

High-Fidelity Implementation of the Public Safety Assessment

Acknowledgments

This manual would not have been possible without the leadership and primary authorship of Mark Carey, President, The Carey Group, whose vision of and commitment to implementation fidelity infuse all phases of Advancing Pretrial Policy and Research (APPR).

About APPR

Advancing Pretrial Policy and Research (APPR) is dedicated to achieving fair, just, effective pretrial practices, every day, throughout the nation. It works with justice professionals and community members to improve pretrial justice systems in ways that prioritize community well-being and safety, racial justice, fairness, and the effective use of public resources. APPR is a project of the National Partnership for Pretrial Justice, with support from Arnold Ventures.

The **Center for Effective Public Policy** (cepp.com) leads all implementation and technical assistance activities for APPR.

C  **P P**

Center for
Effective
Public Policy

Developed in partnership with **The Carey Group**.



Contents

Introduction	1
Purpose	1
Audience	1
Contents.....	2
The Timing of Fidelity Assessments.....	4
Identifying the Fidelity Assessors	4
Maximizing the Benefit of a Fidelity Assessment	4
Instructions	5
Automation Phase	6
Purpose of the Automation Phase	6
Resources to Support Jurisdictions with the Automation Phase.....	6
Potential Fidelity Challenges	7
The PSA Automation Checklist.....	9
Initial Fidelity Check	9
Subsequent Fidelity Checks	12
Assistance Phase.....	14
Purpose of the Assistance Phase.....	14
Resources to Support Jurisdictions with the Assistance Phase	14
Potential Fidelity Challenges	15
The Release Conditions Matrix Checklist.....	17
Initial Fidelity Check	17
Subsequent Fidelity Checks	22
Assessment Phase	24
Purpose of the Assessment Phase	24
Resources to Support Jurisdictions with the Assessment Phase	24
Potential Fidelity Challenges	25
The PSA Violent Offense List Checklist.....	27
Initial Fidelity Check	27
Subsequent Fidelity Checks	31
The PSA Factors and Outcomes Checklist.....	33
Initial Fidelity Check	33
Subsequent Fidelity Checks	35
The Pretrial Assessment Report Checklist	37
Initial Fidelity Check	37
Subsequent Fidelity Checks	41

Training Phase	42
Purpose of the Training Phase.....	42
Resources to Support Jurisdictions with the Training Phase	42
Potential Fidelity Challenges	44
The Stakeholder Education Checklist	46
Initial Fidelity Check	46
Subsequent Fidelity Checks	49
The Assessor Training Checklist	51
Initial Fidelity Check	51
Subsequent Fidelity Check	54
Fidelity Phase	55
Purpose of the Fidelity Phase	55
Resources to Support Jurisdictions with the Fidelity Phase.....	55
Potential Fidelity Challenges	56
The PSA Quality Assurance Checklist.....	59
Initial Fidelity Check	59
Subsequent Fidelity Checks	64
Outcomes and Oversight Checklist.....	68
Initial Fidelity Check	68
Subsequent Fidelity Check	71
Appendix A: PSA Automation Worksheets	74
Initial Fidelity Check.....	74
Subsequent Fidelity Checks.....	76
Appendix B: Release Conditions Matrix Worksheets	77
Initial Fidelity Check.....	77
Subsequent Fidelity Checks.....	79
Appendix C: PSA Violent Offense List Worksheets	80
Initial Fidelity Check.....	80
Subsequent Fidelity Checks.....	82
Appendix D: PSA Factors and Outcomes Worksheets	83
Initial Fidelity Check.....	83
Subsequent Fidelity Checks.....	84
Appendix E: Pretrial Assessment Report Worksheets	85
Initial Fidelity Check.....	85
Subsequent Fidelity Checks.....	87

Appendix F: Stakeholder Education Worksheets.....	88
Initial Fidelity Check.....	88
Subsequent Fidelity Checks.....	90
Appendix G: Assessor Training Worksheets	91
Initial Fidelity Check.....	91
Subsequent Fidelity Checks.....	93
Appendix H: PSA Quality Assurance Worksheets.....	94
Initial Fidelity Check.....	94
Subsequent Fidelity Checks.....	95
Appendix I: Outcomes and Oversight Worksheets.....	97
Initial Fidelity Check.....	97
Subsequent Fidelity Checks.....	99
Appendix J: Fidelity Action Plan	100

Introduction

Purpose

The purpose of this manual is to support the high-fidelity implementation of the Public Safety Assessment (PSA). The PSA is an actuarial assessment that estimates the likelihood that people will fail to appear in court pretrial, have a new criminal arrest while on pretrial release, and have a new violent criminal arrest while on pretrial release. Use of the PSA, in combination with other pretrial advancements, is associated with a variety of outcome improvements.

The benefits of the PSA are many, including providing pretrial decision makers with consistent, relevant, research-supported data that informs pretrial decision making. A growing body of evidence shows that release decisions based on research are fairer and more equitable. Importantly, in addition to these benefits, use of the PSA can promote consistency and transparency across decision makers and provide important data that contributes to understanding pretrial practices and outcomes, including those that inform the analyses of racial and ethnic disparities.

Implementation Fidelity

“Implementation fidelity” refers to the extent to which a strategy or intervention is delivered as intended. Successful outcomes depend on high-fidelity implementation—regardless of the strategy or intervention.

Implementation experts note that up to 85% of change initiatives fail to achieve their desired outcomes due to flawed implementation.¹ Adherence to prescribed planning and implementation processes, and a commitment to ongoing fidelity assessments, will identify implementation deficiencies and provide opportunities for continuous quality improvement.

Audience

This manual was designed for use by jurisdictions that have previously implemented the PSA or that are in the process of doing so. It is consistent with one of APPR’s core principles: that pretrial assessment, policies, and practices that are grounded in rigorous research and refined through ongoing performance measurement offer the greatest promise for success. The manual was written for a broad group of people from governmental, community, and other organizations (hereafter, “stakeholders”) who, working through a collaborative, consensus-based process, agree

¹ Rogers, R. W., Wellins, R. S., & Conner, D. R. (2002). *The power of realization: Building competitive advantage by maximizing human resource initiatives*. <https://silو.tips/download/the-power-of-realization>

to implement the PSA. The manual presupposes that a high-functioning policy team will oversee both the implementation and ongoing fidelity aspects of local PSA use, and that small groups of individuals—perhaps but not necessarily including policy team members—will undertake certain aspects of the planning, implementation, and fidelity assessment.

Contents

This manual serves as a companion to a variety of materials that Advancing Pretrial Policy and Research (APPR) developed to support successful and effective implementation of the PSA. It is assumed that readers will be familiar with these materials, which are available on [APPR's website](#) and include an overview of and detailed information about a seven-phase implementation process. There is an Implementation Guide on each of the core aspects of these phases, as well as a variety of tools designed to support planning and implementation.² Jurisdictions implementing the PSA are expected to comply with the guidance in the Implementation Guides, the [terms of use](#), and other updated recommendations.

The seven phases of PSA implementation are as follows:

1. **Readiness:** The jurisdiction assesses its readiness to implement pretrial improvements, including the PSA.
2. **Engagement:** The jurisdiction engages stakeholders in the pretrial improvement process, creating a policy team.
3. **Automation:** The policy team decides how to automate the PSA and incorporate it into its data system.
4. **Assistance:** The policy team examines state pretrial laws, studies the research on pretrial assessment and services, and develops a Release Conditions Matrix.
5. **Assessment:** The policy team tailors PSA-related materials for local use.
6. **Training:** Stakeholders, community partners, and others learn how the PSA and other advancements contribute to improved pretrial decision making. Assessors are trained to score the PSA.
7. **Fidelity:** A quality assurance process is put in place to ensure the PSA is scored accurately and produces the expected results.

This manual addresses five of these phases and nine core aspects of PSA implementation:

Phases	Core Aspects of PSA Implementation
Automation	PSA Automation
Assistance	Release Conditions Matrix
Assessment	PSA Violent Offense List PSA Factors and Outcomes Pretrial Assessment Report
Training	Stakeholder Education Assessor Training
Fidelity	PSA Quality Assurance Outcomes and Oversight

² You must [sign up](#) on the APPR website and have an account to access the PSA Implementation Guides and related resources.

Each chapter includes a brief description of the phase, the resources available to support implementation, potential threats to fidelity, and checklists designed for use by local stakeholders to self-assess their fidelity of implementation. There are two checklists for each of the nine core aspects of PSA implementation that are being assessed: one for the initial fidelity assessment and a second for subsequent fidelity assessments, which can (and probably should) be conducted multiple times.

Jurisdictions may wish to complete fidelity checklists for each of the nine core aspects of PSA implementation or only for some of them. They might complete the checklists in the sequence shown or in a different sequence. Finally, checklists may be completed during the implementation process or afterward. There is flexibility in how this manual can be used.

Whichever fidelity checklists are completed and whenever they are completed, they are designed to highlight specific activities in implementation that, if missed, conducted in haste, or conducted ineffectively can lead to fidelity concerns. These concerns may fall into one (or more) general categories:

- **Preparation and planning:** Implementation science is the study of methods and strategies that promote the effective application of interventions. In their research on change efforts, Rogers et al.³ have concluded that most change efforts fail not due to ill-conceived ideas or faulty tools or strategies but because of poor planning and execution. The checklists contained in this manual include questions that are intended to surface whether careful planning and preparation were conducted relative to each of the nine core aspects of PSA implementation contained in this manual.
- **Stakeholder consensus:** Both research and experience indicate that inclusive, collaborative processes have a greater likelihood of acceptance—and sustainability—over time. The checklists contained in this manual include questions intended to identify key decisions in the PSA implementation process that are best made through consensus by a multidisciplinary stakeholder group.
- **Local policy development and adherence:** Implementation efforts have a greater likelihood of being well understood and implemented as intended—as well as being more transparent—when they are documented in written policy and routinely reviewed for adherence and adaptation as practices evolve or conditions change. The checklists contained in this manual include questions to determine whether key implementation practices are documented in policy, followed, and reviewed and updated annually.
- **Training and quality assurance:** Effective implementation of the nine core aspects of the PSA involve awareness building, skill training, and specific strategies associated with quality assurance. The checklists contained in this manual include questions to determine whether critically important steps were—and are being—taken to ensure that stakeholders are fully familiar with the PSA and each of its

Why Fidelity Assessments?

The purpose of a fidelity assessment is to identify deficiencies that could threaten the success of a jurisdiction's PSA implementation efforts. The value of conducting a fidelity assessment is in finding and addressing flaws for the purpose of continuous quality improvement.

3 Rogers, R. W., Wellins, R. S., & Conner, D. R. (2002). *The power of realization: Building competitive advantage by maximizing human resource initiatives*. <https://silotips.com/download/the-power-of-realization>

components, PSA assessors are adequately trained and highly skilled in PSA scoring, decision makers understand the PSA's purpose and appropriate use, and ongoing quality assurance measures are in place to ensure the highest possible degree of accuracy and fidelity at all times.

The Timing of Fidelity Assessments

Although the timing of fidelity assessments is ultimately a local decision, the following recommendations are offered:

- **Initial fidelity assessment:** The initial assessment will ideally occur as soon as the planning process steps are completed and prior to PSA implementation. However, some jurisdictions may have implemented the PSA some time ago. In these cases, the initial assessment should be completed as soon as reasonably possible.
- **Subsequent fidelity assessments:** Subsequent assessments will ideally become routine and occur on a periodic basis. As a general rule, the second assessment will be conducted six months following the initial assessment, and subsequent assessments will take place every 6–12 months thereafter.

Identifying the Fidelity Assessors

While some jurisdictions may have the benefit of one or more people tasked with conducting fidelity assessments for pretrial or other justice system operations, such capacity may not be universally available. Take heart! No specific expertise—other than familiarity with the pretrial system and perhaps with the people involved in the implementation of the PSA and the processes they used—is required. The fidelity assessments described in this manual will ideally be conducted by a fidelity designee or a small group of stakeholders representing the various entities invested in the success of (or even dubious about) the PSA. Each set of checklists can be completed by the same person(s) or by different people.

Maximizing the Benefit of a Fidelity Assessment

The purpose of a fidelity assessment is to identify deficiencies that could threaten the success of a jurisdiction's PSA implementation efforts. A fidelity assessment necessitates an objective approach that seeks to reveal potential or real shortcomings and to affirm areas of strength; it is not a perfunctory effort or one that should be undertaken in an effort to “prove” that all activities were flawless. The value is in finding and addressing flaws for the purpose of continuous quality improvement. In this vein, wherever possible, look for substantiation that an activity was or is being conducted rather than merely asking people about their opinions about how work was (or is) accomplished, or relying on memories. This will mean reviewing work products (e.g., documents related to the local Release Conditions Matrix; a printed copy of the pretrial assessment report),

meeting minutes (reflecting that a stakeholder presentation on the PSA was provided, or that consensus was achieved on the PSA Violent Offense List), and other written documentation (e.g., a quality assurance policy on PSA scoring, or a training curriculum for stakeholders on the PSA and its factors), or observing certain practices in action (e.g., a PSA assessor interrater reliability session).

We recommend that the fidelity process be conducted transparently: that the policy team (and others) be aware of and a part of the process; that results be documented, fully shared, and discussed; and that deficiencies be viewed as opportunities for improvement. To that end, Appendix J can be used to list strategies to address any deficiencies that are uncovered.

Instructions

The process for conducting the fidelity assessments is straightforward:

1. Identify your fidelity assessment team.
2. Become familiar with the contents of this manual, especially with the fidelity checklists.
3. Meet to discuss the purpose and benefit of fidelity assessments, and the contents of this manual.
4. Decide which core area(s) to assess.
5. Download the materials related to the core area(s) that will be assessed. (See the “Resources to Support Jurisdictions” section in each chapter.)
6. Develop a plan for conducting the fidelity assessments you’ve chosen, and document your decisions in Appendixes A–I, as appropriate.
 - a. Identify the people responsible for each checklist/item on the checklist.
 - b. Discuss the method(s) that will be used to determine the answer to each item on the checklist.
 - c. Agree on the method(s) that will be used to document the results of the assessment.
 - d. Agree on a timeline for completing each checklist.
 - e. Agree on a regular schedule of reporting progress to the policy team.
 - f. Discuss whether broader communication (i.e., beyond the policy team) about the fidelity assessment process is needed and, if so, how and when this will occur.
7. When the assessments are completed and documented, review the findings with the policy team and with any additional stakeholders who should be involved. Discuss possible strategies to address any deficiencies that were discovered. Then, use Appendix J to develop and document a fidelity action plan. **(Make copies of Appendix J for each core aspect assessed.)**

Automation Phase

Purpose of the Automation Phase

Arnold Ventures (AV) requires the Public Safety Assessment (PSA) to be automated to decrease the risk of human error that would likely occur in the manual calculation of weights, points, and scores. As an added benefit, automation allows for the efficient production of pretrial assessment reports.

Resources to Support Jurisdictions with the Automation Phase

AV and Advancing Pretrial Policy and Research (APPR) have developed several resources to support the selection of a PSA automation method that best meets local needs.

PSA Implementation Guide and Related Resources	Web Link
7. Guide to PSA Automation 7A PSA Business Requirements 7B PSA Data Elements Worksheet 7C PSA Test Scenarios	https://advancingpretrial.org/guide/guide-to-psa-automation/

- **Guide to PSA Automation:** This document provides information about PSA automation options and requirements, reviews the PSA factors and their data sources, and describes functionality—beyond the scoring of the PSA—that an automated solution may provide.
- **PSA Business Requirements:** If you are automating the PSA on your own, this document defines business-level requirements, specifications, and general operational characteristics for automating the PSA. It also provides instructions for the proper weighting and scoring of the PSA. This document does not offer technical details on how the PSA should be implemented from a programming or system perspective.
- **PSA Data Elements Worksheet:** This worksheet identifies each data element necessary to score the PSA and is used to identify the source of these data in the local jurisdiction.
- **PSA Test Scenarios:** This resource provides a set of 200 test scenarios that must be used prior to deployment of a locally developed automated PSA to determine its accuracy.

Other Resources

- **Data Automation Online Workspace⁴ Module.** This online workspace module provides information about the importance of automating the PSA, guides users in determining the local agency best suited to host the PSA, and assists in the selection of the optimal PSA automation solution.

⁴ The online workspace is currently available to only Research-Action Sites and Learning Sites.

- **PSA Scoring App.** This software uses the PSA algorithm to calculate PSA scores. It enables local jurisdictions to customize the software to import their state criminal offenses and Violent Offense List. The software also provides for local customization of the Release Conditions Matrix and associated release conditions, and generates a pretrial assessment report.

Potential Fidelity Challenges

There are a number of threats to the appropriate and effective implementation of the PSA pertinent to the Automation Phase. Below we highlight the most critical:

- **Incomplete consideration of the various options for automating the PSA, including underestimating or disregarding the requirements for building the software locally, may result in an unsuitable choice.** Several options for automating the PSA are available, each with its own requirements and special considerations. Failure to carefully consider and weigh each option to determine which one will best suit the locality may result in an inappropriate selection and in an inefficient use of human and financial resources.
- **Failure to thoroughly test locally built software may result in improper functioning/inaccurate scoring of the PSA.** The benefits of building a local software application in terms of integration with pre-existing applications will be lost if information technology staff are not fully aware of and compliant with the PSA business requirements and/or do not thoroughly test the software to ensure it functions properly/scores the PSA accurately.
- **Errors in establishing application programming interfaces (API) for purposes of auto-populating PSA factors will lead to inaccurate scoring.** While auto-populating PSA factors can create efficiency, saving valuable assessor time, API errors can have dire scoring consequences (i.e., result in incorrect factor scores and potentially harmful pretrial release decisions).
- **Using a software application that inaccurately scores the PSA could lead to inaccurate PSA results.** AV maintains a list of software vendors that are approved to offer the PSA as standalone software or as a component of a larger case management software package. AV enters into limited license agreements with these vendors which require them to adhere to the terms of use. The use of a non-approved vendor is prohibited.
- **Lack of access to the PSA software will make it challenging for assessors to complete the PSA.** The PSA terms and conditions of use require that all PSAs are automatically scored. Assessors must have ready access to the PSA software when it is needed to score PSAs and generate pretrial assessment reports; therefore, decisions regarding where the software is hosted and how and when assessors will access it are critical.

Automation vs. Auto-population

Automation reduces assessment scoring time and errors by capturing factor data, assigning weights to those data, and calculating PSA scores.

Auto-population reduces the time involved in capturing specific data fields by pulling information from an electronic source through an application programming interface (API).

The fidelity checklists that follow are intended to determine whether any of these threats are present and, if they are, to direct implementation teams to the appropriate areas in need of improvement. Use Appendix A to document decisions regarding the process for completing the fidelity checklists and Appendix J to record strategies that will be implemented to address any deficiencies identified through the assessment process.

The PSA Automation Checklist

Initial Fidelity Check

1. Was a group of policy team members/representatives with technical expertise (hereafter, “Data Workgroup”) assembled to consider how best to automate the PSA to meet local needs?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

2. Did the Data Workgroup review in detail the Guide to PSA Automation prior to considering how best to automate the PSA to meet local needs?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

3. Did the Data Workgroup consider the strengths and limitations of each automation option as they relate to the locality and identify the option best suited to the locality? (Specific issues that should be considered include: where the automation will be housed; whether the PSA automation system will auto-populate some data fields; whether a case management system already exists that includes the PSA; whether a case management system already exists to which PSA automation can be added; and whether IT resources are available to program the PSA locally.)

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

4. Did the Data Workgroup discuss the automation options with the policy team and come to consensus on the selected method? (Identify the method of PSA automation selected: programming the PSA into an existing, local information technology system; using an automation option provided by an AV-approved vendor; or using APPR’s complimentary PSA Scoring App.)

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

5. If the policy team decided to program the PSA into an existing, local information technology system, did IT staff receive and review in detail the PSA Business Requirements?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

6. If the policy team decided to program the PSA into an existing, local information technology system, did IT staff receive the PSA Test Scenarios and run all 200 test scenarios?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

7. If the PSA was programmed locally and the 200 test scenarios were run, were any errors found?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

8. If the PSA was programmed locally and the test scenarios identified problems, were IT staff notified and instructed to review in detail the PSA Business Requirements and revise the software accordingly?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

9. If the PSA was programmed locally and revisions were made to the software as a result of the outcome of the test scenarios, were the 200 test scenarios rerun?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

10. Regardless of the specific automation decision made, did IT staff receive and review in detail the PSA Data Elements Worksheet to determine which PSA factors could be auto-populated?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

11. If some PSA factors were auto-populated, did the locality identify the number of test PSAs to run to manually verify the auto-populated data?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

12. If some PSA factors were auto-populated, was the auto-populated data verified manually to ensure that the software accurately interpreted the data?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

13. If some PSA factors were auto-populated and the manual fidelity check revealed interpretation inaccuracies, were steps taken to ensure the accuracy of auto-populated data or to disable the auto-population of the field?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

14. Was a policy developed that articulates the goals of PSA automation, as well as the business requirements, specifications, quality assurance processes, people charged with updating auto-populated fields and other responsibilities, and timelines agreed upon by the policy team?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

The PSA Automation Checklist

Subsequent Fidelity Checks

1. Have any changes been made to the way in which the PSA is automated since the initial fidelity check?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

2. If the PSA was programmed into an existing, local information technology system and changes were made, do those changes comply with the PSA Business Rules?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

3. If the PSA was programmed into an existing, local information technology system and changes were made, were the 200 test scenarios rerun?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

4. If the PSA was programmed locally and the 200 test scenarios were rerun, were any errors found?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

5. If the PSA was programmed locally and the test scenarios identified problems, were IT staff notified and instructed to review in detail the PSA Business Requirements and to revise the software accordingly?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

6. If the PSA was programmed locally and revisions were made to the software as a result of the outcome of the test scenarios, were the 200 test scenarios rerun?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

7. If some PSA factors were auto-populated, has the auto-populated data been routinely verified manually to ensure that the software accurately interpreted the data? (Note the frequency of verification.)

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

8. Have there been routine checks to determine the continued accuracy of the PSA automation? (Note the frequency.)

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

9. Do PSA assessors always have access to the automated PSA?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

10. Has the local policy on PSA automation been reviewed in the past year and updated as needed, has the updated policy replaced the previous version, and have all system stakeholders been made aware of the changes?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

Assistance Phase

Purpose of the Assistance Phase

The purpose of the Assistance Phase of the Public Safety Assessment (PSA) implementation process is to examine state pretrial laws, study the research on pretrial assessment and services, decide where and how the PSA results will be used in a jurisdiction’s pretrial system, and develop a Release Conditions Matrix that matches PSA results to appropriate release conditions.

Resources to Support Jurisdictions with the Assistance Phase

Several resources have been developed to assist jurisdictions as they create a Release Conditions Matrix that accommodates their local needs.

PSA Implementation Guide and Related Resources	Web Link
9. Guide to the Release Conditions Matrix	https://advancingpretrial.org/guide/guide-to-the-release-condition-matrix/
9A Examples of a Release Conditions Matrix	
9B Release Conditions Matrix Presentation	
9C PSA Results Presentation	
9D Release Conditions Matrix Templates	

- **Guide to the Release Conditions Matrix.** The Release Conditions Matrix is an instrument that local policymakers develop to help match pretrial release conditions with a person’s scores on the PSA. Every jurisdiction that uses the PSA should create and use a Release Conditions Matrix. This guide describes the components of the Release Conditions Matrix, the appropriate use of the Release Conditions Matrix, and the steps to developing a locally tailored Release Conditions Matrix.
- **Examples of a Release Conditions Matrix.** This document contains two examples of a Release Conditions Matrix: one for a jurisdiction with moderate resources allocated for pretrial assistance and the second for a jurisdiction with fewer resources allocated for pretrial assistance. It also includes a blank (but non-editable) Release Conditions Matrix template that a jurisdiction can follow to develop its own locally tailored Release Conditions Matrix.
- **Release Conditions Matrix Presentation.** This PowerPoint presentation is designed for use by local stakeholders to increase understanding of the purpose, development, and use of the Release Conditions Matrix. The PowerPoint slides include lesson plan notes for the delivery of this presentation.
- **PSA Results Presentation.** This PowerPoint presentation presents the combined results from the 750,000 cases used to develop the PSA and 500,000 cases used to validate the PSA. Researchers completed the PSA for these cases, which came from across the country, and tracked pretrial

outcomes. The presentation includes the appearance rates and arrest-free rates for each scaled score, and the violent arrest-free rates for the presence and absence of the new violent criminal arrest flag. The PowerPoint slides include lesson plan notes for the delivery of this presentation.

- **Release Conditions Matrix Templates.** These (editable) templates can be used to formalize a locally developed Release Conditions Matrix. Users can fill in each grid cell of the Release Conditions Matrix with their agreed-upon release level, and can complete their release activities and conditions table and their release definitions. When local validation data is available, users can replace the template's national outcome data for the failure to appear (FTA) scaled scores and new criminal arrest (NCA) scaled scores with their own.

Potential Fidelity Challenges

There are two central threats to fidelity relative to the Release Conditions Matrix:

- **Improper planning may lead to a misunderstanding of the appropriate use of the Release Conditions Matrix.** The Release Conditions Matrix is a structured tool—developed by a well-rounded group of key stakeholders—that matches a person's scores on two PSA scales (failure to appear and new criminal arrest) to presumptive levels of pretrial release. Although its principles are relatively simple, a lack of understanding around its appropriate use can lead to improper development⁵ of a locally tailored Release Conditions Matrix or misuse of a properly constructed one. More specifically, the Release Conditions Matrix is not a tool for determining whether a person should be released or detained pretrial but, instead, a tool to guide the appropriate assignment of release conditions if release is granted (hence, the name). The proper construction of a Release Conditions Matrix can serve as a reminder that people have unique needs and, by matching available supportive conditions to those needs, decision makers can increase the likelihood of a person's pretrial success. It can also reinforce key legal and evidence-based practices (i.e., use of the least restrictive conditions; matching release conditions to needs to increase pretrial success where necessary and avoiding the assignment of conditions where the likelihood of success is already high). Thus, a properly constructed Release Conditions Matrix should not include “detention,” as detention is not a condition of release. It also should not artificially inflate PSA scores or presumptive release levels (commonly

Release Conditions Matrix Principles

People should be released with the least restrictive conditions necessary to provide reasonable assurance of court appearance and, if legally relevant, remaining arrest-free.

People assessed as having a high likelihood of pretrial success should be released with minimal or no conditions.

People assessed as having a lower likelihood of pretrial success should be matched to the least restrictive release conditions that are likely to enhance success.

⁵ Improper development includes simply replicating a model used elsewhere or emulating an outdated model.

referred to as “bump-ups”) or assign financial conditions of release. Financial release conditions have failed to demonstrate improved pretrial outcomes and, instead, tend to categorically disadvantage people without financial means. The Release Conditions Matrix should also exclude the use of symbols that over-emphasize pretrial failure (i.e., by color-filling some cells red), since the vast majority of people, even those who score highest on the PSA, are more likely to succeed than to fail.⁶

- **Improper care in constructing the local Release Conditions Matrix may result in the omission of appropriate and supportive release options.** An additional purpose of the Release Conditions Matrix is to ensure universal recognition of the options available to support pretrial success. The omission of available options—or the failure to consider options that might be added to those already recognized as available locally—could result in the assignment of less appropriate conditions that fail to provide the supports that will further enhance the likelihood of success.

The fidelity checklists that follow are intended to determine whether either of these threats are present and, if they are, to direct implementation teams to the appropriate areas in need of improvement. Use Appendix B to document decisions regarding the process for completing the fidelity checklists and Appendix J to record strategies that will be implemented to address any deficiencies identified through the assessment process.

⁶ APPR strongly advises against these features in [Responsible Use of the PSA](#).

The Release Conditions Matrix Checklist

Initial Fidelity Check

1. Did the policy team discuss and understand the purpose and use of the Release Conditions Matrix?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

2. Was a representative group of stakeholders (hereafter, “RCM Workgroup”) assembled to construct a Release Conditions Matrix unique to the locality? (List the members of the RCM Workgroup.)

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

3. Did the RCM workgroup include community members and people directly impacted by the pretrial system?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

4. Did the RCM Workgroup review in detail the Guide to the Release Conditions Matrix prior to beginning work on the locality’s Release Conditions Matrix?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

5. Did the RCM Workgroup download, review, and discuss the Examples of a Release Conditions Matrix?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

6. Did the RCM Workgroup download, review, and discuss the Release Conditions Matrix Presentation?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

7. Did the RCM Workgroup download, review, and discuss the PSA Results Presentation?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

8. Did the RCM Workgroup review state statutes for applicability to the Release Conditions Matrix?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

9. Did the RCM Workgroup develop a list of the currently available resources allocated for pretrial assistance?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

10. Did the RCM Workgroup discuss whether changes to the currently available resources allocated for pretrial assistance might be appropriate?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

11. Did the RCM Workgroup discuss whether it would be beneficial to allocate new/additional resources for pretrial assistance?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

12. Did the RCM Workgroup consider how new/additional resources might be made available?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

13. Did the RCM Workgroup describe the available resources in the Release Conditions Matrix Templates document?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

14. Did the RCM Workgroup identify the number of release levels that would be included on their Release Conditions Matrix?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

15. Did the RCM Workgroup discuss and agree to the association between resources and release levels?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

16. Did the RCM Workgroup discuss the appropriate release levels related to each failure to appear (FTA) and new criminal arrest (NCA) cell on the Release Conditions Matrix grid?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

17. Did the RCM Workgroup complete the grid included in the Release Conditions Matrix Templates to help them develop their locally tailored Release Conditions Matrix?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

18. Did the RCM Workgroup pull a sample of cases that fit within each proposed release level to confirm their decisions about the appropriate release conditions?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

19. When constructing the Release Conditions Matrix, did the RCM Workgroup use the least restrictive conditions necessary at each release level?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

20. When constructing the Release Conditions Matrix, did the RCM Workgroup follow these additional best practices?

a. Exclude financial conditions of release

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

b. Exclude detention

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

c. Exclude the use of the color red

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

d. Exclude automatic bump-ups

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

21. Did the RCM Workgroup discuss their recommended Release Conditions Matrix and come to consensus on it with the full policy team?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

22. Did the RCM Workgroup discuss a method to identify and “flag” circumstances when the Release Conditions Matrix does not meet an individual defendant’s needs for purposes of later discussion with the policy team and potential Release Conditions Matrix refinement?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

23. Was the final, local Release Conditions Matrix incorporated into the locality’s method of PSA automation?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

24. Did an independent party (i.e., someone other than the person who was responsible for uploading/ incorporating the Release Conditions Matrix into the locality’s PSA automation system) review the accuracy of the Release Conditions Matrix data that was uploaded/incorporated?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

25. Was a policy developed that reflects the goals, values, appropriate uses, components of, and processes related to the Release Conditions Matrix?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

The Release Conditions Matrix Checklist

Subsequent Fidelity Checks

1. Did the RCM Workgroup reconvene to determine if modifications to the locality's Release Conditions Matrix were necessary for any reason (e.g., the addition or loss of pretrial assistance resources; experiences with the Release Conditions Matrix that suggest that adjustments to levels and/or resources are advisable)?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

2. When local validation data was made available, did the RCM Workgroup replace the national outcome data with local outcome data?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

3. If changes were made to the locality's Release Conditions Matrix, did the policy team review and approve these changes, has the updated policy replaced the previous version, and were all system stakeholders made aware of the changes?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

4. If there was consensus to change the Release Conditions Matrix in any way, were these changes also made in the locality's PSA automation system?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

-
5. If changes were made to the Release Conditions Matrix, did an independent party (i.e., someone other than the person responsible for uploading/incorporating the Release Conditions Matrix into the locality's PSA automation system) review the accuracy of the Release Conditions Matrix data in the PSA automation system?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

-
6. Has the local policy on the Release Conditions Matrix been reviewed in the past year and updated as needed, has the updated policy replaced the previous version, and have all system stakeholders been made aware of the changes?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

Assessment Phase

Purpose of the Assessment Phase

The purpose of the Assessment Phase of Public Safety Assessment (PSA) implementation is to tailor PSA-related materials for local use. These materials include the PSA Violent Offense List, the PSA Scoring Manual, and the Pretrial Assessment Report. Each is critical to the effective and appropriate use of the PSA.

Resources to Support Jurisdictions with the Assessment Phase

A complete description of the development, purposes, and appropriate use of the Violent Offense List, PSA Scoring Manual, and the Pretrial Assessment Report can be found in the following Implementation Guides. The Implementation Guides also include tools to assist in the initial development of these resources.

PSA Implementation Guides and Related Resources	Web Links
10. Guide to the PSA Violent Offense List 10A Violent Offense List Presentation	https://advancingpretrial.org/guide/guide-to-the-psa-violent-offense-list/
11. Guide to the PSA Factors and Outcomes 11A PSA Scoring Manual	https://advancingpretrial.org/guide/psa-factors-outcomes/
12. Guide to the Pretrial Assessment Report 12A Template Pretrial Assessment Report	https://advancingpretrial.org/guide/guide-to-the-psa-report/

- **Guide to the PSA Violent Offense List:** The PSA assesses three pretrial outcomes (Failure to Appear, New Criminal Arrest, New Violent Criminal Arrest). In developing and testing the PSA, researchers established a specific definition for offenses that qualify as “violent.” This definition is neither the FBI’s Uniform Crime Report definition nor a state’s statutory definition. This guide provides the PSA definition of a violent offense and walks users through the steps of developing a local PSA Violent Offense List.
- **Violent Offense List Presentation:** This PowerPoint presentation is designed for use by local stakeholders to increase understanding of the PSA definition of violent.
- **Guide to the PSA Factors and Outcomes:** This guide provides detailed information about each of the nine factors used to score the PSA and the relationship of each factor to the three PSA outcomes.
- **PSA Scoring Manual:** PSA assessors must strictly follow the PSA scoring rules to maintain fidelity to the assessment and ensure accurate and consistent scoring. This scoring manual provides detailed information about the people who are suitable for assessment using the PSA; definitions, rules, and questions and answers to support accurate scoring of each of the nine PSA factors; and information about the three PSA outcomes. The scoring manual can be adapted to also include local scoring guidance, as necessary.

- **Guide to the Pretrial Assessment Report:** This guide provides information about Arnold Venture’s (AV’s) requirements related to the content of pretrial assessment reports, as well as recommendations pertaining to additional information that a jurisdiction might choose to include in their reports.
- **Template Pretrial Assessment Report:** This document is a template that a jurisdiction can use to create their own pretrial assessment report if their choice of PSA automation system does not auto-generate a report.

Other Resources

- **PSA Overview Online Workspace Module:** This online workspace module examines how the PSA informs pretrial decision making; provides important background on pretrial assessments, including bias; discusses why and how the PSA was developed and validated; and describes the PSA’s factors and outcomes.
- **PSA Violent Offense List Online Workspace Module:** This online workspace module is designed to prepare jurisdictions to develop their PSA Violent Offense List. It explains the role and importance of the PSA Violent Offense List, provides the PSA definition of a violent offense, and walks users through the process of developing their PSA Violent Offense List.

Potential Fidelity Challenges

There are a number of threats to the appropriate and effective implementation of the PSA pertinent to the Assessment Phase. Below we highlight the most critical:

- **Inaccurate preparation of, or adherence to, the PSA Violent Offense List can negatively impact assessment results.** Decision makers may have a preconceived notion of what constitutes a violent offense. This may be based upon federal, state, or local definitions used for crime reporting; defined in statute; or reflective of personal perspective. However, because there is not a single, universal definition of “violent”—and because states’ and people’s interpretations of “violent” vary—the researchers who developed and validated the PSA created a common definition that was universally applied throughout their research. To ensure that the PSA is used as intended, jurisdictions adopting the PSA must apply the researchers’ definition of violence to their own state statutes and develop a list of state-specific violent offenses for purposes of scoring the PSA. Failure to develop this list as described—and to continually update this list (as often as your state updates its laws) to align with changes in state law—can significantly compromise the assessment results.
- **Inaccurate understanding of the PSA factors and the outcomes about which the PSA provides data may lead to misinterpretation and inappropriate use of assessment results.** Failure to understand that the PSA is one tool that can be used in a larger context of pretrial improvements; the outcomes the PSA is designed to assess; and/or the PSA factors,

Applying the Researchers’ Definition of Violence

To ensure that the PSA is used as intended, jurisdictions adopting the PSA must apply the researchers’ definition of violence to their own state statutes and develop a list of state-specific violent offenses for purposes of scoring the PSA.

data, and scoring rules that are central to the assessment itself can result in misinterpretation of the assessment results, false expectations about what the PSA can and cannot assess, and inappropriate claims about, or application of, the information derived from the PSA.

- **Improper scoring of the PSA can result in potentially harmful pretrial release decisions.** Although the PSA appears relatively simple to score, important scoring rules must be applied to ensure the integrity and validity of the assessment results. Improper scoring of the PSA—or changes to the weights, score conversions, or policies that allow for “overrides” (which are expressly prohibited)—may contribute to decisions that are either harmful to the person assessed and/or to the broader community.
- **Improper scoring of the PSA may result in decisions that are harmful to the person being assessed and/or to the broader community.**
- **Incomplete or inappropriate information/representations on the pretrial assessment report may fail to effectively—or may inappropriately—inform decision makers.** The Guide to the Pretrial Assessment Report specifies that a report include certain information, such as the PSA scores and factors. The guide also encourages sharing the report with relevant parties (e.g., judiciary, prosecution, defense). Failure to comply with these requirements may jeopardize the transparency and accuracy that is essential to the assessment process.

The fidelity checklists that follow are intended to determine whether any of these threats are present and, if they are, to direct implementation teams to the appropriate areas in need of improvement. Use Appendixes C, D, and E to document decisions regarding the process for completing the fidelity checklists and Appendix J to record strategies that will be implemented to address any deficiencies identified through the assessment process.

The PSA Violent Offense List Checklist

Initial Fidelity Check

1. Did the policy team discuss and understand the purpose and use of the PSA Violent Offense List?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

2. Was a representative group of stakeholders (hereafter, “VOL Workgroup”) assembled to construct the locality’s PSA Violent Offense List? (List the members of the VOL Workgroup.)

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

3. Did the VOL Workgroup review in detail the Guide to the PSA Violent Offense List prior to beginning work on the locality’s PSA Violent Offense List?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

4. Did the VOL Workgroup download and review in detail the Violent Offense List Presentation?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

5. If another locality within the state was already using a PSA Violent Offense List, did the VOL Workgroup collect and review this list as a starting point for the development of the locality’s list? (Note the locality whose list was reviewed.)

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

6. If another locality within the state was not already using a PSA Violent Offense List, did the locality obtain from APPR the preliminary list of state criminal codes that appear to meet the PSA definition of violent?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

7. Did the VOL Workgroup carefully review the “Definition of a Violent Offense” section of the Guide to the PSA Violent Offense List when constructing the locality’s PSA Violent Offense List?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

8. Did the VOL Workgroup review all state criminal offenses on the preliminary list from APPR or on the list obtained from another locality within the state to determine whether they meet the PSA definition of violent, adding any other offenses that met the definition and deleting any offenses that did not meet the definition?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

9. Did the VOL Workgroup determine if any offenses that meet the PSA definition of violent were *added* to the state’s statutes since the preliminary list from APPR or list obtained from another locality was developed and, if so, did they add these offenses when constructing the locality’s PSA Violent Offense List?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

10. Did the VOL Workgroup determine if any offenses were *revised* in the state’s statutes since the preliminary list from APPR or list obtained from another locality was developed and, if so, did they make any revisions when constructing the locality’s PSA Violent Offense List?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

11. Did the VOL Workgroup determine if any offenses were *removed* from the state’s statutes and, if so, did they remove these offenses when constructing the locality’s PSA Violent Offense List?

- No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

12. Did the VOL Workgroup discuss their recommended PSA Violent Offense List and come to consensus on it with the full policy team?

- No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

13. If the final PSA Violent Offense List is different from the list of another locality within the state, did the VOL Workgroup talk with that site in an effort to make the lists consistent with each other?

- No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

14. Was the final, local PSA Violent Offense List incorporated into the locality’s method of PSA automation?

- No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

15. Did an independent party (i.e., someone other than the person who was responsible for uploading/incorporating the PSA Violent Offense list into the locality’s PSA automation system) review the accuracy of the data that was uploaded/incorporated?

- No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

16. Was a policy developed that reflects the purpose and use of the PSA Violent Offense List, the definition of violent offense relative to the PSA, the list of offenses that meet the PSA violent offense definition, the person who is responsible for keeping up with changes in statute and new charge codes that are considered violent, and the quality assurance processes associated with it?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

The PSA Violent Offense List Checklist

Subsequent Fidelity Checks

1. Has the VOL Workgroup reconvened as often as your state updates its laws to determine if statutory changes were instituted since they created the locality's PSA Violent Offense List?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

2. If statutory changes were made, did the VOL Workgroup update the locality's PSA Violent Offense List to include new criminal offenses that meet the PSA definition of violence and to remove those that no longer meet the definition?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

3. If changes were made to the locality's PSA Violent Offense List, did the policy team review and approve these changes, has the updated list replaced the previous version, and were all system stakeholders made aware of the changes?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

4. If there was consensus to change the PSA Violent Offense List in any way, were these changes made in the locality's PSA automation system?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

-
5. Regardless of whether changes were made to the PSA Violent Offense List, did an independent party (i.e., someone other than the person responsible for uploading/incorporating the PSA Violent Offense list into the locality's PSA automation system) review the accuracy of the PSA Violent Offense List data in the PSA automation system?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

-
6. Has the local policy on the PSA Violent Offense List been reviewed in the past year and updated as needed, has the updated policy replaced the previous version, and have all system stakeholders been made aware of the changes?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

The PSA Factors and Outcomes Checklist

Initial Fidelity Check

1. Did the members of the policy team receive training on the PSA and/or review and discuss informational materials on the PSA factors, how they are weighted and scored, the responsible use of the PSA, and the outcomes the PSA is designed to assess?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

2. Was a Scoring Manual Workgroup, comprised of one or more policy team members or representatives, put in place to develop a localized PSA Scoring Manual?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

3. Did the Scoring Manual Workgroup review in detail the Guide to the PSA Factors and Outcomes?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

4. Did the Scoring Manual Workgroup download and review in detail the PSA Scoring Manual?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

5. Did the Scoring Manual Workgroup identify potential changes to the scoring manual that pertain to local language and local practices and that add to—but do not alter—the guidance around PSA scoring contained in the PSA Scoring Manual?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

6. Did the Scoring Manual Workgroup review and seek consensus on modifications to the scoring manual to ensure its relevance to the locality?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

7. Was the scoring manual adapted to the locality and finalized, with the version of the document and the date that it was completed (e.g., Montgomery County, Alabama, PSA Scoring Manual, v.1, March 1, 2021)?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

8. Was a policy developed that reflects the purpose of the PSA Scoring Manual and expectations and requirements around its use?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

The PSA Factors and Outcomes Checklist

Subsequent Fidelity Checks

1. Do PSA assessors have ready, physical access to the locality's customized PSA Scoring Manual?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

2. Do PSA assessors review and follow the locality's customized PSA Scoring Manual in order to accurately complete each PSA?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

3. Have assessors or others identified additions/modifications that should be made to further customize the scoring manual to the locality (without altering the official scoring guidance provided in the PSA Scoring Manual)?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

4. If additions/modifications have been identified, has the policy team reviewed and approved them?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

5. If the policy team has approved additions/modifications, has the scoring manual been updated, including the addition of a new version number and date (e.g., Montgomery County, Alabama, PSA Scoring Manual, v.2, November 20, 2021)?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

6. If the scoring manual has been updated, have earlier versions of the manual been collected and replaced with the newest version?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

7. Has the local policy on the PSA Scoring Manual been reviewed in the past year and updated as needed, has the updated policy replaced the previous version, and have all system stakeholders been made aware of the changes?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

The Pretrial Assessment Report Checklist

Initial Fidelity Check

1. Did one or more team representatives review in detail the Guide to the Pretrial Assessment Report?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

2. Did one or more team representatives download and review in detail the Template Pretrial Assessment Report?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

3. For localities that automated the PSA using their own internal information technology resources, did one or more team representatives develop a recommended template for their locality's pretrial assessment report based on the Template Pretrial Assessment Report?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

4. For localities that automated the PSA using their own internal information technology resources, did the policy team provide input into and finalize a format for the local pretrial assessment report?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

5. For localities that automated the PSA using their own internal information technology resources, was the local pretrial assessment report programmed by local information technology staff?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

-
6. For localities that automated the PSA using their own internal information technology resources, did the policy team review the programmed pretrial assessment report for compliance with requirements and adherence to the policy team's requests?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

-
7. For localities that automated the PSA using software purchased from an approved vendor or by using APPR's complimentary PSA Scoring App, did one or more team representatives review the report that the software generated to determine the ways in which it can and should be customized to the locality (e.g., entering the name of the locality)?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

-
8. Is the pretrial assessment report appropriately titled (e.g., Pierce County, Washington, Pretrial Assessment Report)? (The report should never be titled "PSA Report" or a similar title.)

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

-
9. Does the pretrial assessment report include the following elements?

- a. A list of the PSA factors

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

- b. The answers for each PSA factor for each assessed person

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

c. The likelihood of success for the factor score

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

10. Does the pretrial assessment report include additional, recommended information?

a. Basic identifying information

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

b. Current charge(s)

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

c. Presumptive release conditions, if any, as described in the local Release Conditions Matrix

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

11. To the extent that the PSA automation method allows, did the policy team determine whether additional information should be included on the pretrial assessment report (e.g., a list of the person's full criminal history, the results of any supplemental assessments that might be administered)? (Best practices recommendation: The pretrial assessment report should not include race, ethnicity, gender identity, address, or zip code.)

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

12. Is the pretrial assessment report completed and generated in advance of each person's first appearance hearing?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

13. Is the pretrial assessment report consistently provided to each party listed below?

a. Judicial officers

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

b. Prosecutors

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

c. Defenders

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

14. Was a policy developed that reflects the purpose, use, contents, and processes associated with the pretrial assessment report, as well as how the report is stored and who has access to it?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

The Pretrial Assessment Report Checklist

Subsequent Fidelity Checks

1. Is the pretrial assessment report completed and generated in advance of each person's first appearance hearing?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

2. Is the pretrial assessment report consistently provided to each party listed below?

- a. Judicial officers

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

- b. Prosecutors

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

- c. Defenders

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

3. Has the local policy on the pretrial assessment report been reviewed in the past year and updated as needed, has the updated policy replaced the previous version, and have all system stakeholders been made aware of the changes?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

Training Phase

Purpose of the Training Phase

The purpose of the Training Phase of Public Safety Assessment (PSA) implementation is to ensure that stakeholders understand the development, validation, and appropriate use of the PSA in pretrial decision making, and that PSA assessors are effectively trained in accurately scoring the PSA.

Resources to Support Jurisdictions with the Training Phase

Arnold Ventures and Advancing Pretrial Policy and Research (APPR) have developed several resources to support stakeholder education and PSA assessor training.

PSA Implementation Guides and Related Resources	Web Links
13. Guide to Stakeholder Education 13A Stakeholder Education Lesson Plan 13B Stakeholder Education Presentation 13C Stakeholder Education Agenda 13D PSA Factors & Pretrial Outcomes 13E PSA Points & Scales 13F List of References	https://advancingpretrial.org/guide/guide-to-stakeholder-education/
14. Guide to Assessor Training 14A Assessor Training Lesson Plan 14B Assessor Training Presentation 14C Assessor Training Agenda 14D PSA Factors & Pretrial Outcomes 14E PSA Points & Scales 14F List of References 14G PSA Practice Cases 14H PSA Practice Case Worksheet 14I PSA Assessor Worksheet	https://advancingpretrial.org/guide/guide-to-assessor-training/

- **Guide to Stakeholder Education:** This guide emphasizes the importance of stakeholder education, identifies the stakeholders who should participate in PSA education efforts, and offers recommendations around the use of APPR’s stakeholder education materials and their customization for local use.
- **Stakeholder Education Lesson Plan:** This complete lesson plan (trainer’s script) serves as a support for delivering the 3-hour Stakeholder Education Presentation. It includes trainers’ notes that correspond to each PowerPoint slide in the Stakeholder Education Presentation. Its purpose

is to establish a context for pretrial improvements in general by reviewing guiding pretrial legal principles; discussing pretrial assessment; sharing information about the development of the PSA; reviewing the PSA factors, scoring, and results; and discussing the purpose and function of the Release Conditions Matrix.

- **Stakeholder Education Presentation:** This resource is a PowerPoint slide deck. It provides prompts on those slides that should be customized for jurisdiction-specific use.
- **Stakeholder Education Agenda:** This document is a customizable agenda for a locally delivered stakeholder education session. It provides prompts for customizing the date of the session, start and end times, the length of each of the session's segments, and presenters' names.
- **PSA Factors & Pretrial Outcomes:** This one-page document is a stakeholder education session handout. It identifies each of the PSA's nine factors and the pretrial outcome scales with which they are associated.
- **PSA Points & Scales:** This two-page document is a stakeholder education session handout. It provides the points assigned to PSA factor responses and the conversion of those points to scaled scores.
- **List of References:** This document is a stakeholder education session handout. It provides citations to studies and other publications relevant to the implementation of the PSA and practices that can support local pretrial improvement efforts.
- **Guide to Assessor Training:** This resource provides information that supports planning and conducting PSA assessor training. It offers guidance around identifying qualified trainers and training participants, the timing of the training relative to PSA implementation, training logistics, and an overview of the content to be covered. It also identifies other ancillary training that may be necessary or desirable.
- **Assessor Training Lesson Plan:** This complete lesson plan (trainer's script) serves as a support for delivering the 5–6-hour Assessor Training Presentation. It includes trainers' notes that correspond to each PowerPoint slide in the Assessor Training Presentation. Its purpose is to establish a context for pretrial improvements in general by reviewing guiding pretrial legal principles; discussing pretrial assessment; sharing information about the development of the PSA; reviewing the PSA factors, scoring, and results; building skills to accurately score the PSA; discussing the purpose and function of the Release Conditions Matrix and supportive release services; and identifying the appropriate content and use of a pretrial assessment report.
- **Assessor Training Presentation:** This resource is a PowerPoint slide deck. It provides prompts on those slides that should be customized for jurisdiction-specific use.
- **Assessor Training Agenda:** This document is a customizable agenda for a locally delivered assessor training. It provides prompts for customizing the date of the session, start and end times, the length of each of the session's segments, and presenters' names.
- **PSA Factors & Pretrial Outcomes:** This one-page document is an assessor training handout. It identifies each of the PSA's nine factors and the pretrial outcome scales with which they are associated.
- **PSA Points & Scales:** This two-page document is an assessor training handout. It provides the points assigned to PSA factor responses and the conversion of those points to scaled scores.

- **List of References:** This document is an assessor training handout. It provides citations to studies and other publications relevant to the implementation of the PSA and practices that can support local pretrial improvement efforts.
- **PSA Practice Cases:** This document is an assessor training handout. It provides information about three fictitious cases presented during the training for purposes of practicing PSA scoring.
- **PSA Practice Case Worksheet:** This document is an assessor training handout. It is used to record paper-and-pencil scoring of the three fictitious practice cases.
- **PSA Assessor Worksheet:** This worksheet is provided to participants of the assessor training for post-training use. In some instances, assessors will record on paper information that is pertinent to the scoring of PSA factors and then later enter this information into their automated PSA system. This worksheet is provided for the paper-and-pencil recording of this information. (In other instances, assessors will record information directly into their automated system and will not make use of this worksheet unless their automated system is offline for a period of time.)

Other Resources

- **PSA Overview Online Workspace Module:** This online workspace module provides information about how the PSA informs pretrial decision making; offers important information on pretrial assessments, including issues pertaining to bias in pretrial assessments; discusses why and how the PSA was developed and validated; and describes the PSA's factors and outcomes.

Potential Fidelity Challenges

There are several threats to the appropriate and effective implementation of the PSA pertinent to the Training Phase, including the following:

- **Insufficient education of stakeholders may lead to significant misunderstandings about, or misuse of, PSA data.** Failure to understand that the PSA is one tool that can be used in a larger context of pretrial improvements; the outcomes the PSA is designed to assess; the misinterpretation or overinterpretation of the NVCA flag; and/or the PSA factors, data, and scoring rules that are central to the assessment itself can result in misinterpretation of the assessment results, false expectations about what the PSA can and cannot assess, and inappropriate claims about, or application of, the information derived from the PSA.

The Importance of Training

To achieve success with the PSA and realize the jurisdiction's pretrial goals, it is essential that key stakeholders are knowledgeable about the PSA and support the newly planned pretrial practices, and that assessors are trained on how to gather information on the nine PSA factors and use the PSA application to generate results.

- **Insufficient training of PSA assessors can result in inaccurate scoring of the PSA and lead to potentially harmful pretrial release decisions.** Although the PSA appears relatively simple to score, important scoring rules must be applied to ensure the integrity and validity of the assessment results. Improper scoring of the PSA may contribute to decisions that are either harmful to the person assessed and/or to the broader community.

The fidelity checklists that follow are intended to determine whether any of these threats are present and, if they are, to direct implementation teams to the appropriate areas in need of improvement. Use Appendixes F and G to document decisions regarding the process for completing the fidelity checklists and Appendix J to record strategies that will be implemented to address any deficiencies identified through the assessment process.

The Stakeholder Education Checklist

Initial Fidelity Check

1. Did the policy team discuss the importance of conducting stakeholder education related to pretrial improvements generally and the PSA specifically?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

2. Did the policy team identify one or more people to assume responsibility for planning and conducting PSA stakeholder education? (List the people responsible.)

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

3. Did the people responsible for coordinating stakeholder education download and review in detail each of the materials developed to support the stakeholder education session (i.e., lesson plan, presentation, agenda, PSA Factors & Pretrial Outcomes handout, PSA Points & Scales handout, and List of References handout)?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

4. Did the people responsible for coordinating stakeholder education identify one or more trainers who have sufficient familiarity with the PSA and with the stakeholder education curriculum to conduct the session?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

-
5. Did the people responsible for coordinating stakeholder education discuss with the policy team which groups would be encouraged to participate in the session (focusing specifically on judicial officers, prosecutors, defenders, law enforcement, court administration, victim service providers, community groups, and pretrial agency representatives)? (List the groups identified.)

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

-
6. Did the people responsible for coordinating stakeholder education discuss with the policy team the most appropriate point in time to conduct the session? (Note the timing that was agreed upon: during the planning process, in advance of PSA implementation, and/or post-implementation?)

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

-
7. Did the people responsible for coordinating stakeholder education adequately prepare for the session (i.e., adapt the curriculum for local use, effectively coordinate the session's logistics)?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

-
8. Did the people responsible for coordinating stakeholder education effectively identify and prepare participants for the session's purpose and content?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

-
9. Did the people identified for participation attend the session? (Document attendees.)

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

10. Did the trainer(s) follow the lesson plan and conduct the session as designed?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

11. Were questions/concerns that stakeholders raised during or after the session brought to the attention of the policy team (or other appropriate parties) for consideration and subsequently addressed? (Document questions/concerns and methods used to address them.)

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

12. Did the policy team debrief on the stakeholder education session and determine if (and when) follow-up education would be conducted?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

13. Was a policy developed that reflects the content for, and expectations associated with, initial and ongoing stakeholder education?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

The Stakeholder Education Checklist

Subsequent Fidelity Checks

1. Have any structured methods been instituted to receive stakeholder feedback—or ascertain stakeholder attitudes and knowledge—about the appropriate and effective use of the PSA? (Describe the methods used.)

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

2. Have these structured methods for receiving feedback been implemented?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

3. Has the policy team taken steps to consider whether additional stakeholder education is needed (e.g., through discussions among policy team members; discussions with managers, supervisors, line staff, or others within stakeholder groups; surveys of stakeholder groups; evidence of concern or misunderstanding about the PSA and its appropriate use and role in pretrial improvement)? (Describe steps and findings.)

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

4. Have additional stakeholder education sessions been implemented? (Describe for whom, how, and when.)

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

5. Has the local policy on stakeholder education been reviewed in the past year and updated as needed, has the updated policy replaced the previous version, and have all system stakeholders been made aware of the changes?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

The Assessor Training Checklist

Initial Fidelity Check

1. Did the policy team discuss the importance of conducting assessor training prior to PSA implementation?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

2. Did the policy team identify one or more people to assume responsibility for planning and conducting the assessor training? (List the people responsible.)

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

3. Did the people responsible for coordinating the assessor training download and review in detail each of the materials developed to support the training (i.e., lesson plan, presentation, agenda, PSA Factors & Pretrial Outcomes handout, PSA Points & Scales handout, List of References handout, PSA Practice Cases, PSA Practice Case Worksheet, and PSA Assessor Worksheet)?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

4. Did the people responsible for coordinating the assessor training identify one or more trainers who have sufficient familiarity with the PSA and with the assessor training curriculum to conduct the session?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

5. Did the people responsible for coordinating the assessor training discuss with the policy team who would be required to participate in the session? (List the people identified.)

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

-
6. Did the people responsible for coordinating the assessor training ensure that participants had access to all necessary tools and systems so that the training was effectively skill based?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

-
7. Did the people responsible for coordinating the assessor training discuss with the policy team and identify ancillary training that should be provided (e.g., interpretation of criminal history records)?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

-
8. Was the assessor training (including any necessary ancillary training) conducted within the prescribed time period (i.e., approximately one month prior to PSA implementation)?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

-
9. Did the people responsible for coordinating the assessor training adequately prepare for the session (i.e., adapt the curriculum for local use, provide local case examples, effectively coordinate the session's logistics)?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

-
10. Did the people responsible for coordinating the assessor training effectively identify and prepare participants for the session's purpose and content?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

11. Did the people identified for participation attend the session? (Document attendees.)

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

12. Did the trainer(s) follow the lesson plan and deliver the training as designed?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

13. Were questions/concerns that PSA assessors identified during or after the session brought to the attention of the policy team (or other appropriate parties) and subsequently addressed? (Document questions/concerns and methods used to address them.)

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

14. Did the policy team debrief on the assessor training and determine if (and when) follow-up training would be conducted?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

15. Did assessors practice scoring the PSA after their training and before the PSA's launch?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

16. Was a policy developed that reflects the content for, and expectations associated with, initial and ongoing assessor training?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

The Assessor Training Checklist

Subsequent Fidelity Check

1. Has an ongoing method to provide PSA assessor training for people who were not in attendance at the initial training been developed and documented?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

2. Does the ongoing training of new PSA assessors adhere to the guidance and content included in the PSA assessor training curriculum?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

3. Have all people conducting PSA assessments been thoroughly trained as described in the PSA assessor training curriculum?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

4. Has the local policy on assessor training been reviewed in the past year and updated as needed, has the updated policy replaced the previous version, and have all system stakeholders been made aware of the changes?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

Fidelity Phase

Purpose of the Fidelity Phase

The purpose of the Fidelity Phase is to establish and adhere to a set of quality assurance practices that will increase the likelihood that the Public Safety Assessment (PSA) is scored accurately and validated locally, resulting in reliability and increased confidence among those who rely upon the assessment’s results. Beyond the PSA, steps undertaken during this phase will identify additional performance measures that are deemed important locally and establish methods for collecting data to evaluate and transparently report on these measures.

Resources to Support Jurisdictions with the Fidelity Phase

Several resources have been developed to assist jurisdictions to establish quality assurance policies and practices and to engage in important pretrial outcome and oversight activities. In particular, a set of four quality assurance tools have been developed to support accurate and reliable PSA scoring. Use of these tools is strongly encouraged, although jurisdictions may want to customize them slightly and develop their own additional tools.

PSA Implementation Guides and Related Resources	Supportive Resources
15. Guide to Quality Assurance 15A QA Review Worksheet 15B QA Monthly Spreadsheet 15C QA Spreadsheet by Officer 15D QA Independent Audit Spreadsheet	https://advancingpretrial.org/guide/guide-to-quality-assurance/
16. Guide to Outcomes and Oversight 16A Pretrial Outcomes Display	https://advancingpretrial.org/guide/guide-to-outcomes-and-oversight/

- Guide to Quality Assurance:** Quality assurance in the context of the PSA refers to the process of verifying that the assessment is scored accurately and consistently. This guide explains the importance of PSA quality assurance and describes the components of an effective PSA quality assurance process.
- QA Review Worksheet:** Quality assurance reviewers can use this tool to record the results of their independent calculation of a person’s PSA scores which will later be compared with the scores originally determined by the PSA assessor.

Quality Assurance and the PSA
 Essential to the use of any assessment is scoring accuracy (quality assurance) and appropriate implementation and use (fidelity of implementation).

- **QA Monthly Spreadsheet:** This spreadsheet provides reviewers with a tool for compiling in a single location the results of review worksheets for all PSA assessors and for calculating accuracy rates by each PSA factor.
- **QA Spreadsheet by Officer:** Similar to the QA Monthly Spreadsheet, this spreadsheet provides reviewers with a tool for compiling the results of review worksheets by individual assessor and for calculating accuracy rates by each PSA factor.
- **QA Independent Audit Spreadsheet:** This document is used by a neutral third party to document the findings of an independent review of randomly selected cases. It also provides instructions for conducting independent reviews and selecting cases for independent review.
- **Guide to Outcomes and Oversight:** This guide provides information about defining and measuring pretrial outcomes, the importance of tracking the performance of the PSA and other pretrial improvements, and the ongoing oversight of PSA fidelity.
- **Pretrial Outcomes Display:** This document illustrates a method to document and display information about people assessed using the PSA. It uses the jurisdiction's Release Conditions Matrix to show, in each cell, the number and percentage of people who received the corresponding PSA scores and the associated success rates for appearance at court hearings and for remaining arrest-free. Row and column totals also present Failure to Appear (FTA) and New Criminal Arrest (NCA) scaled scores.

Other Resources

- **PSA Assessor Worksheet:**⁷ This worksheet is provided to participants of the assessor training for post-training use. In some instances, assessors will record on paper information pertinent to the scoring of PSA factors and then later enter this information into their automated PSA system. This worksheet is provided for the paper-and-pencil recording of this information. (In other instances, assessors will record information directly into their automated system and will not make use of this worksheet unless their automated system is offline for a period of time.)
- **APPR Performance Measures:** This document suggests 24 performance measures pertinent to pretrial performance and PSA implementation. Each measure is accompanied by a layperson's definition and an operational definition describing how the measure is derived.

Potential Fidelity Challenges

There are a number of threats to the appropriate and effective implementation of the PSA pertinent to the Fidelity Phase. Below we highlight the most critical:

- **The lack of clear quality assurance policies and practices can lead to inaccurate PSA scoring (including the interpretation of data that affects scoring), which can adversely affect pretrial decision making and undermine confidence in the PSA.** Quality assurance provides for the careful examination, at the individual assessor level (as well as on the aggregate), of whether the PSA is

7 The PSA Assessor Worksheet can be downloaded from <https://advancingpretrial.org/guide/guide-to-assessor-training/>.

scored and prepared accurately and completely. While the use of an automated PSA will eliminate scoring errors, the automation will not ensure that court or criminal history data are interpreted correctly. Preventing PSA scoring errors necessitates a clearly defined and adhered to set of policies and practices that provide for careful, comprehensive, ongoing review and oversight of PSA scoring. And, when quality assurance practices such as case audits, observations, and coaching suggest deficiencies in assessors' knowledge and skills, immediate resolution is essential.

- **When coaches lack sufficient capacity, resources, or support, it is difficult for them to effectively carry out their role.** Coaching provides the opportunity to address deficiencies that are identified through the quality assurance process, whether due to assessors' need for more preparation before conducting the PSA independently, carelessness, or misunderstanding. For this reason, the effectiveness of both quality assurance reviewers and coaches is essential to PSA scoring fidelity. In order for coaches to successfully administer their duties, their skills must align with their coaching duties: they must be properly trained on PSA scoring and on effective coaching strategies; they must have the time to prepare for and follow through on coaching assignments; and they need access to resources, such as refresher trainings and peer consultation, to keep their skills fresh.
- **Lack of external processes to verify local quality assurance efforts can lead to the perpetuation of scoring errors.** The effectiveness of quality assurance practices relies heavily on the skills and abilities of quality assurance reviewers/coaches. The use of an independent, third-party, objective expert who is proficient in PSA scoring will provide an additional level of confidence in the skills and abilities of local assessors and in the accuracy of their work.
- **Insufficient responses to data errors or to changes in circumstance can lead to misinformed decisions and/or inaccurate historical records.** In some cases, assessors will either miss or misinterpret information related to one of the PSA factors; in other cases, it may come to light that circumstances have changed that affect PSA scoring, such as a change in a person's current charges. Once a PSA has been scored—regardless of whether a pretrial assessment report has been distributed—the record must be corrected following explicit protocols and, where applicable, pretrial assessment reports should be redistributed such that all parties have available to them the most current and accurate information possible.
- **Failure to locally validate the PSA can result in a missed opportunity to improve the predictive accuracy of the assessment.** Validation analyses answer several important questions about the PSA's performance, including its overall predictive accuracy for all people assessed within a jurisdiction, its predictive accuracy for specific subgroups, and its ability to properly classify people by likelihood of pretrial success. To maximize the likelihood that the PSA predicts accurately at the local level, local validation should be conducted prior to implementation (where possible) and/or every 1–3 years following implementation to account for changes in local policies and populations.
- **Failure to track—and transparently share—key PSA and pretrial performance and outcome measures can result in missed opportunities for improvement and erode confidence in the pretrial system.** The identification of pretrial performance measures—including but not exclusive of those related to the PSA—is a critical step in the process of designing and implementing pretrial improvements, and building and sustaining confidence in the system of pretrial justice. Also critical to building and sustaining support for the pretrial system and its processes is transparency in terms

of how data is presented (in a clearly understood manner vs. difficult-to-decipher calculations; using graphic design elements vs. long, dense sections of text).

- **Failure to put in place an effective process to use performance and outcome measures can hamper the ability to improve policies, practices, and outcomes.** Once user-friendly performance and outcome measures are transparently shared, there must be a process to discuss their implications, openly consider opportunities for improvement, and set in motion a series of activities to ensure continuous quality improvement.

The fidelity checklists that follow are intended to determine whether any of these threats are present and, if they are, to direct implementation teams to the appropriate areas in need of improvement. Use Appendixes H and I to document decisions regarding the process for completing the fidelity checklists and Appendix J to record strategies that will be implemented to address any deficiencies identified through the assessment process.

The PSA Quality Assurance Checklist

Initial Fidelity Check

1. Has a comprehensive, written PSA scoring quality assurance plan been developed?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

2. Did the developers of the quality assurance plan download and carefully review the Guide to Quality Assurance and its accompanying resources?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

3. Has the policy team reviewed and approved the PSA scoring quality assurance plan?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

4. Has the PSA scoring quality assurance plan been provided to all PSA assessors?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

5. Does the PSA scoring quality assurance plan contain the following information?

a. The importance of proper scoring

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

b. Initial training procedures and expectations

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

c. An expectation that the PSA Scoring Manual be used for the scoring of all assessments

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

d. The identification of quality assurance reviewers (e.g., peers, supervisors) and their essential qualities (e.g., PSA scoring proficiency; coaching characteristics such as confident, consistent, motivated, empathetic)

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

e. The frequency of PSA quality assurance reviews (e.g., daily and monthly by individual assessor; annually by independent reviewer)

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

f. The percent of PSA cases to be reviewed at each review interval (e.g., 25% per assessor per day; 100% per assessor each week or month, depending upon the number of assessments performed; greater numbers of reviews for newer assessors/those who lack proficiency)

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

g. Scoring proficiency expectations

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

- h. Record retention requirements (e.g., retaining all records associated with the scoring of individual assessments, to the extent allowable, for a fixed period of time)

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

- i. The method for conducting reviews (e.g., collect PSA Assessor Worksheets, criminal history reports, and pretrial assessment reports; independently review and score each factor; compare results to assessors' original scores and the resulting pretrial assessment report, including the release recommendations)

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

- j. The process for conducting reviews (e.g., instructions for selecting cases for review; instructions for completing QA Review Worksheets and QA Monthly Spreadsheets)

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

- k. A requirement that scoring errors be noted and corrected in the automated system (without overriding the original scoring)

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

- l. A requirement that corrected pretrial assessment reports be immediately provided to judicial officers, prosecutors, and defenders

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

- m. A requirement to provide individual assessors timely and complete feedback on their scoring accuracy

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

- n. Transparency around the inclusion of assessors' scoring proficiency in performance reviews (where applicable)

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

- o. A requirement that, if patterns of errors are identified in an individual assessor's work and proficiency standards are not met, a remediation plan is put in place such that all assessments are reviewed prior to the dissemination of pretrial assessment reports until such time that the assessor's scoring accuracy consistently meets the expected threshold

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

- p. A requirement that documents used for quality assurance reviews (e.g., quality assurance worksheets) be retained

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

- q. An expectation that patterns of inaccuracy (by individual assessor or a portion of assessors) are identified for purposes of booster training

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

- r. An expectation that out-of-the-ordinary cases that presented scoring challenges be identified for purposes of booster training

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

s. Expectations for ongoing coaching and booster training

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

t. Expectations for ongoing (e.g., quarterly; semi-annually) interrater reliability sessions

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

u. The timing and method of reporting findings from quality assurance reviews to the policy team

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

v. The frequency with which an independent review will be conducted

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

w. The requirements and expectations of the independent review (e.g., the review period, the percentage of cases to be assessed, a requirement that the assessment include an equal percentage of cases by assessor, the methods for documenting and reporting the results of the independent review)

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

6. Was a policy developed that reflects the goals, values, decisions, processes, methods, responsibilities, and timelines agreed upon by the policy team relative to PSA quality assurance?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

The PSA Quality Assurance Checklist

Subsequent Fidelity Checks

1. Are all PSA assessors familiar with the PSA scoring quality assurance plan?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

2. Do quality assurance reviewers have the requisite skills to effectively fulfill their role?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

3. Do PSA quality assurance coaches receive the supports necessary to conduct effective coaching (e.g., time, booster training, opportunity to participate in coaching support networks)?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

4. Do supervisors routinely observe PSA assessors to ensure that they use the PSA scoring guide to complete assessments?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

5. Are quality assurance reviews conducted in accordance with the PSA scoring quality assurance plan in terms of the following?

a. Daily quality assurance review requirements

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

b. Monthly quality assurance review requirements

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

c. Percent of cases reviewed

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

d. Method of review

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

e. Documentation of review

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

f. Error correction processes

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

6. Do assessors receive timely and complete feedback on their scoring proficiency/areas in need of improvement?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

7. Are scoring proficiency requirements met (including interpretation of criminal history records) prior to allowing assessors to independently score PSAs and to generate and disseminate pretrial assessment reports?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

8. If PSA scoring errors are identified, are judicial officers, prosecutors, and defenders immediately notified and provided a corrected pretrial assessment report?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

9. When PSA errors are discovered and corrected, is the correction updated in the data system and the reason for the correction noted?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

10. Are PSA assessors who consistently demonstrate poor scoring proficiency given performance improvement plans (e.g., additional training and job shadowing) and prohibited from independently scoring PSAs until they demonstrate proficiency?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

11. Do assessors' performance reviews address their PSA scoring proficiency (where applicable)?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

12. Are ongoing coaching and booster trainings conducted? (Indicate frequency.)

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

13. Are routine (e.g., quarterly, semi-annual) interrater reliability sessions conducted? (Indicate frequency.)

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

14. Are periodic independent quality assurance reviews conducted to ensure that the quality assurance methods are working as intended?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

15. Has the local policy on PSA quality assurance been reviewed in the past year and updated as needed, has the updated policy replaced the previous version, and have all system stakeholders been made aware of the changes?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

Outcomes and Oversight Checklist

Initial Fidelity Check

1. Did the policy team discuss the purpose and importance of performance measurement?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

2. Did the policy team assign the Data Workgroup with the responsibility of carefully reviewing the Guide to Outcomes and Oversight, the Pretrial Outcomes Display, and the APPR Performance Measures documents?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

3. Did the Data Workgroup propose, and the policy team agree on, a set of key PSA and pretrial performance measures including, at a minimum, the following:

a. Appearance rates

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

b. No-new-arrest rates

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

c. No-new-violent-arrest rates

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

d. PSA scoring accuracy rate by factor

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

e. Overall PSA scoring accuracy rate

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

4. Were other performance measures, in addition to the suggested minimum requirements, identified? (List them.)

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

5. Did the policy team agree on achievement targets for each pretrial performance measure?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

6. Were methods established to collect and analyze data associated with the identified performance measures?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

7. Did the policy team consider and agree to display PSA data on the Pretrial Outcomes Display?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

8. Was an agreement established around the frequency (e.g., daily, monthly, quarterly) and method of reporting performance measurement data to the policy team?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

9. Did the policy team discuss the value of transparently sharing performance data?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

10. Was a method established to transparently share performance data (e.g., published reports, web-accessible dashboard)?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

11. Did the policy team discuss the value of conducting a PSA validation study?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

12. Did the policy team agree to establish a routine process of PSA validation (every one to three years is recommended)?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

13. Was a policy developed that reflects the goals, values, decisions, processes, methods, responsibilities, and timelines agreed upon by the policy team relative to outcomes and oversight?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

Outcomes and Oversight Checklist

Subsequent Fidelity Check

1. Does the policy team routinely (in accordance with local policy) review their pretrial performance measures?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

2. Has the PSA been validated on the local population?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

3. If the PSA has not been validated on the local population within the last 1–3 years, are plans underway to conduct a validation?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

4. If the PSA was validated on the local population in the last 1–3 years, have improvement needs been identified?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

5. If improvement needs were identified, have improvement methods been discussed and documented?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

6. If improvement methods were discussed and documented, have they been implemented?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

7. If improvement methods were implemented, have modifications been made, as needed, to the Release Conditions Matrix (reflecting FTA and NCA results from the local validation)?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

8. If improvement methods were implemented, have modifications been made, as needed, to the Pretrial Outcomes Display (reflecting FTA and NCA results from the local validation)?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

9. In reviewing the other pretrial performance measures, has the policy team discussed whether improvements are necessary?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

10. If the policy team determines that improvements are necessary, has it prepared and approved written performance improvement action plans?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

11. If the policy team has prepared and approved written performance action plans, it is implementing and monitoring those plans?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

12. Has the local policy on outcomes and oversight been reviewed in the past year and updated as needed, has the updated policy replaced the previous version, and have all system stakeholders been made aware of the changes?

No Partially Yes N/A or Unknown

Comments:

Appendix A: PSA Automation Worksheets

Initial Fidelity Check

Checklist Question	Assessment Method	People Responsible	Begin	End
1. Was a group of policy team members/representatives with technical expertise (hereafter, "Data Workgroup") assembled to consider how best to automate the PSA to meet local needs?				
2. Did the Data Workgroup review in detail the Guide to PSA Automation prior to considering how best to automate the PSA to meet local needs?				
3. Did the Data Workgroup consider the strengths and limitations of each automation option as they relate to the locality and identify the option best suited to the locality?				
4. Did the Data Workgroup discuss the automation options with the policy team and come to consensus on the selected method?				
5. If the policy team decided to program the PSA into an existing, local information technology system, did IT staff receive and review in detail the PSA Business Requirements?				
6. If the policy team decided to program the PSA into an existing, local information technology system, did IT staff receive the PSA Test Scenarios and run all 200 test scenarios?				
7. If the PSA was programmed locally and the 200 test scenarios were run, were any errors found?				
8. If the PSA was programmed locally and the test scenarios identified problems, were IT staff notified and instructed to review in detail the PSA Business Requirements and revise the software accordingly?				
9. If the PSA was programmed locally and revisions were made to the software as a result of the outcome of the test scenarios, were the 200 test scenarios rerun?				
10. Regardless of the specific automation decision made, did IT staff receive and review in detail the PSA Data Elements Worksheet to determine which PSA factors could be auto-populated?				

Checklist Question	Assessment Method	People Responsible	Begin	End
11. If some PSA factors were auto-populated, did the locality identify the number of test PSAs to run to manually verify the auto-populated data?				
12. If some PSA factors were auto-populated, was the auto-populated data verified manually to ensure that the software accurately interpreted the data?				
13. If some PSA factors were auto-populated and the manual fidelity check revealed interpretation inaccuracies, were steps taken to ensure the accuracy of auto-populated data or to disable the auto-population of the field?				
14. Was a policy developed that articulates the goals of PSA automation, as well as the business requirements, specifications, quality assurance processes, people charged with updating auto-populated fields and other responsibilities, and timelines agreed upon by the policy team?				

Subsequent Fidelity Checks

Checklist Question	Assessment Method	People Responsible	Begin	End
1. Have any changes been made to the way in which the PSA is automated since the initial fidelity check?				
2. If the PSA was programmed into an existing, local information technology system and changes were made, do those changes comply with the PSA Business Rules?				
3. If the PSA was programmed into an existing, local information technology system and changes were made, were the 200 test scenarios rerun?				
4. If the PSA was programmed locally and the 200 test scenarios were rerun, were any errors found?				
5. If the PSA was programmed locally and the test scenarios identified problems, were IT staff notified and instructed to review in detail the PSA Business Requirements and to revise the software accordingly?				
6. If the PSA was programmed locally and revisions were made to the software as a result of the outcome of the test scenarios, were the 200 test scenarios rerun?				
7. If some PSA factors were auto-populated, has the auto-populated data been routinely verified manually to ensure that the software accurately interpreted the data?				
8. Have there been routine checks to determine the continued accuracy of the PSA automation?				
9. Do PSA assessors always have access to the automated PSA?				
10. Has the local policy on PSA automation been reviewed in the past year and updated as needed, has the updated policy replaced the previous version, and have all system stakeholders been made aware of the changes?				

Appendix B: Release Conditions Matrix Worksheets

Initial Fidelity Check

Checklist Question	Assessment Method	People Responsible	Begin	End
1. Did the policy team discuss and understand the purpose and use of the Release Conditions Matrix?				
2. Was a representative group of stakeholders (hereafter, "RCM Workgroup") assembled to construct a Release Conditions Matrix unique to the locality?				
3. Did the RCM workgroup include community members and people directly impacted by the pretrial system?				
4. Did the RCM Workgroup review in detail the Guide to the Release Conditions Matrix prior to beginning work on the locality's Release Conditions Matrix?				
5. Did the RCM Workgroup download, review, and discuss the Examples of a Release Conditions Matrix?				
6. Did the RCM Workgroup download, review, and discuss the Release Conditions Matrix Presentation?				
7. Did the RCM Workgroup download, review, and discuss the PSA Results Presentation?				
8. Did the RCM Workgroup review state statutes for applicability to the Release Conditions Matrix?				
9. Did the RCM Workgroup develop a list of the currently available resources allocated for pretrial assistance?				
10. Did the RCM Workgroup discuss whether changes to the currently available resources allocated for pretrial assistance might be appropriate?				
11. Did the RCM Workgroup discuss whether it would be beneficial to allocate new/additional resources for pretrial assistance?				

Checklist Question	Assessment Method	People Responsible	Begin	End
12. Did the RCM Workgroup consider how new/additional resources might be made available?				
13. Did the RCM Workgroup describe the available resources on the worksheet provided in the Release Conditions Matrix Templates document?				
14. Did the RCM Workgroup identify the number of release levels that would be included on their Release Conditions Matrix?				
15. Did the RCM Workgroup discuss and agree to the association between resources and release levels?				
16. Did the RCM Workgroup discuss the appropriate release levels related to each failure to appear (FTA) and new criminal arrest (NCA) cell on the Release Conditions Matrix grid?				
17. Did the RCM Workgroup complete the grid included in the Release Conditions Matrix Templates to help them develop their locally tailored Release Conditions Matrix?				
18. Did the RCM Workgroup pull a sample of cases that fit within each proposed release level to confirm their decisions about the appropriate release conditions?				
19. When constructing the Release Conditions Matrix, did the RCM Workgroup use the least restrictive conditions necessary at each release level?				
20. When constructing the Release Conditions Matrix, did the RCM Workgroup exclude financial conditions of release, "detention," the use of the color red, and automatic bump-ups?				
21. Did the RCM Workgroup discuss their recommended Release Conditions Matrix and come to consensus on it with the full policy team?				
22. Did the RCM Workgroup discuss a method to identify and "flag" circumstances when the Release Conditions Matrix does not meet an individual defendant's needs for purposes of later discussion with the policy team and potential Release Conditions Matrix refinement?				
23. Was the final, local Release Conditions Matrix incorporated into the locality's method of PSA automation?				
24. Did an independent party review the accuracy of the Release Conditions Matrix data that was uploaded/incorporated?				
25. Was a policy developed that reflects the goals, values, appropriate uses, components of, and processes related to the Release Conditions Matrix?				

Subsequent Fidelity Checks

Checklist Question	Assessment Method	People Responsible	Begin	End
1. Did the RCM Workgroup reconvene to determine if modifications to the locality's Release Conditions Matrix were necessary for any reason?				
2. When local validation data was made available, did the RCM Workgroup replace the national outcome data with local outcome data?				
3. If changes were made to the locality's Release Conditions Matrix, did the policy team review and approve these changes, has the updated policy replaced the previous version, and were all system stakeholders made aware of the changes?				
4. If there was consensus to change the Release Conditions Matrix in any way, were these changes also made in the locality's PSA automation system?				
5. If changes were made to the Release Conditions Matrix, did an independent party review the accuracy of the Release Conditions Matrix data in the PSA automation system?				
6. Has the local policy on the Release Conditions Matrix been reviewed in the past year and updated as needed, has the updated policy replaced the previous version, and have all system stakeholders been made aware of the changes?				

Appendix C: PSA Violent Offense List Worksheets

Initial Fidelity Check

Checklist Question	Assessment Method	People Responsible	Begin	End
1. Did the policy team discuss and understand the purpose and use of the PSA Violent Offense List?				
2. Was a representative group of stakeholders (hereafter, "VOL Workgroup") assembled to construct the locality's PSA Violent Offense List?				
3. Did the VOL Workgroup review in detail the Guide to the PSA Violent Offense List prior to beginning work on the locality's PSA Violent Offense List?				
4. Did the VOL Workgroup download and review in detail the Violent Offense List Presentation?				
5. If another locality within the state was already using a PSA Violent Offense List, did the VOL Workgroup collect and review this list as a starting point for the development of the locality's list?				
6. If another locality within the state was not already using a PSA Violent Offense List, did the locality obtain from APPR the preliminary list of state criminal codes that appear to meet the PSA definition of violent?				
7. Did the VOL Workgroup carefully review the "Definition of a Violent Offense" section of the Guide to the PSA Violent Offense List when constructing the locality's PSA Violent Offense List?				
8. Did the VOL Workgroup review all state criminal offenses on the preliminary list from APPR or on the list obtained from another locality within the state to determine whether they meet the PSA definition of violent, adding any other offenses that met the definition and deleting any offenses that did not meet the definition?				
9. Did the VOL Workgroup determine if any offenses that meet the PSA definition of violent were <i>added</i> to the state's statutes since the preliminary list from APPR or list obtained from another locality was developed and, if so, did they add these offenses when constructing the locality's PSA Violent Offense List?				

Checklist Question	Assessment Method	People Responsible	Begin	End
10. Did the VOL Workgroup determine if any offenses were <i>revised</i> in the state's statutes since the preliminary list from APPR or list obtained from another locality was developed and, if so, did they make any revisions when constructing the locality's PSA Violent Offense List?				
11. Did the VOL Workgroup determine if any offenses were <i>removed</i> from the state's statutes and, if so, did they remove these offenses when constructing the locality's PSA Violent Offense List?				
12. Did the VOL Workgroup discuss their recommended PSA Violent Offense List and come to consensus on it with the full policy team?				
13. If the final PSA Violent Offense List is different from the list of another locality in the state, did the VOL Workgroup talk with that site in an effort to make the lists consistent with each other?				
14. Was the final, local PSA Violent Offense List incorporated into the locality's method of PSA automation?				
15. Did an independent party review the accuracy of the data that was uploaded/incorporated?				
16. Was a policy developed that reflects the purpose and use of the PSA Violent Offense List, the definition of violent offense relative to the PSA, the list of offenses that meet the PSA violent offense definition, the person who is responsible for keeping up with changes in statute and new charge codes that are considered violent, and the quality assurance processes associated with it?				

Subsequent Fidelity Checks

Checklist Question	Assessment Method	People Responsible	Begin	End
1. Has the VOL Workgroup reconvened as often as your state updates its laws to determine if statutory changes were instituted since they created the locality's PSA Violent Offense List?				
2. If statutory changes were made, did the VOL Workgroup update the locality's PSA Violent Offense List to include new criminal offenses that meet the PSA definition of violence and to remove those that no longer meet the definition?				
3. If changes were made to the locality's PSA Violent Offense List, did the policy team review and approve these changes, has the updated list replaced the previous version, and were all system stakeholders made aware of the changes?				
4. If there was consensus to change the PSA Violent Offense List in any way, were these changes made in the locality's PSA automation system?				
5. Regardless of whether changes were made to the PSA Violent Offense List, did an independent party review the accuracy of the PSA Violent Offense List data in the PSA automation system?				
6. Has the local policy on the PSA Violent Offense List been reviewed in the past year and updated as needed, has the updated policy replaced the previous version, and have all system stakeholders been made aware of the changes?				

Appendix D: PSA Factors and Outcomes Worksheets

Initial Fidelity Check

Checklist Question	Assessment Method	People Responsible	Begin	End
1. Did the members of the policy team receive training on the PSA and/or review and discuss informational materials on the PSA factors, how they are weighted and scored, the responsible use of the PSA, and the outcomes the PSA is designed to assess?				
2. Was a Scoring Manual Workgroup, comprised of one or more policy team members or representatives, put in place to develop a localized PSA Scoring Manual?				
3. Did the Scoring Manual Workgroup review in detail the Guide to the PSA Factors and Outcomes?				
4. Did the Scoring Manual Workgroup download and review in detail the PSA Scoring Manual?				
5. Did the Scoring Manual Workgroup identify potential changes to the scoring manual that pertain to local language and local practices and that add to—but do not alter—the guidance around PSA scoring contained in the PSA Scoring Manual?				
6. Did the Scoring Manual Workgroup review and seek consensus on modifications to the scoring manual to ensure its relevance to the locality?				
7. Was the scoring manual adapted to the locality and finalized, with the version of the document and the date that it was completed?				
8. Was a policy developed that reflects the purpose of the PSA Scoring Manual and expectations and requirements around its use?				

Subsequent Fidelity Checks

Checklist Question	Assessment Method	People Responsible	Begin	End
1. Do PSA assessors have ready, physical access to the locality's customized PSA Scoring Manual?				
2. Do PSA assessors review and follow the locality's customized PSA Scoring Manual in order to accurately complete each PSA?				
3. Have assessors or others identified additions/modifications that should be made to further customize the scoring manual to the locality (without altering the official scoring guidance provided in the PSA Scoring Manual)?				
4. If additions/modifications have been identified, has the policy team reviewed and approved them?				
5. If the policy team has approved additions/modifications, has the scoring manual been updated, including the addition of a new version number and date?				
6. If the scoring manual has been updated, have earlier versions of the manual been collected and replaced with the newest version?				
7. Has the local policy on the PSA Scoring Manual been reviewed in the past year and updated as needed, has the updated policy replaced the previous version, and have all system stakeholders been made aware of the changes?				

Appendix E: Pretrial Assessment Report Worksheets

Initial Fidelity Check

Checklist Question	Assessment Method	People Responsible	Begin	End
1. Did one or more team representatives review in detail the Guide to the Pretrial Assessment Report?				
2. Did one or more team representatives download and review in detail the Template Pretrial Assessment Report?				
3. For localities that automated the PSA using their own internal information technology resources, did one or more team representatives develop a recommended template for their locality's pretrial assessment report based on the Template Pretrial Assessment Report?				
4. For localities that automated the PSA using their own internal information technology resources, did the policy team provide input into and finalize a format for the local pretrial assessment report?				
5. For localities that automated the PSA using their own internal information technology resources, was the local pretrial assessment report programmed by local information technology staff?				
6. For localities that automated the PSA using their own internal information technology resources, did the policy team review the programmed pretrial assessment report for compliance with requirements and adherence to the policy team's requests?				
7. For localities that automated the PSA using software purchased from an approved vendor or by using APPR's complimentary PSA Scoring App, did one or more team representatives review the report that the software generated to determine the ways in which it can and should be customized to the locality?				
8. Is the pretrial assessment report appropriately titled?				
9. Does the pretrial assessment report include a list of the PSA factors, the answers for each PSA factor for each assessed person, and the likelihood of success for the factor score?				
10. Does each person's pretrial assessment report include basic identifying information, the current charge(s), and presumptive release conditions, if any, as described in the local Release Conditions Matrix?				

Checklist Question	Assessment Method	People Responsible	Begin	End
11. To the extent that the PSA automation method allows, did the policy team determine whether additional information should be included on the pretrial assessment report?				
12. Is the pretrial assessment report completed and generated in advance of each person's first appearance hearing?				
13. Is the pretrial assessment report consistently provided to judicial officers, prosecutors, and defenders?				
14. Was a policy developed that reflects the purpose, use, contents, and processes associated with the pretrial assessment report, as well as how the report is stored and who has access to it?				

Subsequent Fidelity Checks

Checklist Question	Assessment Method	People Responsible	Begin	End
1. Is the pretrial assessment report completed and generated in advance of each person's first appearance hearing?				
2. Is the pretrial assessment report consistently provided to judicial officers, prosecutors, and defenders?				
3. Has the local policy on the pretrial assessment report been reviewed in the past year and updated as needed, has the updated policy replaced the previous version, and have all system stakeholders been made aware of the changes?				

Appendix F: Stakeholder Education Worksheets

Initial Fidelity Check

Checklist Question	Assessment Method	People Responsible	Begin	End
1. Did the policy team discuss the importance of conducting stakeholder education related to pretrial improvements generally and the PSA specifically?				
2. Did the policy team identify one or more people to assume responsibility for planning and conducting PSA stakeholder education?				
3. Did the people responsible for coordinating stakeholder education download and review in detail each of the materials developed to support the stakeholder education session (i.e., lesson plan, presentation, agenda, PSA Factors & Pretrial Outcomes handout, PSA Points & Scales handout, and List of References handout)?				
4. Did the people responsible for coordinating stakeholder education identify one or more trainers who have sufficient familiarity with the PSA and with the stakeholder education curriculum to conduct the session?				
5. Did the people responsible for coordinating stakeholder education discuss with the policy team which groups would be encouraged to participate in the session (focusing specifically on judicial officers, prosecutors, defenders, law enforcement, court administration, victim service providers, community groups, and pretrial agency representatives)?				
6. Did the people responsible for coordinating stakeholder education discuss with the policy team the most appropriate point in time to conduct the session?				
7. Did the people responsible for coordinating stakeholder education adequately prepare for the session (i.e., adapt the curriculum for local use, effectively coordinate the session's logistics)?				
8. Did the people responsible for coordinating stakeholder education effectively identify and prepare participants for the session's purpose and content?				
9. Did the people identified for participation attend the session?				

Checklist Question	Assessment Method	People Responsible	Begin	End
10. Did the trainer(s) follow the lesson plan and conduct the session as designed?				
11. Were questions/concerns that stakeholders raised during or after the session brought to the attention of the policy team (or other appropriate parties) for consideration and subsequently addressed?				
12. Did the policy team debrief on the stakeholder education session and determine if (and when) follow-up education would be conducted?				
13. Was a policy developed that reflects the content for, and expectations associated with, initial and ongoing stakeholder education?				

Subsequent Fidelity Checks

Checklist Question	Assessment Method	People Responsible	Begin	End
1. Have any structured methods been instituted to receive stakeholder feedback—or ascertain stakeholder attitudes and knowledge—about the appropriate and effective use of the PSA?				
2. Have these structured methods for receiving feedback been implemented?				
3. Has the policy team taken steps to consider whether additional stakeholder education is needed?				
4. Have additional stakeholder education sessions been implemented?				
5. Has the local policy on stakeholder education been reviewed in the past year and updated as needed, has the updated policy replaced the previous version, and have all system stakeholders been made aware of the changes?				

Appendix G: Assessor Training Worksheets

Initial Fidelity Check

Checklist Question	Assessment Method	People Responsible	Begin	End
1. Did the policy team discuss the importance of conducting assessor training prior to PSA implementation?				
2. Did the policy team identify one or more people to assume responsibility for planning and conducting the assessor training?				
3. Did the people responsible for coordinating the assessor training download and review in detail each of the materials developed to support the training (i.e., lesson plan, presentation, agenda, PSA Factors & Pretrial Outcomes handout, PSA Points & Scales handout, List of References handout, PSA Practice Cases, PSA Practice Case Worksheet, and PSA Assessor Worksheet)?				
4. Did the people responsible for coordinating the assessor training identify one or more trainers who have sufficient familiarity with the PSA and with the assessor training curriculum to conduct the session?				
5. Did the people responsible for coordinating the assessor training discuss with the policy team who would be required to participate in the session?				
6. Did the people responsible for coordinating the assessor training ensure that participants had access to all necessary tools and systems so that the training was effectively skill based?				
7. Did the people responsible for coordinating the assessor training discuss with the policy team and identify ancillary training that should be provided?				
8. Was the assessor training (including any necessary ancillary training) conducted within the prescribed time period (i.e., approximately one month prior to PSA implementation)?				
9. Did the people responsible for coordinating the assessor training adequately prepare for the session (i.e., adapt the curriculum for local use, provide local case examples, effectively coordinate the session's logistics)?				

Checklist Question	Assessment Method	People Responsible	Begin	End
10. Did the people responsible for coordinating the assessor training effectively identify and prepare participants for the session's purpose and content?				
11. Did the people identified for participation attend the session?)				
12. Did the trainer(s) follow the lesson plan and deliver the training as designed?				
13. Were questions/concerns that PSA assessors identified during or after the session brought to the attention of the policy team (or other appropriate parties) and subsequently addressed?				
14. Did the policy team debrief on the assessor training and determine if (and when) follow-up training would be conducted?				
15. Did assessors practice scoring the PSA after their training and before the PSA's launch?				
16. Was a policy developed that reflects the content for, and expectations associated with, initial and ongoing assessor training?				

Subsequent Fidelity Checks

Checklist Question	Assessment Method	People Responsible	Begin	End
1. Has an ongoing method to provide PSA assessor training for people who were not in attendance at the initial training been developed and documented?				
2. Does the ongoing training of new PSA assessors adhere to the guidance and content included in the PSA assessor training curriculum?				
3. Have all people conducting PSA assessments been thoroughly trained as described in the PSA assessor training curriculum?				
4. Has the local policy on assessor training been reviewed in the past year and updated as needed, has the updated policy replaced the previous version, and have all system stakeholders been made aware of the changes?				

Appendix H: PSA Quality Assurance Worksheets

Initial Fidelity Check

Checklist Question	Assessment Method	People Responsible	Begin	End
1. Has a comprehensive, written PSA scoring quality assurance plan been developed?				
2. Did the developers of the quality assurance plan download and carefully review the Guide to Quality Assurance and its accompanying resources?				
3. Has the policy team reviewed and approved the PSA scoring quality assurance plan?				
4. Has the PSA scoring quality assurance plan been provided to all PSA assessors?				
5. Does the PSA scoring quality assurance plan contain the information indicated on pages 59–63?				
6. Was a policy developed that reflects the goals, values, decisions, processes, methods, responsibilities, and timelines agreed upon by the policy team relative to PSA quality assurance?				

Subsequent Fidelity Checks

Checklist Question	Assessment Method	People Responsible	Begin	End
1. Are all PSA assessors familiar with the PSA scoring quality assurance plan?				
2. Do quality assurance reviewers have the requisite skills to effectively fulfill their role?				
3. Do PSA quality assurance coaches receive the supports necessary to conduct effective coaching (e.g., time, booster training, opportunity to participate in coaching support networks)?				
4. Do supervisors routinely observe PSA assessors to ensure that they use the PSA scoring guide to complete assessments?				
5. Are quality assurance reviews conducted in accordance with the PSA scoring quality assurance plan in terms of daily and monthly quality assurance review requirements, percent of cases reviewed, method of review, documentation of review, and error correction processes?				
6. Do assessors receive timely and complete feedback on their scoring proficiency/areas in need of improvement?				
7. Are scoring proficiency requirements met (including interpretation of criminal history records) prior to allowing assessors to independently score PSAs and to generate and disseminate pretrial assessment reports?				
8. If PSA scoring errors are identified, are judicial officers, prosecutors, and defenders immediately notified and provided a corrected pretrial assessment report?				
9. When PSA errors are discovered and corrected, is the correction updated in the data system and the reason for the correction noted?				
10. Are PSA assessors who consistently demonstrate poor scoring proficiency given performance improvement plans and prohibited from independently scoring PSAs until they demonstrate proficiency?				
11. Do assessors' performance reviews address their PSA scoring proficiency (where applicable)?				

Checklist Question	Assessment Method	People Responsible	Begin	End
12. Are ongoing coaching and booster trainings conducted?				
13. Are routine interrater reliability sessions conducted?				
14. Are periodic independent quality assurance reviews conducted to ensure that the quality assurance methods are working as intended?				
15. Has the local policy on PSA quality assurance been reviewed in the past year and updated as needed, has the updated policy replaced the previous version, and have all system stakeholders been made aware of the changes?				

Appendix I: Outcomes and Oversight Worksheets

Initial Fidelity Check

Checklist Question	Assessment Method	People Responsible	Begin	End
1. Did the policy team discuss the purpose and importance of performance measurement?				
2. Did the policy team assign the Data Workgroup with the responsibility of carefully reviewing the Guide to Outcomes and Oversight, the Pretrial Outcomes Display, and the APPR Performance Measures documents?				
3. Did the Data Workgroup propose, and the policy team agree on, a set of key PSA and pretrial performance measures including, at a minimum, appearance rates, no-new-arrest rates, no-new-violent-arrest rates, PSA scoring accuracy rate by factor, and overall PSA scoring accuracy rate?				
4. Were other performance measures, in addition to the suggested minimum requirements, identified?				
5. Did the policy team agree on achievement targets for each pretrial performance measure?				
6. Were methods established to collect and analyze data associated with the identified performance measures?				
7. Did the policy team consider and agree to display PSA data on the Pretrial Outcomes Display?				
8. Was an agreement established around the frequency (e.g., daily, monthly, quarterly) and method of reporting performance measurement data to the policy team?				
9. Did the policy team discuss the value of transparently sharing performance data?				
10. Was a method established to transparently share performance data?				

Checklist Question	Assessment Method	People Responsible	Begin	End
11. Did the policy team discuss the value of conducting a PSA validation study?				
12. Did the policy team agree to establish a routine process of PSA validation (every one to three years is recommended)?				
13. Was a policy developed that reflects the goals, values, decisions, processes, methods, responsibilities, and timelines agreed upon by the policy team relative to outcomes and oversight?				

Subsequent Fidelity Checks

Checklist Question	Assessment Method	People Responsible	Begin	End
1. Does the policy team routinely (in accordance with local policy) review their pretrial performance measures?				
2. Has the PSA been validated on the local population?				
3. If the PSA has not been validated on the local population within the last 1–3 years, are plans underway to conduct a validation?				
4. If the PSA was validated on the local population in the last 1–3 years, have improvement needs been identified?				
5. If improvement needs were identified, have improvement methods been discussed and documented?				
6. If improvement methods were discussed and documented, have they been implemented?				
7. If improvement methods were implemented, have modifications been made, as needed, to the Release Conditions Matrix (reflecting FTA and NCA results from the local validation)?				
8. If improvement methods were implemented, have modifications been made, as needed, to the Pretrial Outcomes Display (reflecting FTA and NCA results from the local validation)?				
9. In reviewing the other pretrial performance measures, has the policy team discussed whether improvements are necessary?				
10. If the policy team determines that improvements are necessary, has it prepared and approved written performance improvement action plans?				
11. If the policy team has prepared and approved written performance action plans, is it implementing and monitoring those plans?				
12. Has the local policy on outcomes and oversight been reviewed in the past year and updated as needed, has the updated policy replaced the previous version, and have all system stakeholders been made aware of the changes?				

Appendix J: Fidelity Action Plan

Area of Improvement	Action Plan	Lead	Begin	Progress Notes	End

