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Overview

EBP Model and Operational Challenges

Texas Model Development in Travis County

Test of Impact of EBP
EBP Probation in a Nutshell

1. Assessments protocols effectively identifies “swingers”
   - Do OK “No Matter What”
   - May Do OK
   - May Not Do OK
   - “Swingers” “It Matters What”

2. Supervision strategies effectively combine “treatment” “control” and “incentives”
   - Do NOT do OK “No Matter What”
   - May Not Do OK

3. Programs and services standards
4. Collaboration with community partners
EBP Operational Goals

**Do OK**
“No Matter What”

**“Swingers”**
“It Matters What”

**Do NOT do OK**
“No Matter What”

**May Do OK**

**May Not Do OK**

- Reduce the supervision resources spent on this group
- Provide swift and certain sanctions, positive reinforcements and incentives to change behavior
- Provide surveillance and lower tolerance for violations
Organizational Model for EBP Implementation

Community Collaboration Strategies

- Caseload Assignments Based on Risk and Needs
- Diagnosis Based on Validated Assessment Tools

Differential Supervision Strategies and Conditions

- Progressive Sanctions for Violations
- Appropriate Targeting for “Programs”

Judicial Support and Agreement

Research Based Accountability Structure

Training and Personnel Evaluations

Lower Recidivism
Operational Challenges

Integrate all components of the EBP model in a seamless manner in the organization

Generate the support among key stakeholders for changing and maintaining the model over time

Generate the knowledge to show the fidelity of implementation and impact of the practices on public safety
Travis Project is a Collaborative Effort to Develop a Solid EBP Probation Model for Replication

Adult Probation (CSCD)

Travis Community Impact Supervision (TCIS) Initiative

Travis County

Community Justice Assistance Division (CJAD)

Justice Center
The Council of State Governments
Overview

EBP Model and Operational Challenges

Texas Model Development in Travis County

Test of Impact of EBP
Methodical Changes Over Three Years

Phase I
2006-07
- Justice Center Technical Assistance
- Diagnosis process
- Supervision strategies
- Sanctioning strategies
- "Programs and caseloads"
- Quality control
- Training
- Personnel evaluations

Phase II
2007-08
- "Done"
- "Learning organization takes over"

Phase III
2008-09
- Measure outcomes
- Develop knowledge for:
  - Adjusting practices based on outcomes
  - For replicating model in other state and national locations
Creating a Structure to Implement EBP: The “How To” Project Set-up

- Complete organization assessment to identify strengths and weaknesses to agree on needed organizational changes
- Conduct strategic planning sessions to set three year organizational realignment plan
- Set committee structure to manage process of change and empower staff
- Set work plan structure with goals and timelines and implementation accountability benchmarks
- Agree on administrative strategy to maintain to support process of change
The “How To” Project Set-up (cont.)

- Develop research/analytical strategy to generate knowledge to support committee work
- Conduct the needed research and evaluations
- Conduct individual briefings and formal presentations with internal and external stakeholders
- Monitor and document achievement of key benchmarks
We Changed the PSI and Intake Process that.....

....required offenders to show up in different places

......made them submit duplicative information.......

1. PSI narrative format could be streamlined
2. Conditions of supervision are not well coupled with the assessment process requiring many motions for modifications later
3. Duplication of data collection at intake process and no "pre-intake" module in computer case tracking system increases workload
4. Assessment package not cohesive to guide case supervision strategy
5. TAIP also duplicates information collected by PSI and intake unit
… And Involved Many Duplicative Forms.....
With a Central Diagnosis Process……

……that provides “one stop” for offenders

……uses one set of diagnosis forms

……is backed by an assessment process that uses scientifically validated tools

……and is administered by expert officers subject to centralized quality control…. 
…Creating a More Precise End Product….

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before</th>
<th>Now</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PSI</strong></td>
<td><strong>Diagnosis Report</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A “biography” collected using inconsistent interview protocols, with the “story telling” affected by different writing styles and utilizing no proven diagnosis tools to assess offenders</td>
<td>Identifying the offender along risk and behavioral characteristics related to supervision success using proven assessment tools and with short narratives generated from assessment instruments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using a Central Diagnosis Report

PART 1: Identifiers/Demographics

PART 2: Present Offense - Criminal History

PART 3: Strategies for Case Supervision (SCS)

PART 4: Substance Abuse Assessment

PART 5: Risk Assessment

PART 6: Diagnosis Summary Report

APPENDIX

Required forms signed by person

Assessment Tools

Report to the Court

Identifiers and Case Processing Information

Offense and Criminal History

Victim Information

Assessment Highlight in Narrative Format

Diagnosis Matrix Risk and SCS

Supervision Strategy and Conditions of Supervision
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…with an Evidence Based Diagnosis Matrix….

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Risk</th>
<th>SCS Score - Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criminogenic SCS Classifications
...Matched with Supervision Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yellow</th>
<th>Blue</th>
<th>Red</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lowest reporting requirements</td>
<td>Increased reporting requirements</td>
<td>Highest reporting requirements of all supervision levels, including field visits by probation officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No need for intensive discretionary programs</td>
<td>Mix of visits to PO and home visits by PO as necessary</td>
<td>Use of surveillance programs, supplemented by cognitive programs and other programs as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application of low to moderate responses to administrative violations using violation grid</td>
<td>Discretionary programs to address skill/emotional deficits, mainly drug treatment, anger management and cognitive programs</td>
<td>Most restrictive and swift responses to administrative violations of all supervision levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentives for early discharge</td>
<td>More restrictive responses to administrative violations</td>
<td>Incentives to move to “Blue” on successful reassessment but cannot move to “Yellow”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incentives to move to “Yellow” on successful reassessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Activities Related to Diagnosis

- Review of pre-sentence investigation process and paper flow
- Validate risk assessment instrument
- Design new diagnosis process and Central Diagnosis Report
- Create and implement Central Diagnosis Unit in department
- Get agreement from judicial stakeholders to adopt new process
- Implement physical staff relocation and renovations
- Automate diagnosis process
- Redesign orientation process
- Reorganize intake process
- Conduct time studies to fine-tune the time it takes to complete the diagnosis process
- Redesign intake process forms
Activities Related to Supervision/Program Strategies

- Redesign conditions of supervision and develop decision rules to adopt conditions
- Redesign supervision strategies to match diagnosis classifications
- Redesign field interview protocols to allow for motivational interviewing techniques
- Redesign format and protocol related to the development of supervision plans
- Redesign of documentation “chronos” to support new supervision strategies
- Automate new forms
- Strategy to reduce caseload in targeted areas
- Adopt new sex offender treatment protocol and supervision strategy
- Conduct mapping analysis to understand potential of neighborhood based caseloads
- Inventory of programs
- Quality indicators for programs
- DSHS MH, parole and probation integrated in one-stop service center
Travis MH Integrated Center

Probation

MH Treatment

Re-Entry and Parole
Activities Related to Sanctioning Strategies

- Review absconder policies
- Create Absconder Unit and new procedures to track absconders
- Create Felony Revocation Staffing and Review Committee
- Create a Technical Violators Docket
- Develop progressive sanctions to match new diagnosis and conditions of supervision model
- Develop progressive sanctions to match new diagnosis and conditions of supervision model
- Develop new “risk based progressive sanctions and incentives” procedures manual
- Get agreement on adoption of uniform sanction policy from judiciary
- Review early termination procedures and increase referrals for early terminations
Activities Related to Training

- Realign basic training to support TCIS principles
- Train all staff on principles of Evidence Based Practices
- Train officers on Motivational Interviewing and SCS
- Train in cognitive programming
- Comprehensive management and leadership training
Activities Related to Accountability

- Review of reporting requirements
- Redesign automated reports
- Design of new Outcome and Process Tracking Reports
- Inventory of programs
- Quality indicators for programs
- Inter-rater reliability protocols and test implemented
- Design new personnel evaluation form/policies
# New Domains for Personnel Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Casework Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verbal and Written Communication Skills</td>
<td>Report Addresses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Work and Collaboration</td>
<td>Criminogenic Needs Identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problem-Solving</strong></td>
<td>Effective Supervision Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collects Data</td>
<td>Effective Day-to-Day Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifies Problems</td>
<td>Proper Use of Sanctions and Incentives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifies and Considers Alternative Solutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engages in Collaboration and Identifies Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up with critical issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initiative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhances Self-Performance &amp; Maintains Current Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhances Performance of Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Commitment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supports Department’s Mission and Values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continually Develops Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Champions New Initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Evaluation Form is Tailored to Specific Staff Positions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Examples of Different Positions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Probation Officers, Managers, Diagnosis Officers, Counselors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Personnel Evaluation System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Category</th>
<th>Total Tasks</th>
<th>Paperwork or Process Related Tasks</th>
<th>Casework Related Tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Old System</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Management</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referrals</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer/Documentation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Compliance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Relations/Policy Adherence</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Old System</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New System</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casework Application</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, New System</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Test of Impact of EBP
Show Me EBP Results with Numbers

- General Trends
  - Example: Revocations Trends

- Size of Caseloads Matches Assignments
  - Example: High risk = Lower Caseload

- Differential Supervision is Provided
  - Example: Actual Contacts Vary by Risk

- Program Targets Appropriate Population
  - Example: SA Treatment High Need of Treatment

- Caseload Assignments Based on Diagnosis
  - Example: High risk = High Risk Profile

- Recidivism Outcomes
  - Example: Number of Sanctions Prior Revs.

- Progressive sanctions are used
  - Example: Recidivism Outcomes

- General Trends

## Travis Steepest Decline in Felony Revocations

### Felony Revocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>FY 2005</th>
<th>FY 2008</th>
<th>% Change 05-08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bexar (San Antonio)</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>1,468</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>3,183</td>
<td>2,841</td>
<td>-10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris (Houston)</td>
<td>3,549</td>
<td>3,067</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarrant (Ft. Worth)</td>
<td>1,733</td>
<td>1,441</td>
<td>-16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis (Austin)</td>
<td>1,052</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>-19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>24,126</td>
<td>24,028</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Texas Department of Criminal Justice, Community Justice Assistance Division. Report to the Governor and Legislative Budget Board on the Monitoring of Community Supervision Diversion Funds, December 1, 2008.
Travis Lowest Revocation Rate Out of Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>FY 2005</th>
<th>FY 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bexar (San Antonio)</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris (Houston)</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarrant (Ft. Worth)</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis (Austin)</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Texas Department of Criminal Justice, Community Justice Assistance Division. Statistical Data File Provided to Justice Center, January 2008
Travis Steepest Decline in Technical Revocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>FY 2005</th>
<th>FY 2008</th>
<th>Change FY05-08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bexar (San Antonio)</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>2,174</td>
<td>1,515</td>
<td>-30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris (Houston)</td>
<td>2,194</td>
<td>2,028</td>
<td>-7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarrant (Ft. Worth)</td>
<td>1,012</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>-24.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis (Austin)</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>-47.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Average</td>
<td>13,457</td>
<td>12,788</td>
<td>-4.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Texas Department of Criminal Justice, Community Justice Assistance Division. Annual Statistical Data Spreadsheets, 2005 and 2007

Test
General Trends
# Travis Lowest % Technical

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>% Felony Technical Revocations of Felony Revocations</th>
<th>LBB 2005 Sample</th>
<th>LBB 2007 Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Reports 2005</td>
<td>State Reports 2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bexar (San Antonio)</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris (Houston)</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarrant (Ft. Worth)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis (Austin)</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Average</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Travis Lowest Rate of Technical Revocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>FY 2005</th>
<th>FY 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bexar (San Antonio)</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris (Houston)</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarrant (Ft. Worth)</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis (Austin)</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Texas Department of Criminal Justice, Community Justice Assistance Division. Statistical Data File Provided to Justice Center, January 2008
Cost-Savings Significant (Sentencing)

Technical Revocations Avoided Between FY 05-FY 08
- 290

194 (67%)
Would Have Gone to Prison with a 41 Month Sentence
Serving an Average of 16 Months
- $3,961,325
  State Incarceration Cost Avoided
  (At average $42.54 Cost-per-Day)

84 (29%)
Would Have Gone to State Jails with an Average 10 Months Flat Sentence
- $920,556
  State Jail Incarceration Cost Avoided
  (At average $36.53 Cost-per-Day)

12 (4%)
Would Have Gone to Local Jail – No Sentence Data Are Available

Total State Costs Avoided $4,881,881

# Jail Days Impacted by Fewer Violations

The table below shows the County Jail Incarceration of Probationers with motions to revoke probation over two fiscal years, highlighting the impact of fewer violations on jail days and cost.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Number of Probationers</th>
<th>Total Days in Jail</th>
<th>Total Cost (at $24 Per-Day)</th>
<th>Average # of Days/Client</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2,823</td>
<td>111,339</td>
<td>$2,672,136</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2,632</td>
<td>95,225</td>
<td>$2,285,400</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change 07 to 08</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Total Days Change</th>
<th>Total Cost Change</th>
<th>Average # Days Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-191</td>
<td>-6.8%</td>
<td>-16,114</td>
<td>-$386,736</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Travis County. Number of clients with a county jail booking data in the fiscal year and number of days within fiscal year that the clients spent in county jail. Cost-per-day is a blended average jail cost provided by the Travis County Sheriff's Planning and Budget Office.
Travis Places and Revokes Higher Risk Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>% of Cases at Probation Intake Classified as Maximum Supervision State Profile 2007</th>
<th>% of Cases at Revocation with Maximum Risk Assessment at Intake – LBB 2007 Study Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bexar (San Antonio)</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris (Houston)</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarrant (Ft. Worth)</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis (Austin)</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State -Five County (LBB) Average</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research on Outcomes in Process

Population Tracked to Measure Recidivism Pre-and-Post TCIS Implementation

- Pre-TCIS Probationers
  - Jan. to June 2006
  - Number Tracked = 1,287
  - (Felons Only)

- Transition Probationers
  - Jan. to April 2007
  - Number Tracked = 734
  - (Felons Only)

- Post-TCIS Probationers
  - July to October 2007
  - Number Tracked = 614
  - (Felons Only)

Percent re-arrested one year after placement in supervision
After TCIS, Percent High Risk Increased

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td><strong>59%</strong></td>
<td><strong>58%</strong></td>
<td><strong>67%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One-Year Re-arrest Rates Lower After TCIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent Rearrested One Year Later By Risk Level</th>
<th>Pre-TCIS Jan. to June 2006 N=1,287</th>
<th>Transition Jan. to April 2007 N=734</th>
<th>Post-TCIS July to Oct. 2007 N=614</th>
<th>% Change in Rate Pre-TCIS to Past-TCIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>-77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>-50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>-17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New Absconders Declined After TCIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Monthly Absconders Added to Absconder List</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-TCIS Probationers Jan. to June 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition Probationers Jan. to April 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-TCIS Probationers July to October 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Recent TCIS Jan. to June 08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 9% from Pre-TICS Group
Research in Progress

- Caseload Assignments Based on Diagnosis
  - Example: High risk = High Risk Profile
- Differential Supervision is Provided
  - Example: Actual Contacts Vary by Risk
- Program Targets Appropriate Population
  - Example: SA Treatment High Need of Treatment

General Trends
- Example: Revocations Trends

Size of Caseloads Matches Assignments
- Example: High risk = Lower Caseload

Progressive sanctions are used
- Example: Number of Sanctions Prior Revs.

Recidivism Outcomes
- Example: Outcomes with Comparison Groups
Reports and Documentation

- Travis Community Impact Supervision: An Incubator
  Site to Improve Probation
- Better Diagnosis: Organizing Community Supervision and Case Management
  (CSCD), Facing the Challenge: Implement the Travis Community Impact Supervision
  (TCIS) Model, August 2005
- Guiding Justices, Legislatures, and Instruments, November 2005
- Assessing Supervision: Probation Program Impact, Evaluation
- Thinking About Neighborhoods: A Community-Based Model, February 2005
- Resource Recap: Forms, November 2005
- The Logistics: Data Collection, January 2007
- Outcome Tracker: Data Management Strategies, November
- Travis Community Impact Supervision: Report to the Community,
  May 2006
- Measuring Progress: Management Strategies, November
- Strengthening Offenders With Training
- Organizational Assessment of Travis County
- Conceptual Agreement on Central Diagnosis Assessment Form Development Strategy, Diagnosis Committee, February 7, 2006
- Travis County Risk Score Validation and Related Analysis, Report One, March 27, 2006
- Travis County SCS Pilot Study, Report One: Analysis of Preliminary Data for Review by Department, April 10, 2006
- Travis County SCS Pilot Study, Report Two: Analysis of Revised Data, April 13, 2006
- Travis County SCS Pilot Study, Report Three: Supplemental Analysis of Selected Supervision Variables, April 17, 2006
- General Update and Review of Central Diagnosis Process Research, April 25, 2006
- Pending Steps to Complete Central Diagnosis Assessment Form, Diagnosis Committee, March 3, 2006
- Travis County Risk Score Validation Study Group: Review of Absconder Issue Report Two, March 27, 2006
- Travis County Risk Score Validation: Updated Analysis with Additional Cases Report Two, June 1, 2006
- Project Overview & Central Diagnosis Process, Report to County Attorney, June 1, 2006
- Travis County Risk Score Validation: Updated Analysis with Additional Cases Report Two, June 2, 2006
- Annual Report Statistical Tables and Methodology, August 2007

- Travis CSCD Flowchart of Case Intake/Assignment, December
- Analysis of Strategies for Case Intake/Assignment, December
- Computerized Data Reporting System
- Analysis of Strategies for Case Intake/Assignment, December
- Template to Guide Development of Strategies, Supervision Committee
- Proposed Strategy for Quality Control Committee, January
- Conceptual Agreement to Study (CSCD) Supervision Strategies Template
- Diagnosis Committee Work Group
- Comparison of Key Characteristics of Absconding with Felons under Supervision, January 17, 2006
- Comparison of Key Characteristics of Absconding with Misdemeanor Supervision, January 17, 2006
- Annual Report Statistical Tables and Methodology, August 2007
Key Reports Accessible to All
@http://www.co.travis.tx.us/community_supervision/TCIS_Initiative.asp

Justice System Practices that Work Conference - June 29, 2006

- Conference Agenda
- Ed Latessa Presentation
- Eric Cadora Mapping Presentation
- Eric Cadora Mapping Presentation
- Dr. Geraldine Nagy and Dr. Tony Fabelo Presentation

Reports

- 2008 TCIS Progress Report
- 2007 TCIS Progress Report
- Incubator I - TCIS: An Incubator Site to Improve Probation
- Incubator II - Better Diagnosis: The First Step to Improve Probation Supervision Strategies
- Incubator III - Guiding Justice Decisions with Risk Assessment Instruments
- Incubator IV - Assessing Supervision Needs: A Profile of the Travis Probation Population
- Incubator V - Thinking About Location: Orienting Probation to Neighborhood Based Supervision
- Incubator VI - Resource Report: Central Diagnosis Assessment Forms
- Incubator VII - The Logistics of Implementing a Central Diagnosis Unit
- Incubator VIII - Outcome Tracking Reporting for Improving Probation Management Strategies
- Incubator IX - Measuring Process Efficiency to Improve Probation Management Strategies
- Incubator X - Strengthening the Management and Treatment of Sex Offenders While on Probation
- Incubator XI - TCIS Two Year Department Reassessment
National Exposure

STREAMLINING AND STRENGTHENING ASSESSMENTS WITH EVIDENCE-BASED PRACTICES:

THE TRAVIS COUNTY EXPERIENCE

Perspectives

Tony Fabelo, Ph.D. and Geraldine F. Nagy, Ph.D.

American Probation and Parole Association

Perspectives

Fall 2008
National Reports to Guide Replication Pending

“How to” reform probation along EBP blueprint based on Travis experience
Spring 09

Travis case study with outcomes
Summer 09
Overview

EBP Model and Operational Challenges

Texas Model Development in Travis County

Test of Impact of EBP