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BACKGROUND OF THE ASSIGNMENT

In late 1998, Fulton County Pre-Trial Services, which has been a division of the Superior Court of Fulton County (Atlanta), Georgia, for 35 years, underwent a major programmatic and staffing expansion, including a re-organization of the division’s management and operations structure, the establishment of a new supervision unit, and an increase in staff over a six-eight month period from 27 to 37 employees. The most demanding change, from a capacity and procedures perspective, was the establishment of the supervision unit. Although the division’s existing staff had no prior supervision responsibilities or experience, the new unit was immediately tasked with the supervision of a felony caseload of over 1,000 clients, including participants in the Fulton County Drug Court program.

The reorganization also entailed national recruitment for a new Director of Pre-Trial Services, who reports to the Court Administrator. A great deal of work was done by court administration and pretrial staff over the several months following the reorganization of Pre-Trial Services to develop and put in place new policies and procedures and an in-house staff training program. In May 1999, the new director requested CCTAP technical assistance for an outside review of the new policies and procedures in operation, with respect to both screening/intake and supervision activities. Other major objectives of the technical assistance were to augment in-service training by providing the opportunity for staff discussion with consultants about their activities related to the division’s new operational responsibilities (especially with respect to substance abusing felony defendant clients), and to advise senior management on inter-agency relations of the division, particularly its linkages with law enforcement agencies.

The consultants jointly selected by CCTAP staff and the Pre-Trial Services Director for this assignment were Ms. Michelle E. Amos, Certified Addiction Counselor and Supervisor of the District of Columbia Pretrial Services Agency’s Intensive Supervision Unit (whose services on this assignment were provided on a TDY basis as an inter-governmental courtesy to the Fulton County Superior Court by the D.C. Pretrial Services Agency); Ms. Shelley B. Caplan, Certified Chemical Dependency Counselor and a senior Caseworker in the Pretrial Services division of the Montgomery County (Maryland) Department of Correction and Rehabilitation; and Mr. Joseph G. Stelma, Jr., Senior Deputy Court Administrator and Coordinator of the Adult and Juvenile Drug Court of the Fourth Judicial Circuit of Florida, at Jacksonville. Each was chosen because he or she had the requisite professional qualifications and national perspective on the issues that were to be addressed by the technical assistance, and is currently employed in a senior position in a pretrial or drug court program that has a national reputation for innovative programming and quality management and operations. The criterion of current program affiliation was considered important to promoting post-assignment networking between the agencies and programs of the consultants and Fulton County.

The consultants’ on-site work was conducted in two phases during September and October 1999, following review of materials provided by the director of Fulton County Pre-Trial Services and several conference calls to discuss and refine assignment objectives. The objectives and modality of this CCTAP assignment did not require the development of a detailed analytical report on the management and operations of the client agency; only the preparation of memorandum reports by the consultants on salient findings and recommendations. These are presented for each consultant in the following sections of this report.
Phase One
Thursday, September 23, 1999

Joseph A. Trotter, Jr.
CCTAP Project
American University
Brandywine #660
4400 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20016-8159

Dear Mr. Trotter:

Enclosed are the requested receipts and vouchers pertaining to my recent detail to provide technical assistance to the Fulton County Pretrial Services Agency.

As you know, I was on-site from September 13-September 15, 1999. Upon my arrival, I had the opportunity to tour and assess the pretrial intake unit. I was also able to observe an assessment interview conducted at the Fulton County Detention Center. The Intake Unit is housed in a trailer located outside of the institution. I was advised that this was an upgrade from the previous trailer, which was pointed out to me as being condemned on an adjacent lot. Although the current accommodations are new and more spacious than the previous, basic equipment is still not in place. There are very few telephones available, forcing staff to “hover” around them until a line is available. As you might imagine, this impacts the verification process following an assessment interview. Also, as the unit is not actually located within the institution, nor has any space inside been established for the agency’s use, this creates several difficulties. I am concerned not only by the lack of any privacy afforded during these assessments, but also by the time lapse that occurs between interview and verification, as staff then returns to the trailer and awaits an available telephone line. The assessment interview instrument itself is sound; however staff could benefit from additional training in interview techniques.

My second day on-site focused on the supervision unit. It is my understanding that this unit is fairly recent in its development and has experienced a significant expansion in staff within the past few months. A large portion of my time on this day was spent providing training in basic case management practices. In addition, I attended a Compliance Hearing conducted by Judge Lovett. I also had the opportunity to meet with him and provide input with regard to the Compliance Hearing process. During the afternoon, I met with supervision caseworkers for a workshop covering supervision practices. A majority of the staff has no prior experience or background in this area.
Although much of what was addressed seemed new to them, I did feel that staff was receptive to the training.

During my final day on-site, I teamed up with my co-consultant, Ms. Amos, to provide training in courtroom presentations through role play. Again, there seemed to be little or no prior courtroom experience among the staff. This is another area in which additional training would be of benefit.

Overall, I was concerned by the apparent lack of support of the Fulton County Pretrial Services Agency by those agencies with which it interacts. Such a lack of cooperation creates additional hardships for an organization still in its development phases.

Thank you for providing me with the opportunity to provide technical assistance to the Fulton County Pretrial Services Agency.

Sincerely,

SHELLEY B. CAPLAN, CCDC
The following memorandum consists of my overall observations and findings of the Intake Unit and Supervision Unit of the Fulton County Pretrial Services Agency (PSA).

**The Intake Unit**

The Intake Unit is the essence of the pretrial agency. In this unit, the Pretrial Services Officer (PSO) learns the fundamentals of pretrial services and pretrial services release. The PSO learns why recommendations for release are made and how your agency determines the appropriate recommendation.

In discussions with your intake staff, I determined that they lack an understanding of the pretrial services concept in regards to why they make recommendations (according to a recommendation scheme) and how those recommendations connect with the Supervision Unit and the future compliance of the defendant. For instance, it was explained to me that in the past the Intake Unit would recommend the release of a defendant without a verified address. The staff did not understand the importance of having such information. They did not realize that a verified address allows the PSA to notify the defendant of an upcoming court date and to confirm an appearance in court which in turn reduces failure to appear rates. Also, a verified address may enhance a bench warrant investigation and help the PSO get a defendant to surrender on an outstanding warrant. The Intake Unit is more “in touch” with the political aspects of not releasing a defendant. They feel pressure from the sheriff’s department saying that they released more defendants from jail than PSA.

The only document that I had some concern about was the *Fulton County Superior Court Pre-trial Services Supervision Unit*. I learned that the defendant signs this document with the intake staff. The document provides the defendant with his/her conditions while in the pretrial release program. Item number two informs the defendant that he/she will report in person weekly as scheduled by the pretrial counselor. However, when the defendant arrives at the Supervision Unit, he/she may be assigned to a different supervision level which requires the defendant to report more than once a week.
In order to avoid any complications with the defense counsel or the defendant, you may want to rephrase item number two in the above-referenced form. It is suggested that you incorporate into the release that the defendant may be assigned to any of the listed supervision levels and list the specific levels with their respective requirements. This ensures that the PSO has explained all levels of supervision and that the defendant is aware that he/she could be placed in any one of those levels.

I recommend that you consult with the Pretrial Services Resource Center and have them assist you with training the staff on the fundamentals of pretrial services. Also, incorporate your intake procedures and recommendation scheme into orientation for all staff, to ensure that they understand how the fundamentals apply to the work they are completing. Additional training for your staff can be organized through regional PSA conferences along with national conferences.

**The Supervision Unit**

I had the opportunity to review the Fulton County Pretrial Services Policies and Procedures Manual, case/field notes, and a number of project proposals that were submitted to you. In addition, I interviewed your supervision staff, which was very helpful to me in making the following observations.

There are some basic guidelines in your procedures for determining a defendant’s level of supervision. However, the selection for level of supervision is primarily based on a PSO’s best judgment and discretion. I recommend that level of supervision be an Agency policy. The Agency should decide what particular charges should go in specific levels of supervision. The policy should incorporate what specifically in the defendant’s criminal history determines level of supervision, as well as failures in supervision and any special conditions imposed by the court. This ensures a fair, non-biased determination of supervision, and the PSO can accurately report why he placed the defendant on a particular level of supervision.

Currently, you have five levels of supervision and two other categories. I recommend that you combine your levels into three: maximum, medium, minimum, or levels I, II, III. Within these levels you can specify the number of in-person and telephone contacts required. However, I suggest that you have at least one contact in-person in your lowest level of supervision. This is based on the fact that a number of your defendants do not have telephone numbers or permanent addresses. I would maintain the “inactive” category. However, you should not have an “unclassified” category. The defendant should either be active or inactive based on your definition of “inactive.”

After the PSO has determined the level of supervision for the defendant, which should be prior to the defendant’s initial interview with the Supervision Unit, the PSO should prepare a written contract for the defendant. The contract will provide the defendant with his/her responsibilities while under supervision.

I also noticed that during the initial interview, the PSO has the defendant sign a blank release of information. The PSO must fill in the information for the purpose of the release prior to the defendant signing the form.
The information in the policies and procedures book on maintaining field notes is thorough and concise. However, it does not provide guidelines for verifying defendant information. Any information that the defendant provides the PSO with must be verified, specifically, changes in address, employment, or treatment information.

To ensure consistency, the Supervision Unit should establish standardized forms for the court and/or the defendant. The Agency can provide the PSO with templates, and the PSO will only be responsible for adding the information pertinent to the client.

Primarily, the staff’s case management practices are based on their own personal interpretations of case management. They believe that they were not taught proper case management skills and that they do not have guidelines to help them structure their case loads. I think this documentation was very important as the staff became aware of the importance of verifying information and keeping in contact with defendants. What I learned from this exercise is that they have not read their policies and procedures. The information that they need to feel confident about is case management, which is present in your procedures.

I hope this assessment is useful to you. If you would like to discuss my recommendations or matters not covered in this assessment, please do not hesitate to contact me.
Phase One: On-Site Agenda
INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

Date: September 2, 1999

To: All CCTAP Consultants

From: Marlynne D. Jefferson, Director
Fulton County Pre-Trial Services

Regarding: Technical Assistance Work Plan

The following is a list of areas/training needs that we would like you to review, address and share your knowledge and expertise on.

- Tour Fulton County Drug Court (Intake and Treatment Center). Review current collaborative efforts and provide recommendations

- Fulton County Pretrial Intake Unit
  Tour, observe and make recommendations on the interview, assessment and recommendation process

- Fulton County Supervision Unit
  (Please note that this is the area where you will concentrate most of your technical assistance.)
  Provide training on developing groups and supervision options
  Domestic violence/stalking
  HIV/AIDS
  Adult literacy/GED preparation
  Substance abuse
  Employment readiness

- Provide training on group facilitation techniques

- Provide training on supervision enhancements
  Field supervision
  Curfew monitoring
  Drug testing
  Educational seminar
- Provide training on developing Community Networks
  Finding resources
  Establishing community service work sites

- Provide training on proper courtroom decorum

- Provide overview on V.I.P. (Michelle)

- Provide training on handling special needs clients and specialized caseloads i.e. sex offenders

- Review current case management practices
  Case assignments
  Levels of supervision
  Handling warrant cases

While I recognize your time is limited, I will be putting together an agenda to help you meet our training needs. Our Agency Manual, Training Manual, Program brochures and some draft proposals from staff have been mailed you, so you should receive them soon.

As you know, our other consultants will also be here during your visit and I am planning a meeting with both groups at the conclusion of your visit to share ideas and observations. If you have any suggestions or concerns, please contact me at (404) 893-2648. Feel free to bring any information that you feel might be useful, we are able to provide reproduction services on sight.

The staff and I are anxiously awaiting your arrival and look forward to your assistance as we continue to build our program. Thank you again for your assistance and cooperation in this matter.

CC:  Joseph Trotter, American University
     The Honorable Thelma Wyatt Cummings Moore, Chief Judge
     The Honorable Doris Downs, Judge
     Tom Ulbricht, Deputy Court Administrator & Acting Drug Court Director
Phase Two
Ms. Shavonne Cassidy  
Research Associate, American University  
4400 Massachusetts Ave., NW  
Brandywine Suite 100  
Washington, DC 20016-8159

Re: Pretrial Linkage to Law Enforcement  
Fulton County, Georgia

Dear Ms. Cassidy,

On Wednesday, the 20th of October, I met with Mr. Thomas Ulbricht, Senior Deputy Trial Court Administrator and Drug Court Coordinator for Fulton County, Georgia. Mr. Ulbricht has only recently been appointed to the Coordinator’s position and we discussed the recent technical assistance visit concerning the Pretrial Program. Tom had set up a visit for me of the Fulton County Corrections Facility with Mr. Michael Rickles, Intake Supervisor, and his staff. Several items were discussed, most of which have been corrected, or are in the process of being clarified by Staff. These were items outlined by the previous technical assistance visit; it appears that Mr. Rickles and Mrs. Marlynne Jefferson, Director of Pretrial Supervision, have been able to work through these recommendations.
Recommendations concerning Intake at Fulton County Correctional Facility

• The Automated Fingerprint Identification System (AFIS) causes delays in release due to technical problems. This continues to be a problem for the Atlanta Jail Facility and the Fulton County Facility in providing positive identification. I have several years experience with the AFIS equipment used by the Jacksonville Sheriff’s Office and, in my opinion, the solution could be expedited by a meeting involving the AFIS vendor, Intake, the District Attorney’s Office and the Sheriff’s Office. The vendor should have contract requirements to overcome identification procedure problems. This could cause serious problems to Public Safety, to all Pretrial Programs, as well as, jail overcrowding. In fact, until the problems are resolved, my recommendation to Mr. Ulbricht, Mr. Rickles and Ms. Jefferson was to hold a monthly meeting with Corrections, the AFIS vendor and the District Attorney’s Office in order to track the progress and to alleviate any future problems.

• It is recommended that Pretrial peruse arrest dockets on weekends at both city and county correctional facilities; this could expedite release and especially assist Drug Court in getting clients into the system. Ms. Jefferson concurred and will look into that possibility.

• There is an apparent communications problem between the District Attorney’s Office and the Court about who is responsible for the software/hardware hook-up. Mr. Rickles stressed the need to get this system up, in that it has stifled the pretrial intake information. A determination needs to be made as to who retains that responsibility and then a monthly/quarterly meeting between team members to assess the progress.
As Chief Judges rotate, it is suggested that written and verbal Administrative Orders be reviewed concerning Drug Court and Pretrial. This is being discussed by Ms. Jefferson with the current Chief Judge.

**Pretrial Supervision**

On Wednesday, October 20, 1999, I met with Tara Woodward and Candace Yates, Court Support Supervisors, who stated there is a void in the Pretrial Supervision, in that no home or outside visits are made. Numerous reasons have been given, however, the most important one is the safety of the court support personnel and the number of new individuals being hired and trained. The staff understands the need for home visits and are anxious to begin.

Community linkage seems to be another void in this program. Homeless people are not considered due to no permanent address, pregnant women with needs, relocation services, job skill training, housing and emergency housing needs, halfway houses and follow-up are just some of the issues. I provided them with a list of agencies that are under the United Way that can be very fruitful when contacted. The faith community and other social agencies listed should be invited to Drug Court to meet with the Judge, Coordinator and Drug Court Team. It was my recommendation that they set up a monthly meeting until these agencies are on board and then convert to quarterly meetings once the programs are in place. An 800# was provided to assist women with pregnancy needs. This care facility can direct a female to any location in the nation for immediate help.

Pretrial would like the Drug Court Judge to follow their recommendations of referral/screening and possible participation in Drug Court. It is possible that the Drug Court Judge is not aware of this request. A regularly scheduled meeting between the
Judge and the Drug Court Team may very well be the solution here.

- The procedure of receiving cases for screening/assessment and forwarding to the District Attorney appears to be sound.

- There is a possibility of a "fast track" similar to Jacksonville, which could speed up the District Attorney's decision. As it is now, Intake forwards the case to the Felony division of the District Attorney's Office, where contact is made with the Drug Court District Attorney for approval. The case is then placed on a calendar for appearance. In Jacksonville, the Drug Court Attorney contacts the Division Attorney who would normally get the case and discusses approval. This has been very helpful in moving cases and placing clients in rehab care days and, in some instances, even weeks earlier.

- There should be a method of linking community support for the inpatient needs of the client. At the present time, calls are made to several facilities to get assistance. One possible solution is to attempt to procure beds for several agencies in advance; many Drug Courts have a working agreement for reserved beds for Drug Court Clients and if, on the day Drug Court is held, the need is not filled (and usually prior to court appearance, the need is known) the bed is relinquished. This is a grid approach and could really save time and energy. A meeting with Tom, Marlynne, the Judge, and the facilities head can be very productive. The Judge is the key to gaining this support.

- Dual Diagnosed people are not accepted in most cases. This is a large percentage of potential clients who could be assisted and become good citizens. There are many communities in the nation who cannot provide mental health services, however, many courts have volunteer mental health workers and part-time contracted services. This is a cost that cannot be overlooked, even if some other part of the program is curtailed. I suggest that the Coordinator pursue the medical community for these resources immediately. The drug addicted, mentally handicapped population involved in this area
is too large to ignore for any reason. Atlanta must have some help already available and, if not, Drug Court needs to take the leadership role to ensure that this assistance is made available to that segment of their society that needs it.

On Wednesday, October 20, Mr. Ulbricht scheduled a meeting with Judge Isaac Jenrette of Drug Court. Judge Jenrette is the visionary leader of Drug Court for Atlanta. During our discussion, he related a feeling of possible change within the program. There are a large number of absconders and relapses (this program accepts longtime serious substance abusers) have been very high. I advised Judge Jenrette that the sanction of incarceration was very severe at the beginning of the program and the “six month clean” or “set back” was also a very big hurdle for these types of clients. The Judge feels this may need to be revisited; perhaps the Coordinator could begin to assess the sanctions with the Team and revamp them.

Another issue is no incentive. There are many community and business linkages to be explored in Atlanta. Tom and his Team could tap into this area for rewards. I suggested that these items be expedited in order to retain clients as well as drawing new clients into the program. The Judge could also be very helpful in lending his support and name to these efforts.

Treatment

On Thursday, October 21, I met with Carl Reeves, Program Director of Drug Court Treatment, at Hope Hall. Mr. Reeves has been involved as a treatment specialist for some time and is responsible for client rehab and reporting to the Court. He has two State Certified Substance Abuse Counselors, numerous volunteers from “Mirror Image,” a recovery program made up of professional people that make an impact on recovery.
The Hope Hall facility will be replaced by the County when a refurbished center next to the Fulton County Corrections Facility is ready. This will allow for enhanced resources, space and linkages with the Sheriff’s Office.

While at Hope Hall, I met Assistant Chief Ron Slappey of the Fulton County Sheriff’s Office. Chief Slappey has been selected by the Sheriff to be the Law Enforcement Linkage to Drug Court. Chief Slappey has already began to get acquainted with the process, meeting clients and being the linkage that this program needs. He will be in Drug Court to assist in quick follow-up to warrants. Chief Slappey has a good rapport with the community and is knowledgeable about the politics of local government.

I suggested that Tom Ulbricht begin involving Chief Slappey in the everyday life of Drug Court. Ms. Jefferson could begin to train her personnel with Chief Slappey and officers of the neighboring agencies. This will facilitate a smooth entrance into Home visits where Precinct Officers will also get exposure to Drug Court.

The Drug Court Team needs to revisit the Monday, Wednesday and Friday drug screens; this is an expensive venture into monitoring use. The possibility of a color code assignment to clients for daily call in and 24 hour submission may be an avenue to explore. The assistance of Law Enforcement will now allow for home tests with case managers. Following a client with excessive testing until they leave the program does not encourage trust and structure for the client. All drug screens should be random and observed. The Treatment Staff should be responsible for this procedure. Security Guards are not Law Enforcement personnel and have no real obligation to or understanding of substance abuse treatment. This method has proven to be a detriment to some programs as well as creating compromising situations.
Consideration of group sizes and co-ed groups needs to be reassessed by the Team, this can often lead to an atmosphere of not sharing and could build walls of isolation. Females may feel as though they must compete to stay in the group.

Fulton County Sheriff's Office Linkages

On Thursday, October 21, Tom Ulbricht scheduled a meeting with the Fulton County Sheriff's Office Staff. Captain Cunningham and Corporal Baulding will be the liaison with the Drug Court team. These officers appeared to be interested in Drug Court and can provide many linkages for present and future needs. I suggested that officers with the local agencies be introduced to Drug Court at in-service training. This is a requirement to retain their Standards and can give more time for questions about the program and how resourceful they can be. Roll Call training is generally brief and could cause resentment.

The Police Academy is a great source for training tapes. Many agencies can profit from their film expertise and video equipment. Drug Court films for Public Service Announcements can also educate the community. Fire Academy personnel also have great video training equipment available. Captain Cunningham and Corporal Baulding gave great insight into other ways they can assist and contribute to Drug Court.

This Law Enforcement Linkage will be very valuable to Home Visits, Precinct access and Treatment follow-up.
This Drug Court is to be commended for stepping back and reviewing its entire program. Mr. Ulbricht brings excellent management skills; his endeavor to begin cross-training with the entire staff is a bold step. I reviewed correspondence filled with enthusiasm from some personnel involved.

Ms. Jefferson wants an effective pretrial supervision program. She is to be commended for the reorganization; Marlynne is very open to community linkages and wants to have an effective pretrial department. I found Ms. Jefferson and Mr. Rickles sharing of ideas and comments to be open and honest. Communication channels must be open between all agencies and regularly scheduled meetings can facilitate that.

The Law Enforcement Linkage will open up many new linkages and the enthusiasm generated by these officers will garner support.

The Treatment component is essential to recovery. Mr. Reeves and his staff strive for perfection. The advent of a new and larger facility with the Corrections complex should lead to greater awareness of the Drug Court program.

I met with Ms. Sarah Smith, Business Manager for the Court Administration. She and Mr. Ulbricht work closely and I already know her commitment to the program. This support is through finding other sources of funding, which is indeed encouraging coming from the Court Administration side. When time and resources allow, Team members should visit other courts and give their Law Enforcement partners some exposure.
The visit, as a whole, was a successful one, with many different needs identified and suggestions for resources through linkages made; which, if followed through on, should make a decided

If you have any other questions, please do not hesitate to call on me.

Sincerely,

Joseph G. Steima, Jr.
Senior Deputy Court Administrator
Drug Court Coordinator

cc: Mr. Tom Ulbricht
    Ms. Marlynne Jefferson
Phase Two: On-Site Agenda