FOREWORD

The Pretrial Services Agency for the District of Columbia made significant strides in Fiscal Year 2012 as a performance-based, results-oriented organization. The Agency revised its Strategic Plan for fiscal years 2012 through 2016 to conform to federal requirements and incorporated several evidence-based strategic enhancements—such as risk assessment validation, supervision of special populations, integration of new and emerging technology into supervision and treatment, and smarter use of community resources and partnerships—to improve functions with our mission critical areas. PSA also adopted several procedural changes that resulted in better identification and more appropriate monitoring of lower risk defendants and better targeting of supervision and services to medium and higher-risk defendants. Finally, PSA continued to meet or exceed targets under its strategic outcome and performance measures.

PSA’s strategic initiatives will be the foundation upon which we develop mission-critical areas in the future, with the results being more effective and efficient risk assessment, supervision, and treatment services. Our organizational capabilities built over the past four and a half decades of service to the District of Columbia will serve as the foundation for innovations that will guide lead our future organizational success.
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*PSA’s mission is to promote pretrial justice and community safety by assisting judicial officers in making appropriate release decisions, and by providing supervision and pro-social interventions to defendants released into the community.*

*PSA’s vision is to thrive as a leader within the justice system by developing an empowered workforce that embodies integrity, excellence, accountability, and innovation in the delivery of the highest quality services.*
INTRODUCTION

The Pretrial Services Agency for the District of Columbia (PSA or Agency) is pleased to issue its FY 2012 Organizational Assessment. This report summarizes PSA’s performance within its mission critical areas during the fiscal year and describes significant program accomplishments during the year.

PSA’s mission is to promote pretrial justice and community safety by assisting judicial officers in making appropriate release decisions, and by providing supervision and pro-social interventions to defendants released into the community. This mission is the foundation through which the Agency’s programs are designed and executed.

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

- *Minimizing rearrests* among defendants released to the community pending trial—particularly new arrests on violent and drug crimes—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 pretrial supervision with no pending requests for removal or revocation at case disposition* to encourage defendant accountability.
PSA’s Strategic Areas and Supporting Performance Measures

Risk Assessment
• 1.1: Percentage of defendants who are assessed for risk of failure to appear and rearrest.
• 1.2: Percentage of defendants for whom PSA correctly identifies eligibility for appropriate appearance and safety-based detention hearings.

Supervision
• 2.1: Percentage of defendants who are in compliance with release conditions at the end of supervision.
• 2.2: Percentage of defendants whose noncompliance is addressed by PSA either through the use of an administrative sanction or through recommendation for judicial action.

Integrating Treatment into Supervision
• 3.1: Percentage of referred defendants who are assessed for substance abuse treatment.
• 3.2: Percentage of eligible assessed defendants placed in substance abuse treatment programs.
• 3.3: Percentage of defendants who have a reduction in drug usage following placement in a sanction-based treatment program.
• 3.4: Percentage of defendants connected to educational or employment services following assessment by the Social Services and Assessment Center.
• 3.5: Percentage of referred defendants who are assessed or screened for mental health treatment.
• 3.6: Percentage of service-eligible assessed defendants connected to mental health services.

Partnerships
• 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.
**About PSA**

PSA assists judicial officers in the Superior Court of the District of Columbia (DCSC) and the United States District Court for the District of Columbia (USDC) by formulating release recommendations and providing to defendants supervision and treatment services that reasonably assure that those on conditional release 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, unnecessary pretrial detention is minimized, jail crowding is reduced, public safety is increased, and, most significantly, the pretrial release process is administered fairly.

PSA has served the District of Columbia for over 45 years and is a widely-recognized national leader in the pretrial field. Its innovative supervision and treatment programs are regarded as models for the criminal justice system. Adherence to evidence-based practices, effective use of technology, and the development of human capital lead to organizational excellence, transparency, high professional and ethical standards, and accountability to the public.

**Organizational Structure**

The National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997 (111 Stat. 748, Pub. L. 105-33, § 11233) established PSA as an independent entity within the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency (CSOSA) within the Executive Branch of the Federal Government. PSA’s organizational structure promotes the effective management of risk assessment, drug testing, supervision, and treatment services for pretrial defendants and the performance of management and administrative functions. Under the direction of the Associate Director, Operations, the Court Services Program, the Supervision Program, and the Treatment Program carry out PSA’s court- and defendant-related operations. The Office of the Director oversees all management, program development, and administrative support.

**Court Services Program**

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

The Diagnostic Unit interviews defendants arrested on criminal charges processed in the DCSC and formulates release recommendations. This 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. Staff uses this information to assess each defendant’s risk and to make an individualized recommendation to the Court for pretrial release or detention at arraignment. Staff appears in court at 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 screens arrestees for release on citation (so they will not be detained pending their first appearance before a judicial officer) through the arresting law enforcement agency, and schedules citation arraignment dates.

Following a defendant’s release, the Release Services Unit conducts a post-release interview that includes a review of the defendant’s release conditions and an advisement to the defendant 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. When preparing the surrender of defendants to the Court, the Unit conducts a new risk assessment to determine whether additional release conditions are warranted should the defendant be released following surrender. The Unit also prevents the issuance of bench warrants by verifying the defendant’s inability to appear in court (e.g., due to incarceration in another jurisdiction or hospitalization) and notifying the Court. The Unit also conducts criminal history investigations and prepares pretrial services reports on non-criminal D.C. Code violations and traffic lock-ups.

The Drug Testing and Compliance Unit (DTCU) collects urine samples from arrestees for analysis prior to the initial court appearance as well as from defendants ordered to drug test as a condition of pretrial release. Because a substantial number of criminal defendants have substance dependence problems 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 U.S. District Court Unit, and the High Intensity Supervision Program.

The General Supervision Unit (GSU) supervises the majority of defendants released to PSA. Court-ordered conditions may include, among others, orders to stay away from designated persons and places; regular in-person or telephone contact with PSA; drug testing; and referrals for treatment assessment and program placement. Pretrial Services Officers (PSOs) assigned to GSU 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 a defendant cannot be brought into compliance through these efforts, the PSO sends a violation report to the Court, including specific recommendations, such as drug treatment or mental health treatment, designed to address the non-compliance. GSU 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 while on probation). However, the Court can determine, after considering PSA’s risk assessment and release recommendations, that supervised release in the community with appropriate conditions is more consistent with the presumption of release required by the statute. 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 monitors defendants placed into the D.C. Department of Corrections work release (halfway house) program when the Court orders additional conditions, such as drug testing.

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, the Unit supervises released defendants and convicted persons pending surrender for service of their sentences. Like
their counterparts in DCSC, PSOs in the District Court Unit notify USDC judges and magistrate judges of violations of release conditions in federal criminal cases. An added responsibility of the District Court Unit is preparation of compliance reports that are incorporated into pre-sentence investigations conducted by the U.S. Probation Office.

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 being considered for release; or are compliant with halfway house conditions of work release and are now being considered 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. HISP monitors location-based stay away orders imposed by the courts using Global Positioning Surveillance (GPS). Due to the heightened risk associated with this population, PSA reports all program violations to the court within an expedited timeframe.

HISP consists of a Community Supervision phase and a Home Confinement phase. During the Community Supervision phase, supervised defendants must comply with curfew requirements and report to PSA at least weekly for drug testing and meetings with their designated PSO. Home Confinement is used primarily as a graduated sanction for defendants who violate the program requirements under Community Supervision. 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 may leave their homes only for work, to attend school, to report to PSA for face-to-face contacts and drug testing, and other pre-approved purposes. Defendants return to Community Supervision once they have completed the 21 days without incurring any infractions.

**Treatment Program**

The Treatment Program is staffed by clinically trained PSOs and includes the Superior Court Drug Intervention Program (Drug Court), the New Directions Program, 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 substance abusing and addicted defendants charged with non-violent offenses. Participants appear frequently before the Drug Court judge, submit to random drug testing, participate in substance abuse 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 treatment-oriented administrative responses to judicially-imposed jail sanctions. Incentives, such as judicial verbal acknowledgement, tokens, and related items, are rewards for positive behavior. Program completion can result in dismissal of a misdemeanor case and favorable consideration (such as probation) in sentencing for felony-charged defendants.

The *New Directions Program* includes the same treatment, drug testing, and supervision protocols as Drug Court, but is open to more defendants (for example, no restrictions by charge severity) and does not offer a diversion option.
The Sanction-Based Treatment Track (SBTT) is intended for defendants not eligible for Drug Court or New Directions but includes many features of those programs. SBTT defendants receive treatment through contracted treatment providers. Defendants are subject to the same administrative and judicially-imposed sanctions as Drug Court defendants. PSOs in SBTT also recommend swift sanctions and a limited array of incentives. Similar to New Directions, defendants with violent and non-violent charges are eligible, and diversion from prosecution/amended sentencing is not offered.

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 dependence disorders. The SSU ensures that these defendants are linked with community-based mental health treatment through the D.C. Department of Mental Health. Personnel in this unit have mental health expertise and/or specialized training in working effectively with the mentally-ill and dually-diagnosed defendants.

The D.C. Misdemeanor and Traffic Initiative (DCMTI) provides supervision, referrals for substance dependence and mental health treatment, and monitoring of compliance with treatment for defendants charged with certain misdemeanor traffic or D.C. Code offenses. The program primarily serves defendants charged with Driving Under the Influence (DUI), Operating While Impaired (OWI), and Driving While Intoxicated (DWI). Other defendants eligible for this program include those charged with reckless driving, aggressive panhandling, indecent exposure, and fleeing from a police officer. PSOs in this unit ensure the defendants are assessed for and referred to appropriate substance dependence (particularly alcohol) and/or mental health treatment.

The Social Services and Assessment Center (SSAC) conducts substance use assessments and provides social service referrals for defendants under pretrial supervision. These services are provided in response to a court-ordered release condition and/or as the result of a needs assessment. The SSAC conducts approximately 380 substance abuse assessments or re-assessments per month. The SSAC also tests and evaluates defendants suspected of having a 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.

Forensic Toxicology Services

The Office of Forensic Toxicology Services (OFTS) (formerly the Forensic Toxicology and Drug Testing Laboratory) processes urine specimens and conducts drug testing for pretrial defendants under PSA’s supervision, offenders under probation, parole, and supervised release supervision through CSOSA, and persons under the authority of the D.C. Superior Court Family Court. Each sample is tested for three to seven drugs and all positive results are re-tested. Gas chromatography/mass spectrometry (GC/MS) analyses are conducted to confirm test results and provide confirmation of the identity of a drug when results are challenged. Toxicologists conduct levels analysis to determine drug concentrations, which inform the courts whether a positive drug test is due to new use or the residual effect of past use. Expert witness court testimony and forensic consultations are also provided to assist the judicial officers.

OFTS, through its forensic research arm, is at the forefront of identifying emerging new drugs of abuse in the District. For instance, using its sophisticated instrumentation, such as GC/MS/MS
(Tandem Gas Chromatography Mass Spectrometry), OFTS identified and characterized Levamisole in the urine samples of some defendants and offenders who tested positive for cocaine use. Levamisole has been identified as a cocaine cutting agent that has resulted in serious health consequences, including death, for persons who used it. PSA placed notices about this information in each of its treatment program waiting areas. The OFTS technology has also been used in the identification of buprenorphine (Suboxone, Subutex), designer stimulants (bath salts), and other drugs of abuse in urine samples collected.

**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.

**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, and administers training courses; and designs training on PSA programs and systems for external agencies.

**Financial Management**

The Office of Financial Management (OFM, formerly the Office of Finance and Administration):

- Provides all Agency financial management and acquisition services for PSA;
- Formulates budget requests;
- Prepares related justifications and testimony;
- Manages the execution and accounting of approved funding;
- Assures the availability of resources for program priorities; and
- Recommends reprogramming or reallocation as required.

OFM manages contracting and procurement programs to acquire products and services for support of PSA programs as well as contract administration, facilities and asset management, physical security and the provision of a variety of administrative services.
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 be a danger to the community while on pretrial release. In addition, treatment and social service options are developed and/or expanded to address the social problems that contribute to criminal behavior.

Research, Analysis and Development

The Office of Research, Analysis and Development (RAD) promotes informed action within PSA by leading the Agency’s strategic planning, research, program and policy development efforts. RAD also encourages innovative thinking within the Agency to advance best practices in risk assessment, supervision and treatment. Primary efforts that RAD seeks to implement include:

- Development of evidence-based practices for pretrial services programs;
- Improvement of the delivery and presentation of management instructions and Agency policy;
- Guiding PSA’s strategic planning;
- Facilitating objective quality assurance and quality control within the Agency;
- Analyzing performance measure and operational data to help management make more informed and objective decisions;
- Fostering collaborative research relationships;
- Developing, implementing and monitoring action plans; and
- Recognizing and using the strengths of Agency staff to help PSA achieve its overall mission and vision.

RAD’s Director serves as PSA’s Performance Improvement Officer.
STRATEGIC AREAS AND SIGNIFICANT ACHIEVEMENTS

PSA’s strategic areas span the Agency’s major operational functions and are linked to the mission goals of reducing rearrest and failure to appear for court.

Strategic Area 1: Risk Assessment

PSA promotes informed and effective nonfinancial release determinations by formulating and recommending the least restrictive release conditions to assure future court appearance and enhance public safety.

Objectives:

- Conduct a risk assessment on each arrestee to determine the probability of the risk of flight and the potential for criminal behavior.
- Provide to the courts current, verified, and complete information about the history, relevant characteristics, and reliability of each pretrial arrestee.
- Recommend for each arrestee the least restrictive nonfinancial release conditions needed to protect the community and reasonably assure the defendant’s return to court.

Guiding Principle I:

The presumption of innocence of the pretrial defendant should lead to the least restrictive release consistent with community safety and return to court, and preventive detention only as a last resort, based on a judicial determination of the risk of non-appearance in court and/or danger to any person or to the community.

Means and Strategies

Pre-release investigation: Gathering and verifying relevant information about each arrestee is one of the primary activities conducted by PSA during the pre-release investigation. PSOs interview arrestees before the initial appearance hearing and document the information gathered. No questions concerning the circumstances of the current arrest are asked. The PSO reviews the defendant’s criminal history at both the local and national levels. Other information obtained by the PSO includes probation and parole information, lock-up drug test results, and compliance reports from PSA supervision units.

Release recommendations: PSA makes recommendations for release and detention based on an assessment of a defendant’s risk of flight and rearrest. PSA’s recommended supervision levels and conditions are the least restrictive suggested by the defendant’s assessed risk level to reasonably assure appearance in court and protection of the community.

Significant Achievements in FY 2012:

✓ Program staff prepared Pretrial Services Reports (PSRs) for 13,646 of the 13,771 cases (99 percent) filed by the United States Attorney’s Office (USAO).
Program staff interviewed defendants in 11,295 papered cases (82 percent), and provided drug test result data in 12,671 PSRs (92 percent).

Program staff conducted 14,337 citation release investigations, finding 77 percent of arrestees screened eligible for stationhouse release. Staff investigations assisted the Metropolitan Police Department (MPD) in the release of 3,778 arrestees pending arraignment.

PSA staff conducted 505 Failure to Appear (FTA) investigations on defendants who missed scheduled court appearances. During FTA investigations, staff attempt to contact defendants, verify the reason for the failure to appear, and submit a report to the assigned calendar judge outlining the investigation results and making a recommendation for court action. Court Services staff also facilitated the surrender to court of 183 additional defendants who missed scheduled court dates and had outstanding bench warrants issued.

Staff prepared 1,472 updated PSRs for defendants who were held for a preliminary/detention hearing following their initial appearance. In addition, PSA fully implemented new procedures that require PSOs to provide the court with information on all prior papered arrests (rather than just convictions) at detention hearings for defendants charged with violent and weapons offenses.

Strategic Area 2: Supervision

PSA effectively monitors or supervises pretrial defendants—consistent with release conditions—to promote court appearance and public safety. The Agency’s supervision objectives are to:

- Provide a continuum of release conditions – ranging from monitoring to intensive supervision.
- Promote swift and effective consequences for violations of release conditions.
- Promote incentives for defendants who consistently obey release conditions.

PSA focuses its supervision resources on defendants most at risk of violating their release conditions and employs graduated levels of supervision consistent with each defendant’s identified risk level.

Very low risk defendants (those released on recognizance without conditions of supervision) receive only notification of court dates. More moderate 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 or reporting to a case manager. Higher-risk defendants who qualify for pretrial release may be subject to frequent contact with an assigned case manager and drug testing, curfew, electronic monitoring, treatment or other conditions.

Guiding Principle II:

Non-financial conditional release, based on the history, characteristics, and reliability of the defendants, is more effective than financial release conditions. Reliance on money bail discriminates against indigent defendants and cannot effectively address the need for release conditions that protect the public.
Swift response to noncompliance with release conditions is at the heart of effective case management. Failure to appear for a supervisory contact, a resumption of drug use, absconding from substance dependence treatment or mental health services, and other condition violations can be precursors to serious criminal activity. Responding quickly to noncompliance is directly related to meeting the goals of reducing failures to appear and protecting the public. PSA uses graduated sanctions to modify a defendant’s behavior and focuses on modifying the behaviors most closely associated with a return to criminal activity or with absconding. Numerous studies have documented the power of incentives to modify behavior.1 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. To best incorporate accepted drug court best practices, during FY 2012, PSA worked with national experts and local stakeholders to develop a broader array of incentives to reinforce desirable behaviors in sanctions-based treatment.

I. PLACEMENTS TO PSA SUPERVISION UNITS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervision Program</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superior Court General Supervision</td>
<td>12,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Intensity Supervision Program</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. District Court General Supervision</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Release</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL SUPERVISED PLACEMENTS</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,271</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR Without Supervision</td>
<td>3,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL NUMBER OF PLACEMENTS</strong></td>
<td><strong>17,358</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant Achievements in FY 2012:**

✓ General Supervision Units for DCSC supervised 16,562 cases during FY 2012, including over 12,000 ordered into the program during the fiscal year. GSU also managed 435 cases ordered into the Department of Correction’s halfway houses.

✓ General Supervision for USDC supervised 465 cases during FY 2012, including 195 ordered into the program during the fiscal year.

✓ The High Intensity Supervision Program (HISP) handled over 1,300 cases involving higher risk defendants.

---


Strategic Area 3: Integrate Treatment with Supervision

PSA provides or makes referrals to effective substance dependence, mental health, and social services that are designed to assist in reasonably assuring that defendants return to court and do not pose a danger to the community. Treatment Program objectives include:

- Coordinate and provide for substance dependence and mental health interventions, including evaluation and referral to appropriate community-based treatment services.
- Coordinate with community and social services organizations to provide for medical, educational, housing, and employment services.

Means and Strategies

Integration of treatment into supervision: Drug use and mental health issues can both contribute to public safety and flight risks. Therefore, PSA has developed specialized supervision programs that include treatment as an essential component for defendants with substance dependence problems, mental health problems, or both. Treatment, either for substance dependence or mental health, is never provided 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.

Provision of, or referral to, substance dependence and mental health interventions: PSA’s specialized treatment and supervision programs offer centralized case management and access to various treatment modalities. This organizational structure facilitates consistent sanctioning and supervision practices, and leads to better interim outcomes for defendants. PSA also uses a combination of in-house, contract-funded and community-based drug intervention programs. Defendants with mental health issues and other special needs are referred to appropriate community-based treatment programs as part of supervision.

Referral to social services: Defendants placed under PSA’s supervision have a variety of needs. PSA works with defendants to identify their social service needs and refer them to appropriate services. PSA identifies community-based resources to address a variety of defendant needs, including: medical, educational/employment services, family services and other social services. PSA benefits from its collaborative relationship with CSOSA’s Community Supervision Program (CSP), since CSP has developed partnerships with many providers in the community.

Guiding Principle III:

Pro-social interventions that address substance dependence, employment, housing, medical, educational, and mental health issues afford defendants the opportunity for personal improvement and decrease the likelihood of criminal behavior.
II. Placements to PSA Treatment Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drug Court</th>
<th>322</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Directions</td>
<td>487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Supervision Unit</td>
<td>1,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC Traffic/Misdemeanor Initiative</td>
<td>1,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanctions Based Treatment</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL SUPERVISED PLACEMENTS</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,649</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant Achievements in FY 2012:**

- Drug Court managed 678 cases, including 322 placed during the fiscal year. In FY 2012, 271 defendants successfully graduated from Drug Court, and 16 defendants exited the program early, but in a compliant status. (These numbers include some defendants who were placed in the program during the previous fiscal year.)

- The New Directions Program supervised 682 cases — 487 of which were placed into the treatment program during the fiscal year. Unlike Drug Court, these defendants’ cases appear on multiple criminal calendars whose timelines often do not facilitate defendants completing treatment prior to case disposition. If sentenced to a term of probation, defendants continue their treatment with CSOSA. In FY 2012, 13 defendants graduated from the New Directions program while 80 defendants exited the program early, but in compliant status.

- Ninety-three cases included sanction-based treatment contracts, including 82 defendants ordered into treatment during this period. The sanction-based program is designed for those defendants who are not eligible for Drug Court or New Directions.

- In FY 2012, PSA completed 2,629 initial and 688 subsequent Addiction Severity Index substance abuse assessments and 661 Triage Assessment of Addictive Disorders alcohol assessments.

- Treatment program and D.C. Department of Mental Health staff completed 2,024 mental health assessments. Eighty-three percent of assessments showed a need for connection to mental health services or adjustment to current mental health treatment.

- SSU supervised 2,413 defendants needing mental health services, 1,753 of whom were placed into the unit during the fiscal year.

- DCMTI supervised 1,349 defendants, with 1,005 defendants ordered into supervision during that period. Seventy-three percent of DCMTI defendants presented an alcohol abuse or alcoholism issue, down from 82 percent in FY 2011.

- The Mental Health Community Court (MHCC) served 589 defendants during this fiscal year, 395 of whom were placed during the fiscal year. The MHCC placed 309 defendants on diversion agreements during the fiscal year and recorded 132 participants who had their cases
dismissed due to successful completion of diversion requirements. PSA continued to assess and recommend eligible defendants for participation, provide close supervision and referrals for mental health and substance abuse treatment, and report compliance to the court.

✓ Along with RAD, the Treatment Program successfully implemented several research-based enhancements to the Drug Court and PSA’s Support, Treatment and Addiction Recovery Services (STARS) programs. The enhancements, which are expected to improve the quality of PSA clinical services and align them more fully with evidence-based practice research, include in-depth staff training on several evidence-based practices and contingency management; use of amended sentencing agreements for felony-charged defendants in Drug Court; random drug testing throughout all Drug Court phases; a dedicated group of trained Drug Court defense attorneys to provide representation at all Drug Court hearings; direct representation by the assigned PSO at those hearings; and additional status hearings and weekly Drug Court case staffing.

✓ The Treatment Program adopted several evidence-based improvements to in-house treatment, including:
  o increasing the frequency and intensity of PSA treatment services.
  o lengthening the treatment program to 24 weeks from 21 weeks;
  o increasing the number of treatment hours in Phases 1 and 2 to at least 9 hours per week;
  o enhancing Phase 4 to require participation in outside support groups;
  o increasing the timeliness and consistency of PSO responses to missed groups;
  o standardizing protocols for treatment group observation and evaluation; and
  o introducing a requirement for a clinical staffing for defendants failing to progress in treatment.

✓ Added residential substance abuse treatment services for female defendants with children and transitional housing services. Both of these added services are intended to increase defendant stability and treatment access and to mitigate the public safety risk posed by substance abuse and addiction.

Guiding Principle IV:

Innovative, effective use of technology and the development of human capital lead to organizational excellence, transparency, high professional and ethical standards, and accountability to the public.

Strategic Area 4: Partnerships

PSA’s partnerships with the judicial system, 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. Partnership objectives include:

➢ Establish and maintain agreements with organizations and/or agencies through which defendants can fulfill community service requirements.
➢ Establish and maintain agreements with organizations and/or agencies to provide defendants with education, employment training and job opportunities.
Means and Strategies

Effective partnering with other justice agencies and community organizations is a major strategy through which PSA enhances public safety in the District’s neighborhoods and builds capacity for support services for defendants under pretrial supervision. Partnerships with the courts, the United States Attorney’s Office, various District government agencies and non-profit community-based organizations help PSA effectuate close supervision to reasonably assure future court appearance and heighten public safety. In addition, these partnerships cultivate treatment and social service options to address the social problems that contribute to criminal behavior.

PSA proactively identifies initiatives, seeks partnering entities and collaborates with stakeholders to develop goals, objectives and implementation plans. PSA’s partnerships are focused in three general areas.

1. **Social service partnerships:** PSA has partnered with the D.C. Department of Employment Services to facilitate employment referral, assessment, training and placement of defendants in need of employment opportunities.

2. **Substance dependence and mental health treatment partnerships:** PSA also depends upon partnerships to provide a wide range substance dependence and mental health treatment options for defendants. These include the Drug Court, which was established in 1993 through partnership with the D.C. Superior Court, the U.S. Attorney’s Office, and the local defense bar. PSA continues to operate Drug Court through FY 2012, and partnered with its key stakeholders to implement a variety of program enhancements. PSA also continues to operate the Specialized Supervision Unit to address the specialized needs of the mentally ill, mentally retarded and dually-diagnosed defendants (those in need of both mental health and substance dependence treatment). While these programs offer critical services to defendants under supervision, the need for substance abuse and mental health services is greater than what can be provided with Agency resources. By partnering with community-based substance dependence, mental health and dual diagnosis treatment providers, PSA can maximize its treatment capability while improving defendant access to these services.

**Significant Achievements in FY 2012:**

During FY2012, PSA:

✔ Continued participation in GunStat, a collaborative District-wide effort initiated in FY 2008 to track gun cases through the criminal justice system to identify trends and system strengths and weaknesses in handling these cases. This effort is now focused on persons identified by law enforcement as “major violators” and those involved in gang-related activity. PSA’s involvement in GunStat earned it the Metropolitan Police Department’s (MPD) Chief of Police Medal of Merit Award for the Agency’s contributions in helping to reduce the District’s homicide rate.

✔ Collaborated with the D.C. Superior Court and D.C. Office of the Attorney General to begin planning of a DWI initiative for defendants charged with one of several impaired driving related offenses and assessed as needing alcohol abuse treatment. This collaboration included
participation in a number of multi-agency planning meetings, providing DCMTI defendant participation data to assist identifying the size of the “hard-core drinking driver” population, and participation in a four-day *DUI Court Implementation Planning Training* in April 2012.

✓ Executed a Memorandum of Understanding with the D.C. Department of Corrections to procure bed space for federal pretrial defendants arrested and ordered by the U.S. District Court into halfway houses as a condition of pretrial release.

✓ Collaborated with the D.C. Superior Court and U.S. Attorney’s Office (USAO) to expand the “Community Court” model to encompass the entire city, in which low risk defendants are eligible for case dismissal after completing court-ordered community service. PSA staff also provided enhanced courtroom coverage to ensure the success of this critical initiative.

✓ Collaborated with the D.C. Superior Court, the USAO and MPD to develop a pilot program in the Third Police District that will provide enhanced screening of defendants released on citation for diversion, including deferred prosecution, deferred sentencing, Drug Court, and Mental Health Community Court.

**Forensic Toxicology Services**

Testing for illicit drug use by defendants, offenders and other populations, OFTS performs a line function that is critical to all of PSA and CSOSA’s Strategic Areas. Sixty-eight percent of pretrial programs nationwide now use drug testing as a condition of supervision. PSA, however, is among only a handful with in-house full service laboratories. Additionally, the OFTS is certified by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services as meeting quality standards established by Congress, and is staffed by professionals with credentials in forensic toxicology, forensic science, medical technology, chemistry, and biology.

Monitoring drug use facilitates risk assessment, enables close supervision and the prediction of future criminality, measures success of drug treatment, is key to effective supervision of those on pretrial release and probation and parole, provides data for law enforcement partners and provides additional service to the D.C. Superior Court in testing for juveniles and families.

**Significant Achievements in FY 2012:**

In FY 2012, OFTS:

✓ Conducted 3,071,228 drug tests on 478,005 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. These results are critical to assessing risk and needs levels. Approximately 27.3 percent of the pretrial defendants tested in FY 2012 (28,851 of 105,681) had at least one positive test.

✓ Performed 22,801 levels analyses, which aid in the determination of continuing drug use and performed 7,800 GC/MS confirmation tests.

✓ Provided expert witness testimony in 100 cases to interpret drug test results in the face of challenges by defendants.
Continued its successful use of the GC/MS/MS (Tandem Gas Chromatography Mass Spectrometer) to identify Levamisole in the urine samples of certain defendants and offenders that test positive for cocaine use. The technology has also been successful in identifying the presence of buprenorphine (Suboxone, Subutex), designer stimulants such as “bath salts,” and cathinone, the active component of khat. Progress is also being made in the identification of designer marijuana (K2/Spice) in urine samples.

Conducted a pilot study using a new assay kit that more accurately detects the presence of PCP in urine samples without interference from Dextromethorphan. Once fully implemented following the pilot, the new assay has resulted in greater than 99 percent of all PCP confirmation tests confirming the presence of PCP.
Strategic Development

FY 2012-2016 Strategic Plan

In April 2012, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approved PSA’s FY 2012-FY 2016 Strategic Plan, the Agency’s fourth strategic plan and first developed under the Government Performance and Results Act Modernization Act of 2010 (PL 111-352, GPRAMA) criteria. The plan outlines PSA’s strategic enhancements over the next four years, based on feedback from its criminal justice and community-based partners, results from its previous high priority goals and objectives, and anticipated challenges and opportunities over the next four years. The plan also incorporates requirements for federal agencies mandated by GPRAMA, particularly the requirement to link identified strategic enhancement to PSA’s annual performance budgets for fiscal years 2014-2016. Future performance budgets will include progress reports on each strategic enhancement as well as the Agency’s success at meeting its OMB-approved outcome and performance measure targets for the specific fiscal year. Strategic enhancements for the next four fiscal years include:

- Risk Assessment Validation
- Reducing Recidivism Among Youthful Defendants
- Improving Monitoring of Dually-Supervised Defendants
- Creating a Technology Advisory Committee
- Investigating Effective Supervision Options for Special Populations
- Promoting Increased Collaboration to Improve Community-based Services
- Establishing Agency-wide Quality Control/Quality Assurance Procedures
- Incorporating Evidence-Based Practices

To meet GPRAMA’s requirement for closer integration of strategic planning and human capital management planning, the Strategic Plan is linked to PSA’s Human Capital Management Plan. Staff of PSA’s Office of Human Capital Management (OHCM) helped develop the Strategic Plan and identified needed human capital resources for each strategic enhancement. These include staffing additions or reassignments, changes to staff position descriptions, training, and possible points of negotiation with the American Federation of Government Employees Local 1456, PSA’s employee union. OHCM and the Training and Career Development Center have revised their annual work plans to correspond directly to the human capital management systems that are articulated in the Human Capital Management Plan.

Mission Statement

In FY 2007, PSA revised its mission statement and created a first-ever strategic vision statement and set of guiding principles. The mission statement clarified PSA’s three critical success factor areas—risk assessment, supervision, and integration of treatment into supervision—as well the Agency’s commitment to collaboration with its external partners. It also stated more specifically PSA’s main obligations of assuring the highest rate of defendant return to court and community safety and recognized the judicial officer as the Agency’s primary “customer.” The vision statement encouraged PSA to consider its workforce as its primary strength and to make leadership within the local justice system and nationally a top priority.
In FY 2012, PSA further revised its mission statement language to specify pretrial justice as a core Agency ideal and to present the mission to stakeholders in simpler language.

**FY 2007 Mission Statement:**
The mission of the Pretrial Services Agency for the District of Columbia is to assess, supervise, and provide services for defendants, and collaborate with the justice community, to assist the courts in making pretrial release decisions. PSA promotes community safety and return to court while honoring the presumption of innocence.

**Revised FY 2012 Mission Statement:**
The Pretrial Services Agency for the District of Columbia promotes pretrial justice and community safety by assisting judicial officers in making appropriate release decisions, and by providing supervision and pro-social interventions to defendants released into the community.

### Outcome and Performance Measurement

For FY 2012, PSA met or exceeded all of its outcome measure targets:

- Eighty-nine percent of released defendants remained arrest free, one percent better than the established target.
- Eighty-nine percent of released defendants also made all scheduled court appearances, two percent better than the established target.
- Eighty-eight percent of defendants remained on release at the conclusion of their pretrial status without a pending request for removal or revocation due to noncompliance, 13 percent above the established target.

### Table 1—Outcome Measure Results FY 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OUTCOMES</th>
<th>FY 2012 Actual</th>
<th>FY 2012 Target</th>
<th>FY 2013 Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Defendants Rearrested for Violent or Drug Crimes During the Period of Pretrial Supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rearrests for all defendants rearrested for:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any crimes</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent crimes</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug crimes</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rearrests for drug-using defendants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any crimes</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent crimes</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug crimes</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rearrests for non-drug-using defendants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any crimes</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent crimes</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug crimes</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Cases in Which a Defendant Failed to Appear for at Least One Court Hearing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any defendants</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug users</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non drug users</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Defendants Who Remain on Release at the Conclusion of Their Pretrial Status Without a Pending Request for Removal or Revocation Due to Noncompliance</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PSA Performance Improvement Center, October 3, 2012
PSA met or exceeded targets in ten of its eleven performance measure categories. The Agency missed its target for Measure 3.2 (treatment placement of defendants assessed with intensive outpatient needs or greater) by 0.03 of a percentage point.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2—Performance Measure Results FY 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. Risk Assessment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1: Percentage of defendants who are assessed for risk of failure to appear and rearrest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2: Percentage of defendants for whom PSA identifies eligibility for appropriate appearance and safety-based detention hearings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. Supervision</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1: Percentage of defendants who are in compliance with release conditions at the end of supervision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2: Percentage of defendants whose noncompliance is addressed by PSA either through the use of an administrative sanction or through recommendation for judicial action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III. Integrating Treatment into Supervision</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1: Percentage of referred defendants who are assessed for substance abuse treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2: Percentage of eligible assessed defendants placed in substance abuse treatment programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3: Percentage of defendants who have a reduction in drug usage following placement in a sanction-based treatment program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4: Percentage of defendants connected to educational or employment services following assessment by the Social Services and Assessment Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5: Percentage of referred defendants who are assessed or screened for mental health treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6: Percentage of service-eligible assessed defendants connected to mental health services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IV. Partnerships</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PSA Performance Improvement Center, November 19, 2012
Outcome and Performance Measure Revisions

GPRAMA requires federal agencies to adopt outcome and performance measure targets for the ensuing two fiscal years. Selected targets must be ambitious but reasonable, and linked to the agency’s strategic mission and objectives. Consistent with this requirement, PSA’s outcome and performance measure targets for FY 2012 through FY 2016 are based on the Agency’s actual performance over the past five fiscal years as well as management’s expectation of appropriate and quality performance in the strategy areas of risk assessment, supervision, substance abuse treatment and mental health treatment integration, and partnerships. The targets also reflect improvements in data collection under PRISM and enhanced capacity to track, report, and analyze data and trends through PSA’s Performance Improvement Center.

The FY 2012-2016 sub-target for “rearrests on violent crimes” is two percent, one percent lower than in FY 2011. This new target reflects a correction to the data analysis programming that incorrectly included certain felony offenses as “violent” crimes.

PSA adjusted Measure 3.1 and 3.5 targets to 95 percent from 99 percent for FY 2012-FY 2016. This reflects PSA’s improving identification of referrals for initial substance abuse assessments in PRISM as well as increased sophistication and accuracy in measuring these data. PSA considers the 95 percent actual an “ambitious but reasonable” future target, given that compliance with substance abuse and mental health assessment requests from pretrial staff is voluntary for pretrial defendants. Because assessments are not mandatory, unless court-ordered, expecting a near perfect compliance with the procedure is an unreasonable performance goal. For example, PSA recorded close to 4,000 substance abuse treatment assessment referrals in FY 2011. To reach the former 99 percent performance target, no more than 58 referred defendants could decline an assessment for the entire fiscal year. In FY 2011, the 95 percent target would have allowed for 200 declinations for the year, yet still ensured over 3,800 completed assessments.

PSA revised the targeted defendant population under Measure 3.2 to include only those defendants assessed as needing intensive outpatient or inpatient substance abuse treatment. These changes allow PSA to track substance abuse resources to defendants whose drug usage is more closely correlated to failure to appear and rearrest. For example, current literature on pretrial risk assessment suggests that severity of drug abuse and mental health issues are more important than a simple identification of need to placement decisions and outcomes. This also supports evidence-based practices in community supervision that stress matching supervision level (for example, sanction-based treatment and close supervision) to identified risk and needs levels. Finally, PSA believes tracking placement progress among higher-needs defendants will ensure that limited treatment resources produce the greatest community safety and court appearance outcomes.
STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT ACHIEVEMENTS

Business Processes and Information Technology

✓ PSA continued to improve its information technology capabilities and to utilize technology to streamline processes and improve data sharing with its customers.

✓ OIT collaborated with the Bureau of Public Debt to evaluate the security posture and accredit PSA’s network and the Drug Testing Management System.

✓ Consistent with National Institute of Standards and Technology requirements (NIST SP800-53, rev 3), OIT developed an Information Security Policy Statement that replaced 17 outdated security policies.

✓ PSA migrated its PRISM 4.0 production database to the Microsoft.Net platform and included the deployment of several modules: PRISM 4.0 Integrated Source Code; Streamlined Drug Testing module (SDTM); Treatment module (STARS); Treatment Plan Notes Module; and Event Chronology (redesign).

✓ OIT led PSA’s establishment of new data collection protocols with MPD, the Office of the Attorney General, USAO, DCSC, and the Criminal Justice Coordinating Council for the District of Columbia.

Performance Improvement

✓ PSA reorganized RAD along the mission-critical areas of strategic planning, performance improvement, outcome and performance measurement, data analysis and research, and support of performance-based budgeting. This reorganization is designed to better track progress under PSA’s strategic initiatives and conforms to GPRAMA mandates for overall agency performance improvement and quality control. Additionally, PSA named the RAD Director as the Agency’s Performance Improvement Officer (PIO). The PIO reports directly to the Agency’s Chief Operating Officer (COO/Deputy Director) and assists the COO in driving performance improvement efforts across the organization through goal setting, data-driven performance reviews and analysis, cross-agency collaboration, and personnel performance appraisals aligned with organizational priorities.²

✓ RAD and Operations staff completed a major revision to PSA’s operating procedures for staff response to violations of court-ordered release conditions. The new procedures support one of PSA’s two supervision performance measures and outline appropriate PSO actions for defendants’ failure to abide with conditions, such as drug testing, regular contact with PSA, electronic surveillance, and substance abuse and/or mental health treatment.

PSA completed an independent validation of its risk assessment procedures. The resulting validated risk assessment tool has a much higher predictive accuracy than the Agency’s current risk instrument. The new assessment also allows for closer alignment of release and detention recommendations with factors associated with failure to appear and rearrest. This will help PSA to better target supervision, treatment and social service resources based on a defendant’s risk level and minimize resource investment on defendants that require less intervention based on risk. RAD and Operations staff began implementation of the new assessment instrument in May 2012 and full implementation is expected in 2013.

PSA completed external research assessments of SCDIP and its internal intensive outpatient treatment program, PSA Support, Treatment and Addiction Recovery Services (PSA STARS). Among many favorable findings of the assessments was the recognition that SCDIP is implemented largely within the guidelines of the 10 Key Components of Drug Courts adopted by the United States Department of Justice and the National Association of Drug Court Professionals, and PSA’s overall adoption within its treatment protocol of a variety of evidence-based treatment interventions.

**Strategic Human Capital Management**

PSA successfully implemented use of an electronic hiring platform, USA Staffing, to simplify employment applications, in support of the goals of the President’s hiring reform initiative to modernize the hiring process. The new system allows applicants to respond to vacancy announcements on-line and to track their application through the system. PSA also developed an on-line training module for supervisors and managers that fully explains the requirements for veterans preference in hiring.

The Agency passed the Office of Personnel Management’s (OPM) audit of Delegated Examining (DE) activities. OPM found delegated examining to be consistent with merit system principles, to have appropriate procedures in place for accepting and processing applications from all applicants, and strong evidence of a DE accountability system in place. PSA has taken the appropriate steps to address the required and recommended actions and has responded to OPM regarding those actions.

PSA substantially revised its Performance Management Policy and the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) to require that performance standards be results-driven and mission-focused. These changes were made to increase PSA’s General Schedule Performance Appraisal Assessment Tool (PAAT) score given by OPM. Another pending change is the development of biannual on-line performance management training for both supervisors and employees beginning in FY 2013.

OHCM assisted CSOSA’s Office of Human Resources and Equal Employment Office in the development and submission of the Agency’s Diversity and Inclusion Report, which was submitted to OPM in June 2012. PSA’s efforts over the next few years will include developing training for and educating managers on the process for hiring disabled veterans and applicants with targeted disabilities.
OHCM successfully initiated the implementation of the Electronic Official Personnel Folders (eOPF). This project is scheduled to be completed December 2012 and will provide employees with access to their individual OPFs through a secure Internet portal.

OHCM staff submitted an updated Human Capital Plan to OPM. The plan was revised simultaneously with the PSA 2012-2016 Strategic Plan to ensure that Agency’s human capital management efforts support its strategic objectives and enhancements.

OHCM’s Training and Career Development Center (TCDC) worked with Agency staff and supervisors to development of skills competency models to identify job competencies for mission critical positions. TCDC used an assessment tool to measure and address skills gaps for most mission critical employees and to track progress in efforts to close those gaps. It also identified training and developmental activities for individual employees and incorporated widely-needed training sessions in the Agency’s on-site training curriculum.

Management continued to foster effective labor-management partnerships. This included regular bi-weekly forum meetings between union representatives and Agency leadership, pre-decisional union involvement in both organizational improvements and policy development, and one-on-one meetings with senior staff and union leadership to resolve potential issues. The Collective Bargaining Agreement was successfully renegotiated in FY 2012 and the final version was signed and became effective in May 2012.

Management continued to support Special Emphasis Committees and Equal Employment Opportunity initiatives with CSOSA, making staff available on a regular basis for these important efforts. A PSA employee leads the Federal Women’s Committee; another led the Hispanic Program Committee; and a third leads the Disability Employment Program Committee. Other PSA employees participate on these and other committees on an ongoing basis.

TCDC continued PSA’s commitment to developing a workforce to effectively respond to current and future demands in administering pretrial services:
- New agency supervisors are mentored by experienced supervisors/managers.
- 15 mentoring pairs participated in the 2012-2013 Agency-wide mentoring program.
- 20 employees participated in various leadership programs, such as OPM’s LEAD Certificate Program and the Graduate School Executive leadership Program.
- 10 employees participated in the Substance Abuse Treatment Training Program (SATTP). The SATTP is a year-long program that provides requisite education for criminal justice practitioners who wish to become certified addictions counselors in order to more effectively supervise defendants on release.
- Over 180 internal training courses were offered, registering over 2,400 completions, to include PRISM 4.0 training, new hire training, supervisory development training, mandatory training, on-site classes, and reassignment training.

PSA successfully collaborated with the Small Agency Council, the Public Defender Service and CSOSA in the sharing of training resources, by offering enrollment into PSA courses to employees from these agencies and by sending PSA staff to courses offered by the agencies.
✓ PSA and CSOSA partnered to successfully launch a major upgrade to the Learning Management System. The upgrade included the purchase of an on-line course library.

✓ The Agency expanded its telework program to include virtually all positions on at least an unscheduled basis. The telework program reduces employee commuting time and associated problems, thereby helping improve both productivity and morale.

✓ PSA continued participation in the Federal Occupational Health Services (FOH) Employee Assistance Program. This is a professional resource providing the agency problem solving, coaching, training, information, consultation, counseling, resource identification, and support for all employees.

**Auditing**

✓ CSOSA/PSA achieved an “unqualified” (i.e., clean) opinion on its combined FY 2012 financial statement. The independent auditing firm KPMG found no significant issues or material weaknesses, and verified that CSOSA/PSA’s financial records accurately reflected the financial condition of the Agency.

✓ Consistent with GPRAMA, PSA reviewed its reporting requirements to Congress to those plans and reports which are outdated or duplicative. PSA proposed no reports for elimination.
Summary

What is missing in most leadership-related writings and teachings is the lack of attention to results. Most of them focus on organizational capabilities—such as adaptability, agility, mission-directed, or values-based—or on leadership competencies—such as vision, character, trust, and other exemplary attributes, competencies and capabilities. All well and good, but what is seriously missing is the connection between these critical capabilities and results. And this is what results-based leadership is all about: how organizational capabilities and leadership competencies lead to and are connected to desired results.


FY 2012 highlighted PSA’s commitment to results-driven performance. The Agency defined clear and specific strategic goals and linked them to budgeting and human capital management. Improvements in diagnostic protocols and collaboration with criminal justice partners helped to better identify lower-risk defendants and direct Agency resources to defendants that were more likely to be rearrested or to miss scheduled court appearances. Research driven, evidence-based Treatment Program improvements helped target resources to defendants whose substance abuse/addiction issues presented heightened risk for pretrial misconduct. PSA continued its record of successful mission accomplishment, as evidenced by its meeting of all strategic outcome measures and all but one performance measure.

PSA’s strategic initiatives will be the foundation for future improvements in mission-critical areas. Implementation of more predictive risk assessment protocols, identification of defendant populations that need more specialized supervision and services, investment in better drug testing and surveillance technologies, and implementation of best criminal justice and organizational practices will produce more effective and efficient risk assessment, supervision, and treatment services. Finally, PSA will continue its strong collaboration with its stakeholders and partners, all of whom share the Agency’s goal of improving the quality of pretrial justice in the District of Columbia.

Most importantly, PSA’s 45-year foundation of excellent service to the District of Columbia enhances PSA’s efforts to promote effective partnerships and maximize the prospects for future growth and improvement. We are proud that organizational capabilities built over the past four and a half decades will continue to inform and support our future development and innovations.