

THE PRETRIAL REPORTER

A BI-MONTHLY PUBLICATION OF THE PRETRIAL JUSTICE INSTITUTE

WWW.PRETRIAL.ORG

VOLUME XXXV | NO.3 | MAY/JUNE, 2009

In this issue:

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
NATIONAL NOTES	2
CASES	5
RESEARCH	9
JOB ANNOUNCEMENT	12

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S LETTER

Dear Friends:

Democratic Senators Jim Webb (Virginia) and Arlen Specter (Pennsylvania) have introduced legislation to form an 18-month National Commission on Criminal Justice. In June, PJI and NAPSA co-signed a letter asking Senator Webb to include a review of bail reform in this commission's work. As we all know, front-end decisions have a huge impact on back-end outcomes. Pretrial justice - both release and diversion - must be a part of this national examination. Thanks to the fifty others who have added to this effort with their own letters to Senator Webb's office.

In other news, this year marks the 20th Anniversary of the Miami-Dade County Drug Court, the first Drug Court in the nation. I am honored to be among those who helped start this movement, with

Executive Summary

This issue of The Pretrial Reporter contains the following:

National Notes:

- As justice systems all across the country are trying to absorb budget cuts, several jurisdictions are turning to expansion of pretrial services to help contain costs.
- Pretrial initiatives in Oregon and Florida, designed to reduce the impact of crowded jails, show positive results.
- White House drug policy office documents high use of illicit drugs among arrestees.
- Out-of-court settlement reached in class action suit against Philadelphia for its blanket policy of strip searching all new arrestees booked into jail.

Cases:

- Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court rules that the charge of possession of an unlicensed firearm is not a qualifying offense under that state's pretrial detention provisions.
- Ohio appeals court rejects habeas corpus petition alleging that a condition of pretrial release constituted "excessive bail."
- Maryland court affirms that a bail bonding company's obligation is to produce the defendant in court, and, failing that, the bond should be forfeited - even though the company located the defendant in another country but could not return him.
- Florida appeals court rejects a trial court's finding that a defendant's failure to appear in court was willful.

Research:

- Study of pretrial release decision making in the federal system identifies several factors associated with risk of pretrial misconduct.
- Study shows the 15% of males and 31% of females booked into adult jails have a serious mental illness.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S
LETTER
(CONTINUED)

Judge Herbert Klein, then-State Attorney Janet Reno, and then-Dade County Public Defender Bennett Brummer. That court, born out of sheer frustration with seeing the same drug addicted defendants over and over, sparked a national revolution that has changed the way the criminal justice system regards drug addiction. Congratulations to the National Association of Drug Court Professionals and to the unsung heroes who work with the thousands of drug courts around the world.

Finally, in project news, PJI has completed the 2009 Survey of Pretrial Programs and will be publishing it this fall. Our complimentary project, the nationwide scan of practice at the pretrial stage, made possible through a grant from the Bureau of Justice Assistance, is now underway. We believe that identifying the country's pretrial policies and systems is the first step toward understanding how and where resources, both government and private, should be deployed to ensure appropriate detention or release, diversion, and community safety.

National Notes

BUDGET CRISIS CONTINUES TO TAKE ITS TOLL ON JUSTICE SYSTEMS; SEVERAL COUNTIES LOOK TO PRETRIAL SERVICES FOR HELP

The budget crisis facing state and local jurisdictions around the country is continuing to force justice system officials to make difficult choices. In Sacramento County, California, for example, District Attorney Jan Scully drafted a "doomsday scenario" to deal with an expected \$20 million budget shortfall and the layoffs of several prosecutors. The plan calls for the office to decline prosecution of several misdemeanor offenses, including petty theft, public drunkenness, and minor drug possession, and considering on a case-by-case basis prosecution of other misdemeanors, such as vehicle theft, child abuse, domestic violence, and resisting arrest. "When you're talking about \$20 million you have to have a reality-check," stated Scully. "And this is the reality." (*New York Times*, 5/9/09.)

Prosecutors in many other counties are also facing layoffs. "Understaffing is always a problem, and when you talk about cutbacks on top of that it just compounds the problem," noted Christopher Chiles, prosecuting attorney in Cabell County, West Virginia, and president-elect of the National District Attorneys Association. Ironically, prosecutors' offices are facing these cutbacks at a time when the recession seems to be sparking an increase in crime and federal stimulus money is putting more police officers on the street, resulting in more arrests. "My question to the commissioners is when they hire all those new officers and make all those new cases, what difference does it make if we can't prosecute them?" asked Dallas County, Texas District Attorney Craig Watkins, whose office is facing a 10 percent cut. (*New York Times*, 5/9/09.)

Indigent defense services also continue to be hit hard in the budget crisis. In Georgia, the state's Public Defender Council is out of money, with tens of thousands of dollars in unpaid bills to private attorneys who must be hired for cases where public defenders have a conflict. As a result, frustrated conflict attorneys are withdrawing from cases, leaving defendants, including 10 facing the death penalty, without the representation required by law. In Elbert County, where hundreds of indigent defendants have no attorneys, a lawsuit has been filed against the Public Defender Council. "I don't know how to address this because the money is not there," said Mack Crawford, executive director of the Council. (*Atlanta Journal-Constitution*, 5/6/09.)



*“When you’re
talking about \$20
million you have
to have a reality-
check. And this is
the reality.”*

Several jurisdictions are looking to the expansion of pretrial services to help save money.

Faced with cuts to the jail budget and the resulting loss of 12 positions, Larimer County, Colorado Sheriff Jim Alderden has established a 460-person limit on the jail population. With a population that routinely surpassed 500 inmates, the jail has been relying on expanded pretrial services to help keep the population in the low 400s. According to Larimer County criminal justice planning manager Gary Darling, it costs \$104 a day to keep an inmate in jail, and only \$1.93 a day to keep a defendant under pretrial supervision. He estimates that the county will save \$4 million a year with the expanded pretrial supervision. (*Associated Press*, 5/24/09.)

Officials in Fulton County, Georgia, St. Lucie County, Florida, and Spokane County, Washington are also expanding their pretrial services programs to address budget problems. “We, like every jurisdiction in the country, are operating under financial stresses that require us to be innovative,” said Fulton County spokesman Don Plummer, who expects the county to save \$5.5 million a year by expanding its pretrial program. (*Associated Press*, 5/24/09.)

OTHER PROGRAMS SHOWING RESULTS IN HELPING CASH-STRAPPED JAILS

With budget cuts leading to the closure of all but 127 of Lane County, Oregon’s 495 available jail beds, the jail has been forced to release many pretrial defendants who would otherwise stay in jail, unable to afford bail. Included among that group are many defendants charged with domestic violence offenses. Concerned about the threat that these defendants may pose to victims, as well as the risks that they may not appear in court when required, several entities collaborated to establish the Victim Safety Program. Operated by the Lane County Parole and Probation Department, the program monitors domestic violence defendants out on pretrial release. The monitoring consists of small case loads per officer, random home visits, and monitoring any court imposed stay-away orders.

A review of program data shows that of the roughly 500 domestic violence defendants released to the program, only five percent have been rearrested on new charges and just one percent missed a court appearance. “This is the one thing keeping women safe right now,” said Peggy Whelan, executive director of Womenspace, a nonprofit agency that provides services to domestic violence victims. That agency, in addition to Oregon Circuit Court Pretrial Services, the sheriff’s department, and the district attorney’s office, collaborated with Probation and Parole to establish the program. (*Associated Press State and Local Wire*, 4/14/09.)



*We must
concentrate our
resources on
programs that
have proven to
break the cycle of
drugs and crime.”*

Last year, faced with a significantly crowded jail, county commissioners in Broward County, Florida, approved an infusion of \$2.7 million into the county’s pretrial services program. Commissioners also ordered an audit of the program to make sure that the additional funds were having an impact. Results from the audit, recently completed, showed that while there has been no overall increase in pretrial release rates, time to pretrial release has fallen significantly. According to the audit, the number of defendants released at their first appearance in court nearly tripled after the pretrial program’s expansion. (*The Miami-Herald*, 6/4/09.)

STUDY SHOWS HIGH RATES OF RECENT DRUG USE AMONG ARRESTEES

The Office of National Drug Control Policy (ONDCP) has released the results of a survey of drug use among male arrestees in 10 jurisdictions around the country. According to those results, the percentage of male arrestees testing positive for at least one illicit drug ranged from 49% in Washington, D.C. to 87% in Cook County, Illinois. Marijuana was the most commonly detected drug, ranging from just under one-third in Fulton County, Georgia and Washington, D.C. to about half in Mecklenburg County, North Carolina. Methamphetamine was detected much more frequently in the participating western jurisdictions – in 35% of arrestees in Sacramento County, California and 15% in Multnomah County, Oregon, compared to less than one percent in the eastern counties. Arrestees testing positive for multiple drugs ranged from 15% in Fulton County, Georgia to 40% in Cook County.

The survey, which included a drug test and interview, also found that of those arrestees reporting drug use within the previous year, more than one in ten were arrested two or more times in that year in eight of the 10 counties. Overall, more than half the arrestees participating in the survey in all sites had at least one prior arrest; the figure was over 80% in eight of the sites.

In announcing the results, ONDCP director Gil Kerlikowske noted that the findings “tell us that we must concentrate our resources on programs that have proven to break the cycle of drugs and crime. Incarcerating offenders without treating underlying substance abuse problems simply defers the time when they are released back into our communities to start harming themselves and our communities again.”

In addition to the jurisdictions already mentioned, the remaining participant sites were: Denver County, Colorado; Marion County, Indianapolis; Hennepin County, Minnesota; and Manhattan, New York.

For more information, go to www.whitehousedrugpolicy.gov.



*Blanket policy of
strip searching
arrestees has
cost Philadelphia
millions.*

PHILADELPHIA REACHES SETTLEMENT IN ARRESTEE STRIP SEARCH SUIT

Between 2003 and 2007 approximately 38,000 Philadelphia arrestees who were charged with non-violent misdemeanor or traffic offenses not involving drugs or weapons were strip searched, with visual body cavity inspections. The searches were done as part of a blanket policy of the Philadelphia jail system that all persons booked into the jail – even those awaiting initial court appearance – were to be strip searched, regardless of the charge. Two arrestees who had gone through this search after being charged with traffic offenses began a class-action lawsuit in 2005. The city recently agreed to pay \$5.9 million to settle that suit, plus another estimated \$2 million in attorney fees. Payments to individual arrestees will range from \$100 to \$15,000, depending on the offense with which the person was charged.

Philadelphia is the latest in a number of jurisdictions where law suits have been filed and either settled or won against blanket strip search policies of all arrestees. Four counties in New Jersey recently agreed to pay more than \$14 million in settlements, and Dauphin County, Pennsylvania paid \$2 million. Similar law suits are pending in several other Pennsylvania and New Jersey counties.

In its settlement, Philadelphia acknowledged no wrongdoing. Craig Straw of the city's Civil Rights Division, said that city officials acted on the belief that the blanket strip search policy was important to maintain jail security, "but we found a lot of courts weren't agreeing with that reasoning." (*Philly Online*, 6/9/09.)

Cases

COMMONWEALTH V. THOMAS YOUNG, SUPREME JUDICIAL COURT OF MASSACHUSETTS, NO. SJC-10147, 5/4/09

The question before the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court was whether the offense of unlicensed possession of a firearm qualifies as a predicate offense under the commonwealth's pretrial detention statute, § 58A of General Law 276. That statute reads, in part: "The commonwealth may move, based on dangerousness, for an order of pretrial detention or release on conditions for a felony offense that



*Possession
of unlicensed
firearm not
a detainable
offense, says
Massachusetts'
high court.*

has as an element of the offense the use, attempted use, or threatened use of physical force against the person of another, or any other felony that by its nature involves a substantial risk that physical force against the person of another may result,..." It was this last clause that the court was required to interpret to decide the question.

Noting that the statute does not define the term 'substantial risk,' the court turned to Webster's Dictionary for guidance. "Substantial" is defined as "considerable in amount, value, or worth." "Risk" is defined as "the possibility of loss, injury, disadvantage or destruction." "Thus," the court reasoned, "to constitute a predicate offense under the residual clause, an unenumerated felony by its nature must involve a considerable possibility that physical force against another may result." The court concluded that unlicensed possession of a firearm does not meet this test.

"While we are cognizant that unlicensed possessors of firearms may use firearms unlawfully," the court noted, "unlicensed possession of a firearm is itself a regulatory crime. It is passive and victimless. It does not even require proof that a defendant knowingly failed to acquire a license, and thus may occur regardless whether an individual has acquired a firearm for an illicit or lawful purpose, or simply allowed a license to lapse. Because the motive of an unlicensed possessor of a firearm is totally irrelevant to criminal liability, we discern no principled legal distinction between the risk of physical force posed by licensed and unlicensed possessors of firearms."

PROFESSIONAL BAIL BONDS V. STATE OF MARYLAND, MARYLAND COURT OF SPECIAL APPEALS, NO. 0638, 3/31/09

A defendant in Maryland bailed out by Professional Bail Bonds failed to appear in court. The court ordered forfeiture of the \$35,000 bail. Subsequent to the forfeiture order, the bonding company engaged the services of a bounty hunter, who was able to locate the defendant in his native Honduras. The defendant made it clear to the bounty hunter that he had no intention of returning to Maryland for trial. Since the United States and Honduras do not have an extradition treaty, the bounty hunter left without the defendant. The bonding company then filed a motion with the court to vacate the forfeiture, arguing that it had fulfilled its obligation by locating the defendant, and that it was beyond the company's control that there existed no extradition treaty between the U.S. and Honduras. The trial court rejected the motion.

In upholding the trial court's decision, the Maryland Court of Special Appeals explained that the bonding company's argument that it had fulfilled its obligation by locating the defendant "is simply not true. The appellant's obligation was not to locate the defendant.



*“This bail
bondsman in such
a situation is no
helpless victim
deserving of the
law’s sympathy or
pity.”*

Nor was it to make a good faith effort to bring the defendant back to Maryland. Its obligation was to produce the defendant at the Howard County Courthouse to stand trial and nothing less than that...That obligation was never fulfilled.” The court went on the trace the powers afforded to bail bondsmen. “The surety is furnished by law with [these] sweeping prerogatives vis-à-vis its client to guard against the precise risk of what happened in this case, and the surety therefore bears full responsibility for what happens....[T]his bail bondsman in such a situation is no helpless victim deserving of the law’s sympathy or pity.”

INGMIRE V. FLORIDA, COURT OF APPEALS OF FLORIDA, SECOND DISTRICT, NO. 2D07-5499, 5/6/09

In this case, the court of appeals had to assess whether the defendant’s failure to appear at sentencing was willful or simply a mistake. The defendant, Gary Ingmire, had entered a plea to the charge of grand theft, and sentencing was set about two months out from the plea date. Part of the plea agreement was that Ingmire was to pay a total restitution amount of \$77,790, with an initial payment of about \$11,000 to be paid before the sentencing date. The agreement was that if he made that initial payment and appeared as required at sentencing, he would be placed on probation for ten years. If he failed in either, the court could impose any lawful sentence it saw fit. Mr. Ingmire made a restitution down payment of \$8,000 before the sentencing date – short of the amount required, but not protested by the state because the victim was satisfied.

Ingmire also failed to appear on the scheduled sentencing date. He did show up in court on the following day, mistakenly believing, he claimed, that that was the date he was due. He later testified that he spoke with a bailiff who informed him that he was a day late, but that a warrant had yet been issued. Ingmire then says he left the court and went to see his bail bondsman, who advised him to check in daily until a warrant had been issued and then to surrender himself on the warrant. Ingmire says he did this and records show that he did surrender himself on the same date that the warrant was issued. The trial court held a hearing on the failure to appear, taking testimony from Ingmire, an uncle who had accompanied him to court when he appeared a day late for sentencing, and his bail bondsmen. The court, concluding that Ingmire’s story was not credible, found that the failure to appear was willful, put aside the plea agreement, and sentenced Ingmire to 15 years in prison, the maximum penalty for the charge.

On appeal of the finding that the failure to appear was willful, the appeals court set the parameters for addressing the question

*Florida appeals
court disagrees
with trial court's
finding that a
failure to appear
was willful.*

of willfulness, as required by case precedent: “If the trial court’s findings are supported by competent substantial evidence, we will not substitute our judgment for that of the trial court on questions of fact, the credibility of the witnesses, and the weight to be given to the evidence by the trial court.” In looking at the evidence, the court, while respecting the trial court’s finding that Ingmire’s testimony was not credible, noted that the trial court had made no findings regarding the testimony of either the uncle or the bail bondsman. The court noted that their testimony fully supported Ingmire’s. Moreover, the court noted that no motive was presented “to explain why Mr. Ingmire would place his probationary sentence at risk by failing to appear, or why he would fail to appear after paying the substantial agreed upon amount of presentence restitution.” Indeed, the court noted that prosecutors “presented no evidence that even suggested the willfulness of Mr. Ingmire’s actions.” Furthermore, the court pointed out that while Ingmire should have turned himself in immediately, not waiting until the warrant issued, he was following the advice given to him by his bondsman.

“Even without Mr. Ingmire’s own testimony, which the trial court disbelieved, all of the relevant evidence established below is consistent with a person who simply erred and compounded the error through well-intentioned but improper action.” Concluding that “there is an absence of positive evidence to establish willfulness,” the court reversed and remanded the case to the trial court with the instruction to sentence Mr. Ingmire to the probation period specified in the plea agreement.

**SNYPE V. PLOUGH, OHIO COURT OF APPEALS,
ELEVENTH APPELLATE DISTRICT, NO. 2009-P-0013**

Emelda Snype was arrested and charged with criminal trespass stemming from an incident involving a dispute with a bank over the ownership of her home, which was in foreclosure proceedings. She was released with no specific conditions relating to her presence at the disputed property. Approximately 50 days later, however, and while the case was still pending, the court revised the release order to direct Snype to stay away from the property. Snype then filed an action with the Ohio appeals court for a writ of habeas corpus on the grounds that the condition that she stay away from the property constituted “excessive bail.” The basis of this argument was that the court did not have the authority to restrict her contact with the property because such a restriction was not reasonably related to assuring her appearance in court on the trespass charge.

The appeals court began addressing this issue by noting that Ohio case law is clear that if a defendant’s present incarceration is due to

“A writ of habeas

corpus will

generally not

issue unless some

form of actual

confinement is

involved.”

the setting of excessive bail, a habeas corpus action is appropriate to seek immediate release. When the defendant is not in custody, and the issue involves a condition of pretrial release, as was the case here, previous case law has concluded that habeas corpus is not an appropriate vehicle for seeking remedy. After reviewing those cases, the court concluded that “her petition fails to state a viable claim under Ohio law because a writ of habeas corpus will generally not issue unless some form of actual confinement is involved.” The court went on to note that the condition itself was very limited – forbidding her to live at one specific address, but permitting her to reside anywhere else she chose. “Given the limited nature of the condition, it cannot be said that [the trial court] has severely restricted petitioner’s freedom of movement or general liberty,” further reducing the viability of a habeas corpus claim.

As to Synpe’s argument that the condition was without authority because it was not designed to assure her appearance in court, the court noted that her point “is simply irrelevant to the determination of whether she has stated a proper claim for relief.” Moreover, the court pointed out that a court “may impose a condition which is deemed necessary to protect the public safety. Given that the pending charge against the petitioner arose from a dispute concerning the ownership of the subject residence, [the trial court] could have reasonably concluded that keeping her away from the property was needed to avoid future altercations between the underlying parties. Under such an analysis, the condition would still be proper despite the fact that it would play no role regarding the petitioner’s appearance at trial.” The court dismissed the habeas corpus claim.

Research

NEW STUDY LOOKS AT PRETRIAL RISK ASSESSMENT IN THE FEDERAL SYSTEM

In 2007, the Office of the Federal Detention Trustee, in cooperation with the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, commissioned a study to identify statistically significant pretrial release risk factors of federal defendants. The study included all 565,178 defendants charged in federal courts, with the exception of the District of Columbia, between October 1, 2001 and September 30, 2007.

The average age of the defendants was 34 years old, and the most common age was 26. Eighty-five percent were male. The largest racial/ethnic category was White Hispanic – at 44%; White Non-Hispanic was next at 27%, followed by Black Non-Hispanic 23%,

**PRETRIAL RISK
ASSESSMENT IN THE
FEDERAL COURT**



Sponsored by the Office of the
Federal Detention Trustee with
support from the Administrative
Office of the U.S. Courts

Research conducted by:

Research Institute
Marie VanNastrand, Ph.D.
Genea Keebler

April 14, 2009

For the Purpose of Expanding the
Use of Alternatives to Detention



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
OFFICE OF THE FEDERAL DETENTION TRUSTEE

*Pretrial detention
rates in the federal
system rose from
53% in 2001 to 64%
in 2007.*

and Asian, Native American, and Black Hispanic at approximately two percent each. Sixty-two percent of the defendants were U.S. citizens, 31% illegal aliens, and seven percent legal aliens. About half the defendants were determined to have substance abuse problems at the time of the initial appearance. Thirty-six percent of defendants had a drug charge as the most serious offense, 26% were charged with immigration law violations, 17% had theft or fraud related charges, nine percent firearm offenses, about six percent violent offenses, and about eight percent other. Forty-four percent had never been arrested previously and 57% had no prior felony convictions. Eighteen percent had a felony or misdemeanor charge pending in court at the time of their arrest. Eighty-four percent had never failed to appear in court previously.

Pretrial services had recommended detention for an average of 61% of cases. Detention recommendation rates rose from 56% of all defendants in 2001 to 64% in 2007. Looking at the decisions of the court, pretrial detention rates rose each year, going from 53% in 2001 to 64% in 2007. For those released during the pretrial period, the failure to appear rate was 3.5% and the danger to the community rate (as measured by a bail revocation due to a new arrest for a crime allegedly committed while the defendant was on pretrial release) was 3.5%.

The study identified nine factors that were shown to be statistically significant predictors of risk of pretrial misconduct. The factors were:

- Defendants with one or more misdemeanor or felony charge pending at the time of arrest were 20% more likely to fail than those with no pending charges.
- Defendants with one prior misdemeanor arrest were 13% more likely to fail, those with two priors 32% more likely, with three priors 45% more likely, with four 59% more likely, and with five or more 69% more likely to fail.
- Defendants with one prior felony offense were 22% more likely to fail and those with two or more were 38% more likely.
- Defendants with one prior failure to appear were 22% more likely to fail and those with two or more were 35% more likely.
- Unemployed defendants were 21% more likely to fail than those who were employed.
- Defendants who were renting rather than buying their own homes were 65% more likely to fail, those making no financial contribution to their residence 74% more likely, and those with no residence more than twice as likely.



*“A substantial
presence of
individuals with
serious mental
illnesses in our
country’s jails.”*

- Defendants who abused alcohol were 21% more likely to fail, those who abused cannabis 23% more likely, and those narcotics 40% more likely.
- Defendants charged with a felony were 61% more likely to fail than those charged with a misdemeanor.
- When compared to defendants charged with a theft or fraud related charge, those charged with a firearm offense were 51% more likely to fail, a drug offense 78% more likely, and an immigration law violation 78% more likely.

Logistic regression was used to develop a model placing defendants in one of five risk levels. Testing outcomes according to placement, defendants who would have been classified as Risk Level 1, the lowest level, had a failure rate of 2.3%, those in Level 2, 6%, Level 3, 9.2%, Level 4, 11.8%, and Level 5, 15.5%.

Researchers then applied this risk classification scheme to defendants from each of the study years, 2001 through 2007, to determine if any change in risk levels has occurred. The average risk level rose each year during that period, going from an average level of 2.85 in 2001 to 3.1 in 2007. Next, applying the risk classification scheme to actual decisions by the court revealed that courts released 87% of those classified through the model scheme as Risk Level 1, 62% as Level 2, 49% as Level 3, 40% as Level 4, and 28% as Level 5.

A copy of the study, “Pretrial Risk Assessment in the Federal Court,” by Marie VanNostrand and Gena Keebler of Luminosity is available at www.luminosity-solutions.com.

MULTI-SITE STUDY ASSESSES PREVALENCE OF SERIOUS MENTAL ILLNESS IN JAILS

Researchers studied more than 20,000 inmates booked into two jails in Maryland and three jails in New York over two phases – May 2002 through January 2003, and November 2005 through June 2006 – to determine the prevalence of serious mental illness. For the study, “serious mental illness” was defined as the presence of bipolar disorder, schizophrenia disorders, and major depression in the past month. The study did not include such less serious mental illnesses as anxiety disorders, adjustment disorders, or acute reactive psychiatric conditions, such as suicidal thinking.

Clinical research interviewers, specially trained and tested by the research team to assure interrater reliability, conducted Structured Clinical Interviews for the presence of the selected DSM-IV axis I diagnoses. A total of 11,168 adults were interviewed during the first

*Job opportunity
for pretrial
supervisor in Anne
Arundel County,
Maryland*

phase and 10,240 during the second. The study found that 14.5% of the men and 31% of the women had a serious mental illness, with an overall rate of 16.9%. When Post Traumatic Stress Syndrome was added to the list of tested disorders, the figures rise to 17.1% for males and 34.3% for females.

Researchers concluded that these figures show “a substantial presence of individuals with serious mental illnesses in our country’s jails.” This is so despite the fact that over the past several years “there has been a rapid expansion of specialized law enforcement-based responses, problem-solving mental health courts, and specialized probation models aimed at reducing the prevalence of individuals with mental illnesses in jail settings.” Researchers were particularly concerned with the high rate of serious mental illness among female jail inmates – double the rate for males – a concern made even more pressing by the fact that females overall are being arrested and jailed in much greater numbers than in the past.

The study, “Prevalence of Serious Mental Illness Among Jail Inmates,” by Henry Steadman, Fred Osher, Pamela Robbins, Brian Case, and Steven Samuels, appears in the June 2009 issue of Psychiatric Services.

Job Announcement

The Anne Arundel County (Annapolis, Maryland) Department of Detention Facilities is seeking a Criminal Justice Program Supervisor. A chief duty of the supervisor will be to oversee the jail’s pretrial investigation staff, which is responsible for interviewing defendants before their bail-setting appearance in district court, assessing risks of pretrial misconduct, and presenting the information to the court at initial appearance. Minimum requirements include a Bachelor’s Degree from an accredited four-year college or university with major course work in criminal justice, corrections, of the social sciences, and at least four years experience working in criminal justice programs, preferably in corrections. Preference will be given to candidates with experience working within a correctional facility, with classification and/or pretrial risk assessment, with managing a caseload of clients, and with at least one year in a supervisors position. The annual salary range is \$48,470 to \$86,934.

To view the complete job announcement and for application details, go the to Anne Arundel County jobs web site at www.pretrial.org/Pages/Employment.aspx.

THE PRETRIAL REPORTER

A BI-MONTHLY PUBLICATION OF THE PRETRIAL JUSTICE INSTITUTE

WWW.PRETRIAL.ORG

VOLUME XXXV | NO.3 | MAY/JUNE, 2009

INSTITUTE STAFF

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Timothy J. Murray

CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER

Cherise Fanno Burdeen

CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

Amy Peko

SENIOR PROJECT ASSOCIATE

John Clark

SENIOR PROJECT ASSOCIATE

India L. Ochs, Esq.

PROJECT STAFF

Stephanie Garbo

Jessica Keefe

Since 1977, the Pretrial Reporter has been keeping readers abreast of developments in pretrial. Articles are not copyrighted and may be condensed, rewritten, or used verbatim. Whenever the Pretrial Reporter materials are reproduced in another publication, the Pretrial Justice institute should be credited with the reprint and a copy of the publication in which the materials appear should be mailed to the editor.

PTR is an electronic publication emailed to subscribers. To aid in delivery, please ensure PTR@pretrial.org and emails with attachments are not blocked by your system. Special accommodations are made for law libraries. To subscribe, please visit the Analysis and Research section of www.pretrial.org. The subscription rate is \$225 for two years

Pretrial Justice Institute.

927 15th Street, NW, Suite 300,

Washington, DC 20005-2323

202.638.3080 F: 202.347.0493

E: ptr@pretrial.org • www.pretrial.org

