

Pretrial Services Agency
for the District of Columbia



**Congressional Budget Justification and
Performance Budget Request
Fiscal Year 2016**

FEBRUARY 2015

Leadership

Executive Management

Clifford T. Keenan, Esq.
Director

Leslie C. Cooper, Esq.
Deputy Director/Chief Operating Officer

Catherine Terry-Crusor
Associate Director, Operations

Ronald Brown
Director, Office of Human Capital
Management

Ron Hickey
Director, Office of Information Technology

Wendy L. Miller
Director, Office of Finance and
Administration

Felix Adatsi, Ph.D.
Director, Office of Forensic Toxicology
Services

Spurgeon Kennedy
Director, Office of Strategic Development/
Performance Improvement Officer

Claire J. Fay
Director, Office of Justice and Community
Relations

Executive Committee

Honorable Eric T. Washington, Chair
Chief Judge, District of Columbia Court of
Appeals

Honorable Merrick B. Garland
Chief Judge, United States Court of Appeals for
the District of Columbia Circuit

Honorable Richard W. Roberts
Chief Judge, United States District Court for the
District of Columbia

Honorable Lee F. Satterfield
Chief Judge, Superior Court for the District of
Columbia

Honorable Nancy M. Ware
Director, Court Services and Offender
Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia

Honorable Ronald C. Machen, Jr., Esq.
United States Attorney for the District of
Columbia

Avis Buchanan, Esq.
Director, Public Defender Service for the District
of Columbia

Table of Contents

Fiscal Year 2016 President’s Budget 1

Summary of Change 2

Program Justification Changes 3

PSA Program Purpose 6

Performance Outcomes..... 8

Organizational Structure 9

Resource Requirements by Strategic Goal 15

Strategic Areas

 Help Judicial Officers Make Informed Release and Detention Decisions 16

 Supervise Defendants to Support Court Appearance and Enhance Public Safety.. 18

 Integrate Treatment and Pro-social Interventions into Supervision..... 23

 Partnerships 26

Progress on Strategic Initiatives..... 28

Supporting Materials 35

 Using Evidence and Evaluation to Improve Outcomes..... 35
 (OMB M-14-06, Guidance for Providing and Using Administrative Data
 for Statistical Purposes)

Budget Display 39

Pretrial Services Agency Fiscal Year 2016 President's Budget

The Pretrial Services Agency for the District of Columbia (PSA) assists judicial officers in both the Superior Court of the District of Columbia and the United States District Court for the District of Columbia by conducting a risk assessment for every arrested person who will be presented in court and formulating release or detention recommendations based upon the arrestee's demographic information, criminal history, and substance use and/or mental health information. For defendants who are placed on conditional release pending trial, PSA provides supervision and treatment services that reasonably assure that they return to court and do not engage in criminal activity pending their trial and/or sentencing. The result is that, in the District of Columbia (D.C. or District), unnecessary pretrial detention is minimized, jail crowding is reduced, public safety is increased and, most significantly, the pretrial release process is administered fairly.

PSA was created by an act of Congress (the *District of Columbia Bail Agency Act*) in 1967. Under the *National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997*, PSA was established as an independent entity within the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency (CSOSA) in the Executive Branch of the Federal Government. Since its inception as a federal agency, PSA has sharpened its mission and vision and committed itself to being driven by performance and measured by results.

Defendants are placed into PSA supervision programs during the pretrial release period based on the release conditions ordered by the Court. During FY 2014, PSA supervised 18,656 defendants, including 14,142 defendants who were placed onto supervision during the year and 4,514 whose supervision continued from FY 2013.

PSA's FY 2016 President's Budget (PB) reinforces the Agency's commitment to be a performance-based, results-oriented organization that can directly link costs with outcomes. It also highlights the Agency's continued dedication to ensuring public safety and promoting pretrial justice through high-quality risk assessment, supervision and treatment procedures. In FY 2016, PSA will continue to improve its identification of defendants who pose a higher risk of pretrial failure, enhance its supervision and oversight of these defendants, and work with local justice and community partners to expand services and support for persons with substance dependence and mental health needs. The Agency will emphasize evidence-based operational and management practices and emphasize human capital to improve quality. Most importantly, PSA will continue its near 50-year commitment of providing excellent service to the District of Columbia through a strong sense of mission, a dedicated and professional staff, and collaboration with our justice and community partners.

PSA's FY 2016 PB is \$62,357,000, including 373 FTE, a net increase of \$1,512,000 or 2.5 percent above the FY 2015 Enacted Budget. The requested increase consists of \$812,000 in adjustments to base (ATB) and \$700,000 in program changes. Resources are requested for inflationary increases in non-payroll cost categories including rent, contracts, supplies, materials, equipment and utilities. Funds are also requested for the anticipated FY 2016 pay raise of 1.3 percent estimated to be effective January 2016 through September 2016, and for the increase in agency contribution rates to Federal Employee Retirement System (FERS) plans effective October 1, 2015 (per OMB A-11 Section 32, dated July 2014).

The FY 2016 PB includes an increase of \$700,000 in program changes to procure and implement an electronic document records management system (EDRMS) including resources for 1 FTE.

Summary of Change

FY 2016 President's Budget Submission			
	Positions	FTE	Amount \$ (000)
FY 2015 Enacted	376	372	60,845
FY 2016 Requested Adjustments to Base (ATB):			
FY 2016 Pay Raise and Retirement Benefit Cost Increase	-	-	670
FY 2016 Non-payroll Inflation	-	-	142
Total Requested ATB	-	-	812
FY 2016 Requested Program Increase			
Electronic Document Records Management System	-	1	700
Total Requested Program Increase	-	1	700
Total FY 2016 Changes	-	1	1,512
FY 2016 President's Budget	376	373	62,357
Increase above FY 2015 Enacted	-	1	1,512
Percent Increase above FY 2015 Enacted	0.0%	0.3%	2.5%

Program Justification Changes

Requested Program Increase: +\$700,000 0 Positions 1 FTE

PSA requests \$700,000 in FY 2016 resources to procure and implement an electronic document records management system (EDRMS) to manage documents and records throughout the document life-cycle, from creation to destruction.

Justification for Program Increase			
Electronic Document Records Management Systems (EDRMS)			
Strategic Objective II: Use innovative approaches in technology and organizational learning.			
Program Area	Increase in FTE	Increase in Funding	
Procure and Implement EDRMS	0	+\$500,000	One-time; Non-recurring
Operation and Maintenance of EDRMS – personnel costs	1	+\$125,000	Permanent; Recurring
Operation and Maintenance of EDRMS – non-personnel costs (training program, equipment maintenance, supplies)	0	+75,000	Permanent; Recurring
Total Requested Program Increase	1	+\$700,000	

CSOSA (Community Supervision Program (CSP) and PSA) has launched a joint records management program to reform and improve the Agency's¹ recordkeeping capabilities. This funding request represents PSA's share of the cost to implement an effective and efficient recordkeeping solution that is in compliance with the Presidential Memorandum, Managing Government Records (dated November 28, 2014), and OMB/NARA M-12-18, Managing Government Records Directive (dated August 24, 2012).

This request for funding includes a one-time requirement of \$500,000 to procure and implement a CSP/PSA shared EDRMS. This one-time funding will cover PSA's share of the cost of equipment (hardware for capture, storage, and capacity); software (licenses, applications); and technical services to perform system architecture setup, installation, testing, and implementation, and to design file repositories using indexing or taxonomy. In addition, a permanent adjustment to base of \$200,000, including one full-time equivalent (FTE), is requested beginning in FY 2016. This funding and FTE will support PSA's share of the on-going operation and maintenance of the EDRMS (to include securing the privacy and confidentiality of sensitive and personally identifiable information (PII)); continued migration and maintenance of records to electronic

¹ The term "Agency" in the Program Justification Changes section of the PSA FY 2016 budget document refers to CSOSA, which includes CSP and PSA.

format for eventual transfer and accessioning by the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA); and a records management training program.

This funding request is a best estimate based on preliminary research conducted by CSP/PSA information technology (IT) and records management experts. CSP/PSA used FY 2014 funding resources to procure consulting services and records management expertise to analyze existing IT system capabilities and business processes. The results of this analysis will be used to select a technological recordkeeping solution and develop an implementation plan. The analysis will be completed in FY 2015 and, with the requested funding, CSP/PSA anticipates procuring and beginning to implement an EDRMS in FY 2016.

Background

U.S. Code Title 44, § 3101, requires the head of each Federal agency to make and preserve records containing adequate and proper documentation of the organization, functions, policies, decisions, procedures and essential transactions of the agency. Records are to be designed to furnish the information necessary to protect the legal and financial rights of the Government and of persons directly affected by the agency's activities.

NARA's 2012 annual survey identified CSOSA as "high risk" for mismanagement of federal records. In CSOSA's current state, recordkeeping life-cycle management is extremely difficult as the burden is oftentimes placed on individuals to manually manage electronic records. Managing records in this manner can result in the mismanagement of records, which can cause records to be misclassified, and possibly, enable unauthorized access.

For the past several years, CSP and PSA have jointly worked towards correcting noted deficiencies by incorporating statutory records management requirements and sound records management principles into work processes, enterprise architecture, and information systems. The Agency has issued records management policy, appointed a Senior Agency Official (SAO), hired an Agency Records Officer, established Records Inventory and Disposition Schedules (RIDS) and developed a Records Management Strategic Plan.

An EDRMS will significantly aid with achieving CSOSA's goal of creating a paperless agency. While a third of the Agency's records are considered permanent, most of the records are temporary and require storage until the record has reached its disposition. The Agency uses FTEs and financial resources to manage and maintain both on-site and off-site storage facilities. An EDRMS will avoid some of these costs, as the system will be both for storage and destruction. Over time, hard copy records will be reduced as records reaching their disposition are destroyed and new records are created in electronic format.

CSOSA's Records Management Strategic Plan identifies the following major milestones as necessary to fully implement a NARA-approved records management solution.

Target Completion Timeframe	Milestone
FY 2014	Evaluate electronic document records management solutions/products for permanent use which will accommodate multiple formats and meet architectural, information technology security, privacy, Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) and litigation-related requirements.
FY 2015	Identify product and develop an implementation plan.
FY 2016	Procure and perform initial implementation of an EDRMS.
FYs 2017 – 2019	Complete implementation of an EDRMS – continue records conversion; system setup, operations and maintenance; communication, and training. Achieve full compliance with OMB/NARA M-18-12 by December 31, 2019 deadline.
FY 2019 and beyond	Perform on-going operation and maintenance of an EDRMS and administration of records management program, to include communication; training, evaluation and reporting.

CSOSA has made substantial progress in improving its records management program and is on track to complete the strategic milestones through FY 2015. The requested funding is necessary to fully procure and implement a technological solution that will ensure compliance with the goals outlined in OMB/NARA M-18-12, in which Federal agencies are directed to (1) require electronic recordkeeping to ensure transparency, efficiency and accountability; and (2) demonstrate compliance with federal records management statutes and regulations. The acquired IT solution will manage the full records life-cycle and interface with existing agency electronic systems, and prove capable of expanding with future systems acquired by the Agency.

Budget Justification

PSA, in partnership with CSP, is committed to reforming and improving its records management program but does not have sufficient discretionary funding in its current budget baseline to absorb the costs associated with the implementation and on-going operations and maintenance of an EDRMS. Without the requested funding increase, PSA’s progress towards improved records management will be hindered, and it is unlikely that compliance with the aforementioned directives on managing government records by the required deadlines will be achieved.

An EDRMS will greatly improve how the Agency conducts business. Aside from the fact that it will bring the Agency into compliance, it simply makes sense. It will give the Agency better credibility and provide stronger integrity to the work the Agency performs by providing a system that enables a sound systematic approach to managing Federal records. Investing in smarter information technology solutions is in keeping with the President’s Management Agenda to create a Government that is effective and efficient.

PSA Program Purpose

Mission, Vision and Goals

PSA's *mission* is to promote pretrial justice and enhance community safety.

Our *vision* is to thrive as a leader within the justice system through a diverse, inclusive and empowered workforce that embodies integrity, excellence, accountability, and innovation in the delivery of the highest quality services.

Adherence to CSOSA Strategic Goals

PSA supports the CSOSA strategic goals of 1) Establishing strict accountability and preventing the population supervised from engaging in criminal activity; 2) Delivering preventative interventions to the population supervised based on assessed need; and 3) Supporting the fair administration of justice by providing accurate information and meaningful recommendations to criminal justice decision-makers.

Strategic Outcomes

Consistent with its mission—and the legal status of pretrial defendants—PSA's three key strategic outcomes are:

- ✓ *Minimizing rearrests* among defendants released while pending trial to help assure public safety.
- ✓ *Reducing failures to appear for scheduled court appearances* to help promote more efficient administration of justice.
- ✓ *Maximizing the number of defendants who remain on release at the conclusion of their pretrial status with no pending requests for removal or revocation at the conclusion of their pretrial status* to encourage defendant accountability.

Strategic Goals

To translate the strategic goals and outcomes into operational terms, PSA has adopted four *Strategic Goals* and one *Management Goal* that are linked to the outcomes of promoting public safety, court appearance and defendant accountability.

Strategic Goal 1 – *Help judicial officers make informed release and detention decisions throughout the pretrial period.* PSA promotes informed and effective release determinations by formulating and recommending the least restrictive release conditions to reasonably assure that the defendant will appear for scheduled court dates and not pose a threat to any person or to the community while on release.

Strategic Goal 2 – *Supervise defendants to support court appearance and enhance public safety.* PSA effectively monitors or supervises pretrial defendants—consistent with the court-ordered release conditions—to promote court appearance and public safety.

Strategic Goal 3 – *Integrate treatment and pro-social interventions into supervision to support court appearance and enhance public safety.* PSA provides or makes referrals to effective substance use disorder, mental health, and social services to encourage compliance with release conditions, thereby enhancing public safety and supporting court appearance.

Strategic Goal 4 – *Partner with stakeholders to address defendant needs and produce better system outcomes.* PSA’s partnerships with the justice system agencies, local government and private social service providers, and the community enhance its ability to provide effective community supervision, enforce accountability of defendant conduct, and support public safety.

Management Goal 1 – *Maintain a results-driven culture.* PSA strives to be a performance-based, results-oriented organization that can directly link costs to outcomes. PSA’s performance-based culture stresses employee results (measured through employee satisfaction and performance ratings), organization results (measured by appropriate outcome and performance measures), and customer results (measured by customer satisfaction with Agency performance and products).

Performance Outcomes

PSA measures achievement of its critical outcomes through three measures:

1. The percentage of defendants who remain arrest-free during the pretrial release period.
2. The percentage of defendants who make all scheduled court appearances during the pretrial period.
3. The percentage of defendants who remain on release at the conclusion of their pretrial period without a pending request for removal or revocation due to non-compliance.

PSA Performance Outcomes

OUTCOMES	FY 2010 Actual	FY 2011 Actual	FY 2012 Actual	FY 2013 Actual	FY 2014 Actual	FY 2014- 2016 Target
Percentage of Defendants Who Remain Arrest-free During the Pretrial Release Period						
Any crimes	88%	88%	89%	90%	89%	88%
Violent crimes	97%	99%	99%	>99%	99%	98%
Percentage of Defendants Who Make All Scheduled Court Appearances During the Pretrial Period						
Any defendants	88%	88%	89%	88%	88%	87%
Percentage of Defendants Who Remain on Release at the Conclusion of Their Pretrial Status Without a Pending Request for Removal or Revocation Due to Non-compliance						
	83%	88%	88%	87%	88%	85%

Organizational Structure

PSA's organizational structure supports the effective management of risk assessment, drug testing, supervision, and treatment services for pretrial defendants, and performance of a variety of other management and administrative functions. Under the direction of the Associate Director for Operations, the Court Services, Supervision and Treatment Programs carry out PSA's court and defendant related operations. All management, program development and administrative support functions, including forensic toxicology services, are performed under the oversight of the Office of the Director.

Court Services Program

The **Court Services Program** consists of the Diagnostic Unit, the Release Services Unit, and the Drug Testing and Compliance Unit.

The *Diagnostic Unit* interviews defendants arrested and detained on criminal charges in the D.C. Superior Court, formulates release recommendations based on a comprehensive, scientifically validated risk assessment, and provides the recommendations to judicial officers in a pretrial services report (PSR). The pre-release process includes an extensive background investigation, during which information collected in defendant interviews is verified and criminal history information is gathered and analyzed. This information is used to assess each defendant's risk of rearrest and failure to appear in Court. It is also used to make an individualized recommendation to the judicial officer for either pretrial release or detention at arraignment. Recommendations for release include specific conditions that are designed to mitigate the risk of rearrest and failure to appear. Diagnostic Unit staff appears in court during each arraignment to provide information upon request by the judiciary and to facilitate the placement of defendants released into various PSA supervision programs. The Diagnostic Unit also conducts investigations for arrestees being considered by the arresting law enforcement agency for release on citation (so they will not be detained pending their first appearance before a judicial officer).

Following a defendant's release onto pretrial supervision with PSA, the *Release Services Unit* conducts a post-release interview that includes a review of the defendant's release conditions and an explanation of the penalties that could result from non-compliance, failure to appear, and rearrest. This Unit also investigates outstanding bench warrants to re-establish contact with defendants who have failed to appear for court. The Unit prevents the issuance of bench warrants by verifying defendants' inability to appear in court (e.g., due to incarceration in another jurisdiction or hospitalization) and notifying the Court. The Unit is also responsible for conducting criminal history investigations and preparing PSRs for D.C. Code violation and traffic lock-ups.

The *Drug Testing and Compliance Unit (DTCU)* collects urine and oral fluid samples for analysis from defendants detained prior to arraignment, defendants who have been ordered to drug test as a condition of pretrial release, and respondents with matters in D.C. Family Court. Because a substantial number of criminal defendants have substance use disorders that must be addressed to

mitigate their risk to public safety, drug testing provides vital data that informs judiciary release decisions and PSA supervision approaches.

Supervision Program

The **Supervision Program** consists of the General Supervision Unit, the High Intensity Supervision Program, and the United States (U.S.) District Court Unit.

The *General Supervision Unit (GSU)* supervises the majority of defendants released by D.C. Superior Court to PSA on conditional release. Release conditions may include orders to stay away from designated people and places; regular in-person or telephone contact with PSA; drug testing; and referrals for treatment assessment and program placement. GSU Pretrial Services Officers (PSOs) ensure that current and relevant information regarding compliance is continuously available to the Court. PSOs use a variety of case management techniques to encourage defendant compliance with release conditions. If the defendant cannot be brought into compliance through these efforts, the PSO sends a violation report to the Court, including specific recommendations, such as substance use disorder treatment or mental health treatment, designed to address the non-compliance. GSU PSOs, through two teams of designated Court Representative PSOs, also provide daily courtroom support to judicial officers to ensure placement of defendants into appropriate pretrial programs.

Defendants under GSU supervision have been charged with offenses ranging from serious misdemeanors to dangerous and/or violent felonies. Many defendants are statutorily eligible for pretrial detention based on their charge (e.g., robbery, burglary, aggravated assault) or criminal history (e.g., they are arrested while on release in a pending case or on probation). However, the Court can determine, after considering PSA's risk assessment and release recommendations, that supervised release in the community under extensive conditions is appropriate and cost effective. In such cases, the Court's expectation is that PSA will closely supervise compliance with release conditions and promptly report any non-compliance to the Court.

GSU also supervises defendants placed into the D.C. Department of Corrections work release (halfway house) program when the Court orders additional conditions, such as drug testing and reporting in person to PSA.

The *U.S. District Court Unit* conducts pre-release assessment and investigation services for federal defendants similar to those conducted in the Diagnostic Unit. In addition to those responsibilities, the Unit supervises released defendants and convicted persons pending surrender for service of their sentences. Like their counterparts in the D.C. Superior Court, PSOs in the U. S. District Court Unit notify U.S. District Court judges and magistrate judges of violations of release conditions in federal criminal cases. PSOs in this Unit also provide daily courtroom support to judicial officers.

The *High Intensity Supervision Program (HISP)* supervises high risk defendants who have supervision-related failures from other PSA units; are charged with violent misdemeanors and felonies; were initially detained but are now eligible for release; or are compliant with halfway

house conditions of work release and are now appropriate for placement back into the community. Supervision requirements include face-to-face contact and drug testing at least once per week, and a daily electronically monitored curfew. If the Court orders the defendant to stay away from a location, that condition is monitored by Global Positioning System (GPS) equipment.

The program consists of two phases, the Community Supervision phase and the Home Confinement phase. During the Community Supervision phase, defendants are monitored for compliance with curfew requirements and are required to report to PSA at least weekly for drug testing and meetings with their designated PSO. Home Confinement is intended primarily as a graduated sanction for defendants who violate the program requirements under the Community Supervision phase. However, the Court may opt to order a defendant directly into Home Confinement and require the defendant to demonstrate compliance before graduating down to the Community Supervision phase. During Home Confinement, defendants are subject to up to 21 days of 24-hour electronically monitored curfew. They are allowed to leave their homes only for work, to attend school, to report to PSA for face-to-face contacts and drug testing, and for other pre-approved purposes. Defendants are returned to Community Supervision once they have completed the 21 days without incurring any infractions. Due to the heightened risk associated with this population, PSA reports all program violations to the Court within an expedited timeframe.

Treatment Program

The **Treatment Program** is staffed by PSOs experienced in supervising and providing services for defendants with substance use and/or mental health disorders. It includes the Superior Court Drug Intervention Program (Drug Court), the Sanction-Based Treatment Track, the Specialized Supervision Unit, the D.C. Misdemeanor and Traffic Initiative (DCMTI), and the Social Services and Assessment Center.

Drug Court is a treatment/supervision program that implements an evidence-based model for treating defendants with substance use disorders. Drug Court PSOs are clinically credentialed and provide both supervision and treatment services. Generally, Drug Court targets defendants charged with non-violent offenses. Participants in the program appear frequently before the Drug Court judge, submit to random drug testing, participate in substance use disorder treatment, and agree to immediate administrative or court-imposed sanctions for non-compliance with program requirements. The program incorporates contingency management (i.e., incentives and sanctions) to modify behavior. Sanctions range from administrative or treatment responses, such as additional groups or writing assignments, to judicially-imposed jail sanctions. Incentives, such as judicial verbal acknowledgement and nominal value tokens, are provided in response to positive behavior. Program completion can result in dismissal of a misdemeanor case and reduction of felony charges to misdemeanor convictions through amended sentencing agreements.

The *Sanction-Based Treatment Track (SBTT)* is intended for defendants not eligible for Drug Court but includes many features of that program. Defendants in SBTT receive the same treatment options and are subject to the same administrative and judicially-imposed sanctions as Drug Court defendants. SBTT defendants may also receive incentives for positive behavior. However, these

incentives are more limited and less immediate than those awarded in Drug Court. Unlike Drug Court, SBTT defendants have limited judicial interaction (except when being sanctioned) and are not eligible for case dismissal or other favorable case disposition upon successful completion.

The *Specialized Supervision Unit (SSU)* provides critical supervision and case management services for defendants with severe and persistent mental health disorders, as well as those dually diagnosed with both mental illness and substance use disorders. The SSU ensures that these defendants are linked with community-based mental health treatment through the D.C. Department of Behavioral Health and similar agencies in Maryland and Virginia, for residents of those states. Personnel in this unit have mental health expertise and/or specialized experience in working effectively with the mentally-ill and dually-diagnosed defendants. The SSU plays a vital role in supporting the Mental Health Community Court (MHCC), which is a partnership among PSA, the D.C. Superior Court, U.S. Attorney's Office, and local defense bar created to provide an alternative to traditional case processing for appropriate defendants with mental health issues. The MHCC is available to eligible defendants charged with either misdemeanors or felonies and enables positive defendant judicial interaction and full participation in mental health services. PSA's participation in the MHCC includes assessing and recommending eligible defendants for participation, providing close supervision and connection to mental health and substance use disorder treatment, and reporting compliance to the Court.

The *D.C. Misdemeanor and Traffic Initiative (DCMTI)* provides supervision, connection to substance use disorder and/or mental health treatment, and encourages compliance with treatment for defendants charged with certain impaired driving-related and other D.C. Code offenses prosecuted by the Office of the Attorney General for the District of Columbia. The unit primarily serves treatment-needy defendants charged with Driving Under the Influence (DUI), Operating While Impaired (OWI), and Driving While Intoxicated (DWI). Other eligible defendants include those charged with reckless driving, aggressive panhandling, indecent exposure, and fleeing from a police officer, if they are found to require substance use disorder and/or mental health treatment.

The *Social Services and Assessment Center (SSAC)* conducts substance use disorder and mental health assessments and provides social service referrals for defendants under pretrial supervision. These services are provided in response to court-ordered release conditions and/or as the result of a PSO determining that services may be needed to enable release condition compliance. The SSAC conducts approximately 170 substance use disorder assessments or re-assessments and 200 mental health assessments per month. The SSAC also assesses defendants suspected of experiencing mental illness. Staff in the SSAC identify and maintain information on available treatment, employment, education, housing and other social services that may be utilized by defendants in meeting pretrial release obligations or achieving life stability.

Forensic Toxicology Services

The Office of Forensic Toxicology Services (OFTS) processes urine specimens and conducts drug testing for pretrial defendants under PSA's supervision and offenders under the CSOSA Community Supervision Program (CSP) (i.e., persons on probation, parole, and supervised release), as well as respondents ordered into testing by the D.C. Superior Court Family Division.

Each sample is tested for three to seven drugs and all positive samples are retested for confirmation. Gas chromatograph/mass spectrometry (GC/MS) analyses are conducted to confirm test results and provide affirmation of the identity of a drug when results are challenged. Toxicologists conduct levels analysis to determine drug concentrations. These interpretations are essential to the courts for determining continued drug use by a defendant. Expert witness court testimony and forensic consultations are also provided to assist the judicial officers.

OFTS conducts forensic research that leads directly to practical enhancements in drug testing, improves strategies in surveillance monitoring, develops beneficial bi-directional partnerships with the scientific and social research community, and introduces cutting edge technologies that improve efficiency, reduce cost and enhance Agency stature.

Management, Program Development and Administrative Support

The following areas within the Agency provide management, program development, and frontline operations support:²

Justice and Community Relations

The **Office of Justice and Community Relations** establishes and maintains effective partnerships with the judicial system, law enforcement and the community to enhance PSA's ability to provide effective community supervision, enforce accountability, increase community awareness of PSA's public safety role, and develop opportunities for defendants under pretrial supervision and pretrial diversion. It is through these partnerships with the courts, the United States Attorney's Office, various District government agencies and non-profit community-based organizations that PSA can effectuate close supervision to reasonably assure that defendants will return to court and not pose a danger to the community while on pretrial release. In addition, the partnerships foster development and expansion of treatment and social service options to address the social problems that contribute to criminal behavior.

Finance and Administration

The **Office of Finance and Administration** (OFA) assures the effective management and financial integrity of PSA programs, activities, and resources by developing, implementing and monitoring policies, procedures and systems in the areas of budget formulation and execution, finance and accounting, travel, internal controls, financial systems, and contract management. OFA also has responsibility for developing and administering policies, standards, and procedures regarding facilities management, property management and control, space management, vehicles, mail and distribution services, and printing and reproduction services.

² Certain functions are performed by CSOSA for PSA, including those of the Office of General Counsel; Legislative, Intergovernmental, Public Affairs; Equal Employment Opportunity; Diversity and Special Programs; and Professional Responsibility.

Human Capital Management

The **Office of Human Capital Management (OHCM)** develops and administers the full range of human resources programs, including organizational design; a comprehensive classification, pay, and position management program; staffing and recruitment; awards and recognition; payroll administration; employee and labor relations, benefits and assistance; and personnel security.

OHCM also includes the **Training and Career Development Center (TCDC)**, which manages programmatic, systems and management training; performs training needs assessments; develops curricula; prepares, presents, procures and administers training courses; and designs training on PSA programs and systems for external agencies. TCDC also offers formal developmental programs and training and opportunities to all staff.

Information Technology

The **Office of Information Technology (OIT)** plans, develops, and manages the information technology systems that support PSA programs and management operations as well as information technology-related standards, policies and procedures. OIT assesses PSA technology requirements; analyzes potential return on technology investment for internal systems and for PSA interface with external systems; designs and administers system configuration and architecture including hardware and software, telecommunications, network operations, desktop systems, and system security; reviews and approves acquisition of all PSA major hardware, software, and information technology contracts. In conjunction with the Agency management, OIT develops and implements an information technology plan that supports PSA's mission.

Strategic Development

The **Office of Strategic Development (OSD)** promotes informed action within PSA by leading the Agency's strategic planning, performance improvement, and research efforts. OSD also encourages innovative thinking within the Agency to advance best practices in risk assessment, supervision, treatment, and performance management. OSD's Director serves as PSA's Performance Improvement Officer.

Resource Requirements by Strategic Goal

As defined in PSA’s 2014-2018 Strategic Plan, PSA’s strategic goals span the Agency’s major functions and operations and are linked to the outcomes of promoting public safety, court appearance and defendant accountability. PSA uses a cost allocation methodology to determine actual and estimated appropriated resources, including both direct (e.g., staff performing direct defendant supervision) and indirect (e.g., rent, management) resources supporting each goal. Program summaries, accomplishments, and progress related to PSA’s strategic initiatives for each strategic goal are discussed in the following pages. The chart below reflects the funding allocation by strategic goal for fiscal years, 2014, 2015 and 2016.

Funding by Strategic Goal

	FY 2014 Actual	FY 2015 Enacted	ATB	Program Change	FY 2016 PB	Change from FY 2015 Enacted
Strategic Goal 1: Help judicial officers make informed release and detention decisions throughout the pretrial period.						
\$ in thousands	9,449	9,528	88	109	9,725	197
FTE	62	64	0	0	64	0
Strategic Goal 2: Supervise defendants to support court appearance and enhance public safety.						
\$ in thousands	27,168	28,277	335	325	28,937	660
FTE	163	177	0	0	177	0
Strategic Goal 3: Integrate treatment and pro-social interventions into supervision to support court appearances and enhance public safety.						
\$ in thousands	21,262	21,708	373	251	22,332	624
FTE	114	122	0	1	123	1
Strategic Goal 4: Partner with stakeholders to address defendant needs and produce better system outcomes.						
\$ in thousands	1,181	1,332	16	15	1,363	31
FTE	7	9	0	0	9	0
Total \$ in thousands	59,060	60,845	812	700	62,357	1,512
Total FTE	346	372	0	1	373	1

Strategic Areas

Strategic Goal 1 – Help judicial officers make informed release and detention decisions throughout the pretrial period.

Program Summary – Strategic Goal 1

PSA promotes informed and effective release determinations by formulating and recommending the least restrictive release conditions to reasonably assure that the defendant will appear for scheduled court dates and not pose a threat to any person or to the community while on release.

The foundation of effective pretrial supervision is based upon appropriate release conditions. The pretrial services report (PSR), or “bail report,” prepared by PSA provides much of the information the judicial officer uses to determine a defendant’s risk to the community and to determine what level of supervision, if any, the defendant requires. The bail report includes criminal history, lock-up drug test results, risk assessment, treatment needs and verified defendant information (residence, employment status, community ties, etc.).

PSA’s pre-release process assesses both risk of rearrest and failure to appear for scheduled court appearances. The assessment process has two components:

Risk Assessment: PSA uses a scientifically validated risk assessment instrument (RAI) that examines relevant defendant data to help identify the most appropriate supervision levels for released defendants. The assessment scores various risk measures specific to the District’s defendant population (e.g., previous failure to appear for court, previous dangerous and violent convictions in the past 10 years, suspected substance use disorder, current relationship to the criminal justice system, among numerous others). It then generates a score that assigns defendants to different risk categories and corresponding supervision assignments to help reduce the risk of failure to appear in court and rearrest.

Recommendation to the Court: PSA makes recommendations for release or detention based on risk determination. If release is recommended, the Agency recommends the least restrictive conditions for each defendant given the need for public safety and reasonable assurance that the defendant will return to court. When warranted, PSA recommends to the Court a variety of release conditions including, but not limited to, drug testing, substance use disorder treatment, mental health treatment, orders to stay-away from specified persons or places, regular and frequent face-to-face contact with a PSO, halfway house placement, GPS and electronic monitoring.

Performance Measures - Strategic Goal 1

Measures		FY 2010 Actual	FY 2011 Actual	FY 2012 Actual	FY 2013 Actual	FY 2014 Actual	FY 2014 -2016 Target
1.1	Percentage of defendants who are assessed for risk of failure to appear and rearrests	99%	98%	99%	99%	99%	96%
1.2	Percentage of defendants for whom PSA identifies eligibility for appropriate appearance and safety-based detention hearings	96%	95%	95%	95%	95%	94%

FY 2014 Accomplishments - Strategic Goal 1

- ✓ Prepared timely pretrial services reports (PSRs) for 15,504 of the 15,524 cases (over 99 percent) papered by the U.S. Attorney's Office.
- ✓ Interviewed defendants in 11,677 papered cases (75 percent).
- ✓ Conducted 533 failure-to-appear investigations. Staff attempted to contact defendants, verified the reason for the failure to appear, and submitted a report to the assigned calendar judge outlining the investigation results and making a recommendation for court action. Court Services staff facilitated the surrender to court of 198 defendants who missed scheduled court dates and had outstanding bench warrants issued.
- ✓ Prepared 1,014 updated PSRs for defendants who were held for a preliminary/detention hearing following their initial appearance.
- ✓ Implemented a scientifically validated RAI for formulating release condition recommendations. The new risk assessment continues PSA's commitment to grounding its operations and practices in solid, evidence-based research by more closely aligning release and detention recommendations with factors associated with failure to appear and rearrest. The new risk assessment improves PSA's ability to predict defendant misconduct and target supervision resources accordingly. The new assessment enhances the former risk assessment by examining additional risk factors that look specifically at risk of committing dangerous and violent offenses and domestic violence offenses.
- ✓ Began pilot testing of a mobile application for conducting defendant interviews to improve efficiency of operations. The mobile application allows PSOs to collect interview information using tablet technology instead of using paper folders. The information is downloaded into the Agency's information management system in real-time, reducing the time it takes to complete the preparation and production of PSRs.

- ✓ Provided support for the D.C. Service Members, Veterans and Their Families Action Plan released in 2014. This Plan lays out goals, objectives and strategies to guide District government agencies in developing a coordinated system of care that addresses the important needs of service members, veterans and their families (SMVF) along five priority areas: criminal justice, economic security and employment, housing and homelessness, education, and health care. The goal for the criminal justice segment is to decrease the number of incarcerated service members and veterans; for which the following objectives were identified:

1. Improve identification of veterans and service members involved in the DC criminal justice system.
2. Educate law enforcement, judges, corrections officers and mental health services providers on the unique issues faced by SMVF population.
3. Ensure that veterans and services members are represented on advisory bodies.
4. Improve awareness of and access to resources that serve criminal justice-involved SMVF.
5. Improve discharge planning for veterans exiting DC Jail.

While not a D.C. Government agency, PSA has an important role in meeting the goals of this plan for the city since its Court Services program interviews every person arrested in the District on federal and local criminal charges. Whereas a few years ago, PSA had only one “yes/no” question asking if the defendant is a veteran, the Agency now asks if the defendant is in current or had previous military status, which military branch, type of discharge, and discharge date. PSA began collecting data on veteran status in 2011. In FY 2014, there were 327 defendants who identified themselves as veterans. Each year, about 330 new defendants identify themselves as veterans. The criminal justice system is by no means the best place to address the unique issues faced by service members and veterans. However, it is one of the key places where these individuals are identified as needing services. For this reason, in the interest of public health and public safety, the criminal justice system must be proactive in expanding ways to not only identify service members and veterans, but also connect them to comprehensive and appropriate services.

Strategic Goal 2 – Supervise defendants to support court appearance and enhance public safety.

Program Summary – Strategic Goal 2

PSA effectively monitors or supervises pretrial defendants—consistent with the court-ordered release conditions—to promote court appearance and public safety.

PSA supervises defendants in accordance with release conditions that are designed to minimize risk to the community and maximize return to court. PSA focuses its supervision resources on defendants most at risk of violating their release conditions and employs graduated levels of supervision consistent with the defendant’s identified risk level. Very low risk defendants (those released without conditions) receive only notification of court dates. Fairly low risk defendants are placed in monitoring programs that require limited contact with PSA. Medium risk defendants are placed under PSA’s extensive supervision and maintain regular contact through drug testing and/or

reporting to a PSO. High risk defendants may be subject to frequent contact with an assigned PSO and drug testing, curfew, electronic monitoring, substance use disorder treatment or other conditions.

PSA's monitoring and supervision has multiple components:

Notification of Upcoming Court Dates: In order to minimize failures to appear, automated notification letters are mailed to defendants once PSA is notified by the court system of upcoming court appearance dates. Defendants are also required to confirm the date of their next scheduled court appearance during each contact with PSA (drug testing or case management contact). PSA sends nearly 80,000 notification letters annually.

Appropriate Supervision: Defendants who are appropriately supervised are held accountable to the Court. PSA's supervision strategy includes promoting swift and effective consequences for violation of release conditions, and promoting incentives for defendants who consistently obey release conditions.

Swift response to non-compliance with release conditions is at the heart of effective case management. PSA uses graduated sanctions in an attempt to modify a defendant's behavior and focuses on modifying the behaviors most closely associated with a return to criminal activity or failure to appear for court. Failure to appear for a supervisory contact, a resumption of drug use, absconding from substance use disorder treatment or mental health services, and other condition violations can be precursors to serious criminal activity. Responding quickly to non-compliance is directly related to meeting the goals of reducing failures to appear and protecting the public. When violations of conditions are detected, PSA employs all available administrative sanctions, informs the Court and, when warranted, seeks judicial sanctions, including revocation of release.

Numerous studies have documented the power of incentives to change behavior.³ Common incentives recommended by PSA include: reduction in the number of contacts required; reduction in the frequency of drug testing; and placement in less intensive treatment or supervision programs.

Caseload Management: Caseload size affects the quality of supervision. Successful pretrial supervision hinges on the ability of the PSO to respond quickly to violations of the conditions of release. Ensuring that caseloads remain within manageable ranges allows sanctions to be administered swiftly in order to prompt changes in behavior.

³ Finigan, M.W. et al. (2007). *Impact of a Mature Drug Court Over 10 Years of Operation: Recidivism and Costs*. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice. Meyer, W. (2007). *Developing and Delivering Incentives and Sanctions*. Alexandria, VA: National Drug Court Institute. Lindquist, C., et. al. (2006). *Sanctions and Rewards in Drug Court Programs: Implementation, Perceived Efficacy and Decision Making*” *Journal of Drug Issues* Volume 36(1), pp.119-144. Marlowe, Douglas B. and Kimberly C. Kirby. (2000). “Effective Use of Sanctions in Drug Courts: Lessons from Behavioral Research,” *National Drug Court Institute Review*, Vol. 2, No. 1. Alexandria, VA: National Drug Court Institute. Harrell, A. and Roman, J. (2001). “Reducing Drug Use and Crime Among Offenders: The impact of graduated sanctions. *Journal of Drug Issues* (Vol. 31(1) pp. 207-232).

PSA experienced a slight decline in caseloads during FY 2014. The Superior Court of the District of Columbia does not expect a significant change in criminal case filings in FY 2015 and FY 2016, relative to FY 2014 figures.⁴ With caseloads expected to remain stable, PSA will use this period to review and streamline its case management protocols. Specifically, it will evaluate case management techniques to ensure that interventions are appropriately responsive to risk levels designated by the new (RAI). In addition to examining case management interventions, PSA will also begin to explore the concept of “weighted caseloads,” which uses complexity of cases to help determine appropriate caseload ratios.

**PSA Supervision Caseload Ratio Averages
As of September 30, 2014**

Category	PSOs	Defendants	Ratios	Functional Description
General Supervision				
Extensive Supervision	34	2,363	1:70	Defendants with drug testing, stay away, and reporting conditions
Condition Monitoring/ Courtroom Support ^{Note 1}	3	309	1:103	Defendants requiring minimal level supervision
High Intensity Supervision (HISP)	17	359	1:21	Defendants placed on electronic surveillance or home confinement
Halfway House (Work Release)	2	84	1:42	Defendants ordered to the Department of Corrections halfway house; supervision may include other conditions
U.S. District Court	6	190	1:32	Felony and misdemeanor defendants charged in U.S. District Court
Subtotal – General Supervision	62	3,305		
Treatment				
Extensive Treatment ^{Note 2}	12	210	1:18	Defendants ordered to participate in substance use disorder and/or mental health treatment
D.C. Misdemeanor and Traffic Court Initiative	4	339	1:85	
Specialized Supervision Unit (SSU)	21	630	1:30	
Subtotal –Treatment	37	1,179		
Total	99	4,484	1:45	
Released on Personal Recognizance without Supervision		1,404		
^{Note 1} A total of 12 PSOs are assigned to the Condition Monitoring/Courtroom Support category. Most of the PSOs spend the majority of their time serving as Court Representatives to provide daily courtroom support to judicial officers to ensure defendants are placed in appropriate programs, and in addition; they carry a partial supervision caseload. ^{Note 2} Includes totals from SCDIP and SBTT.				

⁴ Tillman, Z. “Plunge in Criminal Case Filings Leaves Defense Bar Hurting.” *National Law Journal*. August 18, 2014.

Drug Testing, Forensic Analysis and Testimony: PSA’s in-house laboratory, operated by the Office of Forensic Toxicology Services (OFTS), conducts drug testing for pretrial defendants under PSA’s supervision, offenders under the CSOSA CSP (i.e., persons on probation, parole, and supervised release), as well as respondents ordered into testing by the D.C. Superior Court Family Division. The laboratory is certified by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services as being in compliance with the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments (CLIA) standards. It is staffed by professionals with credentials in forensic toxicology, forensic science, medical technology, chemistry and biology.

PSA’s operation of an on-site laboratory within the D.C. Superior Court permits same-day turnaround for drug test results in pretrial cases, which allows test results from lock-up cases to be presented to judicial officers at defendant arraignments and presentments. The OFTS can perform “spot” tests ordered by a judicial officer within a two-hour time frame through state-of-the art testing and management information systems. The OFTS performs tests on tens of thousands of samples each month, which translates to millions of analyses for various drugs each year. Laboratory personnel interpret results for new or residual use for over 2,000 individuals each month. When requested, the laboratory’s toxicologists and chemists provide expert testimony in support of analytical results.

Performance Measures - Strategic Goal 2

Measures		FY 2010 Actual	FY 2011 Actual	FY 2012 Actual	FY 2013 Actual	FY 2014 Actual	FY 2014 - 2016 Target
2.1	Percentage of defendants who are in compliance with release conditions at the end of the supervision period	79%	78%	79%	78%	76%	77%
2.2	Percentage of defendants whose non-compliance is addressed by PSA either through the use of an administrative sanction or through recommendation for judicial action: ^{Note 1}						
	- drug testing violations	93%	89%	92%	98%	90%	80%
	- contact violations	85%	84%	87%	97%	85%	70%
	- sanction-based treatment program violations	72%	84%	93%	65%	39%	80%
	- electronic monitoring violations	85%	97%	99%	85%	88%	92%

^{Note 1} In FY 2013, PSA revised its policy for staff responses to infractions of the electronic surveillance and substance use disorder treatment conditions. The new protocols call for more specific and frequent responses than the prior policy. The results reported reflect the early results of compliance with the new requirements.

FY 2014 Accomplishments – Strategic Goal 2

- ✓ Supervised 1,517 higher risk defendants under electronic surveillance.
- ✓ Successfully closed out cases for 874 HISP defendants. This means that the defendants' cases were closed without the defendants incurring any unexcused failures to appear, papered rearrests or requests for removal from PSA supervision.

Drug Testing

- ✓ Conducted 2,317,690 drug tests on 348,721 urine samples of persons on pretrial release probation, parole, and supervised release, as well as for persons (juveniles and adults) whose matters are handled in the Family Court.
- ✓ Performed over 20,369 levels analyses, which aid in the determination of continuing drug use, and performed 7,529 GC/MS confirmation tests.
- ✓ Provided expert witness testimony in 107 cases to interpret drug test results in the face of challenges by defendants, as well as during Drug Court daily pre-court interdisciplinary team meetings.
- ✓ Obtained testing assays for a Randox Analyzer and validated testing procedures for screening specimens for drugs of abuse in oral fluids as well as synthetic cannabinoids and synthetic stimulants in urine. This will enhance PSA's capacity to track new drugs of abuse such as synthetic cannabinoids and synthetic stimulants within the defendant population.
- ✓ Completed a pilot study on identifying new alcohol use through testing of Ethylglucuronide (EtG). EtG testing allows for alcohol detection within two to five days of use. The test is also better than traditional breath, blood and urine tests in detecting true alcohol use by diabetic defendants.
- ✓ Supplemented research begun in FY 2013 under the Office of National Drug Control Policy (ONDCP)-funded *Development of a Community Drug Early Warning System (CDEWS) for Tracking Emerging Drugs in the Criminal Justice Population*, in collaboration with the University of Maryland's Center for Substance Abuse Research (CESAR). *The CDEWS* study tracked new emerging drugs within defendant and offender populations to ensure that drug monitoring programs are testing for the most commonly used licit and illicit drugs.⁵ PSA and CESAR supplemented CDEWS research with additional adult specimens for testing and with PSA's approval of CESAR's request to replicate the study using urine specimens from juvenile respondents.

⁵ *The CDEWS* study tracked new and emerging drugs within defendant and offender populations to ensure that drug monitoring programs are testing for the most commonly used licit and illicit drugs. The FY 2013 study included 900 randomly-selected specimens from PSA for independent analysis of more than 30 drugs. This evaluation helped identify synthetic cannabinoids, such as K2/Spice, are emerging drugs in the District.

- ✓ Partnered with the District of Columbia’s Office of the Chief Medical Examiner (OCME) to research and develop methods for analyzing and characterizing the identities of emerging new synthetic drugs and their urinary metabolites. This partnership allows PSA to stay at the forefront in monitoring this relatively new phenomenon as it relates to drug use in the juvenile, defendant and offender populations. To date, the varieties of the synthetic cannabinoids identified by the OFTS laboratory are all documented as Schedule I drugs in the *DC Register*.
- ✓ Relocated drug testing operations from 300 Indiana Avenue, NW, to 90 K Street, NE in Washington, DC, once again establishing a state-of-the art laboratory environment poised to provide quality forensic services to the justice community. It features an open layout so the inside of the lab where the sample analysis is done is visible through sound-proof glass, but viewers cannot disturb or compromise the scientific activities within. The new laboratory also boasts the acquisition of two new state-of-the-art high speed analyzers, which will improve the turn-around time of test results. Additionally, space has been set aside for the future addition of instruments geared toward our readiness to test for emerging new drugs.

Strategic Goal 3 – Integrate treatment and pro-social interventions into supervision to support court appearance and enhance public safety.

Program Summary – Strategic Goal 3

PSA directly provides or makes referrals to effective substance use disorder, mental health, and social services that will assist in reasonably assuring that defendants return to court and do not pose a danger to the community.

PSA is committed to reducing drug-involved defendant rearrest and failure-to-appear rates through four core activities: 1) identifying and addressing illicit drug use, problematic alcohol use, and other criminogenic needs; 2) delivering and facilitating evidence-based substance use disorder treatment; 3) using motivational strategies and program incentives to encourage treatment initiation, engagement and retention; and 4) establishing swift and certain consequences for continued drug use.

Drug use and mental health issues can both contribute to public safety and flight risks. PSA has developed specialized supervision programs that include treatment as an essential component for defendants with substance use disorders, mental health disorders, or both (referred to as “dual diagnosis”). Treatment, either for substance use or mental health disorders, is provided as a supplement to – and never in lieu of – supervision. Just as defendants are assigned to supervision levels based on risk, they are assigned to supervision units that provide treatment based both on risk and need. Defendants placed in these programs have drug testing, contact, and other release conditions and are held accountable for compliance with the same.

Court-supervised, evidence-based treatment is one of the most effective tools for breaking the cycle of substance involvement and crime. In addition to public safety benefits, the community also benefits from the cost savings of providing supervision with appropriate treatment in lieu of

incarceration. A study conducted by the Department of Justice found that drug courts significantly reduce drug use, crime, and costs.⁶ PSA operates a model Drug Court and other sanction-based treatment programs, which utilize research-supported techniques as a mechanism for enhancing community safety.

PSA's specialized treatment and supervision programs offer defendants access to various treatment levels of care, modalities and interventions. Each unit provides centralized case management of defendants, with Drug Court also providing direct treatment services. This organizational structure facilitates specialized supervision practices and consistent responses to positive and problem behaviors, which lead to better interim outcomes for defendants. In addition to drug use, other factors such as unemployment, low educational attainment, and homelessness can contribute to criminal activity. PSA is looking to build relationships with a broad range of service providers to address needs that may impact criminal behavior or to provide support to defendants. Treatment and support services are provided in the following four areas:

Substance Use Disorder⁷: PSA responds to drug use by referring defendants to appropriate internal or external treatment services. For certain categories of defendants, PSA provides both close supervision and in-house treatment. For others, PSA refers and places defendants in sanction-based residential treatment via contract-funded providers while continuing to provide supervision. If sanction-based treatment is not available or is not ordered by the Court, PSA provides supervision and refers defendants to community-based providers, as available. Community services are limited, however, and are not optimal for higher risk defendants who require close monitoring.

Social Services: Research supports the premise that employment can contribute to a reduction in recidivism. Recognizing this, PSA utilizes its Social Services and Assessment Center to coordinate referrals to external employment and social services for defendants on the "front end" of the criminal justice system and begin the process through which defendants may be able to secure gainful employment.

Peer Recovery Support: Research has demonstrated the utility of peer support networks (e.g., Alcoholics Anonymous) in helping to achieve treatment goals and initiate recovery. Government, research, and clinical professionals are coalescing around a Recovery-Oriented System of Care (ROSC) approach to substance use disorders and mental health-related public health issues. The ROSC views both substance use and mental health disorders recovery as best facilitated by a chronic care, community-centered approach that utilizes an array of professional, non-professional, and peer-related services that span a lifetime. PSA is actively involved in engaging defendants in a ROSC by introducing defendants to peer support groups during PSA in-house treatment, referring defendants to an array of community-based services that support recovery throughout supervision,

⁶ Rossman, S., Roman, J., Zweig, J., Rempel, M., & Lindquist, C., (2011). *The Multi-Site Adult Drug Court Evaluation: Executive Summary*. Urban Institute, June 1, 2011.

⁷ American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-5)*. Substance use disorder in DSM-5 combines DSM-IV categories of substance abuse and substance dependence into a single disorder measured on a continuum from mild to severe. www.dsm5.org.

and requiring peer support group participation for defendants in the final phase of in-house treatment.

Mental Health: Many defendants in the D.C. criminal justice population have mental health problems severe enough to affect their ability to appear in court and to remain arrest-free. Based on surveys in jail systems across the country, it is expected that over 15 percent of defendants have a serious mental illness. Many of these defendants are in need of substance use disorder treatment as well. PSA’s Specialized Supervision Unit address the needs of this dually-diagnosed population by providing specialized supervision and by arranging for needed mental health and substance use disorder treatment services.

Performance Measures - Strategic Goal 3

Measures		FY 2010 Actual	FY 2011 Actual	FY 2012 Actual	FY 2013 Actual	FY 2014 Actual	FY 2014 - 2016 Target
3.1	Percentage of referred defendants who are assessed for substance use disorder treatment	99%	97%	96%	96%	94%	95%
3.2	Percentage of eligible assessed defendants placed in substance use disorder treatment programs <small>Note 1</small>	53%	50%	49%	52%	40%	50%
3.3	Percentage of defendants who have a reduction in drug usage following placement in a sanction-based treatment program	80%	84%	85%	83%	85%	74%
3.4	Percentage of defendants connected to educational or employment services following assessment by the SSAC <small>Note 2</small>	89%	97%	94%	90%	N/A	N/A
3.5	Percentage of referred defendants who are assessed or screened for mental health treatment	92%	95%	95%	96%	96%	95%
3.6	Percentage of service-eligible assessed defendants connected to mental health services	93%	82%	85%	88%	85%	80%

Note 1 A relatively low placement target has been established due to the voluntary nature of substance use disorder treatment and other defendant-specific factors that complicate or delay placement.

Note 2 PSA discontinued this performance measure as of FY 2014. The data presented here mostly are administrative and not tied to mission-critical activities.

FY 2014 Accomplishments - Strategic Goal 3

- ✓ Eighty-four defendants successfully graduated from Drug Court, with 69 defendants charged with misdemeanors having their cases nolleed due to participation.
- ✓ Enhanced the Agency’s on-site intensive outpatient treatment services to address the needs of defendants supervised in the SSU who have a substance use disorder as defined by American

Society of Addiction Medicine (ASAM) criteria and a DSM-V recognized serious and persistent mental health disorder. SSU defendants referred to the program receive nine hours of group psychotherapy services per week and individual psychotherapy, as appropriate.

- ✓ Trained 50 PSA staff in Mental Health First Aid (MHFA). Two staff members became certified MHFA instructors. This training is an eight-hour interactive course that teaches the risk factors, warning signs and symptoms of depression, anxiety disorders, trauma, psychotic disorders, eating disorders, and substance use disorders. It is designed to help non-mental health professionals provide emergency support until an individual can be linked to appropriate professional resources.

Strategic Goal 4 – Partner with stakeholders to address defendant needs and produce better system outcomes.

Program Summary – Strategic Goal 4

PSA’s partnerships with the judicial system, local government, law enforcement and the community enhance its ability to provide effective community supervision, enforce accountability, increase community awareness of PSA’s public safety role, and develop opportunities for defendants under pretrial supervision and pretrial diversion.

It is through partnerships with the Courts, the United States Attorney’s Office (USAO), the Office of the Attorney General for the District of Columbia (OAG), the District’s Criminal Justice Coordinating Council (CJCC), various D.C. government agencies, and non-profit community-based organizations that PSA can effectuate close supervision to assure that defendants will return to court and not be a danger to the community while on pretrial release. In addition, treatment and social service options are developed and/or expanded to enhance PSA’s ability to address the social problems that contribute to criminal behavior, thereby increasing a defendant’s likelihood of success while under pretrial supervision. In order for partnerships to be viable, PSA proactively identifies initiatives, seeks partnering entities, and collaborates with stakeholders to develop goals, objectives, and implementation plans.

Performance Measures - Strategic Goal 4

Measure		FY 2010 Actual	FY 2011 Actual	FY 2012 Actual	FY 2013 Actual	FY 2014 Actual	FY 2014 - 2016 Target
4.1	Number of agreements established and maintained with organizations and/or agencies to provide education, employment, or treatment related services or through which defendants can fulfill community service requirements	20	22	20	20	20	20

Management Goal - Maintain a results-driven culture. This goal emphasizes employee results (measured through employee satisfaction and performance ratings), organization results (measured by appropriate outcome and performance measures), and customer results (measured by customer satisfaction with Agency performance and products). Beginning in FY 2014, objectives under the Management Goal will include:

- ✓ Achievement of all annual outcome measures and 80 percent of performance measures.
- ✓ Achievement of at least 65 percent in employee satisfaction ratings in the Human Capital Assessment and Accountability Framework (HCAAF) indices⁸ of Leadership and Knowledge Management, Talent Management, Job Satisfaction, and Results-Oriented Performance Culture areas.
- ✓ Achievement of at least 90 percent in judicial satisfaction on provision of PSA services, usefulness and quality of PSA reports, and staff professionalism.

Measure		FY 2014 Actual	FY 2014-2016 Target
1.1	Outcome measure targets	100%	100%
1.2	Performance measure targets	55%	80%
1.3	HCAAF indices		
	Leadership and Knowledge Management	63%	65%
	Talent Management	65%	65%
	Job Satisfaction	65%	65%
	Results-Oriented Performance Culture areas	55%	65%
1.4	Judicial Satisfaction		
	Provision of PSA services	93%	90%
	Usefulness and quality of PSA reports	100%	90%
	Staff professionalism	100%	90%

⁸ OPM created the HCAAF indices to guide agencies in building high-performing organizations by providing consistent metrics for measuring progress toward HCAAF objectives. *2013 Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey Results: Governmentwide Management Report*. Washington, D.C.: Office of Personnel Management 2013.

Progress on Strategic Initiatives

This section describes activities and progress under the strategic performance and priority goals identified in PSA's *FY 2014-2018 Strategic Plan*.

Strategic Goal 1

Impact Review of the Validated Risk Assessment Instrument: In FY 2014, PSA began efforts to measure the new RAI's effect on Agency release/detention recommendations, court-ordered defendant assignments to supervision and non-supervision categories, and outcome rates. PSA also engaged staff and stakeholders to gauge opinions about the new assessment. The milestone under this goal is an impact review report which will be completed in FY 2015.

In FY 2014, PSA:

1. Created a RAI Working Group within the Court Services Program to troubleshoot issues involving RAI implementation and to track staff progress in incorporating the RAI into regular diagnostic protocols.
2. Updated the Agency's Performance Improvement Center (PSA's data warehouse) to track RAI results, PSA recommendations and court-ordered releases pre- and post-implementation of the new RAI. The tracker shows the rates and types of recommendations and court-ordered releases and allows comparisons between risk levels, PSA recommended release conditions and subsequent court-ordered release and detention decisions.
3. Developed an automated procedure to compare results under the new RAI to those obtained under the previous risk assessment. This will allow analysis of differences in RAI risk level calculations and subsequent recommendations within the same defendant population.
4. Contracted with the developer of the RAI to examine the cut-off points used for the current risk designations (very low, low, medium, high and very high), evaluate alternate scoring options for several RAI factors, and help PSA interpret results of data from the first year of RAI implementation. The contractor's report will be completed in FY 2015.

Strategic Goal 2

Explore Evidence-based Supervision Techniques to Reduce Recidivism among Youthful Defendants: PSA outlined plans to identify evidence-based strategies to add to its current case management of youthful defendants that can help reduce future criminality and be employed within the relatively short time frame of pretrial supervision. Specifically, OSD would report to the PSA Director, Deputy Director and Supervision Program on youthful defendant demographics, risk characteristics, criminal history, and pretrial outcomes compared to other pretrial defendants and identify factors most associated with pretrial failure and continued criminality following case disposition.

In FY 2014, PSA:

1. Analyzed youthful defendant populations, using cutoff ages of 18, 21 and 25 years and over 38,000 cases filed in DCSC and USDC from October 2010 to September 2012. OSD compared these defendant age groups to each other and older defendants on variables including gender, case type, pretrial appearance and safety, release and detention rates and the risk factors from PSA's former RAI. The data showed that defendants age 21 and under had a 10 percent higher rate of felony filings, though age 18 defendants had more than double that of other defendants. Youthful defendants in all age categories had similar rates of appearance and safety as other defendants. OSD recommended that PSA classify defendants 20 years old and younger as youthful defendants, given the manageability of this population for current staff, but recommended against additional or specialized supervision techniques for this population.

In FY 2015, PSA will update the analysis described above using risk variables and scores from the revised RAI. The new analysis will help determine whether development of supervision techniques specific to youthful defendants will remain a strategic priority.

Investigate Effective Supervision Options for Special Populations: When interviewed during development of the *2014-2018 Strategic Plan*, several of PSA's external stakeholders identified defendant populations that may require additional PSA supervision or support. These groups include veterans, defendants charged with domestic violence, prostitution or felony sex offenses, and those identifying as transgendered. During the strategic period, PSA committed to gauging these defendant groups' levels of risk and need, and comparing these levels to current PSA diagnostic, supervision, and treatment options. Using these and other data, PSA will identify and integrate appropriate supervision options into current PSA supervision and treatment protocols.

In FY 2014, PSA:

1. Completed a review of identified special populations, using data compiled from a six-year period (October 2007 to November 2012). The data did not have enough self-identified veterans and transgendered defendants for analysis of these groups. The data suggested women charged with domestic violence offenses—especially weapons related domestic offenses—and defendants with past arrests for domestic violence related offenses as groups that should be considered for supervision or services beyond what PSA already offers.

In FY 2015, PSA will investigate whether certain defendant populations are more likely to engage in pretrial misconduct at certain points in time during their supervision period (e.g., within the first 30 days of supervision, after a certain number of scheduled court appearances, etc.).⁹ The investigation will use standard survival analysis techniques to calculate hazard rates for failure to

⁹ This will complement PSA's earlier risk assessment validation research, which showed that for those defendants not re-arrested during the first 30 days of release, the risk of re-arrest declined by nearly 45 percent and remained fairly stable throughout the remainder of case adjudication. Kim, K, Bhati, A. and Denver, M. (2012) *Development and Validation of Risk Assessment Instruments for Pretrial Defendants in the District of Columbia*. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute. The authors recommended that PSA consider reducing the initial risk assessment scores by 33% following each 30-day period of compliant defendant behavior.

appear, re-arrest on any criminal charge, rearrest on dangerous or violent charges and rearrests on domestic violence offense at 30-day intervals following pretrial release. If the analysis uncovers consistent timeframes where misconduct is most likely to occur, staff will attempt to identify commonalities in risk assessment factors, supervision level and release conditions of defendants that fail within these time periods. If core characteristics can be identified, PSA will consider whether specialized supervision approaches should be adopted for defendants with similar profiles to help mitigate the risk of pretrial misconduct during the identified timeframes.

Investigate Dynamic Drug Use Trends within the Defendant Population: To ensure that drug testing remains an effective deterrent to future drug use and a control on potential pretrial misconduct, PSA committed during the strategic period to track and report more proactively drug use trends within the defendant population. This will include periodically adding tests for newly discovered drugs in arrest and supervision drug screens, collaborating with research partners, and conducting internal evaluations of relationships between synthetic drugs and pretrial misconduct. For example, during FY 2013 and 2014, PSA worked with the University of Maryland's Center for Substance Abuse Research (CESAR) to develop a "Community Drug Early Warning System" (CDEWS) within the Washington, D.C., Maryland and Virginia area.

In FY 2015, PSA will evaluate the updated CDEWS data sample to determine rates of case filings, pretrial release and detention, and condition supervision placement for defendants identified as synthetic-drug users. The internal evaluation also will study the possible relationship between synthetic drug use and increased risk of failure to appear and rearrest and whether additional external research may be needed on this topic.

Improve Monitoring of Dually-Supervised Defendants: To ensure better compliance by PSA-supervised defendants that are also under the supervision of other entities such as CSP, the District of Columbia Department of Youth Rehabilitation Services (DYRS), and the Department of Child and Family Services, PSA will improve coordination of supervision and services with these other organizations. Objectives here will be reduction of duplicate supervision and service provision, better communication between case managers, regular reporting of defendant compliance to all supervising agencies, and improved management of all agencies' resources. Milestones here included approved memoranda of understanding between PSA and other supervision agencies, revisions to PSA and CSP joint Policy Statement on dual supervision of pretrial defendants and supervised offenders, and improved data sharing between PSA's PRISM and CSP's SMART systems.

PSA revised its policy statement on dual supervision in January 2014.

Strategic Goal 3

Assess the Efficacy of Treatment Program Enhancements: PSA originally planned to evaluate the outcomes of implementing recommended changes to its Drug Court program. The evaluation design was to include a process component to determine whether recommended enhancements actually were implemented according to the original assessment team's recommendations and an evaluation component to measure changes in Drug Court enrollment and participant composition,

defendant compliance to treatment requirements, program completion rates, and rearrests and recidivism.

However, in FY 2014, the Superior Court of the District of Columbia contracted with an independent researcher to conduct a process, outcome, and cost evaluation of the Drug Court. This contracted evaluation includes the same process and impact questions and design features as PSA's planned evaluation. Rather than duplicate these efforts, PSA will support the independent research during the strategic period. PSA expects to play an active role during the evaluation by helping the principal investigators develop a suitable evaluation data base and making Agency subject matter experts available for consultation on data collection, explanations of changes in the PSA treatment protocols, and proposed research design. We anticipate the evaluation to begin in FY 2015 and to be completed in early to mid-FY 2016.

Strategic Goal 4

Collaboration with the District's Department of Behavioral Health to Improve Community-based Substance Dependence and Mental Health Services and Support: Under the initiative, PSA plans to enhance its partnerships with the District's Department of Behavioral Health (DBH) and its work under the Criminal Justice Coordinating Committee's Substance Use Disorder treatment and Mental Health Services Integration Taskforce (the Taskforce) to improve community-based services and support. The objective here will be to adopt an approach that treats the whole person, not just individual issues. This approach would promote better coordination of assessment and treatment resources and communication between PSA and DBH and improve data sharing on treatment provider compliance with local certification standards and contract obligations.

In FY 2014, PSA:

1. Partnered with DBH and the Taskforce to create a Resource Locator, which is a searchable, online database of treatment and community services providers in the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area. The Locator was derived from the Public Defender Service for the District of Columbia's Directory of Adult Services and allows users to navigate easily through services available to those in the community who require assistance on a variety of matters including, but not limited to housing, substance use disorder, mental health, social services, medical and legal needs. The Locator is available to the general public as well as legal, medical, education, and social service practitioners and will be an invaluable tool for service location for defendants in need of treatment and other services to attend scheduled court appearances and avoid criminal behavior pretrial.
2. Participated in a symposium, hosted by the aforementioned Taskforce, that brought law enforcement, criminal justice, health, human services, and business leaders together to raise awareness about the proliferation of synthetic drug use in the District. *The Real Deal on Synthetic Drugs* included presentations by subject matter experts that described the innovative approaches nationally and locally to address this issue. The symposium also allowed Taskforce member agencies to report on progress on monitoring synthetic drug use made since the first symposium that was held in 2013 and continue the dialogue on local response strategies.

3. With CSP and DBH, created the Referral Process Work Group to consider strategies to share and consolidate defendant and offender substance use disorder and mental health case management information housed within the agencies' three management information systems. The Work Group is now accepting vendor proposals for solutions that would allow electronic sending and receipt of defendant and offender information from the separate PRISM (PSA), SMART (CSP) and DATA (DBH) systems. This would streamline data entry and reduce duplication of data in the three systems. Better coordinated data entry and sharing also would provide DBH with immediate access to pertinent information from PSA and CSP regarding defendants and offenders currently in treatment, resulting in better treatment assessments and placements for these populations.

Management Goal

Create a Technology Advisory Committee to Assess and Recommend Emerging Technologies in Mission Critical and Work Management areas: PSA created the Technology Advisory Committee (TAC) in FY 2013 and comprised it of staff from the Office of Information Technology, Strategic Development, and Operations. The TAC investigates and recommends to PSA management the latest diagnostic, supervision, treatment and work management technologies to help the Agency meet its mission, goals and objectives more efficiently and less expensively. In FY 2014, PSA incorporated the TAC as a subcommittee of the Agency's information technology advisory group.

In FY 2014:

1. The TAC recommended using liquid chromatography tandem mass spectrometry (LC-MS/MS) to identify emerging drugs of choice among defendants and offenders. LC-MS/MS offers analytical specificity superiority over immunoassay and other testing methods in detecting newer synthetic and designer drugs.

The Evidence to Practice Series: PSA's *Evidence-to-Practice Lecture Series* showcases a particular evidence-based practice in a set of lectures by leading authorities in that area. In its inaugural year, FY 2013, the lecture series centered on using outcome and performance measurement to achieve organizational results. Discussions here were instrumental in PSA's revision of its mission statement and in the logic modeling of all Agency office and programs activities to PSA's outcomes.

Beginning in FY 2015, PSA will select topic areas and panels of lecturers for future series.

Establish Agency-wide Quality Control/Quality Assurance Procedures: A report detailing PSA's current quality assurance and quality control protocols and recommending several improvements to these procedures was prepared. Recommended changes accepted by PSA management will be implemented in each office and program area beginning in FY 2015.

Improve Outcome and Performance Measurement: GPRAMA requires Federal agencies to review outcome and performance measure targets regularly and when appropriate, suggest revisions to OMB. Recommended measures and targets must be ambitious, but reasonable and linked to the agency's strategic mission and objectives. The *2014-2018 Strategic Plan* introduced a new

management goal of maintaining a results-driven culture. This measure stresses **employee results** (measured through employee satisfaction and performance ratings), **organization results** (measured by appropriate outcome and performance measures), and **customer results** (measured by customer satisfaction with Agency performance and products).

In FY 2014, PSA:

1. Established targets for management goals (see page 27), based on past performance in these categories and expectations of future performance.
2. Received the Urban Institute's (UI) final report on its performance measures system. The two-year assessment involved UI staff critically reviewing, analyzing and providing feedback on PSA's measurement activities and the use of its performance measures. UI's primary functions under this project were to examine PSA's compliance with GPRAMA and recommend enhancements to existing activities to improve future measurement and management activities. The evaluation included a literature review of existing pretrial services performance management, a summary of UI's findings from interviews with internal and external stakeholders and the report on PSA's compliance with GPRAMA. The latter report included results from UI-developed rating criteria of PSA's performance system. Overall, UI found PSA's performance measure protocols well advanced and believed the Agency was engaged in many activities encouraged by advocates in the performance measurement field. However, UI found that PSA could make improvements in several key measurement areas, such as making data easier for PSA's executive leadership and supervisors to obtain and use for decision making, enhancing the value of PSA's quarterly measures meeting by focusing on specific issues arising from the data and having PSA Management lead the data discussions, and using performance data to help improve quality assurance. In addition, UI suggested several new operational and administrative performance measures for PSA's consideration.

In FY 2015, PSA will adopt certain UI recommendations—such as having PSA Management lead future quarterly performance measure review meeting—and determine next steps for evaluation and implementation of other recommendations. The Agency also will review UI's suggested performance measures during a more comprehensive review of current outcome and performance metrics scheduled during the first quarter.

Emphasize Diversity and Inclusion as Agency-wide Core Values: During the strategic period, PSA will continue to focus on recruitment and retention efforts to address workforce underrepresentation of targeted employee groups, particularly Hispanic Americans, Asian Americans, and persons with targeted disabilities. During FY 2014, PSA expanded outreach to these groups, with particular focus on Hispanic recruitment. Specific activities included:

1. Achieved a 17 percent hiring rate for new Hispanic staff (two of twelve new hires in FY 2014).
2. Contracted for the Agency's third Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities intern to begin the first quarter of FY 2015.

3. Incorporated diversity and inclusion strategic activities into the Human Capital Plan, with new performance data on percentage of workforce that is Hispanic in year-end reporting.
4. Made training resources available in PSA's Learning Management System for supervisors, managers and employees to increase awareness of how persons with disabilities can contribute to the Agency's mission-critical efforts and improve Schedule A. PSA previously made training in these areas mandatory for all supervisors and human capital management employees.

FEVS "Lessons Learned": Beginning in FY 2014, PSA tracked and reported trends in employee satisfaction obtained from the Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey (FEVS). This included not only a review of FEVS data, but also feedback obtained from PSA staff through focus groups and smaller select surveys. PSA is closely examining areas of continued strength, increases over reporting periods, and areas of decreases and continued low ratings. Trend data will help PSA Management take advantage of identified strengths and address continued deficits and new challenges.

In FY 2014, PSA:

1. Conducted FEVS follow-up focus groups with 49 PSA staff. These discussions gathered more in depth and specific information about staff perceptions of problem areas identified in the 2012 and 2013 FEVS, such as staff perception of how poor performance is handled, career advancement opportunities with the agency, and the connection between pay raises and job performance. Focus groups also touched upon other areas, such as overall Agency communication, organization leadership's standard of honesty and integrity, and motivation and commitment within the workforce. A final report was completed in September 2014 that included expanded staff opinions on topics such as the Agency's strategic direction, communication among leadership and staff, staff development and opportunities, morale and work environment. The report also included specific recommendations for PSA Management's consideration in FY 2015.
2. The PSA and CSP Diversity and Inclusion Council conducted a series of action planning exercises targeting the FEVS "Diversity and Fairness Index." In September 2014, the Council voted to concentrate its work on identified empowerment concerns, namely, "Employees have a feeling of personal empowerment with respect to work processes" as an action item.

Supporting Materials

Using Evidence and Evaluation to Improve Outcomes

OMB Memorandum M-14-06, “Guidance for Providing and Using Administrative Data for Statistical Purposes,” advises agencies to document efforts to 1) use evidence, evaluation, and data as tools to improve program outcomes and 2) support scaling up new approaches that have been tested and shown to work. Documentation should include specific evaluations or data collections completed in the last year that have actionable implications for budget, policy, or management.

As part of its commitment to results-driven performance, PSA has made internal evaluation a priority in helping to build evidence-based capacity in mission critical areas. In FY 2014, the Agency conducted several internal evaluation projects and studies within its strategic and management priority areas. Besides the previously mentioned internal evaluations, these included:

- ✓ In an effort to improve court appearance outcomes, PSA has notified released defendants of upcoming court appearances since its inception. With recent research validating this as a best practice for pretrial services agencies,¹⁰ the Agency tested the efficiency of court notification by mail, text message and e-mail to determine which method may be the most efficient means of court notification. Preliminary data show text and e-mail messaging as promising approaches. A final report has been issued and is currently under review.
- ✓ The Annual Judicial Survey allows PSA to gauge the opinions of its principle consumers about the Agency’s risk assessment, supervision and treatment services and support. In FY 2013,¹¹ 94 percent of responding judicial officers were “Satisfied” or “Very Satisfied” with PSA services, while 97 percent were “Satisfied” or “Very “Satisfied” with the information PSA provides about its services and programs. Judicial officers made several recommendations to improve how PSA presents information used for judicial decision-making, including better explanations for release or detention recommendations, more options for defendants on the domestic violence calendars besides release to electronic monitoring, offering judges a menu of release conditions instead of specific Agency programs, and improving on the timeliness of reports.

PSA also augmented its survey with follow-up interviews with judges that expressed an interest in follow-up discussions in their survey responses. This will become a regular feature with future surveys. PSA will begin data collection for the FY 2014 Judicial Survey during the third fiscal quarter and release a final report in early 2015.

¹⁰ Herian, M.N. and Bornstein, B.H. (2010). *Reducing Failure to Appear in Nebraska: A Field Study*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska at Lincoln. Jefferson County Criminal Justice Strategic Planning Committee 2005. *Jefferson County, Colorado Court Date Notification Program FTA Pilot Project Summary*. O’Keefe, M. (2007). *Court Appearance Notification System: 2007 Analysis Highlights*. Portland, OR: Multnomah County Budget Office.

¹¹ PSA’s reports here are always from the previous fiscal year.

- ✓ PSA's annual review of the rates of initial detention and subsequent release in both DC Superior Court and US District Court for DC helps the Agency monitor detention in the District and track placements of subsequently released defendants into PSA's supervision and treatment units. Data from FY 2013 (reported in FY 2014) show that 58.3 percent of initially detained defendants were later released (71.5 percent within 7 days), usually to PSA's General Supervision units. Subsequent release rates were highest (76.9 percent) for defendants initially detained due to probation/parole supervision at the time of the new arrest and lowest (5.3 percent) for defendants initially held after being arrested for Murder I, Murder II or Assault with Intent to Kill or on financial bonds (41.9 percent). Subsequently released defendants had similar appearance and safety rates as defendants released at initial appearance; however, their short-term incarceration cost the District of Columbia Department of Corrections just under \$1.4 million.¹²

PSA shared results with the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia, with a recommendation that the Assistant U.S. Attorneys assigned to initial appearance court only recommend detention for those defendants eligible by statute and that score as high risk on PSA's RAI. (The U.S. Attorney has access to RAI results prior to making a charging decision and determining a bail recommendation).

- ✓ The Defendant Focus Group series collects qualitative data from defendants completing PSA's substance disorder treatment units on overall treatment quality and the impact of various treatment and supervision components on drug use reduction. PSA has used data from previous defendant focus groups to help restructure the PSA STARS program and identify suitable incentives for continued treatment compliance. In FY 2015, OSD and Treatment staff will revise the focus group format to better gauge defendant opinions about specific treatment and supervision strategies. PSA also will expand qualitative data collection on defendant opinions to all Agency supervision units.
- ✓ In partnership with the District of Columbia Criminal Justice Coordinating Council (CJCC), PSA is replicating national research on the link between pretrial detention and recidivism. Using data from over 153,000 pretrial defendants processed in the Commonwealth of Kentucky, researchers with the Laura and John Arnold Foundation investigated the relationship between the length of pretrial detention and new criminal activity post-disposition. The research team used multivariate models to control for relevant factors including risk level, supervision status, offense type, offense level, time at risk in the community, and defendant demographics. The research found longer pretrial detentions were associated with the likelihood of failure to appear pending trial and the likelihood of new criminal charges pending trial. Defendants detained two to three days were 1.39 times more likely to have a new rearrest than defendants released within a day. Persons detained 31 or more days were 1.74 times more likely. Pretrial detention of two days or more also was related to the likelihood of post-

¹² Kainu, M. (2014). *Initial Detention and Subsequent Release in the District of Columbia FY 2012 Report of Findings*. Washington, D.C.: Pretrial Services Agency for the District of Columbia. This figure does not include a one-time initial assessment and classification fee, which DC DOC estimates at about \$2,000 per inmate. This cost would have added an additional \$2.9 million to initial detention/subsequent release costs.

disposition recidivism. Generally, as the length of time in pretrial detention increases, so does the likelihood of recidivism at both the 12-month and 24-month points.¹³

The proposed local research would study the effect of pretrial detention on post-disposition recidivism. The research would help determine whether pretrial detention in the District promotes post-disposition recidivism, the defendant populations most susceptible to this effect, and the best strategies to alleviate this relationship. This would benefit the District by helping reduce or control future criminality within the local defendant population and reduce the costs associated with unnecessary or counter-productive detention. PSA expects to complete data collection during the fourth quarter and submit data to CJCC for analysis by the end of the fiscal year.

Fiscal Year Internal Evaluation Projects		
Project	Goal Area Supported	Status
Evaluation of Youthful Pretrial Defendants	Strategic Goal 2	Completed
Review of Special Defendant Populations	Strategic Goal 2	Completed
Dynamic Drug Use Trends within the Defendant Population—Support of CESAR Research	Strategic Goals 1, 2 and 3	Ongoing
Dynamic Drug Use Trends within the Defendant Population—Internal Research	Strategic Goals 1, 2 and 3	Ongoing
Outcome and Performance Measure Audit	Management Goal	Completed
FEVS Follow-up Staff Focus Groups	Management Goal	Completed
Court Notification Comparison Evaluation	Strategic Goal 2	Ongoing
Judicial Survey Series	ALL	Ongoing
Pretrial Detention and Recidivism in the District of Columbia	Strategic Goal 1 and 2	Ongoing
Initial Detention and Subsequent Release Series	Strategic Goals 1, 2 and 3	Ongoing
Defendant Focus Groups	Strategic Goal 3	Ongoing

Other FY 2014 Accomplishments

Strategic Human Capital Management

- ✓ Continued to foster effective labor-management partnerships, particularly by expanding the use of pre-decisional meetings with the union to resolve potential issues at the earliest stage and to ensure agency-wide investment in changes to procedures and practices.
- ✓ Developed a standardized process for completing security investigations, resulting in improved efficiencies. Risk and sensitivity designations have been reviewed for all employees to ensure that the appropriate level of investigation is conducted.

¹³ Lowenkamp, C.T., VanNostrand, M. and Holsinger, A. (2013) *The Hidden Costs of Pretrial Detention*. New York, New York: Laura and John Arnold Foundation.

- ✓ Continued to manage a Training and Career Development program committed to developing a workforce capable of effectively responding to current and future demands in administering pretrial services and creating a work environment that promotes inclusiveness and growth:
 - PSA employees completed over 7,600 training events including on-line courses, instructor-led courses, and on-the-job instruction.
 - Over 200 employees participated in diversity training which focused on the Lesbian, Gay, Bi-sexual and Transgender (LGBT) community, workplace issues, awareness, and communication.
 - An internal Leadership Academy targeting employees at the GS-9 grade level and below was developed to enhance skill sets and aid in career development.
 - Nine employees competed for and were selected to participate in various Graduate School's leadership programs which are designed to strengthen both individual and organizational performance and develop future public service leaders.
 - Successfully collaborated with the D.C. Metropolitan Police Department in conducting training in drug use trends, gangs and intelligence, and active shooter awareness.
 - Strengthened the training needs assessment process which is used to identify performance requirements and the knowledge, skills and abilities needed by the workforce to achieve the requirements. Revamped the performance gap analysis to create targeted development goals based on 'needs' versus 'wants'. Used the improved gap analysis results to determine the best training or other managerial intervention approach to help employees achieve goals and to devise agency-wide training objectives.

Employee Wellness Program

- ✓ Expanded the Federal Occupational Health's (FOH) Employee Assistance Program (EAP) contract to include the medical employability program to allow FOH to make medical determination for continued employment, to review worker's compensation cases, to determine need for reasonable accommodation, and to determine fitness for duty.

Business Processes and Information Technology

- ✓ Continued to maintain and support two in-house mission-critical systems, the Pretrial Real-time Information System Manager (PRISM) and the Drug Test Management System (DTMS). Launched a pilot program for an automated lock-up interview process in PRISM using iPad tablets. Planned systems enhancements include increased use of mobile devices and a major revision of both systems to facilitate testing for various synthetic drugs.
- ✓ Expanded Storage Area Network (SAN), which provides centralized storage for all of PSA's electronic data and improved disaster recovery capability.

Financial Statement Audit

- ✓ Achieved an "unmodified" (clean) opinion on the FY 2014 financial statements. The independent auditing firm KPMG found no significant issues or material weaknesses, and verified that PSA's financial records accurately reflected the financial condition of the Agency.

Budget Display

SALARIES and EXPENSES
SUMMARY OF REQUIREMENTS by GRADE and OBJECT CLASS
(Dollars in Thousands)

Grade	FY 2014 Actual		FY 2015 ¹ Enacted		FY 2016 PB		Variance		FY 2015 ² 95-13/15-1734 Fund Projected	
	FTE	Amount	FTE	Amount	FTE	Amount	FTE	Amount	FTE	Amount
SES	2	352	3	518	3	523	0	5	0	0
GS-15	10	1,501	11	1,658	11	1,634	0	-24	0	0
GS-14	24	3,070	24	2,992	26	3,284	2	292	0	0
GS-13	53	5,561	54	5,697	61	6,433	7	736	0	0
GS-12	180	15,791	192	16,560	187	15,900	-5	-660	0	0
GS-11	16	1,148	20	1,316	19	1,262	-1	-54	0	0
GS-09	11	676	14	856	12	724	-2	-132	0	0
GS-08	11	641	13	751	11	634	-2	-117	0	0
GS-07	36	1,875	38	1,953	40	2,027	2	74	0	0
GS-06	2	83	2	78	2	81	0	3	0	0
GS-05	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Appropriated FTE	345	30,698	371	32,379	372	32,502	1	123	0	0
Object Class										
11.1 Full-time Permanent	345	30,698	371	32,379	372	32,502	1	123	0	0
11.3 Other than Full-time Permanent	1	85	1	60	1	82	0	22	0	0
11.5 Other Personnel Compensation	0	682	0	508		488	0	-20	0	0
12.0 Personnel Benefits	0	12,725	0	13,941		14,611	0	670	0	0
Personnel Costs	346	44,190	372	46,888	373	47,683	1	795	0	0
21.0 Travel and Transportation of Persons		80		82		86		4	0	0
22.0 Transportation of Things		0		1		1		0	0	0
23.1 Rental Payments to GSA		2,519		3,058		3,028		-30	0	200
23.2 Rental Payments to Others		2,113		1,893		1,796		-97	0	0
23.3 Communications, Utilities & Misc. Charges		617		645		760		115	0	0
24.0 Printing and Reproduction		23		30		41		11	0	0
25.1 Advisory and Assistance Services		392		582		410		-172	0	0
25.2 Other Services from non-Federal Sources		5,337		5,154		5,066		-88	0	160
25.3 Other Goods/Services from Federal Sources		1,113		1,083		994		-89	0	0
25.4 Operation and Maintenance of Facilities		77		33		45		12	0	15
25.7 Operation and Maintenance of Equipment		263		243		353		110	0	5
26.0 Supplies and Materials		1,304		903		1,019		116	0	25
31.0 Equipment		1,032		250		1,075		825	0	200
Non-Personnel Costs		14,870		13,957		14,674		717		605
TOTAL	346	59,060	372	60,845	373	62,357	1	1,512	0	605

¹FY 2015 Enacted does not include planned obligations from \$77,732 in unobligated FY 2014 authority to FY 2015 (P.L. 113-76 GP 815).

²The FY 2013 Enacted contained three-year (FY 2013-2015) resources for the PSA Drug Lab relocation.