behavior is less likely to be repeated.³

Justice system policies and practices have historically focused on responding to negative behavior, including new justice system involvement (e.g., a new arrest) and technical violations (e.g., breaking a curfew or skipping assigned treatment programs); however, research demonstrates that reinforcing law-abiding and prosocial behavior is more effective in motivating change.⁴ Studies show that long-term behavior change is most likely to occur when positive reinforcement outnumbers negative responses by at least four to one.⁵

4 : 1

Reinforcements for every Response to Noncompliance

This monograph provides information on and examples of effective behavior management techniques. It also serves as a starting point for developing matrixes to ensure consistent and fair responses to behavior.



THE IMPACT OF VIOLATIONS

Forty-five percent of prison admissions across the country are due to violations of probation and parole conditions.⁶ In 2021, 27% of adults on parole were returned to incarceration, as were 15% of adults on probation.⁷ The majority of these revocations were for violations of supervision conditions as opposed to the commission of crimes.⁸

Because of their frequency among probation and parole populations, violations are a significant burden on the justice system, increasing jail and prison populations and compounding negative outcomes for people who are system-involved. For probation and parole agencies, violations create a web of administrative and logistical challenges, and can contribute to frustration and burnout among officers, in addition to those on supervision.⁹ While commitment to a correctional facility is a common response to violations, years of rigorous research tell us that, in the long term, it does not decrease criminological risk, encourage behavior change, or increase community well-being and safety.¹⁰

Reinforcing Prosocial Behavior

Most people appreciate reinforcement when they work on something that is challenging for them. It affirms their accomplishments and encourages them to keep moving forward. For this reason, it is important for corrections professionals to recognize and reinforce people's prosocial behavior: their positive attitudes, motivation, and behavior; achievement of tasks and goals; improved life and coping skills; sobriety; and general compliance. (See appendix A for a list of prosocial behaviors in these areas).

There are two main ways to reinforce positive behavior: **provide something pleasant** or **remove something unpleasant**. Providing something pleasant might involve offering verbal or written recognition (e.g., words of affirmation and praise, letter of commendation from a judge), tangible reinforcements (e.g., tokens), or justice system modifications (e.g., reduced fees, early discharge). Removing something unpleasant might involve reducing the frequency of drug testing and/or reporting, or reducing or eliminating a curfew. (See appendix B for examples of reinforcements that are used in Pennsylvania.)

Characteristics of Effective Reinforcement

To be effective, reinforcements should be genuine, swift, customized, specific, meaningful, and stacked:

- **Genuine:** The person must know that you truly appreciate what you are affirming and that you are not simply offering a reinforcement out of obligation.
- **Swift:** Apply the reinforcement soon after the behavior. As an example, reinforcing someone for getting a job three months after they are hired is not very impactful; it is "old news."
- **Customized:** Customize the reinforcement to the individual.¹¹ For example, providing movie tickets to someone who is not interested in movies would not be impactful.
- **Specific:** Vague or general affirmations are not as effective as those that are specific. For example, saying, "You have been working hard and making significant progress controlling your anger and walking away from your coworker when he upsets you" is more specific and effective than simply saying "Good job."



- **Meaningful:** A reinforcement is meaningful when it comes from someone the person respects and involves a behavior a person has been consciously trying to change. For example, telling someone that you are proud of them for coming to every appointment on time is not meaningful if the person is naturally punctual. On the other hand, if a person has been making an effort to arrive on time, telling them that you are proud of them for their punctuality will be meaningful.
- **Stacked:** Reinforcements should be offered regularly at the outset, and, as the behavior becomes more ingrained, tapered off and offered for more significant accomplishments.¹² If you continue to reinforce people for everything they do, they are going to act in prosocial ways only to be reinforced and not because it is the right thing to do. Also, reinforcements can lose their impact over time.

The most effective behavior reinforcement is intrinsic: a feeling of satisfaction and pride from doing something positive. To build intrinsic reinforcement, corrections professionals can help people articulate how engaging in positive behavior has resulted in positive outcomes for them and helped them get closer to their goals.

Scenario

John, who has been on probation for two years of his three-year supervision term for a drug-related charge, is assessed as being at moderate risk of recidivism. In the past, he struggled to maintain gainful employment, which led to him selling drugs. John has complied with his conditions and has completed cognitive behavioral programming. One day, another person on probation told John's probation officer that John had just been promoted at the job where he has been working for six months, the longest period of employment he has had in a long time.

Response

The probation officer calls John that day and leaves a message congratulating him on the promotion. At their office visit, three days after learning of the promotion, the PO again congratulates John for his consistent, hard work, which led to the promotion. The PO tells John how proud he is of John for sticking with a job that he was not certain of when he was hired, especially since John was used to turning to ways to earn "fast money" so that he could pay his bills. The probation officer presents John with a cellphone card, which allows John to direct some of the money he would have used to pay his cellphone bill toward other bills.

Reinforcements Checklist

The following checklist summarizes key points for effectively applying reinforcements:

- ✓ Link reinforcements to goals and action steps that help people address their criminogenic needs.
- ✓ Make sure behaviors that will be reinforced are attainable for the person.
- ✓ Make reinforcements meaningful by individualizing them.
- ✓ Ensure that the reinforcements you are offering are available within the agency.
- ✓ Reinforce the behavior immediately or as soon as possible after it is known.
- ✓ Ensure people understand the connection between the reinforcement and their actions.
- ✓ Make sure reinforcements are proportional to behaviors.
- ✓ Be genuine, showing that you mean what you say and that you appreciate the behavior that you are trying to affirm.



- ✓ Reinforce new and desired behaviors frequently in the early stages and then taper off and replace with less frequent reinforcement.
- ✓ Recognize incremental progress, particularly when behaviors are more difficult, and take into consideration the person's risk level and stage of change.
- ✓ Use a structured method to identify and reinforce positive behavior.
- ✓ Provide more positive reinforcements than responses to noncompliance (at least 4:1).
- ✓ Help the person articulate the intrinsic value/benefit of continuing the positive behavior.

Addressing Noncompliance

For corrections professionals, a person's noncompliance with their conditions of supervision and with the legal system (such as the noncompliant behaviors listed in appendix C), can be frustrating and even seem like a personal affront. However, noncompliance often stems from the same criminogenic needs that brought the person into the justice system. As such, it can be considered an opportunity to understand and address the underlying behavior. Viewing noncompliance in this way allows for a balanced and impactful response. It can also increase rapport with the person under supervision and positively impact their motivation to change.¹³

ADDITIONAL REASONS FOR NONCOMPLIANCE

Noncompliant behavior can result from various factors that are not related to a person's criminogenic needs, including:

- a lack of clear communication and understanding of one's conditions of supervision
- challenges in meeting conditions that are beyond one's control (e.g., lack of stable housing, unaffordable fines and fees, etc.)
- personal issues (e.g., untreated mental illness, substance use disorder)
- an unrealistic number of conditions and required programs.

In these circumstances, it is important to address the barriers that people are experiencing. It is also important to recognize the difference between noncompliant behavior and nonresponsive behavior. While noncompliance refers to not adhering to the conditions of supervision or the legal system and is addressed with accountability and behavior-change responses, nonresponsivity refers to a poor response to an intervention and may be best addressed by changing the content or structure of that intervention (e.g., more frequent judicial status hearings in drug court¹⁴).

Responses to Noncompliance

There are two types of responses to noncompliance: **accountability responses**, which reinforce the rules and hold people responsible for their behavior; and **behavior-change responses**, which address the underlying behavior. Accountability responses alone are not empirically associated with long-term change, so it is crucial to also use behavior-change responses, which *are* associated with change over the long term.¹⁵ (See appendix D for examples of noncompliance responses that are used in Pennsylvania.)



Scenario

Erin, who is currently on probation for theft, has been diligent in reporting to her probation officer. During a recent visit, it came to light that she had visited a boyfriend despite a no-contact order from the court. The probation officer previously recommended that the court impose a no-contact condition due to Erin being assessed as being at high need in the area of family and social support and because of past difficulties in her relationship. Erin has been actively participating in her cognitive behavioral group and has been fully compliant with all other conditions of his supervision. This incident marks her first violation of the no-contact condition.

Response

Erin's probation officer would address this first violation with an accountability response—for example, a verbal reprimand—and a behavior-change response—for example, having her complete a decisional balance matrix or a pros and cons list exploring her choices.

Other scenarios may need a firmer accountability response given other factors such as prior violations, severity of the violation, and the risk of the person under supervision. While incarceration is sometimes an unavoidable result of noncompliance, as in the case of a new arrest or violent behavior, extensive research has proven that, in the long term, it does not necessarily decrease risk and may actually increase harmful thinking and recidivism.¹⁶

Characteristics of Effective Responses to Noncompliance

Effective responses to noncompliance share many of the same characteristics as effective reinforcements: they should be swift, certain, fair, proportionate, and customized:

- **Swift:** Respond to noncompliance as quickly as possible. Swift responses cognitively link the noncompliance to a consequence.
- **Certain:** Respond to every noncompliant behavior so people know that we are paying attention and that rules matter. Also, the certainty that noncompliance has a consequence encourages deterrence.
- **Fair:** Responses to negative actions should be clear ahead of time and applied equitably. When responses are understood, logical, and impartial, and when similar decisions are made under similar circumstances by different people, it increases the perception of fairness and, thus, the likelihood of compliance and behavior change. It also decreases the opportunity for pushback.
- **Proportionate:** The level of noncompliance should inform the level of consequence. Responses that are proportional to the behavior support fairness and consistency, and effectively use time and resources.
- **Customized:** Responses should be tailored to the person and be meaningful to them.

Like with reinforcement, the most effective response to noncompliance is intrinsic: an understanding of how one's actions can cause harm to oneself. To help people articulate intrinsic harms, corrections professionals can help them see how their harmful behavior is affecting their ability to achieve their goals.



Responses to Noncompliance Checklist

The following checklist summarizes key points for effectively responding to noncompliant behavior:

- ✓ Make the expected behaviors clear.
- ✓ Let the person know up front that there are consequences for noncompliance.
- ✓ Respond to the behavior immediately or as soon as possible after it is known.
- ✓ Use both accountability and behavior-change responses.
- ✓ Don't threaten consequences that are not enforceable.
- ✓ Demonstrate disapproval of the behavior, not of the person.
- ✓ Use a structured method to identify and respond to noncompliance.
- ✓ Respond at the lowest possible level.
- ✓ Anticipate possible challenges and intervene in appropriate ways to make success more likely.
- ✓ Help the person articulate how their harmful behavior could affect their ability to achieve their goals.
- ✓ Demonstrate understanding that relapse is a normal part of the change process without offering it as an excuse.
- ✓ Be realistic about how much change a person can make in a certain amount of time.

Implementation

Successfully implementing effective responses to prosocial and noncompliant behavior requires a clear plan that accounts for the characteristics of the particular agency, community, and population in mind. Engaging community partners and stakeholders early in the process, maintaining realistic goals and plans (given available funding and resources, staff turnover, population needs, etc.), effectively communicating changes to staff and participants, sustaining fidelity to the model of change, and evaluating the changes on an ongoing basis are critical to achieving desired results. Considering that implementation takes approximately two to four years, ensuring there is leadership support, commitment, and the capacity to implement the change is vital.¹⁷

Applying research to practice is not a simple task. Even if implementation is successful, sustaining fidelity is challenging. One tool that assists in consistently applying the research around effective responses to prosocial and noncompliant behavior is a structured decision-making tool.

Structured Decision-Making Tools

Agencies across the country have developed a wide variety of structured decision-making tools for effectively responding to prosocial and noncompliant behavior. Examples range from very simple flow charts to more elaborate and detailed matrices to electronic decision-making instruments. These tools help ensure consistent responses both by an individual officer and across officers.



To develop a matrix for reinforcing prosocial behavior, a wide cross-section of agency staff and stakeholders would identify examples of prosocial behaviors and responses (such as those in appendixes A and B). The matrix would then show levels of responses that reflect the relationship between the person’s risk of recidivism as identified by an actuarial assessment and the level of the positive behavior (see figure 2). What is considered “positive” may differ from person to person but, generally speaking, involves factors such as the relationship between the prosocial behavior and the person’s assessed criminogenic needs and the frequency, effort, meaningfulness, mastery, or permanency of the behavior (see figure 1). The higher a person’s risk level and the more positive the behavior, the stronger the response.

Figure 1

		RISK LEVEL		
		LOW	MODERATE	HIGH
Positivity of Behavior	Low	Low Response	Low Response	Moderate Response
	Moderate	Low Response	Moderate Response	Moderate Response
	High	Moderate Response	Moderate Response	High Response

Developing a matrix for responding to noncompliance would be similar. A wide cross-section of agency staff and stakeholders would identify examples of noncompliant behaviors and responses (such as those in appendixes C and D). The matrix would then show levels of responses that reflect the relationship between the person’s risk of recidivism as identified by an actuarial assessment and the severity of the noncompliance (see figure 2). The higher a person’s risk level and the more severe the noncompliance, the stronger the response.

Figure 2

		RISK LEVEL		
		LOW	MODERATE	HIGH
Violation Severity	Low	Low Response	Low Response	Moderate Response
	Moderate	Low Response	Moderate Response	Moderate Response
	High	Moderate Response	Moderate Response	High Response

Structured decision-making tools can be more complicated than those described, taking into consideration additional factors. For example, matrixes showing responses to noncompliance might include the severity of the noncompliance, the person’s risk level, the connection between the noncompliance and the illegal act for which the person is on supervision, and the level of decision-making. So, for example, if a person at *low risk of recidivism* has a *moderate-level violation that is or is not connected to the illegal act*, the *probation officer* would decide on the response; if a person at *high risk of recidivism* has a *moderate-level violation that is not connected to the illegal act*, the *supervisor* would decide on the response; and if a person at *high risk of recidivism* has a *moderate-level violation that is connected to the illegal act*, the *court* would decide on the response.



Every tool must allow for discretion and departures from the presumptive response level given stabilizing or destabilizing factors. For example, with noncompliant behaviors, stabilizing factors might lead to a downward departure, or a lower response level, while destabilizing factors might lead to an upward departure, or a higher response level. While adherence to the tool is the default, individual circumstances may warrant further consideration or deviation from the structured response. These deviations should be the exception, not the rule, and are usually subject to a supervisor's approval.

Scenario

Molly has a second violation of curfew; however, she has shared that she was returning home from her treatment group and was a witness to a car accident. She was delayed at the scene for her statement, which is the reason for her violation.

Response

Suppose that a first curfew violation is a low-severity violation, a second curfew violation is a moderate-severity violation, and a third curfew violation is a high-severity violation. Molly's probation officer might consider the mitigating factor and ask the supervisor to approve a downward departure from the presumptive response level (i.e., so that the level of severity of the response would be as if it were a first violation of curfew).

Once the structured decision-making tool is developed, it should be piloted. This will provide valuable insights and allow the agency to address implementation challenges quickly. Implementing in a smaller, focused area also allows for early adopters to assist in supporting the implementation plan.

Next Steps

Traditionally, the field of corrections has focused on punishing, or sanctioning, harmful behavior. Yet, research has shown that punishment does little in terms of achieving long-term, positive behavior change. In fact, it can lead to increased harmful behavior.

Instead, it is the combination of reinforcements and responses to noncompliance that is most effective, with reinforcements outnumbering responses to noncompliance at a rate of at least 4:1. This combination, in addition to adhering to the RNR principles, holds the greatest promise of reducing individual risk, creating long-term behavior change, and protecting community well-being and safety.



Appendix A: Examples of Prosocial Behavior

The following are examples of prosocial behavior in five categories: attitude/motivation, achievement of task/goal, life/coping skills, sobriety, and general compliance. Agencies are encouraged to develop their own list to reflect their needs and the population they serve.

Attitude/Motivation

- Accepted responsibility
- Appropriate prosocial mentoring of another
- Demonstrated honesty
- Enrolled in program/activity
- Motivation shifted from precontemplation to contemplation
- Motivation shifted from contemplation to action
- Positive attitude during contact
- Positive receptivity to case planning process
- Positive report from third party
- Respected others' opinions
- Used change talk
- Used positive language

Achievement of Task/Goal

- Completed case plan objective/action step
- Completed case plan goal
- Completed program
- Earned job readiness certificate
- Remained on task
- Routinely attended and participated in treatment/programming
- Routinely completed take-home assignments

Life/Coping Skills

- Accepted feedback
- Applied a skill learned in programming to an everyday situation
- Attended and participated in programming/treatment
- Education: Registered for school
- Education: Routine attendance at school for [X] days
- Education: Obtained high school diploma/GED
- Employment: Demonstrated search for employment
- Employment: Obtained employment
- Employment: Maintained stable employment for [X] days
- Family/significant other: Positive engagement with family/significant other
- Family/significant other: Routine socialization with family/significant other for [X] days
- Improved communication skills
- Improved physical health/hygiene
- Improved social skills
- Medication compliance
- Obtained stable prosocial housing
- Positive problem solving/coping skills
- Prosocial relationships: Established new prosocial relationships
- Prosocial relationships: Routine socialization with prosocial associates for [X] days
- Resisted or purposefully avoided a high-risk situation or negative peer influence
- Secured transportation plan to meet responsibilities
- Took first steps toward associating with prosocial others
- Volunteered for nonmandated community service



Sobriety

- Clean alcohol test
- Clean alcohol test for [X] days
- Clean drug test
- Clean drug test for [X] days

General Compliance

- Complied with expectations for [X] days
- No violations for [X] days
- Continued reporting after violation
- Followed directions first time given for [X] days
- Kept appointments as scheduled
- Restitution/fines/financial obligations paid in full, or full effort made, given financial ability



Appendix B: Reinforcements in Pennsylvania

The following are examples of reinforcements that are currently being used by county probation and parole departments in Pennsylvania. They are organized by type of reinforcement and level.

Verbal/Written

Low-Level Responses

- Card or note with a message
- Praise
- Words of affirmation

Moderate-Level Responses

- Behavior praised to third party
- Certificates
- Handshake from officer/supervisor
- Recognition from chief/supervisor
- Speak to family/employer on person's behalf

High-Level Responses

- Achievements highlighted in quarterly department newsletter
- Court recognition
- Letter from judge
- Lifestyle commitment award (or similar award)
- Officer attending graduation from agency program or similar event

Tangible

Low-Level Responses

- Bottles of water
- Cell phone grips
- Coffee mugs
- Fidget toys
- ID holders that stick to the back of a cell phone
- Pens
- Reusable water bottles
- Stress balls/toys
- Tokens

Moderate-Level Responses

- Bus pass/ride-sharing gift cards
- Candy
- Cell phones/cards
- Challenge coins
- First aid kits
- Fishbowl
- Gift cards
- Movie tickets
- Pool passes
- Silicon wrist bands with positive affirmations
- Snacks
- Toiletry items
- T-shirts/hats and other apparel



High-Level Responses

- Bicycles (for clients without driver's license)
- Graduation ceremony
- Selection of gift from donated items
- Recognition award that the person can keep for a period of time before passing on to someone else
- Tickets to obtain something

Justice System Modifications

Low-Level Responses

- Allow attendance at event
- Allow missing a treatment session
- Allow rescheduling appointment
- Credit toward community service hours
- Increased virtual appointments

Moderate-Level Responses

- Reduced drug screens
- Reduced fees/financial requirements
- Reduced reporting
- Web/phone reporting

High-Level Responses

- Allow travel
- Early discharge/termination
- Nonreporting
- Waiver of certain court conditions



Appendix C: Examples of Noncompliance

The following are examples of noncompliant behaviors by level of severity. Agencies are encouraged to develop their own list to reflect their needs, their priorities, and the population they serve.

Low Severity

- Curfew violation
- Employment change without permission
- Entering prohibited establishment
- Failure to complete assessment as directed
- Failure to comply with special conditions established by the court
- Failure to comply with special conditions established by the agency
- Failure to maintain employment
- Failure to notify of law enforcement contact
- Failure to pay fees, court costs, restitution, child support
- Failure to take medications as prescribed
- Incomplete assignments
- Late to appointment
- Missed appointment
- Lying to staff/other professional
- Municipal violation
- Possession of drug paraphernalia
- Residence change without notice/approval
- Traffic citation
- Travel violation
- Unauthorized association with person convicted of felony
- Use of alcohol
- Use of any controlled, nonprescription, or mood-altering substances

Moderate Severity

- Absconding during supervision
- Curfew violations (multiple)
- Failure to follow court orders (for people convicted of domestic violence)
- Failure to make intimate partner disclosure (for people convicted of domestic violence)
- Failure to notify PO of relationships (for people convicted of a sex offense or domestic violence)
- New misdemeanor charge
- New misdemeanor conviction
- Possession of a pocketknife/non-weapon
- Possession of prohibited items related to sex offense
- Possession or use of pornography (for people convicted of a sex offense)
- Refusing a search of person
- Refusing a search of property or residence
- Refusing drug/alcohol testing
- Refusing to participate in programs/classes or treatment Refusing to take required mental health medication
- Tampering of monitoring equipment
- Tampering with or falsifying a urine sample
- Use of electronics for sexually explicit material (for people convicted of a sex offense)
- Violation of codefendant no-contact order



High Severity

- Absconding at release
- Absconding multiple times in current supervision period
- Consuming mind-altering substances (high-risk behavior or addiction level)
- Contact with minors when prohibited (for people convicted of a sex offense)
- Destruction of property
- Drug/alcohol use (high-risk behavior or dependence level)
- Failure to notify of law enforcement contact with investigation, arrest, or charge
- Failure to remain outside USA after deportation
- Gang talk, signs, whistling (major level)
- Giving false information (major level)
- Lewd or lascivious behavior
- New felony charge
- New felony conviction
- Physical aggression
- Removal of monitoring equipment
- Stalking
- Theft
- Threatening or intimidating behavior
- Travel to location that is specifically forbidden
- Unsuccessful discharge (all programs)
- Violation of victim no-contact order



Appendix D: Responses to Noncompliance in Pennsylvania

The following are examples of responses to noncompliance that are currently being used by county probation and parole departments in Pennsylvania. They are organized by type of response and level.

Accountability Responses

Low-Level Responses

- Verbal warning by PO
- Verbal warning by supervisor
- Written warning/reprimand

Moderate-Level Responses

- Approved schedule
- Behavioral contract
- Community service
- Curfew
- Garnished wages
- Geographical restrictions
- Increased conditions
- Increased drug testing
- Increased field contacts/visits
- Increased reporting
- Job log
- Loss of privileges
- Maintain calendar/schedule
- No-alcohol conditions
- Report to main office versus field/sub office
- Restricted contact with certain people
- Restricted schedule
- Restricted travel
- Review conditions
- Signed agreement
- Supervisor review

High-Level Responses

- Administrative hearings (prior to actual revocation hearing)
- GPS monitoring
- Hearing with judge
- House arrest/Electronic monitoring
- Jail
- Reduction of windows/locked down on house arrest
- SCRAM device
- Violation hearing (jail)
- Violation hearing (street)

Behavior-Change Responses

Low-Level Responses

- Financial literacy/budget worksheet
- Letter of apology
- Problem solving worksheet
- Skill-building tool
- Skill practice
- Thinking report
- Transportation plan
- Worksheets
- Writing assignment on the impact of behavior



Moderate-Level Responses

- Daily journal
- Job readiness class
- Parenting class
- Referral to prosocial activity
- Relapse prevention plan
- Support group
- Treatment assessment
- Vocational assessment

High-Level Responses

- Day reporting/treatment
- Increase support group attendance
- Refer to problem solving court
- Refer to treatment/group
- Review and update case plan
- Update risk assessment



References

1. Carter, M. M. (2015). *Behavior management of justice-involved individuals: Contemporary research and state-of-the-art policy and practice*. National Institute of Corrections. <https://cepp.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/Behavior-Management-of-Justice-Involved-Individuals-Contemporary-Research-and-State-of-the-Art-Policy-and-Practice-2015.pdf>
2. Andrews, D. A. (2007). Principles of effective correctional programs. In L. L. Motiuk & R. C. Serin (Eds.), *Compendium 2000 on effective correctional programming*. Correctional Service Canada. https://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2024/scc-csc/JS82-100-2000-eng.pdf; Bonta, J., & Andrews, D. A. (2024). *The psychology of criminal conduct* (7th ed.). Routledge.
3. Skinner, B. F. (1974). *About behaviorism*. VINTAGE BOOKS EDITION.
4. Gore, H., & Shapiro, I. (2023). *Incentives for those on probation can improve outcomes and rein in costs*. The Pew Charitable Trusts. <https://www.pewtrusts.org/en/research-and-analysis/articles/2023/02/07/incentives-for-those-on-probation-can-improve-outcomes-and-rein-in-costs>; Mowen, T. J., Wodahl, E., Brent, J. J., & Garland, B. (2018). The role of sanctions and incentives in promoting successful reentry: Evidence from the SVORI data. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 45(8), 1288–1307. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854818770695>; Wodahl, E. J., Garland, B., Culhane, S. E., & McCarty, W. P. (2011). Utilizing behavioral interventions to improve supervision outcomes in community-based corrections. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 38(4), 386–405. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854810397866>
5. Wodahl et al., 2011
6. Council of State Governments Justice Center. (2019). *Confined and costly: How supervision violations are filling prisons and burdening budgets*. <https://csjjusticecenter.org/publications/confined-costly/>
7. Kaeble, D. (2023). *Probation and parole in the United States, 2021* (NCJ305589). Bureau of Justice Statistics. <https://bjs.ojp.gov/sites/g/files/xyckuh236/files/media/document/ppus21.pdf>
8. Wang, L. (2023). *Punishment beyond prisons 2023: Incarceration and supervision by state*. Prison Policy Initiative. <https://www.prisonpolicy.org/reports/correctionalcontrol2023.html>
9. DeMichele, M., & Payne, B. (2018). Taking officer time seriously: A study of the daily activities of probation officers. *Probation Journal*, 65(1), 39–60. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0264550517748358>
10. Drake, E. K., & Aos, S. (2012). *Confinement for technical violations of community supervision: Is there an effect on felony recidivism?* Washington State Institute for Public Policy. https://www.wsipp.wa.gov/ReportFile/1106/Wsipp_Confinement-for-Technical-Violations-of-Community-Supervision-Is-There-an-Effect-on-Felony-Recidivism_Full-Report.pdf; Mears, D., & Cochran, J. C. (2017). Progressively tougher sanctioning and recidivism: Assessing the effects of different types of sanctions. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 55(2), 194–241. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/321078526_Progressively_Tougher_Sanctioning_and_Recidivism_Assessing_the_Effects_of_Different_Types_of_Sanctions
11. Andrews, D. A., Bonta, J., & Hoge, R. D. (1990). Classification for effective rehabilitation: Rediscovering psychology. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 17(1), 19–52. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854890017001004>; Bonta & Andrews, 2024; Bonta, J., & Andrews, D. A. (2007). *Risk-need-responsivity model for offender assessment and rehabilitation*. Public Safety Canada: <http://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/cnt/rsrscs/pblctns/rsk-nd-rspnsvty/rsk-nd-rspnsvty-eng.pdf>
12. Skinner, 1974
13. Bonta & Andrews, 2024; Chamberlain, A. W., Gricius, M., Wallace, D. M., Borjas, D., & Ware, V. M. (2018). Parolee–parole officer rapport: Does it impact recidivism? *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 62(11), 3581–3602. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X17741593>; Kennealy, P. J., Skeem, J. L., Manchak, S. M., & Eno Loudon, J. (2012). Firm, fair, and caring officer-offender relationships protect against supervision failure. *Law and Human Behavior*, 36(6), 496–505. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0093935>; LaForest-Tucker, M. (2023). *Parole officer effects on reentry: Support, deterrence, and bias*. https://michaellaforest.github.io/Parole_Agents.pdf
14. Marlowe, D. B., & Wong, C. J. (2007). Contingency management in adult criminal drug courts. In S. T. Higgins, K. Silverman, & S. H. Heil (Eds.), *Contingency management in substance abuse treatment* (pp. 334–354). Guilford Press.
15. Gore & Shapiro, 2023
16. Drake & Aos, 2012; Mears & Cochran, 2017
17. Fixsen, D., Blase, K., Metz, A., & Van Dyke, M. (2015). Implementation science. In J. D. Wright (Ed.), *International encyclopedia of the social and behavioral sciences* (2nd ed., pp. 695–702). Elsevier.

