# SUBSTANCE USE ADULT

## AN EVIDENCE-BASED CURRIULUM

UCCI’s Cognitive-Behavioral Interventions - Substance Use Adult (CBI-SUA) curriculum provides intervention for individuals that are moderate to high need in the area of substance use. As the name of the curriculum suggests, this intervention relies on a cognitive behavioral approach to teach participants strategies for avoiding substance abuse. The program places heavy emphasis on skill building activities to assist with cognitive, social, emotional, and coping skill development. The following information serves to support the CBI-SUA as an evidence-based program capable of favorably changing offending behavior.

FOLLOWS RNR MODEL OF EFFECTIVE PRACTICES:[[1]](#endnote-1)

* 1. Designed for moderate to high-risk individuals as determined by a validated tool for measuring likelihood for recidivism (risk principle).[[2]](#endnote-2)
	2. Not recommended for low-risk individuals to be included in groups. If the material is delivered to low-risk individuals, it is recommended that dosage be: (risk principle) [[3]](#endnote-3)
* Decreased
* Target specific domains indicated by a dynamic criminogenic need assessment
	1. Flexible dosage to match individual risk level of program participants (risk principle)
	2. Targets multiple criminogenic needs including but not limited to: (need principle) [[4]](#endnote-4)
* Antisocial cognitions
* High-risk peer associations
* High-risk personality traits (anger, aggression, poor problem solving, impulsivity etc.)
* Substance use
* Leisure activities
	1. Uses cognitive-behavioral interventions as demonstrated by: (general responsivity principle) [[5]](#endnote-5) [[6]](#endnote-6) [[7]](#endnote-7) [[8]](#endnote-8) [[9]](#endnote-9) [[10]](#endnote-10)
* Emphasizes the thought-behavior link, thought awareness, thought analysis and risky thought restructuring [[11]](#endnote-11) [[12]](#endnote-12)
* Problem solving
* Structured skill acquisition, development and advanced application [[13]](#endnote-13) [[14]](#endnote-14)
* Emotion regulation: anger, impulsivity, aggression, anxiety, self-centeredness, poor coping, high taste for risk [[15]](#endnote-15)
* Utilizes social learning to promote skills acquisition and mastery through teaching, modeling, role-playing (practice and application), feedback, and graduated practice [[16]](#endnote-16) [[17]](#endnote-17)
	1. Targets specific responsivity by providing optional motivational enhancement sessions [[18]](#endnote-18)

EMPHASIZES FIDELITY PRINCIPLE: [[19]](#endnote-19)

* 1. Clear learning objectives [[20]](#endnote-20)
	2. Scripted sessions [[21]](#endnote-21) [[22]](#endnote-22)
	3. Availability of fidelity observation, coaching and tracking

INCLUDES SUCCESS PLANNING TO ADDRESS RELAPSE PREVENTION: [[23]](#endnote-23) [[24]](#endnote-24)

* 1. Identification of high risk people, places and things
	2. Clear and specific responses of the above to lower risk
	3. Behavioral rehearsal of those above identified situations and responses
	4. Problem solving skill development [[25]](#endnote-25)
	5. Inclusion of a support network
	6. Specific plans for responding to lapses
	7. Development of alternative prosocial activities, supports and behaviors

*In April of 2001, the International Community Corrections Association (ICCA) published an evidence informed checklist in the Journal of Community Corrections (JCC) to assist in the selections of effective curricula. The full article and checklist is available through membership to the ICCA or through a membership-holding library. Of the 83 items on the checklist, the curriculum fulfills all but one recommendation: regarding ethics, the curriculum advises that local or state ethical guidelines be used. A formal evaluation was conducted by the Kansas Department of Corrections and favorable results showed the program an effective intervention in reducing recidivism. A copy of this report is available upon request by emailing* *corrections.institute@uc.edu**.*
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