

GRIP Training Institute

GRIP Fidelity Rating Questionnaire

Fidelity Rankings re GRIP Sessions:

This questionnaire reflects the chain of command implicitly structuring each GRIP Facilitator Team that currently is running the program in California State Prisons. There is one central office with an Executive Director and an Administrative Director. Each prison has a Prison Coordinator that prepares the lesson plans for the teams and is the contact person for us at that prison. The goal is for each teaching team has always one fully Certified Facilitator. Each team almost always has one or more ex-offender GRIP Facilitators as well as one or more outside interns. If a program enters its second year, we can also include selected inmates (currently incarcerated), and train them on site to become facilitators. Facilitators in training are called GRIP Trainee Facilitators (GTF's). Each team debriefs after the session and shares feedback on each other's' performance

Facilitator Satisfaction Indicators

In reviewing sessions, Facilitators are asked to provide a 1-10 rating, where 1=not at all and 10=completely:

- 1) For this past [enter period], rate the extent to which you feel your goals in working with students were clear and realistic.
- 2) For this past [enter period], rate the extent to which you feel you were able to meet your goals in working with students.
- 3) For this past [enter period], rate the extent to which you feel satisfied as a GRIP Facilitator
- 4) Based on this past [enter period], rate how likely you would be to recommend the becoming a GRIP Facilitator to a qualified friend/family member who is considering applying?

(*Note: this is hypothetical; even if you don't have a friend/family member who would consider applying, indicate how likely you would be to recommend this position with GRIP to someone you care about if they told you they were interested in applying.)

Asked once each session:

- o Rate how challenged you felt in your role this week (-5=Not challenged at all; 0=Appropriately challenged; 5 = Overwhelmingly challenged the idea here is that 0 is the sweet spot

Implementation Quality

Asked each session to Facilitators:

- 1) Which was your best moment/interaction this [enter period]? Why?
- 2) Which was your most challenging period moment/interaction this [enter period]? Why?
- 3) How effective were you this [enter period] in meeting your goals/objective with your students? Comments optional.

GRIP Training Institute GRIP Fidelity Rating Questionnaire

We asked these questions of Facilitators as a way to 1) pinpoint exceptional GTF's (and go out and learn why they are exceptional and share those best practices with other GTF's), as well as markedly unexceptional GTF's (and help develop improvement plans for those GTF's), and 2) help our central office staff and senior Facilitators to calibrate what exactly strong GTF behavior entails:

- 1) Rate each of your GTF's on the **quality of their engage during GRIP sessions** (average based on ideal student achievements/behaviors outlined in GTF training manual) - (1=extremely low quality ; 10=extremely high quality)
- 2) Rate each of your GTF's on their **professional and team contributions** (all aspects of a GTF's work outside of the art of facilitating during GRIP sessions) - (1=extremely low quality; 10=extremely high quality)

Facilitator Indicators (asked once each session)

- Facilitator Self-Report: For this past week, rate the extent to which you felt you were effective coaching your GTF's to improve in their practice.
- GTF Rating: For this past week, rate the quality of the observation cycle/ coaching/feedback you received from your (main) Facilitator.
- GTF: What was the most useful piece of observation feedback you received this week from your Facilitator?

GRIP participants tend to be at least 25 years of age or older. The combination of their ages and the fact that many of them were convicted of murder means that they come in to the program with relatively low chances of recidivism. How does this cohere with our claim that GRIP incorporates the risk principle, which states that interventions should be given primarily to high-risk offenders?

Our answer rests of two claims, both of which we would like to see empirically investigated.

The first claim relates to the issue of direct vs. indirect approaches to influencing populations most likely to become offenders or to re-offend.

Research makes clear that the (grand) children of those incarcerated are often at extremely high risk of offending. Although indirect and therefore perhaps counter-intuitive, aiming interventions as the (grand) parents of at risk youth and young adults may be one of the best ways to help those younger populations most at risk of offending. Why? Group-based interventions focusing directly on high risk youth and young adults can have negative unintended consequences. Simply bringing together such populations can lead to negative peer dynamics. Aside from the possibility of negative effects, due to these peer dynamics, there is a distinct possibility that even research-based and well implemented programming may not be effective when aimed directly at high risk, younger populations.

GRIP Training Institute

GRIP Fidelity Rating Questionnaire

The second claim relates to GRIP's influence on broader prison cultures. We are convinced that maintaining high fidelity while GRIP spreads to various (yards at various) prisons can contribute to the overall wellbeing of corrections officers and inmates in these correctional facilities. Especially if a significant percentage of inmates have graduated from GRIP on a specific yard or in a specific prison, we believe this may reduce violence and anti-social behavior while increasing the effectiveness of other (rehabilitative) programs and driving down the costs of managing correctional facilities. Here again we see why an indirect approach may be most useful. Positively impacting the older, and in some cases more respected inmates directly through the GRIP program may 'trickle down' to an indirect yet also positive and (statistically) significant influencing of younger offenders.

In the coming years, we hope to participate in rigorous research that can definitively prove or disprove our claims related to aiming the GRIP program at the (grand) parents of at risk youth and young adults and effects on overall prison cultures. We are hopeful that our theories of change will continue to attract the attention of researchers. Here one bright spot deserves mention. Dr. Paulle (Professor of Sociology, University of Amsterdam) and Dr. Maggioni (Professor of Research Economics, University of Milan) are expected to continue working together with others on a CDCR-supported project entitled "Getting a grip on GRIP: Perceptions of effects on socio-emotional development and behavioral patterns in two California State Prisons." The CDCR Office of Research has approved a test of a newly developed measurement tool. It is being tested in March and April of 2018. Dr. Paulle and his team hope that this research can help them refine instruments and generate support for a much larger, longitudinal, randomized controlled treatment (RCT) study capable of rigorously testing the above mentioned theories of change as well as generating insights into GRIP's impact on recidivism.