



The author(s) shown below used Federal funding provided by the U.S. Department of Justice to prepare the following resource:

Document Title: Evaluation of the Honest Opportunity Probation with Enforcement Demonstration Field Experiment (HOPE DFE), Appendix Volume 3

Author(s): Pamela K. Lattimore, Debbie Dawes, Doris L. MacKenzie, Gary Zajac

Document Number: 251761

Date Received: June 2018

Award Number: 2011-RY-BX-0003

This resource has not been published by the U.S. Department of Justice. This resource is being made publically available through the Office of Justice Programs' National Criminal Justice Reference Service.

Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

NIJ Grant Number 2011-RY-BX-0003

RTI Project Number 021366

Evaluation of the Honest Opportunity Probation with Enforcement Demonstration Field Experiment (HOPE DFE)

Volume III

Appendix I. Individual Process Site Visit Reports

Arkansas Process Detailed Report

Massachusetts Process Detailed Report

Oregon Process Detailed Report

Texas Process Detailed Report

April 2017

Prepared for

National Institute of Justice

810 7th Street NW

Washington, DC 20531

CLACKAMAS COUNTY, OREGON HOPE DFE PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

Contents

Clackamas County, Oregon HOPE Overview.....	1
Key Findings and Conclusions – HOPE Implementation in Clackamas County, Oregon	3
Implementation Fidelity.....	10
Baseline Site Visit Summary.....	12
Involvement & Communication	12
HOPE PC.....	12
HOPE Judge.....	12
HOPE POs.....	13
Probation Management	13
Prosecutor	13
Defense Counsel	13
Jail Administrator.....	14
Sheriff/Other Law Enforcement	14
Summary.....	14
Training.....	15
Perceptions of HOPE and PAU.....	15
Implementation Barriers and Facilitators.....	16
Personal Opinions of HOPE	17
Intermediate Site Visit Summary	18
Involvement in Ongoing Implementation/Operation of HOPE & Communication.....	18
HOPE PC.....	18
HOPE Judge.....	18
HOPE POs.....	19
Probation Management	19
Prosecutor	19
Defense Counsel	19
Jail Administrator.....	20
Sheriff/Other Law Enforcement	20
Other – CC Intake/Support Staff, UA Techs.....	20
Summary.....	20
Training.....	21
Leadership in HOPE	22
Satisfaction with Group Process.....	22
Effectiveness of Sanctions	22
Probationers’ Understanding of HOPE Sanctioning Goals and Process	22
Sanctioning Process.....	23
Personal Opinions of HOPE	23
Implementation and Ongoing Operation Barriers	23
Implementation and Ongoing Operation Facilitators	23
HOPE’s Burden On Stakeholders	23
HOPE’s Burden on Various Departments	23
HOPE Sustainability Plans.....	24
Changes to PAU	24
Key Findings from Intermediate Interviews	24

Final Site Visit Summary.....	25
HOPE PC.....	25
HOPE Judge.....	25
HOPE POs.....	25
Probation Management	26
Prosecutor	26
Defense Counsel	26
Jail Administrator.....	27
Sheriff/Other Law Enforcement	27
Other – CC Intake/Support Staff, UA Techs.....	27
Summary.....	28
Key Components of HOPE.....	29
Implementation Barriers and Facilitators.....	29
Leadership	29
Personal Opinions.....	29
Organizational and System Level Changes	30
Future of HOPE	30
Factors to Consider for the Expansion of HOPE in Oregon	30
Drug Treatment Referrals.....	30
Primary CSAP Strengths	31
Primary CSAP Weaknesses.....	32
References	34

Clackamas County, Oregon HOPE Overview

The following report presents findings from the process evaluation of the HOPE DFE site in Clackamas County, Oregon. Results are presented from three evaluation site visits and an analysis of implementation fidelity metrics. As a preface, we provide an overview of the site itself, discussing key local administrative and organizational features within the site that influence the operation of HOPE. See the Methods chapter for more information about the DFE and the research design.

The HOPE management team in Clackamas County consists of the HOPE judge, HOPE program coordinator, two initial HOPE probation officers who are fully dedicated to HOPE (they do not carry a non-HOPE caseload) with a third officer added during the DFE, three representatives of probation management (Clackamas County Community Corrections, CCCC) including the probation director and two deputy directors, the Undersheriff who oversees CCCC, a representative from the Sheriff's department who oversees the warrant service unit, a representative from the Sheriff's department who oversees county jail operations, the public defender (privately contracted), the district attorney and an assistant district attorney who was closely involved with HOPE implementation.

Probation in Clackamas County - the CCCC— is structured differently than at the other three HOPE DFE sites. CCCC is under the direct administrative control of the Clackamas County Sheriff's office, and the CCCC director and the two deputy directors interviewed as part of the DFE process evaluation are Sheriff's deputies. Thus, the operational linkage between the court and probation is less clear than in other DFE sites, and the HOPE Judge seems to have less formal capacity to direct probation operations related to HOPE.

Probation officers in Clackamas County have arrest powers, and as is discussed in the site visit summaries below, the HOPE probation officers did much of the warrant service associated with HOPE absconders. As the HOPE program evolved, an additional HOPE probationer officer was added, allowing one officer to remain principally in the office while the other two spent a considerable amount of time in the field searching for absconders. Clackamas County has a relatively small population (c. 395,000) but is geographically large (1883 square miles, at least double the size of any of the other DFE counties) and heavily rural and forested, thus complicating the process of searching for absconders. It was also easy for absconders to drift into neighboring Multnomah County (Portland).

CCCC supervises offenders directly sentenced to probation by the court and "local control" probationers who are under supervision after conditional release from county jail incarceration (sentences of one year or less). CCCC can directly administer sanctions for violations by "local control" probationers – there is no need for a judge to be involved in the sanctioning process. However, for the purposes of the HOPE DFE, all sanctioning was deferred to the judge, including for HOPE probationers who were under local control status.

The impetus behind the initiation of HOPE in Clackamas County came primarily from the District Attorney, who had learned of the HOPE model through interaction with several HOPE proponents in the year prior to the release of the BJA solicitation. He had invited Hawaii HOPE Judge Alm to Clackamas County to speak about the HOPE model to the local criminal justice community, including most of the eventual members of the local HOPE management team. A sufficient consensus was developed to support the preparation and submission of an application in response to the BJA HOPE solicitation in

2011, with the DAs office leading the preparation of the grant and serving as the official awardee for Clackamas County.

Key Findings and Conclusions – HOPE Implementation in Clackamas County, Oregon

The implementation of the HOPE DFE in Clackamas County, Oregon was the most challenged of all the four DFE sites. The DFE at this site was characterized by a high degree of conflict in the early to middle stages of implementation between HOPE and the existing organizational culture within probation, as well as by challenges related to the public administrative organizational structure within Clackamas County, which was somewhat different than at the other three DFE sites. The site also experienced a mixed level of implementation fidelity to the intended HOPE model, as promulgated by BJA. These two implementation components – the implementation experience and implementation fidelity – are summarized further below. A detailed discussion of the process evaluation findings is presented following this summary.

Perhaps the primary issue facing the implementation of HOPE in Clackamas County was the conflict between HOPE and the existing treatment culture within probation (Clackamas County Community Corrections, CCCC) as perceived by many whom we interviewed both within and outside of CCCC. Prior to the implementation of HOPE in Clackamas County in 2012, CCCC had invested heavily in the implementation of a treatment approach built around the Risk-Needs-Responsivity (RNR) framework that focuses on targeting key criminogenic needs of offenders using approaches such as cognitive-behavioral therapy and service brokerage (see for example Andrews and Bonta, 2003). In the view of stakeholders within CCCC, HOPE was primarily a sanctioning and deterrence focused approach that was at odds with the human services, social work oriented approach espoused by CCCC (Raynor and Vanstone, 2015). Indeed, HOPE was characterized as “a step backward for probation in Oregon”, and was felt to add little to no value to what CCCC was already doing, while detracting from CCCC’s existing social service, helping orientation. HOPE was seen by CCCC as devoting an inordinate amount of attention to surveillance, apprehension, and punishment, at the expense of cognitive-behavioral therapy, home visits, counseling and human services referral. Stakeholders within CCCC saw little reason to expand HOPE further within Oregon, and argued that probation within Oregon, and especially within Clackamas County, was already following established principles of evidence based practice in probation management. This sentiment came across very clearly during our interviews with CCCC stakeholders, most notably during the baseline and intermediate site visits.

Despite the view that HOPE was of little value, CCCC also expressed the view that they already had the capacity to do much of what HOPE espoused, especially with the local control population. Recall from the site overview above that the “local control” probationers are those who have been released from county jail custody and who can be sanctioned directly by CCCC without the need for judicial intervention. Thus, sanctioning for the control group Probation as Usual (PAU) violators could potentially occur more quickly than for HOPE violators, due to the ability to bypass the judge. While some CCCC stakeholders did also indicate that drug testing and sanctioning within PAU is not always as consistent or predictable as they would like, there remained a strong sentiment that HOPE was not a meaningful innovation for Clackamas County, and simply placed a new label on practices already in common use. There was also some sentiment that HOPE resulted in outside parties receiving credit for things already being done for years by CCCC.

These reservations surrounding HOPE within CCCC were not widely shared by stakeholders outside of CCCC, but those stakeholders clearly recognized the tension felt by many within CCCC towards HOPE. Despite this perceived tension with and even resentment of HOPE within CCCC, stakeholders expressed a very strong commitment to implementing HOPE with fidelity and to promoting its successful operation. There seemed to be a genuine concern within CCCC about having their reputation sullied if HOPE failed in Clackamas County. Thus, they were willing to put aside their personal and professional objections to HOPE for the good of the order.

The opposition to HOPE discussed above was most notable during the baseline (February 2013) and intermediate (November 2013) site visits. By the time of the final site visit in July 2014, there seemed to have been a considerable warming towards the underlying HOPE model within CCCC. Several key interviewees indicated that they now saw value to what HOPE was trying to accomplish, especially with regards to quick warrant service, frequent drug testing, certainty of sanctions and the consistency promoted by HOPE, relative to PAU. But, there remained sentiment that while HOPE *in principle* held promise, it was still not an ideal fit for Clackamas County. This was due to poor relations within the county criminal justice system, a shortage of probation officers, an overcrowded jail, and concerns about the strength of judicial leadership. Indeed, to the extent that HOPE would continue in Clackamas County, CCCC envisioned it continuing without the judge, being run entirely by probation. At the time of the writing of this report (fall 2015), we are given to understand that this is indeed how HOPE is continuing, with sanctions being administered directly by CCCC. Thus, while CCCC stakeholders eventually developed a more sanguine and less oppositional view of HOPE over time, they still questioned its relevance to Clackamas County, and saw it as simply a newer version of the older intensive supervision probation (ISP) model.

Another key challenge facing the early implementation of HOPE in Clackamas County was conflict over the selection of the first HOPE Program Coordinator (PC). The first PC was hired from outside of the state by a panel of HOPE stakeholders which included members from CCCC, but CCCC nonetheless felt that their interests were not fully represented in the selection process. The first PC was seen by CCCC as “working for” the District Attorney, not for CCCC. Indeed, the first PC was officed in a building away from CCCC headquarters. She was perceived by CCCC as having limited experience with probation in general, and as having no connection to or knowledge of the criminal justice system in Clackamas County. CCCC viewed her as improperly “filtering” the information flow between CCCC, the other HOPE team stakeholders, BJA and the training and technical assistance team at Pepperdine University. CCCC felt that she biased this information flow against the interests of CCCC and even of the HOPE project itself. CCCC saw her as an “interloper” who “meddled” in the affairs of CCCC in the name of managing HOPE, again without knowing much about how probation operated in that county.

It became clear then during our first site visit in February of 2013 that a very considerable degree of distrust had quickly developed between this PC and CCCC (HOPE began in Clackamas County in the summer of 2012), and communication patterns between her and CCCC were fractured at best and non-existent at times. She was evidently prohibited by CCCC leadership from communicating directly with the HOPE POs without prior approval and oversight by CCCC supervisors. This clearly had an impact on her efforts to manage HOPE operations. It should be noted that HOPE stakeholders outside of CCCC were clearly aware of this strained relationship, but most of them did have a more favorable view of her

performance, characterizing her as a champion for HOPE who was committed to pursuing fidelity of HOPE implementation.

We do not as part of this process evaluation arrive at any conclusions about the objective performance of the first HOPE PC in the execution of her duties, nor was it our place to do so. Instead, it is enough to point out that CCCC *perceived* significant problems with her, and that this tension had real consequences for the early implementation of HOPE. The gravity of this situation was such that there was legitimate reason to be concerned about the ongoing viability of HOPE within Clackamas County by early 2013.

BJA, NIJ and Pepperdine were aware of this situation, and shortly after our baseline site visit (February 2013), the decision was made between BJA, NIJ, Pepperdine and Clackamas County to remove the first PC and replace her with a new PC selected from within the Clackamas County criminal justice system.¹ By the summer of 2013, a new PC was selected and hired. The new PC had experience with the courts and corrections systems in Clackamas County, and thus was something of a known element within CCCC, engendering greater trust and confidence. At the time of our intermediate/second site visit in November of 2013, the change in the climate between CCCC and the PC was evident and dramatic. CCCC stakeholders expressed a high degree of confidence in and comfort with the new PC, and saw her as being very credible and competent in the role of PC (a “180 degree turn-around”, in the words of one respondent). Communication patterns between her and CCCC were much improved over what had been the case with the first PC. The new PC was also viewed at least as favorably as the former PC by stakeholders outside of CCCC, and there was also a sense of relief on their part that a crisis was averted. The presence of a new PC also seemed to initiate a more salutary attitude about HOPE within CCCC, as is discussed later. The satisfaction with the new PC continued and even expanded at the time of our final site visit in July of 2014.

This episode illustrates the importance of interpersonal and group dynamics within the implementation of a novel intervention such as HOPE. It is unclear if any of this could have been anticipated, but the value of constant monitoring of the organizational climate during implementation is demonstrated here.

The implementation of HOPE in Clackamas County was also troubled by the circumstances under which the HOPE DFE was brought to the county. As noted in the site introduction earlier, the Clackamas County District Attorney was initially the prime mover behind bringing HOPE to Clackamas County, and the application from that county to BJA was prepared by and submitted from the DA’s office. While CCCC did freely sign onto this application, there was strong sentiment within that agency that probation should have been more involved in the decision about whether and how to initiate HOPE. CCCC also felt that external advocates of HOPE, brought into Clackamas County either by the DA or in connection with the DFE, were at times heavy handed in their promotion of HOPE and did not adequately understand or respect existing probation practices. Thus, CCCC felt as if HOPE was foisted upon them and that they felt pressured to agree to it for the good of the order. There was also sentiment within CCCC that the DA was setting unrealistic expectations for HOPE and promoting it, possibly for political motives, in advance of any substantial evidence of its effectiveness. Based upon the discussion earlier about the clash of

¹ Note: Pepperdine hired the outgoing PC onto the TTA team to serve in a cross site coordinating role for the DFE.

cultures between HOPE and existing CCCC practices, it is entirely unclear if Clackamas County would have even pursued HOPE if the decision had been left to CCCC.

Related to this, we detected some evidence of pre-existing tension between the DA's office and CCCC. Neither agency *explicitly* expressed ill will toward the other, but as noted earlier, CCCC felt that the DA's office was aggressive in promoting its political interest in HOPE and in other matters without full consideration of how other agencies such as CCCC would be impacted. Conversely, there was some sentiment within the DA's office that CCCC was overestimating its existing utilization of evidence based probation practices, and that opposition to HOPE was due to excessive pride and a reluctance to change (especially where the change was being driven from outside of the agency). It was clear that these reciprocal assessments did not emerge suddenly in reaction to the HOPE DFE, but reflected conflicts that predated HOPE.

Another key challenge to the implementation surrounded the issue of absconders. While the intention of HOPE was to bring probationers before the judge for a violation hearing very soon after the violation (ideally, within three days, as discussed further in the fidelity section below), this was not always the case. Probationers could flee or "abscond" from apprehension. This was an issue at all four DFE sites, but was notable in Oregon. Fidelity data analyzed for this process evaluation show that 90% of all HOPE probationers committed at least one violation, with a mean of almost 7 violations per probationer who violated. Of those who violated, 70% absconded at least once (some individual violators absconded repeatedly). Thus, 62% of all HOPE probationers absconded at least once. Looking at the absconding activity another way, 30% of all violation incidents resulted in the violator absconding. Thus, while most individual violation incidents did not result in an abscond, most violators did abscond in response to at least one of their violations. We should bear in mind that absconding can be primary (e.g. the probationer simply tires of HOPE and decides to take off), or secondary (i.e. the absconding is in response to some other violation – an attempt to escape consequences for that violation). The data was not always clear on whether a given abscond was primary or secondary. The sanctions were typically higher for those who absconded versus those who complied with apprehension and appeared willingly for a violation hearing, but still it is apparent that many decided to take their chances and flee.

This was discussed at length during the interviews with the HOPE team members as a considerable source of frustration. The sheriff's department had limited resources to track absconders, and by the time of our final visit, a third HOPE probation officer had been added to allow for two HOPE POs to fully dedicated to apprehending absconders. It is unclear why so many in OR were eager to flee, but the sense of many in CCCC was that geography played a role. As noted above in the site description, Clackamas County is by far the largest of the four DFE sites (1883 square miles) and is quite rural and heavily forested. Moreover, it is near the metropolitan Portland area (c. 2.3 million population), where absconders can easily blend in (although in fairness, the same could be said for the Tarrant County site with respect to nearby Dallas, or Essex County with respect to Boston, or Saline County with respect to Little Rock). Still, the impression gleaned from this was that violators who were considering absconding had ample geographic opportunity to do so. This issue also came up during interviews with CCCC with respect to the setting of the original Hawaii HOPE program. There was sentiment with CCCC (and to some extent even outside of CCCC) that Oregon is "different" than Hawaii, with the original Hawaii HOPE being located on the island of Oahu (c. 600 square miles), thus being much smaller than Clackamas County, and requiring absconders to board a boat or airplane to flee anywhere beyond the

confines of the island. Thus, there was the sense that it was much more of a challenge to keep account of recalcitrant probationers within Clackamas County, and that this made implementation there more of a challenge to their resources.

A final implementation barrier in Clackamas County concerned the DFE itself. There appeared to be some confusion among the various members of the HOPE team (not exclusive to CCCC) about the roles and responsibilities of the various players within the DFE – BJA, Pepperdine, RTI, Penn State. CCCC (which was the agency primarily responsible for carrying out HOPE) expressed some concern about patterns of communication between Clackamas County and these external parties to the DFE, and felt that “mixed messages” were often sent about expectations surrounding the DFE. This revolved around core research issues such as randomization and data management. Much of this centered around the substantial degree of conflict with the original HOPE PC, as elaborated on earlier, and these issues became less prominent with the replacement of the PC. As noted in the reports for the other HOPE DFE sites, confusion about the research requirements of the DFE were not uncommon, and may speak to the need for additional research preparation and orientation of field sites in future DFEs of this type.

To the extent that HOPE is continued or expanded in Oregon, the HOPE team in Clackamas County (both within CCCC and outside of it) felt that several factors would be key to success. First, local probation must be much more centrally involved and invested in the decision to initiate a HOPE program and in the initial implementation activities. As noted earlier, CCCC felt excluded and marginalized from this process under the DFE. On a related point, the entire local criminal justice community must feel that they have been included and their voices heard during the implementation, and it would be valuable to conduct an organizational assessment of the local culture to determine the fit of HOPE with what is currently being done with probation. The importance of inter-agency buy-in and fit has been noted in other recent evaluations of focused deterrence strategies (Corsaro and Engel, 2015). Second, any site wishing to implement HOPE must acquire a full understanding of what HOPE is and what it can and cannot accomplish. Visits to the Hawaii HOPE program were seen by attendees as valuable, but some in Clackamas County HOPE still felt that they did not fully understand HOPE until they were well into implementation. CCCC felt that their early implementation struggles were due to an incomplete understanding of what HOPE is and what it required of probation. This also relates to the need for any site thinking about implementing HOPE to consider whether it has the needed resources, including jail space, UA testing capacity, probation officer staffing and other capacity issues, as well as whether state laws and sentencing and supervisory procedures may help or impede HOPE. For example, under Oregon law, probationers can be revoked for a maximum of 60 days (less any credits) so probationers were seen by CCCC as having less of an incentive to cooperate with HOPE – many would rather simply do their time and not be bothered with the requirements of HOPE. Finally, program leadership and coordination are critical. As noted above, the first PC was not respected by CCCC, which created considerable problems for the early implementation of HOPE. Moreover, there was no “champion” for HOPE within CCCC. The DA and HOPE judge were strong proponents of HOPE, but they exercise less formal authority over probation than at the other DFE sites. Thus, HOPE must have someone to push it forward who is viewed as credible and who has sufficient authority to effectuate the sort of change that HOPE can represent within an existing probation system.

In spite of these challenges, the composition of the HOPE team remained relatively stable through the implementation period, with the majority of the stakeholders remaining the same. The one notable

exception was the Program Coordinator, who was replaced approximately mid-way through the DFE, as discussed at length above. The roles, responsibilities and patterns of communication between these parties was substantially constant, again with the exception of communication between CCCC and the first PC, which was poor to non-existent. Perceived leadership of HOPE was somewhat murkier than in the other sites, with no clear consensus on a single stakeholder who provided program leadership. Most notably, the judge was not clearly identified as the leader of HOPE. Leadership nominations varied from the judge, to the PC, to probation management and even the DA. Thus, it is more difficult to conclude that HOPE was a judge driven model in Clackamas County. This likely relates to the administrative organization of probation, as discussed above.

The implementation difficulties noted earlier did not translate into a perception that HOPE was a burden. On a scale of 1 to 5, with higher scores representing a greater burden, most participants reported that HOPE was only a slight burden to them ($M = 2.15, SD = 0.75$). The Judge faces time pressure in trying to manage HOPE with her overall court schedule. CCCC found that supervising the urine sample collection for the drug testing that happens through HOPE is somewhat burdensome and time-consuming. The Undersheriff reported that having enough jail space and doing forced releases is stressful (even though HOPE is not the only cause of the population pressures). Interviewees felt that the greatest burden of HOPE operations fell on the jail, with the least burden on the court. Still, HOPE was not seen by any party as being a serious challenge to themselves or their agencies.

Using a similar 5-point scale, HOPE team members rated the extent to which they believe that HOPE probationers have a good understanding of HOPE sanctioning goals and the process. The HOPE team believed that this understanding was quite good ($M = 4.13, SD = 0.52$). Most probationers were thought to understand the chain of consequences implicit in HOPE - that a violation would lead to a sanction. Several interviewees mentioned that the warning hearings provide very clear information for the probationers about how HOPE works and that the POs reinforce the rules to ensure that the probationers understand them. But, there was a common concern that some probationers simply do not care about sanctions. Spending a few days in jail was not viewed as a true punishment for some probationers, especially for someone who has previously served much longer sentences. HOPE team members frequently opined that criminal thinking is often deeply embedded in this population and it is unclear whether HOPE could change this way of thinking. Some of the more serious offenders do not have the desire to change their behavior. Antisocial attitudes also were thought to prevent probationers from accepting the way HOPE works.

This concern about whether HOPE probationers cared about what HOPE was trying to accomplish led to reservations about the potential for HOPE sanctions to be effective in changing behavior. HOPE team members were asked to rate how effective the sanctions are in changing the behavior of HOPE probationers. On a 5-point scale, with higher scores indicating greater perceived effectiveness, participants rated the sanctions as being moderately effective ($M = 3.38, SD = 0.52$). Several interviewees mentioned that jail sanctions are effective for some, but not all HOPE probationers. HOPE was thought to work often for the “typical” probationer because of the certainty of being caught, frequent drug testing, and heavy monitoring. On the other hand, younger offenders with criminal thinking issues and antisocial behaviors were seen as being more recalcitrant and team members were often more skeptical that HOPE by itself would be effective for them.

In sum, the implementation of HOPE in Clackamas County experienced a significant conflict between the basic precepts of HOPE as perceived by many within CCCC – surveillance and sanctioning – and the existing culture of HOPE as expressed by members of CCCC, focusing on the RNR framework and a social work/human services approach. This relates directly to the concept of *organizational fit*, speaking to the importance of congruence between an innovation and the existing beliefs, values and practices within the organization (Fixsen, et al, 2005). Organizational innovations are of course often intended to “shake things up” within the organization. But where the contrast between innovations and organizational culture are perceived as an existential threat to the underlying cognitive schema of the organization, defensive routines can emerge which complicate implementation (Argyris, 1985). This is what we saw occurring in Clackamas County, especially in the early stages of HOPE implementation. While this cultural conflict did attenuate over time, it did not seem to ever fully disappear.

Implementation was also complicated by the organizational separation of probation from the courts, which seemed to afford the HOPE judge less direct control over the operation of HOPE than in any of the other DFE sites (Zajac, Lattimore, Dawes and Winger, 2015). Pre-existing conflict between the CCCC and the HOPE grantee (the DA’s office) also contributed to the administrative difficulties surrounding implementation. Significant conflict also quickly arose with the original HOPE PC, which may have threatened to scuttle the entire DFE in Clackamas County.

Turning to fidelity, given the preceding discussion, it is perhaps unsurprising that HOPE in Clackamas County experienced mixed levels of implementation fidelity to the model as espoused in the BJA solicitation. Several key aspects of fidelity – focusing specifically on swiftness of punishment and program leadership – were often unrealized or unclear based upon our fidelity analysis reported on in detail later in this report. As noted earlier, there was a strong commitment on the part of this site to carry out HOPE with fidelity to the model, and in many respects, they succeeded. But, the serious challenges of implementation discussed here seem to have constituted somewhat of a barrier to the full realization of that commitment.

Implementation Fidelity

The table below presents the implementation fidelity for Clackamas County HOPE, following methodology elaborated on in the methodology chapter, which explains in detail our measurement strategy, including a full specification of all items used to assess implementation fidelity.

Clackamas County, Oregon HOPE achieved a moderate to high level of implementation fidelity, achieving a minimum standard of 60% on nine of the eleven items. Fidelity was at 80% or greater for six of the eleven items. Most notably, fidelity was weak to moderate for Items 7 and 11, which gets to the point of sanction *swiftness*, one of the key precepts of HOPE. Indeed, only about one-third of violations were addressed before a Violation Hearing within the prescribed three-day time frame. As discussed earlier this was due largely to the relatively high rate of absconding within Clackamas County and the time involved in locating and apprehending the absconders, not to mention some absconders who evidently were not recovered, as inferred from the absence of a Violation Hearing record in the fidelity files we were provided. On the one hand, we might argue that some of this was beyond the control of the HOPE program, for reasons discussed earlier (i.e. the geographic spread of Clackamas County), but whatever the reason the result was an appreciable number of violations that did not result in a particularly swift response.

Regarding Item # 1 – HOPE Leadership – while most team members did nominate *someone* as a HOPE leader during our site visits, these nominations tended to be a bit scattered and hesitant, especially during the intermediate and final site visits. Our discussions with team members on this topic left us with the impression that leadership was uncertain, shifting between the judge, probation management, probation officers, PC and even the DA or sheriff. This is perhaps not surprising given the discussion earlier about the administrative structure of probation in Clackamas County (with CCCC being housed within the Sheriff’s office, with little direct judicial control over it) and the disagreement about HOPE within CCCC. The responsibility for the operational management of HOPE, then, was vested in an agency (CCCC) that was ambivalent about HOPE at best, and at the same time the possibility for formal judicial leadership of HOPE was very limited. These factors complicated the emergence of clear leadership around HOPE.

Overall, we conclude that the fidelity of implementation of HOPE in Clackamas County, Oregon was moderate to moderate-high in strength. This is encouraging, given the preceding discussion of the challenges surrounding the implementation process. As noted, though, CCCC expressed strong commitment to ensuring high fidelity of implementation despite their reservations about the HOPE model itself, and it appears that they followed through substantially on this commitment. Thus, implementation fidelity can rise above turbulence in the implementation experience.

HOPE FIDELITY ITEM	OREGON FIDELITY
1. Leadership	92% of HOPE Team members interviewed across Baseline, Intermediate, and Final identified a leader in HOPE.
2. Probationers High Risk	80% of cases are moderate to high risk(1)
3. Warning Hearing Issued	40% of 5 Warning Hearings assessed addressed 12/14 themes(2)
4. Initial Testing Frequency	87% of probationers had at least 8 tests in first 2 months
5. Stepped Down Testing Frequency	73% of probationers had monthly testing after first 2 months
6. Exceptions for Missed UAs	99% of cases with a missed UA (N=362) received a consequence
7. Time to Violation Hearing	37% of violations (1136 total violations) were followed by a Violation Hearing within 3 days
8. Sanction Type	92% of sanctions were jail time.
9. Sanction Dosage	65% of jail sanctions were at or below the Hawaii HOPE mean of 19 days (Mean = 6 days).
10. Sanction Certainty	96% of violations resulted in a sanction
11. Sanction Swiftmess	63% of sanctions beginning within 3 days of the Violation Hearing

(1) Data was not available on 37 cases. We counted those against fidelity, as the expectation was that risk would be assessed and reported for each case. If we had excluded missing cases, the valid percent assessed as moderate to high risk rises to 98%.

(2) Due in large part to implementation challenges related to communication and tensions within CCCC as discussed above, the Research Coordinator in Clackamas County was able to observe a smaller proportion of Warning Hearings than was the case for the RCs in the other sites.

Baseline Site Visit Summary

Involvement & Communication

Members of the process evaluation team interviewed 13 key individuals involved in HOPE in Clackamas County, Oregon. Those interviewed included the Program Coordinator (PC), three individuals from Probation Management (the Probation Supervisor/Community Corrections Director, Community Corrections Manager, and Community Corrections Supervisor), the HOPE Judge, two HOPE Probation Officers (POs), two District Attorney representatives, the Defense Counsel, the Jail Administrator, the Sheriff Patrol Lt., and the Undersheriff. As part of the qualitative interview, these individuals were asked to rate the following stakeholders on their involvement in the development of HOPE as well as their frequency of communication: HOPE Judge, Prosecutor, Defense Counsel, HOPE POs, Probation Management, Jail Administrator, Sheriff/other law enforcement, HOPE PC, and other. For example, “To what extent has the HOPE Judge been involved in the development of the HOPE program?” (1 = *not at all*; 5 = *great extent*) and “How often do you communicate with the HOPE POs?” (1 = *never*; 5 = *every day*).

HOPE PC²

The HOPE PC was rated very high for her involvement in the implementation of HOPE ($M = 4.80$, $SD = 0.45$). She was hired by the DA and started working in March 2012. The PC worked with the judge and CCCC to establish the HOPE manual, policies, and procedures. She also set up the UA hotline and assisted with developing the judge’s warning hearing script. Her other tasks included creating a database for HOPE and preparing the agenda for HOPE meetings. A few interviewees reported that the PC did not have a foundational knowledge of probation so some of her involvement was misdirected and/or misinterpreted. Unlike the other sites in which the PC’s had worked in the local probation office or had at least been employed in other county criminal justice agencies, this PC came from outside of the state with no probation experience and little knowledge of local criminal justice procedures. Due to personality conflicts and other issues, communication with the PC varied greatly depending on position ($M = 3.50$, $SD = 1.31$). There was no communication at all between the PC and the Community Corrections Manager after August 2012 as the PC was viewed as a “threat” to CCCC. Instead, the PC had to communicate through the Community Corrections Supervisor for any issue involving eligibility, UA testing, or randomization. The PC was often viewed as a “filter” between Community Corrections and BJA, Pepperdine, and RTI/PSU and those in Probation Management often felt like the information coming to them was not completely accurate.

HOPE Judge

The HOPE Judge was also perceived as being very involved in the implementation process ($M = 4.60$, $SD = 0.55$). The Judge is viewed as the leader of HOPE. She helped establish court processes, logistics, forms, and warning hearing procedures. The Judge also helps network with other criminal justice agencies like local police departments and runs the HOPE meetings. On average, the key players communicate with the judge about once a week ($M = 4.00$, $SD = 0.87$). However, the Judge reported that although the team looks to her to resolve various issues, she sometimes does not hear about the problems due to the personality conflicts.

² This PC worked until 3/22/13. A new PC began a few weeks later.

HOPE POs

The HOPE POs were not involved in the initial planning and development of HOPE, but they do manage much of the day to day work ($M = 4.20, SD = 1.10$). They contributed to developing various policies and procedures for running HOPE. Probation Management and the Jail Administrator believed that the POs “embraced” HOPE and worked as problem solvers, while the PC viewed their behavior as possible “obstruction” to the fidelity of the HOPE model. These differing viewpoints serve as further evidence of the conflicts between CCCC and other parties involved in HOPE. All those who were interviewed reported communicating with the POs at least once a week ($M = 4.50, SD = 0.53$).

Probation Management

The three individuals making up Probation Management all provided ratings on their perception of their own involvement in the implementation of HOPE. The Community Corrections director was least involved out of the three, reporting that he wrote parts of the grant and did a lot of the initial planning, but is not heavily involved now in the day to day management of HOPE. He also contributed to establishing selection criteria, policies, and procedures along with the PC. The Community Corrections Manager and Supervisor both reported a high level of involvement in implementation. These individuals worked together to develop intake processes, addressed eligibility issues, and selected the HOPE POs. The PC and the Jail Administrator were the only other interviewees who provided a rating based on Probation Management’s involvement in general. The combined ratings showed an overall high level of involvement in implementation ($M = 4.00, SD = 1.00$). In terms of communication, the PC provided ratings on each of the three individuals (as mentioned above, there is no communication between the PC and the Community Corrections Manager). In general, other members of the team communicate with Probation Management as a whole at least a few times each month ($M = 3.60, SD = 0.89$).

Prosecutor

Only three interviewees provided involvement ratings for the Prosecutor/DA, but he was viewed as playing an important role in the implementation process ($M = 4.00, SD = 1.00$). The DA was exposed to HOPE through David Farabee. Then, Judge Alm was invited to speak about HOPE to potential stakeholders in Oregon. Following this presentation, the DA was under the impression that everyone was on board to participate in HOPE. The DA’s office was responsible for writing the grant.

A few people who were interviewed reported that the Assistant DA contributes a lot of input to HOPE meetings, has a positive attitude, and keeps the team on track. The DA’s office views themselves as cheerleaders for HOPE, but admit that they are not running the program in terms of every day operation. For communication, Probation Management does not communicate with the DA’s office very frequently, but others, like the PC, Defense Counsel, and POs are in contact at least once a week ($M = 3.13, SD = 0.83$). Once again, there was tension reported between Probation Management and the DA since the DA’s office applied for the grant, but does not have any direct oversight of probation.

Defense Counsel

The Defense Counsel’s role in the implementation of HOPE was quite minimal ($M = 2.67, SD = 1.15$). When asked about his role, the Public Defender reported that no one wanted his input regarding HOPE. He attends the HOPE meetings very often and is viewed by others as being very supportive of HOPE, but he did not make any major contributions to implementation. Despite his lack of involvement, most key players still communicate with him fairly often ($M = 3.50, SD = 0.93$).

Jail Administrator

The Jail Administrator had a moderate level of involvement in the implementation of HOPE ($M = 3.20$, $SD = 1.10$). He had to modify some jail policies and procedures as well as train staff on how to classify and book HOPE detainees. He attends HOPE meetings, but most interviewees reported that he is not involved outside of matters related to the jail. Consequently, the key players only communicate with the Jail Administrator about once a month on average ($M = 2.00$, $SD = 0.76$).

Sheriff/Other Law Enforcement

Interviewees reported that the Sheriff was the least involved in implementation in comparison to other key players ($M = 2.00$, $SD = 0.82$). The Sheriff's current duties for HOPE include coordinating the apprehension of absconders when POs are not able to find them. Probation Management believed that the Sheriff's Office should be more active in tracking down absconders. Also, the Prosecutor mentioned that money set aside in the budget for the Sheriff's Office to work overtime for tracking down absconders was not being spent. These concerns seem to contribute to the conflicts occurring in Oregon. The Sheriff's office reported communicating with other law enforcement staff quite frequently, but on average, those involved with HOPE only communicate with the Sheriff about once a month ($M = 2.67$, $SD = 1.22$).

Summary

Overall, much of the tension and problematic communication issues seem to stem from a poor history between CCCC and the DA's office. The DA has been critical of the way CCCC operates and how they operationalize recidivism. CCCC staff feel that HOPE is a step backwards for them as they believed they were already implementing a similar (and more successful) version of HOPE. The negative attitudes toward the PC from Probation Management, which could be characterized as distrusting and resentful, certainly shaped the entire atmosphere surrounding the HOPE program. Any feedback from the PC was interpreted by CCCC as a threat and was perceived as more conflict coming from the DA. Probation Management perceived the PC's behavior as a nuisance to the POs since she had to ask many questions due to her inexperience with probation. The complete lack of communication between the PC and Community Corrections Manager was one of the most serious problems.

Average involvement and communication ratings for each role in the HOPE team

Role	Involvement	Communication
Program Coordinator	4.80	3.50
Probation Management	4.00	3.60
HOPE Judge	4.60	4.00
HOPE POs	4.20	4.50
Prosecutor	4.00	3.13
Defense Counsel	2.67	3.50
Jail Administrator	3.20	2.00
Sheriff/Other Law Enforcement	2.00	2.67

The correlation between involvement and communication was not significant. However, there is a trend for a positive association between average involvement and communication ratings such that

those who are rated as being more involved are more likely to have higher communication ratings ($r = .57$).

Self-Ratings on Involvement Compared to Average Ratings

Role	Self-Rating	Average Rating	Differential
Program Coordinator	5.00	4.80	0.20
Probation Mgt. (Director)	3.00	4.00	-1.00
Probation Mgt. (Manager)	5.00	4.00	1.00
Probation Mgt. (Supervisor)	5.00	4.00	1.00
Jail Administrator	3.00	3.20	-0.20

For the stakeholders in which self-report data were available, personal perceptions of involvement matched well to the average ratings. The average ratings provided for Probation Management were based on stakeholders' ratings of Probation Management group, not individuals.

Training

The PC, POs, Judge, Public Defender, Jail Administrator, a representative from the DA's office, and Probation Management Director and Supervisor all went to the training in Hawaii. The consensus among those who went was that the training was not useful and not specific enough for each of their roles. Those from Probation Management who attended felt like the training focused too much on the courts and not enough on probation. However, others felt like more time should have been spent on courtroom procedures and managing the warning hearings. Interviewees also expressed a desire for more interaction between the four sites during the training so that each site could learn from the others. The POs reported that it would have been useful for them to spend time with the Hawaii POs during this training. Despite reports of the training not being useful, the Community Corrections Manager was upset that she did not go and felt like she missed out on a lot of important information.

Perceptions of HOPE and PAU

HOPE – More face time with the judge was one of the most frequently mentioned elements of HOPE in Oregon. The warning hearing contributes to this as well as the amount of time spent with the judge for every violation. Another key feature of HOPE that seemed particularly relevant is UA testing through the color line. Also, sanctions are very consistent and happen swiftly for positive UA's, missed UA's, or missed PO appointments. Jail sanctions are brief compared to PAU and violators typically spend only a few days in jail for their first violation.

The POs provided some additional information about HOPE, stating that HOPE is the "opposite of evidence-based practice." They believe that Judge Alm's recommendation of 30-day jail stays for those who had absconded is contrary to typical HOPE principles in which short jail sentences are typically recommended. Another important element of HOPE from the POs point of view is that they have no discretion to refer probationers to treatment because they must first wait for 3 positive UA's.

Finally, several interviewees mentioned that there are no home visits from POs in HOPE. They reported that POs are spending most of their time serving warrants and trying to track down absconders. Subsequently, HOPE probationers have less face time with their POs due to this arrangement.

PAU – Nearly all interviewees reported that PAU is “inconsistent,” especially in terms of sanctioning. Another key element of PAU is that UA’s do not occur very often and it is up to the PO to decide when a probationer will be tested. PAU POs play an important role in determining the sanction for a positive UA since it does not have to go through the judge. Each case plan is individualized and POs use their discretion for positive UA’s depending on factors such as the type of drug and whether the probationer is employed at the time. Some interviewees mentioned that sanctions are delayed and not clearly connected to the violation.

Implementation Barriers and Facilitators

The HOPE Judge was mentioned as being very cooperative, flexible, and helpful during the implementation process. Also, Probation Management reported that HOPE is not very different from what they were already doing, so it was simple to modify some forms, policies, and procedures. Interviewees who are not a part of Community Corrections gave credit to the PC for her loyalty and faithfulness to implementing HOPE. The pleasant relationship between the Jail Administrator and the Community Corrections Director helped to facilitate implementation in terms of jail sentencing.

Out of the many barriers to implementation cited, perhaps the most important was CCCC’s attitude toward the HOPE program and the DA’s office. CCCC is committed to HOPE, but some said that it was “a step backwards” for them. CCCC believes they were already using best practices for their probation program. One respondent’s perception of CCCC’s role in the implementation process was that there was too much local innovation and that CCCC chose to do things how they wanted regardless of whether it followed the HOPE model.

Since CCCC did not apply for the grant, they do not have much interest in HOPE other than making sure their reputation is not affected by potentially executing the program poorly. There was weak acceptance of the model and without the buy-in of those most closely involved, the implementation process suffered. Some interviewees reported that PAU POs did not understand HOPE and therefore could not support it. Additional training and written documentation of HOPE procedures could have improved this aspect of implementation.

The communication problems were also seen as a barrier to implementation. As previously mentioned, the PC was viewed as being a “filter” that prevented proper communication between CCCC and Pepperdine and RTI/PSU during the implementation process. Others described these communication issues as receiving “mixed messages” that made it difficult to understand the procedures. Some interviewees mentioned that the HOPE meetings that used to happen regularly at the beginning of implementation have now stopped occurring. This negatively impacts communication and coordination between the different key players

Other issues included the POs concern that there was not a sanction grid at the very beginning of the program, policies for tracking down absconders, and the restrictions on the PC’s access to certain information/data. Several interviewees mentioned the difficulty of dealing with local control cases. For these cases, probationers only face a maximum of 60 days in jail for absconding. Probationers reported that they would rather just do the time and get it over with, rather than participating in HOPE. From their perspective, there is no incentive to be in HOPE. Also, probationers said they would rather be revoked than submit to so much UA testing. The Judge, DA, and Defense Counsel do not normally work

with this population of local control cases so it was difficult for them to understand what authority POs have with these cases.

The Public Defender expressed some concerns regarding his role in the HOPE program and felt that the lack of written information about the HOPE model made it difficult for him to do his job to counsel the clients while still adhering to HOPE's principles of swift and certain sanctioning. The Defense Counsel does not receive group emails about HOPE that often turn out to be relevant for their office.

Finally, one respondent from CCCC mentioned that there was no opportunity for pilot testing at the beginning of the study. She believed that it would have been useful to test all procedures before beginning the program with study participants.

Personal Opinions of HOPE

There were a variety of answers provided when the interviewees were asked about their personal opinions of HOPE. The PC reported being very enthusiastic and positive toward the HOPE program, but the communication issues ruined her attitude. Two members of CCCC felt that HOPE was a step backwards for Clackamas County and vehemently said that HOPE should not be implemented more widely in Oregon. They felt that some elements of HOPE are unnecessary and just end up costing the system more money when they felt like they could run probation successfully without some of these elements (i.e., judge involvement, warning hearings). Another negative opinion of HOPE from Probation Management described how HOPE detracts from their usual human services approach to probation in Clackamas County. Since POs spend so much time tracking down absconders, they do not have as much time to help probationers and provide social services assistance.

The Judge's opinion of HOPE reflected recognition of the potential for HOPE to improve offenders' lives, but she stated that local implementation is certainly problematic. The DA's office reported believing in the principles of HOPE, but they know that they need to wait and see whether it works. They expressed concern that it won't be successful in Oregon because there is not enough buy-in from the people who are critical to making the program work. The Jail Administrator and Sheriff's office said that they saw the value in HOPE, but believe that it may work better in other counties.

Intermediate Site Visit Summary

Involvement in Ongoing Implementation/Operation of HOPE & Communication

Members of the process evaluation team interviewed 13 key individuals involved in HOPE in Clackamas County, Oregon in November, 2013. The intermediate interviews took place about 9 months after the baseline interviews. Those interviewed included the Program Coordinator (PC), three individuals from Probation Management (the Probation Supervisor/Community Corrections Director, Community Corrections Manager, and Community Corrections Supervisor), the HOPE Judge, three HOPE Probation Officers (POs), two District Attorney representatives, the Jail Administrator, the Sheriff Patrol Lt., and the Undersheriff. As part of the qualitative interview, these individuals were asked to rate the following stakeholders on their involvement in the ongoing implementation and operation of HOPE as well as their frequency of communication: HOPE Judge, Prosecutor, Defense Counsel, HOPE POs, Probation Management, Jail Administrator, Sheriff/other law enforcement, HOPE PC, and other. For example, “To what extent has the HOPE Judge been involved in the development of the HOPE program?” (1 = *not at all*; 5 = *great extent*) and “How often do you communicate with the HOPE POs?” (1 = *never*; 5 = *every day*).

HOPE PC³

The HOPE PC was rated highly for her involvement in the ongoing operations of HOPE ($M = 4.50$, $SD = 0.71$). This rating was slightly lower than the rating of the previous PC, who was viewed as being very involved with the initial implementation process ($M = 4.80$, $SD = 0.45$). However, several interviewees mentioned that this new PC (who started working in April, 2013), greatly improved the dynamics of the team and even “saved” the HOPE program in Oregon. One member of Probation Management reported that the new PC has strong credibility and trust. Unlike the former PC, the new PC has had previous experience with probation which seems to contribute to the team members’ trust of her. The new PC is also able to help the POs with paperwork and doing orientation with the newly enrolled HOPE probationers. The POs have found these contributions to be very valuable. In terms of communication, most team members were in contact with this PC at least once a week ($M = 3.78$, $SD = 1.48$). Interviewees reported communicating with this PC more than the previous PC ($M = 3.50$, $SD = 1.31$).

HOPE Judge

Although the HOPE Judge was rated very high for her involvement in HOPE, there were a variety of responses about aspects of her role that could be done differently ($M = 4.58$, $SD = 0.51$; baseline: $M = 4.60$, $SD = 0.55$). Several people mentioned that there is not much time available for violation hearings, so the Judge rushes through the hearing and does not get a chance to be very personal with the probationers. Others believe that she is not always consistent with sanctioning and that she is revoking too many people, too quickly, and for too long. The POs, PC, DA, and Probation Management communicate most frequently with the Judge ($M = 3.33$, $SD = 1.23$) and this has decreased since the baseline interviews ($M = 4.00$, $SD = 0.87$).

³ Oregon’s second PC (who started in April 2013) was interviewed during this visit in November 2013.

HOPE POs

The HOPE POs received the highest score for their involvement in the ongoing operation of HOPE ($M = 4.80, SD = 1.08$). This score increased since the baseline interviews ($M = 4.20, SD = 1.10$). The HOPE POs described themselves as being “in the trenches” with the daily operations of HOPE since they have the most contact with the probationers. Several interviewees mentioned that the POs should have more discretion in dealing with violations and sanctions. The addition of another PO since the baseline interviews has been positive because it allows one PO to be dedicated to office visits, while the other two have time to do home visits and track down absconders. The POs are still concerned though with the amount of paperwork that is required for HOPE since that continues to take time away from meeting with probationers. The POs are also viewed as especially important because they have arrest authority and unlike other states, they are the first responder to arrest warrants. The PC, Judge, and Probation Management all communicate with the POs daily, while others communicate less frequently ($M = 4.00, SD = 1.12$). This average rating shows that stakeholders are communicating less frequently than they did at the baseline interview ($M = 4.50, SD = 0.53$).

Probation Management

Probation Management was viewed as having a moderate level of involvement in the ongoing implementation of HOPE ($M = 3.42, SD = 0.90$). This rating was lower than it was at baseline ($M = 4.00, SD = 1.00$). Probation Management is not heavily involved in the day-to-day operations of HOPE but they are more likely to be involved at the policy level. The tension between Probation Management and other stakeholders has subsided somewhat as Probation Management is more cooperative and supportive of HOPE than in the early stages of implementation. However, they are still viewed by some as obstructionist and they don’t always agree with each other when it comes to problem solving. Communication with Probation Management occurs less frequently than at baseline ($M = 3.29, SD = 1.11$; baseline: $M = 3.60, SD = 0.89$), however, communication now exists between the PC and the Community Corrections Manager. During the time of the baseline interviews, there was no communication at all between these individuals which had resulted in tension and hostility toward the former PC.

Prosecutor

Most interviewees described the Prosecutor as being very supportive of HOPE, but not heavily involved in day-to-day operations ($M = 3.50, SD = 1.08$). His role has decreased since the baseline interviews ($M = 4.00, SD = 1.00$). He is required to be present in court, but he does not prosecute the HOPE cases. He provides input on violation recommendations at the pre-court staffing meetings. Representatives of the DA’s office reported that they are somewhat involved in the “big picture” and political dealings as well as the promotion of HOPE. The Assistant DA was credited by numerous individuals for initiating the MOU with Multnomah County to help track down absconders in Portland. Most key stakeholders do not communicate with the Prosecutor’s office very often ($M = 2.67, SD = 1.12$). On average, people are communicating less frequently with the Prosecutor’s office than at the baseline interviews ($M = 3.13, SD = 0.83$).

Defense Counsel

The original Defense Counsel stepped down in October 2013, shortly before the intermediate interviews were conducted. Nearly all interviewees, except Probation Management, mentioned that

they were pleased with the new Defense Counsel as he is easy to communicate with and understands and follows the HOPE model. The Defense Counsel is viewed as being more important and involved than the DA because he talks with the probationers before violation hearings and explains sanction recommendations to them ($M = 3.75, SD = 0.97$; baseline: $M = 2.67, SD = 1.15$). Several interviewees mentioned that this individual had previous experience working in drug courts and is well-suited for this position. In terms of communication, the PC, Judge, and POs communicate at least once a week, while other stakeholders rarely communicate with him ($M = 2.60, SD = 1.27$; baseline: $M = 3.50, SD = 0.93$).

Jail Administrator

The Jail Administrator is viewed as being important since the threat and use of jail is a critical component of HOPE ($M = 4.00, SD = 1.31$). The Jail Administrator's involvement has increased since the baseline interviews ($M = 3.20, SD = 1.10$). Many interviewees mentioned that overcrowding in the jail is concerning. Some believe that the overcrowding is due to the additional HOPE probationers, but the Sheriff's Office examined some data that indicated there were also increases in parole violators, general arrests, crime, and harsher sentencing patterns. The main problem that the Jail Administrator faces is deciding who to force release. So far, no HOPE probationers have been released early due to overcrowding, but the Undersheriff noted that this could become a problem in the future. Like the baseline interviews, communication with the Jail Administrator was rated as happening infrequently ($M = 2.11, SD = 1.05$; baseline: $M = 2.00, SD = 0.76$).

Sheriff/Other Law Enforcement

The Sheriff's Office was rated as being moderately important with the ongoing implementation of HOPE ($M = 3.36, SD = 1.12$), which is much more involved than with initial implementation at baseline ($M = 2.00, SD = 0.82$). Several interviewees mentioned that the Sheriff's Office has tracked down more absconders since the MOU with Multnomah County went into effect shortly before the intermediate site visit. However, the POs are still serving many warrants and some believe that the Sheriff's Office could continue to increase their warrant service. Regular communication with the Sheriff's Office exists only between the PC, POs, and the Jail Administrator ($M = 2.63, SD = 1.19$; baseline: $M = 2.67, SD = 1.22$).

Other – CC Intake/Support Staff, UA Techs

Two interviewees mentioned the CC Intake/Support Staff as being quite involved with HOPE. They complete eligibility screening. UA Techs were cited by Probation Management and the POs as also making a significant contribution. Finally, the Research Coordinator was also viewed by Probation Management as someone they communicate with at least monthly.

Summary

Overall, there were some substantial changes in Oregon between site visits that had an impact on the ongoing implementation of HOPE. Most notable was the change in PC. This was regarded as very positive by all members of the HOPE team and communication between the PC and others, including Probation Management, was greatly improved. The addition of a new Defense Counsel was also received well. An additional PO joined the team so that one PO could be dedicated to office visits which allowed more time for the other two POs to make home visits and track down absconders. The MOU put in place with Multnomah County has been beneficial for locating absconders; however, the POs would like to see the Sheriff's Office putting in more time for warrant service. Finally, overcrowding in the jail has been of concern, but so far, no HOPE probationers have been released early.

Average involvement and communication ratings for each role in the HOPE team

Role	Involvement	Communication
Program Coordinator	4.50	3.78
Probation Management	3.42	3.29
HOPE Judge	4.58	3.33
HOPE POs	4.80	4.00
Prosecutor	3.50	2.67
Defense Counsel	3.75	2.60
Jail Administrator	4.00	2.11
Sheriff/Other Law Enforcement	3.36	2.63

The correlation between involvement scores between the baseline and intermediate interviews approached significance ($r = .64, p = .09$). The correlation between communication scores across time was significant ($r = .85, p = .01$). There was a positive relationship between involvement and communication scores during the intermediate interviews, but this correlation was not statistically significant ($r = .66, p = .08$).

Self-Ratings on Involvement Compared to Average Ratings

Role	Self-Rating	Average Rating	Differential
Program Coordinator	3.00	4.50	-1.50
Judge	5.00	4.58	0.42
POs	5.00	4.80	0.20
Probation Mgt.	3.00	3.42	-0.42
Prosecutor	3.00	3.50	-0.50
Jail Administrator	5.00	4.00	1.00
Sheriff/Other Law Enforcement	3.50	3.36	0.14

The greatest difference between self-ratings and average ratings was found for the PC, who rated her involvement in the ongoing implementation of HOPE to be much lower than the other stakeholders perceived her involvement. On the other hand, the Jail Administrator perceived his role as more substantial than the others did on average.

Training

The new PC received some training from several different people including some guidance from the original PC, Pepperdine University, and the Texas PC; however, the PC mentioned that the RC was most useful in training her. The consensus from Probation Management and the Judge is that Pepperdine provides “informal” training that comes mostly in the form of “checking in” and TA. The POs have not met with Pepperdine and continue to receive their training from on-the-job experience or from the PC. Pepperdine has provided links to online courses for HOPE, but the POs do not have time to complete these lessons. Probation Management and the Judge attended the meeting in Malibu in early August, 2013. This meeting was viewed as helpful for learning about what the other sites were doing, but there was no formal training incorporated into this meeting.

Leadership in HOPE

There were a variety of responses when participants were asked if a member of the HOPE team had emerged as an especially strong leader. One member of Probation Management said that HOPE is “committee-led” and that the Judge in Oregon does not have the same leadership presence as Judge Alm. Both the Judge herself and others described her more as a “figurehead” rather than a leader. However, the DA repeatedly mentioned that HOPE is judge-driven and he therefore views the Judge as the leader. The Community Corrections Supervisor and the PC are both viewed as “leaders on the ground” for their direct involvement with HOPE. A few interviewees mentioned the Prosecutor as a leader due to his investment in the political side of HOPE.

Satisfaction with Group Process

Most interviewees reported that the group dynamics have improved greatly since the new PC joined the team. If there are any conflicts, they are routed through the PC and subsequently resolved. One area of conflict that was mentioned by Probation Management was their exclusion from the Defense Council selection process. Two people also mentioned that much of the work involved for HOPE occurs in silos and is not always well-integrated across offices. Some members of the HOPE team are viewed as inflexible and too concerned with their own agenda.

Effectiveness of Sanctions

Stakeholders were asked to rate how effective the sanctions are in changing the behavior of HOPE probationers. On a 5-point scale, participants rated the sanctions as being moderately effective ($M = 3.38$, $SD = 0.52$). The typical jail sanctions are 2-7 days for first-time offenses and minor violations and 15-30 days for absconders. Several interviewees mentioned that jail sanctions are effective for some, but not all HOPE probationers. The DA believes that HOPE works for the typical probationer because of the certainty of being caught, frequent drug testing, and heavy monitoring. On the other hand, younger offenders with criminal thinking issues and antisocial behaviors are unlikely to change and HOPE does not appear to be effective for them. Work release and treatment programs have been added recently in addition to serving jail time.

Probationers’ Understanding of HOPE Sanctioning Goals and Process

Using a similar 5-point scale, the key stakeholders believe that HOPE probationers have a good understanding of HOPE sanctioning goals and the process ($M = 4.13$, $SD = 0.52$). Most probationers appear to understand the chain of consequences - that a violation would lead to a sanction - but some of them do not care. Spending a few days in jail is not viewed as a true punishment, especially for someone who has previously had much longer sentences. Criminal thinking is deeply embedded in some probationers and it is unclear whether HOPE could change this way of thinking. Some of these more serious offenders do not have the desire to change their behavior. Antisocial attitudes also seem to prevent probationers from accepting the way HOPE works. Several interviewees mentioned that the warning hearings provide very clear information for the probationers about how HOPE works and that the POs reinforce the rules to make sure the probationers understand. The DA provided some evidence that HOPE might be working to change some probationers’ behaviors. There have been fewer probationers showing up late for their appointments. He also reported that some offenders struggle with the ideas of HOPE at the beginning, but once they have been enrolled for a longer time, they start to understand the rules better.

Sanctioning Process

The sanctioning grid was developed by members of Probation Management and one of the POs. The POs use this grid to provide a sanction recommendation. This recommendation is emailed to the Prosecutor and the Defense. Before the hearing, these stakeholders meet to discuss the sanction and then provide a recommendation to the Judge. There were a variety of responses about how closely the Judge follows the sanctioning grid. The Judge reported that she follows the grid 85% of the time, unless there is a good reason to give a harsher sanction. Others said that the Judge sometimes has personal reactions to the probationers and if they make her mad, she will give longer sentences.

Personal Opinions of HOPE

In general, attitudes toward HOPE have improved slightly since the baseline interviews, and most people attributed that to the new PC joining the team. However, Probation Management still believes that they were already running probation very similar to HOPE and were doing it better because they did it without the Judge and the POs had more discretion. Probation Management also thinks that HOPE lacks a CBT component and ignores criminogenic needs and antisocial attitudes. These individuals seem to be particularly invested in the culture of evidence-based practice using the risk/need/responsivity framework which conflicts with the deterrence-approach methods of HOPE.

Another concern that led to some negativity toward HOPE is the population pressure on the jail and the idea that HOPE has contributed somewhat to the need for forced releases.

Implementation and Ongoing Operation Barriers

Slow warrant service was an ongoing issue that caused problems with tracking down absconders. However, this issue has improved since the MOU with Multnomah County went into effect. Again, the problem with jail space is an ongoing issue and several stakeholders are concerned that HOPE probationers may have to be released early.

Implementation and Ongoing Operation Facilitators

The addition of the new PC was cited as the most important facilitator to the successful ongoing operation of HOPE. The new PC has improved communication between Probation Management and Pepperdine. Also, hiring an additional PO helped ease the burden on the two existing POs. Other important facilitators that were mentioned included good communication among the team and support from Judge Alm and Pepperdine.

HOPE's Burden On Stakeholders

Interviewees were asked to describe the extent to which their participation in HOPE has been a burden to them. On a scale of 1 to 5, with higher scores representing a greater burden, most participants reported that HOPE was only a slight burden to them ($M = 2.15$, $SD = 0.75$). The Judge faces time pressure in trying to manage HOPE with her court schedule full of other duties. The Community Corrections Supervisor found that supervising the UA techs for all of the drug testing that happens through HOPE is somewhat burdensome and time-consuming. The Undersheriff reported that having enough jail space and doing forced releases is stressful for him (even though HOPE is not the only cause of the population pressures).

HOPE's Burden on Various Departments

Participants rated the extent to which they thought HOPE was a burden on the Court, Probation, and the Jail. Using the same 1-5 scale, overall, participants thought that HOPE was most burdensome to

the Jail ($M = 3.63$, $SD = 1.41$), followed by Probation ($M = 3.00$, $SD = 0.71$), and least burdensome to the Court ($M = 2.63$, $SD = 0.52$). Several stakeholders mentioned that Probation should not be feeling a burden because HOPE probationers would be on their caseloads anyway.

HOPE Sustainability Plans

Several stakeholders mentioned that they want to wait to see the results to know if HOPE was effective before making the decision whether to continue HOPE. In a meeting that occurred during the site visit, the DA proposed a plan to the county commissioners to use local justice reinvestment money to fund a three-month extension of HOPE after the BJA grant ends in March 2015. The Community Corrections Director was advocating for this justice reinvestment funding to be used toward day reporting centers. However, there was not enough evidence in favor of day reporting centers for the county commissioners to approve that plan. The funding was awarded for the HOPE extension.

Changes to PAU

There have been no substantial changes to PAU, but the Judge reported that more PAU probationers are sentenced to electronic monitoring due to the jail population pressures.

Key Findings from Intermediate Interviews

One of the most significant findings from the intermediate interviews was the effect of the new PC on the operation of HOPE, as well as communication among the entire team. The new PC has strong credibility and trust which allows the team to work effectively with her. Another frequently mentioned issue dealt with the recent MOU put in place with Multnomah County to address the high number of absconders. The HOPE team was very satisfied with the progress that has been made in tracking down absconders. Jail overcrowding remains an ongoing concern and it is possible that HOPE probationers may be released early in the future. This is the main reason why HOPE has been a burden on the jail.

Unlike other sites, there is not a clear leader of HOPE identified in Oregon. Some stakeholders view the Judge as more of a “figurehead” rather than a leader. Others see the Community Corrections Supervisor and the PC as being leaders with the day-to-day business of HOPE. It also became clear in these interviews that there is much more informal than formal training for members of the HOPE team. Although there were no complaints of Pepperdine and Judge Alm checking in and having discussions, these experiences were not perceived as formal training events.

Most probationers in HOPE seem to understand how the program works. They know that violations will lead to sanctions, but offenders with criminal thinking issues and antisocial attitudes don't seem to care about the punishment. Those who have had long stays in jail previously are willing to spend a few nights in jail as opposed to complying with HOPE. These observations of HOPE participants indicate that HOPE may not be successful for all types of offenders.

Overall, the general attitude toward HOPE in Oregon has improved since the baseline interviews, but there is still some tension and resentment among the different stakeholders as they struggle with wanting to eliminate the Judge's role, regain the POs discretion, and incorporate programs that address criminogenic needs and thinking into HOPE.

Final Site Visit Summary

Members of the process evaluation team interviewed 11 key individuals involved in HOPE in Clackamas County, Oregon in July, 2014. The final interviews took place about 8 months after the intermediate interviews. Those interviewed included the Program Coordinator (PC), three individuals from Probation Management (the Probation Supervisor/Community Corrections Director, Community Corrections Manager, and Community Corrections Supervisor), the HOPE Judge, three HOPE Probation Officers (POs), two District Attorney representatives, and the Sheriff Patrol Lt. As part of the qualitative interview, these individuals were asked to rate the following stakeholders on their involvement in the ongoing implementation and operation of HOPE as well as their frequency of communication: HOPE Judge, Prosecutor, Defense Counsel, HOPE POs, Probation Management, Jail Administrator, Sheriff/other law enforcement, HOPE PC, and other. For example, “To what extent has the HOPE Judge been involved in the development of the HOPE program?” (1 = not at all; 5 = great extent) and “How often do you communicate with the HOPE POs?” (1 = never; 5 = every day).

HOPE PC⁴

The HOPE PC received high involvement ratings for the ongoing operations of HOPE ($M = 4.75$, $SD = 0.43$). This rating is slightly higher than the intermediate rating, which was the first time HOPE team members offered feedback on the second PC (Intermediate: $M = 4.50$, $SD = 0.71$; Baseline: $M = 4.80$, $SD = 0.45$). Three of the interview groups regarded the PC as essential to the “day to day” running of HOPE, The Sheriff shared that the PC keeps the warrant list current which is important to the operation of HOPE in Oregon. Probation management explained how the PC is the “central hub and gatekeeper of HOPE, she monitors everything.” Overall, team members acknowledged a high level of involvement from the PC. As with the intermediate interviews all the interviewees communicated with the PC at least one a week ($M = 4.33$, $SD = 0.47$; intermediate: $M = 3.78$, $SD = 1.48$) Communication with the PC has steadily increased since the first round of interviews (baseline: $M = 3.50$, $SD = 1.31$).

HOPE Judge

The HOPE Judge was rated highly for her involvement in HOPE at all three interview intervals ($M = 4.56$, $SD = 0.81$; intermediate: $M = 4.58$, $SD = 0.51$; baseline: $M = 4.60$, $SD = 0.55$). Three of the six interview groups commented that the judge demonstrates leadership with HOPE and the PC shared that the judge is an “advocate for HOPE.” For example, probation management stated that the judge would initiate the setting up of team meetings. The PC, POs, and DA communicated most frequently with the Judge ($M = 3.77$ $SD = 1.09$). Communication patterns remained consistent with the intermediate interviews after a slight decrease from the baseline interviews (intermediate: $M = 3.33$, $SD = 1.23$; baseline: $M = 4.00$, $SD = 0.87$).

HOPE POs

The HOPE POs received high involvement ratings for their involvement in HOPE for the final round of interviews ($M = 4.75$, $SD = 0.42$). This rating decreased slightly from the last round of interviews (intermediate: $M = 4.80$, $SD = 1.08$; baseline: $M = 4.20$, $SD = 1.10$). The POs were described as having good rapport with the probationers by the PC, Judge, and Probationer Managers. The Sheriff explained

⁴ Oregon’s second PC (who started in April 2013) was interviewed during the final interview in July 2014 and intermediate interview November 2013.

how the POs, “have knowledge of the clients’ habits and routine...POs have a more in depth role even with clients in abscond status.” Two of the interview groups noted how the POs facilitate the UA testing, where in Hawaii this is done by the defense counsel. The Judge and PC reported communicating with the POs at least one a day and all groups had interacted with the POs at least once a week (final: $M = 4.57, SD = 0.44$). Frequent communication patterns with POs were reported across all interviews (intermediate: $M = 4.00, SD = 1.12$; baseline: $M = 4.50, SD = 0.53$).

Probation Management

Probation management was considered by interviewees to be moderately involved and important to the HOPE program ($M = 3.77, SD = 0.88$; intermediate: $M = 3.42, SD = 0.90$, baseline: $M = 4.00, SD = 1.00$). The Judge and Sheriff explained how the Probation Management team offers support to the POs. Probation Management highlighted how they provided the leadership and commitment to HOPE, and helped adapt the local culture for the HOPE to operate. For example, the PC illustrated that the Probation Management offer her support for when she “need(s) something from somewhere else in the agency.” One of the members of the Probation Management team reported that their role in the HOPE program had diminished as the program continued. Communication with Probation Management was occurring daily with the POs and at least weekly with the PC, all other interviewees communicated less frequently with Probation Management ($M = 3.60, SD = 0.89$; intermediate: $M = 3.29, SD = 1.11$; baseline: $M = 3.60, SD = 0.89$).

Prosecutor

Involvement ratings for the Prosecutor remained consistent with the intermediate involvement ratings, which is a slight decrease from the baseline ratings ($M = 3.56, SD = 1.31$; intermediate: $M = 3.50, SD = 1.08$; baseline: $M = 4.00, SD = 1.00$). Probation Management and the Judge noted that the Prosecutor has a minor role in the HOPE operations and is responsible for managing the grant. The PC explained that the Prosecutor offers “advocacy” for the HOPE probationers and the POs noted the importance of the Prosecutor if new criminal charges arise for the probationers. The PC, Judge, and POs reported communicating with the Prosecutor at least once a week, other stakeholders communicated less with the Prosecutor. Communication with the Prosecutor increased from the intermediate interviews ($M = 3.4, SD = 0.89$, intermediate: $M = 2.67, SD = 1.12$; baseline: $M = 3.13, SD = 0.83$).

Defense Counsel⁵

The Defense Counsel was rated as being moderately important to the ongoing operation of HOPE ($M = 3.89, SD = 0.69$). The involvement rating at the final interviews was the highest reported involvement rating across the three interviews and significantly higher than the involvement rating for the original Defense Counsel (intermediate: $M = 3.75, SD = 0.97$; baseline: $M = 2.67, SD = 1.15$). The PC and the Probation Management explained how the new Defense Counsel acts as advocate for clients. The PC noted that the new Defense Counsel offers increased availability to clients and ensures they are educated on how the HOPE program will affect them. Like the Prosecutor, Probation Management noted that the Defense Counsel has a minor role in the HOPE operations. Communication with the Defense Counsel was occurring weekly with the PC, Judge, and POs ($M = 3.41, SD = 1.28$).

⁵ Oregon’s second Defense Counsel was interviewed during the final interview in July 2014 and intermediate interview November 2013.

Communication at the time of the final interviews was higher than at the time of the intermediate interviews (intermediate: $M = 2.60$, $SD = 1.27$; baseline: $M = 3.50$, $SD = 0.93$).

Jail Administrator

The Jail Administrator was regarded as being moderately important to the HOPE program ($M = 3.77$, $SD = 0.78$; intermediate: $M = 4.00$, $SD = 1.31$; baseline: $M = 3.20$, $SD = 1.10$). Two of the interview groups: the PC, POs, and Probation Management Team highlighted the importance of the Jail Administrator in “housing violators.” The Probation Management team and the Sheriff commended the Jail Administrator on adhering to the HOPE program and not releasing HOPE probationers early. Probation Management expanded upon this, and reported that the Jail Administrator finds housing the HOPE violators challenging due to “population pressures from HOPE violators contributes greatly to forced releases of more serious inmates.” Communication with the Jail Administrator increased for the final round of interviews from the intermediate and baseline communication patterns ($M = 3.36$, $SD = 0.72$, intermediate: $M = 2.11$, $SD = 1.05$; baseline: $M = 2.00$, $SD = 0.76$).

Sheriff/Other Law Enforcement

The Sheriff’s Office was rated as having moderate importance to the ongoing operations of HOPE during the final and intermediate interviews (final: $M = 3.00$, $SD = 1.10$; intermediate: $M = 3.36$, $SD = 1.12$), which is much more involved than with initial implementation at baseline ($M = 2.00$, $SD = 0.82$). The Sheriff explained how the Sheriff’s office offers support for the POs. The PC highlighted that the POs were handling most of the warrants and stated that the Sheriff’s office would “pick someone up if they happen to see them but do not really actively search for absconders.” Those who communicated most frequently with the Sheriff at the time of the final interviews was the PC, Judge, POs, and Prosecutor (final: $M = 3.30$, $SD = 0.97$; intermediate: $M = 2.63$, $SD = 1.19$; baseline: $M = 2.67$, $SD = 1.22$).

Other – CC Intake/Support Staff, UA Techs

The UA Techs were cited by Probation Management and the POs as also making a significant contribution. Finally, the Research Coordinator was also viewed by Probation Management as someone important to the operation of HOPE.

Average involvement and communication ratings for each role in the HOPE team

Role	Involvement	Communication
Program Coordinator	4.75	4.33
Probation Management	3.77	3.60
HOPE Judge	4.56	3.77
HOPE POs	4.75	4.57
Prosecutor	3.56	3.40
Defense Counsel	3.89	3.41
Jail Administrator	3.77	3.36
Sheriff/Other Law Enforcement	3.00	3.30

The correlation between the involvement and communication ratings during the final round of interviews was high and statistically significant ($r = 0.87$, $p = 0.005$), indicating a relationship between

who is strongly involved in HOPE operations and who communicates with whom. The correlation between the involvement ratings from the intermediate and final round was quite high and statistically significant ($r = 0.93, p = 0.001$), as was the correlation between the intermediate and final communication scores ($r = 0.92, p = 0.001$).

For this final round of interviews, the strength of the correlation between involvement and communication ratings increased from the intermediate and baseline interviews ($r = 0.87, p = 0.005$; intermediate: $r = 0.66, p = .075$; baseline $r = 0.57, p = 0.139$).

The intermediate and final involvement scores ($r = 0.926, p = 0.001$) compared to the baseline and intermediate involvement scores ($r = 0.64, p = 0.088$) demonstrated a stronger, statistically significant correlation. The intermediate and final communication scores ($r = 0.92, p = 0.001$) compared to the baseline and intermediate communication scores ($r = 0.85, p = 0.007$) again represented a stronger, statistically significant correlation.

Self-Ratings on Involvement Compared to Average Ratings

Role	Self-Rating	Average Rating	Differential
Program Coordinator	5.00	4.75	0.25
Judge	5.00	4.56	0.44
POs	5.00	4.75	0.25
Probation Mgt.	2.83	3.77	-0.94
Prosecutor	5.00	3.56	1.44
Sheriff/Other Law Enforcement	3.00	3.00	0.00

This table illustrates the differences between key stakeholders’ self-ratings on involvement in HOPE with others’ average ratings. Probation management under reported their involvement in comparison to the average ratings provided by the stakeholders. The Prosecutor over reported their involvement in comparison to the average ratings provided by the stakeholders. However, the self-ratings and average ratings for the PC, Judge, POs, and Sheriff corresponded closely.

Summary

The PC, Judge, and POs were rated as being the most involved in the ongoing operation of HOPE. The PC’s was regarded as essential to the operation of HOPE in Oregon, and all individuals interviewed reported communicating with the PC at least once a week. In addition to office responsibilities POs in Oregon are involved with and responsible for the administering the UA tests.

Key Components of HOPE

Four of the six interview groups explained that one of the key components of HOPE is the swift and certain consequences which as the defense attorney explained, “creates a link between the violation and receiving the consequence of sanction,” for the probationers. The interviewees highlighted that the POs immediate prompt response demonstrates to the probationer that they will be held accountable for their actions and absconders will be tracked down. The judge highlighted the importance of the probationers appearing in front of court immediately if they have a positive drug test.

Implementation Barriers and Facilitators

Four of the six interview groups spoke about how the structure of the HOPE team in Clackamas County posed a barrier to implementation. The infusion of the judge into sanctioning probationers, which was being run by the probation officers, posed a challenge. The POs recommended that corrections administer HOPE and not the judge, and explained how the local control population would benefit from corrections because the “POs have more of an opportunity than judges to build rapport with probationers.” The PC explained how the “sites need flexibility to adjust it [HOPE] to their local circumstances.”

Two of the interview groups cited the abundance of heroin users as a barrier to HOPE. The sheriff explained how the county is “geographically large” and with Portland nearby, the population of heroin users has overflowed into Clackamas, County. The sheriff identified these issues as contributing factors to a probationer absconding. The judge explained that many beds were occupied by heavy heroin users, and offered a possible solution for the hard-core addicts as eliminating probationers from the program if they hit a certain number of violations.

Two of the interview groups identified the barrier of including low risk offenders in HOPE. The POs explained that the Oregon state assessment (PSC) for identifying risk is inaccurate and hence low risk probationers ended up in HOPE. Probation management explained how “a few low risk offenders got admitted to HOPE, so they may have been harmed by HOPE by being placed into jail (if they violated) where they were exposed to higher risk offenders.”

A potential barrier identified by the DA was the serving of warrants, which was reported to the DA by the sheriff’s office as a “resource issue.” The POs and PM’s emphasized that the POs were serving warrants, thus this posed a challenge because then less time could be devoted to office visits and provide support to the probationers. Also, the POs cited that serving the warrants is challenging because warrants may be outside of the jurisdiction.

A facilitator mentioned by the Sheriff was how the PC “emails a list of absconders to all patrol deputies each month,” the Sheriff considered this to be “innovative” and that it generated a positive response from the officers.

Leadership

Three of the six interview groups viewed the judge, POs, and the second PC as the leader of the HOPE Program in Clackamas County.

Personal Opinions

Most interviewees appreciated the consistency of the swift and certain sanctions and the high level of accountability that the consequences promoted. The PC explained how “some HOPE probationers do

a kind of cost benefit analysis; if they can tolerate the sanction then they'll commit a violation without worrying about the consequences." Related to this concern, one of the POs recommended that HOPE should include individuals "interested in change." Additionally, the POs emphasized how they liked that in HOPE absconders are still searched for which is important for community safety. Members of PM supported HOPE with the appropriate population of high risk offenders.

Organizational and System Level Changes

Organizationally, the judge related that the amount of jail space occupied by HOPE probationers was viewed as problematic by the judges. The sheriff stated that the PC keeps the sheriff's office up to date on absconders with a monthly email. This was helpful to the officers and the sheriff considered this to be "innovative." The PM explained that it was challenging for the POs to lose their discretion with the probationers.

Future of HOPE

Three of the five interviews groups explained how there were currently ongoing discussions as to the future of HOPE in Clackamas County. The judge suggested the possibility of introducing aspects of HOPE into PAU, and how county funding was used on a transition-center that works with individuals coming out of incarceration. The possibility of incorporating the HOPE program with the transition center was currently being discussed. Probation management explained how HOPE can be run entirely by probation without the judge, and only selecting high risk probationers for participation in the program.

Factors to Consider for the Expansion of HOPE in Oregon

A major point emphasized by the stakeholders was the importance of understanding the local criminal justice system and gaining support from key players. For example, assembling a team of individuals who supported the HOPE model was recommended as a key for the successful expansion of HOPE in Oregon. The judge advised that new judges encountering HOPE receive training immediately and gain a firm understanding of how the program works. Two of the interview groups highlighted that importance of having a PC who has experience with probation.

Drug Treatment Referrals

During the final site visit to the Clackamas County HOPE, we also conducted a brief examination of the primary drug treatment program to which the plurality of HOPE probationers was referred. As with all DFE sites, Clackamas County used a variety of drug treatment providers, and we were not able to examine all of them. Instead, we examined the program that received more HOPE referrals than any other. This was the Corrections Substance Abuse Program (CSAP), which is operated directly by the CCCC. This facility is in Milwaukie, Oregon, which is approximately ten miles from the HOPE program in Oregon City. Clackamas County HOPE made a low to moderate use of treatment in general, referring 23% of all HOPE probationers to some form of treatment. The plurality of all treatment referrals (43%) was sent to the CSAP program, with the remainder spread out over a dozen miscellaneous other providers, primarily focused on drug treatment and related services. Ten percent (19) of all HOPE probationers in Clackamas County experienced the CSAP program, and 58% (11) of those referred to CSAP successfully completed it. Thus, intensive residential drug treatment, even through CSAP, was a relatively small feature of HOPE in Clackamas County.

Our examination of the CSAP program using an abbreviated version of the Correctional Program Checklist (CPC) is described more fully in the methodology chapter. Again, the purpose of this examination was not to conduct a full-scale process or outcome evaluation of CSAP, which is beyond the scope of the HOPE DFE, but rather to provide a basic description of services provided through CSAP within the framework of the principles of effective offender intervention (Andrews and Bonta, 2003, MacKenzie, 2006; MacKenzie and Zajac, 2013). Thus, we cannot draw conclusions about whether CSAP is in fact effective, but we simply offer a summary of core programmatic features as they relate to these principles. Investigators Zajac and Dawes visited the CSAP program to conduct an intensive in-person interview with the CSAP director and several key staff on July 23, 2014, during the final site visit to Clackamas County, to gather information about ISF program operations. The following is a summary of key features of this program.

CSAP is a 20-bed program embedded within a larger 80 bed county work release facility operated by CCCC. HOPE participants represent a small proportion of all offenders participating in CSAP at any given time. Staff reported that CSAP had treated approximately 12 HOPE referrals in total since HOPE began (as noted above, final HOPE program files from Clackamas county indicate 19 total referrals to CSAP over an approximate two-year period). CSAP staff reported that HOPE and non-HOPE clients are mixed in together and that HOPE clients are given the same treatment services as the others. A smaller companion facility for women is on the same grounds, offering comparable services. Thus, treatment provided by CSAP is segregated by gender. Four of the 19 HOPE probationers who were referred to CSAP were women and thus participated in the companion female CSAP program.

CSAP is an inpatient residential program. Program participants are closely monitored while in the program. CSAP is the longest of any of the treatment programs examined at the four DFE sites. CSAP operates in four phases as outlined below, for a total program dosage of 6 to 9 months.

- Phase 1: 60-90 days residential
- Phase 2: 60 days residential
- Phase 3: 60 days transitional – housing, jobs, relapse prevention
- Phase 4: aftercare as needed

We learned prior to our visit to CSAP that this program had been assessed using the CPC in April of 2009. The assessment was conducted by a state evaluation team that had been trained by the CPC developers at the University of Cincinnati. We were provided with a copy of this report by CCCC management. Clackamas County was the only HOPE DFE site where we had available to us a previously completed full scale CPC assessment of its primary drug treatment program. The existence of this prior assessment greatly facilitated our own examination of CSAP.

In the full-scale CPC assessment conducted in 2009, CSAP achieved a score of 86%, placing it in the “Very Satisfactory” category on the CPC. The following presents key highlights from the 2009 assessment of CSAP.

Primary CSAP Strengths

- CSAP program leadership and staff personnel meet or exceed CPC standards regarding educational background and prior experience working with offenders.
- Program curricula and materials were selected following a review of the literature on effective practices.
- CSAP enjoys strong support within the local criminal justice community.

- CSAP utilizes well recognized assessment instruments for its clients, including the Level of Service Case Management Inventory (LSCMI), the Michigan Alcohol Screening Test (MAST), the Drug Abuse Screening Test (DAST), the University of Rhode Island Change Assessment (URICA, an assessment of readiness for treatment) and others.
- These tools are used to screen out inappropriate clients who are then referred to other agencies, and to target treatment to high risk-high needs offenders, who represent the strong majority (over 90%) of all clients accepted by CSAP.
- CSAP targets several key criminogenic needs, including antisocial attitudes and values, self-control and impulsivity, problem solving and interpersonal skills, substance abuse and relapse prevention. Little evidence was found of any time spent on non-criminogenic needs such as physical fitness or artistic skills.
- CSAP employs a strong focus on cognitive-behavioral therapy within the framework of a therapeutic community, which has considerable evidence of effectiveness (Mitchell, Wilson and MacKenzie, 2012; Wexler and Prendergast, 2010).
- CSAP uses a standard, manualized, cognitive-behaviorally oriented curriculum for substance abuse treatment – Milkman and Weinburg’s *Criminal Conduct and Substance Abuse Treatment - Strategies for Self Improvement and Change* (see for example Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration Treatment Improvement Protocol #44 for more information on this curriculum <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK82999/>), and there is evidence that treatment staff adhere closely to the curriculum.
- Group sessions include time for behavioral practice of learned skills through role playing and other activities.
- CSAP is 6 to 9 months in duration, well within the recommended program dosage of 3 to 9 months.
- CSAP participants are occupied 40% to 70% of their time in structured and monitored treatment and related activities. Combined with the previous point, CSAP qualifies as an intensive program.
- Clients are reassessed as they proceed through the program for clinical progress and unmet needs.
- Aftercare plans are developed for each client.

Primary CSAP Weaknesses

- While staff receive adequate new hire training, they require additional ongoing training related to their treatment duties throughout their tenure with CSAP, especially with respect to monitoring for negative effects from punishers administered to clients.
- Additional clinical supervision could be provided for line treatment staff.
- CSAP clients should be monitored more closely while on pass releases to the community.
- CSAP should undertake an outcome evaluation.

It should be noted that a CPC was conducted at the same time on the CSAP companion women’s facility by the same evaluation team. This assessment also produced a score of 86%, along with comparable strengths and weaknesses. Thus, the male and female programs appear to correspond equivalently to the set of evidence based treatment principles measured by the CPC.

While the results of this full-scale CPC assessment do indicate that CSAP has a strong potential for producing a positive treatment effect, we were concerned that these results were five years old and may not fully reflect the current status of the program. Thus, our visit to CSAP was intended to follow-up on and update several of the central findings of the initial CPC assessment. The following discusses key findings from our brief examination of CSAP in July 2014.

Most notably, CSAP staff reported few changes to their change targets, curriculum or overall treatment approach since the time of their original CPC assessment. If anything, they reported adding some additional cognitive behavioral elements beyond what had been in place in 2009.

Clients are graded and promoted based upon their progress through the program. Since the time of the initial CPC assessment, staff have worked on implementing a behavioral score card/contract system, with emphasis on compliance with and accountability for program rules and norms and rewards, including HOPE rules for the HOPE clients. Less serious misconducts for HOPE clients while in CSAP are typically handled in-house according to standard house rules, while more serious infractions are reported back to the HOPE PO for appropriate action and sanctioning. Since CSAP is in fact part of CCCC, HOPE POs can access information on client progress through CSAP as desired. HOPE POs appear to defer client management to CSAP staff during Phases 1 and 2, and resume more active supervision when the HOPE client advances into Phases 3 and 4.

Few changes to staffing patterns and characteristics were reported since the time of the initial CPC assessment. Since that time, staff have received additional training on pro-social reinforcement, including the use of tangible (e.g. commissary scrips) and intangible (e.g. praise) reinforcers. Staff have also received additional training on monitoring for negative reactions to punishers. The CSAP director noted that clients frequently drop their victim stance in response to sanctions as they advance through CSAP, accepting greater responsibility for their actions within CSAP.

Areas of concern we noted for CSAP focused on monitoring of client behavior while outside of CSAP grounds (also noted on the 2009 assessment), the client completion rate, and outcome evaluation (also noted on the 2009 assessment). First, clients may be allowed to leave the CSAP premises for medical appointments, job search or other approved activities. Any movement in community by Phase 1 participants is accompanied by a "responsible" Phase 2 or 3 participant under a pass system, where the time of the absence is tracked (e.g. if a medical appointment, did they take more time than needed to facilitate the appointment and travel to and from?). This does raise some concern that illegal activities could still take place during this absence, given that they are not monitored by a non-offender during the absence. Second, administrative data received from Clackamas County HOPE indicates that 58% of those referred to CSAP successfully completed it. This is slightly outside of the desired successful completion rate of 65-85% recommended in the CPC. This lower rate may suggest that CSAP is either accepting some inappropriate referrals, may be imposing excessively demanding expectations on participants, or may have unclear criteria for successful completion. Third, there has still not been any rigorous outcome evaluation done of CSAP. All things considered, though, these are relatively minor concerns, and do not materially detract from the conclusions of the initial CPC assessment conducted on CSAP.

References

- Andrews, D.A. and James Bonta. 2003. *The Psychology of Criminal Conduct*. Cincinnati: Anderson Publishing.
- Argyris, Chris. 1985. *Strategies, Change and Defensive Routines*. Boston, MA: Pittman.
- Corsaro, Nicholas and Robin S. Engel. 2015. "Most Challenging of Contexts: Assessing the Impact of Focused Deterrence on Serious Violence in New Orleans." *Criminology & Public Policy*, 14(3), 471-505.
- Fixsen, Dean. L., Sandra F. Naom, Karen A. Blase, Robert M. Friedman and Frances Wallace. 2005. *Implementation Research: A Synthesis of the Literature*. Tampa, FL: University of South Florida, Louis de la Parte Florida Mental Health Institute, The National Implementation Research Network (FMHI Publication #231).
- MacKenzie, Doris Layton. 2006. *What Works in Corrections*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- MacKenzie, Doris Layton and Gary Zajac. 2013. *What Works in Corrections: The Impact of Correctional Interventions on Recidivism*. Monograph commissioned by The National Academy of Sciences Committee on the Causes and Consequences of High Rates of Incarceration.
- Mitchell, Ojmarrh, David B. Wilson and Doris L. MacKenzie. 2012. *The Effectiveness of Incarceration-Based Drug Treatment on Criminal Behavior: A Systematic Review*. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 2012:18.
- Raynor, Peter and Maurice Vanstone. 2015. "Moving Away from Social Work and Half Way Back Again: New Research on Skills in Probation." *British Journal of Social Work*, 1-17.
- Wexler, Harry K. and Michael L. Prendergast. 2010. "Therapeutic Communities in United States' Prisons: Effectiveness and Challenges." *Therapeutic Communities*, 31(2), 157-175.
- Zajac, Gary, Pamela K. Lattimore, Debbie Dawes and Laura Winger. 2015. "All Implementation is Local: Initial Findings from the Process Evaluation of the Honest Opportunity Probation with Enforcement (HOPE) Demonstration Field Experiment." *Federal Probation*, 79(1), 31-36.

ESSEX COUNTY, MASSACHUSETTS HOPE DFE PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

Contents

Essex County, Massachusetts HOPE Overview	1
Key Findings and Conclusions – HOPE Implementation in Essex County, Massachusetts	3
Implementation Fidelity.....	7
Baseline Site Visit Summary.....	9
Involvement & Communication	9
HOPE PC.....	9
HOPE Judge (Superior Court).....	9
HOPE Judge (District Court).....	9
HOPE POs.....	10
Probation Management	10
Prosecutor	10
Defense Counsel	11
Jail Administrator.....	11
Sheriff/Other Law Enforcement	11
Other – Court Clerk’s Office	11
Summary.....	11
Training	12
Perceptions of HOPE and PAU.....	13
Implementation Barriers and Facilitators.....	13
Personal Opinions of HOPE	13
Intermediate Site Visit Summary	14
Involvement in Ongoing Implementation/Operation of HOPE & Communication.....	14
HOPE PC.....	14
HOPE Judge (Superior Court).....	14
HOPE Judge (District Court).....	15
HOPE POs.....	15
Probation Management	15
Prosecutor	15
Defense Counsel	16
Jail Administrator.....	16
Sheriff	16
Other – Court Clerk’s Office, Drug Testers, Residential Treatment, Chief Justice	16
Correlations	17
Summary.....	17
Training	18
Leadership in HOPE	18
Satisfaction with Group Process.....	18
Effectiveness of Sanctions	18
Probationers’ Understanding of HOPE Sanctioning Goals and Process	19
Sanctioning Process.....	19
Personal Opinions of HOPE	19
Implementation and Ongoing Operation Barriers	19
Implementation and Ongoing Operation Facilitators	19
HOPE’s Burden on Stakeholders.....	20

HOPE’s Burden on Various Departments	20
HOPE Sustainability Plans	20
Changes to PAU	20
Key Findings from Intermediate Interviews	20
Final Site Visit Summary.....	21
Involvement in Ongoing Implementation/Operation of HOPE & Communication.....	21
HOPE PC.....	21
HOPE Judge (Superior Court).....	21
HOPE Judge (District Court).....	21
HOPE POs.....	22
Probation Management	22
Prosecutor	22
Defense Counsel	22
Jail Administrator.....	23
Sheriff	23
Other – Court Clerk’s Office, Chief Justice, and Residential Treatment.....	23
Correlations	24
Summary.....	24
Key Components of HOPE.....	25
Implementation Barriers and Facilitators.....	25
Leadership	26
Personal Opinions.....	26
Organizational and System Level Changes	26
Future of HOPE	26
Factors to Consider for the Expansion of HOPE in Massachusetts	26
Drug Treatment Referrals.....	27
References	31

Essex County, Massachusetts HOPE Overview

The following report presents findings from the process evaluation of the HOPE DFE site in Essex County, Massachusetts. Results are presented from three evaluation site visits and an analysis of implementation fidelity metrics. As a preface, we provide an overview of the site itself, discussing key local administrative and organizational features within the site that influence the operation of HOPE there. See the Methods chapter for more information about the DFE and the research design.

As a critical preface to the following discussion of HOPE structure in Essex County, the most noteworthy feature of this structure is that HOPE here for all practical purposes consisted of two connected, but in many important respects separate, HOPE courts. These are the Salem Superior Court and the Salem District Court. The Salem Superior Court is the court of general jurisdiction and primarily handles cases that can be characterized as more “serious”, principally felonies. Half of cases in Superior Court are typically violent offenses. The Salem District Court is the court of limited jurisdiction and primarily handles misdemeanor and less serious felony cases for the city of Salem and several surrounding communities. Nearly two-thirds of cases in District Court are typically non-violent offenses. Both courts operate within the statewide judicial branch, which also oversees the state Office of the Commissioner of Probation. Probation in Essex County, then, is a state agency that is organized under state judicial control, operating similarly to probation in Hawaii. Thus, the ability of the two HOPE court judges in Essex County to exercise meaningful control over probation also makes this site similar to the Tarrant County Texas and Saline County Arkansas DFE sites.

The HOPE management team in Essex County is comprised of representatives from the Superior and District Courts and consists of the two HOPE judges, the (single) HOPE program coordinator, HOPE probation officers from both courts, the Chief Probation Officers from the Superior Court and District Court probation offices (which are separate offices, albeit both part of statewide probation), a senior member of the local Salem city police department who early assumed primary responsibility for warrant service, a representative from the Sheriff’s department who oversees county jail operations and the public defender. There did not seem to be a significant role for the District Attorney’s office on this team. As noted later in this report, we also interviewed the Chief Justice for the state Superior Court, the state Commissioner of Probation and representatives from the state Sentencing Commission (all officed in Boston), all of whom played key roles in the initiation of HOPE in Essex County, but who were not involved in the day to day management of HOPE there.

As noted above, probation is a statewide function in Massachusetts. Probation officers do not have the power to arrest, thus, the service of warrants and apprehension of absconders was coordinated primarily by a senior officer within the Salem police department, who took a strong interest in HOPE and utilized his connections and relationships with law enforcement throughout the county to facilitate HOPE warrant service. Unlike at the other three HOPE DFE sites, the probation officers for Essex County HOPE were not solely dedicated to a HOPE caseload – they also carried a non-HOPE caseload. This was due to a statewide hiring freeze that is discussed in greater detail later under implementation barriers. Thus, there were more HOPE probation officers at this site than at the other sites. Again, there were two separate probation offices involved in HOPE, one serving Superior Court and one serving District Court. The numbers of probation officers varied somewhat over time, but generally there were two to three

officers assigned to HOPE in Superior Court, and as many as five in District Court. This difference in the number of HOPE officers between courts was due largely to District Court having more probationers enrolled in HOPE than Superior Court, which itself was largely a function of the nature of the cases handled by these courts. Probation officers cannot sanction probation violators directly; this must be done by the judge. Drug testing for HOPE in Essex County was delegated to a contingent of part-time, temporary college interns who were hired and trained expressly for this purpose. This arrangement was a concession to severe staffing shortages in probation, due to a long term hiring freeze in Massachusetts that predated and outlasted the HOPE DFE.

The probationer population enrolled in the HOPE DFE differed between the two courts. In District Court, HOPE eligible enrollees were intended to be principally the traditional “front end” probationers (where probation is used in lieu of incarceration). In contrast, HOPE probationers in Superior Court were typically “back end” enrollments – those who were released from state and local incarceration to a period of community supervision.

The impetus behind the initiation of HOPE in Essex County was principally at the state level, with strong support coming from the Superior Court Chief Justice, the Commission of Probation and the Sentencing Commission. The concepts behind HOPE were introduced in Massachusetts by presenters from the National Center for State Courts during a statewide judicial conference in 2009 that focused on innovative practices in sentencing and probation. The state Superior Court Chief Justice determined that the HOPE model was worth exploring further, and convened a committee the following year to develop a pilot HOPE program. Essex County was selected as the test site for HOPE based upon judicial interest and county demographics, and the eventual Superior Court and District Court HOPE judges and Chief Probation Officers became fully engaged in the planning process during 2010 and into 2011. When the HOPE program solicitation was released by BJA in 2011, the HOPE planning committee responded to it, with staff from the Sentencing Commission taking the lead in grant writing, with substantial input from the designated Superior Court HOPE judge. Thus, the pump was already primed for the implementation of HOPE in Essex County, with considerable buy-in and planning already established.

Key Findings and Conclusions – HOPE Implementation in Essex County, Massachusetts

The implementation of the HOPE DFE in Essex County, Massachusetts was by all appearances successful. The implementation experience at this site proceeded relatively smoothly and experienced few major barriers or challenges. The site also achieved a moderate to high degree of fidelity to the intended HOPE model, as promulgated by BJA. These two implementation components – the implementation experience and implementation fidelity – are summarized further below. Detailed discussion of the process evaluation findings are presented following this summary.

The greatest factor that facilitated the implementation of HOPE in Essex County was the pre-planning that had already taken place for the development of HOPE. As noted above, state court and probation leadership had become familiar with the HOPE concept well in advance of the release of the BJA solicitation, and had selected Essex County as a testbed for HOPE in Massachusetts. A planning and program development committee was already established in Essex County, led by the eventual HOPE judges and probation management, and a strong team had emerged around the HOPE program concept. Indeed, during our site visits, the existence of strong county-wide teamwork, substantial buy-in from most stakeholders, leadership from the HOPE judges, probation management and others and good communication patterns were repeatedly identified by HOPE team members as key factors aiding the implementation of HOPE. The weekly HOPE team meetings, typically led by the Superior Court HOPE Judge, were seen by the team as being critical vehicles for the communication and coordination needed for HOPE and promoted an effective group dynamic around HOPE. Thus, solid groundwork for HOPE had already been laid well in advance of the release of the BJA solicitation, and this redounded to the benefit of the implementation of the HOPE DFE in Essex County. Moreover, as we documented across the three site visits to Essex County, this team structure was quite resilient, with almost all key players remaining in place for most of the DFE, and with the patterns of their involvement and communication with one another remaining substantially stable over the course of the DFE.

As noted above, probation and the courts are both statewide functions in Massachusetts, with probation operating under the organizational auspices of the courts. This allowed the two HOPE court judges to exercise considerable control over the operations of probation as it related to HOPE. Indeed, for much of the HOPE DFE, the Superior Court Chief Probation Officer was on leave due to extenuating personal circumstances, leaving the HOPE judge in that court as the de facto head of probation in that court. This close organizational linkage of probation and the courts, which we saw in two of the other DFE sites, undoubtedly contributed importantly to the implementation of HOPE there (Zajac, Lattimore, Dawes and Winger, 2015).

The HOPE team members were asked to rate the extent to which the implementation of HOPE was a burden on them and their agencies and to reflect on how HOPE may have been impacting other agencies that were involved in the DFE. On a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being a higher burden, interviewees indicated that HOPE was only a small to moderate burden on them, rating it 2.8 on the 5-point scale. The greatest burden was thought to fall on probation, due to severe resource constraints which are discussed further below. Regardless of any perceived level of burden, most team members had very positive and optimistic personal opinions of HOPE, with some seeing it as “the future of criminal justice”, and “the way probation should be”. They saw HOPE as a great improvement over the study control

condition - Probation as Usual (PAU), which they characterized as inconsistent and idiosyncratic to the individual probation officer. They also complained that sanctioning under PAU is often delayed and disconnected from the probationers' demonstrated behavior. Indeed, as noted earlier, HOPE had made enough of an impression on judicial and probation leadership in Massachusetts to press ahead with the program in Essex County well before there was any prospect of support from BJA. Still, there was also sentiment expressed that it will be important to see the results of the outcome evaluation under the DFE before committing fully to the model. Overall, though, most team members seemed to be happy to be participating in the HOPE program and believed that HOPE held great potential for improving the criminal justice system both in Massachusetts and nationally.

The greatest challenge that attended the implementation of HOPE in Essex County was a statewide hiring freeze that predated HOPE and continued for the duration of the DFE. As a result of the "Great Recession" that began in 2008, Massachusetts imposed a hiring freeze on many functions of state government. This was a "hard" freeze, with few exceptions made. Even though the DFE was in fact supported by a significant award from BJA, the HOPE court in Essex County was not able to create the dedicated probation officer positions that were intended for HOPE. This was not for lack of trying on the part of the HOPE team. But as is often the case in times of financial crisis, the existence of (temporary) external funding was not sufficient to trump the political and bureaucratic imperative of the hiring freeze. Thus, the HOPE probation officers in Essex County were not solely dedicated to HOPE, but instead carried both HOPE and non-HOPE caseloads. This made Essex County unique among the four DFE sites. This also resulted in Essex County having more HOPE probation officers than in the other sites, as the work of HOPE had to be spread among more officers. As noted above, Superior Court typically had two or three officers, with District County utilizing as many as five at any one time. The HOPE caseloads of any given officer were typically only the minority component of the overall caseload of that officer.

This situation led to considerable consternation among the officers at the outset of HOPE. During our initial site visit, many officers felt that HOPE had simply been "dumped" on them with little explanation or opportunity for input, and with little or no meaningful training or orientation. Indeed, some officers seemed to be confused about what HOPE even was or why Essex County was doing it, and were equally perplexed about the research demands imposed by the DFE. During our interviews, several of the HOPE officers were even debating between themselves about how HOPE was supposed to operate, reflecting a lack of organized training for them. This understandably led to strained feelings by the officers about HOPE. They tended to see HOPE as simply another thing that they had to do, with little support from management. During our second site visit approximately one year later, this attitude had moderated somewhat, but the ongoing hiring freeze and the inability to assign officers solely to HOPE continued to serve as a key implementation challenge.

Even at the time of our final site visit to Essex County in September 2014, the hiring freeze still had not been fully lifted, and the HOPE officers were still carrying mixed caseloads. By this time, though, their attitudes towards HOPE had warmed considerably. Many now felt that HOPE had value and believed that it would make a positive difference to probation in Essex County and even in Massachusetts more generally. They felt that HOPE was helping the probationers to become more organized and disciplined in their lifestyles, and was promoting more positive and productive habits within them. Thus, they saw great value to the structure that HOPE provided to probationers, and

believed that the consistency and clear expectations of HOPE promoted better decision making by the probationers. In the words of one initially ambivalent HOPE team member, they had now “drunk the HOPE Kool Aid”, and were “won over” by the program.

Still, there is little question that the hiring freeze imposed a critical constraint on the operation of HOPE that was not paralleled in any of the other DFE sites. The probation officers reported being initially unprepared for the HOPE duties assigned to them and were even unclear at the start about what those duties were. They felt then some sense of “muddling through” with HOPE (Lindblom, 1959), although they did in time manage to learn what was expected of them and to come to view HOPE relatively positively. It remains an open question whether HOPE absolutely requires dedicated probation officers to be assigned to it, but it was again a key implementation issue here.

HOPE team members were asked to rate on a scale of 1 to 5 the extent to which they believe HOPE probationers understand the goals and expectations of HOPE, with a higher score indicating greater perceived understanding. The team members rated probationer understanding of HOPE as 3.9, indicating a moderate to high level of understanding of the program. While team members felt that most probationers understand how HOPE operates and what it means for them, some are ambivalent or even indifferent to HOPE, and are not particularly impressed by the prospect of being sanctioned for violations. This is particularly the case for probationers with deeply set antisocial attitudes, those who have served considerable amounts of time in jail or prison in the past and who have significant substance abuse issues. Some team members also expressed concern that HOPE was not a good fit for probationers with mental disorders, who may need to have a type of “modified” HOPE where expectations are explained more clearly and where support is provided as they attempt to understand and navigate through the program. There was also concern that the goals of HOPE did not resonate with younger probationers with a history of gun offenses, due to their hostile attitudes (but, it was noted that these offenders are a serious challenge for any program). This is an interesting observation, given that the basic precepts of HOPE are rooted in part in the focused deterrence “ceasefire” type programs that are in fact targeted towards gun crime offenders. Further, some probationers evidently had difficulty accepting that they must quit using drugs and did not accept that they had to continue with HOPE even after they had served a jail term for a violation. This would seem to reflect their prior experiences with regular probation, where sanctions were not necessarily administered after every violation. Still, team members felt that most probationers believed that HOPE was trying to help them, even if they were reluctant to buy into the means.

HOPE team members were also asked to rate how effective the sanctions are in changing the actual behavior of HOPE probationers. On a 5-point scale, participants rated the sanctions under HOPE as being quite effective, with a mean rating of 4.1. Most team members noted that probationers are not surprised by a typical 2-3 day jail sentence for a violation. However, for probationers who have spent a lot of time in jail, 2-3 days may not be considered severe enough to affect a change in behavior. There have been some emotional reactions from probationers such as being upset about potential jail sanctions if they miss a drug test due to some type of unpredictable emergency. Still, some team members reported seeing evidence of change in criminal thinking for those who have been in the program for a long time.

At the time of our final visit to Essex County (September 2014), the HOPE team there had not yet developed firm plans for the sustainability of HOPE beyond the DFE. The intention, though, clearly

seemed to be to continue it in some fashion. The Superior Court HOPE judge indicated that he had just been appointed as Chair of the Massachusetts Sentencing Commission and that he intended to use that role to inform others in the criminal justice system throughout the state about what he perceived to be the very positive experience with HOPE in Essex County. The new state probation commissioner evidently was planning to expand HOPE and there was the expectation on the part of most in the team that the state legislature would provide funding for this expansion. Indeed, we were told that the legislature had made an appropriation for HOPE, but that the release of these funds was being held up by the ongoing hiring freeze. At this time, HOPE was evidently being piloted in three other sites in Massachusetts, with some using COMPSTAT principles to enforce fidelity. Thus, while final plans for continuation and sustainment of the Essex County HOPE were still being worked out, there did appear to be a clear commitment to the concept of HOPE and a reasonable expectation that the program would continue at some level in Massachusetts.

Turning to fidelity, HOPE in Essex County was implemented with a moderate to high degree of fidelity to the model as espoused in the BJA solicitation – at least 80% fidelity for most of fidelity items we measured. But, Essex County HOPE performed the weakest with regards to swiftness of sanctioning, which is one of the most important components of HOPE. We speculate that this was due to the staff shortage issue discussed above. Still, there seemed to be a clear commitment to doing HOPE “as intended” and again, the judge was seen by the team as a key enforcer of this fidelity.

Implementation Fidelity

The table below presents the implementation fidelity for Essex County HOPE, following methodology elaborated on in the methodology chapter, which explains in detail our measurement strategy, including a full specification of all items used to assess implementation fidelity.

Given the existence of two separate courts within the nominally single HOPE program in Essex County, we report fidelity results below for each court separately, and for the two courts combined. Essex County HOPE overall achieved a moderate to high level of implementation fidelity, achieving a minimum standard of 60% on ten of the eleven items. Indeed, fidelity was at 80% or greater for eight out of the ten items. It is worth noting, though, that fidelity was the lowest for Item # 7 (time from a violation to a violation hearing), and Item # 11 (time from violation hearing to the start of the sanction), both of which get at the notion of swiftness, which is one of the most critical components of the underlying HOPE logic model. On both items, Essex County HOPE fell only at or slightly below 60%. Thus, we have reservations about characterizing Essex County HOPE implementation fidelity as unequivocally high, despite having achieved at least 60% on all other fidelity items. We speculate that problems with swiftness may have been due to the staff shortages discussed at length earlier in this report. Looking comparatively at both courts, differences between Superior Court and District Court were minor, and both courts met a 60% standard on the same number of items, thus supporting a picture of consistent implementation across the two courts.

HOPE FIDELITY ITEM	MASSACHUSETTS FIDELITY - Overall	MASSACHUSETTS FIDELITY – Superior Court	MASSACHUSETTS FIDELITY – District Court
1. Leadership	83% of HOPE Team members interviewed across both courts across Baseline, Intermediate, and Final identified a leader in HOPE, most commonly Superior Court HOPE Judge	88% of HOPE Team members interviewed in Superior Court across Baseline, Intermediate, and Final identified a leader in HOPE, most commonly Superior Court HOPE Judge	73% of HOPE Team members interviewed in District Court across Baseline, Intermediate, and Final identified a leader in HOPE, most commonly Superior Court HOPE Judge
2. Probationers High Risk	88% of HOPE Probationers were moderate to high risk	89% of HOPE Probationers were moderate to high risk	87% of HOPE Probationers were moderate to high risk
3. Warning Hearing Issued	95% of 42 total Warning Hearings observed across both courts addressed 12/14 themes	94% of 18 Warning Hearings observed in Superior Court addressed 12/14 themes	96% of 24 Warning Hearings observed in District Court addressed 12/14 themes
4. Initial Testing Frequency	91% of all HOPE probationers had at least 8 tests in first 2 months	94% of Superior Court HOPE probationers had at least 8 tests in first 2 months	88% of District Court HOPE probationers had at least 8 tests in first 2 months
5. Stepped Down Testing Frequency	83% of all HOPE probationers had monthly testing after first 2 months	89% of Superior Court HOPE probationers had monthly testing after first 2 months	79% of District Court HOPE probationers had monthly testing after first 2 months

HOPE FIDELITY ITEM	MASSACHUSETTS FIDELITY - Overall	MASSACHUSETTS FIDELITY – Superior Court	MASSACHUSETTS FIDELITY – District Court
6. Exceptions for Missed UAs	97% of cases in both courts with a missed UA (N=195) received a consequence	94% of cases in Superior Court with a missed UA (N=69) received a consequence	98% of cases in District Court with a missed UA (N=126) received a consequence
7. Time to Violation Hearing	56% of violations across both courts (736 total violations) were followed by a Violation Hearing within 3 days	55% of violations in Superior Court (269 total violations) were followed by a Violation Hearing within 3 days	56% of violations in District Court (467 total violations) were followed by a Violation Hearing within 3 days
8. Sanction Type	78% of sanctions across both courts were jail time	80% of sanctions in Superior Court were jail time	78% of sanctions in District Court were jail time
9. Sanction Dosage	85% of jail sanctions across both courts were at or below the Hawaii HOPE mean of 19 days (Mean = 4 days)	72% of jail sanctions in Superior Court were at or below the Hawaii HOPE mean of 19 days (Mean = 4 days)	65% of jail sanctions in District Court were at or below the Hawaii HOPE mean of 19 days (Mean = 4 days)
10. Sanction Certainty	91% of violations across both courts resulted in a sanction	91% of violations in Superior Court resulted in a sanction	92% of violations in District Court resulted in a sanction
11. Sanction Swiftmess	60% of sanctions across both courts began within 3 days of the Violation Hearing	60% of sanctions in Superior Court began within 3 days of the Violation Hearing	60% of sanctions in District Court began within 3 days of the Violation Hearing

Baseline Site Visit Summary

Involvement & Communication

Members of the process evaluation team interviewed 16 individuals from eight key positions involved in HOPE in Essex County, Massachusetts. Since HOPE is operating in both the district court and superior court, individuals from both courts were interviewed for some positions. Those interviewed included the Program Coordinator (PC), the HOPE Judges from both the Superior Court and District Court, HOPE Probation Officers (POs) from the Superior and District court, the Public Defender, the Deputy Sheriff/Jail Administrator, and the Probation Commissioner. As part of the qualitative interview, these individuals were asked to rate the following stakeholders on their involvement in the development of HOPE as well as their frequency of communication: HOPE Judge, Prosecutor, Defense Counsel, HOPE POs, Probation Management, Jail Administrator, Sheriff/other law enforcement, HOPE PC, and other. For example, "To what extent has the HOPE Judge been involved in the development of the HOPE program?" (1 = *not at all*; 5 = *great extent*) and "How often do you communicate with the HOPE POs?" (1 = *never*; 5 = *every day*).

HOPE PC

The HOPE PC was heavily involved in the initial implementation of HOPE in Essex County ($M = 4.67$, $SD = 0.52$). She replaced the original PC in September 2012 after that person accepted another job out of state. She worked closely with the Superior Court HOPE judge to hire and train the UA testers and she currently serves as their supervisor. Some of her other duties included setting up the drug testing hotline, developing forms for HOPE, planning the weekly HOPE management team agenda and taking notes, handling the budget, and preparing reports for BJA. She serves as a liaison between the Superior Court HOPE judge and other departments, as well as keeps an open line of communication between the district court and superior court. Most of the key players in Essex County reported having frequent communication with the HOPE PC, which was on average, at least once a week ($M = 4.00$, $SD = 1.31$).

HOPE Judge (Superior Court)

The Superior Court HOPE judge was viewed as being extremely involved in the development of HOPE ($M = 4.67$, $SD = 0.52$). All interview groups reported that he is the leader and driving force behind HOPE and that his enthusiasm for the project helped carry it forward. The judge had been involved in developing a probation program like HOPE and he contributed to the decision to apply for the grant. He also edited the grant application. The judge initiated and runs weekly HOPE meetings where the entire team gets together to address problems that may have arisen. Several people reported that the judge tried to address the issues regarding short staffing and helps the different key players get what they need to do their jobs. Due to his substantial involvement, many of the individuals working on the HOPE project in Essex County report communicating with him quite frequently ($M = 4.33$, $SD = 0.52$).

HOPE Judge (District Court)

Only two groups of people provided ratings of the District Court HOPE judge's involvement in developing HOPE, but he was viewed as making a moderate level of contributions ($M = 4.00$, $SD = 1.41$). The judge acts as the HOPE leader in District Court, but he, along with all others agree that the Superior Court HOPE judge is the true leader. The District Court judge attended planning meetings and provided some input regarding the necessary resources and information that was needed for the grant

application. Perhaps most importantly, he was responsible for getting those in the District Court on board with participating in HOPE and he also helped change the location to Salem, which was better than the initial location. Only the Superior Court HOPE judge and the District Court POs provided ratings of their communication with the District Court HOPE judge; they communicate with him at least once a week ($M = 4.33$, $SD = 0.58$).

HOPE POs

The involvement of HOPE POs was dependent on whether they work in the District Court or Superior Court ($M = 3.57$, $SD = 1.90$). The HOPE POs for the District Court had very little involvement in implementing HOPE; they reported that it was simply handed to them and they were told to do it. However, some of the District Court HOPE POs reported greater involvement since they contribute a lot to the day-to-day operation of HOPE. They helped to develop the procedures for expediting violations and assisted in developing the sanctioning grid. The HOPE POs administer the ORAS and identify who is eligible for participation. All HOPE POs supervise “regular” probation caseloads (but not PAU), so their caseloads can be quite high. Except the Chief Justice, all key players in Massachusetts communicate with the HOPE POs at least once a week ($M = 4.00$, $SD = 1.55$).

Probation Management

Probation Management was very involved in the implementation of HOPE, as two individuals from the Sentencing Commission/Administrative Office of the Trial Court wrote the grant application ($M = 4.20$, $SD = 0.45$). More than a year before the grant process began, the Chief Justice invited a sentencing expert to the annual Superior Court Justices meeting to discuss evidence-based sentencing practices. Following this meeting, the Superior Court decided to pilot a HOPE-type program. In 2010, the Chief Justice formed a steering committee who met for about a year to plan the HOPE pilot. As they were getting closer to starting the HOPE pilot, the BJA solicitation was released and the steering committee decided to move forward with the grant since it fit nicely with their existing plans for the HOPE pilot study.

Other contributions from Probation Management included selecting the HOPE PC and working to secure state resources to support HOPE. The Chief Probation Officers (CPO) for both the District Court and Superior Court were also very involved at the beginning, but the CPO for the Superior Court has been on an extended medical leave recently and thus has not been present for much of the time that HOPE has been operating. He was critical in setting up the process to identify eligible HOPE cases. The Probation Commissioner reported that he was an avid supporter of HOPE, but did not contribute much to the actual implementation. Although Probation Management is not involved nearly as much in the day to day operations, most people communicate with these individuals very regularly ($M = 4.11$, $SD = 0.78$).

Prosecutor

All key players in Essex County agreed that the Prosecutor played almost no role in the implementation of HOPE ($M = 1.14$, $SD = 0.38$). The DA wrote a letter of support for the grant application despite “mild misgivings.” The DA’s office attends the weekly HOPE staff meetings, but outside of that, there is very little communication with that office ($M = 1.33$, $SD = 0.50$).

Defense Counsel

The Defense Counsel's role in the implementation of HOPE was quite minimal ($M = 1.86, SD = 0.90$). They were viewed as being enthusiastic about HOPE, but their office did not have the influence or power to make any substantial decisions. The Public Defender attends the weekly HOPE meetings, but does not communicate frequently outside of those meetings ($M = 1.86, SD = 0.90$).

Jail Administrator

The Jail Administrator had a moderate level of involvement in the implementation of HOPE ($M = 3.00, SD = 0.82$). This individual provided a useful perspective about how HOPE would impact the jail system. He also had to work with the Judge and other HOPE team members to implement some procedures to ensure that HOPE sentencing did not interfere with an existing restriction about releasing inmates during weekends. Although he was involved with developing these initial procedures, the HOPE team does not communicate with him much more than once a month ($M = 2.13, SD = 0.99$).

Sheriff/Other Law Enforcement

Many HOPE team members reported that the Salem Police Department has been extremely involved in the implementation of HOPE ($M = 4.50, SD = 0.55$). Most importantly, the Salem PD has been critical in facilitating the fast execution of warrants, even with other police departments. Making HOPE cases a priority has been instrumental to the success of the program. The amount of communication with the Salem Police Department seems to vary based on the position, with the HOPE POs and PC communicating most frequently ($M = 2.89, SD = 1.54$).

Other – Court Clerk's Office

The Superior Court POs reported that the Court Clerk's office was very involved in the implementation of HOPE and they communicate with this office on a daily basis. This office worked on policy changes to facilitate HOPE and changed their computer systems to identify, flag, and prioritize HOPE cases.

Summary

Overall, the Superior Court HOPE judge was viewed as being most responsible for implementing HOPE in Essex County. As the leader, he runs the weekly meetings and attempts to address any issues that arise. The Chief Justice of the statewide court was responsible for initiating the application process. Individuals from the Sentencing Commission/Administrative Office of the Trial Court wrote the grant with input from the Superior Court judge. The HOPE PC was seen as being very valuable to developing forms, handling the budget, and setting up the drug testing hotline. The Sergeant from the Salem Police Department was critical in ensuring that warrants for HOPE cases are served as quickly as possible. Neither the Prosecutor nor Defense Counsel played an important role in implementing HOPE. In terms of communication, everyone communicates with the judges at least once a week. HOPE team members reported communicating with the HOPE POs, probation management, and the PC quite frequently as well.

Average involvement and communication ratings for each role in the HOPE team

Role	Involvement	Communication
Program Coordinator	4.67	4.00
Probation Management	4.20	4.11
HOPE Judge (Superior)	4.67	4.33
HOPE Judge (District)	4.00	4.33
HOPE POs	3.57	4.00
Prosecutor	1.14	1.33
Defense Counsel	1.86	3.00
Jail Administrator	3.00	2.13
Sheriff/Other Law Enforcement	4.50	2.89

There is a significant positive correlation between average involvement and communication ratings such that those who are rated as being more involved are more likely to have higher communication ratings ($r = .77$).

Self-Ratings on Involvement Compared to Average Ratings

Role	Self-Rating	Average Rating	Differential
Program Coordinator	5.00	4.67	0.33
Superior Court Judge	5.00	4.67	0.33
HOPE POs DC Group 1	1.00	3.57	-2.57
HOPE POs DC Group 2	5.00	3.57	1.43
HOPE POs SC	5.00	3.57	1.43
Public Defender	1.00	1.86	-0.86

The most noticeable difference between self-ratings and the average rating came from District Court POs Group 1. They reported that they were not involved in implementing HOPE and that it was simply handed to them. District Court POs Group 2 rated themselves highly but mentioned that they were not involved in the work to prepare for implementation. However, they did say that they are very involved in the day-to-day operation of HOPE. Overall, these findings should be interpreted with caution as the average reflects the ratings provided by the stakeholders who did not distinguish between District Court POs and Superior Court POs.

Training

Most HOPE team members reported that they attended the training in Hawaii (both Judges, Public Defender, and Jail Administrator). Those who attended this training session felt that it was useful and worthwhile, except the visit to the drug treatment center. Most POs attended the on-site training provided by Pepperdine and the PC also sat in on this training. One group of POs reported that they wished they could have attended the Hawaii training since they perceived themselves as being critical to

implementing HOPE. These individuals mentioned that they frequently need to explain the principles of HOPE to the defense bar.

Perceptions of HOPE and PAU

HOPE – All interview groups, except for the Public Defender, mentioned at least one of the three key themes of HOPE (swift, certain, and consistent sanctions). Another common theme was HOPE probationers have more face time with the judge. Interestingly, there was disagreement over whether HOPE probationers have more face time with their PO compared to PAU. The Superior Court POs reported that HOPE probationers have more face time with their PO, but others said that HOPE and PAU probationers have the same amount of face time. The DC POs reported that face time with the PO is determined by risk level. Several HOPE team members cited that HOPE takes the discretion and variation away from probation and that a sanction grid is used by the judge to ensure consistent sanctioning.

PAU – PAU was described as highly inconsistent, especially in regards to sanctioning. Sanctions are often delayed and disconnected from the probationers' behavior. The process of UA testing is also inconsistent since it is left up to the individual PO to decide when a probationer will be tested. One group of POs mentioned that UA's only happen once per month and that positive UA's are handled differently depending on the type of drug and other factors. Another key feature of PAU is the lack of interaction with the judge. Probationers may be released from prison and placed on supervision without a court appearance. Under PAU, the PO has a greater role in the violation hearings and presents background information about the probationer. The PO also recommends a sanction to the judge rather than the judge using a sanction grid.

Implementation Barriers and Facilitators

Perhaps the most challenging barrier to implementation in Essex County was the state-wide hiring freeze that caused delays with getting up and running. Implementing HOPE was difficult without having much extra money to hire line probation officers and support staff. Since HOPE POs in Essex County maintain their full caseload, there was some initial pushback from them due to the extra demands placed upon them by HOPE. Others reported that having to follow the procedures of the DFE made for a slow start, especially in terms of figuring out randomization procedures.

In terms of facilitators, most people reported that the cooperation between probation, the jail, and the Salem Police Department has been critical to the success of the program. The Superior Court judge's enthusiasm, leadership, and flexibility have helped all members of the team "buy in" and support HOPE. The weekly meetings were viewed as being valuable to successfully implementing HOPE.

Personal Opinions of HOPE

The Superior Court judge expressed very strong support for HOPE and said that HOPE is the "last best hope of the criminal justice system." On the other hand, the District Court judge admitted to being skeptical about the program at first, but has since come to see the value in it. One group of District Court POs brought into question how well the HOPE program is being carried out in practice. The PC, a group of District Court POs, and the Public Defender all commented that HOPE is the way probation should work. The general feeling towards HOPE seems to be quite positive and with the key players being aware of the success of HOPE in Hawaii, they are willing and enthusiastic to try it in Massachusetts.

Intermediate Site Visit Summary

Involvement in Ongoing Implementation/Operation of HOPE & Communication

Members of the process evaluation team interviewed 15 individuals from eight key positions involved in HOPE in Essex County, Massachusetts in early September, 2013. The intermediate interviews occurred about 9 months after the baseline interviews. Since HOPE is operating in both the District court and Superior court, individuals from both courts were interviewed for some positions. Those interviewed included the Program Coordinator (PC), the HOPE Judges from both the Superior Court and District Court, HOPE Probation Officers (POs) from the Superior and District court, 3 individuals from Probation Management (2 CPOs and the Sentencing Commission), the Public Defender, Police Sergeant, and the Deputy Sheriff/Jail Administrator. As part of the qualitative interview, these individuals were asked to rate the following stakeholders on their involvement in the ongoing implementation and operation of HOPE as well as their frequency of communication: HOPE Judge, Prosecutor, Defense Counsel, HOPE POs, Probation Management, Jail Administrator, Sheriff/other law enforcement, HOPE PC, and other. For example, "How important is the HOPE Judge to the ongoing implementation and operation of HOPE?" (1 = *not at all*; 5 = *great extent*) and "How often do you communicate with the HOPE POs?" (1 = *never*; 5 = *every day*).

HOPE PC

The PC was viewed as critical to the ongoing implementation and operation of HOPE ($M = 4.88$, $SD = 0.31$). This rating increased slightly from the time of the baseline interviews ($M = 4.67$, $SD = 0.52$). The PC maintains fidelity records, manages the federal grant, coordinates weekly meetings, and facilitates communication between everyone involved in the program. An individual from Probation Management noted that the PC's background as a former PO has been very helpful for her role in the project since she is familiar with probation and the court system. One of the CPOs commented that the PC is equal to the Judge in terms of importance to HOPE, however; another person mentioned that "everything flows" from the Judge. The PC stated that she would like to have more time so that she could provide training for the POs and prepare a HOPE manual.

Some of the POs reported that the PC is responsible for managing any issues with the color line and that this is an area for improvement since the Probation department can't keep up with these problems.

Average communication with the PC increased since the baseline interviews with nearly all stakeholders communicating with the PC at least once a week ($M = 4.27$, $SD = 0.65$; baseline: $M = 4.00$, $SD = 1.31$).

HOPE Judge (Superior Court)

This judge was rated the highest out of all the stakeholders for his involvement with the operation of HOPE ($M = 5.00$, $SD = 0.00$). This rating increased since the baseline interviews ($M = 4.67$, $SD = 0.52$). This judge would have liked to devote more of his time to the staffing shortage issues and navigating state bureaucracy issues. One of the CPOs suggested that having more individual time to meet with the Judge would be valuable. This would give the CPOs an opportunity to keep the Judge up to date on POs caseload numbers.

Besides the Jail and Sheriff's office, all stakeholders communicate with this judge at least once a week ($M = 4.11$, $SD = 1.05$). This communication rating has decreased slightly since the baseline interviews ($M = 4.33$, $SD = 0.52$).

HOPE Judge (District Court)

The District Court POs rated this judge on his involvement with HOPE and all agreed that he is very important to the program ($M = 5.00$, $SD = 0.00$). This rating increased since baseline ($M = 4.00$, $SD = 1.41$). One respondent mentioned that more backup HOPE Judges would be useful in District Court, because their current backup Judge is not always in the courthouse. The District Court POs report communicating less frequently with this judge than the Superior Court POs communicate with their own HOPE judge in Superior Court ($M = 3.67$, $SD = 0.58$). They are communicating less often than during the time of the baseline interviews ($M = 4.33$, $SD = 0.58$).

HOPE POs

The HOPE POs were praised for their continued involvement in the operation of HOPE ($M = 4.73$, $SD = 0.47$). This rating was somewhat higher than at baseline because District Court POs had very little involvement during implementation ($M = 3.57$, $SD = 1.90$). The main concern regarding the POs contributions to the program is that they still maintain caseloads outside of the HOPE program. As caseloads continue to grow, the POs recognize that HOPE is a priority, but with it taking up so much of their time, they believe that it would be beneficial to have POs dedicated solely to HOPE caseloads.

Looking specifically at the Superior Court POs, one was recently promoted to assistant chief, so her caseload is decreasing. The other Superior Court PO will be leaving to do something different in the future. These POs reported that they'd like to spend more time with HOPE probationers, like doing home visits and looking for absconders, but their caseloads are too large for this extra time.

In terms of communication, most interviewees communicate with the POs quite often, except the Sentencing Commission and the Deputy Sheriff ($M = 4.22$, $SD = 1.09$). This rating was slightly higher than at baseline ($M = 4.00$, $SD = 1.55$).

Probation Management

Most stakeholders considered Probation Management to be very involved in the ongoing operation of HOPE ($M = 4.50$, $SD = 0.93$). This rating has increased slightly since baseline ($M = 4.20$, $SD = 0.45$). One group of POs mentioned that the CPOs are much more involved than assistant CPOs. Other POs mentioned that sending Management to trainings and meetings is not very productive and that Management should focus its attention on the POs, especially in light of the growing caseloads. For those who rated Probation Management on the lower side, the reasoning was that the philosophy of HOPE is set by certain program parameters and has very little to do with supervisors.

Communication with Probation Management varies based on different positions, but the Superior Court judge and the POs communicate most often with Probation Management ($M = 3.82$, $SD = 0.98$). On average, stakeholders are communicating less frequently with Probation Management than they were at the time of the baseline interviews ($M = 4.11$, $SD = 0.78$).

Prosecutor

Much like at the baseline interviews, the Prosecutor has very little involvement in terms of the ongoing operation of HOPE ($M = 1.45$, $SD = 0.82$; baseline: $M = 1.14$, $SD = 0.38$). Several individuals mentioned that perhaps the Prosecutor will be more involved when the evaluation is over and they can have a say in recommending defendants for HOPE. Since the Prosecutor is not involved, there is almost no communication outside of attendance at HOPE staff meetings ($M = 1.67$, $SD = 0.89$; baseline: $M = 1.33$, $SD = 0.50$).

Defense Counsel

The Defense Counsel was viewed as having moderate importance in the ongoing implementation of HOPE ($M = 3.27$, $SD = 0.52$). This rating has increased since the baseline interviews since the Defense Counsel was not involved in the initial implementation of the program ($M = 1.86$, $SD = 0.90$). One common observation among several stakeholders was that HOPE was never formally introduced or explained to the Defense Counsel, so the POs often spend a lot of time talking about the program to them. The Public Defender reported that the Defense Counsel is “superfluous to HOPE,” but believes that the warning hearings are much better than PAU and is glad that probationers only get two or three days in jail.

Many of the central stakeholders communicate with the Defense Counsel often, but others like the Sheriff and Jail Administrator are rarely in contact ($M = 3.18$, $SD = 1.08$). On average, people are communicating with the Defense Counsel more often than they did during the baseline interviews ($M = 1.86$, $SD = 0.90$).

Jail Administrator

Most interviewees rated the Jail Administrator highly for his involvement in the continuing operation of HOPE ($M = 3.88$, $SD = 1.17$). This rating has increased since the baseline interviews ($M = 3.00$, $SD = 0.82$). Several stakeholders mentioned that the communication between the Jail Staff and other HOPE team members is very positive and effective. There is good coordination for HOPE violation processes like transportation and detention and HOPE is well-integrated into the Jail’s normal functions. Communication with the Jail Administrator has decreased since the baseline interviews ($M = 1.91$, $SD = 0.70$; baseline: $M = 2.13$, $SD = 0.99$).

Sheriff

The Sheriff’s Office was rated highly for its ongoing involvement in the operation of HOPE ($M = 4.55$, $SD = 0.69$). This rating was nearly the same as it was at baseline ($M = 4.50$, $SD = 0.55$). The expedited warrant service was mentioned by several interviewees as one of the Sheriff Office’s most valuable contributions. Also, the coordination between the Salem Police Department and other police departments has been successful for serving warrants in other areas in the region.

In terms of communication, most stakeholders do not communicate with the Sheriff’s Office very often ($M = 2.45$, $SD = 0.69$). This rating is slightly lower than at baseline ($M = 2.89$, $SD = 1.54$).

Other – Court Clerk’s Office, Drug Testers, Residential Treatment, Chief Justice

As in the baseline interviews, some interviewees mentioned the contributions of the Court Clerk’s Office to the ongoing implementation of HOPE. This office is responsible for coordination, documentation, and getting warrants out quickly to the various police departments. Other important stakeholders that were mentioned include drug testers and the Salvation Army which is the residential treatment provider. Finally, the Chief Justice was cited by the PC and the Judge as an important player when it comes to staffing requests.

Average involvement and communication ratings for each role in the HOPE team

Role	Involvement	Communication
Program Coordinator	4.88	4.27
Probation Management	4.50	3.82
HOPE Judge (Superior)	5.00	4.11
HOPE Judge (District)	5.00	3.67
HOPE POs	4.73	4.22
Prosecutor	1.45	1.67
Defense Counsel	3.27	3.18
Jail Administrator	3.88	1.91
Sheriff/Other Law Enforcement	4.55	2.45

Correlations

Involvement scores across time were highly correlated ($r = .92, p < .001$). Communication scores also remained stable between the time of the baseline and intermediate interviews ($r = .94, p < .001$). Within the intermediate interviews, there was a significant relationship between involvement scores and communication ($r = .74, p = .02$). Higher involvement scores were associated with higher communication scores.

Self-Ratings on Involvement Compared to Average Ratings

Role	Self-Rating	Average Rating	Differential
Program Coordinator	5.00	4.88	0.12
Probation Management	5.00	4.50	0.50
Superior Court Judge	5.00	5.00	0.00
HOPE POs DC Group 1	5.00	4.73	0.27
HOPE POs DC Group 2	5.00	4.73	0.27
HOPE POs SC	4.00	4.73	-0.73
Defense Counsel	2.50	3.27	-0.77
Jail Administrator	5.00	3.88	1.12
Sheriff	5.00	4.55	0.45

Several of the self vs. average ratings were very similar; however, the largest difference exists for the Jail Administrator, who rated himself higher than others did on average. Another noticeable difference was the Public Defender who rated herself between a 2 and a 3 while other stakeholders perceived her involvement to be more substantial.

Summary

Overall, most of the ratings of stakeholders' involvement and communication about HOPE remained very similar at the intermediate interviews. There is still no direct involvement from the Prosecutor; however, contributions from the Jail Administrator, Defense Counsel, and POs have increased since initial implementation. Quick warrant service has been maintained thanks to the good relationships built

between the Salem police department and other local police departments. Finally, one major area for improvement would be considering some type of training for the Defense Counsel on HOPE since this group of people was never formally introduced to the program.

Training

There has been no formal training since the Hawaii training in 2012. However, both Judges and the District Court CPO attended Pepperdine's meeting in Malibu in early August, 2013. Some POs expressed some concern over the fact that they did not receive any formal training. Two stakeholders were interviewed for the first time at the intermediate interviews and they provided feedback on the Hawaii training. One participant mentioned that the Hawaii training was very valuable. The other respondent said that the Hawaii training would have been more helpful if she had been able to spend time with the CPO in Hawaii. This person would have also liked to have seen the POs included in the Hawaii training. Her perception was that HOPE is very judge-driven since Judge Alm created it, but she recognizes that in implementing the program, it is much more probation-driven.

Leadership in HOPE

There was some variety in the responses to the question about which members of the HOPE team have emerged as strong leaders. Several interviewees nominated the Superior Court judge, including himself. However, some stakeholders view the Judge as more of an advocate for HOPE rather than a leader. The CPOs were also identified as leaders for their critical role in handling quality control and managing the referral process for HOPE. One group of District Court POs identified the District Court HOPE judge as the leader while another group of District Court POs named the PC as the leader of the program. The Superior Court PO who now serves as assistant chief was also mentioned as a leader by a fellow PO. At the state level, the Chief Justice is seen as a leader through her support of HOPE. Others expressed the idea that no one person is the leader and that HOPE is a collaborative effort.

Satisfaction with Group Process

Most stakeholders reported that they are satisfied with the group process and are pleased with the staffing meetings that occur weekly. Others noted some tension between District Court and Superior Court. The perception is that the Superior Court gets all the resources and is viewed as more important than District Court. The District Court POs expressed the most discontent over this issue, and were also concerned about the lack of training and feedback for their role in HOPE. Other POs mentioned that all the POs should be included in the team meetings since this does not currently happen.

Effectiveness of Sanctions

Stakeholders were asked to rate how effective the sanctions are in changing the behavior of HOPE probationers. On a 5-point scale, participants rated the sanctions as being quite effective ($M = 4.13$, $SD = 0.83$). Most interviewees noted that probationers are not surprised by a typical 2-3 day jail sentence for a violation. However, for probationers who have spent a lot of time in jail, 2-3 days may not be considered severe enough to influence a change in behavior. There have been some emotional reactions from probationers such as being upset about potential jail sanctions if they miss a UA due to some type of unpredictable emergency. One of the CPOs reported seeing some evidence of change in criminal thinking for those who have been in the program for a long time.

Probationers' Understanding of HOPE Sanctioning Goals and Process

Using a similar 5-point scale, the key stakeholders believe that HOPE probationers have a moderate understanding of the sanctioning goals and process ($M = 3.85$, $SD = 1.00$). Most interviewees said that the probationers understand the chain of consequences, but there are some whose antisocial attitudes are so strong that they will not succeed. The Public Defender noted that many probationers who have served long sentences prior to HOPE do not understand why they must continue in the HOPE program after serving their short jail sentence. These probationers seem to be the type who won't completely understand and won't change their behavior. Also, the Judge mentioned that drug users have difficulty understanding why they shouldn't be able to use drugs, but at least some of them do understand that HOPE is trying to help them lead a better life.

Sanctioning Process

The Judges, CPOs and POs were involved in developing the sanctioning grid based on information from the other sites. The same grid is used in both Superior and District courts which keeps the process consistent. When asked how closely the Judges follow the grid, answers ranged from 80% of the time to 99% of the time. The District Court HOPE judge identified four factors that help determine the length of the sanction: nature of the violation, number of prior violations, extenuating circumstances, work schedule. The Judges do not escalate sanctions and the typical range is 1 – 3 days.

Personal Opinions of HOPE

There was a range of responses for stakeholders' personal opinions of HOPE. The Superior Court judge believes that HOPE is the future of criminal justice, while others said that they will wait to see what the results say about the program's effectiveness before forming an opinion. One PO doesn't fully support HOPE because he believes the Judge is too lenient when tolerating repeated violations. Overall, most interviewees have positive opinions and are happy to be working with the program. The District Court judge thinks the whole experience will be the most rewarding if there is a reduction in recidivism and if probationers appreciate the program on a personal level.

Implementation and Ongoing Operation Barriers

The most commonly cited problems in the ongoing operation of HOPE were the staffing issues and hiring freeze. One major concern is that the POs have high caseloads and are not solely dedicated to HOPE. The POs mentioned that this is problematic because when there is a violation from a HOPE probationer, the PO must immediately stop what they're doing and process the violation. This can be very time-consuming and it is problematic for the non-HOPE probationers assigned to that PO. The POs also expressed a concern about using the ORAS, saying that it is very subjective. The POs suspect that they are not admitting everyone who may be eligible and there could be some probationers coming into the program who really shouldn't be admitted. Finally, there is concern about the number of violations that can accumulate before a probationer is revoked. The POs feel that this threshold is too high.

Implementation and Ongoing Operation Facilitators

Many stakeholders mentioned that the weekly staff meetings and good communication across various departments were some of the most important facilitators to the ongoing implementation of HOPE. The support from Pepperdine in terms of weekly phone calls and trainings was mentioned as another positive aspect of the program. The leadership and support from all the Judges, including those directly involved in the program, and the Chief Justice, was viewed as very valuable. All stakeholders

appear to get along well, have positive attitudes, and collaborate effectively in the best interest of HOPE.

HOPE's Burden on Stakeholders

Interviewees were asked to describe the extent to which their participation in HOPE has been a burden to them. On a scale of 1 to 5, with higher scores representing a greater burden, most participants reported that HOPE was only a slight to moderate burden ($M = 2.79, SD = 1.56$). For those who indicated that HOPE was a burden to them, it was described as a burden due to the lack of resources and staffing issues. Some of the POs reported that HOPE is a burden on them, due to their increased caseloads and the extra time that is required to deal with violations. The Superior Court judge felt like HOPE has been a burden on him, but he also admits that he is in charge of making sure that everything and everyone is working properly for the program.

HOPE's Burden on Various Departments

Participants rated the extent to which they thought HOPE was a burden on the Court, Probation, and the Jail. Using the same 1-5 scale, overall, participants thought that HOPE was most burdensome to Probation ($M = 3.10, SD = 1.45$) and the Court ($M = 2.77, SD = 1.25$) and less burdensome to the Jail ($M = 2.00, SD = 0.94$). Returning to the staffing issues again, one respondent mentioned that there would be very little burden on probation if they had the proper resources. Also, one respondent rated the District Court probation department different than the Superior Court probation department. This person said that District Court probation runs better and therefore HOPE has been less of a burden there than in Superior Court probation.

HOPE Sustainability Plans

The state legislature has established funding for implementing HOPE in other counties. The Judges have been involved in some efforts to expand HOPE across the state by presenting at conferences and fielding phone calls from other sites. One respondent mentioned that the new commissioner is already interested in investigating HOPE to determine whether HOPE can become the new PAU. However, another respondent said that the continuation of HOPE will depend on the outcome of the study and who is remaining in Salem from the HOPE team.

Changes to PAU

One of the CPOs described some changes to PAU that went into effect in May 2013. There are an increased number of home visits required and there is additional paperwork and documentation. No other interviewees mentioned any other changes to PAU.

Key Findings from Intermediate Interviews

The most important findings from the intermediate interviews stress the lack of resources and staffing issues that seem to have some influence on the dynamics of the relationship between the District Court and Superior Court. Hiring dedicated HOPE POs would relieve the burden on the Probation department. Providing initial training for HOPE POs as well as for the Defense Counsel would also be valuable. Overall, the positive communication and collaboration between members of the HOPE team has contributed to the smooth operation of HOPE; however, including more people in the weekly staff meetings would improve upon this even more.

Final Site Visit Summary

Involvement in Ongoing Implementation/Operation of HOPE & Communication

Members of the process evaluation team interviewed 13 individuals involved in HOPE in Essex County, Massachusetts in early September, 2014. The final interviews occurred about 12 months after the intermediate interviews. Since HOPE is operating in both the District Court and Superior Court, individuals from both courts were interviewed for some positions. Those interviewed included the Program Coordinator (PC), the HOPE Judges from both the Superior Court and District Court, HOPE Probation Officers (POs) from the Superior and District court, 3 individuals from Probation Management (2 CPOs and the Sentencing Commission), Police Lieutenant from Salem Police Department, the Deputy Sheriff/Jail Administrator, and the Chief Justice. As part of the qualitative interview, these individuals were asked to rate the following stakeholders on their involvement in the ongoing implementation and operation of HOPE as well as their frequency of communication: HOPE Judge, Prosecutor, Defense Counsel, HOPE POs, Probation Management, Jail Administrator, Sheriff/other law enforcement, HOPE PC, and other. For example, “How important is the HOPE Judge to the ongoing implementation and operation of HOPE?” (1 = *not at all*; 5 = *great extent*) and “How often do you communicate with the HOPE POs?” (1 = *never*; 5 = *every day*).

HOPE PC

The PC was regarded as essential to the operations of HOPE ($M = 4.78$, $SD = 0.51$) by 8 of the interview groups. This rating has decreased slightly from the intermediate interviews ($M = 4.88$, $SD = 0.31$; baseline: $M = 4.67$, $SD = 0.52$). The interviewee from the Salem Police Department stated that the PC is the “production manager for HOPE. Keeps the team working together and the overall HOPE process going.” Five of the stakeholders highlighted how the PC ensures that HOPE is running smoothly and intervened if mistakes with implementation occurred. The interviewee from the Sentencing Commission noted how the PC will “host visitors (judges, legislators) and respond to media interest.”

Communication with the PC remained fairly consistent across all three interviews ($M = 4.14$, $SD = 0.78$; intermediate: $M = 4.27$, $SD = 0.65$; baseline: $M = 4.00$, $SD = 1.31$).

HOPE Judge (Superior Court)

The Superior Court HOPE Judge’s perceived involvement in the ongoing operation of HOPE in Essex County has been very high across all interviews with the stakeholders ($M = 4.86$, $SD = 0.38$; intermediate: $M = 5.00$, $SD = 0.00$; baseline: $M = 4.67$, $SD = 0.52$). The Superior Court Judge shared that he is aware of all aspects of the HOPE program and is receptive to feedback from the HOPE team. Aside from the Jail Administrator and Sentencing Commission, all stakeholders communicate with the judge at least once a week ($M = 4.14$, $SD = 0.90$; intermediate: $M = 4.11$, $SD = 1.05$). This communication rating has decreased slightly since the baseline interviews ($M = 4.33$, $SD = 0.52$).

HOPE Judge (District Court)

The District Court POs and Probation Management rated the District Court HOPE Judge as very important to the HOPE Program ($M = 5.00$, $SD = 0.00$). This is consistent with the ratings at the intermediate interviews, with both ratings being slightly higher than the baseline ratings (intermediate: $M = 5.00$, $SD = 0.00$; baseline: $M = 4.00$, $SD = 1.41$). The District Court POs expressed that the Judge provides swift and certain sanctioning to the HOPE probationers. District Court HOPE Judge highlighted

the importance of “maintain[ing] fidelity.” Aside from the Jail Administrator and Sentencing Commission, all stakeholders communicate with the District Court HOPE Judge relatively frequently, at least once a week ($M = 3.96$, $SD = 0.77$). Both the final and intermediate interview ratings are slightly lower than the baseline ratings (intermediate: $M = 3.67$, $SD = 0.58$; baseline: $M = 4.33$, $SD = 0.58$).

HOPE POs

The HOPE POs have consistently been regarded as important for their involvement in HOPE ($M = 4.90$, $SD = 0.32$; intermediate: $M = 4.73$, $SD = 0.47$). These ratings are higher than the ratings from the interviews at baseline ($M = 3.57$, $SD = 1.90$). Six of the interview groups stated that the POs were successful at quickly getting HOPE violators before the Judge. Two of the interview groups commented how the POs have adhered to the HOPE model with limited resources (e.g. staffing).

Communication with the POs happens regularly, except the Sentencing Commission and the Jail Administrator ($M = 4.25$, $SD = 1.16$; intermediate: $M = 4.22$, $SD = 1.09$, baseline: $M = 4.00$, $SD = 1.55$).

Probation Management

The interviewees regarded Probation Management as highly involved in the operation of HOPE ($M = 4.82$, $SD = 0.37$; intermediate: $M = 4.50$, $SD = 0.93$; baseline: $M = 4.20$, $SD = 0.45$). Six of the stakeholders highlighted how Probation Management offers support to the HOPE POs. For example, the Superior Court POs stated that Probation Management will “pull other POs in to help when needed.” The interviewee from the Salem Police Department stated that Probation Management functions as a “liaison with the HOPE judges, promote consistency and compliance with the model and promote buy in by the POs.”

The Superior Court CPO expressed how important his role is to HOPE and how he works to “drive HOPE forward,” the Superior Court Judge recognized the Superior Court CPO as a leader of HOPE who “keeps order in probation.”

Communication with Probation Management occurs fairly frequently with most of the stakeholders ($M = 3.92$, $SD = 0.61$; intermediate: $M = 3.82$, $SD = 0.98$; baseline: $M = 4.11$, $SD = 0.78$).

Prosecutor

Like the intermediate and baseline interviews, the Prosecutor was not rated as highly involved in the ongoing operation of HOPE ($M = 1.50$, $SD = 0.97$; intermediate: $M = 1.45$, $SD = 0.82$; baseline: $M = 1.14$, $SD = 0.38$). The Jail Administrator did state that the Prosecutor understands the HOPE model and demonstrates “cooperation with the judge.” Stakeholders reported little to no communication with the Prosecutor ($M = 1.20$, $SD = 0.42$; intermediate: $M = 1.67$, $SD = 0.89$; baseline: $M = 1.33$, $SD = 0.50$).

Defense Counsel

Interviewees reported that the Defense Counsel had moderate importance to the operation of HOPE in Essex County ($M = 3.44$, $SD = 0.73$). This rating is similar to the intermediate rating, both the final and intermediate ratings are higher than the baseline ratings (intermediate: $M = 3.27$, $SD = 0.52$; baseline: $M = 1.86$, $SD = 0.90$). The Defense Counsel was regarded as someone who provides advocacy for the probationers and as someone with a knowledge of the workings of the violation hearings. The District Court HOPE Judge and the Jail Administrator highlighted that the Defense Counsel demonstrates buy-in to HOPE.

The HOPE Judges, POs, and Probation Management reported the most contact with the Defense Counsel. Communication with the Defense Counsel increased throughout the interview intervals ($M = 3.30, SD = 1.25$; intermediate: $M = 3.18, SD = 1.08$; baseline: $M = 1.86, SD = 0.90$).

Jail Administrator

Interviewees reported varying degrees of importance when rating the Jail Administrator’s role in the HOPE Program ($M = 3.10, SD = 1.29$). This rating has decreased since the intermediate interviews ($M = 3.88, SD = 1.17$) and is similar to the baseline ratings ($M = 3.00, SD = 0.82$). Two of the interview groups cited how the Jail Administrator works to house violators. The Jail Administrator stated that, “We process the house violators- this means more work for us but it’s important. We treat HOPE inmates like any other inmate.” Communication with the Jail Administrator has been fairly consistent across the three interviews ($M = 2.00, SD = 0.71$; intermediate $M = 1.91, SD = 0.70$; baseline: $M = 2.13, SD = 0.99$).

Sheriff

Stakeholders rated the Sheriff’s Office highly for its importance and involvement in HOPE ($M = 4.89, SD = 0.33$). This rating is consistent with the involvement ratings from stakeholders at the previous two interview periods (intermediate: $M = 4.55, SD = 0.69$; $M = 4.50, SD = 0.55$). Seven of the interview groups expressed that the Sheriff serves warrants quickly. The Superior Court POs highlighted that the Sheriff ensures the model by “follow[ing] through” with finding HOPE probationers. The Jail Administrator echoed this sentiment in that the Sheriff provides “diligence in tracking and apprehending absconders.”

Interviewees communication with the Sheriff’s Office increased slightly since the last set of interviews ($M = 3.06, SD = 1.01$; intermediate: $M = 2.45, SD = 0.69$; baseline: ($M = 2.89, SD = 1.54$).

Other – Court Clerk’s Office, Chief Justice, and Residential Treatment

As in the intermediate and baseline interviews, some interviewees noted the importance of the Court Clerk’s Office as they handle the paperwork from HOPE and are receptive to “add-ons, last minute violations.” The Superior Court POs and the Superior Court HOPE Judge highlighted the importance of the Chief Justice in bringing HOPE to Massachusetts. Finally, the Salvation Army was cited by the District Court POs as important to HOPE since it provides job training to HOPE probationers.

Average involvement and communication ratings for each role in the HOPE team

Role	Involvement	Communication
Program Coordinator	4.78	4.14
Probation Management	4.82	3.92
HOPE Judge Lu (Superior)	4.86	4.14
HOPE Judge Brennan (District)	5.00	3.96
HOPE POs	4.90	4.25
Prosecutor	1.50	1.20
Defense Counsel	3.44	3.30
Jail Administrator	3.10	2.00
Sheriff/Other Law Enforcement	4.89	3.06

Correlations

The correlation between the involvement and communication ratings during the final interview round was high and statistically significant ($r = 0.91, p = 0.001$), indicating a connection between who is strongly involved in HOPE operations and who communicates with whom. The correlation between the involvement ratings from the intermediate and final round was quite high and statistically significant ($r = 0.96, p < 0.001$), as was the correlation between the intermediate and final communication scores ($r = 0.96, p < 0.001$).

For this final round of interviews, the strength of the correlation between involvement and communication ratings increased from the intermediate and baseline interviews ($r = 0.91, p = 0.001$; intermediate: $r = 0.74, p = .02$; baseline $r = 0.77, p = 0.02$).

The intermediate and final involvement scores ($r = 0.96, p < 0.001$) compared to the baseline and intermediate involvement scores ($r = 0.92, p < 0.001$) demonstrated a slightly stronger, statistically significant correlation. The intermediate and final communication scores ($r = 0.96, p < 0.001$) compared to the baseline and intermediate communication scores ($r = 0.94, p < 0.001$) again represented a slightly stronger, statistically significant correlation.

Self-Ratings on Involvement Compared to Average Ratings

Role	Self-Rating	Average Rating	Differential
Program Coordinator	5.00	4.78	0.22
Probation Management	5.00	4.82	0.18
Superior Court Judge	5.00	4.86	0.14
District Court Judge	5.00	5.00	0.00
HOPE POs DC Group 1	5.00	4.9	0.10
HOPE POs DC Group 2	5.00	4.9	0.10
HOPE POs SC	5.00	4.9	0.10
Jail Administrator	5.00	3.10	1.90

The majority of the self vs. average ratings were very similar; however, the largest difference exists for the Jail Administrator, who rated himself higher than others did on average.

Summary

All stakeholders, except the Jail Administrator were rated as being highly involved in the operation of the HOPE program over the years. Individuals' perceived perception of importance to the HOPE program was accurate for all stakeholders except the Jail Administrator.

Key Components of HOPE

Seven of the interview groups highlighted the quick and consistent sanctions as one of the key components of HOPE. For example, the PC explained that the “certainty of detention; this was the most impactful” and how word of mouth has spread that jail sanctions will occur. Two of the interview groups stated that the clarity of the HOPE rules has made it easier for probationers to understand than PAU. The interviewee from the Sentencing Commission highlighted the importance of the public warning hearings, because that “has had a big impact on judges because there is a public forum (family, lawyers not familiar with HOPE) and it’s good for the public to see and hear these proceedings.”

Implementation Barriers and Facilitators

Four of the interview groups highlighted how HOPE presented a challenge in that probationers with mental health cases should not be in HOPE. The District Court Judge explained that mental health probationers have trouble understanding the model because “swift and certain didn’t register with them... sanctioning (jail) interfered with taking medications. Jail staff found it difficult to administer meds given short-term stays.” Two of the interview groups expressed interest in including non-English speaking probationers in the study. For example, a District Court team member explained that “a large Hispanic population...was excluded from participating in HOPE (because of the evaluation). We could adjust the model to make culturally appropriate for this population.”

Four of the interviewees explained how the short jail stays may not be effective for some probationers. The Jail Administrator stated that “for some harder core probationers, jail is just a cost of doing business, so doesn’t have much of an effect on them.” The Superior Court POs echoed this sentiment in that if a probationer does not work on the weekends that may factor into their cost-benefit analysis when violating, as they may not care about being in jail if they have nothing else going on then.

The Superior Court POs and the District Court CPO highlighted how allowing some discretion with sanctioning may be appropriate for certain cases with legitimate excuses. For example, The Superior Court CPO explained how “frequent UA testing can conflict with other demands on the probationers, such as their work schedules and family duties. This collateral damage can be unfair, but it’s part of the model.”

The PC and interviewee from the Sentencing Commission cited that the misconception that HOPE is simple, but instead is very resource intensive. The PC explained how HOPE, “requires staff, supportive judge and chief judge, police department for warrant service, a lot of coordination, cooperation, and commitment across agencies is required.” Four of the interview groups cited staffing as a potential barrier to HOPE, due to the POs heavy caseload, which was compounded by the long term, statewide hiring freeze that was in effect in Massachusetts since before the DFE even began.

The District and Superior Court CPOs explained how running both HOPE and an extensive pilot of the ORAS offender risk assessment system simultaneously was challenging. The HOPE District Court Judge highlighted a barrier being that there were two courts that had different approaches to HOPE. The District Court CPO and POs stated that it would have been helpful to and educate all POs about HOPE so if they need to fill in for a HOPE PO they would be familiar with how HOPE operates.

A facilitator highlighted by the Jail Administrator was that the jail operated smoothly and that “short jail stays have made an impact on most probationers- disrupts their lives- they are distraught from being taken from their kids, jobs, routines.”

Leadership

Most of the stakeholder interviewees mentioned multiple people as leaders of HOPE in the Essex County and three of the interviewees expressed that it is a joint effort from the HOPE team. Seven of the interview groups (Superior Court POs, Superior Court Judge, Chief Justice, Jail Administrator, District Court Judge, Salem Police Department, and Superior Court CPO) identified the Superior Court Judge as the leader of HOPE. Five of the interview groups highlighted the PC as a leader. Four of the interview groups mentioned the District Court Judge as leader of HOPE. The interviewee from the Salem Police Department was identified as a leader by the Jail Administrator, Chief Justice, and the Superior and District Court Judges. The Superior Court was also nominated by several team members as playing a leadership role.

Personal Opinions

Most interviewees felt positive about the HOPE program and appreciated the standardization of procedures to follow. For example, the District Court POs explained that “HOPE makes work easier- it takes away the gray area.” The District Court CPO and POs highlighted that PAU isn’t effective due to probationers not taking PAU seriously, where HOPE consequences are enforced. The interviewee from the Salem Police Department expressed that HOPE was a “better allocation of resources” because not all probationers need drug treatment, “HOPE is a better option for less serious addicts” frees up space in jail and treatment.

Organizational and System Level Changes

Four interviewees highlighted that a result of having HOPE in Essex County was that there was increased communication among the jail and police department. The interviewee from the Salem Police Department explained how, “HOPE has promoted better communication and information sharing between the agencies about offenders.” The Jail Administrator explained that “HOPE facilitated better relations between the jail and probation. Our relationship was good before, but better now.” The Chief Justice stated that they “plan on pushing for continuation and expansion of HOPE in Superior Court statewide.” Finally, the Superior Court Judge highlighted how through running HOPE and having interns “collect UAs in HOPE,” the Superior Court Judge wanted to “ask for a full-time UA staff for all probation...[to] help the overall staffing shortage in probation- no need to have POs doing this task.”

Future of HOPE

The PC explained how there is “legislative interest in expanding HOPE statewide,” this sentiment was echoed by the District and Superior Court Judges and the interviewee from the Sentencing Commission. The District Court POs and the interviewee from the Salem Police Department described that they thought planning was underway for HOPE to continue. Three of the interview groups, the Superior Court CPO, District Court POs, and the jail administrator, all cited that there would be positive support if HOPE were to continue in Essex County. The District Court Judge and the POs highlighted that HOPE was still operating in Essex County as they were continuing to randomize probationers. For HOPE to continue in Essex County the District and Superior Court CPOs both highlighted the need for additional staff POs.

Factors to Consider for the Expansion of HOPE in Massachusetts

Four of the twelve interview groups emphasized the point of having the necessary resources to run HOPE, especially available staff. The Superior and District Court judges highlighted the importance of

having an advocate for HOPE to promote buy-in with the legislature and judges, both individuals cited the Chief Justice as this person in Massachusetts. Two stakeholders, the Deputy Sheriff and the District Court CPO, stated the importance of local leadership for HOPE. The PC, District Court Judge, and the stakeholder from the Sentencing Commission all mentioned the risk assessment as something that needs to be considered for the expansion of HOPE in Massachusetts. For example, the District Court Judge explained how HOPE should be for high risk offenders, not low-risk offenders. The District Court HOPE POs and the Jail Administrator would encourage individuals engaging with the expansion of HOPE to maintain the swift and certain sanctions with the HOPE probationers. An understanding of the local agency was deemed important for expansion of HOPE by the Jail Administrator, Superior Court HOPE Judge, and the District Court CPO. Both the PC and the interviewee from the Sentencing Commission listed fidelity monitoring and standardized drug testing logistics for the expansion of HOPE. The stakeholder at the Salem Police Department explained the importance of getting the patrol officers to buy-in to the HOPE model since they are the individuals who search for absconders.

Drug Treatment Referrals

During the final site visit to Essex County HOPE, we also conducted a brief examination of the primary drug treatment program to which the plurality of HOPE probationer referrals were sent. As with all of the DFE sites, Essex County used a variety of drug treatment providers, and we were not able to examine all of them. Instead, we examined the program that received more HOPE referrals than any other. This was the Salvation Army Facility located in nearby Saugus, Massachusetts, approximately ten miles from the Essex County Courthouse in Salem. Essex County made the least use of treatment of any of the four DFE sites, referring only 15% of the HOPE probationers to some sort of drug treatment or other services. Most treatment referrals (54%) were to the Salvation Army program, with the remainder sent to over a dozen miscellaneous other providers. Thus, 15 (8%) of all HOPE probationers in Essex County experienced the Salvation Army program, although there was a great deal of recycling of probationers within specific programs (i.e. repeated referrals of the same probationer to the same program) as well as probationers being referred to multiple programs over time. Still, Salvation Army was clearly the preferred program for the HOPE court, and thus was the logical choice for our examination as reported below.

Our examination of the Salvation Army program using an abbreviated version of the Correctional Program Checklist (CPC) is described more fully in the methodology chapter. Again, the purpose of this examination was not to conduct a full-scale process or outcome evaluation of the Salvation Army program, which is beyond the scope of the HOPE DFE, but rather to provide a basic description of services provided through this Salvation Army site within the framework of the principles of effective offender intervention (Andrews and Bonta, 2003, MacKenzie, 2006; MacKenzie and Zajac, 2013). Thus, we cannot draw conclusions about whether this Salvation Army site is in fact effective, but we simply offer a summary of core programmatic features as they relate to these principles. Investigators Zajac and Dawes toured this site and conducted an interview with the director and several key staff at this site on September 2, 2014, during the final site visit to Essex County, to gather information about Salvation Army program operations. The following is a summary of key features of this program.

This Salvation Army site is a community residential facility attached to a typical Salvation Army donation center and retail store. This facility houses approximately 100 male and 20 female clients who

are housed in gender segregated units. This site employs approximately six staff who serve in counseling roles, in addition to other staff associated with the retail and other facility operations. The facility director indicates that this site has been in operation for approximately ten years and services there are entirely funded by proceeds from the retail operation, with no funding for HOPE referrals coming from the county or state. The director indicated that they do not always know in advance whether a given referral is from HOPE, but usually find out once the client has arrived. HOPE referrals make up a very small proportion of their overall clientele, which consists of a mix of agency and self-referrals, including offenders and non-offenders. The director indicated that the HOPE clients are not treated any differently than any other client.

Clients remain at this residential facility for at least six months, and up to one year. Length of stay seems to be determined primarily by clinical judgment and/or at the request of the client. Clients proceed through four phases:

- Phase 1 – Orientation – 4 weeks
- Phase 2 – Education/insight, relapse prevention, building support networks – 6 weeks
- Phase 3 - reentry planning (employment, housing and finding a sponsor) – 8 weeks
- Phase 4 – Aftercare planning – 8 weeks

A typical day at this facility is as follows:

- 6am - 7am: Breakfast and prayer
- 7:30am – 4pm: “work therapy” in retail center and warehouse
- 4pm – 6pm: Dinner and miscellaneous tasks
- 6pm – 7pm: Unspecified group activities, depending on phase

The HOPE court makes referrals to this Salvation Army site (as well as to other drug programs used by HOPE) based on a demonstrated pattern of need for treatment, such as repeated positive urine screens. This decision appears to be based on clinical judgment of HOPE probation staff, although no objective assessment of need for treatment using a standardized instrument appears to be conducted. The HOPE court also assesses the risk level of probationers using the ORAS (see elsewhere in the final DFE report for a discussion of risk assessment methods across sites), but the Salvation Army facility itself does not appear to conduct any sort of criminogenic risk or needs assessment of referrals. Indeed, as noted above, this facility also serves non-criminal justice clients for whom such assessments would not be appropriate. The Salvation Army staff report that they would likely reject a referral based upon a specific offense type (e.g. sex offenders or arsonists) or due to a previous history of that client dealing drugs while at the facility, but otherwise they accept 95% of referrals.

The facility staff indicated that the primary targets of change addressed by their program are self-esteem, self-worth, and spiritual needs, as well as some evidently lesser emphasis on anger, communication and substance use. Little discussion was made of targeting more empirically supported criminogenic needs, such as anti-social attitudes and values, criminal peers or pro-social decision making (Andrews and Bonta, 2003). Thus, the primary targets of change here appear to be non-criminogenic.

With respect to the treatment model in use, facility leadership and staff were quick to emphasize that they do not consider themselves to be a treatment facility, and they do not consider what they do to be “treatment.” They preferred to use the more general term “rehabilitation” to refer to what they do. They emphasized that they are entirely self-funded (from proceeds of their retail operations) and

draw no support from public funds, which would subject them to regulatory oversight as in the case of a licensed drug treatment facility. They also do not charge any fees to their clients (or “beneficiaries”, as they preferred to call them), who themselves work in the facility’s retail operations. They characterized their services as a holistic, Christian, faith-centered approach that emphasizes self-help principles (12 Step groups), drug and alcohol education, some aspects of anger management and relapse prevention, and some individual counseling as needed. They indicated that they follow the “standard” Salvation Army faith-based approach to the services they deliver to clients. For the most part, all clients receive all aspects of these services, regardless of need (which is not formally assessed). Again, it is worth reemphasizing that this facility does not identify itself as a “treatment program” in the conventional clinical sense, and indeed we saw no evidence to suggest otherwise. Our impression was that this facility follows an eclectic model of service delivery with a common focus on faith-based and basic psycho-educational approaches, along with a strong and indeed primary emphasis on work.

As noted earlier in the outline of the typical daily schedule for this facility, the great majority of the clients’ days (c. 8 hours per day) are spent working in the facility’s retail operations, primarily in the warehouse, sorting and prepping public donations for sale in the attached retail store. Again, this facility indicated that they derive the bulk of their budget from this retail operation. There is a small amount of time in the evenings devoted to various types of groups, including 12 Step, small discussion groups focusing on topics such as anger and relapse, and other psycho-educational activities. There was no indication that time is devoted to the formal practice and rehearsal of any behavioral skills learned in the group setting. The size of the evening groups can range from approximately 15 clients to the entire facility, depending on the group. Thus, while the clients *are* kept busy in formal, supervised activities for much of the day and even into the evening, these activities focus primarily on routine warehouse work assignments that would seem to be unrelated to the putative reason for their referral to this facility, namely, a behaviorally determined substance abuse problem.

After completion of Phase 1, clients can get a pass for 2 overnights away from the facility per month. There appears to be no monitoring of their activities while on pass, and their HOPE probation officer is not necessarily informed when they are on a community pass. Thus, there is some concern about unsupervised activities while in the program. But, the facility also reports conducting urine screens twice per week, on a random and for cause basis.

Client completion criteria are based on attainment of specific objectives, not simply on time spent in the program. But, these objectives include criteria such as adherence to a dress code and tardiness at work, which are not relevant to the rehabilitation of substance abuse problems. Staff also report that many program graduates stay on as “resident employees”, so for these clients it is unclear when and how the tie to the program is completely severed.

This facility employs six counseling staff, all of whom possess a Bachelor’s Degree, with varying levels of experience in offender rehabilitation, but a “Christian commitment” was indicated as being the most important criteria for staff selection. It is unclear to what extent if any staff are provided with formal training on principles of evidence based offender intervention. Again, this facility also has a significant non-offender clientele, making a focus on offender issues less salient for the staff.

HOPE probation staff indicated that they do not regularly check on the HOPE clients while in this program, but recognize the need to do so, albeit being limited in their ability to do so due to staff

shortages. They also do not conduct any formal program auditing of this site. Finally, it does not appear that this facility has undergone any sort of formal outcome evaluation.

In sum, it is difficult for us to properly examine this program in light of the principles of effective offender intervention, as this program is not principally geared towards the treatment of offender criminogenic needs (or of offenders in general), and does not consider itself to be a treatment program. Instead, we provide above a basic description of the services delivered in order to better understand the primary program to which HOPE probationers in Essex County are referred, bearing in mind the overall small number of treatment referrals at this DFE site.

References

- Andrews, D.A. and James Bonta. 2003. *The Psychology of Criminal Conduct*. Cincinnati: Anderson Publishing.
- Lindblom, Charles E. 1959. "The Science of 'Muddling Through'." *Public Administration Review*, 19(2), 79-88.
- MacKenzie, Doris Layton. 2006. *What Works in Corrections*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- MacKenzie, Doris Layton and Gary Zajac. 2013. *What Works in Corrections: The Impact of Correctional Interventions on Recidivism*. Monograph commissioned by The National Academy of Sciences Committee on the Causes and Consequences of High Rates of Incarceration.
- Zajac, Gary, Pamela K. Lattimore, Debbie Dawes and Laura Winger. 2015. "All Implementation is Local: Initial Findings from the Process Evaluation of the Honest Opportunity Probation with Enforcement (HOPE) Demonstration Field Experiment." *Federal Probation*, 79(1), 31-36.

SALINE COUNTY, ARKANSAS HOPE DFE PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

Contents

Saline County, Arkansas HOPE Overview.....	1
Key Findings and Conclusions – HOPE Implementation in Saline County, Arkansas.....	2
Implementation Fidelity.....	6
Baseline Site Visit Summary.....	7
Involvement & Communication	7
HOPE PC.....	7
HOPE Judge.....	7
HOPE POs.....	7
Probation Management	7
Prosecutor	8
Defense Counsel	8
Jail Administrator.....	8
Sheriff/Other Law Enforcement	8
Other – AOC (Administration Office of the Courts).....	8
Summary.....	8
Training.....	9
Perceptions of HOPE and PAU.....	10
Implementation Barriers and Facilitators.....	10
Personal Opinions of HOPE	10
Intermediate Site Visit Summary	12
Involvement in Ongoing Implementation/Operation of HOPE & Communication.....	12
HOPE PC.....	12
HOPE Judge.....	12
HOPE POs.....	12
Probation Management	13
Prosecutor	13
Defense Counsel	13
Jail Administrator/Staff.....	13
Sheriff/Other Law Enforcement	14
Other – AOC (Administration Office of the Courts).....	14
Correlations	14
Summary.....	15
Training.....	15
Leadership in HOPE	15
Satisfaction with Group Process.....	16
Effectiveness of Sanctions	16
Probationers’ Understanding of HOPE Sanctioning Goals and Process.....	16
Sanctioning Process.....	17
Sanctioning Grid	17
Technical Violations	17
General Sanctionable Offenses.....	17
Positive Test with Positive Confirmation	18
Abscond Probationers.....	18

Personal Opinions of HOPE	18
Implementation and Ongoing Operation Barriers	18
Implementation and Ongoing Operation Facilitators	19
HOPE’s Burden on Stakeholders.....	19
HOPE’s Burden on Various Departments	19
HOPE Sustainability Plans	19
Changes to PAU	20
Key Findings from Intermediate Interviews	20
Final Site Visit Summary.....	21
HOPE PC.....	21
HOPE Judge.....	21
HOPE POs.....	21
Probation Management	22
Prosecutor	22
Defense Counsel	22
Jail Administrator.....	22
Sheriff	23
Other (Administration Office of the Courts).....	23
Summary.....	24
Key Components of HOPE	25
Implementation Barriers and Facilitators.....	25
Leadership	25
Personal Opinions.....	26
Organizational and System Level Changes	26
Future of HOPE	26
Factors to Consider for the Expansion of HOPE in Arkansas	26
Drug Treatment Referrals.....	26
References	31

Saline County, Arkansas HOPE Overview

The following report presents findings from the process evaluation of the HOPE DFE site in Saline County, Arkansas. Results are presented from three evaluation site visits and an analysis of implementation fidelity metrics. As a preface, we provide an overview of the site itself, discussing key local administrative and organizational features within the site that influence the operation of HOPE there. See the Methods chapter for more information about the DFE and the research design.

The Saline County HOPE site was the smallest and arguably the most rural of the four DFE sites. This program was based in Benton Arkansas, approximately 30 miles southwest of Little Rock. The HOPE management team in Saline County consists of the HOPE judge, HOPE program coordinator, two HOPE probation officers who are fully dedicated to HOPE (they do not carry a non-HOPE caseload), two representatives from the Sheriff's department, the public defender and an assistant district attorney. Unlike in the other three DFE sites, there was no consistent presence from state probation management. Instead, oversight of the HOPE probation function was largely delegated to the HOPE judge for the purposes of the DFE.

Probation in Saline County is a statewide function with probation officers being state employees assigned to local districts. Probation is a state cabinet level agency and is not directly connected to the state Administrative Office of the Court (AOC). At the time of our first visit to the site, probation was known as the Department of Community Corrections, or DCC, later changing its name to Arkansas Community Corrections, or ACC. For the purposes of the HOPE DFE, DCC/ACC delegated to AOC the authority for the HOPE Judge to exercise considerable direction over the work of the two HOPE probation officers as they executed their HOPE duties. Thus, the HOPE judge served as the de facto supervisor of the HOPE probation officers, making the operational linkage between probation and the court relatively strong.

Probation officers in Arkansas have arrest powers and are armed. In addition to the typical direct supervisory and paperwork tasks associated with probation, the two HOPE probation officers also conducted all risk and needs assessments on HOPE probationers, administered all drug tests, served most of the warrants for violators and absconders, were responsible for transportation and other processing tasks and engaged in service brokerage and case management. Unlike the other DFE sites, the Saline County site did not have specialized units or officers for tasks such as assessment or drug testing.

The origins of the HOPE program in Saline County traces to a state prison reform/justice reinvestment panel on which the eventual HOPE judge sat in the years prior to the release of the BJA solicitation. HOPE was discussed as an option during the deliberations of this panel, and the judge found the concept appealing. Moreover, Act 570 passed by the Arkansas legislature in 2011 encouraged and supported the exploration of HOPE-type programs throughout Arkansas. Upon the release of the BJA solicitation in 2011, the AOC decided to apply, and the eventual Saline County HOPE judge persuaded AOC to use Saline County as the site for the DFE. Thus, as was the case in the other DFE sites, the pump had already been primed for the implementation of HOPE in Arkansas, and specifically in Saline County. SWIFT-type courts were also being set up in Arkansas (see the Tarrant County, Texas site report for a discussion of SWIFT) and this provided a foundation and structure for the implementation of the HOPE model as part of the DFE.

Key Findings and Conclusions – HOPE Implementation in Saline County, Arkansas

The implementation of the HOPE DFE in Saline County, Arkansas was by all appearances successful. The implementation experience at this site proceeded relatively smoothly and experienced few major barriers or challenges. The site also achieved a moderate to high degree of fidelity to the intended HOPE model, as promulgated by BJA. These two implementation components – the implementation experience and implementation fidelity – are summarized further below. Detailed discussion of the process evaluation findings is presented following this summary.

With respect to factors that facilitated the implementation of HOPE in Saline County, the HOPE team members interviewed largely agreed that the cooperation and teamwork among the different agencies and stakeholders involved was very significant to the successful implementation of HOPE. Team members noted that there was good enthusiasm around the concept of HOPE and that team members had positive attitudes toward its implementation. Some team members mentioned that the funding from the grant facilitated the implementation of the program since it enabled them to hire full-time probation officers and a program coordinator and use the funding for other necessary resources.

As was the case in most of the other DFE sites, most team members expressed the view that HOPE was “what probation was supposed to be”, and was a “common sense” approach to probation reform. Others described HOPE as “liberating.” Team members widely concurred that HOPE corrected the inconsistencies and frequent lengthy delays in sanctioning that were characteristic of the control condition – Probation as Usual (PAU), thus promoting better accountability by probationers. HOPE was also seen as allowing for smaller probationer officer caseloads and thus more interaction between the officers and their cases, allowing for more productive communication between them. Team members also felt that HOPE promoted more and better interaction between the probationers and the judge and that this reinforced a message of accountability and rehabilitation. Indeed, given the small setting that is the Saline County court, we observed that the warning and violation hearings were dedicated to HOPE, unlike in most of the other DFE sites where court sessions were intermixed with other, non-HOPE court business. The HOPE judge was able to spend as much time as desired on these hearings without interruption.

Turning to implementation challenges, perhaps the factor most commonly noted was the perceived ambivalence or disinterest towards HOPE on the part of the state probation office (DCC/ACC). The greatest issue seemed to be with the DCC/ACC chain of command being reticent about making changes to existing DCC/ACC policies and procedures to accommodate the HOPE innovation. This included mundane matters such as purchasing and personnel regulations, as well as more important procedures surrounding probationer supervision and sanctioning. While the team members seem to have found ways to adjust to this, they did find it vexing and detrimental to the smooth implementation of HOPE. This experience seems to fall into the category of routine administrative obstacles well described in the literature on bureaucratic organizations (Scott, 2002). Still, these issues did not significantly interfere with HOPE implementation or rise to the level of “wicked problems” for which solutions are elusive (Rittel and Webber, 1973).

Other challenges revolved around the DFE itself. As was noted in the other DFE sites, some team members believed that the selection criteria for the DFE made it very difficult to recruit eligible clients,

for example, by the intended focus on higher risk offenders. Others expressed concern about not being able to recommend certain clients to HOPE and may have had trouble understanding the random assignment process. In addition to this struggle, word had spread among the jail inmates to avoid HOPE because it is too harsh, with some claiming to reside outside of Saline County so that they would not be eligible for participation. Finally, there were issues regarding the role of the Defense Counsel. There was a fine line between advocating for the clients while also trying to promote HOPE.

Approximately mid-way through the DFE, between our intermediate and final site visits, another issue emerged unexpectedly with the sudden removal of the initial two HOPE probation officers and their replacement by two other officers from outside of Saline County. Despite interviews with key stakeholders involved in this switch, we were not able to fully elucidate the circumstances surrounding it, other than to speculate that it resulted from a disagreement between the judge and the initial HOPE probationer officers over policies and procedures surrounding HOPE supervision. We interviewed the two new HOPE officers during our final site visit in October of 2014. While they reported some initial challenge with settling into the HOPE role, including revising some procedures and establishing a rapport with their probationers (the initial two officers seem to have been popular with the probationers), they did seem to have settled into their roles by the time of our visit, and in fact had eagerly volunteered for this assignment. Thus, while the reassignment of officers was a shock when it happened, it did not appear to constitute an existential threat to the ongoing implementation of HOPE.

Another challenge that was not necessarily noted by the team, but which stood out to us as important, was the fact that the HOPE probation officers had to fulfill many of the major tasks surrounding HOPE, including drug testing, risk assessment, intake processing, warrant service and apprehension, some transportation, and of course routine supervision and case management duties. At the other three DFE sites, at least some of these tasks were handled variously by specialized units or officers within probation; Saline County was the only site where the HOPE officers served as the “one stop shop” for HOPE. Again, while neither the officers themselves nor other team members expressly mentioned this as a problem, it seems that it must have constituted a considerable and unique HOPE workload for these officers and thus an implementation issue worth noting.

Team members were asked to rate on a five point scale the extent to which the implementation and operation of HOPE was a burden to them. The mean burden rating was only 1.7, indicating that the team felt little or no burden associated with HOPE. There was very little variation in perceived burden between the various offices involved in HOPE (i.e. court, probation, jail, etc.), but the greatest burden was thought to fall on the HOPE probation officers, thus reinforcing our speculation that HOPE represented much more work for them than did PAU.

Apart from the change in the HOPE probation officers, the HOPE team remained relatively stable over the course of the DFE, with most members maintaining their roles throughout, and with patterns of communication between members remaining consistent. The HOPE judge was consistently identified as the leader of HOPE, although some endorsement was also provided to the probation officers and program coordinator for providing leadership in their own way. Still, HOPE in Saline County seems to fit the mold of a judge-driven model. Team members largely agreed that a good group dynamic had been established around the HOPE DFE, with good communication and agreement on the broad goals for HOPE and the DFE. Several team members felt that more frequent meetings of the entire HOPE team would have helped somewhat with coordination and decision making, but this was not cited as a major

concern. As touched upon earlier, this good group dynamic was undoubtedly promoted by the positive attitudes towards HOPE exhibited by most team members, with HOPE being seen by them as a good idea that was worthy of the time and other resources being invested in it.

The HOPE team members were asked to rate on a five point scale the extent to which they believed that the probationers participating in HOPE understood the whole concept behind HOPE. The team rated this understanding as 4.1, indicating a belief that the probationers generally grasped the concepts of swift and certain sanctioning, and that a given behavior would be met with a specific set of consequences. The warning hearings were thought to be important in promoting this understanding. Again, HOPE was seen by the team as an improvement over PAU, promoting more accountability, personal responsibility and support for probationers seeking to change their lives. As was found at the other DFE sites, while probationers were believed to understand the process in principle (i.e. that a given behavior will lead to specific consequences), they often had a harder time fully accepting that what they did was wrong. Strong antisocial attitudes and criminal thinking seem to prevent some probationers from developing a complete buy-in to the program. The judge suggested that it might be valuable to conduct a second warning hearing for probationers about six months into the program. This would reinforce the sanctioning goals and process for them.

Team members were also asked to rate the extent to which HOPE sanctions will be effective in promoting behavior change among the probationers, using the same five-point scale. Team members rated sanction effectiveness as 4.6, thus reflecting a strong belief that sanctions will deter future misconduct. The issue of the inconvenience of sanctioning cropped up repeatedly, with the belief that probationers who feel highly inconvenienced by the immediate imposition of jail time for violations will be more likely to comply with the program in the future. Probationers who are less bothered about spending a few days in jail were thought to be less motivated by HOPE. There also seemed to be a situation emergent where inmates in the jail were reported to be advising others to avoid HOPE expressly because it is a strict and cumbersome program compared to PAU. Some offenders attempted to avoid HOPE by claiming out of county residency, which would make them program ineligible. Conversely, other probationers indicated to HOPE team members that they found HOPE to be helpful to their goals to seek treatment and turn around their lives, largely due to the structure provided by HOPE. Finally, there was sentiment among the team that HOPE should also more formally incorporate rewards for good behavior and compliance with program rules.

As discussed earlier, there was considerable support for and belief in the value of HOPE among the Saline County team throughout the DFE, but as of the time of our final site visit in October 2014, there was not a definitive sustainability plan in place. All stakeholders were personally interested in continuing HOPE, though. The program coordinator and the probation officers indicated that they had been “planting seeds” to keep HOPE running by contacting DCC/ACC leadership. However, most interviewees noted that DCC/ACC might be unlikely to provide tangible support for the continuation of HOPE, given their lukewarm response to the program thus far. There was a plan to host a meeting of state legislators at the courthouse in the very near future to showcase HOPE and build support for a legislative appropriation for it. There was evidently stiff competition for this money for additional prison construction, so the immediate prospects for such funding for HOPE were unclear.

Finally, turning to implementation fidelity, HOPE was implemented in Saline County with a reasonable degree of fidelity to the intended model, meeting the minimum desired implementation

metrics on nine of eleven items assessed. The greatest challenge to fidelity was the time it took to bring violators before the judge for a violation hearing. This is important, as swiftness of sanctioning is one of the most central precepts of the HOPE model. Fidelity is examined more thoroughly in the next section.

Implementation Fidelity

The table below presents the implementation fidelity for Saline County HOPE, following methodology elaborated on in the methodology chapter, which explains in detail our measurement strategy, including a full specification of all items used to assess implementation fidelity.

Saline County, Arkansas HOPE achieved a moderate to high level of implementation fidelity, achieving a minimum standard of 60% on nine of the eleven items. Indeed, fidelity was at 80% or greater for seven out of the eleven items. It is worth noting, though, that fidelity was very low for Item # 7 (time from a violation to a violation hearing), which gets at the notion of swiftness, and which is one of the primary components of the underlying HOPE logic model. Indeed, only about one-third of violations were before the judge within three days. This may have been due to the need for the HOPE probationer officers in this site to assume responsibility for most HOPE operations (i.e. assessment, drug testing, warrant service, regular supervision, etc.). In addition, the data provided to us indicated that the majority of probationers admitted to HOPE were assessed as low risk prior to enrollment in HOPE, contrary to the intended goal of admitting high risk offenders. We suspect this was due to the relatively small population of probationers available in this county, thus necessitating admission of lower risk cases. Thus, we have some reservations about characterizing Saline County HOPE implementation fidelity as unequivocally high, despite achieving at least 60% on all the other fidelity items.

HOPE FIDELITY ITEM	ARKANSAS FIDELITY
1. Leadership	15/18 (83%) individuals interviewed identified a leader, Judge was mentioned the most.
2. Probationers High Risk	27% of cases are moderate to high risk
3. Warning Hearing Issued	86% of 14 Warning Hearings assessed addressed 12/14 themes
4. Initial Testing Frequency	88% of probationers had at least 8 tests in first 2 months
5. Stepped Down Testing Frequency	82% of probationers had monthly testing after first 2 months
6. Exceptions for Missed UAs	100% of cases with a missed UA (N=146) received a consequence
7. Time to Violation Hearing	38% of violations (639 total violations) were followed by a Violation Hearing within 3 days
8. Sanction Type	88% of sanctions were jail time.
9. Sanction Dosage	78% of jail sanctions were at or below the Hawaii HOPE mean of 19 days (Mean = 6 days).
10. Sanction Certainty	97% of violations resulted in a sanction
11. Sanction Swiftness	76% of sanctions beginning within 3 days of the Violation Hearing

Baseline Site Visit Summary

Involvement & Communication

Members of the process evaluation team interviewed nine individuals from six key positions involved in HOPE in Saline County, Arkansas. Those interviewed included the program coordinator (PC), the assistant director of the Department of Community Corrections (DCC; Probation Management), the HOPE judge and backup HOPE judge, AOC Staff Attorney, HOPE Probation Officers (POs), the Deputy Prosecuting Attorney, and the Public Defender (Defense Counsel). As part of the qualitative interview, these individuals were asked to rate the following stakeholders on their involvement in the development of HOPE as well as their frequency of communication: HOPE Judge, Prosecutor, Defense Counsel, HOPE POs, Probation Management, Jail Administrator, Sheriff/other law enforcement, HOPE PC, and other. For example, “To what extent has the HOPE Judge been involved in the development of the HOPE program?” (1 = *not at all*; 5 = *great extent*) and “How often do you communicate with the HOPE POs?” (1 = *never*; 5 = *every day*).

HOPE PC

The HOPE PC was hired in March 2012, after the grant was already written and submitted. She had previously been employed for Saline County courts as an administrator. The PC was viewed as being a critical part of successfully implementing HOPE in Arkansas ($M = 4.67$, $SD = 0.58$). She created forms, handbooks, and data systems, and coordinated trainings. She also helped establish selection criteria as well as scheduling. The PC was seen by the team as instrumental in bridging relationships with the DCC, as well as with criminal justice staff. Most people communicate with her very frequently ($M = 4.20$, $SD = 0.84$).

HOPE Judge

There was significant agreement among those interviewed that the HOPE Judge was extensively involved in developing the HOPE program in Saline County ($M = 4.67$, $SD = 0.58$). He was responsible for the initial startup and addressing implementation logistics among everyone who worked on the project. The PC, POs, and Deputy Prosecuting Attorney credited the Judge with being the leader and champion of HOPE and some people mentioned that it would not exist without him. Once HOPE was underway, he served more as a policymaker, rather than being directly involved with the day-to-day tasks. Most of the people who were interviewed reported that they had frequent contact with the HOPE Judge ($M = 3.80$, $SD = 1.10$).

HOPE POs

The POs were perceived as being extremely involved in the development and implementation of HOPE ($M = 5.00$, $SD = 0.00$). They set up the DFE eligibility criteria, identified existing problems with probation that had the potential to influence HOPE procedures, worked out logistics, and fostered relationships with DCC. The POs seem to do the most day-to-day work in terms of keeping HOPE up and running. Since the POs were so directly involved, most of the other people communicated with them very often ($M = 4.00$, $SD = 0.71$).

Probation Management

Probation Management had some involvement in the initial logistics of setting up HOPE, but is not considered to be part of the immediate team ($M = 3.00$, $SD = 0.00$). In fact, several people mentioned

that there was some resistance from the DCC toward implementing HOPE. This conflict stemmed from DCC's reluctance to change their existing procedures and schedules. Now that HOPE is underway, there is little communication between DCC and the HOPE team ($M = 2.20$, $SD = 0.84$).

Prosecutor

Although the Deputy Prosecuting Attorney reported that he did not contribute much to the initial development and planning of HOPE, others perceived that he was quite involved ($M = 4.33$, $SD = 0.58$). With HOPE underway, he is present at all court hearings and monitors the procedural adequacy of the hearings and proceedings. In terms of communication, most people speak with the prosecutor once or twice a week ($M = 3.40$, $SD = 1.34$).

Defense Counsel

There was a fair range of responses for the perceptions of how involved the defense counsel was in the development of HOPE ($M = 3.33$, $SD = 1.53$). The Public Defender himself reported that he was more involved than he needed to be and that HOPE could have been successfully implemented without his help. He is credited with making sure that HOPE cases follow all legal procedures. The Public Defender serves as a source of information for probationers so that they know what to expect before the warning hearings. Most key players communicate with the Public Defender at least once a week ($M = 3.40$, $SD = 1.34$).

Jail Administrator

The Jail Administrator was perceived as being very supportive and facilitates a good relationship between warrant officers and POs ($M = 4.00$, $SD = 1.00$). He contributes more to the day-to-day mechanics of operating HOPE compared to the initial implementation. Communication with the Jail Administrator seemed to vary based on the position with the PC, POs, and the Public Defender having the most frequent communication ($M = 3.00$, $SD = 1.26$).

Sheriff/Other Law Enforcement

The transport and warrant officers along with the local police departments have been involved with assisting the HOPE POs with apprehending absconders and processing warrants ($M = 3.50$, $SD = 0.71$). They also worked to alter the paperwork system so that HOPE warrants are dealt with as soon as possible. Despite their cooperation, most individuals do not communicate with them regularly ($M = 2.17$, $SD = 0.98$).

Other – AOC (Administration Office of the Courts)

The PC and the HOPE POs both mentioned the AOC as another key player in the implementation process. The AOC applied for the grant and recruited the eventual HOPE judge, so this organization made some significant contributions early in the development of HOPE ($M = 3.50$, $SD = 0.71$). With the study underway now, there is not a lot of regular communication with the AOC ($M = 2.00$, $SD = 0.00$).

Summary

Those involved in the HOPE program in Arkansas reported that the PC, POs, and HOPE Judge were the most critical players for the development of HOPE. The HOPE Judge took on a significant leadership role and was responsible for the initial startup. The PC and POs are now more involved with the day-to-day tasks of operating HOPE. There was some resistance from DCC in terms of having to alter their already established procedures, but they moved beyond this conflict. Law enforcement personnel contributed to the successful implementation of HOPE by making HOPE cases a priority and working

hard to apprehend absconders. In regards to communication, the HOPE POs and PC speak with the other key players most frequently.

Average involvement and communication ratings for each role in the HOPE team

Role	Involvement	Communication
Program Coordinator	4.67	4.20
Probation Management	3.00	2.20
HOPE Judge	4.67	3.80
HOPE POs	5.00	4.00
Prosecutor	4.33	3.40
Defense Counsel	3.33	3.40
Jail Administrator	4.00	3.00
Sheriff/Other Law Enforcement	3.50	2.17
Other – AOC	3.50	2.00

There is a significant positive correlation between average involvement and communication ratings such that those who are rated as being more involved are more likely to have higher communication ratings ($r = .83$).

Self-Ratings on Involvement Compared to Average Ratings

Role	Self-Rating	Average Rating	Differential
Program Coordinator	5.00	4.67	0.33
HOPE POs	5.00	5.00	0.00
Public Defender	3.00	3.33	-0.33

Due to the nature of the data, only three roles could be used to compare self-ratings on involvement with average ratings. As shown above, self-ratings on involvement corresponded closely with average ratings. Although the Prosecutor did not provide a self-rating on his involvement in the implementation of HOPE, he did say that he did not do much, and simply made some recommendations for taking clients from stock. However, the PC, POs, and Public Defender rated him as being very involved.

Training

The PC, Prosecutor, Public Defender, the HOPE Judges, AOC Staff Attorney, and one of the POs reported that they attended the Hawaii training. Several people also mentioned attending the talk given by Judge Alm and staff from the HOPE training and technical assistance provider from Pepperdine University. The HOPE PC, HOPE judges, and the Public Defender all mentioned that the Hawaii training would have been more useful with a greater focus on training for the Defense Counsel, so that there would be a better understanding of how these individuals could balance advocacy for their clients while still promoting HOPE. One of the HOPE POs reported that the Hawaii training was worthwhile, but more time could have been spent on local implementation strategies. On a related note, the Deputy Prosecuting Attorney mentioned that hearing about other jurisdictions at the Hawaii training was not

particularly helpful since all sites are so different from each other. Also, this individual had already attended several other drug court trainings and he felt that the Hawaii training was very similar to those.

Perceptions of HOPE and PAU

HOPE – Three of the six interview groups agreed that one key feature of HOPE is that probationers experience much more face time with the judge than those in PAU. There is also more face time for the probationers with their POs and, as a result, there seems to be better and more productive communication between these people. HOPE probationers keep the same PO throughout the entire process and HOPE POs have significantly smaller caseloads than PAU POs. Most interviewees mentioned the swift and certain sanctioning that is characteristic of HOPE. The violation hearings usually occur within 2 days. The sanctions are enforced and probationers are held accountable for their behavior. One feature of HOPE that appears to be unique to Arkansas is that the Defense Attorney talks to the probationers before the warning hearing to let them know what to expect from the judge.

PAU – Four of the six interview groups cited “inconsistency” as one of the defining features of PAU in Arkansas. They reported that drug testing, the type and level of sanctioning, and regular contact with the PO is all inconsistent. Sanctioning can take several months so probationers fail to see the association between their behavior and the consequences. Perhaps most notable is the procedure for PAU probationers that requires them to pay fees. PAU POs are required to meet a “fee quota” and would be disciplined if their probationers were not paying fees. Therefore, the focus of many PAU POs is to simply collect these fees.

Implementation Barriers and Facilitators

All six interview groups involved with HOPE in Arkansas believed that the cooperation and teamwork among the different agencies and positions was a significant contributing factor to the successful implementation of HOPE. Everyone seemed to be enthusiastic and had a positive attitude toward HOPE. Others mentioned that the funding from the grant facilitated the implementation of the program since it enabled them to hire full-time POs and the PC, and use the funding for other necessary resources.

In terms of implementation barriers, defining the role of the DCC was problematic for many interviewees. The greatest issue seemed to be with the lower and middle managers being unwilling to make changes to accommodate HOPE procedures. Some interviewees believed that the selection criteria for the DFE have made it very difficult to recruit eligible clients. Others expressed concern about not being able to recommend certain clients to HOPE and may have had trouble understanding the random assignment process. In addition to this struggle, word spread among the jail inmates to avoid HOPE, and many claimed to reside outside of Saline County to avoid HOPE eligibility. Finally, there were issues regarding the role of the Defense Counsel. There was a fine line between advocating for the clients while also trying to promote HOPE. This is where some additional training for the Defense Counsel could have been useful.

Personal Opinions of HOPE

Both the PC and Prosecutor described their personal feelings towards HOPE as “the way probation should be.” Others described HOPE as “liberating” and “great.” The Judge said that “HOPE works, it’s common sense.” When asked whether HOPE should be more widely implemented in Arkansas, the PC stated that it should be extended to the state level as an alternative to prison. The POs believe that in

order for state-wide dissemination to work, there would have to be better coordination between judges in terms of how the courts operate. This is an issue that has been a problem for the implementation of SWIFT.

Intermediate Site Visit Summary

Involvement in Ongoing Implementation/Operation of HOPE & Communication

Members of the process evaluation team interviewed nine individuals from six key positions involved in HOPE in Saline County, Arkansas in mid-August, 2013. The intermediate interviews occurred about 9 months after the baseline interviews. Those interviewed included the Program Coordinator (PC), the HOPE Judge, two HOPE Probation Officers (POs), Deputy Prosecuting Attorneys, the Public Defender (Defense Counsel), and two members of the Jail Staff. As part of the qualitative interview, these individuals were asked to rate the following stakeholders on their involvement in the ongoing implementation and operation of HOPE as well as their frequency of communication: HOPE Judge, Prosecutor, Defense Counsel, HOPE POs, Probation Management, Jail Administrator, Sheriff/other law enforcement, HOPE PC, and other. For example, "How important is the HOPE Judge to the ongoing implementation and operation of HOPE?" (1 = *not at all*; 5 = *very important*) and "How often do you communicate with the HOPE POs?" (1 = *never*; 5 = *every day*).

HOPE PC

The HOPE PC is viewed as a critical member of the HOPE team who handles all the administrative details and coordinates activities related to the DFE ($M = 4.57$, $SD = 0.79$). Although some stakeholders perceive her role as vital, others mentioned that some of her duties could be shifted to the Judge's coordinator, POs, or the Prosecutor's office. This may be one reason why the PC's involvement ratings decreased slightly from baseline ($M = 4.67$, $SD = 0.58$). However, the PC is viewed as quite valuable because she eases the burden on the POs when they get too busy. She also facilitates communication across the different stakeholders, so most people are in contact with her quite often ($M = 4.67$, $SD = 0.52$). The PC's communication rating increased from the baseline interviews ($M = 4.20$, $SD = 0.84$).

HOPE Judge

Some stakeholders described the Judge's role in the ongoing operation of HOPE as less critical than what it was when HOPE was first starting. However, the Judge still holds the program together and maintains an important role in facilitating interagency relations. His ratings for involvement were slightly higher than at the baseline interviews ($M = 4.86$, $SD = 0.38$; baseline: $M = 4.67$, $SD = 0.58$). The Judge reported that he needs to spend more time visiting the treatment providers and local law enforcement to stay in touch and promote outreach on behalf of the whole HOPE program. One of the POs commented that he would like to see the Judge give more attention to mitigating factors and be more flexible with the sanctioning process.

Stakeholders reported communicating with the Judge slightly less at the intermediate interviews than they did at baseline ($M = 3.67$, $SD = 1.37$; baseline: $M = 3.80$, $SD = 1.10$).

HOPE POs

The POs were rated the highest out of all the stakeholders for their involvement in the ongoing implementation and operation of HOPE ($M = 5.00$, $SD = 0.00$). These ratings did not change at all from the baseline interviews. Several interviewees reported that the HOPE POs seem to be overworked due to the caseloads associated with HOPE. (Each PO has around 50 probationers). The POs continue to be involved in every aspect of HOPE including UA's, arrests, court proceedings, and tracking down absconders. The Judge mentioned that the HOPE POs are seriously invested in HOPE since they were both former regular POs and they know how traditional probation works in comparison to HOPE.

The POs struggle at times due to the amount of paperwork required by DCC. If they had more time, they would want to devote more effort into apprehending absconders. One common theme across interviews was that the addition of another HOPE PO would be beneficial to the program, especially to help with apprehending absconders. Since the time of the interviews, an additional staff member was hired to help serve warrants and assist with UAs.

In terms of communication, all stakeholders are in contact with the HOPE POs at least once a week ($M = 4.60, SD = 0.55$). This rating increased from the baseline interviews ($M = 4.00, SD = 0.71$).

Probation Management

Probation Management's role in the ongoing operation of HOPE was viewed as minimal, similar to their perceived role during the initial implementation of the program ($M = 3.00, SD = 0.82$; baseline: $M = 3.00, SD = 0.00$). DCC has very little direct involvement in HOPE outside of a few tasks like signing timesheets and holding monthly staff meetings that the HOPE POs attend. Since DCC provides funding for probation and provides oversight to personnel management, their role is still necessary for the program to operate. However, DCC is not central to the daily operations of HOPE. In the context of HOPE, the HOPE POs said that they report to the Judge and not DCC.

One of the POs communicates with Probation Management every day, but the other key players do not have much contact with DCC ($M = 2.43, SD = 1.62$). This communication rating is slightly higher than it was at baseline ($M = 2.20, SD = 0.84$).

Prosecutor

The Prosecutor's involvement in HOPE is viewed as adequate, but there has been some conflict regarding the balance of involvement between the POs and the Prosecutor in the sanctioning decision making process. The Prosecutor describes his role as "advocating for the state" when determining whether a violator should be sanctioned or revoked. However, the POs wish to have some more input. The Prosecutor's involvement remained stable since the baseline interviews ($M = 4.29, SD = 0.95$; baseline: $M = 4.33, SD = 0.58$).

With regards to communication, the Public Defender has the most frequent contact with the Prosecutor while the other stakeholders communicate on a weekly basis ($M = 3.67, SD = 1.37$). Communication with the Prosecutor increased slightly since the baseline interviews ($M = 3.40, SD = 1.34$).

Defense Counsel

The Defense Counsel's role is legally required for due process rights for probationers, so they are present at all hearings ($M = 4.29, SD = 0.76$). The Judge reported that the Defense Counsel encouraged clients to cooperate with HOPE, so they are supportive of the overall goals of the program. The Public Defender reported that his role is critical in that he can reach the clients in a less threatening way than the Judge or POs.

Except for the Jail Staff, all stakeholders communicate with the Defense Counsel at least once a week ($M = 3.50, SD = 1.23$), which is similar to the communication pattern at baseline ($M = 3.40, SD = 1.34$).

Jail Administrator/Staff

The Jail Staff's role in HOPE is viewed as critical since jail space is required to ensure swift and certain sanctioning ($M = 4.50, SD = 0.55$). Transporting violators from jail to court is another vital aspect

of the Jail Staff’s contributions to HOPE. They are also responsible for transporting probationers from the jail to the off-site treatment facilities. The Jail Staff’s involvement increased since baseline, presumably as enrollment increased ($M = 4.00, SD = 1.00$). Similarly, communication with the Jail Staff also increased since baseline ($M = 3.50, SD = 1.38$; baseline: $M = 3.00, SD = 1.26$).

Sheriff/Other Law Enforcement

The Sheriff’s Office is responsible for serving warrants so this is viewed as being important to the ongoing operation of HOPE ($M = 4.00, SD = 1.27$). Several stakeholders mentioned that they are helpful in serving warrants, but they could be doing better in terms of timeliness. Non-HOPE warrants also need to be served so the Sheriff’s Office has competing interests and not enough manpower to serve all the warrants in a short amount of time. One effect that the slower warrant service is potentially having on HOPE is that the Public Defender stopped warning his clients that they would be arrested “right away” if they violate the terms of their probation. This indicates that the “swiftness” of HOPE may be at risk.

On the other hand, the Sheriff’s Office reported that since they are in a small town, it is easy to locate absconders. In that sense, warrant service should not take an excessive amount of time. Like the Jail Staff, the Sheriff’s Office’s involvement increased slightly since baseline ($M = 3.50, SD = 0.71$). As reported during the baseline interviews, there is not a lot of frequent communication with the Sheriff’s Office, the exception being the Jail Staff ($M = 2.86, SD = 1.35$; baseline: $M = 2.17, SD = 0.98$).

Other – AOC (Administration Office of the Courts)

AOC was viewed as being important in the ongoing operation of HOPE because they managed the grant and at the time of the interview, they were working on the grant extension ($M = 3.67, SD = 1.53$). The perception of their involvement increased slightly since baseline ($M = 3.50, SD = 0.71$). The POs reported that they would like to see AOC become more involved in conveying information about HOPE to the legislature. As at the baseline interviews, communication with AOC is infrequent ($M = 2.00, SD = 1.00$; baseline: $M = 2.00, SD = 0.00$).

Average involvement and communication ratings for each role in the HOPE team

Role	Involvement	Communication
Program Coordinator	4.57	4.67
Probation Management	3.00	2.43
HOPE Judge	4.86	3.67
HOPE POs	5.00	4.60
Prosecutor	4.29	3.67
Defense Counsel	4.29	3.50
Jail Administrator/Staff	4.50	3.50
Sheriff/Other Law Enforcement	4.00	2.86
Other – AOC	3.67	2.00

Correlations

Involvement scores remained stable across time as there was a significant positive correlation between scores at baseline and at the intermediate interviews, $r = .87, p = .002$. The relationship for communication was also very strong between the baseline and intermediate interviews, $r = .95$,

$p = <.001$. Finally, within the intermediate interviews, there was a significant positive correlation between involvement and communication scores, $r = .83$, $p = .01$. These results indicate that the stakeholders who are more involved in the operation of HOPE also tend to communicate more frequently with the team.

Self-Ratings on Involvement Compared to Average Ratings

Role	Self-Rating	Average Rating	Differential
Program Coordinator	5.00	4.57	0.43
HOPE Judge	5.00	4.86	0.14
HOPE POs	5.00	5.00	0.00
Prosecutor	3.00	4.29	-1.29
Defense Counsel	4.00	4.29	-0.29
Jail Staff	5.00	4.50	0.50

This table demonstrates the difference between stakeholders’ personal perceptions of their involvement and how others have rated them on average. The difference between the Prosecutor’s self-rating and average rating was the largest among the stakeholders in which these data were available. This indicates that the Prosecutor underestimates his involvement in HOPE compared to how others view his contributions. Overall, the self-ratings and average ratings were fairly similar, indicating close agreement in perceptions of involvement.

Summary

Overall, the HOPE POs, Judge, PC, and Jail Staff are perceived as being the most involved with the ongoing operation of HOPE. The HOPE POs have large caseloads and several stakeholders agreed that adding an additional PO would relieve the burden on the current POs and would add support to the Sheriff’s Office for apprehending absconders. This was addressed in late August 2013 with the addition of a staff member to assist with absconders. One area of conflict in Arkansas is the balance of input between the Prosecutor and POs in the sanctioning process. The POs reported wanting a greater say and the Judge expressed his support for them in this matter.

Training

There has not been any additional formal training since the baseline interviews. The PC mentioned attending Pepperdine’s meeting in Malibu in early August 2013, but she did not view this as formal training.

Leadership in HOPE

All interviewees reported that the Judge is the primary leader of HOPE. Additionally, several stakeholders mentioned that there are others who lead in their own way based on their role in the operation of HOPE. The POs viewed themselves and the PC as leaders since they were involved in all aspects of the day-to-day operation of HOPE. One of the HOPE POs has gone above and beyond to provide additional information on policy issues and research. This person is viewed as a leader by the Judge due to the individual’s efforts in handling logistics and acting as a problem solver.

Satisfaction with Group Process

In general, the key stakeholders are very satisfied with the group process and believe that the group gets along well. The conflict between the POs and the Prosecutor regarding input in the sanctioning process was mentioned again and as of the time of the interviews, this issue was being resolved. Several interviewees mentioned that the team could be run better if there were more frequent and regular staff meetings. The staff meetings are held as needed. The need for another HOPE PO was also stressed to improve the overall group process by easing the burden on the Jail Staff for apprehending absconders, and it would help reduce the caseloads of the HOPE POs. To address these issues, a new staff member was hired to assist with absconders.

The role of DCC is viewed as disruptive to the group process of the HOPE team. DCC's "bureaucratic expectations" such as required trainings and unscheduled meetings disrupt the HOPE program. However, it was reported that DCC is unlikely to change its policies and procedures in response to HOPE.

Some of the positive aspects of the group process in Arkansas included good communication and the fact that all stakeholders are passionate about what they do.

Effectiveness of Sanctions

Stakeholders were asked to rate how effective the sanctions are in changing the behavior of HOPE probationers. On a 5-point scale, participants rated the sanctions as being quite effective ($M = 4.57$, $SD = 0.53$). The PC reported that 98% of the sanctions are jail time and that the Judge typically follows the sanctioning grid. The Prosecutor mentioned that their site does not use community service because there is not a well-established community service system in place. However, he believes that community service would not be effective anyway for most violators because it is not very swift in relation to the violation and probationers would not consider it to be a major inconvenience to them. On the other hand, the Prosecutor views jail time as being most effective for probationers who have not spent time in jail before and who have a job and family, as being in jail is an inconvenience.

Several stakeholders reported that many probationers have been talking among themselves in jail about the HOPE program. They tell other inmates to avoid HOPE because it's too strict. Conversely, some probationers have a positive attitude toward HOPE because they want to change their behavior and get treatment and HOPE is the best way for this to happen.

The POs reported seeing positive changes in HOPE probationers such as talking and looking differently, and showing up early to their appointments. In addition to sanctions, the Judge mentioned that they are starting to focus on rewards and positive reinforcement. During the Pepperdine meeting in Malibu in early August 2013, the Judge discussed social rewards for probationers who have met compliance with program rules.

The Public Defender noted some concerns regarding the effectiveness of sanctioning. He believes that some probationers should be revoked and that they should not have been placed on probation in the first place. For those in which jail sanctions are appropriate, he questioned whether HOPE only helps probationers to successfully complete probation or if it helps them become better people and change their behavior.

Probationers' Understanding of HOPE Sanctioning Goals and Process

Using a similar 5-point scale, the key stakeholders believe that HOPE probationers have a good understanding of the sanctioning goals and process ($M = 4.14$, $SD = 0.69$). Several interviewees made the

distinction between how well probationers understand HOPE when they start the program and when they get close to finishing it. They reported that participants have a moderate understanding (3) when they start and by the end they understand the program very well (5). Probationers seem to understand the process (X leads to Y), but they have a harder time understanding that what they did was wrong. Strong antisocial attitudes and criminal thinking seem to prevent probationers from developing a complete understanding of the program.

In regards to this idea, the Judge suggested that it might be valuable to conduct a second warning hearing for probationers about six months after starting the program. This would reinforce the sanctioning goals and process for them.

The Prosecutor reported that the Judge, HOPE POs, and Defense Attorney all do a good job of explaining to probationers the idea that certain actions will have consequences and that how they act determines how others will respond to them.

Sanctioning Process

The PC developed the sanctioning grid in January 2013 based on recommendations from Pepperdine. Although she drafted it, the whole team was involved in reviewing, editing, and approving the sanctioning grid. The Judge had the final say over the grid and consulted with Judge Alm to make sure it corresponded with the Hawaii model. There have been some minor changes to it since its development. The Judge follows the grid 90% of the time and occasionally deviates from the grid if there is a certain reason to do so.

The POs expressed some concern that the sanctioning grid causes those involved in sanctioning to disregard aggravating and mitigating factors. The POs also mentioned their desire to utilize other sanctioning options besides jail.

The process for making recommendations on sanctions changed in the past year. Previously, the HOPE POs provided a report, along with sanction recommendations, to the Prosecutor, Defense, and the Judge. Since the Prosecutor believed that the recommendations should come from his office, the process changed. The POs provided a report without recommendation to the Judge, and the Prosecutor and Defense each made a recommendation during the violation hearing. This change caused the hearings to be much longer which frustrated the Judge. To avoid lengthy hearings, the process was modified: the PO, Prosecutor, and Defense talk before court to agree on a common recommendation to the Judge.

Sanctioning Grid

Technical Violations

First time technical violations; 1-3 days in jail

Two months or more behind in fees; Sanction Hearing to be set and weekend jail sanction until fees paid to date if found true

General Sanctionable Offenses

Include violations which require sanction hearing. May include; positive test, late for office visits or testing, failure to appear, admitted use of controlled substance, noncompliance/incompletion of treatment, failure to pay three months or more of fees.

Number days in jail	Number of violation
3- 5 days jail	1 st Offense
5-10 days jail	2 nd Offense
15-20 days jail	3 rd Offense
20-25 days jail	4 th Offense
30 days jail	5 th Offense

Positive Test with Positive Confirmation

Includes a test which is confirmed by the lab as positive after denial by a probationer.

Number of days in jail	Number of tests sent for confirmation
15 days in jail	1 st confirmation test
30 days in jail Plus payment of confirmation testing	2 nd confirmation test

Abscond Probationers

Includes probationers who actively evade law enforcement after violation of probation.

Number of days in jail	Number of times to abscond
30 days in jail	1 st time to abscond
60 days in jail	2 nd time to abscond
Revocation	3 rd time to abscond or if second time to Abscond and missing for one month or longer

Personal Opinions of HOPE

All stakeholders besides the Prosecutor had very positive attitudes toward HOPE. The Prosecutor stated that they do not know yet whether HOPE works, but they believe that all probation programs should be run this way. The POs reported that they have smaller caseloads than they do with PAU which allows them to work more closely with probationers and build better rapport. The POs also mentioned that they like HOPE because it helps improve other aspects of probationers' lives such as employment and drug use, rather than just focusing on successfully completing probation. The POs stated that jail sanctioning serves as a tool for behavior modification and not just a punishment. Along the same lines, jail provides motivation for change for those who do not have the self-motivation to change their own behavior. Several interviewees felt positive about HOPE because they believe it will save money in the long run. The Jail Staff appreciates the HOPE program because they are dealing with fewer absconders.

Implementation and Ongoing Operation Barriers

The most common problem for Arkansas in their implementation has been the DCC bureaucracy. DCC rules and policies interfere with some aspects of HOPE. Since the Judge has the authority to supervise the HOPE POs, that limits some of the tension since the POs do not need to directly report to DCC.

Another problem has been the need for more staff members. The POs struggle with conducting UA's, attending court hearings, and holding office visits with probationers. Being busy with these tasks

does not allow enough time for home visits or warrant service. The recently hired staff member should alleviate some of this burden.

One PO reported that technology is not satisfactory for the requirements of HOPE. This PO would recommend automated assessment tools, especially since the training on the ORAS assessment tool was poor. Having a separate assessment unit would be beneficial so that cases are not underclassified by POs who may just be looking to lighten their caseloads.

Despite utilizing the sanctioning grid, the Public Defender said that consistency across cases has been problematic. They have realized that all parties need to coordinate between the Prosecutor, Defense, and Judge in order to agree on the appropriate sanction for a given violation.

Implementation and Ongoing Operation Facilitators

Good communication and teamwork were the most frequently cited assets to the successful ongoing implementation of HOPE. The Prosecutor reported that the strong existing relationships among HOPE team members have helped the program run smoothly. The Prosecutor also mentioned that the Judge is approachable and trusted, which is important since he is viewed as the leader of the program. The availability and access of HOPE team members also contributes to the positive environment.

HOPE's Burden on Stakeholders

Interviewees were asked to describe the extent to which their participation in HOPE has been a burden to them. On a scale of 1 to 5, with higher scores representing a greater burden, most participants reported that HOPE was only a slight burden ($M = 1.67, SD = 0.82$). The Public Defender noted that HOPE has impacted court time. In order to address this, HOPE hearings are held early in the morning before the Judge's regular court schedule, so those involved in the court hearings have to come into work earlier than they did before HOPE started.

HOPE's Burden on Various Departments

Participants rated the extent to which they thought HOPE was a burden on the Court, Probation, and the Jail. Using the same 1-5 scale, overall, participants thought that HOPE was most burdensome to the Court ($M = 2.50, SD = 1.38$) and the Jail ($M = 2.50, SD = 1.38$) and less burdensome to Probation ($M = 2.33, SD = 1.53$). As the Public Defender noted, HOPE takes up a fair amount of court calendar time, however, violation hearings now occur only three days a week as opposed to every day. In terms of Probation, much of the perceived burden falls on the HOPE POs who are overworked compared to their colleagues with PAU caseloads. The primary burden on the Jail was transportation of prisoners.

HOPE Sustainability Plans

Although there were no formal sustainability plans at the time of this interview, all stakeholders were personally interested in continuing HOPE. The PC and POs have been "planting seeds" to keep HOPE running by contacting DCC leadership. However, most interviewees noted that DCC might prevent them from continuing since they do not have a strong interest in HOPE and are unlikely to provide additional funding to keep HOPE running. The PC believes that the Judge would find a way to keep the program running even without DCC support and since the Judge does not have a challenger for the upcoming election, leadership for the program would remain stable. Another goal for future planning would be to officially hire HOPE POs as county employees so they are not tied to DCC.

Changes to PAU

Interviewees reported that some changes in PAU occurred due to a scandal that affected DCC and restructured its leadership. In early summer of 2013, a parolee killed an 18 year old man. The parolee was released from prison in 2008 after serving 19 years for a variety of offenses. He had accumulated 8 parole absconder warrants since his release. According to the HOPE POs, the DCC's response to this incident has been to incarcerate parole violators for longer periods of time. The POs noted that in relation to that incident, the PAU sanctioning grid has been revised numerous times, resulting in confusing procedures. The Prosecutor stated that many people on parole are being incarcerated and that this will eventually have an impact on probation.

Key Findings from Intermediate Interviews

In terms of involvement and communication, there is a very positive atmosphere among the key stakeholders that contributes to the overall success of the HOPE program. The leadership of the Judge in conjunction with the teamwork of other players seems to result in a good balance of power among those most directly involved in HOPE. DCC's lack of involvement and interest is viewed as problematic at times and is concerning for the future of the program. The sanctioning grid has been useful for establishing consistency, although there are still some details to be resolved regarding input from POs on sanction recommendations. Overall, the program could benefit from the addition of a HOPE PO to reduce the burden on the current POs and to aid the Sheriff's Office in tracking down absconders. This issue has been somewhat addressed by the addition of a staff member to assist with absconders.

Final Site Visit Summary

Members of the process evaluation team interviewed eight individuals from key positions involved in HOPE in Saline County, Arkansas in October, 2014. The final interviews occurred about 14 months after the intermediate interviews. Those interviewed included the Program Coordinator (PC), the HOPE Judge, two HOPE Probation Officers (POs), the Deputy Prosecuting Attorney, the Public Defender (Defense Counsel), and two members of the Jail Staff. As part of the qualitative interview, these individuals were asked to rate the following stakeholders on their involvement in the ongoing implementation and operation of HOPE as well as their frequency of communication: HOPE Judge, Prosecutor, Defense Counsel, HOPE POs, Probation Management, Jail Administrator, Sheriff/other law enforcement, HOPE PC, and other. For example, “How important is the HOPE Judge to the ongoing implementation and operation of HOPE?” (1 = *not at all*; 5 = *very important*) and “How often do you communicate with the HOPE POs?” (1 = *never*; 5 = *every day*).

HOPE PC

The HOPE PC received high involvement ratings for the ongoing operations of HOPE ($M = 4.60$, $SD = 0.55$). This rating is higher than the intermediate ratings but slightly lower than the baseline rating (Intermediate: $M = 4.57$, $SD = 0.79$; Baseline: $M = 4.67$, $SD = 0.58$). The Prosecutor, Judge, and defense counsel noted how the PC position is essential to the DFE but not necessarily to the HOPE program. For example, one of the interviewees noted that without a study the PC role may not be necessary and that a PO may be able to fulfill this position. The POs, Jail Administrator, and PC described the PC role as heavily involved in many aspects of the HOPE program. The PC and POs noted how the PC was always available to the POs when they encountered questions about HOPE. According to the jail administrator, the PC “coordinates everything across entities; it would fall apart with her.” The communication ratings for the PC decreased since the intermediate interviews ($M = 3.83$, $SD = 1.83$; Intermediate: $M = 4.67$, $SD = 0.52$, Baseline: $M = 4.20$, $SD = 0.84$), which may suggest some degree of programmatic “settling in” in the later stages, necessitating less intense communication.

HOPE Judge

The stakeholders rated the Judge as someone who is involved in the day to day operation of HOPE, but from the two previous interviews these ratings have decreased from being heavily involved to being moderately involved ($M = 3.80$, $SD = 1.10$, Intermediate: $M = 4.86$, $SD = 0.38$; Baseline: $M = 4.67$, $SD = 0.58$). All interview interviewees reported that the HOPE Judge was essential to the program, in terms of interacting with the probationers and being available to the HOPE team. The Prosecutor and Jail Administrator explained how the Judge maintains fairness with the probationers by outlining the rules of the program and enforcing the consequences. Communication with the Judge was occurring very frequently for this final round of interviews ($M = 5.00$, $SD = 0.00$). Much more communication with the Judge was taking place at the final round of interviews than in the intermediate or baseline (Intermediate: $M = 3.67$, $SD = 1.37$; Baseline: $M = 3.80$, $SD = 1.10$).

HOPE POs

At all interview periods the POs have been rated as very involved in the HOPE program ($M = 4.80$, $SD = 0.45$; Intermediate and Baseline: $M = 5.00$, $SD = 0.00$). All interviewees noted the importance of the POs in the day to day operations of HOPE based on their direct interaction with the probationers and the administering of the swift and certain sanctions. For example, the Judge explained how the POs are

“reinforcing the goals of HOPE to the probationers.” The Jail administrator noted that the POs go after the absconder and administer the drug tests, in addition to managing their high caseloads. The POs viewed themselves as individuals who “ensure the fair treatment for all HOPE probationers.”

Communication with the POs increased for this final interview period, throughout the running of the HOPE program in Arkansas communication with the POs has been frequently consistent ($M = 4.83$, $SD = 0.41$, Intermediate: $M = 4.60$, $SD = 0.55$; Baseline: $M = 4.00$, $SD = 0.71$).

Probation Management

Stakeholders reported minimal involvement from the Probation Management to the HOPE Program ($M = 2.00$, $SD = 0.89$). Involvement ratings for this final round of interviews are slightly lower when compared to the intermediate and baseline interviews, where the Probation Management was rated as “somewhat involved” (Intermediate: $M = 3.00$, $SD = 0.82$; Baseline: $M = 3.00$, $SD = 0.00$). The Judge discussed how Probation Management is a minor part of HOPE, but are administratively necessary because the POs report to them. The POs found it challenging to work with Probation Management. Communication with Probation Management was occurred infrequently with other stakeholders ($M = 2.33$, $SD = 1.51$, Intermediate: $M = 2.43$, $SD = 1.62$; Baseline: $M = 2.20$, $SD = 0.84$).

Prosecutor

The Prosecutor was consistently rated as being heavily involved in the day to day operation of HOPE ($M = 4.10$, $SD = 0.22$, Intermediate: $M = 4.29$, $SD = 0.95$; Baseline: $M = 4.33$, $SD = 0.58$). Four of the six interviewees reported that the Prosecutor is essential for providing necessary legal counsel to the probationers. The Judge noted how the Prosecutor is very responsive to the demands of the program. The Defense Counsel echoed this sentiment, expressing that the Prosecutor has a “mindset for how cases are to be handled.” Communication with the Prosecutor by the stakeholders increased from previous interview periods ($M = 4.33$, $SD = 0.82$; Intermediate: $M = 3.67$, $SD = 1.37$; Baseline: $M = 3.40$, $SD = 1.34$).

Defense Counsel

The Defense Counsel has a moderate involvement in the day to day operations of HOPE ($M = 3.40$, $SD = 1.34$, Intermediate: $M = 4.29$, $SD = 0.76$; Baseline: $M = 3.33$, $SD = 1.53$). Five of the interviewees noted the importance of the Defense Counsel as someone who works with the HOPE probationers and advocates for their rights. For example, the POs explained how the defense counsel will provide “balance to the process by looking out for the probationers’ rights and interests during the sanctioning process.” The Defense Counsel described how he works with the probationers in preparation for the meeting with the judge and court appearance. The Prosecutor and judge noted that the Defense Counsel is responsive and available to the needs of the probationers. Most stakeholders communicated with the Defense Counsel fairly often at the final interview round ($M = 4.42$, $SD = 0.66$). Communication with the Defense Counsel increased from the intermediate and baseline interview rounds (Intermediate: $M = 3.50$, $SD = 1.23$; Baseline $M = 3.40$, $SD = 1.34$).

Jail Administrator

The Jail Administrator was rated as being somewhat involved in the HOPE program ($M = 3.00$, $SD = 1.58$). Ratings for involvement at the final interview period were lower than the intermediate and baseline ratings (Intermediate: $M = 4.50$, $SD = 0.55$, Baseline: $M = 4.00$, $SD = 1.00$). All six of the interviewees reported that the Jail Administrator is essential for carrying out the transportation and

housing of the HOPE violators. For example, the Prosecutor explained how the Jail Administrator was very accommodating to the HOPE program and would, “provide jail space,” and “critical logistical support with frequent transports of inmates from jail to the courthouse.” Additionally, the Defense Counsel noted that the cooperation of this individual is significant due to the responsibility to “hold in jail for transportation.” The PC reported that the Jail Administrator was willing to do UA testing in the jail for HOPE probationers. Interviewees reported communicating with the Jail Administrator fairly often ($M = 4.17, SD = 0.75$). Final communication ratings were higher than at the intermediate and baseline interview periods (Intermediate: $M = 3.50, SD = 1.38$; Baseline: $M = 3.00, SD = 1.26$).

Sheriff

Involvement ratings for the Sheriff by the interviewees decreased for this final round of interviews and reported not much involvement from the Sheriff in the day to day operation of the HOPE program ($M = 2.83, SD = 1.72$). The ratings for the final round of interviews are much lower than the intermediate and baseline ratings (Intermediate: $M = 4.00, SD = 1.27$, Baseline: $M = 3.50, SD = 0.71$). The Judge and POs explained how the Sheriff provided assistance in serving warrants and locating absconders. The PC highlighted how the Sheriff was able to provide a car and equipment to the new POs. The Defense Counsel highlighted the need for the Sheriff to be supportive because the POs were the ones serving the warrants to the probationers, this respondent reflected how perhaps this may be a resource issue for the Sheriff. Communication with the Sheriff increased for this final round of interviews compared to the intermediate interviews ($M = 3.58, SD = 1.28$, Intermediate: $M = 2.86, SD = 1.35$; Baseline: $M = 2.17, SD = 0.98$).

Other (Administration Office of the Courts)

The PC was the only interviewee who rated the Administration Office of the Courts (AOC) in the final site visit. The PC rated the AOC as somewhat involved in the operation of HOPE over the course of the interviews ($M = 3.00, SD = n/a$, Intermediate: $M = 3.67, SD = 1.53$, Baseline: $M = 3.50, SD = 0.71$). The HOPE PC discussed how the AOC is involved with HOPE in terms of running the grant and financial management of the program. A moderate level of communication with the Administration Office of the Courts was reported across the interviews ($M = 5.00, SD = n/a$, Intermediate: $M = 2.00, SD = 1.00$; Baseline: $M = 2.00, SD = 0.00$).

Average involvement and communication ratings for each role in the HOPE team

Role	Involvement	Communication
Program Coordinator	4.60	3.83
Probation Management	2.00	2.33
HOPE Judge	3.80	5.00
HOPE POs	4.80	4.83
Prosecutor	4.10	4.33
Defense Counsel	3.40	4.42
Jail Administrator	3.00	4.17
Sheriff/Other Law Enforcement	2.83	3.58
Other-AOC	3.00	5.00

The correlation between the involvement ratings from the intermediate and final round was strong and statistically significant ($r = 0.83, p = 0.01$), this differs from the correlation between the intermediate and final communication scores which demonstrates a particularly weak correlation ($r = 0.26$).

For this final round of interviews, the strength of the correlation between involvement and communication ratings decreased from the intermediate and baseline interviews ($r = 0.58, n.s.$ intermediate: $r = 0.83, p = 0.01$; baseline: $r = 0.83, p = 0.01$).

The intermediate and final involvement scores ($r = 0.83, p = 0.01$) compared to the baseline and intermediate involvement scores ($r = 0.87, p = 0.002$) remained consistent and demonstrate a strong, statistically significant correlation. The intermediate and final communication scores ($r = 0.26, n.s.$) compared to the baseline and intermediate communication scores ($r = 0.95, p = <.001$) represented a weaker correlation. Thus, patterns of involvement of the stakeholders over time remained relatively consistent, with communication patterns being a bit more mixed, especially near the end of the DFE.

Self-Ratings on Involvement Compared to Average Ratings

Role	Self-Rating	Average Rating	Differential
Program Coordinator	5.00	4.60	0.40
HOPE Judge	5.00	3.80	1.20
HOPE POs	5.00	4.80	0.20
Prosecutor	3.00	4.10	-1.10
Defense Counsel	3.50	3.40	0.10
Jail Administrator	4.00	3.00	1.00

This table illustrates the differences between key stakeholders' self-ratings on involvement in HOPE with others' average ratings. The self-ratings and average ratings for PC, POs, and Defense Counsel correspond closely. Self-ratings for the Judge and Jail Administrator on involvement were over reported in comparison to the average stakeholders. The prosecutor under reported their involvement in comparison to the average ratings provided by the stakeholders.

Summary

The HOPE POs, PC, and Prosecutor were rated as being the most involved in the ongoing operation of HOPE. The POs handled the day to day management of HOPE, including meeting with the probationers, administering drug tests, and locating absconders. Interviewees rated the PC as another individual who is essential for coordinating and organizing the daily operations of the HOPE program. All stakeholders reported communicating with the POs and PC either every day or multiple times a week.

Key Components of HOPE

Five of the six interview groups highlighted the swift and certain sanctions as a key component of HOPE. The prosecutor illuminated how the “immediate and short sanctions...provides the short, quick disruption of their [the HOPE probationers] lives that gets their attention.” The judge and the POs noted how all the probationers are being treated equally, thus the probationers perceive fairness with HOPE. Warning hearings were mentioned by the POs as a critical component of HOPE because “it sets the tone for HOPE” with this coming from the authority of the judge.

Implementation Barriers and Facilitators

Team members discussed how certain populations may present a barrier to the HOPE program. For example, the prosecutor and the jail administrator cited the importance of individuals in HOPE being at a point in life where they were ready to enact positive change for themselves. The jail administrator discussed how HOPE may not be as helpful for lifelong offenders and the prosecutor supported this idea describing a population of stubborn “middle aged probationers,” that were “resistant to change,” these probationers “refuse to conform to demands of HOPE,” and thought they get just get through HOPE as they had with past probation experiences.

Working with the Arkansas Community Corrections (ACC) was a challenge highlighted by the judge and PC, noting that ACC would place bureaucratic obstacles in the way of HOPE. For example, ACC would enforce various regulations with the HOPE POs that could work counter to their HOPE duties, requiring the judge to intervene with ACC (require from the earlier discussion that the judge had been granted great latitude over the supervision of the POs for the purposes of the DFE).

A barrier highlighted by the POs included some probationers wanting to remain on the color line even after completing HOPE “to remind them to stay straight.” The dependence on the color line to maintain a life apart from drugs may present a challenge if the color line were to end, then this tool would be removed from the probationers’ arsenal and how then would they cope with the ongoing challenge of maintaining sobriety? This issue was also brought up at other sites. The POs stated how the high caseloads pose a challenge and recommend more POs who would be committed to HOPE.

The defense counsel noted the importance of appropriate punishment as a potential barrier and how for example probationers would be assigned community service for a probation supervision payment that was posted late, which could be detrimental to those probationers with full time jobs. A final barrier noted by the defense counsel was that individuals “not high functioning enough to comply with HOPE” may find meeting the requirements of HOPE challenging. The prosecutor presented the size of the county being small as a potential barrier to enrollment in HOPE.

A facilitator highlighted by the PC was that the probationers were learning life skills and time management, which was seen by some as an essential element to the success of HOPE. The jail administrator noted that the investigator who was hired to help the team find absconders was a key facilitator because it removed some of the strain from the HOPE POs.

Leadership

Five of the six individuals interviewed cited the judge as the leader of HOPE in Saline County. The PC described the judge as the “cheerleader for HOPE...heads the team and public face of HOPE.” The judge, prosecutor, jail administrator, defense counsel, and probation officers also recognized the probation officers as leaders because of their high visibility with the day to operations of HOPE.

Personal Opinions

All six interviews groups felt positively and were in support of HOPE. Four of the interviews groups discussed how HOPE compared to PAU is as the judge noted “more effective.” For example, individuals reported that PAU should strive to be like HOPE. The judge and the prosecutor noted how HOPE is effective at changing negative offender behavior. Two interview groups, the judge and the PC remarked how HOPE promotes public safety. The jail administrator commented on the importance of an individual being willing to change for HOPE to be successful for them. On a final note, the defense counsel discussed the importance of tailoring punishment to the circumstances of individual HOPE violators (i.e. probationers with employment should not be punished in such a way as to jeopardize their jobs).

Organizational and System Level Changes

No organizational or system level changes were reported in the wake of the HOPE DFE.

Future of HOPE

Four of the interview groups highlighted that the future of HOPE in Saline County would depend on securing “legislative support,” as reported by the judge. The prosecutor noted that funds would be needed to support the PC and POs positions for HOPE to continue. The PC and defense counsel highlighted the possibility of the defense counsel and prosecutor referring individuals to HOPE. For example, the defense counsel explained how HOPE can be a barrier to maintaining employment for those with jobs, thus excluding these individuals may be helpful.

Factors to Consider for the Expansion of HOPE in Arkansas

Four of the six interview groups identified the importance of having the HOPE stakeholders initially be exposed to rigorous training on the HOPE program and to try to form a group of individuals in support of HOPE. The PC discussed the significance of altering the color line so probationers would be unable to determine a pattern. Advocacy for additional staff was highlighted by the jail administrator. For example, having an investigator was helpful in Arkansas because it relived the “burden” of HOPE from the POs because the investigator aided in the transportation of violators. The defense counsel expounded on the importance of having good “quality and competency of HOPE POs...and prosecutor” that would have sensitivity for probationers. Additionally, the defense counsel noted the importance of the judge offering lenience to probationers (i.e. with full time employment).

Drug Treatment Referrals

During the final site visit to the Saline County HOPE, we also conducted a brief examination of the primary drug treatment program to which the plurality of HOPE probationer referrals was sent. As with all DFE sites, Saline County used a variety of drug treatment providers, and we were not able to examine all of them. Instead, we examined the program that received more HOPE referrals than any other. This was the Central Arkansas CCC Treatment Facility (CCC), located in downtown Little Rock and operated directly by ACC (i.e. by state ACC staff, not contracted out). Saline County HOPE made moderate use of treatment in general, referring 31% of all HOPE probationers to some form of treatment. The plurality of all treatment referrals (29%) were sent to the CCC program, with the remainder sent to over a dozen miscellaneous other providers, primarily focused on drug treatment and related services, such as dual diagnosis. Thus, 16 (9%) of all HOPE probationers in Saline County experienced the CCC program, and as discussed below the majority of them completed the program.

Our examination of the CCC program using an abbreviated version of the Correctional Program Checklist (CPC) is described more fully in the methodology chapter. Again, the purpose of this examination was not to conduct a full-scale process or outcome evaluation of CCC, which is beyond the scope of the HOPE DFE, but rather to provide a basic description of services provided through CCC within the framework of the principles of effective offender intervention (Andrews and Bonta, 2003, MacKenzie, 2006; MacKenzie and Zajac, 2013). Thus, we cannot draw conclusions about whether CCC is in fact effective, but we simply offer a summary of core programmatic features as they relate to these principles. Investigator Zajac conducted an intensive in person interview with the CCC director and several key staff on October 3, 2014, during the final site visit to Saline County, to gather information about CCC program operations. The following is a summary of key features of this program.

CCC is a relatively large program within a secure lockdown state community corrections residential facility. At the time of the interview, there were approximately 150 male offenders in total at CCC; there are no females served at CCC. At any given time, the HOPE participants represent a very small proportion of all offenders participating in CCC. HOPE referrals are housed in a special “short term court program” unit, which houses referrals from specialty courts in Arkansas such as drug court, veterans court and HOPE court. This unit is run akin to a modified therapeutic community (TC) and is kept separate from the rest of the facility, which is also run as a conventional TC largely for referrals from the Arkansas Department of Corrections. This unit typically houses 30-40 clients, with 2 counselors and 1 supervisor staffing this unit. CCC staff were only vaguely aware of what HOPE was or how it operated, but such knowledge was not essential to the services offered there. Staff in this unit do not do anything differently with the HOPE clients than with other referrals. Indeed, as was the case for the drug treatment programs examined at all four DFE sites, the lack of detailed knowledge by treatment staff of HOPE is beneficial for the DFE as it further ensures that HOPE clients are not treated differently than any other probationers referred there, including potentially any PAU probationers. This helps to further isolate the impacts of the core HOPE model (swift and certain sanctioning).

CCC is an inpatient residential program, operating within the context of a secure state community correctional institution. Program participants are thus closely monitored and are not permitted outside release privileges while enrolled in the program. CCC is a 30 to 90+ day program, depending on client progress, which at the higher end falls just within the recommended program dosage range of three to nine months established by the CPC.

Primary targets of change within CCC center on core criminogenic needs: antisocial attitudes and values, peer associates, substance use (including relapse prevention), anger/hostility, problem solving/decision making/coping skills, interpersonal skills and conflict resolution. There appeared to be little attention given to non-criminogenic needs, such as physical fitness or artistic skills. Thus, CCC appears to devote the overwhelming proportion of its time to addressing factors that are directly related to offending behavior.

CCC operates within the broad framework of therapeutic community (TC). TC’s have considerable evidence of effectiveness for recidivism reduction (Mitchell, Wilson and MacKenzie, 2012; Wexler and Prendergast, 2010). More specifically, CCC uses the *New Freedom* curriculum by Phoenix Systems. Modules focus on cognitive-behavioral therapy (CBT), anger management, relapse prevention, substance abuse, plus individual modules as needed. This is a manualized curriculum with workbooks for participants. Upon inspection, this curriculum appears substantially similar to other commonly used CBT

curricula such as *Thinking for a Change* and *Changing Offender Behavior*. The *New Freedom* curriculum was selected by a state committee that examined approximately 20 curricula and graded them against a national grid of evidence based practices developed by Marilyn Van Dieten. They selected the curriculum that best fit this grid, that had an emphasis on continuum of care and that was well manualized.

The format of treatment groups includes small group discussion of issues, sharing of insight, working through problem scenarios from manuals and review of homework. Role playing is also used (e.g. refusal skills, dealing with antisocial peers, thought stopping) followed by analysis and discussion of the role play. If-then exercises are also used. Groups include some focus on details of skill acquisition. Staff modeling of pro-social behavior is also reinforced and staff are held accountable for any behavioral displays on their part that are counter to the treatment message and goals. It was unclear exactly how much time per group is spent on role playing, behavior rehearsal and other skills practice activities, but it does appear that some such activities do occur on a regular basis. Group size ranges from 18-36 participants, which is outside the CPC recommended range of no more than approximately 10 clients per group/facilitator. State licensing standards mandate a ratio of 1:25, which is also too large.

The typical day for a client at CCC appears to be quite structured. By state licensing requirements, CCC is mandated to provide clients with at least 25 hours per week of staff based treatment services. The typical proceeds approximately as follows:

- 8-8:30: Morning group
- 8:30-9:30: Maintenance/hygiene/breakfast
- 9:30-10:30: Orientation for new members or other activities
- 10:30-11:30: Groups utilizing New Freedom curricula
- 11:30-12:30 Lunch

Afternoon activities includes process groups, interpersonal/communication skills groups, GED (if needed), other individual services.

Evening groups focus on AA/NA, financial management, spiritual groups, etc. Some of these are volunteer facilitated (they noted they have an active and supportive volunteer community).

There do not appear to be regular work assignments for clients, other than routine cleaning and such. Instead, the focus is on group and other treatment activities, with a primary focus on the New Freedom curriculum, which they are able to work through in a 60-90 day period. CCC appears to meet the CPC standard of at least 40% of a client's time being spent in direct treatment activities.

Thus, it appears that CCC is using an evidence based treatment modality (TC) combined with structured curricula that are grounded in a strong cognitive behavioral approach, which is another central CPC standard.

Turning to assessment, all HOPE clients are supposed to be high risk, and as discussed in the implementation fidelity section of this report, the data supplied to us indicates that approximately three-quarters of HOPE enrollees were in fact medium to high risk, thus meeting the CPC standard of at least 70% of clients being higher risk. Also, as noted above, HOPE clients are part of a specialty court unit within CCC and are housed separately from the regular Arkansas Department of Correction inmate population also being treated at CCC. It appears that most client assessment information available to CCC is done centrally by ACC, but drug and alcohol needs are reported to be assessed following

guidelines from the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (“DSM”), and mental health needs are assessed using a SAMSHA screener. While local CCC staff were not versed in all the details of assessments conducted by ACC, it appears that an adequate level of assessment information for these clients is available to CCC.

Tangible rewards are provided to CCC clients, such as extra sleeping time. Rewards are group based, in accordance with the community-as-method approach in this modified TC. Punishers include essays, singing in French for sleeping in past the wake-up period, and loss of privileges. Misconduct can be reported back to the HOPE team for further action. CCC reports doing relatively few rewards, but also having handed out few punishments either – they note that most participants quickly “get with the program”, so there is not a great need for punishers. But, it would appear punishers do outweigh rewards, which is against the guidance of the CPC.

Specific criteria for client advancement were not clear, but it appears that clients can be kept on longer if they do not show adequate progress through the groups. Based upon fidelity data supplied to us by the HOPE team, it appears that approximately 80% of the HOPE referrals to CCC successfully completed the program, which is well within the CPC normed range of 65% to 85%.

In terms of aftercare, each client has an individual treatment plan, which is updated periodically. This plan is recorded in the ACC central information system, which is viewable by the HOPE probation officers. Each discharged client receives an aftercare plan including referral to local programs and connection with medical assistance and other social services as needed. This plan is transmitted to the HOPE probation officers.

Per state civil service regulations and state substance abuse facility licensing requirements, all counseling staff must have at least a Bachelor’s degree and Certified Addictions Counselor certification or be working towards same. The current unit supervisor has at least 10 years of experience with drug treatment, and the two subordinate counselors have at least two years of experience with offender treatment. Thus, CCC easily meets the basic CPC requirements for staff education (70% must possess at least an Associate’s Degree) and level of experience (75% must have at least two years of experience in offender treatment).

CCC is a state licensed substance abuse treatment facility and thus comes under regular state drug and alcohol auditing and oversight. But, no one from the HOPE team appears to have made any regular visits to CCC to observe what is being done with the HOPE referrals there, nor do any team members have detailed knowledge of the operations at CCC. It appears that the HOPE team relies on CCC primarily because it is state licensed and operated by ACC, and thus is assumed to be a good facility. Team members acknowledge that they should conduct more regular oversight of their clients at CCC. While ACC tracks the recidivism rate of offenders discharged from CCC, finding a 21% recidivism rate for CCC completers compared to 79% for the overall Arkansas Department of Corrections inmate population, no rigorous outcome evaluation has been conducted utilizing a formal control group.

Primary areas of concern noted for CCC focus on group size, client reward structures, and oversight and evaluation. First, as noted above, the facilitator to client ratio is quite high, approximately 1:25. This is markedly higher than the maximum ratio of 1:10 recommended by the CPC. Thus, individual groups are attempting to serve far too many clients at one time, potentially diminishing treatment effects. This may speak to poor selectivity in determining which client needs which specific group, as well as inadequate staffing levels. Second, as noted above, punishers seem outweigh rewards in this program.

While this may seem to be in line with the sanctioning oriented approach of HOPE in general, it is the opposite of the desired goal within a treatment setting of rewards outweighing punishers by a ratio of 4 to 1 as outlined in the CPC. Moreover, some of the punishers border on being shaming, such as having clients sing in French for certain infractions. Shaming approaches engender negative client effects from clients that work against the larger goals of a treatment program such as this. It is also unlikely that such approaches do anything to teach more appropriate behavioral routines to clients. Finally, the CCC program has not been formally evaluated, and the HOPE team conducts no notable oversight of the services delivered there. Overall, the areas of concern noted here are relatively minimal.

References

- Andrews, D.A. and James Bonta. 2003. *The Psychology of Criminal Conduct*. Cincinnati: Anderson Publishing.
- MacKenzie, Doris Layton. 2006. *What Works in Corrections*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- MacKenzie, Doris Layton and Gary Zajac. 2013. *What Works in Corrections: The Impact of Correctional Interventions on Recidivism*. Monograph commissioned by The National Academy of Sciences Committee on the Causes and Consequences of High Rates of Incarceration.
- Mitchell, Ojmarrh, David B. Wilson and Doris L. MacKenzie. 2012. *The Effectiveness of Incarceration-Based Drug Treatment on Criminal Behavior: A Systematic Review*. Campbell Systematic Reviews, 2012:18.
- Rittel, Horst W.J. and Melvin M. Webber. 1973. "Dilemmas in a General Theory of Planning." *Policy Sciences*, 4, 155-169.
- Scott, W. Richard. 2002. *Organizations: Rational, Natural and Open Systems*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Wexler, Harry K. and Michael L. Prendergast. 2010. "Therapeutic Communities in United States' Prisons: Effectiveness and Challenges." *Therapeutic Communities*, 31(2), 157-175.

TARRANT COUNTY, TEXAS HOPE DFE PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

Contents

Tarrant County, Texas HOPE Overview.....	1
Key Findings and Conclusions – HOPE Implementation in Tarrant County, Texas	3
Implementation Fidelity.....	7
Baseline Site Visit Summary.....	8
Involvement & Communication	8
HOPE PC.....	8
HOPE Judge.....	8
HOPE POs.....	8
Probation Management	9
Prosecutor	9
Defense Counsel	9
Jail Administrator.....	9
Sheriff/Other Law Enforcement	9
Other – Court Officers	9
Summary.....	9
Training.....	10
Perceptions of HOPE and PAU.....	10
Implementation Barriers and Facilitators.....	11
Personal Opinions of HOPE	11
Intermediate Site Visit Summary	12
Involvement in Ongoing Implementation/Operation of HOPE & Communication.....	12
HOPE PC.....	12
HOPE Judge.....	12
HOPE POs.....	13
Probation Management	13
Prosecutor	13
Defense Counsel	13
Jail Administrator.....	14
Sheriff/Other Law Enforcement	14
Other – Court Officers, Field POs & Supervisors, UA Supervisor	14
Summary.....	15
Training.....	15
Leadership in HOPE	15
Satisfaction with Group Process.....	15
Effectiveness of Sanctions	16
Probationers’ Understanding of HOPE Sanctioning Goals and Process	16
Sanctioning Process.....	16
Personal Opinions of HOPE	17
Implementation and Ongoing Operation Barriers	17
Implementation and Ongoing Operation Facilitators	17
HOPE’s Burden on Stakeholders.....	17
HOPE’s Burden on Various Departments	18

HOPE Sustainability Plans	18
Changes to PAU	18
Key Findings from Intermediate Interviews	18
Final Site Visit Summary	19
Involvement in Ongoing Implementation/Operation of HOPE & Communication	19
HOPE PC	19
HOPE Judge	19
HOPE POs	19
Probation Management	20
Prosecutor	20
Defense Counsel	20
Jail Administrator	21
Sheriff/Other Law Enforcement	21
Other – UA Supervisor and Assessment Supervisors	21
Summary	22
Key Components of HOPE	23
Implementation Barriers and Facilitators	23
Leadership	24
Personal Opinions	24
Organizational and System Level Changes	24
Future of HOPE	24
Factors to Consider for the Expansion of HOPE in Texas	24
Drug Treatment Referrals	24
References	28

Tarrant County, Texas HOPE Overview

The following report presents findings from the process evaluation of the HOPE DFE site in Tarrant County, Texas. Results are presented from three evaluation site visits and an analysis of implementation fidelity metrics. As a preface, we provide an overview of the site itself, discussing key local administrative and organizational features within the site that influence the operation of HOPE there. See the Methods chapter for more information about the DFE and the research design.

The HOPE management team in Tarrant County consists of the HOPE judge, HOPE program coordinator, two HOPE probation officers who are fully dedicated to HOPE (they do not carry a non-HOPE caseload), several representatives of probation management from the Community Supervision and Corrections Department (CSCD), a representative from the Sheriff's warrant service unit, and unique to this site, a staffer from the dedicated CSCD drug testing unit and another from the dedicated CSCD offender assessment unit; both of these units serve all probationers within CSCD. Also unique to this site, there is no participation in HOPE management or implementation by the district attorney or public defender's offices, or by Tarrant County Jail (the latter most likely due to the jail having excess capacity, thus, HOPE does not represent a strain on that agency).

The ten felony court judges in Tarrant County are elected to four year terms, with full re-election races rather than retention elections. There is no President Judge at either the county or state level, so each judge exercises considerable autonomy over their court and over any specialty programs that they oversee.

Probation in Tarrant County - the Community Supervision and Corrections Department, CSCD – is a “hybrid” state-county level office whose director is selected by and reports to the collectivity of the judges in Tarrant County. The administrative linkage between the court and probation there is direct and unimpeded. Thus, the HOPE Judge is able to direct the probation operations related to HOPE to the fullest extent that she desires. The importance of this for HOPE operations in Tarrant County is discussed in the detailed findings below.

Probation officers in Tarrant County do not have arrest powers, and thus do not serve warrants to HOPE probationer violators. Instead, this task is covered principally by the Tarrant County Sheriff's office warrant service unit, which consists of approximately 22 deputies. Sanctions for probation violations can be administered only by the judge, not by the CSCD office or individual probation officers. This further reinforces, and indeed even necessitates, the role of the judge within Tarrant County HOPE.

The impetus behind the initiation of HOPE in Tarrant County was the CSCD Director who had experience with a HOPE-like variant in a neighboring county. This was the Supervision with Intensive Enforcement, or “SWIFT” program. SWIFT shares many of the same features as HOPE, notably the primary emphasis on providing immediate and certain sanctions to probation violators, while downplaying severity of sanctions. SWIFT also employs warning and violation hearings, like HOPE, and frequent drug testing. This Director had a positive experience with SWIFT elsewhere in Texas, and upon joining Tarrant County CSCD invited national HOPE proponents to speak to local officials (including the eventual HOPE judge) about the concept in late 2010. Tarrant County subsequently implemented a SWIFT program, approximately one year prior to the implementation of HOPE under the auspices of the

DFE. Thus, this site already had some basic level of experience with the HOPE model, and had achieved considerable buy-in to the underlying concept. This is discussed further in the results sections below. Upon release of the HOPE DFE program solicitation by BJA in 2011 the CSCD Director initiated an application on behalf of Tarrant County, having achieved agreement among the key HOPE team stakeholders, most notably a strong partnership around HOPE with the eventual HOPE judge.

Key Findings and Conclusions – HOPE Implementation in Tarrant County, Texas

The implementation of the HOPE DFE in Tarrant County, Texas was by all appearances successful. The implementation experience at this site proceeded smoothly and was relatively uneventful. The site also achieved a high degree of fidelity to the intended HOPE model, as promulgated by BJA. These two implementation components – the implementation experience and implementation fidelity – are summarized further below. A detailed discussion of the process evaluation findings is presented following this summary.

The implementation of HOPE in Tarrant County benefited greatly from the previous experience that this site had with the very similar SWIFT program. SWIFT (Supervision with Intensive Enforcement) is a swift and certain sanctioning model, incorporating many of the same design features as HOPE. SWIFT in Tarrant County began approximately one year before HOPE did, and provided a blueprint for the implementation of HOPE. Many of the barriers and challenges to the implementation of the swift and certain sanctioning approach were worked out at this site with SWIFT, thus greatly easing the implementation of HOPE. Consequently, HOPE team members reported that the implementation of HOPE was very little burden to them (mean of 1.9 on a scale of 5). Indeed, as of the time of the final process evaluation site visit (October 2014), it appeared that the HOPE and SWIFT dichotomy was a distinction without a difference. As the end of the BJA funding for the HOPE DFE approached, the intention in Tarrant County was to simply continue HOPE under the rubric of SWIFT, as the two programs had become indistinguishable. Still, the HOPE team largely agreed that it was important to see the full results of the HOPE DFE (specifically, the outcome evaluation) before making final decisions about the long-term continuation or expansion of HOPE/SWIFT in Tarrant County. Thus, the SWIFT experience emerged as one of the key facilitators of HOPE and this experience contributed to few major implementation barriers being reported by the members of the HOPE team.

Perhaps the primary implementation barrier noted in the interviews with the HOPE team members were the requirements of the DFE itself, principally the need to randomize clients to either HOPE or the control condition - Probation as Usual (PAU). Some team members and other local staff were confused about the purpose of the randomization and sometimes felt that deserving clients were excluded from HOPE because of it (which of course is an inevitable part of a randomized control trial). Still, the HOPE team was able to work through these issues with few problems.

Related to this, the operation of HOPE under the DFE required immediate arrest of violators. Immediate arrest had not been a key feature of SWIFT. The HOPE team was ambivalent about the importance of same day arrest, as had been done in Hawaii HOPE, as opposed to next day arrest. They argued that since probation officers in Tarrant County cannot make arrests on their own, the need to rely on external law enforcement agencies to serve warrants made same day arrests impractical in most cases. They felt that the goals of HOPE would be served by next day arrest, in spite of opposition to this from external HOPE proponents. Regardless, Tarrant County had to develop new procedures to coordinate rapid warrant service with the Sheriff's department. Interviews with the Sheriff's department, though, suggested that they did not view the need for quick warrant service to be a major

problem. They were able to easily integrate HOPE warrants into the activities of their rather large warrant service team (c. 22 deputies). Indeed, the Sheriff's office noted that HOPE warrants are a "drop in the bucket" of the approximately 3000 new warrants they receive each month (and they report clearing approximately 2500 of them), and they had no problem with prioritizing the HOPE warrants. Thus, the need for immediate arrest under HOPE was not a significant barrier for Tarrant County.

The implementation of HOPE in Tarrant County was characterized by a high degree of stability, consistency and predictability in the key stakeholders involved in the implementation process, and in the communication patterns between these stakeholders. Very little change in these dimensions was seen across the two to three-year implementation cycle that we observed and documented. Most stakeholders reported a stable level of involvement by themselves and by their fellow team members in the implementation process, as well as consistent patterns of communication among one another. There seemed to be little if any role confusion noted, and few if any complaints about the contributions made by other team members. The common refrain we heard was that "everyone knows their role and does what they are supposed to do for HOPE." This is to say that a positive HOPE group dynamic seems to have been established there, with little intragroup conflict or tension. This cooperative and harmonious court climate was reported to have predated HOPE, and even SWIFT. Thus, the implementation of HOPE in Tarrant County seems to have benefited greatly from an existing organizational culture that made the adoption of innovations like HOPE less contentious. The formal administrative relationship between the court and probation likely contributed to this environment. Probation in Tarrant County (Community Supervision and Corrections Department, CSCD) is under the direct authority of the collectivity of the judges in that county; the CSCD Director reports and is accountable to the judges (Zajac, Lattimore, Dawes and Winger, 2015). Thus, the HOPE judge is able to exercise a direct and unimpeded line of control over HOPE, which is in accordance with the theory of HOPE as espoused in the BJA solicitation and as exhibited in the prototypical Hawaii HOPE program. This was thought to reduce bureaucratic delays in the implementation of HOPE. Still, both the HOPE judge and probation (CSCD) management noted emphatically that HOPE is a team based project; it is not "us" and "them", but rather "we." The judge, though, was clearly nominated by most HOPE team members as being the primary leader of HOPE. Her role was seen as working to ensure fidelity to the model, transmitting the values of HOPE to probationers, building teamwork among the HOPE team, promoting HOPE within the broader criminal justice community and the public, and approving all major decisions about the program. The HOPE PC also emerged later as being another key leader, but HOPE in Tarrant County clearly retained the character of a judge-driven program.

Interestingly, HOPE in Tarrant County operated entirely without a role for the prosecutor/district attorney or defense counsel/public defender. While these two roles were of lesser prominence in the HOPE teams at all four HOPE DFE sites, their minimization was most pronounced in Tarrant County. The absence of these roles did not seem to cause any problems for HOPE implementation there, and indeed was not even brought up as an issue during interviews with team members. This undoubtedly reflects a feature of the court culture established as part of SWIFT, but nonetheless remains an important local variation, illustrating how HOPE implementation can be tolerant of differences in team composition.

A key factor that seems to have promoted this positive group dynamic around HOPE implementation was the very strong level of personal support and buy-in for HOPE voiced by virtually the entire HOPE team. Team members were enthusiastic about HOPE (albeit tempering that enthusiasm by a strong desire to see the results of the DFE), and believed that it is an innovation worthy of their best efforts. Very little dissent on this point was evident, and personal opinions about HOPE did not change much over time. Team members repeatedly noted that “HOPE is the way probation should be”, and characterized HOPE as “a long time coming; the future of probation.” They were very supportive of the accountability, personal responsibility and clear expectations established for probationers by HOPE. They also felt that the strictly enforced accountability requirements of HOPE helped probationers to hone their basic life skills, including time management, daily planning, job management skills, family relations and financial management. They believed that HOPE helped these probationers to achieve a more pro-social organization of what were often characterized as chaotic and aimless lifestyles.

Their enthusiasm for HOPE was set as a counterpoint to their feelings about PAU, which they saw as inconsistent (in supervision, violation processes and sanctioning), idiosyncratic, failing to set clear expectations and to match consequences to actions, and unfair to probationers. HOPE was seen as being easier to manage than PAU, due to its consistency, predictability and the behavior-consequences messaging given to probationers. On a related point, they also felt that the consistency and simplicity of HOPE made it easy for probationers to understand the core precepts of the program, rating probationer understanding of the concepts behind HOPE as 4.4 on a 5-point scale. They also believed that HOPE would be effective at reducing recidivism for the typical probationer, rating HOPE sanction effectiveness at 4.3 on a 5-point scale.

In spite of this high level of support for the theory and practice of HOPE, team members did express some reservations about the model. First, while noting that probationers *understood* in principle the chain of consequences that underlies HOPE (i.e. that X behavior will lead to Y consequence), probationer *acceptance* of this was not always a given. Especially among probationers with deeply entrenched anti-social attitudes, values and decision making processes, there was often a reluctance to take responsibility for actions and an unwillingness to admit that their own behavior was the cause of their problems. Thus, while they understood HOPE on an intellectual level (they knew what HOPE expected of them), for some probationers the leap to actual behavioral change was more challenging – they simply did not believe that they were doing anything wrong and felt that HOPE was “singling them out” for consequences. This observation was reported in other DFE sites.

Second, there was concern within the HOPE team that the basic logic model of drug test – detect – sanction with swiftness and certainty was simply not quite enough for many of the higher risk probationers, especially those with very serious addiction problems. There was skepticism that the basic HOPE sanctioning model *by itself* was adequate to the needs of this sub-population. Again, this sentiment was echoed in other DFE sites. They argued that intensive, cognitive-behaviorally oriented drug treatment was needed in addition to HOPE for these cases, and indeed, Tarrant County HOPE did have a relatively high rate of referral to residential treatment (c. 50% of cases). They felt that their utilization of intensive treatment at this rate was implicitly frowned upon by some national HOPE promoters, but they believed that it was the right path for these clients.

Third, and at the opposite end of the spectrum, some HOPE team members felt that HOPE resulted in over-supervision and excessive sanctioning for some lower risk probationers (as discussed below, approximately 10% of probationers admitted to HOPE in Tarrant County were assessed as low risk). This was felt to increase the odds of these probationers being caught up in the system in ways that they might not otherwise within PAU, especially for minor infractions. This was thought to have negative impacts on their employment and family situations, due to disruptions caused by jail stays, and potentially a detriment to their rehabilitation prospects.

Thus, there was a sense that HOPE still needed to figure out who was the best fit for the model and that for this model to work, it could not be monolithic, but had to be adaptable to local conditions and constraints. The question for whom does HOPE work (if indeed it does) and under what circumstances is a critical one. On the one hand, concern was expressed that HOPE was not having the intended impact on the more committed offenders, and on the other hand, that it may be overkill for the lowest level offenders. This leads us to ask if HOPE is most suited to more malleable “mid-range” offenders, those who clearly need some sort of intervention (as opposed to simply being left undisturbed), but who are not so deeply entrenched in the criminal lifestyle that the threat of sanctioning alone is insufficient to elicit behavioral change. More research is needed to develop our understanding of who (if anyone) is likely to maximally benefit from a swift and certain sanctioning regimen such as HOPE.

Another concern was noted by the evaluation team, based on an observation offered by several HOPE team members who reported that some probationers were asking to remain on the urine analysis color call in line even after they were no longer required to (this was also reported at other sites and was noted during interviews with HOPE probationers themselves). These probationers felt that they would be more likely to relapse to drug use without the close monitoring provided by the color line, and were concerned about their fate when HOPE was no longer “keeping them honest.” While these probationers are to be commended for their concern for their own sobriety, this does beg the question of how well these individuals will fare when they are completely removed from the supportive, close monitoring structure of HOPE. In other words, does the frequent drug testing (and other quasi-parental monitoring components of HOPE) serve as a sort of crutch for these individuals? This is an area that would seem to be ripe for future research.

Turning to fidelity, given the preceding discussion, it is perhaps unsurprising that HOPE in Tarrant County was implemented with a high degree of fidelity to the model as espoused in the BJA solicitation – at least 80% fidelity for most items. There seemed to be a clear commitment to doing HOPE “as intended” and again, the judge was seen as a key enforcer of this fidelity. The experience with the nearly identical SWIFT program also undoubtedly enabled a clean implementation of HOPE. Finally, the high degree of personal buy-in to the underlying swift and certain sanctioning model facilitated adherence to HOPE standards. Thus, we see here a congruence of a very positive qualitative experience with the implementation process, leading to strong fidelity and overall satisfaction with the process.

Implementation Fidelity

The table below presents the implementation fidelity for Tarrant County HOPE, following methodology elaborated on in the methodology chapter, which explains in detail our measurement strategy, including a full specification of all items used to assess implementation fidelity.

Tarrant County, Texas HOPE achieved a very high level of implementation fidelity, achieving a minimum standard of 60% on each of the eleven items. Fidelity was at 80% or greater for ten out of the eleven items. It is worth noting, though, that fidelity was the lowest for Item # 7 (time from a violation to a violation hearing), which gets at the notion of swiftness of sanctioning, which is one of the primary components of the underlying HOPE model. Overall, though, we conclude that the implementation of HOPE in Tarrant County, Texas was very strong.

HOPE FIDELITY ITEM	TEXAS FIDELITY
1. Leadership	100% of HOPE Team members interviewed identified a leader, most commonly the HOPE Judge, with some secondary endorsement of probation management and the HOPE Program Coordinator
2. Probationers High Risk	91% of HOPE Probationers were moderate to high risk
3. Warning Hearing Compliance	100% of 19 warning hearings assessed complied with the model warning hearing script
4. Initial Drug Testing Frequency	90% of HOPE probationers had at least 8 tests in first 2 months
5. Stepped Down Drug Testing Frequency	81% of HOPE probationers had at least 1 test per month after first 2 months
6. Exceptions for Missed Drug Tests	100% of 221 cases with a missed drug test received a consequence
7. Time to Violation Hearing	66% of 1199 total violations were followed by a Violation Hearing within 3 days
8. Sanction Type	97% of sanctions were jail time
9. Sanction Dosage	93% of jail sanctions were at or below the Hawaii HOPE mean of 19 days (Mean = 5 days)
10. Sanction Certainty	>99% of violations resulted in a sanction
11. Sanction Swiftness	83% of sanctions began within 3 days of the Violation Hearing

Baseline Site Visit Summary

Involvement & Communication

Members of the process evaluation team interviewed 9 key individuals involved in HOPE in Tarrant County, Texas. Those interviewed included the Program Coordinator (PC), the Probation Management team (3 individuals including the probation director, probation operations manager, and budget coordinator), the HOPE judge, two HOPE Probation Officers (POs), the UA Supervisor, and the Assessment Supervisor. As part of the qualitative interview, these individuals were asked to rate the following stakeholders on their involvement in the development of HOPE as well as their frequency of communication: HOPE Judge, Prosecutor, Defense Counsel, HOPE POs, Probation Management, Jail Administrator, Sheriff/other law enforcement, HOPE PC, and other. For example, “To what extent has the HOPE Judge been involved in the development of the HOPE program?” (1 = *not at all*; 5 = *great extent*) and “How often do you communicate with the HOPE POs?” (1 = *never*; 5 = *every day*).

HOPE PC

The HOPE PC joined the team following the writing and submission of the grant. Everyone agreed that the HOPE Program Coordinator provided significant contributions to the development of HOPE following the grant submission ($M = 5.00$, $SD = 0.00$). The PC manages day-to-day operations, logistics, and assists with data collection and randomization procedures. She also supervises the HOPE POs, manages the budget, and helped establish the roles for other individuals within the probation office. The PC had 10 years of experience in various probation jobs before being promoted to her current position. The PC has direct communication with the other individuals at the site very frequently ($M = 4.60$, $SD = 0.55$). Those who were interviewed reported being in contact with the HOPE PC either every day or once or twice a week.

HOPE Judge

There were high levels of agreement that the HOPE Judge played a key role in the development of HOPE ($M = 4.80$, $SD = 0.45$). Those most closely involved in the day-to-day operations of HOPE reported communicating with the HOPE Judge frequently ($M = 3.40$, $SD = 1.82$). Since the SWIFT program was already in use in Texas, the HOPE Judge was very familiar with the shared principles. The HOPE Judge has good relationships with people throughout the criminal justice system and has worked hard to build support for HOPE both internally and in the broader community. The PC and Probation Management clearly stated that they viewed the HOPE Judge as the primary leader of the program.

HOPE POs

HOPE POs began working after the program had already begun initial development. However, since they came on board, they have been very involved with implementing the day-to-day tasks associated with running HOPE successfully ($M = 4.40$, $SD = 0.89$). They are involved in a wide variety of tasks such as coordinating UA’s and other activities related to probationers’ violations as well as meeting with the assessment unit staff. The key players who were interviewed reported communicating with the HOPE POs quite often, at least once a week ($M = 4.60$, $SD = 0.55$).

Probation Management

Probation Management was heavily involved in implementing HOPE ($M = 4.60$, $SD = 0.55$). The CSCD Director was responsible for initiating the grant-writing process. These individuals worked extensively in building support for HOPE. They were also responsible for hiring the PC. Now that HOPE is underway, Probation Management is no longer as directly involved, but they are still providing positive support for the program. The amount of communication that occurs with Probation Management seems to vary based on particular roles ($M = 3.40$, $SD = 1.14$). The PC and Judge communicate most frequently with probation management. The HOPE Judge reported that the CSCD Director is as much of a champion for HOPE as she is.

Prosecutor

Interviewees were either unaware of any contributions to HOPE by the Prosecutor or reported that the Prosecutor had very little influence in the implementation of HOPE ($M = 1.00$, $SD = 0.00$). Key players rarely communicate with the Prosecutor ($M = 1.33$, $SD = 0.52$). Some people noted that although the DA's office did not have a specific role in implementing HOPE, they were still generally supportive of it.

Defense Counsel

Similar to the Prosecutor, there was very little involvement reported for the Defense Counsel ($M = 2.00$, $SD = 1.15$). Also, most individuals did not communicate regularly with the Defense Counsel ($M = 1.67$, $SD = 0.82$). The Assessment Supervisor was the only person who reported communicating with the Defense Counsel as frequently as once or twice a month. Again, it appears that there is support coming from them, but not much direct involvement.

Jail Administrator

Nearly all who were interviewed agreed that they either didn't know how the Jail Administrator was involved in the development of the program or believed that this individual was not involved at all ($M = 1.50$, $SD = 0.71$). Subsequently, there is very little communication with the Jail Administrator ($M = 1.50$, $SD = 0.84$). The Program Coordinator and individuals from Probation Management are the only people who have any communication with the Jail Administrator.

Sheriff/Other Law Enforcement

Cooperation from the Sheriff's department has been instrumental in implementing HOPE, as warrant officers are needed to make arrests in Texas ($M = 3.75$, $SD = 0.96$). Coordinating this effort was very important in the early stages of developing HOPE. Now that the warrant procedures have been established, there is not a lot of frequent communication with the Sheriff ($M = 2.00$, $SD = 0.89$).

Other – Court Officers

The PC and individuals from Probation Management reported that Court Officers were quite involved in the development of HOPE. They handle the logistics and administrative issues of processing cases through the court. The PC communicates with the Court Officer every day.

Summary

In Texas, it appears that the HOPE Judge, PC, and Probation Management were most involved in implementing HOPE. Now that HOPE is up and running, the HOPE POs and Court Officers provide much

of the day-to-day support that allows HOPE to function smoothly. In terms of communication, the PC and HOPE POs are communicating with the key players more frequently than those in any other position. Overall, the Prosecutor, Defense Counsel, and Jail Administrator were not involved in developing the HOPE program and subsequently, they are rarely contacted.

Average involvement and communication ratings for each role in the HOPE team

Role	Involvement	Communication
Program Coordinator	5.00	4.60
Probation Management	4.60	3.40
HOPE Judge	4.80	3.40
HOPE POs	4.40	4.60
Prosecutor	1.00	1.33
Defense Counsel	2.00	1.67
Jail Administrator	1.50	1.50
Sheriff/Other Law Enforcement	3.75	2.00
Other - Court Officers	4.50	5.00

There is a significant positive correlation between average involvement and communication ratings such that those who are rated as being more involved are more likely to have higher communication ratings ($r = .86$).

Self-Ratings on Involvement Compared to Average Ratings

Role	Self-Rating	Average Rating	Differential
Program Coordinator	5.00	5.00	0.00
Probation Management	4.00	4.60	-0.60
HOPE POs	5.00	4.40	0.60

The three interview groups who rated themselves on their own involvement appear to be very closely in line with the others’ perceptions of their involvement in implementing HOPE.

Training

The PC, Probation Management, and the HOPE Judge all reported having attended the formal training session in Hawaii. The HOPE POs did not receive any formal training on HOPE procedures, but they did participate in the standard department training on CBT and MI. The UA Supervisor and Assessment Supervisor reported that they did not participate in any formal training, but they did engage in some more informal activities such as attending a presentation from done by the HOPE training and technical assistance team at Pepperdine and searching for information about HOPE online. It was suggested that more formal training about experimental methods, randomization, and other research methodology would have been beneficial.

Perceptions of HOPE and PAU

HOPE – The interviewees in Texas emphasized that HOPE involves a substantial amount of accountability from probationers and clear expectations are established for their behavior. HOPE

probationers are expected to be honest. Probationers have a lot of face time with the judge and the sanctions for violations are swift and consistent.

PAU – Five out of six interview groups reported that PAU is inconsistent. This inconsistency covers many aspects of PAU, such as differences in level of punishment, level of tolerance for violations, amount of time between violation and seeing a judge, frequency of UA's, supervision, etc. The Judge and the PC reported that the PAU sanctions are more severe (1 month in jail); however, several violations are typically needed before this type of sanction occurs. Probation Management and the Assessment Supervisor reported that PAU has been adopting some HOPE elements such as using shorter jail sentences to get the probationers' attention.

Implementation Barriers and Facilitators

The PC and the Judge mentioned the SWIFT program as both a barrier and facilitator in the implementation process. Having recently established SWIFT, there were a lot of challenges that were addressed during that process that made the start of HOPE run smoothly. Many procedures and documents from SWIFT served as a model for those that would be used with HOPE. On the other hand, it became difficult at times to differentiate SWIFT procedures from HOPE. Many POs were confused about the differences between the two groups and had difficulty keeping track of their duties for the different groups of probationers. Even the HOPE Judge mentioned that SWIFT and HOPE are the same. Another barrier was the lack of knowledge about randomization procedures and experimental methods. Some individuals were confused as to why probationers needed to be randomly assigned to HOPE or PAU. Therefore, the research aspect of implementing HOPE was challenging, but did not really impact how HOPE was operating. Developing the procedures for immediate arrests as part of HOPE was challenging since this required coordination with the Sheriff's warrant teams.

Despite the barriers mentioned, most of the people who were interviewed reported that the Judge's leadership and enthusiasm for HOPE was a positive aspect of the implementation process. There appears to be good communication between the various parties involved and those who are working in the program are supportive of the cause, believe that HOPE works, and are genuinely interested in the outcome of the study.

Personal Opinions of HOPE

The PC and Probation Management reported that they believe HOPE works because offenders respond well to the fairness and clear consequences for their behavior. The Judge said that she "feels" like HOPE will work, but she mentioned that the data would need to verify her belief. All others interviewed said that they like HOPE very much and are very enthusiastic about it.

Intermediate Site Visit Summary

Involvement in Ongoing Implementation/Operation of HOPE & Communication

Members of the process evaluation team interviewed 10 key individuals involved in HOPE in Tarrant County, Texas in mid-June 2013. The intermediate interviews occurred 7 months after the baseline interviews. Those interviewed included the Program Coordinator (PC), the Probation Management team (3 individuals including the assistant Probation Director, probation operations manager, and budget coordinator), the HOPE Judge, two HOPE Probation Officers (POs), a lieutenant from the Sheriff's office, the UA Supervisor, and the Assessment Supervisor. As part of the qualitative interview, these individuals were asked to rate the following stakeholders on their involvement in the ongoing implementation and operation of HOPE as well as their frequency of communication: HOPE Judge, Prosecutor, Defense Counsel, HOPE POs, Probation Management, Jail Administrator, Sheriff/other law enforcement, HOPE PC, and other. For example, "How important is the HOPE Judge to the ongoing implementation and operation of HOPE?" (1 = *not at all*; 5 = *very important*) and "How often do you communicate with the HOPE POs?" (1 = *never*; 5 = *every day*).

HOPE PC

The HOPE PC's ongoing involvement with operating HOPE was rated as being quite important ($M = 4.86$, $SD = 0.38$; baseline: $M = 5.00$, $SD = 0.00$). One of the PC's responsibilities at this site is to supervise the HOPE POs. She also manages the randomization process. These two aspects of her job have helped to maintain fidelity and ensure that probationers are properly randomized. Texas is the only site where the PC officially supervises the HOPE POs. All stakeholders are pleased with the PC's involvement and contributions to running HOPE. The Assessment Supervisor noted that the PC has established a "safety net" so that even if she's not in the office, others have been trained to carry on the program smoothly without her. As with the baseline interviews, interviewees reported communicating with the PC at least once a week ($M = 4.33$, $SD = 0.52$; baseline: $M = 4.60$, $SD = 0.55$).

HOPE Judge

All individuals who were interviewed reported that the HOPE Judge is very important to the ongoing implementation and operation of HOPE ($M = 5.00$, $SD = 0.00$). Her involvement is perceived as adequate and some believe she goes above and beyond her duties. Interviewees also noted that the Judge's interactions with probationers are critical to the success of HOPE and that she is succeeding in this area. In terms of the Judge's own perception of her contributions, she would like to spend some more time publicizing HOPE in the local criminal justice and public community, but her availability for these activities is limited. The HOPE Judge is perceived as being slightly more involved than she was during the baseline interviews (baseline: $M = 4.80$, $SD = 0.45$).

The HOPE Judge received communication ratings in the moderate range as some stakeholders communicate with her quite often, while others do not communicate as regularly ($M = 3.33$, $SD = 1.51$). The PC, POs, and Sheriff's office communicate with the Judge most frequently. Her communication ratings have decreased slightly since the baseline interviews (baseline: $M = 3.40$, $SD = 1.82$).

HOPE POs

HOPE POs were rated as very important to the ongoing implementation of HOPE by all stakeholders who were interviewed ($M = 5.00$, $SD = 0.00$). Since the baseline interview, one of the original HOPE POs left to take another job. The remaining original PO has mentored the new PO and has also stepped up to assume the role of court officer (the official court officer is completely consumed by SWIFT). This PO has been very enthusiastic and serves as the “right hand” to the PC. Involvement ratings have increased for the HOPE POs since the baseline interview (baseline: $M = 4.40$, $SD = 0.89$).

Most key stakeholders communicate with the HOPE POs frequently ($M = 4.16$, $SD = 0.75$). Their average communication rating is slightly lower than at baseline ($M = 4.60$, $SD = 0.55$), but all stakeholders seem to be satisfied with their interactions with the POs.

Probation Management

Probation Management was also rated highly for their involvement in the ongoing implementation of HOPE ($M = 4.33$, $SD = 1.03$). The three individuals from Probation Management who were interviewed rated themselves differently. The Budget Coordinator rated herself highest for her ongoing involvement since she is involved in identifying stock clients and providing reporting to BJA. The Probation Operations Manager deals with office logistics and decision making but he doesn’t manage HOPE on a day-to-day basis. The CSCD Assistant Director reported the least amount of involvement, saying that he would only be directly involved if something went wrong. Despite these different roles within Probation Management, there is not a rigid chain of command in the department. They are team-oriented and focused on problem solving. Most interviewees agreed that Probation Management was very important in the early stages of implementation, but now they play more of a background role. As would be expected, Probation Management’s average involvement score decreased since the baseline interview (baseline: $M = 4.60$, $SD = 0.55$). Communication with Probation Management was in the moderate range with the PC, UA Supervisor, and Assessment Supervisor communicating most frequently ($M = 3.17$, $SD = 0.98$; baseline: $M = 3.40$, $SD = 1.14$).

Prosecutor

As stated in the baseline interviews, the Prosecutor has a very minor role in the ongoing implementation of HOPE ($M = 1.75$, $SD = 0.96$). This rating was somewhat higher than at the baseline interviews ($M = 1.00$, $SD = 0.00$), but three interviewees stated that they did not know the Prosecutor’s level of involvement. Those who did rate the Prosecutor believed this involvement was adequate for the minor role he plays. The PC was the only respondent who reported having any communication with the Prosecutor ($M = 1.14$, $SD = 0.38$; baseline: $M = 1.33$, $SD = 0.52$).

Defense Counsel

The role of the Defense Counsel was perceived as being similar to that of the Prosecutor. Interviewees either did not know about how the Defense Counsel contributes to HOPE or rated the involvement as minimal ($M = 2.00$, $SD = 1.15$; baseline: $M = 2.00$, $SD = 1.15$). Probation Management reported that once the DFE is finished, the Defense Counsel may be more involved by encouraging their clients to participate in HOPE. This is not possible now since random assignment determines the clients’ placement into HOPE or PAU. The same pattern of communication for the Prosecutor also applied for the Defense Counsel ($M = 1.14$, $SD = 0.38$; baseline: $M = 1.67$, $SD = 0.82$).

Jail Administrator

There was a noticeable change in the Jail Administrator's involvement at the intermediate interviews in comparison to the baseline interviews. Now that HOPE has been running for a year, the Jail Administrator is much more involved with warrant service and communicating warrant status to the necessary stakeholders ($M = 4.80$, $SD = 0.45$; baseline: $M = 1.50$, $SD = 0.71$). The POs reported that that they work cooperatively as a team with the Jail personnel since so many probationers are sent to jail. Despite the increased involvement, most stakeholders still do not communicate with the Jail Administrator on a regular basis ($M = 1.43$, $SD = 0.45$; baseline: $M = 1.50$, $SD = 0.84$).

Sheriff/Other Law Enforcement

Like the Jail Administrator, the Sheriff's Office is much more involved in the ongoing operation of HOPE rather than the initial implementation ($M = 4.60$, $SD = 0.89$; baseline: $M = 3.75$, $SD = 0.96$). Several stakeholders praised the Sheriff's involvement with prioritizing warrants and following up with absconders. The POs noted that they do not have to worry about absconders because this is completely taken care of by the Sheriff's Office. When the lieutenant was asked to reflect on his office's involvement, he actually rated the office lower than average. He said that his staff would be out serving warrants anyway so he feels like their contribution to HOPE is only somewhat important and is not making or breaking the program. Besides the Judge and PC, there is not a lot of regular communication with the Sheriff's Office from the key stakeholders ($M = 1.83$, $SD = 0.98$; baseline: $M = 2.00$, $SD = 0.89$).

Other – Court Officers, Field POs & Supervisors, UA Supervisor

The UA Supervisor was identified as another key stakeholder. Those who rated her believed her involvement was adequate ($M = 4.00$, $SD = 1.00$) and had frequent communication with her ($M = 4.50$, $SD = 0.71$). Court Officers were also mentioned, although there have been different people in this role due to one of the officers working primarily with SWIFT cases. The Assessment Supervisor cited the Field POs and Supervisors as important to HOPE due to their previous involvement with identifying probationers from the stock population. However, there are new processes in place for this procedure, so these individuals are not used for that task as much anymore.

Average involvement and communication ratings for each role in the HOPE team

Role	Involvement	Communication
Program Coordinator	4.86	4.33
Probation Management	4.33	3.17
HOPE Judge	5.00	3.33
HOPE POs	5.00	4.16
Prosecutor	1.75	1.14
Defense Counsel	2.00	1.14
Jail Administrator	4.80	1.43
Sheriff/Other Law Enforcement	4.60	1.83
Other – Drug Testing Supervisor	4.00	4.50

For this round of interviews, the strength of the correlation between involvement and communication scores decreased slightly ($r = .69$, $p = .06$; baseline: $r = .86$, $p < .01$). Across time, there

was a significant positive correlation between baseline involvement scores and intermediate involvement scores ($r = .72, p = .05$). Also, the correlation between baseline and intermediate communication scores was very strong, indicating very little change over time ($r = .99, p < .001$).

Self-Ratings on Involvement Compared to Average Ratings

Role	Self-Rating	Average Rating	Differential
HOPE PC	5.00	4.86	-0.14
Probation Management	3.00	4.33	1.33
HOPE Judge	5.00	5.00	0.00
HOPE POs	5.00	5.00	0.00
Sheriff/Other Law Enforcement	3.00	4.60	1.60
Other – Drug Testing Supervisor	3.00	4.00	1.00

This table illustrates the differences between key stakeholders’ self-ratings on involvement in HOPE with others’ average ratings. Probation Management and the Sheriff’s Office under reported their involvement in comparison to the average ratings provided by the other stakeholders. However, the self-ratings and average ratings for the PC, Judge, and HOPE POs corresponded closely.

Summary

The Judge, HOPE POs, PC, and the Jail Administrator are perceived as being the most involved in the ongoing operation of HOPE. The PC’s involvement has been especially important since her responsibilities include supervising the POs and managing the randomization process. One reason why the ongoing operation of HOPE runs smoothly in Texas could be due to the team-oriented nature of Probation Management. The frequency of communication among the different key stakeholders remained stable across time.

Training

No formal training on HOPE occurred between the time of the baseline interviews and the intermediate interviews. The new HOPE PO mentioned that she had done some informal reading on HOPE, but was not given any specific training.

Leadership in HOPE

Three interviewees (Assessment Supervisor, UA Supervisor, and the POs) stated that the PC has emerged as an especially strong leader of the HOPE program. The other stakeholders mentioned the Judge as the key leader of the program. Most interviewees indicated that these individuals serve as a leader. The PC reported that one of the POs is also a leader due to her contributions to the randomization process. The UA Supervisor commented that the PC has high credibility with the POs and the agency. This high credibility seems to contribute to the positive relationships that exist between the PC and the line staff.

Satisfaction with Group Process

Interviewees were asked to describe their satisfaction with the group process and how the HOPE team operates. All stakeholders reported that there are no conflicts within the team and that the HOPE team could not be run better. The PC described the fact that everyone has bought in to the

purpose of HOPE. She believed this buy-in was strong because of their experience with SWIFT. Working on the SWIFT model led to their curiosity about HOPE and the desire to learn about the research behind it. Another reason for the positive dynamic among the HOPE team was the fact that there were good relationships between key stakeholders before the HOPE program began. These individuals were comfortable working with each other and have always communicated well.

Effectiveness of Sanctions

Stakeholders were asked to rate how effective the sanctions are in changing the behavior of HOPE probationers. On a 5-point scale, participants rated the sanctions as being quite effective ($M = 4.33$, $SD = 0.82$). Sanctions include: jail time, essays, and community service. Several interviewees mentioned that jail time is the most effective sanction because it is immediate. It takes time to arrange community service and some stakeholders mentioned that the team is considering some ideas to make community service more immediate. Another issue with community service is that there can be difficulty making arrangements to place the probationers and they often struggle to complete their assignment. The Judge occasionally assigns essays in addition to other sanctions to help the probationer plan out a course of action for their behavior to avoid future violations. Essay assignments are specific to the issues each probationer faces (i.e., thinking errors). The HOPE POs review the probationers' essays, determine whether the response is appropriate, and discuss it with the probationers. Those with low literacy levels are not required to write essays. The Sheriff's Office reported that the jail sanctions are very effective in changing the behavior of HOPE probationers because when a warrant is issued, at least some probationers turn themselves in immediately because they know they will get less jail time if they surrender.

Probationers' Understanding of HOPE Sanctioning Goals and Process

Using a similar 5-point scale, the key stakeholders believe that HOPE probationers have a good understanding of the sanctioning goals and process ($M = 4.42$, $SD = 0.92$). The PC provided additional details explaining that they have a better understanding of the process than for understanding why they should be punished. She stated that probationers think they did nothing wrong and they don't believe that jail will change them. Probationers understand that certain behaviors will lead to certain results, but due to their criminal thinking and antisocial attitudes, they have difficulty understanding that what they did is wrong. Accountability and responsibility are new concepts to the probationers, but the stakeholders have seen probationers make progress in these areas.

Sanctioning Process

Texas does not use a sanctioning grid, but the Judge follows a consistent pattern in which the first violation results in 4 days in jail; second violation of the same type is 6 days in jail; and the third violation is 8 days in jail. The Judge tries to tailor the punishment to the individual and the specific violation. She also considers the probationer's reaction during the violation hearing and may give harder sanctions if the probationer is rude or aggressive in court. If a warrant is issued and the offender does not turn him/herself in, the sanction is 30 days in jail.

Personal Opinions of HOPE

Many of the personal opinions about HOPE remained unchanged from the baseline interviews. In general, these opinions were quite positive and enthusiastic about HOPE. The Judge reported that she still wants to wait for the outcome results before forming a final opinion, but she believes it works and is making a valuable impact on probationers. The POs stated that HOPE is a great program and one reason why they like it is because it makes their job easier, especially with support from the Judge in terms of spelling out consequences for violations. HOPE probationers are also more serious about showing up for their appointments with the POs or least calling to reschedule the appointments in advance. The respondent from the Sheriff's Office (who was not interviewed at baseline) reported that his opinion of HOPE had changed over the past year. At first he was not impressed with it, but he has since come to appreciate the program because he sees how it saves time and money and promotes compliance from probationers. The Assessment Supervisor was not as positive as the other stakeholders as he expressed a concern that treatment is not appropriate for all offenders. He is doubtful that HOPE works for the very high risk individuals, but understands that it is meant for moderate-high to high risk offenders.

Implementation and Ongoing Operation Barriers

A few minor issues were reported that included logistical issues like securing office space and equipment, replacing a PO, coordinating community service assignments, initial communications with Jail staff and Sheriff's Office, glitches with the UA color line, and eligibility. All of these issues have been adequately addressed. The main barrier to ongoing successful implementation is the Judge's tendency to use jail sentences that are slightly longer than what is typically used at the other sites. Pepperdine addressed these sanctioning issues with Texas. Also, the Judge expressed concern about the potential for an upcoming problem. She is up for reelection next spring and if a different Judge is elected, they cannot guarantee that this new Judge would support HOPE as fervently as the current Judge. This could have consequences for implementation.

Implementation and Ongoing Operation Facilitators

As mentioned in the baseline interviews, several interviewees cited the direct and open lines of communication between team members as an asset to the successful operation of HOPE. Having buy-in and support from all those involved in running HOPE has also been beneficial. The POs stated that it is important for stakeholders outside of probation, such as the Sheriff, to express belief in HOPE. The Judge reported that there is a county-wide commitment to HOPE, which seems to contribute to its overall success.

HOPE's Burden on Stakeholders

Interviewees were asked to describe the extent to which their participation in HOPE has been a burden to them. On a scale of 1 to 5, with higher scores representing a greater burden, most participants reported that HOPE was only a slight burden ($M = 1.93$, $SD = 0.84$). The UA Supervisor said that HOPE has been a moderate burden on her due to the additional testing regime, testing locations, and results data that she has to manage.

HOPE's Burden on Various Departments

Participants rated the extent to which they thought HOPE was a burden on the Court, Probation, and the Jail. Using the same 1-5 scale, overall, participants thought that HOPE was most burdensome to the Court ($M = 3.17$, $SD = 0.75$), and less burdensome to Probation ($M = 2.00$, $SD = 0.58$) and the Jail ($M = 2.33$, $SD = 1.03$). Several interviewees mentioned that the Court had to hire a part-time bailiff due to the increase in custody placements.

HOPE Sustainability Plans

The Judge and Probation Management were the only stakeholders who had enough knowledge to comment on whether the agency has been planning for the continuation and sustainability of HOPE. Probation Management said that they thought it was too early to start planning, but speculated that it might be combined with SWIFT in the future. The Judge offered more details, stating that SWIFT has funding from the Governor's Office and is well-liked so they believe SWIFT will continue to operate for quite some time. It appears that as time goes on, they will explore ways to integrate HOPE and SWIFT in order to continue some aspects of the program after the grant period ends.

Changes to PAU

Probation Management mentioned some minor principles of HOPE bleeding over into PAU. For example, the practice of using shorter sanctions and building greater rapport between the PO and the probationer have started to happen in PAU. Probation Management reported that probationers can now remain with their original PO if they move rather than being reassigned to the closest PO.

Key Findings from Intermediate Interviews

Out of all of the interviews, several key findings emerged that seem to be related to the success of HOPE in Texas. First, the PC is viewed as credible by the HOPE team members which helps them trust her and support her efforts in running HOPE. One of the PC's most important duties is supervising the HOPE POs. This role allows her to keep the randomization process operating consistently and effectively. Due to all of her contributions, the PC is viewed by some stakeholders as a leader of HOPE. One of the HOPE POs is also seen as a leader. All stakeholders reported working well together and there is strong buy-in; all are enthusiastic and supportive of HOPE. Although still in the early stages of planning, the Judge is thinking about continuing HOPE by combining it with SWIFT which is likely to maintain continued funding. Finally, one of the only challenges that the team has faced in Texas is that they are finding HOPE to not be as effective with offenders who have particularly strong anti-social attitudes and high levels of criminal thinking. Stakeholders reported that these offenders had difficulty understanding that their behavior is wrong.

Final Site Visit Summary

Involvement in Ongoing Implementation/Operation of HOPE & Communication

Members of the process evaluation team interviewed 10 key individuals involved in HOPE in Tarrant County, Texas in late-October 2014. The final interviews occurred 16 months after the intermediate interviews. The HOPE team members interviewed were the Program Coordinator (PC), the Probation Management team (3 individuals including the Probation Director, probation operations manager, and budget coordinator), the HOPE Judge, two HOPE Probation Officers (POs), a lieutenant from the Sheriff's office, the UA Supervisor, and the Assessment Supervisor. As part of the qualitative interview, these individuals were asked to rate the following stakeholders on their involvement in the ongoing implementation and operation of HOPE as well as their frequency of communication: HOPE Judge, Prosecutor, Defense Counsel, HOPE POs, Probation Management, Jail Administrator, Sheriff/other law enforcement, HOPE PC, and other. For example, "How important is the HOPE Judge to the ongoing implementation and operation of HOPE?" (1 = *not at all*; 5 = *very important*) and "How often do you communicate with the HOPE POs?" (1 = *never*; 5 = *every day*).

HOPE PC

The HOPE PC's continued involvement with operating HOPE was rated as being highly important ($M= 5$, $SD = 0.00$; intermediate: $M = 4.86$, $SD = 0.38$; baseline: $M = 5.00$, $SD = 0.00$). One of the PC's responsibilities at the site is to supervise the HOPE POs. The Judge and the POs noted that the PC is the "gatekeeper for the HOPE referrals." The PC is responsible for collecting fidelity data and provides leadership to the POs. Additionally, the HOPE POs explained that the PC sets the "expectations at the intake phase" with the probationers. As with the baseline and intermediate interviews, interviewees reported communicating with the PC at least once a week ($M= 4.33$, $SD= 0.82$; intermediate: $M = 4.33$, $SD = 0.52$; baseline: $M = 4.60$, $SD = 0.55$).

HOPE Judge

All interviewees stated that the judge is the leader of the HOPE program ($M=5.00$, $SD= 0.00$). Probation Management described the judge as someone who "builds teamwork, promotes leadership, and enforces fidelity." The Sheriff's Office recognized how the Judge explains how the HOPE program will work to the probationer and emphasizes that violations will result in a sanction. Overall the interviewees cited the judge as important to HOPE. The HOPE Judge is perceived as being equally involved at both the final and intermediate interviews (final $M=5.00$, $SD=0.00$; intermediate $M=5.00$, $SD= 0.00$), slightly more than she was during the baseline interviews (baseline: $M = 4.80$, $SD = 0.45$).

The HOPE Judge received communication ratings in the moderate range as some stakeholders communicate with her quite often, while others do not communicate as regularly ($M=3.14$, $SD= 1.43$). The PC, POs, and Sheriff's office communicate with the Judge most frequently. Her communication ratings have decreased slightly since the intermediate and baseline interviews (intermediate $M=3.33$, $SD= 1.51$ baseline: $M = 3.40$, $SD = 1.82$).

HOPE POs

HOPE POs were rated as very important to the ongoing implementation of HOPE by all stakeholders who were interviewed ($M= 4.67$, $SD= 0.82$). The HOPE Probation Officers are regarded as

committed to the HOPE program, and described as offering consistency to their probation cases. The UA supervisor described how the probation officers “monitor problems” and ensure that the violators go before the judge. Involvement ratings during the final round have decreased slightly for the HOPE POs since the intermediate interview ($M = 5.00$, $SD = 0.00$), returning closer to the baseline rating (baseline: $M = 4.40$, $SD = 0.89$).

Most key stakeholders communicate with the HOPE POs frequently ($M=3.5$, $SD= 1.52$). Their average communication rating is slightly lower than at intermediate ($M=4.16$, $SD= 0.75$) and baseline ($M = 4.60$, $SD = 0.55$), but all stakeholders seem to be satisfied with their interactions with the POs.

Probation Management

Probation Management (PM) was also rated highly for their involvement in the ongoing implementation of HOPE, showing no change from the intermediate interview (final: $M = 4.33$, $SD = 1.03$; intermediate: 4.33 , $SD = 1.03$). Probation Management was described by the POs and the UA Supervisor as an office that demonstrates positive support for the HOPE program. The Judge explained how Probation Management is not as involved in the day to day processes related to HOPE, this same observation was also made by one of the Probation Managers. As would be expected from this observation, Probation Management’s average involvement score decreased somewhat since the baseline interview (baseline: $M = 4.60$, $SD = 0.55$).

Communication with Probation Management was in the lower range ($M=2.5$, $SD= 0.84$), having decreased since baseline and intermediate, with the PC and the Judge communicating most frequently (intermediate: $M = 3.17$, $SD = 0.98$; baseline: $M = 3.40$, $SD = 1.14$).

Prosecutor

As was reported in both the baseline and intermediate interviews, during the final round the Prosecutor was rated as having a very minor role in the ongoing implementation of HOPE (final: $M=1.50$, $SD= 1.00$; intermediate: $M = 1.75$, $SD = 0.96$; baseline: $M = 1.00$, $SD = 0.00$). Other HOPE team members tended to rate the Prosecutor “not at all important” to the operation of HOPE, with only the PC noting a moderate level of involvement from the Prosecutor.

Again, as was reported in the baseline and intermediate interviews, little communication with the Prosecutor was reported in the final round, with only the Sheriff’s office reporting some communication with the Prosecutor (final: $M=1.14$, $SD= 0.38$; intermediate: $M = 1.14$, $SD = 0.38$; baseline: $M = 1.33$, $SD = 0.52$).

Defense Counsel

The role of the Defense Counsel was perceived as being similar to that of the Prosecutor. Interviewees either did not know about how the Defense Counsel contributes to HOPE or rated the involvement as minimal (final: $M= 1.50$, $SD= 1.00$; intermediate: $M = 2.00$, $SD = 1.15$; baseline: $M = 2.00$, $SD = 1.15$). Again, individuals tended to rate the Prosecutor “not at all important” to the operation of HOPE, with only the PC noting a moderate level of involvement from the Prosecutor.

The same pattern of communication for the Prosecutor also applied for the Defense Counsel (final: $M=1.29$, $SD= 0.49$; intermediate: $M = 1.14$, $SD = 0.38$; baseline: $M = 1.67$, $SD = 0.82$).

Thus, across all the site visits, we confirm that in Tarrant County neither the prosecutor nor the defense counsel are factors in the implementation of HOPE, making this site somewhat different than the other three sites that are part of this DFE.

Jail Administrator

The Jail Administrator was regarded as important to the ongoing implementation of the HOPE program ($M = 4.40$, $SD = 1.34$). The Probation Management team and the Judge explained how the Jail Administrator provides flexibility in terms of accommodating HOPE violators who need to retain their jobs while “serving their jail sanctions.” The involvement ratings from the final interviews are similar to the ratings from the intermediate interviews (intermediate: $M = 4.80$, $SD = 0.45$; baseline: $M = 1.50$, $SD = 0.71$).

Despite the increased involvement, most stakeholders still do not communicate with the Jail Administrator on a regular basis (final: 2.00 , $SD = 0.82$; intermediate: $M = 1.43$, $SD = 0.45$; baseline: $M = 1.50$, $SD = 0.84$).

Sheriff/Other Law Enforcement

Like the Jail Administrator, the Sheriff’s Office is much more involved in the ongoing operation of HOPE rather than the initial implementation (final: $M = 4.60$, $SD = 0.89$; intermediate: $M = 4.60$, $SD = 0.89$; baseline: $M = 3.75$, $SD = 0.96$). The Sheriff’s Office was described by the PC as “responsive and effective with warrant service, [they] usually capture absconders within 48 hours.” Additionally, the Sheriff’s Office was praised for serving warrants quickly and their skills at finding the absconders.

Besides the Judge and PC, there is little regular communication with the Sheriff’s Office from the key stakeholders (final: $M = 2.11$, $SD = 1.19$; intermediate: $M = 1.83$, $SD = 0.98$; baseline: $M = 2.00$, $SD = 0.89$).

Other – UA Supervisor and Assessment Supervisors

The UA Supervisor was identified as another key stakeholder. Those who rated her believed her involvement was adequate (final: $M = 4.17$, $SD = 0.77$, intermediate: $M = 4.00$, $SD = 1.00$) and had frequent communication with her (final: $M = 4.5$, $SD = 0.71$; intermediate: $M = 4.50$, $SD = 0.71$). The UA Supervisor and the POs both emphasized that the UA Lab provides strong communication with the POs.

Average involvement and communication ratings for each role in the HOPE team

Role	Involvement	Communication
Program Coordinator	5.00	4.33
Probation Management	4.33	2.50
HOPE Judge	5	3.14
HOPE POs	4.67	3.50
Prosecutor	1.50	1.14
Defense Counsel	1.50	1.29
Jail Administrator	4.40	2.00
Sheriff/Other Law Enforcement	4.60	2.11
Other – Drug Testing Supervisors	4.17	4.50

The correlation between the involvement and communication ratings during the final interview round was high ($r = 0.71$), indicating a seemingly logical connection between who is heavily involved in HOPE implementation and who communicates with whom. The correlation between the involvement ratings from the intermediate and final rounds was quite high ($r = 0.99$), as was the correlation between the intermediate and final communication scores ($r = 0.96$).

For this final round of interviews, the strength of the correlation between involvement and communication ratings increased slightly from the intermediate round but fell somewhat from the baseline round (final $r = 0.71$; intermediate: $r = .69, p = .06$; baseline: $r = .86$). Across time, there was a significant positive correlation between baseline involvement scores and intermediate involvement scores ($r = .72, p = .05$) and between intermediate and final involvement scores ($r = 0.99$). Also, the correlation between baseline and intermediate communication scores was very strong, indicating very little change over time ($r = .99, p < .001$), this was echoed when we compare the final communication scores to the intermediate scores ($r = 0.96$).

Self-Ratings on Involvement Compared to Average Ratings

Role	Self-Rating	Average Rating	Differential
HOPE PC	5.00	5.00	0.00
Probation Management	2.67	4.33	-1.66
HOPE Judge	5.00	5.00	0.00
HOPE POs	5.00	4.67	0.33
Sheriff/Other Law Enforcement	3.00	4.60	-1.60
Other – Drug Testing Supervisors	4.00	4.17	-0.17

This table illustrates the differences between key stakeholders' self-ratings on involvement in HOPE with others' average ratings. Probation Management and the Sheriff's Office under reported their involvement in comparison to the average ratings provided by the other stakeholders. However, the self-ratings and average ratings for the PC, Judge, and HOPE POs corresponded closely.

Summary

The Judge, HOPE POs, and PC, are rated as being the most involved in the ongoing operation of HOPE. The PC's involvement has been especially important since her responsibilities include supervising the POs and managing the randomization process. What also stands out for HOPE in Tarrant County is the high degree of consistency, stability and predictability across time in ratings of who was principally involved in the implementation of HOPE and how HOPE stakeholders communicated with one another. This provides a very clear picture of the group dynamics and communication patterns of HOPE implementation there across the two-year implementation period examined here.

Key Components of HOPE

Five out of the seven interview groups explained that one of the key components of HOPE is that the probationers know what is expected of them and understand that consequences will be immediate. Additionally, three of the interviews highlighted the importance of the structure HOPE provides to the probationers, noting that the HOPE probationers often lack basic life skills such as time management and daily planning. These interviewees report that the strict compliance requirements of HOPE (e.g. reporting for regular drug testing) has helped the probationers to organize their lives in such a way that redounds to the benefit of their employment, family relations, sobriety and financial management. The judge and PC also expressed how the judge's presence at the violation hearings is important, reinforcing the message that even the smallest violation is taken seriously by probation and the court. In some sense, this was thought to convey to the probationers the notion that their success "matters" to the system, as opposed to the indifference that is often felt in PAU.

Implementation Barriers and Facilitators

Three of the seven interview groups reported that because Texas was already running the SWIFT court, transitioning to HOPE was not a challenge. The positive relationship and direct organizational connection between probation and the courts was identified as a facilitator to implementing HOPE by two of the interview groups. Two of the interview groups recommended that programs must be able to adapt to local circumstances. For example, in Texas POs do not have the authority to arrest people, "so HOPE can't operate here the way it does in other jurisdictions." The emphasis on same day arrest by Pepperdine and Judge Alm was thought to have been overblown by many at the Tarrant County site. The Texas stakeholders adapted to this circumstance and have experienced success with next day arrest, owing to a strong partnership between the Sheriff's office, the court and probation.

A potential barrier to HOPE highlighted by the PM was the over supervision of the low risk probationers. This was felt to increase the odds of these lower risk probationers being caught up in the system in ways that they might not otherwise within PAU, especially for minor infractions. This was thought to have negative impacts on their employment and family situations, due to disruptions caused by jail stays. PM also explained that high risk, heavy drug users need more than swift and certain sanctioning – intensive drug treatment coupled with cognitive behavioral therapy is critical for this population. They argued that HOPE by itself has less of an impact for these hard core addicts (esp. heroin), that it not enough to just drug test them frequently and sanction them for positives (they noted that they "catch hell from HOPE advocates" for saying this, but they stand by it). But, they also report a dearth of outpatient treatment options within Tarrant County, necessitating the frequent transfer of such cases to a distant (3 hours away) residential program run by the Texas Department of Corrections. They also felt that for these hard core addicts, participation in HOPE may have delayed their referral to treatment, given the primary reliance within HOPE on testing and sanctioning, which treatment coming only after sanctioning has been tried. The POs also observed that it may be difficult for HOPE probationers facing mental health concerns to grasp the program.

Leadership

Six of the seven interview groups viewed the judge as the leader of HOPE. Additionally, the PC was regarded as a leader by 3 of the stakeholders. Thus, HOPE in Tarrant County clearly seems to have been a judge driven model, albeit with increasing influence by the HOPE PC over time.

Personal Opinions

Most of the interviewees reacted positively to the program, and appreciate the accountability and immediacy of sanctioning that HOPE provides. Personal opinions of HOPE did not seem to have changed much over time, remaining very positive throughout the DFE. The Judge echoed PM's observation that low risk probationers may not be a good match for HOPE, due to over-supervision. The Assessment Supervisor and the UA Supervisor emphasized that HOPE offers probationers an opportunity to change their behavior.

Organizational and System Level Changes

The HOPE program has been impacting additional courts with the implementation of swift sanctions. For example, the PO interview group explained how HOPE will be introduced to sex offenders. Additionally, they explained how the "threat [of] being placed in HOPE" is effective at keeping PAU probationers "in line." PM highlighted that HOPE really benefitted because they were already running SWIFT at the site. The judge stated that she now exercises enhanced accountability in all her cases, hence applying the premise of HOPE.

Future of HOPE

Five of the interview groups explained how HOPE will remain in place as SWIFT. These interviewees emphasized that SWIFT is now operating identically to HOPE. The only question will be whether the post DFE program will be call HOPE or SWIFT. Additionally, other counties have expressed interest in starting HOPE.

Factors to Consider for the Expansion of HOPE in Texas

Investment in the HOPE model was the major point the interviewees stated when asked about the expansion of HOPE in Texas. The PO and Judge stated the importance that all stakeholder be invested in the program, explaining that "buy-in is critical." The Sheriff's Office explained that this includes ensuring that law enforcement is involved and invested in the HOPE program. The PM stressed the importance of probation being directly organizationally linked to the courts in Texas, and the POs investment in HOPE.

Drug Treatment Referrals

During the final site visit to the Tarrant County HOPE, we also conducted a brief examination of the primary drug treatment program to which the plurality of HOPE probationer referrals was sent. As with all of the sites, Tarrant County used a variety of drug treatment providers, and we were not able to examine all of them. Instead, we examined the program that received more HOPE referrals than any other. This was the Intermediate Sanction Facility (ISF) program located at the East Texas Multi-Use Facility (ETMUF) operated by the Management and Training Corporation under contract to the Texas Department of Criminal Justice. This facility is in Henderson Texas, which is approximately three hours east of the HOPE program in Tarrant County. Tarrant County HOPE made *extensive* use of treatment in

general, referring 56% of all HOPE probationers to some form of treatment. Indeed, Tarrant County HOPE had by far the highest treatment referral rate of any of the four HOPE DFE sites. The overwhelming majority of all treatment referrals (80%) were sent to the ISF program, with the remainder sent to miscellaneous other providers, primarily focused on drug treatment and related services, such as dual diagnosis. Thus, 83 (45%) of all HOPE probationers in Tarrant County experienced the ISF program, and as discussed below the vast majority of them completed the program.

Our examination of the ISF program using an abbreviated version of the Correctional Program Checklist (CPC) is described more fully in the methodology chapter. Again, the purpose of this examination was not to conduct a full scale process or outcome evaluation of ISF, which is beyond the scope of the HOPE DFE, but rather to provide a basic description of services provided through ISF within the framework of the principles of effective offender intervention (Andrews and Bonta, 2003, MacKenzie, 2006; MacKenzie and Zajac, 2013). Thus, we cannot draw conclusions about whether ISF is in fact effective, but we simply offer a summary of core programmatic features as they relate to these principles. Investigator Zajac conducted an intensive phone interview with the ISF director and several key staff on October 23, 2014, during the final site visit to Tarrant County, to gather information about ISF program operations. The following is a summary of key features of this program.

ISF is a large program within a large, secure lockdown facility. At the time of the interview, there were approximately 2,200 offenders in total at the ETMUF, split among various programs, including ISF (approximately 1400 participants), and several other smaller treatment programs offered there. ETMUF is licensed by the Texas Department of Health Services. There were approximately 120 treatment staff at the facility. Again, most HOPE referrals to ETMUF participated in the ISF track, although at any given time the HOPE participants represent a very small proportion of all offenders participating in ISF. ISF staff reported that they are not always aware of which clients are HOPE, and at any rate do not do anything different with them even if they do know that they have been referred from HOPE.

ISF is an inpatient residential program, operating within the context of a secure state correctional institution. Program participants are thus closely monitored and are not permitted outside release privileges while enrolled in the program. ISF is a three to four month program, depending on client progress, which falls within the recommended program dosage range of three to nine months established by the CPC.

Primary targets of change within ISF center on core criminogenic needs: antisocial attitudes and values, peer associates, substance use (including relapse prevention), anger/hostility, problem solving/decision making/coping skills, interpersonal skills and conflict resolution, education/vocational skills, and family dynamics. There appeared to be little if any attention given to non-criminogenic needs, such as physical fitness or artistic skills. Thus, ISF appears to devote the overwhelming proportion of its time to addressing factors that are directly related to offending behavior.

While substance abuse treatment is the primary focus of ISF, ISF also offers employment and financial management counseling, cognitive-behavioral groups, and anger management. ISF operates within the broad framework of therapeutic community (TC). TC's have considerable evidence of effectiveness for recidivism reduction (Mitchell, Wilson and MacKenzie, 2012; Wexler and Prendergast, 2010). ISF uses a variety of recognized, manualized treatment curricula that have some evidence in the

literature of effectiveness, including the National Institute of Corrections *Thinking for a Change* (Golden, Gatchel and Cahill, 2006; Lowenkamp, Hubbard, Makarios and Latessa, 2009), *Living in Balance* (which is listed on the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration's National Registry of Evidence-based Programs and Practices), *Success for Life*, *Mapping Anger*, *Cage Your Rage*, *Moving on for Women* (Duwe and Clark, 2015) and others. These curricula were selected by Management and Training Corporation headquarters on the basis of evidence suggesting their effectiveness. Per state licensing requirements, clients are required to engage in behavioral rehearsal and practice of learned skills (role playing) for at least one hour per day within a structured group setting, and role playing is encouraged in most groups. Thus, it appears that ISF is using an evidence based treatment modality (TC) combined with structured curricula that are grounded in a strong cognitive behavioral approach, which is another central CPC standard. Staff emphasized that addressing criminal thinking and drug use with cognitive-behavioral approaches is the core of what they do and drives everything else. For female clients (who are treated in groups separate from male clients), services also focus on trauma and gender responsiveness.

A typical day within ISF appears to be well structured, with at least half of all group time spent in treatment activities. By state licensure, they are required to have four hours of treatment services, plus another four hours of ancillary services per day. Voluntary evening programs are also offered. Weekend family services are provided. Each client also receives an individual counseling session monthly. Special needs groups are also offered. Thus, it would appear that ISF meets the CPC standard of at least 40% of a client's time being spent in direct treatment activities, and possibly as high as 70%.

Clients are graded daily on their performance and progress, with emphasis on compliance with and accountability for program rules and norms and rewards (e.g. food, extra sleep time, etc.) are based on that. Graduated sanctions are also based on daily grading as well as instant misbehaviors. ISF staff do provide regular updates on client progress through phone calls to the two HOPE POs, and devise a reentry plan for each discharged client which is communicated to the POs.

All treatment staff serving ISF are licensed on some level by the Texas Department of Health Services, implying at least an Associate's Degree and 4000 hours of experience (e.g. roughly 2 years). Moreover, 22 of the treatment staff are fully licensed chemical dependency counselors, thus they provide clinical supervision to more junior staff some of whom may be working towards full licensure. ISF also serves as a clinical training institute for the state. Annual training for staff is required as part of state licensure. Thus, ISF meets the basic CPC requirements for staff education (70% must possess at least an Associate's Degree), level of experience (75% must have at least two years of experience in offender treatment) and ongoing training.

As noted above, ISF is a state licensed substance abuse treatment facility and thus comes under regular state drug and alcohol auditing and oversight. Management and Training Corporation also does annual needs assessments and program review of all facilities. Moreover, the Tarrant County HOPE Judge and Program Coordinator have visited ISF several times to examine program operations there, although it is unclear to what extent the HOPE team conducts any systematic monitoring of the treatment delivered there. While Management and Training Corporation tracks the recidivism rate of

offenders discharged from ISF, finding a 30% recidivism rate, no rigorous outcome evaluation has been conducted utilizing a formal control group.

Areas of concern noted for ISF focus on group size, client selection and completion criteria and reward structures. First, the facilitator to client ratio is quite high, ranging from 1:25 to 1:56. This is markedly higher than the maximum ratio of 1:10 recommended by the CPC. Thus, individual groups are attempting to serve far too many clients at one time, potentially diminishing treatment effects. This may speak to poor selectivity in determining which client needs which specific intervention. Second, HOPE clients are sent to ISF largely on the basis of an order by the HOPE Judge. As noted earlier, over 90% of HOPE probationers are assessed by the HOPE program as being moderate to high risk for reoffending, and ISF does conduct additional assessment of referrals, with the widely used *Addiction Severity Index*. While ISF does report rejecting some HOPE referrals, it appears that they do accept the vast majority of them, thus raising some concern that they *may* not be sufficiently selective in accepting only those clients who can maximally benefit from ISF. Third, program completion is based on progress in individual treatment plans derived from daily and weekly reviews. Clients must understand their thinking errors, demonstrate basic uptake of some strategies for dealing with high risk people/places/situations, and show they can apply what they have learned through behavioral practice. Completers are provided with a certificate and a transcript which may be needed to regain things like a driver's license. Most program failures are due to clear misconduct such as fighting. While this completion policy does comport with the CPC standards, the ISF completion rate is over 90%, which is outside of the CPC recommended range of 65% to 85%, suggesting that the program may be engaging in some degree of social promotion of clients who have struggled in the program. Finally, the reward structure in place appears to be competitive, with rewards given to the higher scoring clients (i.e. grading on a curve). This is a concern, as it can demoralize clients who do well, but not as well, as others. On the whole, though, the areas of concern noted here are relatively minimal.

References

- Andrews, D.A. and James Bonta. 2003. *The Psychology of Criminal Conduct*. Cincinnati: Anderson Publishing.
- Duwe, Grant and Valerie Clark. 2015. "Importance of Program Integrity: Outcome Evaluation of a Gender Responsive, Cognitive-Behavioral Program for Female Offenders." *Criminology & Public Policy*, 14(2), 301-328.
- Golden, Lori Suzanne, Robert J. Gatchel and Melissa Anne Cahill. 2006. "Evaluating the Effectiveness of the National Institute of Correction's 'Thinking for a Change' Program Among Probationers." *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 43(2), 55-73.
- Lowenkamp, Christopher T., Dana Hubbard, Matthew D. Makarios and Edward J. Latessa. 2009. "A Quasi-Experimental Evaluation of Thinking for a Change: A 'Real World' Application." *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 36(2), 137-146.
- MacKenzie, Doris Layton. 2006. *What Works in Corrections*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- MacKenzie, Doris Layton and Gary Zajac. 2013. *What Works in Corrections: The Impact of Correctional Interventions on Recidivism*. Monograph commissioned by The National Academy of Sciences Committee on the Causes and Consequences of High Rates of Incarceration.
- Mitchell, Ojmarrh, David B. Wilson and Doris L. MacKenzie. 2012. *The Effectiveness of Incarceration-Based Drug Treatment on Criminal Behavior: A Systematic Review*. Campbell Systematic Reviews, 2012:18.
- Wexler, Harry K. and Michael L. Prendergast. 2010. "Therapeutic Communities in United States' Prisons: Effectiveness and Challenges." *Therapeutic Communities*, 31(2), 157-175.
- Zajac, Gary, Pamela K. Lattimore, Debbie Dawes and Laura Winger. 2015. "All Implementation is Local: Initial Findings from the Process Evaluation of the Honest Opportunity Probation with Enforcement (HOPE) Demonstration Field Experiment." *Federal Probation*, 79(1), 31-36.