RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING EVALUATION OF THE IMPACT OF THE DRUG COURT PROCEDURES AND ENHANCED TREATMENT PROGRAM IN BERRIEN COUNTY (ST. JOSEPH), MICHIGAN
RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING EVALUATION OF THE IMPACT OF THE DRUG COURT PROCEDURES AND ENHANCED TREATMENT PROGRAM IN BERRIEN COUNTY (ST. JOSEPH), MICHIGAN

August 1993

Consultant
Brian T. Yates, Ph.D.

CTAP Staff
Caroline S. Cooper
Joseph A. Trotter, Jr.

COURTS TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROJECT
Services to State and Local Courts Under a Grant From the State Justice Institute
Brandywine Building, Suite 660
4400 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20016-8159
Technical Assistance No.: 3-047

Requesting Jurisdiction: Berrien County (St. Joseph), Michigan

Requesting Agency: Circuit Court for Berrien County

Requesting Official: Hon. Ronald Taylor, Chief Judge

Local Coordinator: Hon. Ronald Taylor

Dates of On-Site Study: June 22-23, 1993

Consultants Assigned: Dr. Brian Yates

CTAP Staff Coordinator: Caroline S. Cooper

Central Focus of Study: Assessment of Court-Annexed Treatment Program

This report was prepared in conjunction with the Courts Technical Assistance Project, which is conducted under a grant from the State Justice Institute to The American University. The points of view expressed do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the State Justice Institute.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION

II. EVALUATION DESIGN FOR THE BERRIEN COUNTY DRUG COURT PROCESS AND ENHANCED TREATMENT PROGRAM
   A. Interest Groups
   B. Due Date
   C. Hypotheses
   D. Experimental vs. Correlational Approaches to Evaluation Design
   E. Experimental Design
   F. Process Measures
   G. Defendant Background Measures
   H. Outcome Measures
   I. Cost Measures, Cost-Savings Estimates
   J. Measurement Instrumentation and Data Collection
   K. Plans for Statistical Analysis

APPENDIX:

Forms Currently Used by Pretrial and Probation Departments Which May Provide Data for Purposes of Drug Court Evaluation

A. Basic Information Report: Michigan Department of Corrections
B. Probation Department: Defendant History Form
C. Pre-Sentence Investigation Report
D. Probation Officer's Recommendation Form
E. Berrien County Health Department: Alcohol/Drug Abuse Program Drug Court Referral Form

[Substance Abuse Subtle Screening Inventory (SASSI) Form Also Used]
I. INTRODUCTION

In October 1991, the Circuit Court for Berrien County (St. Joseph), Michigan established a Drug Court to expedite the disposition of drug offenses. Five case processing tracks were established to which drug cases were assigned based on the seriousness of the charge and the defendant's criminal history. On July 1, 1993, an enhanced treatment component was added to the Drug Court program which provides intensive counselling, education, acupuncture, and other treatment services for eligible defendants convicted of drug possession. The acupuncture component of the enhanced treatment program was supported by an initial grant from Berrien County.

To assess the impact of the enhanced treatment program and the acupuncture component in particular

In the Spring of 1993, Hon. Ronald Taylor, Chief Judge of the Second Judicial Circuit Court in Berrien County (St. Joseph), Michigan requested technical assistance from SJI's Courts Technical Assistance Project (CTAP) at The American University to design an evaluation scheme to assess the impact of the newly established enhanced treatment program and the acupuncture component in particular, as well as the expedited procedures utilized by the Drug Court generally. In response to this request, Joseph A. Trotter, Jr. and Caroline S. Cooper, CTAP Director and Deputy Director, respectively, and Dr. Brian Yates, Associate Professor of Psychology at The American University, visited St. Joseph on June 22 and 23, 1993, to meet with local justice system and Berrien County Health Department officials involved in the operation of the Drug Court program and delivery of treatment services to defendants.

During the site visit, meetings were held with the following Berrien County officials:

- Joseph Foster, Director of Substance Abuse Services for Berrien County,
- Jennifer Grimm, Case Manager for the Berrien County Circuit Court Drug Court,
- Daniel McKisson, Clinical Supervisor for the Berrien County Health Department,
- Mark Sanford, Assistant Berrien County Prosecutor for Drug Cases,
- Judge Ronald Taylor, Chief Judge, Berrien County Circuit Court, and
- Dino Yacobozzi, Drug Rehabilitation Specialist

In addition, the study team spoke by telephone with David Dreese, Chief Probation Officer,
and Michael Collier, Director of Pretrial Services, who provided copies of intake and supervision forms currently maintained for Berrien County Drug Court defendants. Copies of these forms are included in the Appendix for use by local officials in identifying potential data sources for the evaluation measures discussed in this report.

The report which follows discusses issues relevant to the evaluation design generally and presents a suggested outline for evaluating the primary components of the Drug Court program.
II. EVALUATION DESIGN FOR THE BERRIEN COUNTY DRUG COURT PROCESS AND ENHANCED TREATMENT PROGRAM

A. Interest Groups

The primary audiences for the findings of this evaluation are the County Board and administrators, judicial system officials, and the substance abuse treatment community. Additional audiences include taxpayers, evaluation researchers, and defendants and their representatives.

B. Due Date

An interim evaluation report on the acupuncture dimension of the evaluation is needed at the beginning of 1994; final findings are needed by the middle of 1994. More specifically, data collected up to one month prior to 1 January 1994 and 1 July 1994 could be used in evaluation reports. It would be natural to include in these reports evaluations of the Drug Court dimension of the evaluation, too.

C. Hypotheses

The purpose of evaluation designs is to facilitate discovery of answers to specific questions posed by a service system or other interested parties. In formal evaluation, these questions are stated in the affirmative, to be confirmed (hopefully) by statistical analyses. For the Berrien County setting, the following hypotheses were generated.

1. The **Drug Court** program is superior to traditional courts on the following measures for defendants whose involvement in substance abuse has facilitated their criminal behavior:
   a. reducing future criminal behavior (including nondrug as well as drug-related crimes, drug use, and probation violations);
   b. improving defendants' lives (health, mental health, social relations, financial situation, education, housing);
   c. enhancing the lives of defendants' relatives (same measures as for defendants);
   d. increasing court efficiency;
e. decreasing difficulty of probation supervision;

f. deterring future criminal behavior by persons other than the defendants (through reduction of perceptions by persons in the community that penalties for criminal behavior are minor, delayed, and probabilistic); and

g. improving prison capacity (for incarceration of other offenders and for alleviation of overcrowding and reduction of prison violence).

2. Acupuncture contributes significantly to the effectiveness of both:

   a. standard and

   b. enhanced drug treatment programs.

(The standard and enhanced programs are included under the acupuncture hypothesis because the decision to enhance treatment services was made simultaneously with the addition of acupuncture.)

D. Experimental vs. Correlational Approaches to Evaluation Design

In program evaluation there are two basic approaches to collecting and analyzing data to test these hypotheses: experimental or correlational. The experimental approach systematically manipulates each dimension in the evaluation design. In our evaluation, each of the major hypotheses can be thought of as a different dimension of the evaluation design. Drug Court and traditional court represent two distinct levels along the design dimension Court Type. The experimental approach to examining the acupuncture question would be manipulative as well: defendants would be assigned to a treatment that did or did not include acupuncture. In this way, two different levels of the Acupuncture dimension are created by manipulation: includes acupuncture versus excludes acupuncture.

The correlational approach to testing hypotheses is observational rather than manipulative. Variations that occur "spontaneously" are used to create the levels of the dimensions being investigated. These natural variations are likely to vary from person to person, and rarely approach the discreteness of being of one specific "level" or another. For example, while an experimental design would hold the duration and number of acupuncture sessions constant for all participants in the "includes acupuncture" level, a correlational design would allow the acupuncture provider to decide which participants should receive many, few, or no sessions of acupuncture, and how long each session should be. Sometimes decisions involving treatment are necessarily discrete, because treatment
comes only in discrete "types," e.g., Drug Court or traditional court. Still, the correlational approach would not constrain assignment to courts but would allow existing "natural" processes to determine who was seen in the Drug Court and who was seen in the traditional court process.

One advantage of correlational designs is that less effort is needed, since no formal manipulations are conducted. Blame for negative effects of manipulations (e.g., assignment to a group that receives substandard treatment) also is avoided in correlational designs.

One disadvantage of correlational designs is that people who happen to be exposed to a particular level of a dimension may be different from people exposed to another level of the dimension. This is especially likely when people are allowed to select which level of each dimension of treatment they receive (possibly causing a "self-selection bias"), or when other people make assignment decisions based on defendant background. To avoid plausible alternative explanations of findings, we recommend that an experimental design be used.

E. Experimental Design

1. Experimental Design Dimension I: Drug Court vs. Traditional Court Process

For the purposes of this report, "Drug Court" refers to the expedited procedures for disposition of drug offenses which have been instituted by the Circuit Court in Berrien County. "Traditional court" refers to the procedures for disposing of drug offenses used in Van Buren County which are similar to those used in Berrien County for drug offenders prior to the Drug Court's creation. Both the Berrien County Drug Court and the Van Buren County traditional court use traditional probation techniques for drug offenders; the Berrien County Drug Court, however, also uses enhanced treatment services, begun approximately July 1, 1993, which include acupuncture as an adjunct to these services.

The present evaluation examines the impact of the enhanced treatment services provided to defendants in the Berrien County Drug Court (primarily, as we understand it, defendants from St. Joseph). These enhanced services differ from the traditional probation supervision services previously provided to defendants in St. Joseph and currently provided to defendants outside of St. Joseph by providing and requiring more educational and counseling sessions, urinalysis drug testing, and other treatments such as acupuncture.

The evaluation suggested in this report is designed to serve as an initial evaluation approach that can examine one drug court (Berrien County) and one traditional court (Van Buren County) to pilot-test measures and procedures relating to the adjudication process and treatment supervision programs being instituted in Berrien County. Findings about the impacts of drug courts would be most generalizable if more than one drug court, and more
than one traditional court, were used (since drug courts probably differ somewhat in their procedures, as do traditional courts). If matching rather than random assignment is used (discussed later), finding differences in the expected direction between several pairs of drug courts and traditional courts would be especially impressive. We recognize, however, that initial work may need to be done on only two or three courts in total. Positive findings from this initial evaluation might generate interest and funding for inclusion of additional courts in subsequent evaluations.

2. Experimental Design Dimension II: Acupuncture versus Other Treatment Procedures

The substance abuse treatment system used in Berrien County is being enhanced, with acupuncture being one of several major changes enacted during the first month. It is our understanding that acupuncture is generally considered to be an experimental procedure most appropriate for defendants who are attempting to cease substance abuse within the context of participating in a comprehensive drug treatment program. The current lack of widespread acceptance of acupuncture in the drug counseling and court communities might be best addressed by studies that randomly assign substance abusing defendants to acupuncture or "control" procedures.

The purpose of this assignment strategy is to separate for measurement the bona fide effects of acupuncture from other effects that, while "real," are not unique to acupuncture. For example, adding a "new" or "special" procedure to treatment enhances defendants' and counselors' expectations of success: these raised expectations may breed real additional successes. The effects of acupuncture probably include some of these "Hawthorne" effects (named after the researcher who first made them explicit to modern researchers), but several other effects as well. Acupuncture sessions also may include personal one-on-one contact with a service provider and probably involve some relaxation instructions as well. These components also are not unique to acupuncture, and likely can be engendered by relaxation training, meditation, and similar procedures. What is supposed to be unique to acupuncture involves the effects of inserting needles in specific locations on the body.

The full complement of control conditions for acupuncture, which probably is not possible in the current setting, would involve random assignment of drug-abusing defendants eligible for treatment to either:

(a) acupuncture

(b) needle insertion at nonacupuncture sites
(c) relaxation or meditation training with one-on-one contact, or

(d) no specific "special" component, in addition to counseling and other treatment procedures.

It is likely that clinical or other considerations would prevent use of so many groups. A somewhat conservative approach to demonstrating the effectiveness of acupuncture relative to other procedures would be to compare acupuncture to a treatment that includes all ingredients of acupuncture that contribute to positive outcomes except for needle insertion and the specific procedures leading up to needle insertion, e.g., to relaxation training.

3. Design Diagram

The following diagram represents the two dimensions of the complete design. All possible combinations of each level of the design are not possible: the blank cells are not feasible. The feasible cells are annotated to indicate our understanding of their present status.
Table 1.1

Design for Evaluation of Acupuncture and Drug Court Procedures

**Dimension I:**

Expedit ed or Nonexpedited Court Procedure (nonrandom assignment to either:)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension II: Drug Court Process with random assignment to either:</th>
<th>Berrien County: Expedited Disposition</th>
<th>Berrien County: Traditional Disposition</th>
<th>Van Buren County: Traditional Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Drug Treatment + Acupuncture</td>
<td>Cell A (current planned program)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Drug Treatment + Relaxation Training</td>
<td>Cell B (proposed control group)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Drug Treatment</td>
<td>Cell C (proposed control group)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Drug Treatment</td>
<td>Cell D (proposed control group)</td>
<td>Cell E (current conditions)</td>
<td>Cell F (current conditions)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Random Assignment versus Matching to Drug Court or Traditional Court Process

The ideal way in which to test the hypotheses given above is to create separate programs that represent each alternative, and to then assign randomly to each program participants who are eligible for all programs.

For the hypothesis regarding the Drug Court versus the traditional court process for handling the adjudication of drug offenders, this would amount to assigning persons who
were eligible for the Drug Court to either the Drug Court or the traditional court according to random numbers tables. Because this is not possible in Berrien County (where all drug cases proceed through the same Drug Court process), a fall-back position is to compare a sample of persons seen in the Berrien County Drug Court against a sample of very similar persons seen in the traditional court, e.g., Van Buren County. Within these groupings, breakdowns can be made for those Berrien County defendants who participate in the enhanced treatment program and those who receive traditional probation supervision/treatment services.

Findings will be more defensible if an effort is made to "match" characteristics of the persons seen in the traditional court to the characteristics of persons who are seen in the Drug Court. In a "matching" design, a defendant from the comparison group (e.g., Van Buren County) would be selected so that the matched defendant was of the same gender as the defendant receiving Drug Court treatment, and was of approximately the same age, had a similar level of prior drug abuse, current drug involvement, and was within predetermined ranges on other variables that research has shown to affect the effectiveness of drug programs (e.g., years of drug abuse, number of drugs abused, etc.). Matching at this level of detail would, of course, involve a well-organized database of defendant characteristics that was updated regularly and that was accessible to the evaluators.

The problem with "matching" is that if a difference in subsequent criminal behavior, drug usage, or other outcome measures is found between the two groups, the difference could be attributed to a variable other than the treatment to which they had been assigned and other than the ones on which the defendants had been matched.

For example, if Drug Court defendants were found to be less likely than traditional court defendants to engage in criminal behavior subsequent to treatment, that difference could be explained by any of the many differences between Berrien and Van Buren counties, e.g., differences in unemployment rates in the county economies, strength of criminal organizations in the counties. These differences, and any others that may be suggested by critics, would have to be investigated, and it is likely that one or more difference might be found to differ between the counties.

Perhaps the best way to appreciate this problem is to consider how one might explain a finding of no difference in criminal behavior between defendants handled by the Drug Court and the traditional court, or a finding of even more criminal behavior following Drug Court versus traditional court participation. Several explanations come to mind readily for this hypothetical finding, many of which involve possible differences between the counties. It is possible, for example, that the one variable on which Drug Court defendants are not matched to traditional court defendants is the severity of their current drug abuse: it is possible that drug abusing defendants are more likely than nonabusing defendants to relapse to criminal behavior.
In the ideal world, these and most other alternative explanations could be eliminated by randomly assigning a substantial group of defendants from the same jurisdiction to a drug court or a traditional court process, both operating in the same jurisdiction. Given the operational procedures for the Drug Court in Berrien County, such assignment is not possible; however, these issues can be addressed, at least partially, in two ways:

(a) first, by an analysis of the impact of Drug Court procedures on relevant measures relating to the post-trial performance of defendants who receive traditional probation supervision and treatment services and those receiving enhanced treatment services (including acupuncture treatments.), and

(b) second, by constructing information on the post-trial performance of a sample of Berrien County defendants who received traditional probation/treatment supervision prior to the creation of the Drug Court's enhanced treatment program, and comparing this sample with a similar group of defendants participating in the enhanced treatment program.

These analyses would provide a conceptual framework for assessing the impact of the Drug Court and enhanced treatment program now; (b) and the impact of procedures prior to creation of the Drug Court and the enhanced treatment program and the situation that would exist again if the enhanced treatment program was dismantled.

F. Process Measures

These are measures of the degree to which the acupuncture program is implemented, and of the extent to which Drug Court procedures are followed. It often is useful to obtain these measures, because defendants may not participate fully in treatment, and because implementation of Drug Court procedures may differ among defendants. Poor outcomes for some individuals assigned to acupuncture or Drug Court may be explained by low participation or inadequate program implementation. Measures of process that could be helpful to collection include:

- Referral source (prosecutor-pretrial diversion; court, probation, etc.);
- Adjudication track assigned (Drug Court, not Drug Court; see above experimental design);
- Defendant participation in the adjudication procedure to which he or she was assigned (e.g., accepted or refused to cooperate);
- Treatment track assigned (acupuncture and mental health services, relaxation training and mental health services);

- Defendant participation in the treatment procedures to which he or she was assigned, such as:
  * number of acupuncture sessions attended,
  * percent of scheduled acupuncture sessions attended,
  * number and percent attended of mental health sessions attended,
  * number and percent attended of other professional (e.g., vocational training) sessions attended,
  * defendant follow-through on medical, employment, and other referrals made by counselors, others),
  * length of time in the Drug Court program,
  * length of time in mental health services program.

- Concurrent participation in other mental health, social service, or physical health programs,

- Type of discharge from mental health services (e.g., dropped out, dismissed due to noncompliance, completion), and

- Defendant participation in aftercare programs.

It is important, of course to include all defendants in evaluations of drug courts and substance abuse services, whether they participated in them or not. If only those defendants who participated in the courts and services were included in the evaluation, findings could not be generalized to the average defendant and might be unrepresentative.

G. Defendant Background Measures

Theory, research, and judicial and clinical experience with drug offenders suggests that some defendants benefit more than others from drug court, substance abuse counseling, and other innovative procedures. Variation in outcomes may be explained not only by differences in compliance to and implementation of treatment procedures, but also by what the defendant brings to court and treatment in terms of prior
experience with courts, with substance abuse, and with treatment programs. In addition, defendants who possess more education and who have better vocational skills, and social skills may benefit more from our efforts. Finally, age, gender, and other demographic variables may represent other factors that also moderate the effectiveness of treatment, as may the absence of serious health or mental health problems.

To examine the possible effects on outcome of the above defendant background variables, it may be advisable to collect information on defendants:

- Age,
- Age of onset of drug use,
  * for illicit drugs,
  * for licit drugs, i.e., alcohol, tobacco,
- Duration of drug use
  * for illicit drugs,
  * for licit drugs, i.e., alcohol, tobacco,
- Prior judicial system involvement
  * juvenile versus adult involvement (it may not be possible to ascertain juvenile involvement from court records, but defendants may report this involvement when asked),
  * prior arrests,
  * adherence to prior probation
- Referral source (prosecutor-pretrial diversion\(^1\); court, probation, etc.)
- Education level,
- Vocational skills,

---

\(^1\) It is our understanding that referral of a defendant to the enhanced treatment program through the prosecutor's diversion program without adjudication would be very rare under current procedures.
- Social skills,
- Physical disabilities, e.g., blindness, paraplegic
- Physical health problems,
- Mental health problems,

H. Outcome Measures

- Criminal behavior (during participation, following participation)
  * probation violations, e.g., being in prohibited areas,
  * rearrests,
  * nature of new offense (drug/non-drug related; assaultive/non-assaultive; length of time in program when new offense occurred)
  * convictions,
  * self-reports of criminal activities,

- Incarceration,

- Drug use (assessed by self-report, other-report, urinalysis, and breathalyzer)
  * illicit drugs,
  * licit drugs (including self- and other-reports of inebriation)

- Health,
  * cardiovascular functioning, e.g., high blood pressure
  * presence of sexually transmitted diseases
  * behaviors related to HIV transmission, e.g., safer sexual behaviors, not sharing syringes
  * use of health-related services outside of the enhanced treatment program, e.g., physician visits, emergency room visits
- Mental health,
  * anxiety,
  * depression,
  * other personality disorders,
  * other mental dysfunction,
  * use of mental health services external to the enhanced treatment program,
    e.g., appointments with psychiatric social workers, psychologists, psychiatrists,

- Employment and employability,

- Education,

- Housing,

- Financial well-being,

- Social Relationships

I. Cost Measures, Cost-Savings Estimates

Money, time, and other resources consumed by courts and substance abuse treatments are always of concern. Relative to traditional adjudication procedures for drug offenders, the processes of drug courts and substance abuse treatments may require more effort from court officials and defendants initially. Additional persons, i.e., counseling and acupuncture service providers, also are involved. Thus, the innovative procedures being evaluated will likely cost more in the short-run. It is hoped, of course, that drug courts and drug treatment will result in savings in future costs. Indeed, the outcomes measures mentioned above, e.g., crimes, rearrest and incarceration, can be readily translated into cost-savings using estimates developed by other researchers.

We anticipate that funders, taxpayers, and their representatives might be especially interested in the cost and cost-savings benefits generated by the Drug Court and acupuncture programs. The following are measures of cost developed in our earlier work in social service and substance abuse treatment programs. Cost-savings estimates would be generated for a subset of the above outcomes related to justice services.
1. **Costs of Enhanced Treatment Services and Cost of Drug Court Process**

   It seems quite likely that these additional costs are considerably less than the difference in adjudication, incarceration, and related expenses of operating the Drug Court and the enhanced treatment program as opposed to the traditional court process and traditional probation supervision/treatment approach. Nevertheless, from the perspective of society at large, the "cost" of the Drug Court and the enhanced treatment program is more than what is listed in court and jail accounts. Other resources that may be used more in the Drug Court, such as the time and efforts of probation officers, also need to be considered in comparisons of the Drug Court process and the traditional court process. A comprehensive assessment of costs would begin with all personnel time expended in the Drug Court versus the personnel time expended in the traditional court process that was devoted to handling of information related to the defendants that are included in the study and to their monitoring and "processing". Costs of facilities, equipment, and material used in cost assessment also would be measured and divided among participants in proportion to the personnel resources devoted to their case.

2. **Costs to Defendants**

   Finally, the time, effort, and any funds required of defendants for their participation also would be fruitful to assess. Informal observations suggest that there is a limit to the amount of time, effort, "hassle," and certainly to the money that defendants are willing to devote to drug treatment. It is possible that some treatments may be so rich in components and commitments that they exceed the temporal and other resources that at least some defendants are willing to expend. If so, we may better understand offenders' compliance, noncompliance, and dropping out of treatment if we assess temporal and other costs exacted from defendants in the course of acupuncture, other treatment, and Drug Court versus traditional court procedures.

3. **Specific Cost Measures**

   - People's time
     - justice personnel (law enforcement, court, jail, elsewhere),
     - defendants, their legal representatives, and their friends and family,
     - service providers (e.g., counselors, acupuncture specialists),
     - administrative personnel
     - fringe benefits (e.g., life insurance, health insurance)
- Space for:
  * law enforcement,
  * justice system,
  * incarceration,
  * treatment,
  * administration

- Equipment, supplies, e.g.,
  * law enforcement weapons,
  * computers and local computer networks
  * other office equipment,
  * disposable acupuncture needles,
  * remote defendant monitoring ("bracelets").
  * maintenance and replacement of equipment,
  * other,

- Transportation
  * transportation of justice and other professional personnel to sites,
  * transportation of defendants

- Telecommunications
  * phone equipment and service access,
  * computer network access

- Insurance and financial services
* (personnel life insurance covered in fringe expenses for personnel),
* professional and other liability,
* accounts, accounting,
* interest payments on loans

J. Measurement Instrumentation and Data Collection

1. Instrumentation

The measures describe above for processes, outcomes, and costs are, we recognize, are larger set than may be possible. Data already collected by courts and service providers may be all that will be available for an evaluation. If additional time and funds are available, instruments such as the Individual Assessment Profile (IAP) can be used to collect most of the above information. The IAP, in particular, has been developed for use with clients of substance abuse programs. It requires 45 to 60 minutes for the initial administration and approximately 30 minutes in subsequent administrations. The IAP and similar instruments need to be administered in an interview format, by a person with basic reading and recording skills.

A computerized IAP is available; the interviewer is prompted to ask specific questions by the computerized IAP and records the answers directly into the computer. This minimizes errors in transcribing data from questionnaires to computers, eliminates data transcription costs, and makes interview data immediately available for posting on a service network and for data analysis.

The schedule for data collection, and the amount of data that need to be collected, depend greatly on the evaluation budget. A power analysis should be conducted to determine how many subjects are needed in each cell of the design to allow differences between conditions to emerge, if they exist, and to be found statistically significant. Data should be collected until the sample sizes suggested by power analysis are achieved.

2. Follow-up

Follow-up of defendants involved in the Drug Court and substance abuse treatment can be scheduled from the end of participation in the court and treatment, or follow-up can be scheduled to occur at regular intervals following admission to the Drug Court and drug treatment. Because different defendants will likely spend very different
amounts of time in treatment, starting follow-up at discharge leaves the amount of time in treatment uncontrolled and can make interpretation of findings difficult. If substance abuse treatment is of limited duration, e.g., for 5 to 10 weeks, there are few difficulties with the scheduling of follow-up.

Generally, the longer follow-up is and the more frequent it is, the better. Follow-up typically lasts between 6 months and 5 years in substance abuse programs, and difference in outcome may not emerge until after a year. Given budget limitations, and the need to generate a final report by July 1994, it seems advisable to limit follow-up for now to 3 and 6 months following completion of the program. That would allow, however, for only a few months of intake into the Drug Court and treatment program prior to beginning follow-up. More specifically, if defendants can spend up to 2 months in the program, at which time follow-up begins, then defendants who participate between September 1 and October 15 of 1993 would begin their follow-ups between November 1 and December 15, would have 6-month follow-ups between May 1 and June 15 of 1994, yielding data for a final July 1994 evaluation report. If too few defendants can be recruited between September 1 and October 15, the follow-up and report due dates would need to be extended if meaningful findings are to be generated from this evaluation.
K. Plans for Statistical Analysis

1. Statistical Tests

Each of the different cells in the design as a different condition, to be examined in a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) with planned contrasts. These contrasts would test the statistical significance of differences on each of the dependent measures.

2. Process Analyses and Predicted Differences

The first analyses should be of process variables, contrasting the process variables listed above for Drug Court versus non-Drug Court assignment, and for acupuncture plus enhanced substance abuse services, relaxation training plus enhanced services, enhanced services, or no formal substance abuse services.

3. Outcome Analyses and Planned Contrasts

The next analyses would be of the individual outcome measures. These would include contrasts within simple ANOVAs, plus a parallel series of ANOCVAs (analyses of covariance) that consider the extent of defendant participation in the assigned regimen (e.g., Drug Court with acupuncture plus enhanced treatment) to be a covariate. For each outcome measure, the hypothesized rating of means would be:

a. Cell A ( Expedited Disposition + Acupuncture + Enhanced Substance Abuse Treatment), should be significantly different from

b. Cell B ( Expedited Disposition + Relaxation Training + Enhanced Substance Abuse Treatment), which should not differ significantly from

Cell C ( Expedited Disposition + Enhanced Substance Abuse Treatment).

Both sets a and b above are predicted to differ significantly from

c. Cell D ( Expedited Disposition only).

It is further predicted that sets a, b, and c above will differ significantly from the remaining cells:

---

2 If distributions deviated markedly from the assumptions of ANOVA, e.g., dramatically bimodal distributions with large numbers of zeros, we would opt for nonparametric analogs of ANOVA and planned contrasts.
d. Cell E (Traditional Disposition) and

Cell F (Traditional Disposition, neighboring Van Buren County)

4. Cost-Effectiveness and Cost-Benefit Analyses

The cost-effectiveness and cost-benefit of using the Drug Court as an alternative to the traditional court process would be useful to examine, as noted earlier; we also advocate studying the cost-effectiveness and cost-benefit of adding acupuncture to enhanced and standard drug treatment programs. The results likely would be a contribution that would receive attention from the evaluation community as well as from funders. If several variations of drug court and treatment procedures were available, we could contrast the increment in effectiveness yielded by new procedures to the increase in cost due to those new procedures. It is likely that the Drug Court and the enhanced treatment program would demonstrate both improved effectiveness, on several of the measures noted earlier, and reduced cost, on the measures noted above. In this way, cost-effectiveness and cost-benefit analysis might generate especially powerful arguments for dissemination of drug court procedures and enhanced treatment techniques. Another topic for cost-effectiveness and cost-benefit analysis would be the gain, versus the expense, of adding acupuncture.
APPENDIX:

Forms Currently Used by Pretrial and Probation Departments which May Provide Data for Purposes of Drug Court Evaluation

A. Basic Information Report: Michigan Department of Corrections
B. Probation Department: Defendant History Form
C. Pre-Sentence Investigation Report
D. Probation Officer's Recommendation Form
E. Berrien County Health Department: Alcohol/Drug Abuse Program Drug Court Referral Form

[Substance Abuse Subtle Screening inventory (SASSI) form is also used]
### BASIC INFORMATION REPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MDOC No.</th>
<th>Court Name (Last, First, Middle)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alias or Maiden Name</th>
<th>Given Name</th>
<th>Last Known Address &amp; Telephone No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Birth</th>
<th>Citizenship</th>
<th>DOB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE &amp; DLN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SSN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FBI No.</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Hair</th>
<th>Eyes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Highest Grade Completed</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health Ins.</th>
<th>Assets of $1,500 &amp; Up</th>
<th>Monthly Income of $75 &amp; Up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Dependents</th>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Military Branch</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Discharge Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marks, Scars, Amputations, Tattoos</th>
<th>Drug Abuse</th>
<th>Alcohol Abuse</th>
<th>Known Homosexual</th>
<th>Mental Health Treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Y</em> N</td>
<td><em>Y</em> N</td>
<td><em>Y</em> N</td>
<td><em>Y</em> N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arresting Agency &amp; No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CRIMINAL HISTORY

#### JUVENILE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSC Convictions</th>
<th>Age of First Arrest</th>
<th>SAI Eligible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Y</em> N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pending Charges In Court</th>
<th>No. Prior Felony Convictions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Y</em> N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ADULT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status at Time of Offense</th>
<th>Delated Sentence</th>
<th>Parole</th>
<th>Probation</th>
<th>District Prob.</th>
<th>State Prisoner</th>
<th>On Bond</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. 1 Docket No.</th>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>PACC Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. 2 Docket No.</th>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>PACC Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>Circuit</th>
<th>Judge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codefendant(s)</th>
<th>Codefendant(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Arrest</th>
<th>Date of Bond</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Conviction</th>
<th>Method of Disp.</th>
<th>Date of Conviction</th>
<th>Method of Disp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Y</em> N</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Y</em> N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bail Credit</th>
<th>Guilty But Mentally Ill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Y</em> N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Report</th>
<th>Date Completed</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Recommended Disposition</th>
<th>Prob. Viol. - New Sentence</th>
<th>Prob. Viol. - Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CURRENT OFFENSE DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SENTENCING GUIDELINE RANGE</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence Type</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>CTN</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Yrs.</th>
<th>Mos.</th>
<th>Days</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>Yrs.</th>
<th>Mos.</th>
<th>Days</th>
<th>Fine</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Rest</th>
<th>Jail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DISPOSITION
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APPENDIX B.

PROBATION OFFICE, Ground Floor, Courthouse, St. Joseph, Michigan. Phone 903-1111 Ext. 251
If released from jail on bond, immediately contact the above office.

PLEASE PRINT AND FILL OUT COMPLETELY

NAME ___________________________ SOCIAL SECURITY NO. ____________

ADDRESS ___________________________ PHONE NUMBER ____________

Date of birth __________________ Place of birth __________________

Tell in your own words the story of what you did to be arrested (if additional space is needed, use reverse side).

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

List places (cities, etc.) and dates of any previous arrests.

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

Father’s name ___________________________ Age _______ Address __________

Mother’s name ___________________________ Age _______ Address __________
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List brothers and sisters (oldest first), their names, ages and present address.

Write a short summary of your life as a child.

Wife’s name ............................................................ Age .................................... Address ............................................................
List sons and daughters (oldest first).

List former wives, if any, their names, ages and addresses.

EDUCATION
List schools attended, highest grad completed, reason for leaving school and date left.

SERVICE RECORD
APPENDIX B.

EMPLOYMENT
List all jobs, starting with the last job you had, and list the date started and also employer's name, address and weekly wages.

DEBTS AND INCOME
List all your debts, amount of money owed and to whom. List all income, including wife's.

HEALTH
List any medical problem you have now or have had in the past. List any physical or mental problems you have now or have had in the past, including drug or alcohol and/or rehabilitation.

HABITS AND RECREATIONS
List what you do with your free time.
APPENDIX B.

RELIGION
Did you ever, or do you now belong to a church? If so, which church and how long have you been attending.

---

PLANS
At the present time, what are your plans for the future?

---

List any and all previous addresses and any additional comments you may have.
MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
BUREAU OF FIELD SERVICES
BERRIEN COUNTY
PRE-SENTENCE INVESTIGATION REPORT
02/05/93

TO THE HON. DAVID M PETERSON
CIRCUIT COURT OF BERRIEN COUNTY

DOCKET NO. [READERS TO COMPLETE]

BY: KERRY TIE TSORT

00077653
20001131
BENTON HARBOR, MI 49022

B/M 509 125 BLK/BRO
08/10/59 MI 382-70-517
SINGLE (616)927-193

OFFENSE: 11/21/92 CONTROLLED SUBSTANCE-DELY/MFG NARC/COCaine <50 GRM
DISPOSI: 01/22/93 GUILTY ORIGINAL CHARGE, BY JURY CL: 333.7401
ARREST : 01/22/93 AGENCY: BERRIEN CO. SHERIFF DEPT MAX: 020 YEARS
BOND: 11/23/92 TYPE: 10% BOND AMOUNT: 900.00
ATTORNEY: GARY G HOSBEIN

CODEFENDANTS:
JAIL CREDIT: 020 DAYS PENDING CHARGES: NO

RESIDENCY: (VERIFIED)
WHOSE RESIDENCE: [READERS TO COMPLETE]
others living there: BROTHER, ISISTER, 3 CHILDREN
TIME IN BERRIEN COUNTY: 25 YRS
BIRTH PLACE: BENTON HARBOR, MI
LAST PRIOR ADDRESS:

LENGTH:

RELATIONSHIP: MOTHER
LENGTH: 8 YRS
IN MICHIGAN: 25 YRS
ADDRESS CHANGES IN PAST YEAR:

FAMILY DATA: (VERIFIED)
CHILDREN/AGES: N/A
LIVE WITH: MOTHER
SUPPORTED BY: SAME
CHILD SUPPORT COURT ORDERED:

EDUCATION:
CURRENTLY INVOLVED:
WHERE:
PROGRAM TYPE: COUNSELOR/TEACHER:
HIGHEST LEVEL: SCHOOL-GRADE 10 YEAR: 1976

EMPLOYMENT: (VERIFIED)
EMPLOYMENT STATUS: UNEMPLOYED
EMPLOYER:
SUPERVISOR:
PHONE:
CROSS PAY: NET PAY:

START DATE:
CAN RETURN:
INCOME:  
HOW SUPPORT SELF: P/T JOB/SETTLEMENT  
TRANSPORTATION:  
ASSETS $1500+:  
INCOME MONTHLY 75+: YES  
OTHER INCOME:  
OTHER PROPERTY:  
OTHER OBLIGATIONS:  

SPECIAL ISSUES:  
PHYSICAL PROBLEM: NO PROBLEMS INDICATED.  
ALCOHOL ABUSE: DRUG ABUSE:  
HAVE HAD PROFESSIONAL HELP:  
WHERE/WHEN:  
HOW LONG HAD PROBLEM:  
PROBLEM DESCRIP:  
RELATED TO CHARGE:  
MENTAL HEALTH TREAT:  
INTEREST IN TREATMENT:  

JUVENILE INVOLVEMENT:  
JUVENILE COMMITMENTS:  
PROB:  
ESCAPE:  
ASSAULTIVE:  
JUVENILE PROB AGENT:  

PRIOR CONVICTIONS (NON-BERRIEN)  
LOCATION  
MONTH/YR  
DISPOSITION  

PRIOR CONVICTIONS AND OPEN CASES (BERRIEN)  

79A04030 05/17/79 BENTON HARBOR CITY  
A) TRESPASS - ENTRY FORBIDDEN  
05/29/79 GUILTY PLEA - CHARGED OFFENSE  
05/29/79 F/C 4U  

80A03600 02/27/80 BENTON HARBOR CITY  
A) LARCENY OVER $100  
04/22/80 GUILTY PLEA - LESSER OFFENSE  
04/22/80 F/C 110  
RESTIT 999999.99  
ALTERN 0280  
PROBAT 006M  
B) BENCH WARRANT/PROBATION VIOLATION  
10/02/84 GUILTY PLEA - CHARGED OFFENSE  
10/05/84 CONFIN 090D JAIL  

92A06834 11/21/92 BENTON HARBOR CITY  
CIT: 92201418  
924508FH  
A) CONTROLLED SUBSTANCE-DEL/MFG NARC/COCaine <50 GRM  
01/22/93 GUILTY ORIGINAL CHARGE, BY JURY  

***** END OF DATA *****
PRIOR RECORD: [redacted] has two prior felonies for Larceny O/$100 and Unauthorized Use of a Motor Vehicle. He also has an outstanding warrant issued in Maryland for a charge of Battery.

RESTITUTION: None.

SENTENCING GUIDELINES: The defendant scored in the C-2 drug category, placing him in the 12 to 48 month guideline range. The defendant has been convicted of two prior low-severity felonies and has now been convicted of a drug crime in a high drug traffic area. Due to these facts and the mandatory one year minimum, it is this agent's recommendation that Henry Darnell Fields be sentenced to eighteen months to twenty years with the Michigan Department of Corrections with credit for thirty-seven (37) days, as of February 24, 1993. Also that he be ordered to pay $30.00 to the Crime/Victims Rights Fund before release from parole. This would be at a cost of $36,452.52 to society.

Respectfully submitted,

Approved: 

Chief Probation Officer

By: 

Kerry P. Tietzort, PA 727
Probation Officer

DATE RECEIVED: 2-17-93
DATE TRANSCRIBED: 2-18-93

KPT:mi

H.I.V. test ordered: Yes XX No
Proposal B: XX Yes No
Consec. Sentence: Yes XX No
Jail Time Credit: XX Yes No
Sentence To: XX Jackson _ Huron Valley _ Riverside _ Scott _ Berrien County Jail
Prosecutor's recommendation part of plea bargain: Yes XX No
INVESTIGATOR'S VERSION OF THE OFFENSE:

On November 21, 1992, the Benton Harbor Police Department Drug Operations/Gang Unit received a phone call from a citizen who had observed drug selling activity in front of the Elks Club (at the corner of Fair and Highland Streets) in Benton Harbor, Michigan. Upon arriving to the area of suspected activity, a black male subject was observed to fit the description given by the caller. Upon further investigation of the scene, a plastic vitamin/pain bottle was found containing several pink tinted seals of crack/cocaine. The bottle was found by the south stairway at the Elks Club. The defendant was read his Miranda Rights and admitted to picking up the bottle and placing it by the stairs.

The defendant was then arrested and charged with Possession With Intent to Deliver Cocaine < 50 Grams. The defendant was also found to have, in his possession, $164.00 in U.S. currency and a Motorola brand pager.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Defense Attorney, Gary Hosbein, and a representative from the Prosecutor's Office will make recommendations to the Court at sentencing.

OFFENDER'S DESCRIPTION OF THE OFFENSE:

"On November 21st about 7:30 I was standing up on Fair and Highland when a police approach me and said I had a caller say I was selling drugs up here. So he put me in the car and the found some drugs in the grass about 20 ft. from me."

PREVIOUS CRIMINAL RECORD:

JUVENILE RECORD: Not available due to defendant's age.

ADULT RECORD:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Charge</th>
<th>Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-17-79</td>
<td>BHPD</td>
<td>Trespassing Entry Forbidden</td>
<td>Pled guilty to charged offense with fines an costs of $40.00.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-27-80</td>
<td>BHPD</td>
<td>Larceny O/$100</td>
<td>Pled guilty; fines &amp; costs of $110.00 or 20 days jail. Placed on probation for 6 months. Bench warrant for probation violation 10-2-84; pled guilty; charged 10-5-84; sentenced to 90 days jail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-26-88</td>
<td>Washington D.C.</td>
<td>Unauthorized Use of a Vehicle</td>
<td>4-19-88 pled guilty; 1 year probation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-1-92</td>
<td>Montgomery County PD</td>
<td>Battery</td>
<td>Warrant has been issued for defendant's arrest on this charge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-21-92</td>
<td>BHPD</td>
<td>Controlled Substance/ Delivery of Narcotic/ Cocaine &lt; 50 Grams</td>
<td>Pled guilty 1-22-93; Instant Offense.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PERSONAL HISTORY:

Father, [redacted], whereabouts are unknown. The defendant has had no contact with his father since he was five-years-old.

Mother, [redacted], age 48, 842 East Main Street, Benton Harbor, Michigan. Employed with the State of Michigan, Department of Social Services, and also owns her own clothing store.

Sister, [redacted], age 31, resides in St. Joseph, Michigan and is employed at Hughes Plastics.

Sister, [redacted], age 30, address of 842 East Main Street in Benton Harbor, Michigan is employed at Bendix.

Sister, [redacted], age 29, resides with sister, Veronica, in St. Joseph Michigan and currently unemployed.

Brother, [redacted], age 26, resides in Oakland, California.

Brother, [redacted], age 22, resides at 842 E. Main Street, Benton Harbor, Michigan and is employed at his mother's clothing store.
To the Hon. David M. Peterson
Circuit Court of: Berrien County

NAME: [Blank]

OFFENSE: Possession With Intent to Deliver Cocaine < 50 Grams

MCL: 333.7401(2)(a)(iv)
MSA: 14.15(7401)(2)(a)(iv)
MAX: 1 to 20 years OR lifetime probation

SUMMARY

was found guilty in Berrien County Drug Court on January 22, 1993 to the offense of Possession With Intent to Deliver Cocaine < 50 Grams. is incarcerated and should receive 37 days jail credit as of February 24, 1993. He is represented by Attorney Gary Hosbein of St. Joseph, Michigan.

On November 21, 1992, undercover officers from Benton Harbor Police Department responded to an anonymous tip concerning a drug sale and a description of the seller. Upon arrival to the intersection of Fair and Highland Streets in Benton Harbor, an individual fitting the description was observed. A plastic vitamin bottle was found in the vicinity, by a staircase, at the Elks Club. The bottle contained twenty (20) pink tinted seals of suspected crack cocaine. The defendant admitted to picking up the vitamin bottle, with crack, and placing it behind the stairway. The subjects rights were read and he was arrested and charged with Possession With Intent to Deliver Cocaine < 50 Grams. No plea bargain or agreements were made. There are no co-defendants.

has an outstanding warrant for his arrest in Montgomery County, Maryland, for the charge of Battery.

EVALUATION AND PLAN

is a 32-year-old, single male resident of Benton Harbor. He attended school at Benton Harbor High School and then McKinley Tech in Washington D.C., but dropped out in the eleventh grade. He enlisted in the Army in 1980 and was trained as a combat medic. He was honorably discharged in 1983 at the rank of PFC-3. He then resided in Washington D.C., working on the streets, downtown, as a general merchandise vendor. He then moved back go Benton Harbor in the fall of 1992 to work for his mother at her clothes store or Fair Street. His mother pays him a weekly salary of $150.00. He has no major assets or debts.

admitted to using marijuana in teens and early twenties. He reports that now he drinks alcohol approximately once per week. He rates his physical and mental health as good and takes no prescription medicine.

has two sons, (age 7) and (age 4), from a previous relationship. His fiancé, , is currently four months pregnant with his child. He is not obligated to pay child support as of now.
"A preliminary screening of the placement criteria for the Special Alternative Incarceration Program (prisoner boot camp) has been conducted. Based on information known at this time, the defendant may qualify for the program. It is recommended that the Court indicate on the judgment of sentence, at the time of sentencing, that it does not object to placement of the defendant in the program provided all statutory and Department eligibility requirements are met."
Michigan Department of Corrections
BASIC INFORMATION REPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MDOC No.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alias or Maiden Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Birth</td>
<td>Benton Harbor, MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOB</td>
<td>8-10-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Known Address &amp; Telephone No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State &amp; DLN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBI No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hair</td>
<td>Blk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eyes</td>
<td>Brn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Grade Completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Ins.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assets of $1,500 &amp; Up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Income of $75 &amp; Up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependents</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>Baptist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Branch</td>
<td>Army</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From-To</td>
<td>1980 - 1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discharge Type</td>
<td>Honorable PFC-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arresting Agency &amp; No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRIMINAL HISTORY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUVENILE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADULT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status at Time of Offense</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delayed Sentence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parole</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pending Charges in Court</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Prior Felony Convictions</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT OFFENSE DATA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 1 Docket No.</td>
<td>92-4508-FH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACC Code</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offense</td>
<td>PWID Cocaine Less Than 50 Grams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circuit</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>David M. Petersen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codefendant(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codefendant(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Offense</td>
<td>11-21-92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim(s) Relationship</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Arrest</td>
<td>11-22-93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>Garry Horshein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Bond</td>
<td>11-22-93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Conviction</td>
<td>1-22-93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method of Disp.</td>
<td>Plea, Jury, HYTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Conviction</td>
<td>1-22-93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method of Disp.</td>
<td>Bench, Sec.7411, Nolo Cont.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Report</td>
<td>XPSI, PSI Up date, HYTA/Delay Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Completed</td>
<td>2-17-93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Berrien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Disposition</td>
<td>Prob. Viol. - New Sentence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence</td>
<td>11-92-2014/8-01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Habitual Offender Information

Provide the following if convicted as a Habitual Offender:

**1st Subsequent Conviction:**
- 2nd Subsequent Conviction:
- 3rd or Greater Subsequent Conviction:
- New Stat Max:

### Actual Sentence Length (state in months):

- Probation:
- Jail:
- Prison:
- to Max:

### Delayed Sentence:

- Y N

### Sentence Agreement:

- Y N

### Prosecutor Recommendation:

- Y N
SENTENCING GUIDELINES: The guidelines do not apply in this case.

RESTITUTION: None.

Given the need to protect the community, punish this defendant, and deter others from committing like offenses, it is respectfully recommended that he be sentenced to serve a prison term of 10 to 20 years in the State Prison of southern Michigan. This should be consecutive to the term he is now serving out of Wayne County, [redacted] Possession of Heroin U/25 Grams. He should also be ordered to pay the sum of $30.00 to the Crime/Victims Compensation Fund within the first 30 days after release from sentencing. Cost of confinement would be approximately $243,016.00.

Respectfully submitted,

Approved: 
David W. Dreese
Chief Probation Officer

By: 
Carol A. Morningstar, PA 336
Probation Officer

DATE RECEIVED: 3-18-93
DATE TRANSCRIBED: 3-19-93
CAM:mi

H.I.V. test ordered: Yes No
Proposal B: Yes No
Consec. Sentence: Yes No
Jail Time Credit: Yes No
Sentence To: Jackson Huron Valley Riverside Scott Berrien County Jail
Prosecutor's recommendation part of plea bargain: Yes No
INVESTIGATOR’S VERSION OF THE OFFENSE:

appeared before Your Honor on March 24, 1993, and entered a plea of guilty to the charge of Possession of Heroin in an amount more than 50 grams, but less than 225 grams. In return for his plea of guilty to this charge, the original charge of Possession of Heroin Over 50 Grams, but Less Than 225 grams - 2nd offense, will be dismissed, as will a charge of Driving While License Suspended - 2nd offense. The prosecutor’s office has also agreed to recommend sentencing not exceed 10 to 20 years.

The instant offense occurred on January 27, 1993, on eastbound I-94 near M-140. On that date, Deputy Hopkins was on routine patrol on I-94 when he observed a vehicle fail to use his signals in changing lanes. Upon running the plates of a 1993 Toyota Camry, he found that it was registered to the Hertz Corporation out of Metro/Detroit airport and was registered to a 1992 Pontiac GrandAm. The vehicle was stopped, and the driver was identified as . When Deputy Hopkins ran Mr. license number, he found that his license was suspended. also informed him that he did not have the paperwork for the vehicle, but that the vehicle had been rented by the passenger, . indicated she did not have the paperwork either, and that the vehicle had been rented by her sister.

was placed under arrest while Driving While License Suspended, then when asked if there was anything illegal in the vehicle, said that there was not. Officers asked for permission to search the vehicle, and he told them to go ahead and search. In the rear seat of the vehicle, they found a jacket and in the left pocket was a plastic baggie, containing suspected drug. Upon questioning Lott, he advised officers that he believed it to be FPC. Drug testing revealed that the package containing 141.241 grams of heroin. Also found in the vehicle was $144.00 in cash, a cellular phone, and a radar-detector.

Officers interviewed the passenger, , who stated that she had no idea the drugs were in the car. indicated that had asked her if she’d like to go sightseeing in Chicago, and she had never been there, decided to go. She indicated, however, that when they got to Chicago, they went to a house, watched T.V. for awhile, and disappeared with someone in the house. When he returned they left, and she was somewhat upset that they didn’t have more time to spend in Chicago.

No charges were lodged against .

It should be noted that when this offense occurred, the defendant was on parole out of Detroit, following his conviction for Possession of Heroin U/25 Grams. This officer has notified the Parole Department, in Detroit, of the defendant’s whereabouts, and Parole Violation proceedings may be initiated. Parole Agent, Sparks, stated that had never asked permission to go out of state.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Per the plea bargain agreement, the prosecutor’s office recommends that sentencing not exceed 10 to 20 years.

DEFENDANT’S VERSION OF THE OFFENSE:

"I was paid $400.00 to ride with to Chicics and meet two guys. I then gave them the bag that contained the money, and they gave me a small bag which had some small balls in it. We left Chicago heading back toward Detroit, I stopped at Denny's to get a cup of coffee and we continue on down 94. Then I saw a police car behind me and he pulled us over. He said the plate for the rental car was wrong, and then asked me for rental papers and my Drivers license. Then he asked me to step out of the car and had me sit in his car. And after a few minutes he told me my license were suspended," that I was under arrest for this. He then asked me if he could search the car, told him that I didn’t think it was necessary to do so, but he did and that when he found this bag. I am not a drug dealer and has not use any drugs for 4 1/2 years. At the time this happened things were not going well for me, at far a money and a job was concerned, I didn't think before I taking the money. I should have known better to think I could do this one time. At my age I shouldn't be taking chances with my life and freedom."
**PRIOR CRIMINAL HISTORY:**

**JUVENILE HISTORY:** Unknown

**ADULT HISTORY:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>charge(s)</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11-26-78</td>
<td>Detroit Police Dept.</td>
<td>MDP 0/$100.00</td>
<td>On 4-8-80 defendant placed on probation for 1 year in the Detroit Recorder’s Court Halfway House.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-21-80</td>
<td>Detroit Police Dept.</td>
<td>Att. PWID Heroin</td>
<td>Pled guilty and on 4-29-80, placed on 2 years probation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-14-84</td>
<td>Detroit Police Dept.</td>
<td>Two counts of Armed Robbery AND one count Felony Firearm</td>
<td>Pled guilty and on 1-15-85, sentenced to serve 2 to 10 years on the Armed Robbery counts, and two years consecutive for the Felony Firearm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On January 25, 1988, the defendant was transferred to the Correction Center in Detroit, Michigan, and on 4-6-88, was placed on extended furlough. After he received two civil infractions, he was returned to the Correction Center on 7-28-88.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>charge(s)</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8-6-88</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bring a Controlled Substance into the Correctional Ctr.</td>
<td>Defendant pled guilty on 10-3-88 and on 10-14-88 was ordered to serve 6 months to 5 years consecutive sentencing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The defendant was paroled on 12-15-89 for a period of two years.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-16-90</td>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>Possession of Heroin</td>
<td>Pled guilty and on 1-24-91 was sentenced to serve six months years, consecutive to his parole.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The defendant was paroled to Wayne County on 3-6-92 with special conditions of No Drugs or Drug Paraphernalia, and Treatment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>charge(s)</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-27-93</td>
<td>BCSD</td>
<td>Possession of Heroin</td>
<td>Instant Offense.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Over 50 Grams But Less Than 225 Grams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PERSONAL HISTORY:**

Father, 64, and lives at Detroit, Michigan, and is retired from GMC.

Mother, and lives with defendant’s father and is the Manager of a retail store.

Brother, 32, and lives in Detroit.

Brother, 31, and lives in Detroit, and is employed at the Mazda Plant.

Sister, 29, and lives in Detroit and is a hair stylist.

was born and raised in Detroit, the product of a stable family. He reports no one else in the family has been in any type of legal difficulties, and although his parents are not happy with his legal difficulties, they remain supportive. The defendant is single, but states he has two children, ages 13 and 9. The children live with his former girlfriend in Detroit, and he states he has been ordered to pay $10.00 per week in child support. He indicates that he had regular contact with his daughters.
attended Detroit public schools, and according to a pre-sentence investigation completed in Detroit, was expelled from Central High School in 1974, while in the eleventh grade, for fighting. The defendant states he earned his G.E.D. while in the prison system and also completed twelve hours of college credits. Immediately prior to his arrest, he was unemployed, stating he last worked for the Symbol Sign Company in Detroit. A prior pre-sentence investigation indicates he worked for this company for some six months in 1988, and was described as a very good worker. At that point, his supervisor indicated that his job would be waiting for him when he was released. The defendant states that when he got out this time he did return, but unfortunately his employer was going through a divorce and the business was floundering. He indicates that he was laid-off, and was unable to collect unemployment.

The defendant reports he is in good physical and mental health, and states that he is now drug-free. He indicates that he stopped using drugs in 1988, although this officer confronted him about his heroin charge in 1990. He states that the heroin was not his, and that he was basically involved in free-basing cocaine. He admits that, as a young man, he started selling drugs and unfortunately began experimenting with them as well. He admits he had a problem with drug abuse, but feels that this has been completely resolved.
To the Hon. Ronald J. Taylor
Circuit Court of: Berrien County

NAME: 

Your Honor:

MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
BUREAU OF PROBATION
PRE-SENTENCE INVESTIGATION REPORT
DRUG COURT

March 18, 1993

Docket No.
By: Carol A. Morningstar, PA 336

NAME: 

OFFENSE: Poss. of Heroin Over 50 Grams Less Than 225 Grams

Your Honor:

MCL: 
MSA: 
MAX: Not Less Than 10 Nor More Than 20 Years

SUMMARY

appeared before Your Honor on February 25, 1993, and entered a plea of guilty to the charge of Possession of Heroin Over 50 Grams But Less Than 225 Grams. The instant offense occurred on January 27, 1993, and he was arrested the same date. He has no jail credit, given his parole status, and is represented by Attorney Daniel Blank of Birmingham, Michigan.

On the aforementioned date, the defendant was stopped for a traffic violation and found to be in possession of 141.241 grams of heroin.

In return for his plea of guilty to this charge, the original supplemental charge will be dismissed, as well as a charge of Driving While License Suspended, and the prosecutor's office has agreed to recommend that the defendant be sentenced to serve a 10 to 20 year term.

It should be noted that when this offense occurred, the defendant was on parole out of Detroit following his conviction for Possession of Heroin Under 25 Grams.

A second subject was also in the vehicle, but no charges were lodged against her.

EVALUATION AND PLAN

is a lifelong resident of Detroit, Michigan, the product of a stable family. He is single, but has two children.

The defendant states he completed high school through the prison system, as well as twelve hours of college credit. He was unemployed when he committed this offense, and states the reason he committed this offense was to make $400.00.

The defendant states he is in good health at this point, and denies any current substance abuse. He admits that, as a youth, he began selling drugs and started using cocaine. He states he has been off drugs since 1988.

has had several felony convictions and was a parolee when he committed the instant offense. He minimizes his involvement in this offense stating he was not aware he was picking up heroin, but rather something to make drugs with. The fact remains, his contact with drugs continued while he was on parole. It is also noted that he went out of state without permission of his parole officer. Unfortunately, he resorts to criminal acts as a means of supporting himself while he is being supervised in the community.
APPENDIX D.

Michigan Department of Corrections
BASIC INFORMATION REPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MDOC No.</th>
<th>Court Name (Last, First, Middle)</th>
<th>Given Name</th>
<th>DOB</th>
<th>Last Known Address &amp; Telephone No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4-1-59</td>
<td>Detroit, MI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alias or Maiden Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Place of Birth</th>
<th>Citizenship</th>
<th>DOB</th>
<th>D.L.N.</th>
<th>S.I.D. No.</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Hair</th>
<th>Eyes</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Highest Grade Completed</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Health Ins.</th>
<th>Assets of $1,300 &amp; Up</th>
<th>Monthly Income of $75 &amp; Up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G.E.D.</td>
<td>unemployed</td>
<td>Y.XX N</td>
<td>Y.XX N</td>
<td>Y.XX N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Dependents</th>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Military Branch</th>
<th>From - To</th>
<th>Discharge Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>single</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependants</th>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Military Branch</th>
<th>From - To</th>
<th>Discharge Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marks, Scars, Amputations, Tattoos</th>
<th>Drug Abuse</th>
<th>Alcohol Abuse</th>
<th>Known Homosexual</th>
<th>Mental Health Treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tatoo: Upper left &amp; rt. arms</td>
<td>XX Y</td>
<td>Y XX N</td>
<td>Y XX N</td>
<td>Y XX N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arresting Agency &amp; No.</th>
<th>CRIMINAL HISTORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90-53-2410</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JUVENILE</th>
<th>ADULT</th>
<th>Status at Time of Offense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSC Convictions</th>
<th>Age of First Arrest</th>
<th>SAi Eligible</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Prior Felony Convictions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CURRENT OFFENSE DATA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| No. 1 Docket No: | 93-414-FH-T |
| No. 2 Docket No:|             |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PACC Code</th>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>PACC Code</th>
<th>Offense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foss. Heroin</td>
<td></td>
<td>50 - 224 grams</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>Circuit</th>
<th>Judge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Ronald J. Taylor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codefendant(s)</th>
<th>Codefendant(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Offense</th>
<th>Victim(s) Relationship</th>
<th>Date of Offense</th>
<th>Victim(s) Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-27-93</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Arrest</th>
<th>Date of Bond</th>
<th>Attorney</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-27-93</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>D. Blank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Conviction</th>
<th>Method of Disp.</th>
<th>Date of Conviction</th>
<th>Method of Disp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-25-93</td>
<td>XX Ples. Jury HYTA</td>
<td>Bench_Sec.7411</td>
<td>Nolo Cont.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bail Credit</th>
<th>Guilty But Mentally Ill</th>
<th>Bail Credit</th>
<th>Guilty But Mentally Ill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y X X N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Report</th>
<th>Date Completed</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Date Completed</th>
<th>Agent &amp; Caseload</th>
<th>Type of Report</th>
<th>Date Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Berrien (11)</td>
<td></td>
<td>C. Morningstar, 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SENTENCING GUIDELINE RANGE</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sentence Type</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>CTN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-93-200188-01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**DRUG COURT REFERRAL FORM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLIENT NAME:</th>
<th>DATE:</th>
<th>CASE NUMBER:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADDRESS:</th>
<th>D.O.B.:</th>
<th>AGE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHONE:</th>
<th>EMPLOYED:</th>
<th>yes</th>
<th>no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROBATION OFFICER:</th>
<th>PHONE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENTS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within 48 hours of your referral by the court, you must show up with the pink copy of this referral sheet between 8:30 am - 4:30 pm Monday thru Thursday at the Alcohol/Drug Abuse Program office at 756 Pipestone in Benton Harbor (across the street from the Health Department). Be prepared to provide the secretary with your name, address, telephone number, birthdate, social security number, along with other information about yourself. Please identify yourself as referred by the Berrien County Drug Court.

**CLIENT INFORMATION RELEASE AUTHORIZATION**

I hereby authorize the Berrien County Alcohol/Drug Abuse Program to release information concerning my attendance and progress to the Court/court worker listed above. This consent is subject to revocation at any time except in those circumstances in which the program has taken certain actions on the understanding that the consent will continue unrevoked until the purpose for which the consent was given have been accomplished. However, any consent given under 42CFR Part 2, Federal Register, Volume 52, Number 110, June 9, 1987, have a duration no longer than reasonably necessary to effectuate the purpose for which it is given. The purpose and need for the disclosure to coordinate and monitor services. Without expressed written revocation, this consent expires one (1) year from the date indicated below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLIENT SIGNATURE:</th>
<th>DATE:</th>
<th>WITNESS:</th>
<th>DATE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Client Response:

- Registered as above: date of initial contact: 
- Missed app't. but rescheduled for: 
- Appointment made, no show. 
- No contact for 30 days. 
- Never contacted office.

(Program signature) (Date)

[White - Tt. Program copy] [Yellow - court copy] [Pink - Client copy]

Rev. 5/92

BCHD-ADAP-132