

## When Gender-Neutral is Not Good Enough in Working with Justice Involved Women: Transcript

### Slide 1:

#### Leading with Innovation

NIC Virtual Conference

November 9, 2016

### Slide 2:

#### When Gender-Neutral is Not Good Enough in Working with Justice Involved Women

Dr. Emily Salisbury

**Dr. Emily Salisbury:** Hi everyone this is Dr. Emily Salisbury. I'm an associate professor at the University of Nevada Las Vegas in the Department of Criminal Justice, believe it or not there is actually a university in Las Vegas. So for those of you that think that there's only gaming and fun in Sin City there is actually a university. I'm really excited to talk to you all about a topic that's really important to me just in terms of the things that I really feel are critical and often times an ignored population in our correctional system, and that's with regard of course to female offenders or justice involved women. So I'm excited to kind of talk to you about when gender neutral policies and strategies in our correctional system are not really good enough in working with justice involved women.

### Slide 3:

#### Learning Goals

- Emphasize why gender-responsive strategies are part of evidence-based corrections
- Develop an understanding of how risk, need, responsivity look different with women offenders
- Clarify how strictly gender-neutral (i.e., male-based) assessment and classification strategies limit women offenders' likelihood of success

**Dr. Emily Salisbury:** So I just want to outline a little bit around some of the learning goals that we have for this presentation and for our discussion today. First of all, I want to emphasize why gender-responsive strategies are part of evidence-based practices or evidence-based corrections. There's a lot of mythology out there about what it means for agencies to be gender-responsive and to take a more gender-responsive approach with female offenders, and so I want to talk to you little bit about what the gender-responsive movement really is, and really start to hone in around why that's part of evidence-based practices that when agencies want to take a gender-responsive approach that they are actually doing evidence-based practices or what we know to be working with justice involved women. I'm interested in also helping to develop an understanding for you folks about how risk, need, and responsivity, these principles of effective correctional intervention really start to look different with women offenders but we're not going to throw out risk, need, and responsivity when we're talking about gender-responsive strategies. Those are critical pieces that we need to know for female offenders, but that each one of those principles start to look different both conceptually and in practice with justice involved women. And to clarify how strictly gender-neutral or what we're sort of defining as male-based assessment and classification strategies often times limit the success of justice involved women. That there are additional criminogenic needs or crime producing or predictive needs that female offenders have that are often times ignored or missed on gender-neutral or male-based assessment instruments that simply mean that we're not serving the population as best that we could. But I think that we can accomplish that in the time that we have.

**Slide 4:**  
**Evidence-Based Corrections**

- Using scientific evidence to drive policy, programming, and practices for positive outcomes.
- Programs that focus on reducing recidivism will have stronger impacts in the long run for safety inside and outside.

**Dr. Emily Salisbury:** So first off, I just want to remind everybody why we're doing evidence-based corrections in the first place and how evidence-based practices have really transformed the way that we do business and supervision and management with correctional population. So obviously when we're doing evidence-based corrections we're using intentionally scientific evidence to drive policy, programming, and practices, all of course for positive outcomes. And that when we focus on programs that reduce recidivism we're obviously going to have a stronger impact in the long run for both those inmates, the offenders, the defendants, anybody involved in the criminal justice system and of course for our larger community. For a long time in corrections we weren't doing evidence-based practices we were doing very sort of off the cuff common sense things that some people thought might be effective with offenders and I know you've many of you've heard my mentor Ed Latessa kind of go around the country and talk about some of the things that he's seen, some of the crazy stuff that he's seen in correctional agencies around - you know people lighting candles and doing all kinds of crazy things and calling it programming, and we know that there are some things that can actually be harmful when we deal with offenders and with justice involved individuals. And so we have an effort to really do evidence-based corrections of course in practice

**Slide 5:**  
**Evidence Matters**

Lives are at stake -

- Offenders' lives
- Offenders' family members
- Correctional staff
- General community

**Dr. Emily Salisbury:** And that's because evidence matters. At the end of the day, we're delivering human services to individuals and lives are really at stake. This is not just offender's lives, but the family members of those individuals who are incarcerated or on correctional supervision, correctional staff member's lives are at stake, given the kinds of policies and procedures that we put in place, as well as of course the general community. So I don't know about you but you know evidence whether we're talking about medicine, or corrections, or public health, none of us want, if we're thinking about in the medical field, none of us want a physician here that's some kind of quack. And some of you've heard, again, some things around correctional quackery before that some of the things we've done in the past have been really, really, pretty harmful. So we have to remember that lives are at stake whether we're talking about medicine,

**Slide 6:**  
**Evidence-Based Corrections: Public Safety At Its Finest**

- Correctional leaders have a professional obligation and responsibility to seek out research evidence and use this evidence to inform their decisions.
- In human services, whether it is medicine or corrections—IGNORANCE is a dangerous thing.

**Dr. Emily Salisbury:** or we're talking about you know human services in corrections - ignorance is a dangerous thing. And so correctional leaders such as yourselves really have a professional obligation, a moral responsibility to seek out research evidence and to use this evidence to inform decisions. It's part of the reason why I'm excited of course to be delivering this NIC presentation because you're learning some of the state of the art things around gender-responsive strategies.

**Slide 7:**  
**700% Increase in Incarceration**

**Dr. Emily Salisbury:** So we need to kind of have a conversation around a little bit around why we're focusing on women offenders and justice involved women. Between 1980 and 2014 the number of incarcerated women in the correctional system, who are incarcerated increased by more than 700%, rising from a total of 26,378 in 1980 to 215,332 in 2014. These numbers continue to increase, women have the war on drugs has very much been a war not just on male offenders, but of course on women offenders too, particularly women of color. Because anytime we widen the net around bringing more people into the system, particularly around drug crimes we know that women disproportionately commit drug and property crimes, much more so than what we see with male offenders. So the increase in incarceration has been significant for the rise in women's incarceration. And so even though many more men are in prison than women the rate of growth for female imprisonment has actually out-paced men by more than 50% between 1980 and 2014. There's 1.2 million women under the supervision of the criminal justice system and you know of course the overwhelming majority of women on supervision are on probation. I often times hear people say you know and agencies sort of wonder why do we really need to focus on women they only make up 7% of the inmate population and that's true but you know every single policy and procedure that we put on that we place on women that are based on men effect each and every woman 100%. And it's important to remember that, again a quarter of women who are on probation or excuse me based on the number of people who are on probation 25% of those probationers are women. So we have a need to really think about some different services and different strategies for that population.

**Slide 8:**  
**False Dichotomy**

Emphasis on women in the criminal justice system is often portrayed as a losing game.

**Dr. Emily Salisbury:** And one of the things that happens when I go around the country and kind of start talking about this issue is that again, there's this idea from agencies and I think a little bit of confusion around what it means to be doing evidence-based practices is or what works versus gender-responsive strategies and there's this what I'm calling this false dichotomy between these two approaches Marilyn Van Dieten has sort of talked about this in other presentations as well and I think it's a really good illustration of this idea that people and agencies think that if they start doing gender-responsive strategies that they're somehow not doing evidence-based corrections but somehow doing things with women is considered a losing game and I'm hoping by the end of this presentation you start to see that actually gender-responsive strategies is really part of evidence-based practices and that we can do both. It means that we're going to be thinking about how to integrate both of these ideas together because gender-responsive strategies has a lot of scientific evidence behind it but often gets ignored by individuals who don't embrace this kind of idea that we need to be doing something different for female offenders. So I'm going to talk to you a little bit about that evidence.

**Slide 9:**  
**Evidence-Based and Gender-Responsive**

*Evidence-Based Practices*

- Tested by methodologically rigorous research
- Found to be effective at reducing recidivism

*Gender-Responsive Practices*

- Tested by methodologically rigorous research
- Found to be effective at reducing recidivism
- **Account for differences in characteristics and life experiences of women and men in the justice system**

**Dr. Emily Salisbury:** So just to be clear about what I mean around what typically gets called evidence-based practices and gender-responsive strategies. Evidence-based practices right again, means that we're testing the strategies and policies methodologically using very rigorous research. I'm editor of an academic journal called Criminal Justice and Behavior many academics and criminologists know this journal because it's one of the top journals in correctional psychology and correctional practices. Some of you may even know about the journal because you might subscribe to it. The evidence that comes out of that peer review journal is important to be used to drive policy and practices to bring

that to the field of course. We're only going to use of course practices and programs that are found to be effective at reducing recidivism. The same goes for gender-responsive practices too, we're going to be doing things that are tested by methodologically rigorous research and found to be effective at reducing recidivism but the main difference between these two policies or these two practices is really that gender-responsive strategies accounts for the differences and characteristics and life experiences of women and men in the criminal justice system. Notice that it's not just women but also men. Gender-responsive strategies, yes, today we are focusing primarily on female offenders or justice involved women but there's nothing to suggest that there wouldn't be some things that come out of this movement, this evidence that can help male offenders in some ways too. So it's intentionally called gender-responsive strategies or practices because we know that these things sort of matter in terms of some of the things we talk about like trauma. Trauma doesn't just effect women it effects men too. It has different kinds of effects but the things that we learn from gender-responsive strategies on how to deal with trauma and manage trauma can also help inform what we do with male offenders as well.

**Slide 10:**  
**What Do We Mean by "Gender"?**

- Sex is biologically constructed.
- Gender is socially constructed.
- Feminine and masculine social roles (gender roles).

**Dr. Emily Salisbury:** So what do we really mean by gender we have to kind of take a step back to and think about what, when I say the word gender you know and when people talk about gender, what does that really mean? So we have to recall that you know sex is something that's biologically constructed something that's anatomically assigned to each individual whereas gender is something that's socially constructed. Something that you know, is constructed out in society, you know the different norms that exist around masculinity versus femininity. We do or exhibit gender in lots of different ways, you know through the clothes we wear, to the way we walk, or the way we speak and communicate, and the way we show emotion. So the picture here that you're seeing here is a good friend of mine's daughter this is Maddie. Maddie is the star player on her 6<sup>th</sup> grade football team in Portland, Oregon. She violates all kinds of stereotypical gender roles because she throws for passes and touchdowns as the quarterback. She runs, catches, and tackles better than most of the boys out there and her parents of course support her in this, as do the boys on her team. So she's like violating a lot of stereotypical gender norms and gender roles and so some of us when we see that she's playing football might initially think, wow we're worried about her, we're worried that she might injure herself, but she's tough as nails I'll tell you that much. Maddie's definitely a tomboy like I was growing up. Now as she starts to age and maybe hit puberty and get to high school things may change a little bit in terms of this acceptance of her because the force that gender stereotyping and gender roles really have on our society. So if we talk about the stereotypical masculine versus feminine and social roles you know if we were really going to talk about these things we would think about well what is the stereotypical characteristics of masculinity? There are things like being independent, being strong, being the breadwinner, unemotional, assertive, maybe being a little loud, more logically cognitively. Whereas the stereotypical roles around femininity have more to do with being dependent, being quiet, being small or passive, emotional, and caring and caregivers, and maternal, and polite, and now I know most of the women who are listening to this lecture and work in corrections you know probably don't, they have a little more masculine sort of features about them or characteristics because they are strong assertive women working in corrections. It's important to remember that all of us have masculine and feminine sort of characteristics about us but that these things shift over time and when we step out of those masculine or feminine roles sometimes people judge us for it. They're consequences socially because those social forces are really strong. These are important concepts to remember because they effect the population that we're working with when we're talking about justice involved women. These gender roles also effect the population you know that we're serving.

**Slide 11:**  
**Gender Role Expectations**

- In most societies, the foundation of these behavioral expectations is patriarchal...
- ...meaning, masculine behavior is the "normative" behavior.

**Dr. Emily Salisbury:** So the gender role expectations in most societies, the foundation of these behaviors, the behavioral expectations is patriarchal. So those gender roles really do sort of create a lens for which we expect behavior to - people to behave. So if we see somebody who's more masculine we assume he or she will act in more masculine ways and vice versa. And when I say that the foundation of these

behavioral expectations is patriarchal what I really mean there is that patriarchy has a lot of misperceptions about what it means. People think it just means the oppression of women and that's not really a proper definition of what patriarchy is. Patriarchy just simply means that masculine behavior is normative behavior that it's sort of what's expected in our society in many ways and that doesn't just effect women it effects men in many ways too. So when males step out of that masculine role or the masculine traits that they're supposed to have there are consequences for doing that and so really it's about a hierarchy and the difference really is that men can achieve a hierarchy if they embrace, can achieve higher up in a hierarchy in social status and social norms if they embrace their masculine traits. Women on the other hand can never fully be that masculine trait and so you know or have that masculinity about them no matter sort of what that is and so that's what those gender norms start to mean around patriarchy. And it's why in a lot of ways we're starting to see gender shift as a social construction if you think about a couple slides ago I mentioned gender is socially constructed. For instance, you know we're seeing children today embrace all kinds of different gender roles. More and more children are identifying as transgender or gender queer where they don't actually embrace any kind of gender, or different kinds of roles like if you think about Facebook for instance they have in 2014 they decided that they were going to have 58 different categories for gender and now it's actually an open-ended question when you sign up for Facebook that people can put anything in there. And so this idea of gender is really changing rapidly right now in our society. So these roles shift overtime and have dictate how people behave in many ways and so it's important for us for this discussion to kind of put that lens of gender on when we're thinking about the women who are in our system and the policies that we need to put in place to best serve them.

**Slide 12:**

**Gender-Responsive Strategies**

- Use research on gendered life experiences to direct programming for women.
- Goal is to produce favorable outcomes by tailoring supervision and services to needs and strengths.

**Dr. Emily Salisbury:** Gender-responsive strategies at the end of the day is really about intentionally using the research on gendered life experiences to direct programming and policies and practices for women. It's understanding that a women's experience in this world is just simply not the same as a man's experience that the jury is out, women are different than men, and that one gender isn't better than another, but that we have to make sure we understand the different sociological, psychological, and cultural differences that exist across the spectrum of gender. Again, there's a lot of mythology out there around the idea of being gender-responsive and that it's somehow not holding women accountable for their behavior or that we're blaming men for all the problems that they have and that of course is not what gender-responsive strategy really is. I don't have time to go into all the principles of what it means to be gender-responsive that information can be found elsewhere including in some of the recommended materials alongside this presentation. But at the end of the day, the goal really is to produce favorable outcomes by tailoring supervision and services to the needs and strengths of women. To understand that their lives are often times very different when they come to the criminal justice system.

**Slide 13:**

**Gender-Responsive Strategies Part of Evidence-Based Practices**

**Dr. Emily Salisbury:** So really to understand what gender-responsive strategies is, is to understand of course what evidence-based practices is. That we can put ourselves in a win-win position instead of a losing position, but if you're doing and if you want to do evidence-based strategies and gender-responsive strategies that you can do both. That gender-responsive practices is part of evidence-based practices because there is about forty years of data that support some of the policies and procedures that I'm about to start outlining for you. So it is a myth if people tell you that gender doesn't matter, that's simply incorrect. There's forty or fifty years of data and research that we're going to start to kind of walk through a little bit and understanding why gender-responsive strategies is part of evidence-based practices.

#### Slide 14:

##### Studies Supporting Gender-Responsive Strategies

- Qualitative Population Profiles
- Quantitative Research
  - Prediction Research
    - Pathways Studies
    - Risk-Assessment Studies
  - Evaluation Studies
  - Meta-Analyses

**Dr. Emily Salisbury:** So I'm going to start talking to you a little bit about some of the concepts that Pat Van Voorhis, who's a mentor of mine back at the University of Cincinnati. She recently published a consumer's guide to understanding gender-responsive research it's published by the Center for Effective Public Policy in the National Resource Center on Justice Involved Women which is also linked to this presentation. So there's various kinds of ways that we have researched and studied research on gender-responsive strategies and I want to make the distinction between qualitative and quantitative research here. A lot of the research that we have discussed in gender-responsive strategies and the knowledge base of gender-responsive strategies really started with originally qualitative population profiles.

#### Slide 15:

##### Qualitative Population Profiles

- Primarily used for exploratory purposes
- Do not involve statistical analyses, but
  - Seek to contextualize experiences
  - Understand relationships and motivations
  - Uncover trends and unpack complex processes

**Dr. Emily Salisbury:** And the qualitative population profiles often times were dismissed by the researchers that were working more on the evidence-based what works practices. This is people like Andrews and Banta, it just sort of wasn't as respected of a research procedure. And that's a shame because there's a lot of good very good research that've come out of this type of research strategy. So qualitative research really is about using research for exploratory purposes. Anytime you have a new idea, something that you want to think about studying that there hasn't been a lot of research on such as women offenders because the vast majority of what we know about people in the system comes from research that has been done primarily on white men. If you want to know about how our system might look if we started with women in mind it's a very natural place to start with qualitative research. Qualitative research doesn't involve statistical analyses, these fancy stats, but it seeks to contextualize experiences of justice involved women. To hear the voices of women who are in the system, to ask them questions about their life histories, about what got them in the system, what got them in trouble, to have focus groups and interviews with justice involved women. To kind of hear their own stories and their own narratives about some of the problems that they've experienced throughout their life and some of the things that they worry about when they're incarcerated and of course what they're concerned about upon release. So it tends to be very exploratory and to understand different kinds of relationships and motivations for offending. It's less generalizable than what we see with quantitative research which we'll get to momentarily but it's no less important to understand the stories and the voices of justice involved women.

#### Slide 16:

##### Qualitative Evidence

Consistent narratives from women that were very different compared to men:

One tragedy (early abuse/trauma/neglect) led to another (mental health problems) which led to the need to numb/self-medicate (substance abuse).

**Dr. Emily Salisbury:** And some of those voices and many of those narratives have consistently been saying the same sorts of things. A lot of criminologists before me have done a lot of work around this area and have continued to hear that one tragedy led to another which led to the need to numb and self-medicate. That early trauma and abuse, or neglect, with these justice involved women led to a lot of mental health problems, depression, anxiety, major mood disorders, which then led to women or as girls to numb and self-medicate and become addicted to substances. Over and over and over again we have continued to hear the same sorts of stories from many women that this is a narrative that got them in the system. That this was one of the pathways to their criminal justice entry. And so once you start to hear a

number of women talk about these issues you start to see patterns across this new exploratory idea. And so I know many of you working with women offenders and women in the system have heard this story and know that this is a pattern that we often times see with female offenders.

**Slide 17:**

**Prediction Research: Pathways Studies**

- Prediction studies are quantitative, involving numbers and structured methods.
- Pathways research quantitatively tests whether women's qualitative narratives hold up in statistical models using larger samples of women offenders.

**Dr. Emily Salisbury:** Another kind of research though that we have to think about is part of quantitative evidence or quantitative research and this is something called the pathways research in the gender-responsive strategies theoretical background. So prediction research and pathways studies this is an area that I do a lot of work in is understanding that these are quantitative there's going to be numbers assigned, they're going to be structured methods, it's not necessarily focus groups and interviews necessarily with women, but it's intentionally done to see whether those qualitative stories that women have told us over and over and over again, around their pathways actually holds up statistically, using you know statistics and numbers to be able to understand if it's generalizable across many different types of justice involved women. And so back at the University of Cincinnati when I was a doctoral student...

**Slide 18:**

**Women's Pathways to Crime**

**Crime and Imprisonment**

- Childhood Victimization
- Unhealthy Relationships
- Social and Human Capital

**Dr. Emily Salisbury:** one of my major projects in my dissertation was looking at this very issue and seeing if the pathways that we heard many women tell us actually held up statistically. And what we found is that sure enough these ideas around childhood victimization, getting in trouble because of unhealthy intimate relationships, and a lack of socially human capital, actually did lead to women probationer's failures on probation. I'm not giving you all of the fancy numbers and statistics here because I'm worried your eyes might glaze over and I might lose you. But if you're interested in learning more about the data behind that I'm happy to show it to you and share it with you. But really we not only heard that narrative around childhood victimization leading to mental health problems and leading to substance abuse but a lot of other women also have mentioned that, you know, I'm going to get out of this institution and I feel like I've been in some pretty good programs but you know, I just know I'm going to meet up with Johnnie again and things are going to just fall apart. Over and over and over again, we actually saw that unhealthy relationships, unhealthy intimate relationships, and were cause for concern and a serious problem for justice involved women. That unhealthy relationships are often times a primary driver for women's misconducts in institutions. I know many of you are nodding your head at this moment because I've seen it in my own trainings across the country. That unhealthy relationships are a key driver for women's anti-social behavior. We also have to understand that a lot of women also talk a lot about a lack of social support and a lack of human capital. So social capital is really just our ideas around or the amount of social support that we often times have. For instance, each one of you didn't get to the position you've gotten to in your agencies without having some level of social support to be able to be successful. Human capital are more things that are internal to us and less socially driven. So things like education and self-efficacy or our confidence in our ability to achieve goals and when we get new challenges. So we know that women are actually far more socially marginalized than what we see with male offenders. There's a lack of social support that we see with females, you can see this just in terms of the number of visitations that they receive sometimes. You can see this in a lot of different ways. These pathways, it turns out to bring this point kind of back home it is that it's actually statistically significant that these issues are significant drivers to women's failure on probation and entry into the criminal justice system. So these are pathways that can't be ignored they are sort of substantiated by statistical research in the pathways research. So sure enough there's no reason to dismiss the qualitative evidence that we know to exist.

**Slide 19:**

**Domestic and International Prison Reform**

- Gender-Responsive Strategies, 2003 NIC (USA)
- Ministry of Justice, United Kingdom: Prison Service Order 4800 2008
- United Nations Rules for the Treatment of Women Prisoners and Non-Custodial Measures for Women Offenders

**Dr. Emily Salisbury:** Additionally, we can also think about gender-responsive strategies from the issue of human rights and so many of you may not be aware that there's been actually a lot domestic international prison reform around the idea of justice involved women. The image that you see here is from penal reform international it's sort of their guide book to what's called the United Nations Bangkok Rules on women offenders and prisoners. The United Nations actually has a resolution that passed in 2010 for the treatment of women prisoners and non-custodial measures for women offenders. Some people think this idea of gender-responsive strategies is going to go away, that it's one of those flavor of the week, that it's you know not really relevant to be thinking about gender differently, or women differently, this is not an issue that's going away, the jury is out, women are different. And if the United Nations is pushing of course to have gender-responsive strategies, we know that we have a mandate not only around the Nelson Mandela rules which the United Nations has for all offenders and prisoners, but also the Bangkok rules to understand that different policies and procedures have to be in place for women. Many of these United Nations rules and the Bangkok rules came from a really important report that's sort of considered the bible, so to speak, of gender-responsive strategies, published by Barbara Bloom, Barbara Owen, and Stephanie Covington for NIC in 2003. So the issue really is that equality doesn't mean having the same exact policies across gender because those exact same policies and practices can actually backfire if we don't start with the population that we're trying to supervise and target for change. You know every time I walk into an agency I want people to think about what our system would look like if we started with women in mind, instead of men. Because at the end of the day, that's how we're going to be most effective, if we're going to be serving that population the most effectively and overall public safety.

**Slide 20:**

**Effective Correctional Intervention**

- Not all treatment programs are equally effective.
- Not every offender poses the same risk to the community.
- 3 Main Principles:
  - Risk - "who" to target
  - Need - "what" to target
  - Responsivity - "how" to target

**Dr. Emily Salisbury:** So I know many of you, most of you, all of you, should really know what these evidence-based practices are the effective correctional interventions, the principles of effective correctional intervention really are, that you know, again, evidence-based practices and risk, need, and responsivity have really changed the way that we do business, supervision, and treatment, across corrections. We know that not all treatment programs are equally effective. That just because something is called rehabilitation doesn't mean that is effective and reducing recidivism. We have to know that there's a science behind rehabilitation and good programming. We also know that not every offender poses the same risks to the community. So these main principles, of course, are very important in understanding that a one-size fits all approach in rehabilitation and correctional programming just simply doesn't work, of course.



## Slide 21:

### Risks and Needs

Risk: Who

- High
- Medium
- Low

Need: What

- Antisocial Attitudes
- Antisocial Peers
- Antisocial Personality Traits

Responsivity: How & Barriers

- Cognitive-Behavioral Approach
- Gender
- Motivation
- Cognitive Deficits

**Dr. Emily Salisbury:** So of course risks, and needs, and responsivity I'm just giving you, again, a kind of snapshot just as a reminder of what risk, need, and responsivity really mean, right. So I want to start to have a discussion here a little bit around why each one of these principles needs to start changing around when we're working with women offenders. So risk, of course, means who we want to target for treatment. We know that we need to be targeting the high and the moderately high, or the medium level risk individuals because we can harm individuals who are low risk if we put too many resources and supervision and programming to the low risk people, because they're low risk to begin with for a reason. We get the most, of course, bang for our buck when we're treating those individuals who are high and moderately high risk. Need of course is understanding what to target the primary criminogenic needs, which up here you see of course antisocial attitudes, antisocial peers, and antisocial personality traits. These are part of the big four criminal histories' not up here of course, because we can't target it for treatment. It is a predictor of criminal behavior in the future, but we can't target it in treatment. Responsivity, of course, how we're going to approach the modality of treating offenders and the barriers in which we find with offenders that need to be accommodated in order to actually start treating the criminogenic or crime producing needs. The risk, and needs, and responsivity, that you see on this slide, again, are primarily founded upon research that has focused on male offenders. It does not mean that these don't also apply to women, there is some research out there that actually show that these principles are very important for female offenders too. We should not throw out risk, need, and responsivity when working with women offenders but the vast majority of the research has focused only on men. And that's why I'm here to start talking to you about why these things need to start shifting and changing because of the research evidence that we know to see a little bit of a difference around risk, need, and responsivity for women. First of all, I want you to notice in the responsivity column this is around specific responsivity that gender is considered a barrier to effective treatment. But gender in the what works or evidence-based literature has often been relegated to a specific responsivity issue. That gender somehow needs to be accommodated in some way, we need to do something about, you know, a little bit different with women offenders but the what works research has not really embraced an understanding of what those differences really should be. And for those of you that really know risk, need, and responsivity, you know that sometimes responsivity is often times set aside as a principle and not seen as important because we're so primarily focused on reducing criminogenic needs.

## Slide 22:

There is now enough evidence to promote the Gender-Responsive Principles of Effective Correctional Intervention

**Dr. Emily Salisbury:** And I'm here to sort of start to talking to you about the fact that there's now enough evidence to promote what I'm calling the Gender-Responsive Principles of Effective Correctional Intervention. That the gender neutral principles of effective correctional intervention that you just saw on the last slide are simply not enough to be serving female offenders in the best way possible.

**Slide 23:**

**“Risk” Manifests Differently**

- Consider the relative risk an individual poses within her peer group.
- Gender-neutral assessments appear to be less valid for women who follow gendered pathways to crime.

**Dr. Emily Salisbury:** So, one thing to keep in mind first when we're talking about risk, particularly of course with justice involved women is that risk means something fundamentally different for women. I'm not saying that women can't be dangerous, that they don't have the potential for being dangerous, but that women simply pose less risk or less dangerousness to our society than men. We see evidence of that on a daily basis. The vast majority of people, again, entering our criminal justice system are men. Doesn't mean one gender is better than another that's just simply a fact. And so we have to think and consider the relative risk an individual poses within her own peer group. When we're comparing and using the same risk assessments for men as we are for women we're often times doing a service and assuming that that woman poses the same level of risk as somebody who's a male. And that's simply not true. Gender-neutral assessments appear to be less valid for women who follow what are the gender-responsive or gender pathways to crime that I just mentioned previously. So a lot of research evidence starts to see that even though gender-neutral risk assessments like an LS/CMI, or an LSI-R, or an ORAS, is valid for female populations that it does work, it doesn't work as effectively for women who follow these gender-pathways to crime and that it's missing additional criminogenic needs that are actually predictive of women's offending.

**Slide 24:**

**Psychometric Gymnastics**

Cut-points and weights and equations, Oh My!

If statistically predictive, gender-responsive items are not included in an instrument in the first place, we will never see true and accurate measures of women's criminogenic risk.

**Dr. Emily Salisbury:** And if risk manifests differently for women I know that, you know, this is recognized on gender-neutral assessments such as, you know an LS/CMI or an ORAS, cut points, and weights, and equations, are given to lots of gender-neutral assessment instruments and that's not a bad thing necessarily but at the end of the day, it's really quite honestly psychometric gymnastics. If statistically predictive, gender-responsive measures are not included in an instrument, if there are criminogenic needs that are not actually included on a gender-neutral assessment, if they're not included on that assessment then we're never going to see true and accurate measures of women's criminogenic risks. So because those gender-neutral assessments like the LS/CMI and again the ORAS didn't start with women in mind they're missing additional criminogenic needs that are important for female offenders and that are actually predictive of women's misconducts in prison and their failure on probation or parole.

**Slide 25:**

**Women Have Needs Not Asked on Gender-Neutral Assessments**

- Some traditional (male-based) criminogenic needs are not as predictive with women.
  - There is little research to suggest that antisocial attitudes and peers should be primary treatment targets for women.
- Need
- Attitudes?
  - Peers?
  - Personality?

**Dr. Emily Salisbury:** So what are some of those additional criminogenic needs for women? You know I have question marks next to these “Need” areas because what I've seen and what the research has actually shown around some of the additional criminogenic needs is that some traditional or what we're calling you know sort of male-based criminogenic needs are simply not as predictive with women. There is a pattern in the research data that look at women offenders and assessment research that shows that there's not as much, there's not nearly as much research to suggest that antisocial attitudes and peers should be the primary treatment targets for justice involved women. Antisocial attitudes some women absolutely have those traditional antisocial attitudes that we hear from men quite frequently. So things like, if the keys are in the car and if I don't steal it somebody else will. You know I'm just sitting in front of

you because I got caught. You know if you can't defend the necklace that you're wearing then I'm entitled to it. Those attitudes do exist; some women do have those attitudes without a doubt. But the vast majority of women seem to have a lot more attitudes that are actually more self-defeating. Things like, I'm no good, I'm worthless, I shouldn't even try, antisocial attitudes that are a bit more self-defeating and less about, you know, necessarily engaging in, or the attitudes that we typically hear with male offenders. Doesn't mean they don't have them. Antisocial peers also starts to look a little bit different too. So sometimes women will have people that, you know, in their lives that are not good for them or that model antisocial behaviors, but usually those are intimate partners, and for men those are people usually who are friends. And so if those two criminogenic needs are very different it necessitates a kind of different treatment modality as well. Again, the research doesn't show that these are necessarily the most predictive criminogenic needs for women offenders.

**Slide 26:**

**Women Offenders' Unique Criminogenic Needs**

2002: NIC & University of Cincinnati (Pat Van Voorhis) enter cooperative agreement to develop a risk and needs assessment instrument specifically designed for women.

**Dr. Emily Salisbury:** And so we have a need to start thinking about what are those additional criminogenic needs. And what are the things that are most likely to be predictive of antisocial behavior in justice involved women. So in 2002 NIC and the University of Cincinnati with Dr. Pat Van Voorhis entered a cooperative agreement to develop a risk and needs assessment instrument specifically designed for women. I was project director of two of those research sites when I was a doctoral student of Dr. Van Voorhis at the University of Cincinnati so I also had a hand in playing a role in developing those instruments. So I want to talk to you a little bit about some of the outcomes that we, you know, have out of the development of this particular gender-responsive risk assessment instrument.

**Slide 27:**

**2002 Risk and Needs Assessment**

Charged with answering these questions:

- If we started with women in mind, what criminogenic needs would risk assessments measure?
- Are gender-neutral (male-centric) assessments missing salient criminogenic needs for women?

**Dr. Emily Salisbury:** So in 2002 we were basically charged with answering these questions. Again, if we started with women in mind, what criminogenic needs would risk assessments measure specifically of course for women? And are gender-neutral or male-centric assessments missing certain criminogenic needs for women and of course we know that there are criminogenic needs that have been missing.

**Slide 28:**

**Risk Factors Similar for Men and Women**

- Criminal History
- Antisocial Attitudes
- Antisocial Friends
- Substance Abuse
- Employment/Financial

**Dr. Emily Salisbury:** So what we found across many different samples using probation, parole, pre-release, pre-trial, institutions, different samples I want to say there were four or five samples at the beginning when we construction samples and then there's been revalidation on several states five or six different states. NIC and the University of Cincinnati found that some of the criminogenic needs were similar for men and women. And many of these are important to still measure on a gender-responsive risk assessment tool. That criminal history and antisocial attitudes, friends, substance abuse and employment/financial, of course, are all very critical for justice involved women in terms of being predictive of their antisocial behavior. But important to sort of know that each one of these even looks different when you start to pick apart each one of them. So women don't nearly have as much criminal history as we see with men. The antisocial attitudes as I've mentioned seem to look different. Antisocial friends, sometimes women often times don't have any friends to even talk about, they may have some pro-social friends, but very few antisocial friends because sometimes they're so isolated in their unhealthy relationship that they don't have any friends. Substance abuse, the onset, and the way that women start using substances often times looks different. And employment and financial needs are far higher for female offenders than what we see with male offenders. They score relatively, usually high on employment and financial needs far more than what we see with male offenders. So even though they are

the same and important to include on a risk assessment tool for women they even start to look different when you look at and pick apart what they really mean. What we also found is that risk factors are...

**Slide 29:**

**Risk Factors Predictive for Women**

Depression/Anxiety	Child Abuse
Unhealthy Relationships	Adult Abuse
Psychosis	Housing Safety
Anger	Parental Stress

**Dr. Emily Salisbury:** Some risk factors are predictive for women only. So these are the additional criminogenic needs that I've been talking about that are often times are missed on gender-neutral risk assessment tools, an LS/CMI or an ORAS. That we have actually found in our research across many different samples that things like depression and anxiety symptoms are critical in terms of predicting women's anti-social behavior, that you can't have conversations about women's risk without also talking about unhealthy relationships and how unhealthy intimate relationships get women in trouble. So these are things like when we ask women are you more likely to get in trouble with the law when you're in a relationship than when you're not in a relationship? Do you have a loss of personal power and control when you're in a relationship? Do you feel like you would do anything for your partner? These are the kind of things, you know, that loss of autonomy in relationships that gets women in trouble. And if you'll recall when we think about the gender roles that we expect and that we talked about at the beginning of this discussion it all comes back to each one of these things come back to the gender roles that are prescribed in our society. So we expect women to be dependent. We socialize girls to be more dependent than we socialize young boys to be independent. Those things have consequences for not just you and me but also for, of course, people who are justice involved. Psychosis and anger, anger you know, women often times are not allowed to display their anger, how are women often times aggressive, they're relationally aggressive. Sometimes women in our system of course, are physically aggressive and when women are physically aggressive they are stepping out of their gender role, right? So we have a need to measure also that the anger and frustration that many women have because it also is a criminogenic need. Adult abuse and child abuse it turns out we can't talk about women offenders without talking about the extreme amount of trauma and victimization that women have experienced. You know, if I had time at the beginning of this discussion to really talk about gender-responsive strategies you would've heard me talk a lot more about the significant amount of trauma and victimization that women offenders have experienced. We are now advocating for trauma informed care in nearly, in every prison, because we have to take universal precautions and assume that every single woman in that facility has experienced some form of trauma because the research shows it's upwards of 80-90% of women have experienced some form of emotional, sexual, or physical abuse. And we've actually found that some of those abusive experiences are actually criminogenic or can get women in trouble if it's not adequately treated. This doesn't mean that men don't have trauma in their lives too, and that they don't need treatment for it, but what we see is that it can be criminogenic for female offenders if it's not adequately treated. So the housing safety is another issue that often times gets ignored and we have seen to be predictive for women as well as the fact that the vast majority of women who are in our system have children. And so the stress that comes with raising children can also be criminogenic for female offenders and so, the main point of this is that if we're using gender-neutral assessment tools and if they're not asking these questions about these particular criminogenic needs which are predictive of women's failures, then they will never get treated in programming. You all know the importance of assessment and classification, and that assessment drives nearly every decision on behalf of that woman throughout the system. If we're not asking the right questions from the beginning that are predictive of her failure down the road, then it's never going to be treated. And so it's important to recognize that these needs are critical in the success on behalf of those justice involved women and the safety and security inside institutions as well.

**Slide 30:**

**Strengths Predictive for Women**

- Self-efficacy
- Family Support
- Educational Assets
- Parental Involvement

**Dr. Emily Salisbury:** We also have to think about the strengths that women present with, so gender-responsive strategies and a gender-responsive instrument that we helped develop which by the way is called - The Women's Risk Need Assessment Tool, it is an NIC instrument and the University of Cincinnati.

So we have to think about the strengths that women present and on our risk assessment tool these are subtracted from the risk factors because we have to think about what, every person has strengths that she brings and that we can build upon to build her self-efficacy and move forward in programming in a treatment plan. So one interesting result that we often, that we found, with our research is that women who had high levels of self-efficacy, self-efficacy are things like your confidence in your ability to achieve your goals. Women who had a lot of self-efficacy actually got written up a lot more in women's institutions compared to women who had low self-efficacy. Some of you will, know understand why it was a bit of a training issue that we had that you know women like to talk back and when they have some self-efficacy they'll talk back even more and they want to know why, they want to know why they're getting written up and they will stand up for themselves. They got written up more than the women who were quiet and passive and a little bit more polite, so to speak. The self-efficacy though when we followed the same women into the community and looked at their recidivism they actually had lower recidivism the women who had higher self-efficacy had lower recidivism than the women who had lower self-efficacy. So it means that self-efficacy was a risk factor for them in the institutions but turned into a protective factor or a strength upon release. And so that's a training issue to understand, to teach correctional officers that women who stand up for themselves isn't a bad thing. It's a protective factor once they get out, but they may need some redirection around how to use that self-efficacy and why they're using that self-efficacy in a way that's getting written up. Some women have family support, some women have an educational background that's going to serve them well when they are released. Some of them want to be involved in their children's lives and so these are one of the pains of imprisonment that we know to be the strongest for women is the loss of the relationships with their children. Let's use that as a strength that they want to be with their children but often times they need effective programming on how to be an adequate parent and how to parent effectively.

**Slide 31:**

**From "Big Four" to "Female Four"**

Criminal History	Economic Marginality
Antisocial Attitudes	Unhealthy Relationships
Antisocial Peers	Substance Abuse
Antisocial Personality Traits	Depressive/Anxious Symptoms

**Dr. Emily Salisbury:** So before I mentioned, you know, that Big Four around criminogenic needs and that what we know as evidence-based practices and the what works research shows that, you know, many of you can probably recite the big four risk factors. The big four meaning the four criminogenic needs that are most predictive of antisocial behavior. Criminal history, antisocial attitudes, antisocial peers, and antisocial personality traits, again, the vast majority of that research has been done with male offenders and now that we have enough research to really start looking at the differences for female offenders, you know again, I'm not convinced that that big four are the strongest predictors for female offending. What I'm seeing in my own research and the research of other criminologists that work with women offenders is that we need to start thinking about the female four not necessarily the big four. So economic marginality, unhealthy relationships, substance abuse, and depressive and anxious symptoms, are what I'm starting to see are the primary drivers of antisocial behavior for women. Study after study shows that these are actually the four that we should be focusing more on with female offenders when we're working with justice involved women. I know that you all have heard the big four over, and over, and over again, and this is for some of maybe a hard pill to swallow in terms of thinking about differences, but again, you know, science changes more evidence comes out every year around justice involved women and the different needs that they have and while I can't say that there's any particular, like there's not one study that has looked at these female four to really pit them against the big four but there are, there's a pattern of studies and are risk assessment research Pat Van Voorhis, and mine, and Emily Wright, and Ashely Bauman, alongside a lot of criminologists that have done this work that suggests that the female four needs to be seriously considered in terms of changing from the big four. So these are the primary drivers that I'm advocating for agencies to really focus in on because these are the things that we see to be most predictive in our research in the research literature that's out there for failures that women have on supervision and in the community as well.

### Slide 32:

#### Rethinking Responsivity for Women

Responsivity: How & Barriers

- Cognitive-Behavioral Approach?
- Gender?
- Motivation
- Cognitive Deficits

CBT programs still most effective but gender-responsive CBT curricula are even better

Gender is no longer limited to being a specific responsivity factor

Rather, it should be at the forefront in all of R-N-R

**Dr. Emily Salisbury:** We also need to think about responsivity differently. So not just thinking about how risk looks different, how need looks different, but also rethinking the idea of responsivity for justice involved women. Cognitive behavioral programs are still what we consider to be most effective in what we talk about and what we should be doing with justice involved women in terms of the modality in the program but it shouldn't just be cognitive behavioral in nature it should also be gender-responsive curricula, that are even better. That we see that it's not just about talking about antisocial or how attitudes drive behavior but also talking about this idea that there's other things going on with those justice involved women besides just antisocial attitudes, and thinking about where those antisocial attitudes come from, and thinking about all of the relational needs that we know women have, and the issues that we just sort of went through in the criminogenic needs that they have. So if curricula in the modality should not just be cognitive behavioral but also gender-responsive and there are a number of validated and effective programs out there that are cognitive behavioral in nature and gender-responsive. If you're interested in learning more about what those curricula are please let me know and I can get you a list of what those are, but those are things like The Women Offender Case Management Models from Marilyn Van Dieten, Moving On also from Marilyn Van Dieten, Beyond Trauma by Stephanie Covington, Beyond Violence also by Covington, there's a number of gender-responsive curricula, Seeking Safety by Lisa Najavits is another one, there's a list of things. So we know it's important to be looking at these and so the idea of general responsivity changes. I also want to take gender out of this idea of being a specific responsivity factor if we're going to be doing gender-responsive strategies gender isn't just something that should be an afterthought in a responsivity factor or a barrier to success in treatment. It should really be at the forefront of all of what we do. We should have a gendered lens from the beginning and think about what our system, again, should look like in programming and practice, and supervision when we start with women in mind, so it should be at the forefront. I don't want to say that gender is a barrier, I'm sorry it's like I'm, it's more than that we know that there are risk factors that change and that gender really should be, again, at the beginning of our discussion in thinking about practices.

### Slide 33:

#### Gender-Responsive Responsivity

Responsivity

- Cognitive-Behavioral Approach
- Gender
- Motivation
- Cognitive Deficits

G-R Responsivity

- GR Cognitive-Behavioral Approach
- Trauma-Informed
- Motivation
- Cognitive Deficits

**Dr. Emily Salisbury:** So I know that this is a bit awkward of a title for the slide Gender-Responsive Responsivity, but I didn't, sort of working on this conceptually and theoretically right now, this will probably change, but if we think about how responsivity really should look different for women this is how it changes. Things like using trauma informed care in our modality and in our practices is going to change too for gender-responsive practices and gender-responsive responsivity so it means that we'll use, again, gender-responsive cognitive-behavioral approach, trauma informed, and of course focus in all of those other responsivity factors that we often times think about generally with male offenders. So lack of motivation, increasing motivation, increasing their engagement in treatment, looking at treatment readiness, cognitive deficits, anything else, you know, lack of transportation, lack of housing, all of those specific responsivities, or responsivity factors that agencies are already looking at. The difference is, is the

approach changes we're going to use trauma informed strategies and no longer keep gender relegated to responsiveness but start with gender in mind.

**Slide 34:**

**Meta-Analysis: 37 Studies & 22,000 Justice Involved Women**

- Gender-responsive programs were as effective as gender-neutral programs in reducing women's recidivism.
- When limited to the 18 most methodologically rigorous studies, **G-R programs were significantly more likely to reduce women's recidivism compared to G-N programs.**

**Dr. Emily Salisbury:** Some of the research around why this is important is we now have one of the first meta-analysis that supports these gender-responsive programs. This is research from Rene Gobeil and her colleagues, we now know that based off of 37 studies and nearly 22,000 justice involved women that gender-responsive curricula are even more effective than what we see with gender-neutral curricula. So a meta-analysis for those of you who don't know is basically a study of studies and the research literature that comes out of the evidence-based and what works literature has talked about, and has a few meta-analyses that supports their research. This meta-analysis is a study of studies of both gender neutral and gender-responsive programming curricula. The author really wanted to know, the authors of this meta-analysis wanted to know, well what's more effective, is it the gender neutral curricula, things like, you know, T for C - thinking for a change, or the other sort of cognitive behavioral programs that are standard, or are the programs that are specifically designed for female offenders but that are also cognitive behavioral are those effective? What they found was that when they limited the research to the 18 most methodologically rigorous studies that gender-responsive programs were significantly, statistically significantly, more likely to reduce women's recidivism compared to the gender neutral programming curricula. So essentially what that means is that if we want to be as successful as we possibly can with female offenders it's best to have curricula that again, are cognitive behavioral in nature and gender-responsive as well. That we actually do better, have better outcomes when we use programs like Moving On, like Seeking Safety, like Beyond Violence and Beyond Trauma. That those programs have something about them that women engage more in and actually change their criminogenic needs. So critical in terms of a meta-analysis, this is again, quantitative research that supports the justifications for changing that responsiveness principle for justice involved women.

**Slide 35:**

**Implications for Program Audits**

- CPAIs and CPCs map the wrong theoretical templates onto gender-responsive programs.
- Better to use program tools that are gender-responsive:
  - Gender-Informed Practices Assessment
  - Gender-Responsive Policy and Practices Assessment
  - Gender-Responsive Community Programs Inventory

**Dr. Emily Salisbury:** Some of the implications for this are pretty important to also keep in mind when we're talking about program audits. So I know many of you use the correctional program checklist or CPAIs in order to determine continued funding and to think about how well a program adheres to gender, gender neutral, or what works, or evidence-based practices. Some things that we've seen come up within agencies is that, if agencies start to embrace gender-responsive strategies that it's no longer relevant to be using a CPC or CPAI for an audit on those programs because the CPC and the CPAI were also not founded upon the research that we know to be most effective with women offenders. The CPAIs and the CPCs were founded upon the same kinds of research that were male-based. So we've seen the use of these tools backfire on agencies that are actually doing very good work with their female offenders and moving towards gender-responsive strategies. So in response there are other audits that have come out recently that are now being used and validated for use with agencies that are doing gender-responsive strategies. These are the gender-informed practices assessment, the gender-responsive policy and practice assessment, and the gender-responsive community programs inventory. Some of these are NIC tools, the first two I believe are and the gender-responsive CP inventory is a tool recently developed by Pat Van Voorhis at the University of Cincinnati. Each one of these can help agencies think about how well they're doing in achieving from a systemic perspective, from a system wide perspective, how well they're achieving the gender responsive principles and evidence-based practices. So we will start to see a shift in the use of CPAIs and CPCs with programs that are doing gender-responsive strategies because these CPAIs and CPCs, again, map the wrong theoretical templates onto gender-responsive programs.

**Slide 36:**

**Designed for Men-Applied to Women**

Every policy and practice designed for men and applied to women affects all women 100%, not 7%.

*If our goal is to reduce offending and extend positive outcomes to families, children, and communities, we have to know and address women's criminogenic needs and build upon their strengths.*

**Dr. Emily Salisbury:** At the end of the day, just in closing, I want to just remind everybody that every policy and practice that's designed for men and applied to women effects women 100% of the time, each and every woman, not 7%. So even though women only make up 7% of a correctional population and institutions and in prisons, every single policy that we have that's male-based and then applied to women effects each one of them and then effects their children, and then effects potentially more victims and our overall public safety. And if our goal really is to reduce offending and extend positive outcomes to families and children in communities we have to know and address women's criminogenic needs that we know they have and build upon their strengths. I want to thank you for your time today and appreciate the attention to this issue, it's an important issue that if we don't do enough around, we'll continue to see unfortunately women cycle through the system, but again, I'm here to tell you there are solutions to this. If you're an individual whose been kind of banging his or her head against the wall thinking about why doesn't this work with women, you probably understand that there needs to be different policies and procedures for women and that there is an overwhelming amount of research to support gender-responsive strategies. Thanks very much.