

2014 PSA ANNUAL JUDICIAL SURVEY

*Feedback from Judicial Officers of the Superior Court of
the District of Columbia and the United States District
Court for the District of Columbia on PSA Services*

Pretrial Services Agency for the District of Columbia

Clifford T. Keenan, Director

633 Indiana Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20004

July 2015



Table of Contents

OVERVIEW	4
SURVEY HIGHLIGHTS.....	4
DC Superior Court Findings.....	4
US District Court Findings.....	5
SURVEY SAMPLE	5
SURVEY QUESTIONS.....	6
SURVEY FINDINGS	7
DC Superior Court Judges	7
US District Court Judges	10
INTERVIEW FINDINGS	12
PSA as an Agency	12
PSA Staff	12
Pretrial Services Reports and Other Reports	13
Partnerships	14
Drug Testing and Assessments	15
Access to Data	15
Other Recommendations.....	16
CONCLUSION	16
NEXT STEPS	16
Appendix	18

2014 PSA Annual Judicial Survey

*Feedback from Judicial Officers of the Superior Court of the
District of Columbia and the United States District Court for the
District of Columbia on PSA Services*

Published by the
Pretrial Services Agency for the District of Columbia
Clifford T. Keenan, Director

Prepared by the PSA's Office of Strategic Development
Spurgeon Kennedy, Director

Written by Laura House, Ph.D., OSD Senior Program Analyst

July 2015

OVERVIEW

The Pretrial Services Agency for the District of Columbia (PSA) conducts a biennial survey and voluntary, follow-up individual interviews with judicial officers from the Superior Court of the District of Columbia (DCSC) and the United States District Court for the District of Columbia (USDC). The purpose of the survey and follow-up interviews is to solicit information from judicial officers related to PSA's overall quality and performance in providing services and support to the courts. PSA considers judicial officers in both the Superior Court and the District Court to be its primary stakeholders and collaborators in helping the Agency to fulfill its mission and objectives. The Agency values the feedback that these officials provide and strongly considers their recommendations when developing enhancements to its overall services.

This report presents findings from the 2014 PSA Judicial Survey and follow-up individual interviews. Overall, judicial officers from the DCSC and USDC reported that PSA provides quality and beneficial information that assists them in making sound decisions regarding a defendant's release or detention and the imposition of appropriate release conditions.

SURVEY HIGHLIGHTS

Major highlights of survey results are listed below and specific findings are detailed later in this report.

DC Superior Court Findings

- All of the DCSC judicial officers who participated reported that they were highly satisfied with PSA programs and services. Specifically, they reported satisfaction with PSA services, including supervision and electronic surveillance.
- Most DCSC judicial officers reported being satisfied with the resourcefulness, availability, and helpfulness of PSA staff in and out of court. Most judges also indicated that both PSA pretrial services officers (PSOs) and supervisors were accessible and responsive in addressing their concerns and issues. In addition, the judges indicated that PSOs are resourceful and helpful in the courtrooms and present when needed.
- A majority of DCSC judicial officers indicated that PSA's reports and information were helpful in decision-making. However, a few respondents requested that PSA reconsider the formatting and structure of its reports, ensure that reports are timely, and consider emailing violation reports directly to judges before court hearings to reduce the amount of paper used to print reports.

- Some Superior Court judges recommended that PSA explore requesting and utilizing more funding and resources for drug and mental health treatment for defendants, which they identified as a critical resource needed to support and improve the overall conditions of defendants.

US District Court Findings

- All USDC judges who participated reported that they were satisfied with PSA services. They indicated great satisfaction with PSA's supervision and electronic monitoring services to defendants.
- They also expressed wanting to be provided with more information about the menu of options that PSA offers for judges and defendants as alternatives to detention.
- Most judges indicated they were satisfied with the timeliness of Pretrial Services Reports (PSRs), other reports detailing defendant compliance, supervision, electronic surveillance, and drug testing.
- A majority of judges reported that PSOs and their supervisors were accessible and helpful to them in addressing and resolving concerns.

SURVEY SAMPLE

Thirty-eight Superior Court judges and 21 District Court judges were invited to complete the 2014 PSA Judicial Survey. Seven Superior Court judges and eight District Court judges completed surveys, for a response rate of 18% and 38%, respectively. For the 2014 PSA judicial survey, the response rates exceed the widely-accepted rate for external surveys of 15 to 30%.¹

The Superior Court judges indicated that they had served on the bench for a range of two to 20 years with an average of 18 years of service, while District Court judges reported they had served on the bench for a range of two to 25+ years for an average of 13 years.

Both DCSC and USDC judicial officers were asked about their willingness to participate in follow-up interviews to provide more detailed information about their experiences and satisfaction with the quality of PSA services and staff and recommendations for improvement. This was the second year that PSA followed up the judicial surveys with individual interviews. A total of 10 judicial officers volunteered to participate in

¹ Hamilton, M. B. (2003). Online survey response rates and times: background and guidance for industry. Tercent, Inc. Also in Survey Monkey. (2009). Response Rates & Surveying Techniques: Tips to Enhance Survey Respondent Participation. Retrieved March 5, 2010.

interviews: seven from DCSC and three from USDC. Of those, PSA interviewed all seven DCSC judges one USDC judge.

All interviews lasted between 30 and 45 minutes and took place in the judicial officers' chambers.

In 2015, two PSA supervisors in the Office of Operations, who provide oversight to PSA Court Representatives and PSOs, requested to observe the interviews with judges. This appeared to be helpful in allowing them to hear feedback and recommendations for improvement to the quality of PSA services to judges.

Overall, judicial officers who participated in the 2015 follow-up individual interviews from both Superior Court and District Court expressed great satisfaction with PSA services. They also provided important observations and recommendations that are detailed later.

SURVEY QUESTIONS

The 2014 PSA judicial survey consisted of 20 questions that included closed-ended, multiple-choice questions as well as open-ended questions (See Appendix). The topics for the questions included issues such as judicial satisfaction with PSA services, the quality of PSA reports and information, the quality of PSA supervision to higher risk defendants and defendants with mental health and substance use disorders and the provision and quality of related treatment services.

The major findings from the 2014 survey concluded that PSA staff was resourceful, helpful and available in and out of the courtroom. The survey also found that the reports were generally high quality, timely and useful. Other findings were that PSA staff worked professionally and communicated well with judges in both courts, and supervised defendants well.

Close to 70% (5) of Superior Court judges were "Very Satisfied" and 29% (2) were "Satisfied" with the information PSA provided to them about its services and programs.

SURVEY FINDINGS

DC Superior Court Judges

- Overall, 86% (6) of Superior Court judges were “Very “Satisfied,” and one judge was “Satisfied” with PSA’s services to the Court.
- Eighty-six percent (6) of the Superior Court judges found the information that PSA provides related to individual cases to be “Very Useful” and one judge found it to be “Useful” in decision-making.
- Superior Court judges made several recommendations for improving the quality of individual case information it provides to judges. These recommendations included the following:
 - Include more information about defendant connections to community-based services that support their ability to comply with conditions of release (e.g., services for homeless individuals required to verify addresses, employment or tokens for indigent persons who have trouble traveling to Court or PSA for hearings, drug testing and check-ins).
 - Include information on the status of the case since the last hearing (i.e., quickly chronicle any details that have occurred since the last hearing early in the report, which should be the crucial starting point for every hearing). One judge indicated that this reformatting of the report is particularly important in Mental Health Court for Specialized Supervision Unit (SSU) defendants.
 - Develop a system for getting information about defendants with non-compliant behaviors to judges in a more timely fashion. One judge indicated that this can help with scheduling show cause hearings. He stated: “I find that sometimes that happens, but often I don’t learn of extreme noncompliance until a day or two before the defendant is due in court.”
 - Eliminate inaccuracies in reports, especially those that require research in court to clarify a defendant’s status.
- Forty-three percent (3) of Superior Court judges that were surveyed reported that PSA recommendations were “Very Useful,” 29% (2) report that they were “Useful” and 29% (2) reported that they were “Average” in their decision-making.
- Superior Court judges also provided suggestions for improving the recommendations that PSA makes. These included the following:
 - Recommend alternatives to removing defendants from supervision. At times, PSOs simply recommend that a defendant be removed from their

current level of supervision without explaining this fully or recommending alternatives.

- Provide more detailed recommendations for defendant release conditions based on the assessment. One judge indicated that PSOs should be more specific in their recommendations about defendant reporting and discuss the frequency, methods and other specifics regarding reporting.
- Provide more detail on compliance behavior of defendants, particularly in probation, parole and supervised release cases. One judge said “At times, it is difficult to determine from the notes whether the person who is on pre- and post-trial release is complying with conditions.”
- Provide information that details the defendant’s compliant behavior, including good behavior. One judge reported having issues with the “no news is good news” presupposition (i.e., “no report” indicates the defendant is in compliance). He stated that it was uncomfortable to make this assumption but understood the need for the Agency to prioritize resources in terms of providing written reports to the court on defendants who are compliant. However, some brief information might be helpful.

Superior Court judges rated PSA services to the Court as follows:

- Slightly over 70% (5) of the Superior Court judges rated pretrial services reports for release and detention decision-making as “Excellent” and another 30% (2) rated them as “Good.”
- Close to 86% (6) of the judges rated PSA’s reports detailing defendant compliance or noncompliance with release conditions as either “Excellent” or “Good” while 14% rated them as “Average.”
- Forty-three percent (3) rated the timeliness of reports and evaluations as well as the quality and comprehensiveness of reports and evaluations as “Excellent,” and 57% (4) rated them as “Good.”
- Slightly over 70% rated the timely appearance of PSOs in court when requested as “Excellent” (5) and 29% rated this as “Good.”
- All judges (100%) rated PSA staff resourcefulness and helpfulness in court as “Excellent.”
- Seventy-one percent (5) of the judges rated failure to appear investigations and warrant surrenders as “Excellent” or “Good,” and 28% (2) did not respond.
- Eighty-six percent (6) of the judges rated drug testing and forensic laboratory services as “Excellent” or “Good,” and 14% (1) of the judges rated these services as “Fair.”
- Eighty-three percent of the judges (5) rated the timeliness of treatment placements as “Excellent” or “Good,” and one judge did not respond.

- A few Superior Court judges provided information about how PSA could improve its efforts in the service areas above, which included the following:
 - Identify cases where defendants may need to be tested for additional drugs and test them before the court hearing. Some judges indicated that they may find out that defendants have problems with specific drugs, but PSA fails to do drug screens for these drugs or others before the court hearing.
 - Ensure that drug test results are complete and available at the time the case is presented in court. At times, drug test results are not available for defendants at the time of the hearing.
- All judges (100%) reported that they were “Very Satisfied” with the level of communication with PSA staff and 83% (6) reported they were “Very Satisfied” with their communication levels with PSA supervisors and managers.
- All judges (100%) rated PSA’s responsiveness in resolving their needs and concerns as either “Excellent” or “Good.”
- All judges (100%) also rated PSA’s responsiveness in conducting evaluations and screenings for PSA program placement in HISP, Drug Court and other programs as “Excellent.”
- The Superior Court judges also rated PSA services for defendants in the following areas:
 - Slightly over 70% of the judges were “Very Satisfied” and 29% (2) were “Satisfied” with PSA’s substance-related treatment services.
 - Eighty-six percent (6) of the judges were “Very Satisfied” and 14% (1) were “Satisfied” with PSA’s supervision services.
 - Seventy-one percent (5) of the judges and 14% (1) were either “Very Satisfied” or “Satisfied” with PSA’s electronic surveillance services.
 - Fifty-seven percent (4) of the judges were “Very Satisfied” and 43% (3) were “Satisfied” with mental health services.
 - Twenty-nine percent (2) were “Very Satisfied,” 43% (3) were “Satisfied,” and two did not respond regarding PSA’s prosocial interventions, such as supportive resources for employment, educational resources and referrals.
- Superior Court judges also indicated that they would like to see PSA utilize other services and technologies in its supervision and treatment program with defendants, such as:
 - Report the number of pro-social interventions that defendants have been referred to the extent to which defendants received or followed up on these services.
 - Provide more services to MHCC participants. Many need referrals for employment, education and other social services but do not appear to be receiving them from SSAC.

Help defendants with mental health issues to better navigate PSA procedures and protocols and making PSA procedures and protocols more user-friendly and accessible to defendants with mental health issues.

US District Court Judges

- Fifty-percent (4) of the District Court judges who responded were “Very Satisfied” with PSA services to the Court, 25% (2) were “Satisfied,” one judge reported being “Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied,” and one judge did not respond.
- Twenty-five percent (2) of the District Court judges reported being “Very Satisfied,” 50% (4) were “Satisfied,” one judge was “Dissatisfied,” and one did not respond regarding the information PSA provides about its services and programs.
- Seventy-five percent (6) of the District Court judges found the information PSA provided related to individual cases to be “Very Useful” or “Useful” to decision-making, one found it to be “Not Useful,” and one did not respond.
- Twenty-five percent of the judges (2) reported that PSA recommendations were “Very Useful” in their decision-making, 50% percent (4) reported that the recommendations were “Useful,” one reported they were “Not Useful” and one did not respond.

District Court judges rated various PSA services to the Court as follows:

- Seventy-five percent (6) of the judges rated pretrial services reports for release and detention decision-making as either “Excellent” or “Good,” one as “Fair” and one judge did not respond.
- Eighty-eight percent (7) of the judges rated PSA reports detailing defendant compliance or noncompliance with release conditions as either “Excellent” or “Good,” and one did not respond.
- Sixty-three percent (5) of the judges rated the timeliness of reports and evaluations as “Excellent,” one as “Average,” one as “Fair,” and one did not respond.
- Sixty-three percent (5) rated the quality and comprehensiveness of reports and evaluations as “Excellent,” or “Good,” one as “Average,” one rated them as “Fair,” and one did not respond.
- Eighty-eight percent (7) rated appearances as timely in court as “Excellent” or “Good” and one did not respond.
- Eighty-eight percent (7) rated PSA’s staff as resourceful and helpful in court as “Excellent” or “Good,” and one did not respond.

- Twenty-nine percent (2) of the judges rated FTA investigations and surrenders as “Excellent” or “Good,” one as “Average,” and five did not respond.
- Eighty-eight percent (7) rated PSA staff’s resourcefulness and helpfulness in court as “Excellent” or “Good” and four did not respond.
- Seventy-five percent (6) rated drug testing services and laboratory/forensic services as “Excellent” or “Good,” one as “Average,” and one did not respond.
- Sixty-three percent (5) rated timeliness of treatment placements as “Excellent” or “Good,” one as “Average,” and two did not respond.
- Eighty-eight percent (7) of the District Court judges reported that they were “Very Satisfied” or “Satisfied” with the level of communication with PSA staff and one did not respond.
- Seventy-five percent (6) reported that they were either “Very Satisfied” or “Satisfied” with their level of communication with PSA supervisors and managers and two did not respond.
- Eighty-six percent (6) of the District Court judges rated PSA’s responsiveness in resolving their needs and concerns as “Excellent” or “Good,” 14% rated it as “Average,” and one did not respond.
- Seventy-five percent (6) reported that they were “Very Satisfied” or “Satisfied” with PSA’s responsiveness to conducting evaluations and/or screenings for PSA placements, 13% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied and 13% did not respond.

The District Court judges also provided satisfaction ratings for PSA programs and services for defendants as follows:

- Eighty-eight percent (7) of the judges reported they were either “Very Satisfied” or “Satisfied” with PSA’s substance-related treatment services and one did not respond.
- Seventy-five percent (6) of the judges reported that they were “Very Satisfied” or “Satisfied” with PSA’s supervision, and 13% (1) one reported that they were “Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied,” and one did not respond.
- Eighty-eight percent (7) reported being “Very Satisfied” or “Satisfied” with electronic surveillance and one did not respond.
- Seventy-five percent (6) reported being “Very Satisfied” or “Satisfied” with PSA’s mental health services and 25% (2) did not respond.
- Seventy five percent (6) reported being “Very Satisfied” or Satisfied with PSA’s pro-social interventions that PSA provided, one reported being “Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied,” and one did not respond.

INTERVIEW FINDINGS

PSA as an Agency

All of the judges who were interviewed in Superior Court and District Court spoke favorably about PSA's efforts and services to the court. They indicated that PSA provided critical services to the court that positively contributed to their ability to make appropriate and relevant release and detention decisions. Many indicated that they felt fortunate to have a critical resource such as PSA to provide them with information and recommendations for release and detention. Some of the observations and comments that judges shared about PSA include the following:

- "I feel spoiled by having the PSOs sitting in the courtroom with me during citations."
- "PSOs are capable, bright and conscientious."
- "I have long been impressed with SSU because they deal with some of the most challenging clients. The SSU staff is not only professional but also patient."
- "Some judges visited the Court from Baltimore and were impressed with our mental health court and resources."
- "It's a pleasure working with PSA. PSA is a model for how pretrial services should be delivered."
- "PSA is approachable and responsive when I need people to get treated and assessed."

PSA Staff

The Superior Court and District Court judges who were interviewed also shared their experiences and perspectives on PSA staff and supervisors. In general, the judicial officers spoke favorably of PSA's staff - both the pretrial services officers and supervisors/managers. They indicated that PSA staff always has a high degree of professionalism and knowledge. They also repeatedly mentioned that PSA staff was resourceful and helpful. If they did not have the information or resources that judges requested in court, they always made efforts to access that information or resource. The judges provided the following comments about PSA staff.

- "It's more about me supporting PSA than the opposite. The case managers do the heavy lifting and hard work to support [the judge]. They fill in the blanks so that when we have to make a decision, it's a good one."
- "PSOs are always professional, available and responsive to questions."
- "PSOs never come to the courtroom unprepared unlike other entities."
- "PSA staff appears to treat defendants with respect and maintain respectful relationships with defendants."

- “PSOs never seem to overstep their roles and boundaries with judges. They make recommendations and then seem to understand that judges must weigh their recommendations with other factors to determine the best final ruling.”
- “PSA staff exercise great patience in terms of handling different and challenging behaviors of defendants.”

The judges recommended a few potential areas for improvement regarding PSOs. These include the following:

- Quickly accessing information in court such as defendant drug-testing results, substance abuse issues and treatment compliance, and other issues related to noncompliance.
- Ensuring reports are always submitted to the court for review before court hearings.
- Providing judges with clear and full explanations for different recommendations, such as removal from programs, changes to conditions, sanctions and other recommendations.
- Quickly connecting defendants with pro-social interventions at community partner agencies and organizations.

Pretrial Services Reports and Other Reports

A few judges made recommendations to help improve PSA’s pretrial services reports and other reports to the court. Generally, the judges found the reports to be helpful and adequate in terms of the information they provided to help judges in the decision-making process. Below are several recommendations that judges believed might improve the reports:

- Provide the most recent drug testing information and updated information about defendant compliance.
- Include as much information in the pretrial services report as possible about defendant behavior and compliance.
- Develop a unique and uniform reporting form for SSU. This should include information on the defendant’s mental health treatment, reporting, drug testing, and substance abuse treatment.
- Structure the pretrial services reports in a way that allows judges to go to important sections of the report quickly and easily. Bolding and underlining section in the report might help with this.
- Begin pretrial services reports with a brief status update of the case detailing any events or issues that have occurred since the last hearing at the beginning of the report.
- Move away from providing a lot of narrative in the report to a bulleted format for the report.

- Provide information on actual contacts with core service providers of defendants. A couple of judges indicated not wanting to know about attempted contacts or outreach to providers.
- Make sure that the drug testing report attached to the compliance report is up to date. Sometimes, the drug testing reports may be outdated by a week.
- Consider faxing or emailing reports to the judges, especially status reports, which would save in terms of timing. PSOs would also not have to come to court to deliver them. Last year all three traffic courtrooms secured fax numbers so that CSOSA could fax their violation reports. A similar process could be developed for PSA with the court. “PSA kills a lot of trees. You may want to stop wasting paper and preparing reports for defendants with no prior history or for citation cases.”
- Put recommendations early in the reports and noncompliance behavior early in the report.
- Develop a unique and uniform reporting form for Drug Court with bullet points versus long narrative. It should include number of treatment groups scheduled, attended, and missed, drug-testing results, and other compliance behaviors.
- Alert judges of defendant violations earlier. In most instances, judges have to wait until the court hearing to learn about defendant violations. They indicated that they might be able to respond earlier to some of these violations if they had knowledge of them.

Partnerships

A number of judges made observations about the importance of PSA forging stronger relationships with community-based providers and agencies to be able to connect defendants with resources and additional support in critical areas of need. Judges who are assigned to the calendars for the specialty courts were particularly vocal about PSA figuring out ways to help defendants to access critical services, such as employment, educational and vocational training, and housing. Many viewed this as critical to defendants’ ability to be successful in the future. Some of the recommendations included the following:

- For defendants with mental health and substance abuse treatment issues, PSA should explore how to get core service providers working with defendants to attend hearings to report on defendant progress in treatment.
- PSA should share with the court what special populations among defendants need services or additional support help such as veterans. Also, provide judges with this information (i.e., the number of pretrial defendants who are veterans and receiving or in need of services for mental health and substance abuse).

- PSA should better incorporate pro-social interventions into its programs. The Agency should also work to develop stronger partnerships with community programs.
- PSA should communicate better with defendants about its variety of pro-social interventions and resources and track this. For example, PSA could hold conversations and meetings with community-based providers, such as Project Empowerment and the University of the District of Columbia, on how to better coordinate employment, educational, and social services with PSA services for defendants. One judge volunteered to participate in a group discussion between PSA and community service providers to forge stronger partnerships to support defendants.

Drug Testing and Assessments

The judges who participated in individual interviews also made observations and recommendations about PSA's drug testing and assessment services for defendants. These included the following:

- One judge asked about how defendants who come to court and present with mental health and substance abuse issues. but can receive diagnostic assessments. PSA supervisors who participated in individual interviews were helpful and shared information with this judge and others about PSA's process for judges to request diagnostic interviews for defendants. They also provided these judges with information regarding how to contact PSA's diagnostic unit directly in these situations. These judges were appreciative of the information. PSA should also make sure that other judges are aware of this option.
- Another judge asked if spot drug tests could be ordered for defendants during a hearing. The PSA supervisors shared that it was possible for judges to order spot tests. The test results typically take 30 to 45 minutes. Requests also can be made for defendants to be tested for alcohol and marijuana. However, judges must request it. PSA should also inform judges of this option.

Access to Data

Several judges indicated that they would be interested in having access to data on defendant outcomes and other issues regularly to increase their understanding of defendants and their outcomes. They indicated that they would find data on several issues helpful in their decision-making process. These areas include the following:

- For defendants with mental health and substance abuse treatment issues, a couple of judges indicated that it would be helpful to learn more about defendant triggers and causal behaviors.

- Specialty populations among pretrial defendants who need special attention, support, or resources.
- Better understanding what happens to defendants after they leave the program or court, especially problem-solving courts.

Other Recommendations

The judges made additional recommendations for PSA to consider, including the following:

- PSA coordinating a roundtable once a year for judges to discuss PSA services and alternatives to detention for defendants.
- PSA reviewing the types of incentives defendants receive in Drug Court and making appropriate changes such as increasing the provision of transportation vouchers as an incentive.

CONCLUSION

Overall, findings from the 2014 PSA judicial survey of DCSC and USDC judges were favorable and indicated that judges were highly satisfied with the quality, variety and impact of PSA services. Specifically, judges appeared to find PSA's supervision, drug testing and electronic surveillance services and resources helpful. Judges also indicated that they are pleased with their communication and the levels of responsiveness of PSA staff and supervisors. Areas for improvement included enhancing the quantity and quality of pro-social interventions that PSA provides to defendants; improving the structure and content of pretrial services reports and other reports provided to the court; making sure that drug test results provided to the court for hearing are timely and up to date; making sure that PSA staff is able to explain fully and clearly reasons for recommendations of certain release or detention recommendations and changes in program participation; being able to refer defendants for diagnostic assessments for suspected mental health or substance abuse issues.

NEXT STEPS

OSD recommends that PSA create a stronger feedback loop for judicial survey and results. One suggestion is that PSA share the judicial survey results with judicial officers, PSA staff, and other stakeholders through the PSA public and internal websites. Judicial officers should also be provided with electronic copies of the judicial report. The PSA Director and Deputy Director should also consider sharing the final judicial results and report with judicial officers through in-person meetings.

OSD also suggests that PSA develop a standing judicial action committee that will be responsible for reviewing judicial recommendations following the survey and individual interviews biennially beginning in the summer 2015. The judicial action committee should consist of no more than ten individuals from PSA staff, including representatives from the Court Representative team, Ops leadership, and PSOs. Following the review of the judicial report and prioritization of judicial recommendations by PSA's director, the committee should develop a plan of action and implement the plan during the year following the survey. . They should also prepare a final, brief report of their efforts and results for PSA senior leadership, staff, and judicial officers.

APPENDIX

Pretrial Services Agency for the District of Columbia 2014 Judicial Survey

The annual Judicial Survey of the Pretrial Services Agency for the District of Columbia solicits feedback from judicial officers at the Superior Court of the District of Columbia and the United States District Court for the District of Columbia on the services PSA provides to these courts and to defendants released pending trial. Gauging the opinions of our most important partners will allow us to improve the quality and delivery of our services and supervision and meet our mission of promoting pretrial justice and enhancing community safety.

-
1. Please indicate in which Court you preside: Superior Court of the District of Columbia ☐ United States District Court for the District of Columbia ☐
 2. Please indicate the number of years that you have served on the Bench: _____
 3. Overall, how satisfied are you with the services that PSA provides to the Court?
 - 1 Very Satisfied
 - 2 Satisfied
 - 3 Neither
 - 4 Dissatisfied
 - 5 Very DissatisfiedNA Not applicable
 4. Overall, how satisfied are you with the information PSA provides about the services/programs it offers to the Court?
 - 1 Very Satisfied
 - 2 Satisfied
 - 3 Neither
 - 4 Dissatisfied
 - 5 Very DissatisfiedNA Not applicable
 5. How useful to you is the information that PSA provides in assisting you with your decision-making process?
 - 1 Very Useful
 - 2 Useful
 - 3 Average
 - 4 Not Very Useful
 - 5 Not Useful At AllNA Not applicable
 6. How can PSA improve upon the individual case information it provides to better assist your decision-making?

7. How useful to you are PSA's recommendations to your decision-making?

- 1 Very Useful
- 2 Useful
- 3 Average
- 4 Not Very Useful
- 5 Not Useful At All
- NA Not applicable

8. How can PSA improve its recommendations and/or its recommendation process?

9. How would you rate the services that PSA provides in the following areas?

Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Avg	Fair	Poor	NA
Pretrial Services Reports for release/detention decision-making						
Reports detailing defendant compliance or noncompliance with release conditions						
Timeliness of reports and evaluations						
Quality/comprehensiveness of reports/evaluation						
Timely appearances in court when requested						
PSA staff resourcefulness and helpfulness in Court						
FTA investigations/warrant surrenders						
Drug Testing Services and Laboratory/Forensic Services						
Timeliness of treatment placements for defendants detained for that purpose						

10. Please provide any additional information about how we can improve in the specific areas listed above.

11. Are there other services and/or technologies that you would like to see PSA utilize to assist in providing services to the Court?

12. How satisfied are you with the level of communication between you (and/or your staff) and PSA staff and supervisors?

Answer Options	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	N/A
Pretrial Services						
Officers						
Supervisors/Managers						

13. How would you rate PSA's responsiveness in resolving your overall needs or concerns?

- 1 Excellent
- 2 Good
- 3 Average
- 4 Fair
- 5 Poor
- NA Not applicable

14. Overall, how satisfied are you with PSA's responsiveness to conducting evaluations and/or screenings for PSA program placement (for example, HISP, Drug Court, etc.)?

- 1 Very Satisfied
- 2 Satisfied
- 3 Neither
- 4 Dissatisfied
- 5 Very Dissatisfied
- NA Not applicable

15. How satisfied are you with the services that PSA provides for defendants in the following areas?

Answer Options	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	N/A
Substance-related treatment services						
Supervision						
Electronic Surveillance (both GPS and EM)						
Mental Health Services						
Other pro-social interventions (e.g., employment, educational resources and referrals)						

16. Are there other services and/or technologies that you would like to see PSA utilize in its supervision and treatment programs for defendants?

17. Is there any additional information that you would like to bring to our attention at this time? If so, please indicate this here:

18. Although optional, we would appreciate you providing your name below so that we can follow-up with you for additional information, if necessary. All responses disseminated outside of our research office will remain anonymous.

19. If you have provided your name above, please let us know if we may contact you for additional information.

Yes ☐ No ☐

20. Would you be willing to participate in an in-person interview to provide additional feedback? Yes ☐ No ☐