June 1982

The Alaska Pretrial Intervention Evaluation Development Project

Knowlton W. Johnson

Summary

In 1978 the Alaska Department of Law implemented the Pretrial Intervention Program (PTI) in
Anchorage to provide an alternative to formal prosecution of first-time offenders. The program was
later expanded to 8 other sites in Alaska. The PTI Evaluation Development Project was initiated in 1982
to develop an evaluation system for the PTI program which would provide information to assist PTI
management to set screening and treatment policy, determine staff workloads, and make program
modifications. This report details the evaluation system's development. Codebook and SPSS programs
included in appendices.

The Alaska Pretrial Intervention

Evaluation Development Project

JUSTICE CENTER

University of Alaska, Anchorage
Anchorage, Alaska

The Alaska Pretrial Intervention

Evaluation Development Project

Report prepared for the

Alaska Department of Law

Knowlton W. Johnson, Ph.D.

Justice Center
University of Alaska, Anchorage

JC # 8204

1982

ABSTRACT

In 1978, the Alaska Department of Law implemented the
Pretrial Intervention Program (PTI) in Anchorage, Alaska. This
program was mandated to work with the district attorney's office
in providing a viable alternative to formal prosecution of first
time offenders. In cases where the defendant(s) was diverted,
PTI provided rehabilitative service such as employment, job
training, education and counseling. The program also coordinated
victim restitution payments in the form of money or community
work service. Today the PTI program has expanded to eight other
locations in the state.

Since the inception of the program, there has been a strong
push for producing reliable and valid evaluation data for
improving services being delivered to defendants who have been
diverted from the criminal justice system. The need has not been
for evaluation per se, but for relevant information that could
assist PTI management in setting screening and treatment policy,
in determining staff workload, and in making program modifica-
tion. Further, counselors have found extensive profile and
historical data helpful when developing treatment plans for
diverted defendants and when providing treatment services to
defendants under PTI's supervision. It has also been deemed
important that a close information interface should exist between
the PTI program and the central administration of the Department
of Law.

The Pretrial Intervention Development Project was initiated

as a direct response to fulfilling the above information needs. This project centered on developing an evaluation information system for the PTI program which would produce data on a continual basis. As conceived, the project was designed as a collaborative effort between outside evaluation specialists and PTI program staff. It was envisioned that an outside/inside team approach would positively affect the compatibility of the evaluation information system with the needs of its users, staff involvement in the development process, and staff awareness of program evaluation and the use of its products.

The evaluation information system was designed by a research team from the Justice Center, University of Alaska at Anchorage. This team was commissioned to achieve three project objectives. First, the evaluation system was to be devised for a multiplex audience including PTI counselors and managers and central administrators of the Department of Law. Second, the system was to produce evaluation data that could be used for daily decision making as well as for making futuristic programmatic decisions. Third, data generated by the evaluation system was to be useful for research being initiated and pursued by agencies in addition to the Department of Law.

The development activities were divided into two complementary phases to be completed in connection with the Anchorage PTI office. In Phase I, effort focused on extracting and analyzing record data that had been maintained since the inception of the PTI program in July 1978. The product of this analysis was the

starting point for the Phase II activities which concerned establishing data requirements of the evaluation system and constructing blueprints for data recording forms.

Scientific and policymaking assessment criteria were used in selecting the evaluation data elements. Scientific criteria centered on concerns regarding the distribution shape, reliability and validity of each data element being considered for inclusion in the evaluation system. Policymaking criteria reflected concerns of time consumption, data collection and processing difficulty, costs and the interface with PROMIS.

In total, 122 data elements were required for inclusion in the evaluation system. These elements concern admission and release data needs. Admission data requirements were established that would produce a composite of each diverted defendant, his or her current and past physical and psychological makeup and a description of his or her treatment plan. Release data requirements focused on process and program effectiveness measures including staff effort, condition and treatment compliance, interagency referral and defendant disposition. Additionally, data were required for PROMIS that would display individual case summaries without breaking the chain of events of a case.

Recommendations for future evaluation development activities focused on implementation of the evaluation information system on a statewide basis. Initiating such activities was recommended because the system, as it currently exists, is based on the Anchorage PTI office operation; and, therefore, the uniqueness of

rural Alaska is not adequately built into the design. Further, PTI's capacity to process, store and analyze large quantities of data has yet to be determined. Assistance may also be needed in dealing with anticipated complexities of a statewide interface with the Department of Law's PROMIS system. Finally, more attention is needed for developing behavioral measures to assess the total impact (legal and rehabilitative) of the PTI program.

These recommendations are offered in light of the exemplary status of PTI's evaluation component. This component marks the most comprehensive evaluation effort to be initiated in the Alaska human services area. Further, Alaska is one of the first states to develop an intensive evaluation information system in connection with its pretrial services. PTI program management and central administration of the Department of Law are to be commended for their forethought in developing such an advanced evaluation component.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

report.

Finally, acknowledgment is extended to the Justice Center for providing additional Center resources to the project and to the University of Alaska Computer Network for providing computer time.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I

HISTORY OF THE PROJECT

The Alaska Pretrial Intervention (PTI) program was initiated in February 1978 by the State Department of Law with original funding provided by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. The program was conceived as an alternative to full prosecution in cases where the antisocial behavior did not warrant the full weight of the criminal justice process. This option was offered to defendants at the screening stage as a non-criminal disposition in return for their participation in a pretrial diversion program. To insure that this alternative was in the best interest of the defendant and society, the Department of Law considered program evaluation as a critical management activity.

In 1979 the Justice Center of the University of Alaska, Anchorage evaluated the impact of the PTI program after its first year of operation.[1] The results revealed that the PTI program was successful in diverting cases out of the formal criminal justice system. Additionally, the program was cost efficient and was more effective (i.e., less recidivism) than the majority of pretrial diversion programs in other states.

Later in 1979, the PTI program was examined in connection with legislative proposals to implement the Division of Corrections Master Plan. In this review the PTI program was considered a viable diversion effort. At approximately the same

---

[1]Ring, P.S. and K.K. Bruce (1980) Evaluation of Pre-trial Diversion Project. A Report Submitted to the Alaska Department of Law, Justice Center, University of Alaska, Anchorage, Alaska.

time, the Judicial Council scrutinized the PTI program and recommended that pretrial diversion be continued as an alternative to prosecution and incarceration of non-dangerous first offenders. These evaluation efforts helped the legislature to find sufficient justification to fund an expanded, statewide project for FY81.

The Pretrial Intervention Evaluation Development Project described herein supplements the above evaluation activities. The scope of the project entailed developing and implementing an evaluation system which could generate management information about the PTI program on an ongoing basis. To insure that the resulting system employed the most advanced and responsive techniques available, the Department of Law requested the assistance of the Justice Center to complete the project. A six month time schedule was set to develop and pilot the evaluation system, which was intended to produce information for multiple audiences functioning in the PTI program and the Department of Law. This report describes the development process of this project.

The following sections highlight the developmental process. Section II provides a detailed description of the PTI program as it currently functions. In Section III a general utilization-focused strategy for developing an evaluation system is laid out. In sequence, Section IV presents a description of the step-by-step process of designing the evaluation system. Section V summarizes the project and offers suggestions regarding the implementation of the evaluation system.

SECTION II

THE PRETRIAL INTERVENTION PROGRAM[2]

The Pretrial Intervention (PTI) Program of Alaska was founded on two basic assumptions which integrated legal and rehabilitative perspectives. First, it was assumed that there are defendants who should be given an opportunity to correct their asocial behavior without being processed through the traditional justice system. In these cases, rehabilitative services are offered that are tailored to individual needs which include requiring them to make restitution and to perform community work service. Second, the prosecutor must decide whether or not to refer a particular case based on pretrial eligibility criteria. As such, a diversion program should be administered within the Criminal Division of the Department of Law.

Program Objectives

There are three main program objectives of PTI. One objective concerns the district attorney offices which operate in various locations across the state. The PTI program is to provide prosecuting attorneys with a viable alternative to formal prosecution in the processing of a criminal offense according to well-defined criteria and guidelines with respect to both offenses and offenders. Currently, the PTI program is operating in Anchorage, Barrow, Bethel, Fairbanks, Juneau, Kenai, Nome and Valdez. Later this year, PTI services will be provided in Ketchikan, Kodiak and Sitka.

---

[2]This section was drafted in collaboration with PTI management personnel. These included Jeanne Bussey (Anchorage PTI Program Coordinator), Chris Cobb (Statewide PTI Program Coordinator) and Patrick Conheady (Chief of PTI services).

A second objective of the diversion project is to provide rehabilitative services such as employment, job training, education and counseling to residents of Alaska who are charged with essentially non-serious crimes, providing this charge is their first offense. If they had been previously convicted, the previous conviction could not reflect a pattern of antisocial behavior or habituation to crime. Further, any previous conviction must have occurred far enough in the offender's past to allow a reasonable inference that the subsequent crime was not a manifestation of prior antisocial behavior or habituation to crime. Additionally, participants can not have been previously enrolled in a pretrial diversion program. The only exceptions to the first-time criteria are in domestic assault and battery cases.

Victim restitution is a third program objective in the Pretrial Intervention Program. Most importantly, victims are reimbursed monetarily for damages. Additionally, community work service is generally required of defendants as a means of reaffirming society's norms. It is felt that either type of restitution has a rehabilitative effect on the individual defendants when combined with a well-defined treatment plan.

Program Description

Currently, PTI receives potential program participants from the State and Municipal Prosecutor offices. State referrals are alleged felons and misdemeanants who have been accused of committing property and/or personal crimes. Municipal referrals are

offenders who are accused of committing property or personal misdemeanor crimes.

After initial prosecutorial screening of those individuals who are eligibile for the PTI Program, offenders are interviewed to ascertain their willingness to participate. Prospective participants have to be willing not only to accept treatment but also to waive certain procedural rights, including the right to a speedy trial. In addition, offenders participate in an in-depth intake interview to identify employment, social, educational and family background. Psychological problems are also identified that are to be addressed by the project's referral and diagnostic services.

This interview information is used to develop an individual treatment plan for each participant during the initial interview. The treatment plan includes long- and short-term goals mutually developed by the program staff and the individual. Short-term goals focus on the immediate needs and problems that continually disrupt the participant's life, such as family, social, financial and medical problems, while the long-term goals focus on education, restitution, employment, family and psychological problems. The longevity of an individual treatment plan generally ranges from six to twelve months.

Immediately following the intake interview, outside agency referrals are made which are based on identifiable problems and goals. In instances where participants have limited employment skills and/or experience, they are given interest and aptitude

testing before being referred to one of the available community job development resources. Participants who demonstrate skills are immediately referred to job development resources.

In addition to the above services, PTI has developed unique program components for domestic assault and battery cases and shoplifting cases. The domestic violence services differ from other program services in regard to staff interaction with victims. That is, victims are given explanations about options available through the criminal justice system and the women's shelter. Safety of the victim is the priority issue.

In Anchorage, if the victim prefers prosecution, PTI staff assist in any way possible. Importantly, the staff relays the victim's wishes to the prosecutor. If the victim prefers deferred prosecution the prosecutor can choose to refer the defendant to PTI for supervision. The defendant must then comply with the condition that he or she attend domestic violence counseling and must abstain from the use of violence during the period of the deferred prosecution. Alcohol and/or drug counseling may also be conditions if appropriate. These procedural policies are about to be implemented on a statewide basis.

Shoplifting offenders and other Municipal misdemeanor property offenders are required to do community or public service work. PTI has some 150 non-profit agencies statewide available for placement of these volunteer workers. These agencies record the number of hours the volunteer completes and foward this information to the PTI Volunteer Coordinator. In some cases, the

Volunteer Coordinator makes an intake decision to require as a condition the attainment of a GED or attendance at counseling rather than participation in community service.

All rehabilitative and restitution services rendered to offenders and victims are documented, and individual cases are monitored by the project staff. After an individual has successfully completed the program, the project staff recommends to the prosecutor's office that the criminal charges pending be dismissed under Rule 43(a) of the Rules of Criminal Procedure. Individuals who fail to successfully complete the PTI program are terminated from the project and returned to the criminal justice system for prosecution.

SECTION III

A STRATEGY FOR DEVELOPING AN EVALUATION SYSTEM

Systems for generating evaluation and feedback information on justice operations are recent phenomena.[3] These new developments come primarily from increased demands placed on agencies to be "accountable" for their activities and to offer services that will ensure achievement of desired ends. While traditionally these information requirements emphasized descriptive data (e.g., defendant background characteristics), the type of data being collected is changing. That is, as a result of contemporary evaluation and management information systems in most human service areas (e.g., law, drug abuse, mental health, etc.), information is now being gathered on inputs, processes and outcomes characterizing both offenders and staff. Accordingly, voluminous amounts of data are available to document organizational activities.

This increased attention concerning the collection and storage of evaluative information poses critical problems for the production of usable information. For example, most systems, whether called management information systems or evaluation systems, consist primarily of monitoring-focused data that relate only to day-to-day operations. Little emphasis is placed on data for programmatic or policy changes that are both immediate and

---

[3]Cohen, S.H., J.C. Noah and A. Pauley (1979), Evaluation and Program Planning, Vol. 2, 49-58. A discussion of the well-known management information system, "PROMIS," in the justice area can be found in Weimer, D.L. (1980) Improving Prosecution? The inducement and implementation for prosecution management. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press.

long term. In addition, there is a lack of concern for an evaluation system which provides data for multiple audiences on an ongoing basis. Most systems also are not designed to facilitate additional research activities which are separate, but complimentary, e.g., provide a partial data base for experimenting with innovative program expansions. In short, the underlying concern with current evaluation systems is that primary emphasis has been on information production, not information use.[4]

In an effort to focus attention on usable evaluation information, a three-faceted strategy served as the foundation for the PTI Evaluation Development Project. The first facet of the utilization-focused strategy emphasized research activities that centered on data requirements which meet the needs of a variety of users.[5] The evaluation framework included data elements which could be used for screening, developing treatment plans for defendants, monitoring defendants' progress in meeting contract conditions and treatment goals, allocating staff work loads and evaluating program impact. It was designed so that potential users could include statewide PTI staff (counselors, supervisors and administrators) and other Department of Law personnel

---

[4]Emphasis on usable research information is an out-growth of the 1960's "evaluation research" boom. See Patton, M.Q. (1978) Utilization-focused Evaluation, Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, for an excellent discussion of this development.

[5]Havelock, R.G. (1969) in collaboration with A. Guskin, et al., Planning for Innovation (4h Printing), Ann Arbor, MI. Center for Research on Utilization of Scientific Knowledge, a general discussion regarding the importance of compatibility of research with the user's needs. For a discussion of the importance of research compatibility in stimulating the use of evaluation research among justice decision makers, see Johnson, K.W. (1980).

(district attorneys and central office administrators).

Second, the strategy focused on the ability to apply a collaboration model of intervention when interacting with decision makers.[6] Collaboration between designers of the PTI evaluation system and personnel within the Department of Law was realized by adopting an "outside/inside team" approach. That is, throughout the various phases of the developmental process, which will be discussed in detail later, the Justice Center research staff and PTI staff assumed joint areas of responsibility. The research team provided expertise regarding technical matters of program development and evaluation, and the PTI staff offered expertise concerning substantive and practical aspects of the system. This approach calls for introducing the "personal factor" into the evaluation process.

The Chief of Pretrial Services, the PTI statewide coordinator and the Anchorage PTI office coordinator were heavily involved in all phases of the project. Counselors of the Anchorage office also participated heavily in developing the evaluation system since this office was selected as the first office to experiment with the new evaluation system. Importantly, administrative personnel with the central office of the Department of Law were involved in matters concerning the interface of the PTI evaluation system with the Department of Law's statewide PROMIS

---

[6]The importance of the evaluation-policy makers relationship has been discussed by a number of authors, see for example, Clark, P. (1975) "Organization Design: A Review of Key Problems." Administration and Society, 7:213-56. See also, Dunn, W.N. and F. Swierczek (1977) "Planned Organizational Change: Toward Grounded Theory." The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 13:135-57.

system. Because of proximity limitations, PTI coordination of the remaining seven statewide PTI offices was only minimally involved in the project.

While the research team was responsible for final products of the project, it was reasoned that intensive involvement and assistance of the PTI and other Department of Law personnel would produce a useful and viable evaluation system for the Department of Law.

The third and final facet of the strategy was designed to increase program staff awareness and understanding of the evaluation system. It was assumed that users' basic understanding of how the system was developed, how it worked, and what kind of results could be produced are associated with commitment to the maintenance and use of the products.[7]

Numerous meetings were held that exposed Anchorage PTI staff to the evaluation process, e.g., codebook construction, data coding, computer programming, and data analysis and interpretation. Additionally, this staff learned about evaluation through their involvement in extracting data from PTI records and preparing this information for keypunching and computer analysis. Further, the knowledge of the Anchorage staff, PTI coordinators of other statewide offices, and central office administrative personnel was increased through the decision making process concerning the identification of data requirements for the statewide

---

[7]Horst, P., J.N. Nay, J.W. Scanton and J.S. Wholey (July-August 1974) "Program Management and the Federal Evaluator, "Public Administration Review."

evaluation system, construction of data collection forms, and the interface of the evaluation system with PROMIS.

In summary, literature and reports of personal experiences among justice decision makers suggest that the need is not for evaluation per se, but rather for a multi-faceted evaluation strategy which can provide direction needed to improve program quality. As such, compatibility of evaluation results, collaboration between research and key decision makers and understanding of the evaluation system and its products were deemed critical to the development of a utilization focused evaluation system.

SECTION IV

DESIGN OF THE PRE-TRIAL INTERVENTION EVALUATION SYSTEM

The need to design an evaluation system for the Pretrial Intervention Program stemmed from management's lack of summary results on which to monitor and develop new components for a rapidly expanding statewide program. Prior to the evaluation development project, data on diverted defendants were being used primarily by counselors for screening and treatment purposes. Management use of this information was limited and centered mainly on impromptu descriptive summaries of information which were requested by the administrative arm of the Department of Law. There were periodic summary results produced, but only of selected information for monitoring purposes, e.g., amount of restitution paid. Finally, on several occasions the data being collected by the PTI office in Anchorage served as the basis for evaluation studies being conducted by outside researchers and students.

In an effort to produce evaluation data for more extensive management and counselor use, the evaluation development project relied heavily on past experience of the Anchorage office staff in their efforts to record policy relevant information. This PTI office handles the largest volume of diverted cases, and was the original test site for pretrial diversion programming in Alaska.

While the evaluation system was developed in the Anchorage location, some of the uniqueness of other statewide PTI offices was taken into consideration through the heavy participation of

the statewide PTI coordinator and the Chief of Pretrial Services. Moreover, PTI coordinators from a majority of the other state offices provided input to the development of the system through participation in a training workshop.

The evaluation system development project was conceptualized as a two-phased project. In Phase I, effort focused on examining the Anchorage office record information that had been collected since its inception in July 1978. The results of this examination which provided an indepth description of diverted defendants as well as the program's operation in Anchorage provided a starting point for determining the data requirements for the evaluation system. It was envisioned that PTI staff participation in producing these results would increase awareness of general evaluation requisites. Moreover, it was assumed that this awareness would further facilitate making decisions about the data requirements of the evaluation system.

Phase II activities consisted of tasks associated with selecting data elements and their codes, constructing forms to collect information on an ongoing basis, and conducting a short pilot test of the data collection forms. Importantly, attention was given to the interface of the PTI evaluation system with the Department of Law's PROMIS management system.[8]

---

[8]Presently, the Institute of Law and Social Research (InsLAW) is contracted to develop and implement PRosecution Management Information System (PROMIS) in the Alaska Department of Law. The final computer programming details have been completed and plans are being made for the District Attorney's office in Juneau to begin data collection using the PROMIS format. Later, all district attorney offices in the state will provide data for PROMIS.

Data Analysis Activities: Phase I

Phase I activities involved tasks focusing on data processing, analysis and interpretation of data collected from the Anchorage PTI office. Initially, the research team reviewed PTI's data sources and examples of old case files in which data had been collected via various forms. It was determined that eight sources were being relied upon to capture data on each diverted defendant who was accepted into the program. These sources included the following:

° police arrest report;

° intake form;

° performance agreement form;

° stipulation for deferred prosecution form;

° restitution form;

° defendant contact form;

° case summary form; and

° agency letters.

Based on this review, a codebook was drafted which defined over 100 unique data elements in reference to the eight data sources. This codebook served as the focal point for subsequent staff training sessions concerning the collection of data from the previously mentioned sources. In these sessions staff reviewed each data element and its corresponding codes to determine whether all counselors had consistently recorded information in the same way. A number of the original data elements of the research team codebook review were deleted because of data gaps

which were identified by the staff. In some cases, data elements that were considered to have future relevance were not eliminated even though missing data was anticipated.

The staff was also instrumental in producing exhaustive codes for each data element which accurately reflected how the data had been recorded. In regard to several data elements, the Anchorage office program coordinator conducted a content analysis of open-ended record information (i.e., descriptive data) to establish the codes.

Five codebook revisions were completed.[9] The final version was based on a pretest which entailed ten data collectors using the codebook to extract data on a purposive sample of cases. In total, plans were made to collect information on 107 data elements.[10] This information, which concerned the defendant and staff, centered on the following information categories:

° legal information on defendants (e.g., charges);

° defendant characteristics (e.g., age);

° defendant employment history;

° defendant's educational histories

° defendant's physical and psychological history;

° defendant's diversion conditions required and completed;

° staff effort (e.g., number of contacts with defendant);

° status of the defendant.

---

[9]Because of the extensiveness of changes from draft to draft, each revised codebook was retyped.

[10]See Appendix A for a copy of the final codebook which was used to extract data from the PTI records.

Included in the study were eight hundred and twenty-six cases which had been opened and terminated between July 1978 and December 1981. These included 296 state felony cases, 524 state and municipal misdemeanors and 65 domestic assault and battery cases. Wherever possible the PTI program coordinator assigned to a counselor his or her own case files to review and code. In instances where the number of terminated cases per counselor were extensive, or where the counselor on the case was no longer with PTI, other data collectors reviewed and coded these files.[11] The counselor for a case or the program coordinator was available to make decisions whenever the file information was ambiguous. Importantly, a detailed set of coding instructions were developed by the program coordinator.[12]

Inter-reliability checks were conducted by having each staff member recode 10% of the cases for another staff member. With the exception of not applicable and missing information errors, the error rate was less than two percent.

Data processing centered on transferring data from the coding forms to IBM computer cards. Following data keypunching and verifying, a Fortran program was used to uncover keypunching and

---

[11]Additional data coders included new counselors with minimal or no terminated cases, secretaries, a temporary staff person and the research assistant of the Justice Center's research team.

[12]These instructions were formulated by the PTI Program Coordinator after she had coded 20 to 25 cases and had reviewed the first six cases which had been completed by each staff member. In instances where there were errors, staff made the necessary corrections. Coding inconsistencies were noted and corrected.

additional coding errors. A frequency describing the distribution of each data element for the 826 cases was produced to locate additional keypunching coding errors. A staff review of this initial computer run facilitated the completion of data editing activity.

Data analysis served a two fold purpose. First and foremost, the analysis produced descriptions of the distribution for each data element being considered for inclusion in the evaluation system. Distribution distortions (e.g., skewness) and missing data problems were weighted heavily in deciding whether or not to consider a particular data element for the evaluation system. Redundancy among the data elements was also easily detected from descriptions of the distributions.

A second purpose of the analysis was to generate profiles of the 826 cases according to key defendant background and program characteristics. PTI staff personnel were interested in examining the relationship between four key defendant characteristics (i.e., age, gender, race and education) and other select data elements which were included in the analysis. In addition, PTI staff desired to compare favorably terminated defendants with unfavorably terminated defendants. State felony cases were also profiled by examining particular data elements that related to screening and treatment of defendants.

While a complete analysis and interpretation of these data were beyond the scope of this project, the research team produced

fully-labeled computer printouts for PTI staff review. These results included defined and newly created variables using options available in the computer program, the statistical package for the social sciences (SPSS). This program allowed particular data elements to be redefined by collapsing codes (i.e., recoding) to make the cell size large enough to be meaningful in subsequent analyses (e.g., education level). Through the use of SPSS, new data elements were also created by combining or using arithmetic functions (e.g., amount unpaid restitution or lapsed time between contract date and program termination). Notably, PTI staff made decisions on all redefinitions and newly created variables after reviewing several preliminary computer runs.[13]

Development of the Evaluation System: Phase II

Phase II of the Evaluation System Development Project centered on two activities. These were as follows:

    ° establishing data element requirements; and

    ° constructing data collection forms.

Each of the activities are described below in detail. It is important to note that an interface between the PTI and PROMIS systems was considered a major task associated with each Phase II activity.

---

[13]See Appendix B for a display of the SPSS subprograms that produced the final results for the PTI staff. The research teams used the following SPSS subprogram in the analysis: Frequencies, crosstabs, and breakdown as they have been interfaced with the University of Alaska Honeywell system. See Norman H. Nie, et al, Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, 2d ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975, for a detailed discussion of these analysis routines.

Establishing Data Requirements

Results from the PTI data analysis provided a foundation for establishing the data elements requirements for the evaluation system. Through a series of staff meetings, decisions were made about which elements to eliminate and which ones to incorporate into the system. Additionally, the original elements were combined and codes were modified. These decisions were based on an examination of each of the data elements from a scientific and policy making point of view.

Basic scientific concerns focused on the shape of data element distributions, reliability and validity. In regard to the distribution, skewness presented the most frequent problem (i.e., most of the cases fell into one or two categories). Whenever skewness was found to be a problem, the data element was either eliminated or redefined by making the codes more sensitive, thereby producing more variation. The latter was the more frequently used solution.

Reliability problems centered on the extent to which information about particular data elements could be collected accurately over time and across counselors. For example, data elements that pertained to staff contact with the defendant were deemed important to incorporate into the evaluation system. An overview of the findings, however, revealed that previous record keeping procedures concerning these data elements produced inaccurate data over time and across counselors. In response to this problem, structured measures were constructed for this category

of data elements, and procedures were established so that counselor interaction with defendants could be accurately recorded.

Problems associated with validity concerned the extent to which defendant characteristics and behavior of interest were being correctly measured. An example of this problem occurred when measuring defendant's disposition. Originally, the disposition of state defendants was measured by their compliance to conditions of the contract (e.g., drug counseling) and positive behavioral change as noted by the counselor).[14] Following the coding and analysis of data relating to this data element, it was decided to eliminate the behavioral change facet of the measure because it was subjective and thereby distorted the defendant's disposition. As such, the final version for the measure focused only on law violation, and degree of compliance to the conditions for diversion.[15]

In the process of establishing the data requirements, policy making considerations of a more practical nature were also deemed important. The most critical of these concerns included time consumption, data recording difficulty and costs associated with collecting and analyzing the required data. Equally important was the compatibility of the data requirements with data being required by PROMIS.

---

[14]See codes for data element #99, Appendix A.

[15]See codes for the final version of the defendant disposition measure presented in Appendix C.

Time was perceived to be a major concern if the amount of data being collected required too much of the staff member's time. This concern was taken into consideration in the Anchorage office by involving counselors heavily in the decisions about the essential data elements to include in the evaluation system. To minimize having irrelevant elements in the system, each element was evaluated by the entire staff as to its usefulness in making counseling and management decisions. That is, data elements had to pass the "so what" test before being seriously considered for the evaluation system.

Closely associated with the problem of excessive time consumption is difficulty in recording information. In addressing this problem, staff involvement was viewed as a way to enhance the ease with which data could be obtained. In regard to information about defendants, emphasis was placed on collecting information which required little subjective judgment of counselors. Staff effort information (e.g., number and nature of contacts with victim, defendants, etc.) were kept to a minimum because of the difficulty in recording such information.

The cost factor was also weighed heavily in making decisions about the data requirements. The major cost-related problem was in connection with coding and processing information for computer storage and analysis. While large management information systems like PROMIS are designed to handle numeric and alphabetic data, it was decided that an economic evaluation system at the program level should be designed so that numeric and alphabetic would be

collected, but only the former type of data would be prepared for computer storage and analysis. How this decision affected the design of the system will be discussed in a later subsection of this report.

The final policy making consideration for establishing the data requirements centered on a data interface with PROMIS. In this regard, meetings were held with central administration of the Department of Law to determine diversion data that was needed for PROMIS. Because of the sensitivity of the treatment related PTI data and because of constraints in PROMIS, it was decided that the only information which was needed would display individual case summaries without breaking the chain of events of a case.[16] These data elements included personnel information (e.g., DOB, SSN), dates and conditions of the diversion contract.

Close scrutiny of PTI's data requirements using the above scientific and policy making assessment criteria yielded the data elements that are displayed in Table 1 (overleaf).[17] These requirements are divided into admission and release data requirements. Admission data develops a composite of defendants which

---

[16]In approximately nine months a special diversion transaction record will be created as a subfile within PROMIS. However, because current computer programming modification of PROMIS has been completed for use in Alaska, diversion data for PROMIS will be stored and accessed from a sequence note in the defendent's activity transaction record. See a listing of the transaction table of the Alaska version of on-line PROMIS for these details.

[17]There is no distinction made between data elements for use by management and by counselors. In most instances data requirements pertaining specifically to the needs of the counselor were requests for detailed alphabetic information that was only an extension of particular numeric information being collected for management purposes.

TABLE 1. DATA ELEMENT REQUIREMENTS FOR THE PRETRIAL INTERVENTION EVALUATION SYSTEM

ADMISSION DATA REQUIREMENTS		RELEASE DATA REQUIREMENTS

CONTACT INFORMATION
Date of Birth
Age at Intake
Social Security Number

INDIVIDUAL INFORMATION
Sex
Race/Ethnic Background
Veteran Status
Marital Status
Current Living Status
Length of Time at Current Address
Length of Time in Alaska

LEGAL INFORMATION
Diverted Charge
Post Conviction Status
Source of Referral
Type of Case
Domestic Violence Involvement
Victim/Witness Unit referral
Victim Relationship to Defendant
Jurisdiction in Which
  Primary Offense Took Place
Arrest & Pretrial Lapse Time
Type of Defense Attorney
Any Time Spent in Jail
  On This Charge
Bail Posted or Exonerated
Stage at Time of Filing of
  Stipulation
Legal Status

EMPLOYMENT INFORMATION
Employment Status
Primary Source of Income
Number Months Most Recent Job
Number Weeks Unemployed at Intake
Average Weekly Wage at
  Most Recent Job

EDUCATION/TRAINING BACKGROUND
Highest Postsecondary Level
  Achieved/Highest School Grade
  Completed
Number Vocational Training
  Courses Completed

PHYSICAL/PSYCHOLOGICAL INFORMATION
Physical Handicap/Special Health Problems
  and Medication Taken
Drug/Alcohol Influence at Time of Arrest
Alcohol Caused Problems
Treatment For Alcohol Problems
Drug Caused Problems
Treatment For Drug Problems
Prescription Drugs Abused
Mental Health Problems And Medications
  Taken
Treatment For Mental Health Problems
Suicide Attempts
Sexual Abuse Victim/Perpetrator
Physical Abuse Victim/Perpetrator

CONDITIONS & TREATMENT GOALS
Community Volunteer Work Required
Monetary Restitution Required
Education Required
Career Counseling Required
Psych. Individual Counseling Required
Alcohol Counseling Required
Maintain/Seek Employment
Maintain Prescribed PTI Contact

STAFF EFFORT INFORMATION
Defendant Referred for Counseling
Type of Victim
Number Contacts with Victim
Number Telephone Contacts with Defendant
Number Face-To-Face Contacts with
  Defendant
Number Written Contacts with Defendant

CONDITION & TREATMENT COMPLIANCE
Total Hours Community Volunteer
  Work Completed
    Volunteer Work Waived
Amount of Monetary Restitution Paid
    Monetary Restitution Waived
Education Requirement Completed
    Education Waived
Career Counseling Completed
    Career Counseling Waived
Psych. Group Counseling Completed
    Group Counseling Waived
Psych. Individual Counseling Completed
    Individual Counseling Waived
Drug Counseling Completed
    Drug Counseling Waived
Alcohol Counseling Completed
    Alcohol Counseling Waived
Domestic Violence Counseling Completed
    Domestic Violence Counseling Waived
Extent to Which Defendant
  Maintained Employment
Extent to Which Defendant Sought
  Employment
Extent to Which Defendant Maintained
  Prescribed PTI Contact
    Prescribed PTI Contact Waived

INTER-AGENCY REFERRAL INFORMATION
Name of Agency
Number Contacts
Purpose of Referral
Agency Program Completed

DISPOSITION INFORMATION
Weeks Served In Program
Defendant's Contract Extension
Defendant Permanently Left Alaska
Defendant Permanently Entered Military
Subsequent Charge While in Program,
  at 6 Month Follow-up and at 12 Month
  Follow-up

includes information about their legal, personal, employment and educational history. Additional elements of this composite include past and present physical and psychological information. The final type of admission data being required concerns the conditions and treatment goals associated with the diversion contract.

Conditions for diversion are legal requirements imposed in lieu of prosecution. If not met by the defendant, the case can be reopened by the district attorney's office. Conversely, treatment goals are set voluntarily by the defendant and are not legally binding. They are considered measures which are associated with PTI's rehabilitative function, whereas data being collected on conditions for diversion are considered as measures associated with the agency's legal and rehabilitative functions.

Four types of release data being required include information about staff effort, condition and treatment compliance, interagency referral and defendant disposition. These data elements relate to measures of PTI's program effectiveness. Importantly, follow-up information is being required on defendants subsequent to program termination.

In most instances data being generated by the evaluation system were seen as serving more than one audience. For example, on the one hand, the employment history of the defendant is considered by the counselor as an initial variable to take into consideration when developing a defendant's treatment plan. On the other hand, aggregate information (i.e., summary data) concerning

this category of data elements can be examined by management to detect whether or not job referral services in the community are being adequately used by the PTI staff. While these elements have distinctly different uses for counselor and management, important feedback to both counselors and management is provided by building in employment data requirements that elicit information on the type of services being provided to defendants who are referred to community job services.

Presented above have been the scientific and policy making considerations that guided the establishment of the data requireaent for PTI's evaluation system and its interface with PROMIS. While these concerns are not exhaustive, they do illustrate how the science and practice points of view can be made to converge.

Constructing Data Collection Forms

Construction of the forms for recording the data for the PTI evaluation system was difficult and time consuming. This was due mainly to the multiple user aspect of the system: different kinds of information were needed for PTI managers, counselors and central administrators of the Department of Law.

In the case of PTI management and counselor needs, the final decision was to integrate data elements for both groups with the management elements being distinguishable by numbers from 1 to 122 and boxes for their code. Data that were recorded for counselor use in working with defendants appear in proximity to management data elements which were similar in content. The final drafts of the admission and release forms are presented in

Appendix C. PTI intends to use the basic structure of these forms, but modifications are envisioned during printing.[18] Additionally, due to the confidentiality of some of the counselor related information, it is also envisioned that during printing a partial carbon will be created which transfers only the management numeric data to a record sheet. In turn, the carbon copy will be used as the data source for data entry onto computer cards, tape, or floppy disk files of a micro-computer. Since the format of the coding structure was constructed for recording convenience (i.e., boxes for codes follow each data element), there is a need to reduce data entry error (e.g., keypunching) by transferring data from the carbon sheets onto IBM coding forms.

In regard to data collection for PROMIS, a special short form has been prepared (Appendix D). The counselor will complete the form at the time of the initial interview and forward it to the District Attorney's office for the data to be entered by terminal onto a computer storage medium being maintained by the Department of Law.

In summary, the data requirements for PTI's evaluation system were established by scientific and policymaking assessment criteria. Scientific criteria centered on concerns regarding the distribution shape, reliability and validity of each data element being considered for inclusion in the evaluation system. Policy making criteria reflected concerns of time, consumption, data collection and processing difficulty, costs and the interface with PROMIS.

---

[18]PTI plans to prepare a detailed instructional manual in connection with using the admission and release forms.

Using these criteria, admission data requirements were established that would produce a composite of each diverted defendant, his or her current and past physical and psychological makeup and a description of his or her treatment plan. Release data requirements focused on measures which could be used for determining program effectiveness. Special forms were constructed for collecting data required by the evaluation system and by PROMIS.

Now that the evaluation system has been developed and implemented in the Anchorage PTI office, time and thought should be given to its implementation statewide. Following in Section V are several suggestions regarding this expansion.

SECTION V

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This report details the development of a pretrial interven-
tion evaluation system in Alaska.   In order to maximize use of
the evaluation system, a three-faceted research strategy was
employed.   This strategy focused on developing a system which
would produce evaluation data on an ongoing basis for a multi-
plex audience, involving PTI staff in all aspects of the develop-
ment process and increasing staff understanding of program eval-
uation and use of such results.

This development project required completion of a set of
well-defined activities that centered on examining the relevance
of the data which are currently being recorded, establishing new
data requirements and constructing data collection forms.   The
principal product of this two-phased project was a final draft of
data collection forms to be used as the blueprint for printing
standardized forms for use in PTI offices across the state.

Given the importance of the pretrial evaluation system, there
are recommendations which warrant serious consideration.   These
concern the initiation of a structured development project which
centers on statewide implementation of the system that has been
developed in the Anchorage office.

The need for a structured statewide development project is
critical.   The evaluation system, as it has been developed, has
relied on the experience of the Anchorage pretrial office which

is in the only large urban area in Alaska. As such, the unique-
ness of rural Alaska has received little attention. Further,
PTI's capacity to process, store and analyze large quantities of
data is still an unknown. In addition, there are anticipated
complexities associated with interfacing the PTI evaluation
requirements with the requirements of PROMIS. Finally, the
number of behavioral outcome measures for the current evaluation
system is limited.

In response to these problems, statewide evaluation capacity
building efforts should focus on four activities. First, a
modified version of the utilization focused evaluation develop-
ment project as described in this report should be initiated,
with special attention given to maximum involvement of coor-
dinators from all pretrial offices. This would entail collecting
six to eight months of data from the statewide pretrial offices
which is being generated by the new admission and release forms.
An analysis of these data would produce results for the pretrial
office coordinators to review. Based on this review process,
changes could be made in the forms and in the data collection
procedures which reflect the uniqueness of individual offices in
different parts of the state. Staff involvement in this develop-
ment process and understanding of program evaluation is para-
mount.

Second, the PTI has a need for data processing, storage and
analysis capabilities; therefore, it is recommended that detailed
procedures and agreements be established for processing and anal-

ysis of the data which are collected on a statewide basis. It is envisioned that a more indepth analysis of the Anchorage PTI data can assist in determining the type of results which should be periodically produced on a statewide basis. Further, a close examination of PTI needs should be conducted to determine whether or not to store data on computer cards, tape, or a floppy disk of a micro-computer. These decisions parallel decisions that have to be made regarding whether PTI will develop the capacity to analyze their data or whether agreements have to be established with another agency to complete this task.

A third activity of a statewide evaluation development project concerns an interface with PROMIS. Once PROMIS is fully implemented statewide, it can be beneficial for the PTI operation to be closely linked to this larger information system, for there are additional policy relevant data on each diverted case that could be meaningful to PTI. In particular, a close linkage between PROMIS and the PTI system means that data from the district attorney as well as the police can be made available for analysis on diverted cases. Comparative analyses between diverted cases and prosecuted cases can also be easily conducted. These results would be useful to PTI and the central administration of the Department of Law.

The fourth and final evaluation system development activity being suggested is the selection of additional behavioral outcome measures for the statewide evaluation system. This need stems from the limited number of outcome measures which have been

incorporated in the current evaluation system. The activity would center on selecting and pretesting standardized measures which relate to PTI program objectives. While behavioral outcome measurement was beyond the scope of this current project, this should be viewed as an important activity for statewide evaluation development efforts.

In conclusion, The PTI evaluation system marks the most comprehensive evaluation effort to be initiated in the Alaska human services area. Further, Alaska is one of the first states to develop an intensive evaluation component in connection with its pretrial services. The PTI management is to be commended for their forethought in developing such an advanced evaluation component to produce information for future programmatic decisions.

APPENDIX A

CODEBOOK FOR THE PRETRIAL INTERVENTION PROGRAM

CODEBOOK FOR THE

PRETRIAL INTERVENTION PROJECT

Prepared by

Knowlton W. Johnson, Ph.D.
Director of Research
Justice Center
University of Alaska, Anchorage

In collaboration with

Pretrial Intervention Staff

Sources of Data:

(PR) Police Arrest Report

(I)   Intake Form

(PA) Performance Agreement

(DP) Stipulation for Deferred Prosecution

(R)   Restitution Form

(CC) Client Contact Form

(CS) Case Summary

(AL) Agency Letters

IBM COL. #	DATA ELE-MENT #	DATA ELEMENT DESCRIPTION	DATA ELEMENT CODE	SOURCE OF DATA
1-3	-	I.D. #		
4	-	Card #	8,98,998=NA 9,99,999=Missing Data	
5-6	1	PTI Location	00=Anchorage 01= 02= 03= 04= 05= 06= 07= 08= 09= 10= 11= 12= 13= 14= 15=	
7-11	2	Intake Interview Julian Date	78080 . . Present	
12-16	3	Contract Julian Date	78080 . . Present	
17-18	4	Counselor	00=Chris Cobb 01=Ron Gleason 02=Jeanne Bussey 03=Mori Kirkpatrick 04=Gretchen Imperiale 05=Sheila Corey 06=Marilyn Martin 07=Nancy Allen 08=George Githara 09=June Covert 10=Phyllis Ruemler 11=Joel	

IBM COL. #	DATA ELE- MENT #	DATA ELEMENT DESCRIPTION	DATA ELEMENT CODE	SOURCE OF DATA
		ADMISSION DATA: LEGAL INFORMATION		
19	5	Judge referral	0=No 1=Yes	I
20	6	Total # Municipal misdemeanor charges	0=0 . . 7+	I
21	7	Total # State misdemeanor charges	0=0 . . 7+	I
22	8	Total # State felony charges	0=0 . . 7+	I
23	9	# diverted Municipal misdemeanor charges	0=0 . . 7+	I
24	10	# diverted State misdemeanor charges	0=0 . . 7+	I
25	11	# diverted State felony charges	0=0 . . 7+	I
26	12	# prosecuted Municipal misdemeanor charges	0=0 . . 7+	I
27	13	# prosecuted State misdemeanor charges	0=0 . . 7+	I
28	14	# prosecuted State felony charges	0=0 . . 7+	I

IBM COL. #	DATA ELE-MENT #	DATA ELEMENT DESCRIPTION	DATA ELEMENT CODE	SOURCE OF DATA
29	15	Type of case	0=Municipal misdemeanor 1=State misdemeanor 2=State felony 3=Shoplifting 4=Domestic violence 5=Alternative sentencing program	I
30-36	16	Criminal Code # for primary divert-ed charge	See attachment	
37	17	Type of defense attorney	0=None 1=Private 2=Public defender 3=Court appointed attorney	I

38-39	18	Legal status	00=Clear, 1st time offense
			01=Clear, prior(s), juvenile
			02=Clear, prior(s), misdemeanor
			03=Clear, prior serious traffic
			04=Clear, prior felony(s)
			05=Misdemeanor pending
			06=Serious traffic pending
			07=Felony pending
			08=Misdemeanor pending,
			   w/juvenile prior(s)
			09=Misdemeanor pending,
			   w/misdemeanor prior(s)
			10=Misdemeanor pending,
			   w/serious traffic prior(s)
			11=Misdemeanor pending,
			   w/felony prior(s)
			12=Serious traffic pending,
			   w/juvenile prior(s)
			13=Serious traffic pending,
			   w/misdemeanor prior(s)
			14=Serious traffic pending,
			   w/serious traffic prior(s)
			15=Serious traffic pending,
			   w/felony prior(s)
			16=Felony pending, w/juvenile
			   prior(s)
			17=Felony pending, w/misdemeanor
			   prior(s)
			18=Felony pending, w/serious
			   traffic prior(s)
			19=Felony pending, w/felony
			   prior(s)
				I

IBM COL. #	DATA ELE-MENT #	DATA ELEMENT DESCRIPTION	DATA ELEMENT CODE	SOURCE OF DATA
		ADMISSION DATA: INDIVIDUAL INFORMATION		
40-41	19	Age at intake	17-97	I
42	20	Sex	0=Male 1=Female	
43	21	Race	0=Black 1=White 2=Native 3=Oriental 4=Hispanic 5=American Indian 6=Other	I
44	22	Veteran status	0=Nonveteran (no military serv.) 1=Past (Reserves) 2=Veteran 3=Current military (regular) 4=Current military (Reserves)	I
45	23	Marital status	0=Married 1=Widowed 2=Divorced 3=Separated 4=Never married	
46-47	24	Length of current marriage	00=Less than 1 year 01=1 year . . 98=N/A (never married; divorced; widowed)	I
48	25	# of dependents	0-7+	I
49	26	Current living status	0=Alone 1=Parent(s)/relatives 2=Institution 3=Spouse 4=Children 5=Friend/opposite sex 6=Friend/same sex 7=Transient	I
50-51	27	Length of time at current address	00=< 1 month 01-97+ (months) 98=N/A (transient)	I
52-53	28	Time in Alaska	00=< 1 year 01-97 (years)	I

IBM COL. #	DATA ELE-MENT #	DATA ELEMENT DESCRIPTION	DATA ELEMENT CODE	SOURCE OF DATA

ADMISSION DATA: EMPLOYMENT INFORMATION

IBM COL. #	DATA ELE-MENT #	DATA ELEMENT DESCRIPTION	DATA ELEMENT CODE	SOURCE OF DATA
54	29	Employment status at intake	0=Full-time 1=Part-time (35 hrs. or less) 2=Unemployed 3=Student 4=Homemaker 5=Retired 6=Disabled 7=Never employed	I
55	30	Primary source of income	0=U.E. 1=Employment 2=Employment (spouse) 3=Welfare 4=Parents/relatives 5=Friends 6=Other	I
56-57	31	# of months at current job	00=< 1 month 01=1 month . . 97 98=N/A (not employed)	I
58-59	32	If not employed at intake, # of months at most recent job	00=< 1 month 01=1 month . . 97=97+ months 98=N/A (never been employed/cur-rently employed)	I
60-63	33	Average weekly wage at current or most recent job	Actual wage in dollars 9998=N/A (never been employed)	I
64	34	Present work schedule	0=Days only 1=Afternoons only 2=Nights only 3=Shift work/varying schedule 8=N/A (not employed)	I
65-66	35	# of weeks unemployed at intake	00=< 1 week 01=1 week . . 97=97+ weeks 98=N/A (employed/student/homemaker/ retired/never been employed)	I

IBM COL. #	DATA ELE- MENT #	DATA ELEMENT DESCRIPTION	DATA ELEMENT CODE	SOURCE OF DATA
67	36	# of employers in last 12 months	1=1 employer . . 8=N/A (not employed)	I
68-69	37	# weeks employed in last 12 months	01=1 week . . 52 weeks 98=N/A (not employed)	I
70-74	38	Total earnings in last 12 months	5 digits (in dollars) 99998=N/A (not employed)	I

IBM COL. #	DATA ELE-MENT #	DATA ELEMENT DESCRIPTION	DATA ELEMENT CODE	SOURCE OF DATA

NEW CARD

IBM COL. #	DATA ELE-MENT #	DATA ELEMENT DESCRIPTION	DATA ELEMENT CODE	SOURCE OF DATA
1-3	-	I.D. #		
4	-	CARD 2		

ADMISSION DATA: EDUCATION/TRAINING BACKGROUND

IBM COL. #	DATA ELE-MENT #	DATA ELEMENT DESCRIPTION	DATA ELEMENT CODE	SOURCE OF DATA
5-6	39	Highest grade completed in school (academic only)	In years	I
7-8	40	Highest educational level achieved (academic only)	00=No high school degree nor GED 01=GED 02=High school degree 03=Some college education 04=AA degree 05=AA plus additional courses 06=BA degree 07=BA plus additional graduate or law school courses 08=Master's degree 09=Law degree/Doctorate/MD	I
9	41	# of vocational training courses entered	0=None . . 7+	I
10-11	42	# of months of vocational training program	00=< 1 month 01=1 month . . 97+ months 98=N/A (no vocational training)	
12	43	Hobbies (exclude sports)	0=None 1=Group related (at least 1 listing) 2=Individual (all listings) 3=Both	I
13	44	Hobbies concerning sports	0=No 1=Yes, 1 listing 2=Yes, 2 or more listings	I

IBM COL. #	DATA ELE-MENT #	DATA ELEMENT DESCRIPTION	DATA ELEMENT CODE	SOURCE OF DATA

ADMISSION DATA: PHYSICAL/PSYCHOLOGICAL PROBLEMS

IBM COL. #	DATA ELE-MENT #	DATA ELEMENT DESCRIPTION	DATA ELEMENT CODE	SOURCE OF DATA
14	45	Current physical handicap/special health problems	0=No 1=Yes, self report 2=Yes, friend/relative diagnosis 3=Yes, counselor diagnosis 4=Yes, outside specialist diagnosis 5=Yes, official records or confirmation	I
15	46	Past physical handicap/special health problems	0=No 1=Yes, self report 2=Yes, friend/relative diagnosis 3=Yes, counselor diagnosis 4=Yes, outside specialist diagnosis 5=Yes, official records or confirmation	I
16	47	Current problem of excessive alcohol use	0=No 1=Yes, self report 2=Yes, friend/relative diagnosis 3=Yes, counselor diagnosis 4=Yes, outside specialist diagnosis 5=Yes, official records or confirmation	I
17	48	Past problem of excessive alcohol use	0=No 1=Yes, self report 2=Yes, friend/relative diagnosis 3=Yes, counselor diagnosis 4=Yes, outside specialist diagnosis 5=Yes, official records or confirmation	I
18	49	Current problem of excessive drug use	0=No 1=Yes, self report 2=Yes, friend/relative diagnosis 3=Yes, counselor diagnosis 4=Yes, outside specialist diagnosis 5=Yes, official records or confirmation	I
19	50	Past problems of excessive drug use	0=No 1=Yes, self report 2=Yes, friend/relative diagnosis 3=Yes, counselor diagnosis 4=Yes, outside specialist diagnosis 5=Yes, official records or confirmation	I
20	51	Current problem of mental illness	0=No 1=Yes, self report 2=Yes, friend/relative diagnosis 3=Yes, counselor diagnosis 4=Yes, outside specialist diagnosis 5=Yes, official records or confirmation	I

IBM COL. #	DATA ELE- MENT #	DATA ELEMENT DESCRIPTION	DATA ELEMENT CODE	SOURCE OF DATA
21	52	Past problem of mental illness	0=No 1=Yes, self report 2=Yes, friend/relative diagnosis 3=Yes, counselor diagnosis 4=Yes, outside specialist diagnosis 5=Yes, official records or confirmation	I
22	53	Under the influence at time of arrest	0=No 1=Yes, alcohol 2=Yes, marijuana 3=Yes, other drugs 4=1 & 2 5=1 & 3 6=2 & 3 7=1 & 2 & 3	I/PR
23	54	Problem with alcohol/drugs at time of arrest	0=No 1=Yes, alcohol 2=Yes, drugs 3=Yes, both	
24-25	55	Other problem/ stress/pressures at time of arrest	00=None 01=Financial 02=Family/marriage 03=Work 04=Peer pressure 05=Health/medical 06=1 & 2 07=1 & 3 08=1 & 4 09=1 & 5 10=2 & 3 11=2 & 4 12=2 & 5 13=3 & 4 14=3 & 5 15=4 & 5 16=1, 2, 3 17=1, 2, 4 18=1, 2, 5 19=1, 3, 4 20=1, 3, 5 21=1, 4, 5 22=2, 3, 4 23=2, 3, 5 24=2, 4, 5 25=3, 4, 5 26=Other	I/PR
26	56	Current use of prescription drugs	0=No 1=Yes	I

IBM COL. #	DATA ELE-MENT #	DATA ELEMENT DESCRIPTION	DATA ELEMENT CODE	SOURCE OF DATA

<div align="center"><u>CLIENT FLOW DATA</u></div>

IBM COL. #	DATA ELEMENT #	DATA ELEMENT DESCRIPTION	DATA ELEMENT CODE	SOURCE OF DATA
27	57	Stage of screening of client	0=After arraignment, misdemeanors only 1=Before preliminary hearing 2=After prel. hearing/grand jury 3=After arraignment, felony 4=At sentencing	
28	58	Location of interview	0=PTI office 1=Jail 2=Institution/residential program	
29-30	59	Lapse time between arrest & pretrial contract	00=Same day 01=1 day . . 97+ days	
31-33	60	Weeks served in the program	000=< 1 week 001=1 week . . 977+ weeks	CS
34	61	Client moved out of state	0=No 1=Yes, authorized 2=Yes, unauthorized	

<div align="center"><u>CONDITIONS REQUIRED</u></div>

IBM COL. #	DATA ELEMENT #	DATA ELEMENT DESCRIPTION	DATA ELEMENT CODE	SOURCE OF DATA
35-38	62	Community volunteer work in hours	0000=None 0001=1 . .	PA
39-43	63	Monetary restitution in dollars	00000=None 00001=$1 . .	PA
44	64	Education	0=No 1=Yes, GED 2=Yes, college 3=Yes, English as second language 4=Yes, vocational	PA
45	65	Career counseling	0=No 1=Yes	PA
46	66	Psychological group counseling	0=No 1=Yes	PA

IBM COL. #	DATA ELEMENT #	DATA ELEMENT DESCRIPTION	DATA ELEMENT CODE	SOURCE OF DATA
47	67	Psychological in-dividual counseling	0=No 1=Yes	PA
48	68	Drug counseling	0=No 1=Yes	PA
49	69	Alcohol counseling	0=No 1=Yes	PA
50	70	Domestic violence counseling	0=No 1=Yes	PA
51	71	Condition to main-tain employment	0=No 1=Yes	PA
52	72	Condition to seek employment	0=No 1=Yes	PA
53	73	Condition to main-tain prescribed amount of contact with PTI	0=No 1=Yes	PA

CONDITIONS COMPLETED

IBM COL. #	DATA ELEMENT #	DATA ELEMENT DESCRIPTION	DATA ELEMENT CODE	SOURCE OF DATA
54-58	74	Amount of resti-tution paid	00000=None 00001=$1 . . Actual amount 99998=N/A (no restitution required)	R
59	75	# monetary resti-tution deviations (late payments, unauthorized re-duced payments)	0=None 1=1 . . 7+	CC
60	76	Restitution waived	0=No 1=Yes, unable to contact victim 2=Yes, victim never specified amount 3=Yes, financial problems 4=Yes, medical problems 5=Yes, mental problems 6=Yes, other	CC
61	77	Insurance involve-ment	0=No 1=Yes, deductible limit 2=Yes, no deductible limit	CC

IBM COL. #	DATA ELE- MENT #	DATA ELEMENT DESCRIPTION	DATA ELEMENT CODE	SOURCE OF DATA
62	78	Type of victim	0=No victim 1=Business 2=Private individual 3=Public official/agency	I
63-64	79	# telephone con- tacts with victim	00=None 01=1 . . 97+	CC
65-66	80	# face-to-face contacts with victim	00=None 01=1 . . 97+	CC
67-68	81	# written contacts with victim	00=None 01=1 . . 97+	CC
69-72	82	Total hours com- munity volunteer work completed	0000=None 0001=1 hour . . 9997 hours 9998=N/A (no volunteer work required)	
73	83	Community service waived	0=No 1=Yes, financial or employment reasons 2=Yes, mental or physical state 3=Yes, educational reasons 4=Yes, other	CC
74	84	Total counseling completed (exclud- ing tutoring)	0=None 1=Partially completed 2=All completed 3=More than required completed 4=Waived	CC
75	85	Extent of educa- tion requirement completed or ade- quate progress made toward com- pletion	0=None 1=Partially completed 2=All completed 3=More than required completed 4=Waived	(CC/AL)

IBM COL. #	DATA ELE-MENT #	DATA ELEMENT DESCRIPTION	DATA ELEMENT CODE	SOURCE OF DATA
NEW CARD				
1-3	–	I.D. #		
4	–	CARD 3		
5	86	Extent to which client maintained or sought employ-ment	0=No effort to maintain or seek 1=Some, but not adequate effort 2=Adequate effort to maintain or seek employment 3=Considerable effort to main-tain or seek employment 8=N/A (not a condition)	(CC/AL)
6	87	Extent to which client maintained PTI prescribed contact	0=None 1=Insufficient 2=Sufficient 3=All required by contract 4=More than required by contract	(CC/AL)
7	–	–	Code 9	
8	88	Client referred for counseling	0=No 1=Intra-office referral (PTIP) 2=1 outside agency 3=Multiple outside agencies 4=Both inside and outside agency	(CC/AL)
9	89	Public assistance referral	0=No 1=Yes	(CC/AL)
10	90	Outside employment referral	0=No 1=Yes	(CC/AL)
11	91	Outside medical referral	0=No 1=Yes	(CC/AL)
12	92	Outside legal (civil) referral	0=No 1=Yes	(CC/AL)
13	93	Other referral	0=No 1=Yes	(CC/AL)

IBM COL. #	DATA ELE-MENT #	DATA ELEMENT DESCRIPTION	DATA ELEMENT CODE	SOURCE OF DATA

STAFF EFFORT DATA

IBM COL. #	DATA ELE-MENT #	DATA ELEMENT DESCRIPTION	DATA ELEMENT CODE	SOURCE OF DATA
14-15	94	# telephone contacts with client	00=No contact 01=1 contact . . 97+ contacts	CC
16-17	95	# face-to-face contacts with client	00=No contact 01=1 contact . . 97+ contacts	CC
18-19	96	# written contacts with client	00=No contact 01=1 contact . . 97+ contacts	CC
20-21	97	Total # outside sources contacted (justice system, victims, referral sources, family, friends, etc.)	00=No contact 01=1 contact . . 97+ contacts	CC
22-23	98	Total # crisis situations while in program (e.g., family, financial, medical, employment, suicidal ideation or attempts, pregnancy, loss of loved one, etc.)	00=No contact 01=1 contact . . 97+ contacts	CC

IBM COL. #	DATA ELE- MENT #	DATA ELEMENT DESCRIPTION	DATA ELEMENT CODE	SOURCE OF DATA
24	99	Program disposition	0=Unfavorable termination for felony charge 1=Unfavorable termination for misdemeanor charge 2=Unfavorable termination for total noncompliance to conditions 3=Unfavorable termination for only partial compliance 4=Favorable termination for partial compliance, no positive behavioral changes 5=Favorable termination for partial compliance, with positive behavioral changes 6=Favorable termination for total compliance, no positive behavioral changes 7=Favorable termination for total compliance, with positive behavioral changes 8=N/A (shoplifting alternative sentencing cases)	
25	100	Program disposition for shoplifting and alternative cases	0=Unfavorable termination for felony charge(s) 1=Unfavorable termination for misdemeanor charge(s) 2=Unfavorable termination for total noncompliance to conditions 3=Unfavorable termination for only partial compliance to conditions 4=Favorable termination for partial compliance to conditions 5=Favorable termination for total complaince to conditions 8=N/A (nonshoplifting/alternative sentencing cases)	
26	101	Subsequent charge while in program	0=None 1=Misdemeanor arrest 2=Misdemeanor conviction 3=Felony arrest 4=Felony information/indictment 5=Felony conviction	
27	102	Type of subsequent charge while in program	0=DWI or OMVI 1=Misdemeanor, property 2=Misdemeanor, domestic violence 3=Misdemeanor, other (except traffic) 4=Felony, property 5=Felony, domestic violence 6=Felony, Part I offenders 8=N/A (no subsequent charge)	

IBM COL. #	DATA ELE-MENT #	DATA ELEMENT DESCRIPTION	DATA ELEMENT CODE	SOURCE OF DATA
28	103	Disposition of subsequent charge	0=Dismissed 1=Diverted 2=Prosecuted 8=N/A (no subsequent charge)	
29	104	Level of responsible behavior (includes choice of friends, goal setting, punctuality/attendance, managing money, taking care of self, etc.)	0=Regression 1=No change 2=Some positive change 3=Significant poisitive change 8=N/A (coder unable to assess behavior)	CC
30	105	Level of ability to handle stress (includes ability to use good judgment, rather than acting impulsively when in stress, etc.)	0=Regression 1=No change 2=Some positive change 3=Significant poisitive change 8=N/A (coder unable to assess behavior)	CC
31	106	Outlook toward justice system & staying arrest-free	0=Regression 1=No change 2=Some positive change 3=Significant poisitive change 8=N/A (coder unable to assess attitude)	CC

APPENDIX B

SPSS COMPUTER SUBPROGRAMS FOR THE

PRETRIAL INTERVENTION DATA ANALYSIS

```
  L PRET2
$$ ROUT(A5),MONI,TAB(:,8,16)
$:IDENT:auviolence,pretrial project felony frequencies
$:SELECT:SX/SPSS/EXEC
$:limits:20,55k,12k,25k
$:file:p1,null
$:prmfl:08,r,s,auviolence/pretdatx
print back:control
pagesize:noeject
run name:pretrial felony frequencies
file name:pret2
variable list:id,a1 to a106
input medium:disk
n of cases:826
input format:fixed(f3.0,1x,f2.0,2f5.0,f2.0,11f1.0,f7.0,f1.0,
::2f2.0,4f1.0,f2.0,2(2f1.0,2f2.0),f4.0,2(f1.0,f2.0),f5.0/
::4x,2f2.0,f1.0,f2.0,12f1.0,f2.0,3f1.0,f2.0,f3.0,
::f1.0,f4.0,f5.0,10f1.0,f5.0,4f1.0,3f2.0,f4.0,3f1.0/
::4x,2f1.0,1x,6f1.0,5f2.0,8f1.0)
missing values:a5 to a15,a17,a20 to a23,a25,a26,a29,
::a30,a43 to a54,a56,A57,a61,a64,A73,
::a78, (9)/
::A41,A58,A65 TO A72,A87 TO A93,A101,
::a34,a36,a75,a76,a77,a83,a84,a85,a86,a99,a100
::a102 to a106 (8,9)/
::a24,A27,A31,A32,A35,A37,A42,A59,A79 TO A81 (98,99)/
::a1,a4,a18,a19,a28,
::a39,a40,a55,a94 to a98 (99)/
::a60 (999)/A62 (9999)/a2,A3 (99999)/
::A33,A82 (9998,9999)/A38,A63,A74 (99998,99999)/
::A16 (9999998,9999999)
if::(a19 eq 17 or 18 or 19) newage=0
if::(a19 ge 20 and le 25) newage=1
if::(a19 ge 26 and le 35) newage=2
if::(a19 ge 36 and le 45) newage=3
if::(a19 ge 46 and le 69) newage=4
if::(a59 ge 0 and le 10) lapse=0
if::(a59 ge 11 and le 30) lapse=1
if::(a59 ge 31 and le 60) lapse=2
if::(a59 ge 61 and le 95) lapse=3
if::(a59 eq 97) lapse=4
if::(a60 ge 1 and le 25) served=0
if::(a60 eq 26) served=1
if::(a60 ge 27 and le 51) served=2
if::(a60 eq 52) served=3
if::(a60 ge 53 and le 990) served =4
if::((a66 eq 0) or (a67 eq 0)) psych=0
if::((a66 eq 1) or (a67 eq 1)) psych=1
assign missing newage,lapse,served,psych (9)
compute:volun=a62 - a82
compute:dollars = a63 - a74
assign missing volun (9999)
assign missing dollars (99999)
count::victim=a79, a80, a81 (1 thru 97)
assign missing victim (99)
count::agency=a89, a90, a91, a92, a93 (1)
assign missing agency (9)
if::(a99 eq 0 or 1 or 2 or 3) dispos1=0
if::(a99 eq 4 or 5 or 6 or 7) dispos1=1
assign missing dispos1 (9)
if::(a99 eq 0 or 1 or 2 or 3) dispos2=0
if::(a99 eq 4 or 5) dispos2=1
if::(a99 eq 6 or 7) dispos2=2
```

```
assign missing dispos2 (9)
if::(a99 eq 0) dispos3=0
if::(a99 eq 1) dispos3=1
if::(a99 eq 2) dispos3=2
if::(a99 eq 3) dispos3=3
if::(a99 eq 4 or 5) dispos3=4
if::(a99 eq 6 or 7) dispos3=5
assign missing dispos3 (9)
if::(a100 eq 0 or 1 or 2 or 3) shordis=0
if::(a100 eq 4 or 5) shordis=1
assign missing shordis (9)
recode::a6 to a14 (2 thru 7=2)/
::a19 (17,18,19=0)(20 thru 25=1)(26 thru 35=2)
::(36 thru 69=3)/a21 (5=2)(4,6=3)/
::a27 (8 thru 12=7)(13 thru 18=8)(19 thru 24=9)
::(25,26,30,36=10)(40,42,48=11)(50 thru 96=12)/
::a29 (4,5,6,7=3)/a31,a32 (8 thru 12=7) (13 thru 18=8)
::(19 thru 24=9)(25 thru 39=10)(40 thru 49=11)
::(50 thru 97=12)/a40 (2=1)(3,4,5=2)(6,7,8,9=3)/
::a45 to a52 (2=1)(3,4,5=2)/
::a76 (2 thru 6=1)/
::a79,a80,a81 (2 thru 97=1)/
::a88 (3,4=2)/a98 (3 thru 17=2)/
::a101 (2=1)(3,4=2)
value labels:a6 to a14 (2)2  or   more/
::newage (0)17-19 (1)20-25 (2)26-35
::(3)36-45 (4)46-69/
::a19 (0)17-19 (1)20-25 (2)26-35 (3)36-69/
::a21 (0)black (1)white (2)native- indian (3)other/
::a29 (3)other/
::a27,a31,a32 (7)7-12 (8)13-18 (9)19-24 (10)25-39
::(11)40-49 (12)50-96/
::a40 (0)No HS   or GED (1)HS-GED (2)Some col or AA
::(3)BA   or   higher/
::a45 to a52 (1)Yes, self (2)Yes, counselor/
::lapse (0)0-10    days (1)11-30    days (2)31-60    days
::(3)61-95   days (4)97 or more days/
::served (0)1-25      weeks (1)26 weeks (2)27-51   weeks
::(3)52 weeks (4)53 or more weeks/
::a76 (1)Yes/
::victim (0)No contact (1)1 type contact
::(2)2 types contact (3)3 types contact/
::a79,a80,a81 (0)no contact (1)1 or more/
::a88 (2)outside agency/a98 (2)2 or more/
::dispos1 (0)unfavorable (1)favorable/
::dispos2 (0)unfavorable (1)fav-partial
::(2)fav-total/dispos3 (4)fav-partial
::(5)fav-total/
::shordis (0)unfavorable (1)favorable/
::a101 (1)misdemeanor (2)felony
select if::(a16 eq 1115134 or 1115190 or 1115220 or
::1115240 or 1115250 or 1115295 or 1120010 or 1120030 or
::1120080 or 1120090 or 1120100 or 1120140 or 1120150 or
::1120200 or 1120220 or 1120230 or 1120280 or 1120350 or
::1120525 or 1125010 or 1125020 or 1141210 or 1141220 or
::1141510 or 1146120 or 1146130 or 1146210 or 1146300 or
::1146310 or 1146482 or 1146505 or 1710010 or 1712010 or
::2835050)
frequencies:general=a1 TO a14,a16 TO a19,newage,
```

```
::a20 to a23,a25 to a33,a35 to a38,a40,a41,
::a43 to a56,a59,lapse,a60,served,
::a61 to a67,psych,a68 to a70,
::a73,a74,a76,dollars,a77 to a81,victim,
::a83,volun,a84 to a93,agency,
::a94 to a99,dispos1,dispos2,dispos3,
::a100,shordis,a101 to a103
read input data
finish
$:endjob
*
```

```
  L PRET3
$$ ROUT(A5),MONI,TAB(:,8,16)
$:IDENT:auviolence,pretrial project primary crosstabs
$:SELECT:SX/SPSS/EXEC
$:limits:20,55k,12k,25k
$:file:p1,null
$:prmf1:08,r,s,auviolence/pretdatx
print back:control
pagesize:noeject
run name:pretrial primary crosstabs
file name:pret3
variable list:id,a1 to a106
input medium:disk
n of cases:826
input format:fixed(f3.0,1x,f2.0,2f5.0,f2.0,11f1.0,f7.0,f1.0,
::2f2.0,4f1.0,f2.0,2(2f1.0,2f2.0),f4.0,2(f1.0,f2.0),f5.0/
::4x,2f2.0,f1.0,f2.0,12f1.0,f2.0,3f1.0,f2.0,f3.0,
::f1.0,f4.0,f5.0,10f1.0,f5.0,4f1.0,3f2.0,f4.0,3f1.0/
::4x,2f1.0,1x,6f1.0,5f2.0,8f1.0)
missing values:a5 to a15,a17,a20 to a23,a25,a26,a29,
::a30,a43 to a54,a56,A57,a61,a64,A73,
::a78, (9)/
::A41,A58,A65 TO A72,A87 TO A93,A101,
::a34,a36,a75,a76,a77,a83,a84,a85,a86,a99,a100
::a102 to a106 (8,9)/
::a24,A27,A31,A32,A35,A37,A42,A59,A79 TO A81 (98,99)/
::a1,a4,a18,a19,a28,
::a39,a40,a55,a94 to a98 (99)/
::a60 (999)/A62 (9999)/a2,A3 (99999)/
```

```
::A33,A82 (9998,9999)/A38,A63,A74 (99998,99999)/
::A16 (9999998,9999999)
if::(a59 ge 0 and le 10) lapse=0
if::(a59 ge 11 and le 30) lapse=1
if::(a59 ge 31 and le 60) lapse=2
if::(a59 ge 61 and le 95) lapse=3
if::(a59 eq 97) lapse=4
if::(a60 ge 1 and le 25) served=0
if::(a60 eq 26) served=1
if::(a60 ge 27 and le 51) served=2
if::(a60 eq 52) served=3
if::(a60 ge 53 and le 990) served =4
if::((a66 eq 0) or (a67 eq 0)) psych=0
if::((a66 eq 1) or (a67 eq 1)) psych=1
assign missing lapse,served,psych (9)
compute:volun=a62 - a82
compute:dollars = a63 - a74
assign missing volun (9999)
assign missing dollars (99999)
count::victim=a79, a80, a81 (1 thru 97)
assign missing victim (99)
count::agency=a89, a90, a91, a92, a93 (1)
assign missing agency (9)
if::(a99 eq 0 or 1 or 2 or 3) dispos1=0
if::(a99 eq 4 or 5 or 6 or 7) dispos1=1
assign missing dispos1 (9)
if::(a100 eq 0 or 1 or 2 or 3) shopdis=0
if::(a100 eq 4 or 5) shopdis=1
assign missing shopdis (9)
recode::a6 to a14 (2 thru 7=2)/
::a3 (78001 thru 78031=0)(78032 thru 78059=1)
::(78060 thru 78090=2)(78091 thru 78120=3)(78121 thru 78151=4)
::(78152 thru 78181=5)(78182 thru 78212=6)(78213 thru 78243=7)
::(78244 thru 78273=8)(78274 thru 78304=9)(78305 thru 78334=10)
::(78335 thru 78365=11)
::(79001 thru 79031=12)(79032 thru 79059=13)(79060 thru 79090=14)
::(79091 thru 79120=15)(79121 thru 79151=16)(79152 thru 79181=17)
::(79182 thru 79212=18)(79213 thru 79243=19)(79244 thru 79273=20)
::(79274 thru 79304=21)(79305 thru 79334=22)
::(79335 thru 79365=23)
::(80001 thru 80031=24)(80032 thru 80060=25)(80061 thru 80091=26)
::(80092 thru 80121=27)(80122 thru 80152=28)(80153 thru 80182=29)
::(80183 thru 80213=30)(80214 thru 80244=31)(80245 thru 80274=32)
::(80275 thru 80305=33)(80306 thru 80335=34)(80336 thru 80366=35)
::(81001 thru 81031=36)(81032 thru 81059=37)(81060 thru 81090=38)
::(81091 thru 81120=39)(81121 thru 81151=40)(81152 thru 81181=41)
::(81182 thru 81212=42)(81213 thru 81243=43)(81244 thru 81273=44)
::(81274 thru 81304=45)(81305 thru 81334=46)(81335 thru 81365=47)/
::a16 (805030,1115190 thru 1115240,1115295,
::1141210 thru 1141230,1141510,1161210=0)
::(805120 thru 1115134,1115250,1120010 thru 1140130,
::1141250,1145030 thru 1161110,1710010 thru 2835050=1)/
::a19 (17,18,19=0)(20 thru 25=1)(26 thru 35=2)
::(36 thru 69=3)/a21 (5=2)(4,6=3)/
::a29 (4,5,6,7=3)/a40 (2=1)(3,4,5=2)(6,7,8,9=3)/
::a45 to a52 (2=1)(3,4,5=2)/
::a55 (2 thru 26=1)/
::a76 (2 thru 6=1)/
```

```
::a79,a80,a81 (2 thru 97=1)/
::a83 (2,3,4=1)/
::a88 (3,4=2)/a98 (3 thru 17=2)/
::a101 (2=1)(3,4=2)
value labels:a6 to a14 (2)2 or    more/
::a3 (0)Jan-78 (1)feb-78 (2)mar-78 (3)apr-78 (4)may-78
::(5)Jun-78 (6)Jul-78 (7)aug-78 (8)sep-78 (9)oct-78
::(10)nov-78 (11)dec-78 (12)Jan-79 (13)feb-79 (14)mar-79
::(15)apr-79 (16)may-79 (17)Jun-79 (18)Jul-79 (19)aug-79
::(20)sep-79 (21)oct-79 (22)nov-79 (23)dec-79 (24)Jan-80
::(25)feb-80 (26)mar-80 (27)apr-80 (28)may-80 (29)Jun-80
::(30)Jul-80 (31)aug-80 (32)sep-80 (33)oct-80 (34)nov-80
::(35)dec-80 (36)Jan-81 (37)feb-81 (38)mar-81 (39)apr-81
::(40)may-81 (41)Jun-81 (42)Jul-81 (43)aug-81 (44)sep-81
::(45)oct-81 (46)nov-81 (47)dec-81/
::a16 (0)violent (1)non-violent/
::a19 (0)17-19 (1)20-25 (2)26-35 (3)36-69/
::a20 (0)male (1)female/
::a21 (0)black (1)white (2)native- indian (3)other/
::a29 (3)other/
::a40 (0)No HS    or GED (1)HS-GED (2)Some col or AA
::(3)BA   or   higher/
::a45 to a52 (1)Yes, self (2)Yes, counselor/
::a55 (0)none (1)some problem/
::lapse (0)0-10    days (1)11-30    days (2)31-60    days
::(3)61-95   days (4)97 or more days/
::served (0)1-25    weeks (1)26 weeks (2)27-51    weeks
::(3)52 weeks (4)53 or more weeks/
::psych (0)no (1)group or individual/
::a76 (1)Yes/
::victim (0)No contact (1)1 type contact
::(2)2 types contact (3)3 types contact/
::a79,a80,a81 (0)no contact (1)1 or more/
::a83 (0)no (1)yes/
::a88 (2)outside agency/a98 (2)2 or more/
::dispos1 (0)unfavorable (1)favorable/
::shopdis (0)unfavorable (1)favorable/
::a101 (1)misdemeanor (2)felony
crosstabs:tables=a19 by a3,a6 to a14,a16 to a18,a20 to a23,
::a26,a29,a30,a40 to a41,a45 to a56,lapse,served,a61,
::a64 to a67,psych,a68 to a70,a73,dollars,volun,a76,
::a78 to a81,victim,a83 to a85,a87 to a93,a98,a99,
::dispos1,a100 to a103/
::a20 by a3,a6 to a14,a16 to a18,a21 to a23,a26,
::a29,a30,a40 to a41,a45 to a56, lapse,served,a61,
::a64 to a67,psych,a68 to a70,a73,dollars,volun,a76,
::a78 to a81,victim,a83 to a85,a87 to a93,a98,a99,
::dispos1,a100 to a103
options:5
read input data
finish
$:endjob
*
```

APPENDIX C

BLUEPRINTS OF THE DEFENDANT ADMISSION AND RELEASE FORMS

1. PTI Location-Counselor   ☐☐☐☐   Intake Date_____
   (See reverse side for codes)

                                      3. Contract Date ☐☐   ☐☐   ☐☐
                                                      Month   Day   Year

2. Defendant ID   ☐☐☐☐   Projected Term. Date_____

PRETRIAL INTERVENTION PROJECT

DEFENDANT ADMISSION FORM

Contact Information

Name_____

Address_____   Home phone_____

      _____   *(/)_____

    *(/)_____   *(/)_____

      _____   Work phone_____

    (/)_____   (/)_____

      _____   (/)_____

*Insert date of change   Example (1/82)

4.   DOB   ☐☐   ☐☐   ☐☐   5.   Age at intake (17-97)   ☐☐
             Month   Day   Year

                                                     Place of birth_____

6.   Social Security #   ☐☐☐   ☐☐   ☐☐☐☐   _____

Spouse/nearest contact_____   Keep confidential_____

    Address_____   Home phone_____

       _____   Work phone_____

    Relationship to defendant_____

Nearest Contact_____   Keep confidential_____

    Address_____   Home phone_____

       _____   Work phone_____

    Relationship to defendant_____

Father_____   Mother_____

    Keep confidential_____   Keep confidential_____

    Address_____   Address_____

       _____   _____

    Phone _____   Phone _____

    Occupation_____   Occupation_____

Defendant's Siblings (Age/Sex)_____

Comments_____

       _____

Item 1 - PTI Location-Counselor

Location - Counselor		Location - Counselor
00=Anchorage	00=Chris Cobb	01=Fairbanks
	01=	
	02=Jeanne Bussey	
	03=	
	04=Gretchen Imperiale	
	05=	
	06=	
	07=	
	08=George Githara	
	09=June Covert	
	10=	
	11=	
	12=Jim Tarr	
	13=	
	14=	
	15=	

Location   -   Counselor
02=Juneau

PRETRIAL INTERVENTION PROJECT

DEFENDANT ADMISSION FORM

Individual Information

7. Sex (0=Male; 1=Female) ☐   8. Race/ethnic background
                                     (0=Black; 1=White; 2=Native; 3=Other) ☐

9. Veteran status ☐   Is defendant eligible for military benefits _____
    (0=Nonveteran (including Reserves)
    1=Veteran (non-combat)   _____
    2=Veteran (combat)
    3=Current military (regular)) _____

10. Marital status ☐   Length of current marriage_____
    (0=Married;   1=Widowed
     2=Divorced;   3=Separated   _____
     4=Never married)

11. Current living status ☐
    (See reverse side for codes)

12. Length of time at current address ☐☐   13. Length of time in Alaska ☐☐
    (00=< 1 month; 98=N/A, transient)   (00=< 1 year; 97=97+ years)

List children (age/sex)_____

Number of persons dependent on defendant's income_____

Comments_____

_____

Legal Information

14. Court Case #   ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐

Charges_____

Codefendant(s)_____

15. Criminal code (primary diverted   ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐
    charge

16. Post conviction (0=No; 1=Yes) ☐   17. Source of referral (0=DA; 1=Judge) ☐

                                            Name_____
18. Services only client (0=No; 1=Yes) ☐

19. Type of case ☐   20. Domestic violence (0=No; 1=Yes) ☐
    (See reverse side for code)

Item 11 - Current Living Status

   0 = Alone
   1 = Parent(s)/Relatives
   2 = Institution
   3 = Spouse
   4 = Children
   5 = Friend/opposite sex
   6 = Friend/same sex
   7 = Transient

Item 19 - Type of Case

   0 = Municipal misdemeanor
   1 = State misdemeanor
   2 = State felony

Legal Information (cont.).

21. Victim/Witness Unit Referral ☐☐
    (01=No contact with unit
     02=Crisis intervention
     03=Rape
     04=Social services
     05=Victim compensation board
     06=PTIP
     07=Other)

22. Victim relationship to defendant ☐
    (01=Spouse
     02=Cohabitant
     03=Parent
     04=Child
     05=Other family
     06=Stranger
     07=Acquaintance
     08=Business)

Victim's name_____

Address_____

Comments_____

Home phone_____

Work phone_____

_____

23. Jurisdiction in which primary offense ☐
    took place
    (1=First; 2=Second; 3=Third; 4=Fourth)

24. Lapse time between arrest ☐☐☐
    and pretrial contract date
    (000=same day; 997=997+ days)

25. Type of defense attorney ☐
    0=None
    1=Private
    2=Public defender
    3=Court appointed attorney

Name_____

Address_____

Phone_____

26. Any time spent in jail on this charge ☐
    (0=No; 1=Yes)

27. Bail posted (0=No; 1=Yes) ☐

28. Bail exonerated (0=No; 1=Yes) ☐

29. Stage at time of filing of stipulation ☐
    (0=After District Court arraignment
     1=Before preliminary or grand jury
     2=After preliminary hearing or grand jury

    3=After waiving preliminary or grand jury
    4=After Supreme Court arraignment
    5=At sentencing)

Next court appearance date_____

Type of hearing_____

Comments_____

30. Legal status ☐☐
    (See reverse side for codes)

Explain any prior record:

Age	Charge	Disposition	Release Status
____	_____	_____	_____
____	_____	_____	_____
____	_____	_____	_____

Comments_____

Item 30 - Legal Status

00=Clear, 1st time offense
01=Clear, prior(s), juvenile
02=Clear, prior(s), misdemeanor
03=Clear, prior DWI or OMVI
04=Clear, prior felony(s)
05=Misdemeanor pending
06=DWI or OMVI pending
07=Felony pending
08=Misdemeanor pending, w/misdemeanor prior(s)

09=Misdemeanor pending, w/DWI or OMVI prior(s)
10=Misdemeanor pending, w/felony prior(s)
11=DWI or OMVI pending, w/misdemeanor prior(s)
12=DWI or OMVI pending, w/DWI or OMVI prior(s)
13=DWI or OMVI pending, w/felony prior(s)
14=Felony pending, w/misdemeanor prior(s)
15=Felony pending, w/DWI or OMVI prior(s)
16=Felony pending, w/felony prior(s)

Employment Information

Employment status at arrest_____

31. Employment status at intake   ☐   32. Primary (usual) source of income   ☐
    0=Full-time   0=Unemployment insurance
    1=Part-time (35 hours or less)   1=Employment
    2=Unemployed   2=Employment (spouse)
    3=Student   3=Welfare
    4=Homemaker   4=Parents/relatives
    5=Retired   5=Friends
    6=Disabled   6=Other
    7=Never employed

Current or most recent job (circle which): Job title_____

Employer's name_____ Phone_____

Address_____

Comments_____

33. Number of months at current job   ☐☐   34. If not employed at intake, number   ☐☐
    (00=< 1 month; 98=N/A, not   of months at most recent job
    employed)   (00=< 1 month; 98=N/A, never been
                                              employed/currently employed)

35. Number of weeks unemployed at intake   ☐☐
    (00=< 1 week; 97=97+ weeks; 98=N/A, employed/
    student/homemaker/retired/never been employed

36. Average weekly wage at current or most recent job ☐☐☐☐ Present work schedule_____

Present mode of transportation_____

Number of employers in last 12 months_____

Comments on employment/unemployment_____

_____

_____

Job skills/prior work experience_____

_____

_____

List any unions defendant belongs to_____

_____

Education/Training Background

36. Highest education level achieved
    (academic only)

Item 36 – Highest Education Level Achieved
    00=No high school degree nor GED
    01=GED
    02=High school degree
    03=Some college education
    04=AA degree
    05=AA plus additional courses
    06=BA degree
    07=BA plus additional graduate courses
    08=Master's degree
    09=Doctorate/MD/Law degree

37. If less than a high school degree,
    number of years completed in school
    (98=N/A, high school graduate)

38. Number of vocational training
    course completed
    (0=None; 7=7+)

Comments_____

Special interests/hobbies_____

_____

_____

Physical/Psychological Information

39. Physical handicap/special health
    problem (0=No; 1=Yes)

40. Taking medication for physical handi-
    cap/special health problem
    (0=No; 1=Yes)

Comments_____

_____

Problems/stress/pressures at time of arrest_____

_____

41. Under the influence at time of arrest
    (0=No; 1=Yes, alcohol; 2=Yes, marijuana;
    3=Yes, other drugs; 4=1+2; 5=1+3;
    6=2+3; 7=1+2+3)

42. Alcohol causes/caused problems
    (0=No; 1=Yes)

43. Any treatment for alcohol problem(s)
    (See reverse sides for codes)

Describe drinking patterns, family's drinking patterns, treatment_____

_____

_____

44. Drugs cause/caused problem(s) in
    defendant's life (0=No; 1=Yes)

45. Any treatment for drug problem(s)
    (See reverse side for codes)

Describe kinds of drugs taken, patterns of drug use/abuse, family's drug use patterns, treatment_____

_____

_____

46. Prescription drugs abused (0=No; 1=Yes)   Comments_____

_____

Items 43, 45

    0 = No, no treatment
    1 = Current
    2 = Completed
    3 = Was, but left before completing
    8 = N/A, no problem

Physical/Psychological Information (continued)

47. Present or past mental health problems(s) (0=No; 1=Yes)   ☐

48. Any treatment for mental health   ☐   49. Mental health medications taken   ☐
     problem(s) (See reverse side for   (0=None; 1=Currently; 2=In past)
     codes)

Describe defendant's mental health problem(s), medications taken, mental illness in family, treatment___

_____

_____

Any present thoughts of suicide (describe the suicide plan, availability of means to carry out)_____

_____

_____

_____

50. Any suicide attempt(s) (0=No; 1=Yes)   ☐

Describe suicide plan, weapons involved, availability of means to carry out, number of attempts, his
intent at the time, family history of suicide attempts, what stopped/prevented suicide:

_____

_____

_____

For the following items, explain when abuse took place, duration, relationships of victim/perpetrator
and whether defendant received any counseling:

51. Victim of sexual abuse   ☐   Comments_____
     (0=No; 1=Yes)

_____

52. Victim of physical abuse   ☐   Comments_____
     (0=No; 1=Yes)

_____

53. Perpetrator of sexual abuse   ☐   Comments_____
     (0=No; 1=Yes)

_____

54. Perpetrator of physical abuse   ☐   Comments_____
     (0=No; 1=Yes)

_____

Item 48

0 = No, no treatment
1 = Current
2 = Completed
3 = Was, but left before completing
8 = N/A, no problem

Defendant's Own Plans/Goals:

_____

_____

_____

References:

Name_____ Phone_____

Name_____ Phone_____

Name_____ Phone_____

Accepted_____ If screened out, reason & disposition_____

_____

_____

Conditions And Treatment Goals

55. Community volunteer work
    required, in hours
    (0000=None)

56. Community volunteer work
    (0=No; 1=Yes, condition;
    2=Yes, treatment goal)

57. Monetary restitution
    required, in dollars
    (00000=None)

58. Monetary restitution
    (0=No; 1=Yes, condition;
    2=Yes, treatment goal)

59. Education
    (See reverse side for codes)

60. Education
    (0=No; 1=Yes, condition;
    2=Yes, treatment goal)

61. Career Counseling
    (0=No; 1=Yes, condition;
    2=Yes, treatment goal

62. Psychological group counseling
    (0=No; 1=Yes, condition;
    2=Yes, treatment goal)

63. Psychological individual counseling
    (0=No; 1=Yes, condition;
    2=Yes, treatment goal)

64. Drug counseling
    (0=No; 1=Yes, condition;
    2=Yes, treatment goal)

65. Alcohol counseling
    (0=No; 1=Yes, condition;
    2=Yes, treatment goal)

66. Domestic violence counseling
    (0=No; 1=Yes, condition;
    2=Yes, treatment goal)

67. Maintain employment
    (0=No; 1=Yes, condition;
    2=Yes, treatment goal)

68. Seek employment
    (0=No; 1=Yes, condition;
    2=Yes, treatment goal)

69. Condition to maintain prescribed
    amount of contact with PTI
    (0=No; 1=Yes)

Comments_____

_____

_____

Item 59 - Education

    0 = No
    1 = Yes, GED
    2 = Yes, college
    3 = Yes, English as a second language
    4 = Yes, vocational
    5 = Yes, basic reading

Staff Effort Information

70. Defendant referred for counseling
(Include any counseling listed in "Condition and Treatment Compliance" section)
(0=No; 1=intra-office referral (PTIP); 2=Outside agency(s);   agency ☐
  3=Both inside and outside agency(s))

71. Type of primary victim   ☐   72. Number contacts with victim
(0=No victim; 1=Business;   (00=None; 97=97+;   ☐☐
  2=Private individual; 3=Public official/agency)   98=No victim)

73. Number telephone contacts with defendant (include attempted)   ☐☐
(00=None; 97=97+)

74. Number fact-to-face contacts with defendant   ☐☐
(00=None; 97=97+)

75. Number written contacts with defendant   ‾‾‾‾‾
(00=None; 97=97+)

☐☐

Condition & Treatment Compliance

76. Total hours community   ☐☐☐☐   77. Community service waived   ☐
volunteer work completed   (0=No; 1=Yes
(9998=N/A, no volunteer work required)   8=N/A, none required)

78. Amount of monetary   ☐☐☐☐☐   79. Monetary restitution waived   ☐
restitution paid   (0=No; 1=Yes;
(99998=N/A, no restitution required)   8=N/A, none required)

80. Extent of education requirement   ☐   81. Education waived   ☐
completed or adequate progress   (0=No; 1=Yes;
made toward completion   8=N/A, none required)
(See reverse side for codes)

82. Career counseling completed   ☐   83. Career counseling waived   ☐
(See reverse side for codes)   (0=No; 1=Yes;
                                           8=N/A, none required)

84. Psychological group counseling   ☐   85. Psychological group counseling waived   ☐
completed (See reverse side for codes)   (0=No; 1=Yes;
                                           8=N/A, none required)

86. Psychological individual   ☐   87. Psychological individual counseling   ☐
counseling completed   waived (0=No; 1=Yes
(See reverse side for codes)   8=N/A, none required)

88. Drug counseling completed   ☐   89. Drug counseling waived   ☐
(See reverse side for codes)   (0=No; 1=Yes;
                                        8=N/A, none required)

90. Alcohol counseling completed   ☐   91. Alcohol counseling waived   ☐
(See reverse side for codes)   (0=No; 1=Yes;
                                        8=N/A, none required)

92. Domestic violence counseling   ☐   93. Domestic violence counseling waived   ☐
completed (See reverse side for codes) (0=No; 1=Yes;
                                         8=N/A, none required)

94. Extent to which defendant maintained   ☐   95. Extent to which defendant sought   ☐
employment (See reverse side for codes)   employment (See reverse side for codes)

Items 80, 82, 84, 86, 88, 90, 92

    0 = None
    1 = Partially completed
    2 = All completed
    3 = More than required completed
    8 = N/A, none required

Item 94 - Extent To Which Defendant Maintained Employment

    0 = No effort to maintain employment
    1 = Insufficient
    2 = Sufficient
    8 = N/A, not a condition

Item 95 - Extent To Which Defendant Sought Employment

    0 = No effort to seek employment
    1 = Insufficient
    2 = Sufficient
    8 = N/A, not a condition

Condition & Treatment Compliance (cont.)

96. Extent to which defendant maintained prescribed PTI contact (See reverse side for codes) ☐

97. PTI contact waived (0=No; 1=Yes; 8=N/A, no contact required) ☐

Reasons for any waived conditions _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Inter-Agency Referral Information

98. Name of agency (See reverse side for codes)   99. Number contacts between defendant and agency (00=None; 97=97+; 98=N/A, no agency referrals)   100. Purpose of referral (See reverse side for codes)   101. Agency program completed (See reverse side for codes

	98.	99.	100.	101.
Agency 1	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐
Agency 2	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐
Agency 3	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐
Agency 4	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐
Agency 5	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐

Disposition Information

102. Weeks served in program (000=< 1 week; 997=997+) ☐☐☐

103. Defendant's contract extended at some time (0=No; 1=Yes) ☐

104. Defendant moved out of state permanently (0=No; 1=Yes, authorized; 2=Yes, unauthorized) ☐

105. Defendant entered military (0=No; 1=Yes) ☐

106. Program disposition (See reverse side for codes) ☐

107. Subsequent charge while in program (See reverse side for codes) ☐

108. Subsequent charge at 6 month follow-up (See reverse side for codes) ☐

109. Subsequent charge at 12 month follow-up (See reverse side for codes) ☐

Item 96 - Extent To Which Defendant Maintained Prescribed PTI Contact

    0 = None
    1 = Insufficient
    2 = Sufficient
    3 = More than required
    8 = N/A, no contact required

Item 98 - Name Of Agency *NOTE: Names change according to location. Check location code from Item 1
                          on Client Admission Form.

    Anchorage 00 =   10 =   Fairbanks 00 =
              01 =   11 =   01 =
              02 =   12 =   02 =
              03 =   13 =   03 =
             .04 =   14 =   04 =
              05 =   15 =   05 =
              06 =   16 =   06 =
              07 =   17 =   07 =
              08 =   18 =
              09 =   19 =

Item 100 - Purpose Of Referral   Item 101 - Agency Program Completed

    00 = Education counseling   0 = None
    01 = Career or employment counseling   1 = Partially completed
    02 = Mental health counseling   2 = All completed
    03 = Public assistance   3 = More than required completed
    04 = Drug counseling   4 = Screened by agency
    05 = Alcohol counseling   5 = Program inappropriate/unsatisfactory
    06 = Urine testing   (as determined by PTIP)
    07 = Domestic violence counseling   8 = N/A, none required
    08 = Medical
    09 = Legal (civil)
    10 = Other
    11 = N/A, no referral, no agency contacted

Item 106 - Program Disposition

    0 = Unfavorable termination for subsequent felony charge(s)
    1 = Unfavorable termination for subsequent misdemeanor conviction(s)
    2 = Unfavorable termination for total noncompliance to conditions
    3 = Unfavorable termination for only partial compliance to conditions
    4 = Favorable termination for partial compliance to conditions
    5 = Favorable termination for total compliance to conditions

Items 107, 108, 109 - Subsequent Charge While
  in Program

    0 = None
    1 = Misdemeanor arrest
    2 = Misdemeanor conviction
    3 = Felony arrest
    4 = Felony information/Indictment
    5 = Felony conviction
    6 = Domestic violence, rebattering

110. Criminal code of subsequent charge
while in program
(999999999999998=N/A, no subsequent charge while in program)

111. Criminal code of subsequent charge
at 6 month follow-up
(999999999999998=N/A, no subsequent charge while in program)

112. Criminal code of subsequent charge
at 12 month follow-up
(999999999999998=N/A, no subsequent charge while in program)

113. Domestic violence involved in
subsequent charge (0=No; 1=Yes;
8=N/A, no subsequent charge)

114. Domestic violence involved in
subsequent charge at 6 mo follow-up
(0=No; 1=Yes; 8=N/A, no subsequent
charge)

115. Domestic violence involved in
subsequent charge at 12 mo follow-up
(0=No; 1=Yes; 8=N/A, no subsequent
charge)

116. Disposition of subsequent charge
(See reverse side for codes)

117. Disposition of subsequent charge at
6 month follow-up
(See reverse side for codes)

118. Disposition of subsequent charge at
(See reverse side for codes)

Items 116, 17, 18 - Disposition of Subsequent
  Charge

0 = Dismissed
1 = Diverted
2 = Prosecuted
8 = N/A, no subsequent charge

APPENDIX D

PROMIS FORM

PROMIS FORM

Defendant's Name _____

Social Security Number ___ - ___ - ___   ___ - ___   ___ - ___ - ___ - ___

Date Of Birth ___ - ___   ___ - ___   ___ - ___
               Month   Day   Year

Court Case Number _____

Contract Date ___ - ___   ___ - ___   ___ - ___
            Month   Day   Year

Termination Date ___ - ___   ___ - ___   ___ - ___
              Month   Day   Year

Total Hours Community
        Volunteer Work Completed ___ - ___ - ___ - ___

Amount of Monetary Restitution Paid ___ - ___ - ___ - ___ - ___

Counseling Required (Yes/No) _____

Type of Counseling Completed _____
  (Career=Career
   Psygroup=Psychological   _____
               Group
   Psyindiv=Psychological   _____
             Individual
   Alcohol=Alcohol   _____
   Drug=Drug
   Domvio=Domestic Violence)

Education Requirements Completed _____

Special/Other Conditions Completed _____