MINNESOTA JUDICIAL BRANCH

FOURTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

Fourth Judicial District Pretrial Evaluation: Scale Validation Study

October, 2006

Deborah Eckberg, Ph.D., Principal Research Analyst

Gina Kubits, Research Analyst I

Executive Summary

Fourth Judicial District Pretrial Evaluation:
Scale Validation Study

Background

The current Pretrial Scale used in the Fourth Judicial District was designed in 1992 by a cross-departmental committee after 18 months of investigation. The report that was written at that time suggested that this new scale should be validated within the first few years of use. As it turned out, it has been closer to 14 years before the research to evaluate the tool was enacted.

The purpose of a full bail evaluation is to determine the risk level that defendants have for committing a new crime or failing to appear for an appearance while they are in pretrial status. Those at the lowest risk can be released without any special requirements. Those defendants who are at higher risk will be released with certain conditions imposed upon their behavior (conditional release) while those at the highest risk will be released only after review by a judge and if they post a certain amount of bail or post a bond.

There are about 7,000-8,000 full bail evaluations performed each year by the Community Corrections Department where the Pretrial Scale is utilized. The current research started with a 10% random sample of people who were arrested and evaluated using the Pretrial Scale during the years of 2000-2004.

Research Questions

The main question this research was designed to address was whether the Pretrial Evaluation Scale used in Hennepin County (synonymous with the Fourth Judicial District) was able to reliably predict both outcome variables (pretrial crime and failure to appear pretrial). Other research questions included whether racial bias was associated with any of the scale items and whether the scale still identifies a similar proportion of those evaluated as needing judicial review.

Finally, policy makers were curious about how often and to what effect probation officers asked the court to override the scale score. In this jurisdiction, probation officers have a place on the evaluation form to indicate that they find some reason to deviate from the scale score recommendation. We kept track of those overrides and we will evaluate whether the probation override is a better, similar or worse indicator of pretrial crime and failure to appear. We will also determine whether or not the probation override introduces any racial bias independent of the scale.

Results

Predictive Ability of the Model
        The current pretrial evaluation scale does a better job of predicting the outcome variables than the previous scale used in this jurisdiction or than other models tested by the previous research, but even the current scale does a poor job of explaining the variation in pretrial failure. The scale does a slightly better job of predicting failure to appear pretrial than predicting a new crime pretrial. Only five of the nine indicators are actually necessary to predict pretrial crime and the likelihood of missing a court appearance. These indicators are related to the main charge (was the offense on the Judicial Review[1] list, was it not on the list but still at the felony level), the employment situation (knowing whether the defendant was employed 20 hours or more per week), and prior history (knowing the prior criminal history score and prior failures to appear within the previous three years).

        Four indicators on the scale are not significant predictors of pretrial crime or failure to appear: whether the defendant is a Minnesota resident, whether the defendant lives alone, the age of the defendant when booked for the main charge, and whether or not a weapon was used during the main offense.

Racial Bias of the Scale Items
        Three of the scale indicators are correlated with race but are not correlated with committing a new offense while on pretrial status or missing a court appearance: using a weapon during the main offense, living alone and being under the age of 21 at the booking for the main charge. Living alone and using a weapon were indicators added to the scale for policy reasons and not because the previous statistical work indicated that they were important; furthermore neither of these variables ended up being significant indicators in the full logistic regression models.

        Prior research suggests being under the age of 21 at the point of booking for the main charge is a statistically significant indicator for both outcome variables.[2]   In the current study it was related to failing to appear but is not related to pretrial crime. There are fewer defendants who are 21 or younger during our study years compared to the previous research, and this indicator was not significant in the full model.

        When whites and non-whites are examined separately, very similar results occurred in terms of the type of indicators that predicted failure during the pretrial window and the direction of the prediction. Given that the same indicators are significant for white and non-white defendants and that three of the four non-significant indicators are correlated to race it is recommended that these indicators be dropped from the scale or replaced with indicators that improve the ability to predict pretrial failures.

---

[1] Offenses include felony level crimes mostly against persons; robbery, assault, homicide, (Appendix A)
[2] Goodman, Becky, (1992) Hennepin County Bureau of Community Corrections, Planning and Evaluation, *Pretrial Release Study*.
Goldkamp, John, (1987) "Prediction in Criminal Justice Policy Development" in *Prediction and Classification: Criminal Justice Decision Making,* ed. Don Gottfredson and Michael Tonry. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Has the average scale score increased recently?

Since 1992 when the scale was developed, there have been many discussions as to whether or not the average score for defendants was increasing. Some of the arguments have been that the aging population had had more time to gain prior offenses which would increase the prior history points and raise the overall score. In addition, others speculated that more sophisticated data information systems made it easier to gain information about prior offenses from other jurisdictions and that also could raise the overall score. In reality, the average scale score has not changed over the five years of this study and is also very similar to when the scale was developed 14 years ago.

Probation Overrides

Probation officers only agreed with the scale score in slightly more than 53% of the cases; in another 11% of the cases they recommend a less restrictive release option than the scale suggested, and in 36% of the cases they recommended a more restrictive release decision than the scale. A content analysis of the reasons for the overrides suggests that probation officers find other indicators on the full bail evaluation but not on the Pretrial Scale itself to be the driving force behind the overrides. For example, they cite victim safety, chemical dependency issues, mental health issues or refusal by the defendant to stay on his/her medication as reasons to request an override. In addition probation officers often ask for more restrictive release decisions when they do not have all of the information available to them, such as when they have not seen the police report, have not been able to contact the victim or when they are unable to determine whether a weapon was used in the commission of the crime. Finally, for some lower level crimes (gross and common misdemeanor crimes) the scale does not differentiate whether the defendant had one or ten prior offenses and the same was true for failure to appear – six points are added to the scale score for one missed appearances or ten missed appearances. For defendants with multiple past low level convictions or multiple failures to appear probation would ask for more restrictive overrides.

When probation officers recommended a more restrictive release policy than was suggested by the pretrial scale, it was more often for white defendants than for non-white defendants and this was true for both pretrial crime and failure to appear. For pretrial crime this relationship held true regardless of whether the defendant actually committed pretrial crime or not. However, for failure to appear, probation officers asked for more restrictive overrides for white defendants who did *not* fail to show up for a pretrial appearance significantly more than for similar non-white defendants (52% versus 28%). There were no significant differences in how probation officers asked for overrides for defendants who did fail to appear.

Probation overrides improved the failure to appear equation only for whites and, when added to the significant indicators from the Pretrial Evaluation Scale, the odds of predicting who would fail to make a court appearance pretrial increased. The overrides did not improve the odds of predicting who would commit pretrial crime and did not improve the ability to determine which non-whites would fail to appear for court.

Table of Contents

Introduction

The current Pretrial Scale tool used in the Fourth Judicial District was designed in 1992. The report that was written at that time suggested that this new scale should be validated within the first few years of use. As it turned out, it has been closer to 14 years before the research to evaluate the tool was enacted.

Prior to 1992, Hennepin County utilized a modified Vera scale. The current scale was designed to improve on some of the shortcomings of that scale. In particular, Dr. Ericson (nee Goodman in 1992)[3], notes that there were a number of advantages in the new scale such as: a wider range of possible scores making a person with a high number of prior convictions quite visible to the Court, fewer items that relied on defendant self-reported information, an institutionalized mechanism for sharing the decision of release between the pretrial unit and the bench, and less dependence on indicators that are related to race but were not necessarily related to the types of pretrial failure the scale was attempting to measure. Finally, since the modified Vera scale did not include prior criminal record as part of the scale, an individual who had a prior serious conviction for a person crime but was currently being evaluated for a more minor offense would have been released without conditions under that system. Under the new pretrial scale, such a person would be released with conditions since prior convictions are included in the point scale, and those convictions for crimes against persons are given higher scores.

Pretrial Release Process

People who are arrested and jailed at the Hennepin County Detention Center can be released in a number of different manners. They can be released by the Sheriff's Office if they meet the qualification for 'no bail required' as established by the Fourth Judicial District. They can also be released if no charges are filed within 72 hours. If they are arrested on felony probable cause and charged by complaint, arrested on a complaint warrant, or arrested by tab charge for an alcohol or person-related offense, they will be seen by the Community Corrections Pretrial Unit for review. The Pretrial Unit has release authority granted by the court for people who score lower than 17 on the Pretrial Scale. People who score 18 points or higher on the Pretrial Scale must be reviewed by a judge prior to release.

The purpose of a full bail evaluation is to determine which defendants are at the lowest risk level for committing a new crime or failing to appear for an appearance while they are on pretrial status. Those at the lowest risk can be released without any special requirements. Those defendants who are at higher risk will be released with certain conditions imposed upon their behavior (conditional release) while those at the highest risk will be released only if they post a certain amount of bail. Besides calculating the Pretrial Scale score, a full bail evaluation includes a criminal history review, an interview with the defendant, and collateral phone calls to verify the information that has been given during the interview.

---

[3] Goodman, Rebecca, Senior Statistical Analyst, Pretrial Release Study. Hennepin County Bureau of Community Corrections, December, 1992, p. 19

Current Analysis Sample

There are about 7,000-8,000 full bail evaluations performed each year by the Community Corrections Department where the Pretrial Scale is utilized. The current research includes a 10% random sample of people who were arrested and evaluated using the Pretrial Scale during the years of 2000-2004. Table 1 below shows the number of cases that were selected in the random sample.

Table 1. Random Sample of 10% of cases Scaled in 5 years		
Year	**Number of Cases**	**Percent**
2000	863	22.5
2001	714	18.6
2002	748	19.5
2003	787	20.5
2004	731	19.0
Total	3,843	100.0

The data for the selected random sample were then matched to data in the Fourth Judicial District's criminal database to retrieve key information on case processing. In order to determine the pretrial window (from release from jail to first final disposition), we needed to determine the dates for each of these events. There were some situations for which we were not able to retrieve this information. In some cases, we could not retrieve any case information because the case has been expunged from the criminal data base and in other cases there was no final disposition date because the person was on warrant status and had never returned so that the court could complete the case. These situations accounted for 179 cases (or 4.7%).

One other situation that necessitated eliminating cases due to insufficient data occurred when the bail evaluation was completed after the first final disposition but while the case was still under court jurisdiction. This accounted for another 95 cases being removed from the analysis (2.5%).

There was one additional group of cases that didn't fit into the normal use of the bail evaluation – cases where the current bail evaluation, selected through sampling, occurred quite late in the age of the case. In a few cases, the bail evaluation score was completed several years after the start of the case. This situation accounts for another 191 cases (4.9%). Table 2 below shows the final cases that were included in the subsequent analysis. The reader will notice that the distribution of the final cases selected is very similar to the original random sample. In other words, no systematic exclusion occurred for any of the years in the sample.

Table 2. Final Selection of Cases with Full Data		
Year Scaled	Frequency	Percent
2000	740	21.9
2001	631	18.7
2002	652	19.3
2003	722	21.4
2004	633	18.7
Total	3,378	100.0

Percent Released

Cases can be released from pretrial detention for a number of different reasons, such as bailing out of jail or because of how they scaled on the Pretrial tool. The table below shows the number and percent of cases released prior to the end of their case. On average, about 80% of the cases that are scaled are released during the pretrial window.

Table 3. Year Scaled by Whether the Person was Released Pretrial				
Year Scaled		Was the person released pretrial?		Total
		No	Yes	
2000	Count	127	613	740
	Row %	17.2%	82.8%	100.0%
2001	Count	114	517	631
	Row %	18.1%	81.9%	100.0%
2002	Count	155	497	652
	Row %	23.8%	76.2%	100.0%
2003	Count	176	546	722
	Row %	24.4%	75.6%	100.0%
2004	Count	117	516	633
	Row %	18.5%	81.5%	100.0%
Total	Count	689	2,689	3,378
	Row %	20.4%	79.6%	100.0%

One of the goals of the original research that constructed this pretrial scale was to be able to release at least 60% of those evaluated prior to or at the first appearance date in court. The table below shows that for each of the years included in the study, the goal of 60% release was met in each of the years reviewed.

Table 4. Number and Percent of Pretrial Evaluations that result in a Release Prior to or At the First Appearance				
Year Scaled		**Released before or at the First Appearance**		**Total**
		No	**Yes**	
2000	**Count**	274	466	740
	Row %	37.0%	63.0%	100.0%
2001	**Count**	248	383	631
	Row %	39.3%	60.7%	100.0%
2002	**Count**	228	424	652
	Row %	35.0%	65.0%	100.0%
2003	**Count**	258	464	722
	Row %	35.7%	64.3%	100.0%
2004	**Count**	207	426	633
	Row %	32.7%	67.3%	100.0%
Total	**Count**	1215	2,163	3,378
	Row %	36.0%	64.0%	100.0%

Demographics of those Evaluated

Nearly 45% of the defendants were under the age of 30, another 30% were between 30 and 40 years old, and only one quarter of the sample were 40 or older. Males made up nearly 83% of the sample, although females comprised up to 20% of the sample by 2004. Forty-two percent of those evaluated were white and another 48% were black or African American. American Indians or Natives comprised 6% of the sample, while people of Asian or Hispanic descent made up two percent each.

Two-thirds of those evaluated were single and never married. Another 14% were married at the point of the interview, and 15% were divorced, separated or widowed. No marital information was available on 4% of the sample. Over one-third of those evaluated reported having no children, 20% had one child and another 18% had two children. Eleven percent reported three children, and 13% reported having 4 or more children.

More than one-quarter of the people in our sample had not completed high school (26%), and 28% were high school graduates. Eleven percent had attended or graduated from college, and another 19% reported post college education. We had no available education information on 15% of the sample.

Pretrial Scale Indicators

Over half of the defendants were charged with offenses that were on the Judicial Review list (see Appendix A for a full listing of offenses and a copy of the Pretrial Evaluation Scale). These offenses included such crimes as homicide, assault, robbery, kidnapping, arson, burglary, drug sales and criminal sexual conduct. Another 21% were charged with a felony level offense but not one that was on the Judicial Review list. Use of a weapon was charged in 11% percent of these cases.

Thirty-nine percent of defendants in the sample were employed less than 20 hours per week, were not students and had no sources of income. Only 15% of those evaluated live alone. Only 5% of those in the sample were not born in Minnesota or had been here less than 3 months. Less than 16% were 21 years of age or younger at the time of the pretrial interview.

The criminal history of one-fifth of those interviewed included prior felony or gross misdemeanor person convictions and 19% included misdemeanor level person convictions. Nearly one-third (31%) also had one or more non-person felony convictions and 61% had one or more gross or common misdemeanor non-person convictions. Table 5 shows entire scale and each component with its accompanying point total.

Table 5. Pretrial Scale Point Scale			
Pretrial Scale Item	Scale Score	Percent Receiving the Points	Percent Not Receiving the Points
Present Offense on the Judicial Review List	+9	52.2%	47.8%
Weapon Used (609.11)	+9	11.2%	88.8%
Present offense was a felony not on Judicial Review List	+3	21.0%	79.0%
Age as of the booking date 21 or younger	+3	15.8%	84.2%
Living Alone	+1	14.7%	85.3%
Employed less than 20 hours or, unemployed, and not a student	+3	38.8%	61.2%
Current MN Resident 3 months or less	+1	4.9%	95.1%
Each prior Felony or Gross Misdemeanor person conviction	+9	20.1%	79.9%
Each prior Misdemeanor Person conviction	+6	19.8%	80.2%
1 or more prior other felony conviction	+3	31.2%	68.8%
1 or more prior other gross/misdemeanor conviction	+1	61.0%	39.0%
Failure to appear within last three years	+6	30.6%	69.4%

Research Questions

This research was started as a result of a number of factors: primarily, the question remained as to whether the scale was valid on both dependent variables (pretrial crime and failure to appear) since the follow up study had never been conducted. In addition, this research will determine whether racial bias was associated with any of the scale items, whether the scale still identifies a similar proportion of those evaluated as needing judicial review, and finally, how often and to what effect the probation override was used. In this jurisdiction, probation officers have a spot on the evaluation form to indicate that they find some reason to deviate from the scale score recommendation. We kept track of those overrides, and we will evaluate whether the probation override is a better, similar or worse indicator of pretrial crime and failure to appear. We will also determine whether or not the probation override introduces any racial bias independent of the scale.

Scale Recommendations

Within our sample, about 35% of the cases scored 18 or higher on the Pretrial Scale and that would require bail prior to release. Another 37% scored 9-17 on the Pretrial scale and this would indicate being released with specific conditions. Finally, 25% were recommended to be released with no bail and no conditions (scoring 8 or below). Three percent of our sample was in a category labeled 'unable to score' which can occur for a number of different reasons, such as incomplete data, a defendant not cooperating with the evaluator, etc.

Table 6. Scale Score Recommendation		
	Frequency	**Percent**
Unable to Score	116	3.4
No Bail Required	837	24.8
Conditional Release	1,239	36.7
Bail Required	1,186	35.1
Total	3,378	100.0

Over the five years evaluated, the percentages in each category of scale recommendations have been fairly consistent.

Table 7. Scale Score Recommendation by Year Scaled						
Year of Pretrial Scale		**Scale Score Recommendation**				**Total**
		Unable to Score	**No Bail Required**	**Conditional Release**	**Bail Required**	
2000	**Count**	9	190	268	273	740
	Row %	1.2%	25.7%	36.2%	36.9%	100.0%
2001	**Count**	26	150	251	204	631
	Row %	4.1%	23.8%	39.8%	32.3%	100.0%
2002	**Count**	26	172	240	214	652
	Row %	4.0%	26.4%	36.8%	32.8%	100.0%
2003	**Count**	34	166	243	279	722
	Row %	4.7%	23.0%	33.7%	38.6%	100.0%
2004	**Count**	21	159	237	216	633
	Row %	3.3%	25.1%	37.4%	34.1%	100.0%
Total	**Count**	116	837	1,239	1,186	3,378
	Row %	3.4%	24.8%	36.7%	35.1%	100.0%

Probation Recommendations

Probation officers recommended bail more often than the scale suggested for 60% of the sample. Across the entire sample, they recommended bail over half the time (56%). They also recommended conditional release 29% less often than the scale suggested and they recommended NBR 32% less than the scale score indicated. In only about 17% of the cases the probation officer recommended NBR (no bail required), and in a little over a quarter of all of the cases they recommended conditional release. Clearly, the probation officers do not feel that the scale captures some critical components of the risks of pretrial crime and missing court appearances pretrial.

Table 8. Probation Recommendation		
	Frequency	**Percent**
Unable to Score	40	1.2
No Bail Required	572	16.9
Conditional Release	879	26.0
Bail Required	1,887	55.9
Total	3,378	100.0

Once again, we see consistency in the recommendations over the five years included in the study. In reviewing the probation officers' recommendations we see that for each year they recommended bail in over half of the cases, in about one-quarter of the cases they recommended conditional release, and in 15-17% of the cases they recommended NBR.

Table 9. Probation Recommendation by Year Scaled						
		Probation Recommendation				
Year of Pretrial Scale		**Unable to Score**	**No Bail Required**	**Conditional Release**	**Bail Required**	**Total**
2000	**Count**	5	113	230	392	740
	Row %	.7%	15.3%	31.1%	53.0%	100.0%
2001	**Count**	6	107	177	341	631
	Row %	1.0%	17.0%	28.1%	54.0%	100.0%
2002	**Count**	9	115	161	367	652
	Row %	1.4%	17.6%	24.7%	56.3%	100.0%
2003	**Count**	6	123	163	430	722
	Row %	.8%	17.0%	22.6%	59.6%	100.0%
2004	**Count**	14	114	148	357	633
	Row %	2.2%	18.0%	23.4%	56.4%	100.0%
Total	**Count**	40	572	879	1,887	3,378
	Row %	1.2%	16.9%	26.0%	55.9%	100.0%

Agreement between Scale and Probation Recommendations

The pretrial scale and the probation officer's recommendation coincide in over half of the evaluations, but in a full third of the cases or more, probation officers are

recommending a higher level of release than the scale would recommend (Table 10). So, for example, if the scale recommends conditional release, the probation officers feel bail should be required. In about 10-12% of the cases the probation officers feel that the scale has scored the defendant at too high a level, and thus they recommend a lower level of release.

Table 10. Agreement between Scale and Probation Recommendation by year					
Year of Pretrial Scale		**Do Scale Score and Probation recommendations agree?**			**Total**
		Override less	**No Override**	**Override more**	
2000	**Count**	73	395	251	719
	Row %	10.2%	54.9%	34.9%	100.0%
2001	**Count**	72	296	222	590
	Row %	12.2%	50.2%	37.6%	100.0%
2002	**Count**	62	316	229	607
	Row %	10.2%	52.1%	37.7%	100.0%
2003	**Count**	79	367	230	676
	Row %	11.7%	54.3%	34.0%	100.0%
2004	**Count**	70	298	223	591
	Row %	11.8%	50.4%	37.7%	100.0%
Total	**Count**	356	1,672	1,155	3,183
	Row %	11.2%	52.5%	36.3%	100.0%
Override less=Scale would recommend Conditional Release but Probation recommended NBR - or - Scale would recommend Bail Required while Probation recommended CR or NBR. **Override more**=Scale would recommend NBR but Probation recommended Conditional Release or Bail Required - or - Scale would recommend CR but Probation recommended Bail Required.					

Missing data=195.

Where was the agreement and disagreement?

When the scale recommended no bail be required, probation officers were recommending a more restrictive release decision 62% of the time (see Table 11). They agreed with the scale 38% of the time. In over half of the cases where the scale recommended conditional release, probation officers recommended that bail be required, and in 16% of cases they recommended NBR. In about 30% of the cases where conditional release was recommended by the scale score, the probation officers agreed. The area that showed the most agreement was the most restrictive release decision – bail required. When the scale recommended bail, the probation officers agreed 86% of the time and only recommended less than the scale 14% of the time.

Table 11. Scale Score Recommendation by whether there was agreement between the Scale Score and Probation				
Scale Score Recommendation	**Agreement between Scale Score and Probation recommendations**			**Total**
	Override less	**No Override**	**Override more**	
No Bail Required Count		317	**511**	828
No Bail Required Row %		38.3%	**61.7%**	100.0%
Conditional Release Count	198	372	**644**	1,214
Conditional Release Row %	16.3%	30.6%	**53.0%**	100.0%
Bail Required Count	158	**983**		1,141
Bail Required Row %	13.8%	**86.2%**		100.0%
Total Count	356	1,672	1,155	3,183
Total Row %	11.2%	52.5%	36.3%	100.0%

Missing data=195

Reasons for Probation Overrides

In 39% of the felony cases being evaluated by the Pretrial unit, 61% of the gross misdemeanor cases and 53% of the misdemeanor cases Probation Officers are asking for a different release decision than the Pretrial Scale would recommend. More restrictive release options (Override More) are most often requested for: gross misdemeanor DWI cases (30%), misdemeanor level domestic assault cases (27%), and felony level property offenses (11%). Less restrictive release options (Override Less) are most often requested for: misdemeanor level domestic assault (39%), felony level property cases (19%) and non-domestic non-DUI misdemeanor level cases. Since misdemeanor level domestic assault cases and property felony cases are most often in both the Override More and the Override Less, case type alone is not enough information to explain these overrides.

A content analysis of the reasons for the overrides suggests that probation officers find other indicators on the full bail evaluation but not on the Pretrial Scale itself to be the driving force behind the overrides. The most common reasons given for less restrictive recommendations was that the prior offenses were very old or that the defendant had been clean for the last 5-10 years, the victim was not in fear for his or her safety, or that the number of prior failure to appears was small or the history was old.

On the 'Override More' side probation officers cite victim safety, chemical dependency issues, mental health issues or refusal by the defendant to stay on his/her medication as reasons to request a more restrictive override. In addition probation officers often ask for more restrictive release decisions when they do not have all of the information available to them, such as when they have not seen the police report, have not been able to contact the victim or when they are unable to determine whether a weapon was used in the commission of the crime. Moreover, for some lower level crimes

(gross and common misdemeanor crimes) the scale does not differentiate whether the defendant had one or ten prior offenses and the same was true for failure to appear – six points are added to the scale score for one missed appearances or ten missed appearances. For defendants with multiple past low level convictions or multiple failures to appear probation the probation officers would ask for more restrictive overrides. Finally, when defendants had a number of the issues listed above they would ask for an override. Meetings with the Pretrial unit corroborated these content analysis findings.

Does the Probation Override introduce racial bias?

At this point we know that probation officers are asking the court to make more restrictive decisions in 36% of the cases that they evaluate than would be suggested by the 1992 scale. The next question becomes, what is the effect of these requested overrides? The next two tables show when the probation officer asked for overrides according to racial grouping, and whether or not the person actually failed pretrial.

Table 12 Probation Agreement with the Scale by Racial background and Pretrial Crime					
Was the defendant convicted of a crime that was committed during pretrial?	**Did the Probation Recommendation Agree with the Scale Score?**		**Racial Background**		**Total**
			Non-white	**White**	
No	**Override less**	**Count**	185	134	319
		Column %	11.1%	10.5%	10.9%
	No Override	**Count**	1,016	526	1,542
		Column %	61.2%	41.2%	52.5%
	Override more	**Count**	460	**617**	1,077
		Column %	27.7%	**48.3%**	36.7%
	Total	**Count**	1,661	1,277	2,938
		Column %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Yes	**Override less**	**Count**	26	11	37
		Column %	16.5%	12.6%	15.1%
	No Override	**Count**	92	38	130
		Column %	58.2%	43.7%	53.1%
	Override more	**Count**	40	**38**	78
		Column %	25.3%	**43.7%**	31.8%
	Total	**Count**	158	87	245
		Column %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-square for no pretrial crime 138.93, 2 df, sig.=.000
Chi-square for pretrial crime: 8.72, 2 df, sig.=.013

As seen in Table 12, probation officers were asking for a more restrictive release 48% of the time for white defendants compared to 28% of the time for non-white defendants. This same proportion held for those defendants who actually did commit pretrial crime; probation officers asked for more restrictive release conditions for 44% of the white defendants compared to 25% of the non-white defendants. Both of these comparisons were statistically significant.

Correspondingly, probation officers deviated from the scale less for non-white defendants than for white defendants – both for those who committed a new crime and those who did not.

Table 13. Probation Agreement with the Scale by Racial background and Pretrial Failure to Appear					
Pretrial Failure to Appear	Did the Probation Recommendation Agree with the Scale Score?		Racial Background		Total
			Non-white	White	
Made all appearances	Override less	Count	145	107	252
		Column %	10.5%	9.8%	10.2%
	No Override	Count	840	417	1,257
		Column %	61.0%	38.1%	50.8%
	Override more	Count	392	**571**	963
		Column %	28.5%	**52.1%**	39.0%
	Total	Count	1,377	1,095	2,472
		Column %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Failed to Appear Pretrial	Override less	Count	66	38	104
		Column %	14.9%	14.1%	14.6%
	No Override	Count	268	147	415
		Column %	60.6%	54.6%	58.4%
	Override more	Count	108	**84**	192
		Column %	24.4%	**31.2%**	27.0%
	Total	Count	442	269	711
		Column %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-square for no pretrial failure to appear 151.15, 2 df, sig.=.000
Chi-square for pretrial failure to appear: 3.96, 2 df, sig.=.138

For those defendants who made all their pretrial appearances and were white, probation officers asked for more restrictive release conditions than suggested by the scale 52% of the time compared to 29% of the time for non-whites in the same situation. This comparison is statistically significant whereas the difference between white and non-white defendants who actually did fail to appear was not statistically significant (Table 13).

Court Release Decision

Ideally, it would have been helpful to be able to examine not only the scale recommendation and the probation recommendation but to also know the final decision that was followed by the court, i.e., how the person actually was released. This would have told us if the judges were following the scale or probation recommendations more often and under what circumstances. Unfortunately, our court information system does not allow us to confidently identify those pieces of data. In addition, since all cases go through multiple phases during the course of a criminal case (starting with Hold without Bail during the initial 36/48 hours before charging, bail set according to the Bail Schedule, bail revisions based on jail population issues, etc.), it might be difficult to narrow down the decision based on the Pretrial Evaluation even if the information system allowed for these various phases.

Average Scale Score over Time

Other work done by Hennepin County[4] suggests that the average score on this Pretrial Scale has increased over the years. This would make some intuitive sense because the information systems have become more sophisticated and more complete over time. Table 14 below shows the average (using the mean), the median and the maximum score over the five years of our study.

Table 14. Average, Median and Maximum Pretrial Scale Score over Five Years			
Year	*Mean*	*Median*	*Maximum Score*
2000	17.05	13	94
2001	15.97	13	99
2002	16.25	13	106
2003	17.31	13	79
2004	16.91	13	154
Anova analysis: F=1.150 significance level p=.331 (no significant difference between years)			

---

[4] Hennepin County internal Memo, September 28, 2005 from Brad Kaeter, Principal Planning Analyst to Richard Johnson, Deputy County Administrator; Subject: Follow-up to the Daily Jail Population Study. The reference to the average score increasing was related to Felony Charges only.

There have been no significant differences over the five year period in the mean or the median. The maximum score for cases being evaluated has fluctuated and should be watched in the future, since the most recent year in the current research indicates the largest maximum score to date. Even if scale evaluations are restricted to felony charges however, there were no indications of a significant increase in scale scores.

However, we have seen an increase in the severity of the charges (based on level of charge, i.e., felony, gross misdemeanor or misdemeanor level). In 2000, 30% of the cases evaluated were for felony charges, 26% were for gross misdemeanor charges and 44% were for misdemeanor charges. Five years later in 2004, 37% of the cases were charged at the felony level, 27% at the gross misdemeanor level and 37% at the misdemeanor level.

Pretrial Failure

The dependent variables (i.e., the issues being studied in this research) are two different types of pretrial failure. One is committing a new crime while on pretrial status (that is, between release from jail and the first final disposition of the original case). Researchers have used both arrests and convictions as an indicator of pretrial crime. In the current research we have included both indicators. The second measure is of failure to appear for a court hearing while in pretrial status. Since only those people who were released before the end of their case could commit pretrial crime or fail to appear for a hearing, we have reduced the sample to only those people (number of cases=2,689).

Failure to Appear

About 26% of the cases in our sample had at least one failure to appear prior to the end of their criminal case, ranging from 28% in 2000 to 23% in 2004 (see Table 15). In the original research the failure to appear rate was about 16%-22% for the two samples.

Table 15. Number and Percent of Failure to Appear Pretrial				
Year Scaled		**Failure to Appear?**		**Total**
		Made all appearances	**Failed to Appear Pretrial**	
2000	**Count**	439	174	613
	Row %	71.6%	28.4%	100.0%
2001	**Count**	380	137	517
	Row %	73.5%	26.5%	100.0%
2002	**Count**	362	135	497
	Row %	72.8%	27.2%	100.0%
2003	**Count**	407	139	546
	Row %	74.5%	25.5%	100.0%
2004	**Count**	396	120	516
	Row %	76.7%	23.3%	100.0%
Total	**Count**	1,984	705	2,689
	Row %	73.8%	26.2%	100.0%

Pretrial Arrests

In Minnesota, all felony and gross misdemeanor arrests are supposed to be fingerprinted at a local jail, and that arrest record along with the fingerprint is to be sent to the Minnesota Bureau of Criminal Apprehension (BCA). In addition, targeted misdemeanors (i.e., more serious low level crimes such as domestic assault, DWI, violations of protection orders, indecent exposure, etc.) are also supposed to follow this same track. In reality, not all arrests end up at the BCA for a variety of reasons. And, quite a few do get to the BCA but end up in the 'suspense' file due to some problem such as not being able to connect an arrest with a court disposition or vice versa, some type of clerical error, or some omission of critical information.

In addition, only a small percentage of cases are actually arrested before coming to court. In Hennepin County for example, only 30% of the non-felony cases are arrested while most non-felony cases begin with a citation (48%) or a complaint (22%) where the most likely method of contacting the defendant is a summons to court. Even on the felony level, a large percentage of our cases are summoned to court; for example, all of our property felonies are summoned to court if a valid address is available. Although we gathered all of the arrest records that the BCA had on our sample of cases, it is doubtful that this is a complete record of arrests and that arrests are a complete picture of pretrial crime.

Pretrial Convictions

Due to the issues related to the discussion on arrests above, we captured all of the BCA arrests that resulted in convictions and we supplemented it with the only other source of convictions available which was the Hennepin County Conviction History Table. Below is the table that represents the number and percent of pretrial offenses (as defined by an offense date for a convicted crime between release from jail and first final disposition on the original case). The rate of new convictions is smaller than Dr. Ericson found in her study because they included petty misdemeanors and because they used bookings at the Hennepin County Jail as the indicator of pretrial crime. The percent of cases that were considered pretrial crime in the original study was 15%-20% across the two samples, whereas our average is about 9% overall. The difference between the individual years was not statistically significant (see Table 16).

Only 5% of the sample failed on both failure to appear and committing new crime pretrial (or about 136 of the 2,689 people who were eligible to fail). In general, about 53% of those people who committed a new offense also failed to appear for a court hearing whereas of those who failed to appear for a court hearing, only 19% committed a new crime.

		Was the defendant convicted of a crime that was committed during pretrial?		Total
Year Scaled		**No**	**Yes**	
2000	Count	549	64	613
	Row %	89.6%	10.4%	100.0%
2001	Count	469	48	517
	Row %	90.7%	9.3%	100.0%
2002	Count	453	44	497
	Row %	91.1%	8.9%	100.0%
2003	Count	493	53	546
	Row %	90.3%	9.7%	100.0%
2004	Count	469	47	516
	Row %	90.9%	9.1%	100.0%
Total	Count	2,433	256	2,689
	Row %	90.5%	9.5%	100.0%

Table 16. Pretrial Convictions

Bivariate Analysis

The pretrial scale is composed of items that relate to and hopefully help to predict our dependent variables: pretrial crime and failure to appear. Along with these items are associated weights that give more or less credit for certain independent variables. For example, a person with a current offense that is of the most serious nature (that requiring Judicial Review) is given a score of 9, and if a weapon were used in the commission of the crime another 9 points are assigned. A person would also get more points for more prior felony convictions, and in particular, would get a higher number of points if the prior convictions were for crimes against a person as opposed to a property conviction or a drug conviction. All of these points are summed to create a score on the pretrial scale that indicates the level of seriousness and thus helps to determine who should or should not be released and how a release decision is made.

Although most of the decisions regarding which indicators to include were determined by the statistical modeling done in the previous research by Dr. Ericson, the statistical models were *not* used to derive weights for the scale. Some other decisions about indicators were policy decisions. In other words, there was no statistical evidence that a particular indicator predicted either of the dependent variables but the decision makers felt intuitively that it made sense to include these indicators. In most of these cases, smaller weights were assigned to these indicators. Examples of these types of indicators are related to 'community ties', such as length of time as a MN resident, and living situation. The 1992 report indicates that the policy makers felt uncomfortable not taking these indicators into account despite the statistical evidence from inside and outside this jurisdiction that they were unrelated to indicators of interest.

Another set of indicators were added to the pretrial scale without statistical evidence, and these were related to the Pretrial Unit being asked to evaluate a new type of offender. In the past, this unit only evaluated people charged with felonies and gross misdemeanors but at the point of implementing this scale they were also asked to evaluate people who are arrested and charged with common misdemeanor crimes. To help differentiate the more serious offenders from these newly included offenders, three separate indicators were added: Present Offense/Main Charge Requiring Judicial Review, Present Offense/Main Charge Not Requiring Judicial Review, and Weapon Used. Since the rationale of the Pretrial Unit is to balance public safety with jail size limitations, these indicators were considered necessary to help categorize people into more and less serious offenders and make them easily recognizable.

Finally, the indictors that the statistical model recommended were: employment, age at the point of the arrest, prior history of failure to appear for court, and prior criminal history score. Each of these independent variables is 'dummy' coded into a dichotomy. If the presence of the indicator is positive, a one was coded otherwise it is coded as a zero. This allows categorical indicators to be analyzed as metric variables. It is therefore appropriate to run correlations and to be included in the subsequent regression analysis.

The one exception to this coding scheme was prior criminal record. For this set of indicators a scale was created that summed the total number of prior criminal history points that were a part of the pretrial scale score. On the scale, prior history is a set of 4 different measures that allow for differing points systems. A person could receive 9 points for each felony/gross misdemeanor *person* conviction, 6 points for each misdemeanor *person* conviction, 3 points for each 'other' felony conviction, etc. If these indicators were dummy coded like the rest of the independent variables, we would only know *IF* someone was convicted in such a manner but we would not know how many times it occurred. This summed indicator is an interval level variable and can be used directly in inferential statistics, better representing the person's conviction history.

Table 17 below shows that all but two of the independent variables are correlated with failure to appear (living alone and current MN resident). These same two indicators were not related to pretrial crime as defined by convictions, as well as whether a weapon was used in the current offense and whether the defendant was 21 or younger.

Table 17. Correlations between the Independent and Dependent Variables		
(Pearson Correlation Coefficients and Significance levels)		
Independent Variables	*Pretrial Crime*	*Failure to Appear*
Present Offense on the Judicial Review List	-.068**	-.247**
Weapon Used (609.11)	-.009	-.085**
Present offense felony not on Judicial Review List	.106**	.224**
Age as of the booking date 21 or younger	.010	.046*
Living Alone	-.020	-.002
Employed less than 20 hours, unemployed, and not a student	.083**	.145**
Current MN Resident 3 months or less	-.001	.006
Failure to appear within last three years	.145**	.319**
Prior Criminal Conviction Score	.123**	.079**

* = significant at the .01 level, ** = significant at the .001 level.

For offenses that were on the judicial review list, there was an inverse relationship with presence of pretrial crime or failure to appear. In other words, people who were booked for offenses on the judicial review list were less likely to commit new crime and were less likely to fail to appear pretrial. Many recidivism studies show that defendants who commit felonies against people have some of the lowest new crime rates when compared with property felons or non-felons; in short, this finding is not unexpected.

A history of failure to appear and prior convictions was positively and significantly related to both dependent variables, as was whether the defendant was employed or not. Whether the defendant is a current MN resident or lives alone is not related to either dependent variable. This finding is not different than what the original

research found, nor is this different from what others have found in past research and in other jurisdictions. These two indicators were added to the scale for policy reasons.

Weapon use and age at booking were not related to pretrial crime but were related to failure to appear. The younger the defendant and the less they used a weapon in the commission of the crime, the more likely it was that they would fail to appear for a pretrial hearing.

Multicollinearity

Having independent variables that are highly correlated with one another can cause problems in a regression analysis, and this problem is called multicollinearity. Simply put, if different indicators measure a similar property, then they are redundant. A principal danger of this redundancy is the over-fitting of a regression model. Models that have the 'best fit' are those that have independent variables that are highly correlated with the outcome variable but correlate only minimally with each other. Correlations of .70 or above are considered highly suspect and should be investigated. None of the independent variables in this study are highly correlated with one another so the threat of multicollinearity does not exist.

The two variables most highly correlated were Present Offense on the Judicial Review list (indicating a person felony for the most part) and Present Offense not on the Judicial Review list but at the felony level. This correlation was -.50 and quite far from the threshold of multicollinearity. These two indicators do not completely capture the severity of the present offense; there were still a number of people who would have been included in our sample who were evaluated for a non-felony level offense (about 27%).

Bias of Scale Items

If an item on the scale was correlated with race but it was not correlated with failure to appear or pretrial crime then we have the first indication of an element of the scale that might introduce bias. One question might be why is it part of the pretrial scale if it is not related to either of the dependent variables? An explanation was provided in the original report and was discussed above. Certain items were added to the scale for policy reasons, rather than because of any statistical model. The examination of the correlation matrix with race included showed that race was related to three indicators that were not related to one or both of the dependent variables. These indicators were: living alone, weapon use, and age at booking.

As it turns out, being white is correlated with a statistically higher probability of living alone (a statistically significantly higher number of whites live alone – 16% versus 14% for non-whites), and living alone is not related to either of the dependent variables. This was a variable that was added to the scale for policy reasons and so it may foster more discussion this time. This is the only independent variable that is unrelated to both dependent variables. However the percentage difference between whites and non-whites

is very small – only 2% - so we may want to see the effect of the indictor in a multiple regression analysis before making a final decision.

In addition, non-whites use weapons in the commission of their current offense more often than whites do, and this is statistically significant for our population (14% for non-whites and 9% for whites). However, using a weapon is not related to pretrial crime but is related to failure to appear. This variable was added to the pretrial scale when the population being evaluated changed toward the end of the original analysis to include common misdemeanors. It was thought to be necessary to help identify more serious offenders to the court.

Finally, there is one other indicator that is related to race and unrelated to pretrial crime. Non-whites were more likely to be 21 or younger when they committed the crime for which they were evaluated than were whites (18% versus 13%) and this indicator was not related to pretrial crime. Again, however, it is related to failure to appear. This is a new finding since this variable was included in the past scale (modified Vera) and was a significant explanatory indicator of the dependent variables in the past. One thing to note is that in 1992 when this research was done, about 22%-27% of the different samples were composed of defendants who were 21 or younger at the point of their arrest. In the current research, less than 16% of the defendants overall were 21 or younger.

Table 18. Where the Independent Variables are related to race and Are Unrelated to the Dependent Variables (Significance levels)				
Independent Variables	*Pretrial Crime*	Race related to IV	*Failure to Appear*	Race related to IV
Present Offense on the Judicial Review List	**	**	**	**
Weapon Used (609.11)	Ns	**	**	**
Present offense felony not on Judicial Review List	**	*	**	*
Age as of the booking date 21 or younger	Ns	**	*	**
Living Alone	Ns	*	Ns	*
Employed less than 20 hours, unemployed, and not a student	**	**	**	**
Current MN Resident 3 months or less	Ns	Ns	Ns	Ns
Failure to appear within last three years	**	**	**	**
Prior Criminal Conviction Score	**	**	**	**

Ns=Not significant; * = significant at the .01 level;** = significant at the .001 level.
IV= Independent variable

These items indicate that there are parts of the pretrial scale that are related to race but unrelated to the dependent variable. This could be introducing bias into the scale. If the independent variables were added as a result of the prior statistical work, there would be a definite need to review the decision to add these indicators. However, if the decisions to add these indicators to the scale were made based on policy decisions, a

more thorough policy discussion is needed. In addition, the multivariate analysis below will help to shed some light on the subject too. It may be that these items are not affecting the scale's ability to predict pretrial crime or failure to appear, in which case they may not be causing any harm but they are not improving our prediction abilities either.

Multivariate Analysis

The main idea behind multivariate analyses is to account for a number of different factors that may affect the variables of interest (in this case, pretrial crime and failure to appear during the pretrial window) while controlling for the other indicators simultaneously. The cases that are included in these analyses are only those that actually were released pretrial and thus had an opportunity to fail during the pretrial window. Separate equations will be run for each dependent variable since past research has shown that the best predictors of pretrial crime are not necessarily the same predictors of failure to appear.[5]

Non-metric indicators have to be expressly coded to be entered into a multivariate equation. Any variable that is a categorical indicator can be set up to be 'indicator coded' which allows us to look at one 'category' of these independent variables while the remaining category acts as a reference category. Table 19 shows the main indicator, how it was categorized, and the number of cases that fell into each category.

Table 19. Categorical Variables Coding		
Categorical Independent Variable	**Categories**	**Frequency**
Failed to appear within the last 3 years?	**No failure to appear in 3 years=0**	1,935
	Fail to appear in last 3 years=1	754
Was a Weapon used?	**No Weapon Used=0**	2,435
	Weapon Used=1	254
Was the Main Charge a felony but not on the Judicial Review list?	**Not=0**	2,098
	Main Charge Felony, not on Judicial Review =1	591
Is the Defendant a MN Resident?	**MN Resident=0**	2,573
	MN Resident <= 3mos / non-MN resident=1	116
Does the defendant live alone?	**Not living alone=0**	2,295
	Living Alone=1	394
Was the defendant 21 or Younger at booking	**Over 21=0**	2,279

[5] Goldkamp, John, et. al (1981) Bail Decision Making: A Study of Policy Guidelines; NYC Criminal Justice Agency, (2005), Predicting the Likelihood of Pretrial Re-Arrest: An Examination of New York City Defendants.

	Age 21 or under=1	410
Employment status of defendant	Employed more=0	1,766
	Employed < 20 hr/week; not student; no inc=1	923
Was the offense on the Judicial Review list?	Not on the Judicial Review list=0	1,373
	Main Charge on Judicial Review List=1	1,316

In addition to the categorical indicators, we have one other variable that is measured at the interval level and therefore are suitable to be used in a regression analysis: prior convictions score. Table 20 shows the means, standard deviations, medians, minimums and maximums for this independent variable.

Table 20. Continuous Variable					
Interval level Independent Variables	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Total prior convictions score	5.53	1.0	10.33	0	162

Since both of our dependent variables only have two options (fail to appear or not, commit pretrial crime or not), multivariate logistic regression is the most appropriate statistical technique to use. Under these conditions using ordinary least squares regression that is based on the assumption of linearity can lead to incorrect analysis of the effects of the independent variables on the dependent variable.[6] Logistic Regression, which utilizes the maximum likelihood method of parameter estimates, is designed for dichotomous dependent variables and does not share this problem.

In linear regression, the coefficients reflect the amount of change in the dependent variable for a one unit change in the independent variable. Logistic regression rearranges the equation to instead examine the log odds of an event occurring given a one unit change in the independent variable. Log odds reflect the ratio of the probability of an event occurring to the probability of an event not occurring. The log odds increase if the logistic coefficients are positive while negative coefficients indicate reduced or decreased odds.

Predictive strength of the equation will be assessed using a number of different measures. A classification table provides the percentage of cases correctly classified. To determine how well the model fits we will use the *model chi-square statistic* (also known as the -2 x log-likelihood) which indicates whether the independent variables do a better job of predicting the outcome variable than the constant alone. The constant in a logistic

---

[6] Aldrich and Nelson, (1984), Linear Probability, Logit, and Probit Models. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

regression is the percent of cases that we know to have a value of 1 on the outcome variable or, put another way, it is the percent of cases that did commit pretrial crime and did fail to appear. Additionally, one other method is to examine the 'pseudo R^2' which is similar to the amount of variance explained in ordinary least squares regression and analysts consider it to be a conservative measure of predictive strength of a logistic method.[7] In this analysis we will use the Nagelkerke R Square statistic.

In the first set of equations, only the scale items will be added to see how well the items predict pretrial crime or failure to appear pretrial. In the original research conducted by Dr. Ericson, the equations that were examined accounted for a very low percentage of variance – only 6% of the pretrial crime and 2% of the failure to appear. These equations modeled the previous scale (a modified Vera scale) and a number of new possible independent variables that were being considered to be included in the new scale. A higher percent of explained variance would indicate a better fit of the model.

Table 21. Testing the Hennepin County Pretrial Scale						
Independent Variables	Pretrial Crime			Failure to Appear		
	Coef.	*SE*	*Sig.*	*Coef.*	*SE*	*Sig.*
Was the offense on the Judicial Review list?	-.333	.172	.054	-1.018	.120	.000
Was a Weapon used?	.171	.249	.494	-.186	.198	.348
Was the Main Charge a felony but not on the Judicial Review list?	.330	.177	.062	.301	.124	.015
Is the Defendant a MN Resident?	.281	.323	.385	.411	.230	.074
Does the defendant live alone?	-.257	.205	.210	-.017	.138	.904
Employment status of defendant	.373	.142	.008	.438	.102	.000
Was the defendant 21 or Younger at booking	.089	.189	.639	.206	.135	.127
Failed to appear within the last 3 years?	.809	.142	.000	1.454	.103	.000
Total prior conviction history score	.027	.005	.000	.012	.005	.007
Constant	-2.854	.151	.000	-1.467	.097	.000
Sample Size	2,689			2,689		
Nagelkerke R-squared	9.3%			23.8%		
Model Chi-square	118.84, 9 df, sig.=.000			477.74, 9 df, sig.=.000		
Percent correctly classified	90.4%			77.0%		

Pretrial Crime Equation

Each coefficient (listed as *Coef.* above) indicates the direction of the relationship of each independent variable with the probability of pretrial crime, as well as the strength of the relationship while controlling for the effects of all of the other variables. When the sign of the coefficient is negative it indicates that probability of pretrial crime is

---

[7] Aldrich and Nelson (1984).

decreased and correspondingly, if the sign is positive it indicates a higher probability of pretrial crime.   When the independent variable has only two categories, the category that is associated with the 1 is associated with the increase or decrease in the probability of pretrial crime. The strength of the relationship is indicated in the significance level (listed as *Sig*. above). A significance level of .05 or less indicates that the chances of the observed relationship not being 'true' are less than 5 out of 100. For this study, we will only consider significance levels of .05 or less as 'significant'.

Four of the indicators in Table 21 show a significant relationship with crime during the pretrial window of time. Having a higher number of prior convictions, a history of failing to appear over the 3 years prior to the current offense and being employed less than 20 hours per week, unemployed or not receiving public assistance increases the odds of a person committing pretrial crime. All three of these indicators are significantly important in predicting pretrial convictions.

Having a main offense on the Judicial Review list *decreases* the odds of a defendant committing pretrial crime. This negative relationship with pretrial crime may seem counter-intuitive but under further scrutiny is understandable. Offenses on the Judicial Review list are mostly felonies against persons (such as homicide, assault, criminal sexual conduct, etc.), and defendants who commit these types of crimes tend to recidivate less than defendants who commit non-person felonies (such as property felonies) and non-felony level offenses.

Weapon use, whether or not the defendant is a MN resident, whether or not the defendant lived alone, and the age of the defendant at booking (21 or younger versus older than 21) were not significant indicators of pretrial crime.

This model does a better job of explaining the total variance (9.3%) in pretrial crime than the previous research which suggests that the Vera Scale explained (.04%) or the statistically 'best model' excluding non-legal indicators, such as race (5.4%)[8]. These four variables were able to predict 90% of the defendants overall but nearly all of these were on defendants that did not commit pretrial crime. In other words, this model does a very poor job of predicting who is actually going to fail by committing pretrial crime (1%). Part of the reason for this is the rare event of pretrial crime, even given the large sample size that we have in the current study.

Pretrial Failure to Appear Equation

Five indicators are significant predictors of pretrial failure to appear. The same four indictors that were significant for pretrial crime are also significant for failure to appear at a scheduled court hearing. In addition, each of the four is related to this type of pretrial failure in the same manner as noted above. That is, having a history of failing to appear, having a higher prior conviction history, and being employed less than half time increase the odds of failing to appear for court and finally, having a main offense that is on the Judicial Review list decreases the odds of this type of failure. This is borne out by

---

[8] Ericson (nee Goodman), 1992 p.40.

the one additional significant variable, being charged with a felony level offense but not one that is on the Judicial Review list – these defendants had increased odds of failing to appear for a scheduled hearing (Table 21).

Weapon use, whether or not the defendant is a MN resident, whether or not the defendant lived alone, and the age of the defendant at booking (21 or younger versus older than 21) were not significant indicators of failure to appear.

This model does a better job compared to past models[9] of explaining the variance in pretrial failure to appear: the current scale explains 24.0% compared to 0.21% for the Vera Scale and 2.2% of the 'best model' tested previously. In addition, this model was able to predict whether a defendant would fail to appear 77% of the time based on knowing these 5 variables. This overall predictive ability is based on those that do not fail to appear 92% of the time and those that do fail to appear 36% of the time.

Parsimonious Models

When non-significant variables are included in a model they have the tendency to decrease the 'goodness of fit' of the model. In statistics, we are always trying to explain the most about a phenomenon using the fewest explanatory indicators – this is the definition of parsimony in the statistical sense. Therefore, the next step is to see if we can explain the same amount or a similar amount of information about pretrial crime and failure to appear pretrial using fewer variables.

There are different methods that analysts employ in exploring this type of work. First, we could simply take the indicators that were significant above and look at that model. Second we can ask the statistical program to add indicators one by one taking the most significant first, the next most significant (generally referred to as stepwise method), etc. Both methods will be tested here and compared (see Tables 22 and 23).

---

[9] Ibid, p. 42

Table 22. Testing a Parsimonious Model – using the significant indicators from the full model						
Independent Variables	Pretrial Crime			Failure to Appear		
	Coef.	*SE*	*Sig.*	*Coef.*	*SE*	*Sig.*
Was the offense on the Judicial Review list?	-.457	.139	.001	-1.058	.117	.000
Weapon Used?						
Was the Main Charge a felony but not on the Judicial Review list?				.320	.123	.009
Is the Defendant a MN Resident?						
Does the defendant live alone?						
Employment status of defendant	.428	.139	.002	.473	.101	.000
Under age 21 at booking?						
Failed to appear within the last 3 years?	.838	.141	.000	1.452	.103	.000
Total prior conviction history score	.027	.005	.000	.010	.004	.021
Constant	-2.730	.122	.000	-1.433	.092	.000
Sample Size	2,689			2,689		
Nagelkerke R-squared	8.7%			23.5%		
Model Chi-square	111.89, 4 df, sig.=.000			471.51, 5 df, sig.=.000		
Percent correctly classified	90.4%			77.4%		

Table 23. Testing a more Parsimonious Model – using Stepwise addition of variables						
Independent Variables	Pretrial Crime			Failure to Appear		
	Coef.	*SE*	*Sig.*	*Coef.*	*SE*	*Sig.*
Was the offense on the Judicial Review list?				-1.027	.117	.000
Weapon Used?						
Was the Main Charge a felony but not on the Judicial Review list?	.520	.146	.000	.320	.123	.009
Is the Defendant a MN Resident?						
Does the defendant live alone?						
Employment status of defendant	.377	.139	.007	.473	.101	.000
Under age 21 at booking??						
Failed to appear within the last 3 years?	.797	.142	.000	1.452	.103	.000
Total prior conviction history score	.025	.005	.000	.010	.004	.021
Constant	-3.029	.115	.000	-1.433	.092	.000
Sample Size	2,689			2,689		
Nagelkerke R-squared	8.8%			23.5%		
Model Chi-square	112.98, 4 df, sig.=.000			471.51, 5 df, sig.=.000		
Percent correctly classified	90.4%			77.4%		

The results show very similar models – particularly for the dependent variable of
failure to appear. For this outcome measure, the exact same predictive indicators were

chosen. For pretrial crime the only difference was that the stepwise program selected whether the main charge was a felony but not on the judicial review list while the full model selected the main offense being on the judicial review list. Both of these indicators were either significant or close to significant so this finding is not that surprising. Since this scale was designed to be able to identify defendants at risk of failing in both flight and pretrial crime, and both indicators are important for failure to appear, the recommendation is to include both of these indicators.

Adding the Probation Override to the Equations

Since the override variable is an ordinal scale and not appropriate for a regression analysis, a new indicator was created and 'indicator coded' to be a 1 if the probation officer agreed with the scale recommendation and 0 if the probation officer disagreed. If the new indicator contributes significantly to the equation after the scale items have been accounted for then there would be evidence that the probation officers recommendations would help to predict pretrial failures.

To determine if adding the probation override indicator improves the predictive strength of the statistical model, we will analyze another version of the chi-square statistics – one that tells us whether adding the indicator adds more explanatory strength. If the new indicator improves the equation the chi-square change will be significant (less than or equal to .05). Table 24 shows the two pretrial failure equations with the probation override added.

For pretrial crime, knowledge of the override does not significantly improve our ability to predict future behavior, but the probation officers intuition seems to help in determining who will be a flight risk. We know from the analysis above that probation officers ask for more restrictive release decisions for white defendants – particularly for those who end up making their appearances (presumably because the bench followed the probation recommendation and that kept defendants less likely to flee).

Table 24. Testing the effect of the Probation Overrides						
Independent Variables	Pretrial Crime			Failure to Appear		
	Coef.	*SE*	*Sig.*	*Coef.*	*SE*	*Sig.*
Was the offense on the Judicial Review list?	-.261	.168	.120	-1.068	.118	.000
Was the Main Charge a felony but not on the Judicial Review list?	.356	.176	.043	.298	.123	.015
Employment status of defendant	.406	.140	.004	.453	.101	.000
Failed to appear within the last 3 years?	.823	.143	.000	1.417	.104	.000
Total prior conviction history score	.027	.005	.000	.008	.005	.072
Probation officer agreed with the scale (1=yes, 0=no)	-.176	.142	.214	.321	.100	.001
Constant	-2.819	.150	.000	-1.539	.099	.000
Sample Size	2,689			2,689		
Nagelkerke R-squared	9.2%			24.0%		
Model Chi-square	117.38, 6 df, sig.=.000			481.74, df=6, sig.=.000		
Adding PO override Chi-square change	1.55, df=1, sig.=.213			10.23, df=1, sig.=.001		
Percent correctly classified	90.4%					

Adding Race to the Equations

Adding race to the equations may seem like an exercise in futility since it would never be added to a pretrial release scale. But race may be related to a number of our independent variables and therefore we need to explore whether or not adding it as an explanatory indicator has different effects on the indicators that are used to explain our outcome variables. Adding an 'indicator coded' race variable does not impact either equation (see Table 26). The same independent variables are still predictive in the same manner as in the previous models and there was not much more variance explained by knowing the race of the defendant – less than 1 %. In both models, race is a significant predictor for pretrial crime and failure to appear, and the negative coefficient means that whites have decreased odds of committing new crime while in the pretrial window, and also have decreased odds of missing a court appearance compared to non-whites. Once again though, adding this indicator does not have an impact on either equation.

One other way to explore the effect of race is to run the equations for whites and run a separate equation for non-whites to see if the explanatory indicators react differently for different sets of defendants.

Table 26. Testing the Parsimonious Model and Adding Race						
Independent Variables	Pretrial Crime			Failure to Appear		
	Coef.	*SE*	*Sig.*	*Coef.*	*SE*	*Sig.*
Was the offense on the Judicial Review list?	-.330	.168	.050	-1.073	.118	.000
Was the Main Charge a felony but not on the Judicial Review list?	.329	.176	.061	.297	.123	.016
Employment status of defendant	.374	.140	.008	.457	.101	.000
Failed to appear within the last 3 years?	.748	.144	.000	1.407	.104	.000
Total prior conviction history score	.025	.147	.000	.009	.004	.036
Race (1=white, 0= non-white)	-.304	.147	.038	-.262	.103	.011
Constant	-2.691	.167	.000	-1.268	.111	.000
Sample Size	2,689			2,689		
Nagelkerke R-squared	9.4%			23.8%		
Model Chi-square	120.21, df=6, sig.=.000			478.06, df=6, sig.=.000		
Adding race Chi-square change	4.37, df=1, sig.=.036			6.55, df=1, sig.=.010		
Percent correctly classified	90.4%			77.0%		

Testing Separate Equations for Whites and Non-whites

Pretrial Crime

Very similar indicators show up as significant predictors of the outcome variables
when only whites are included in the equation and only non-whites are included. For
both white and non-white defendants a history of failing to appear and having more prior
convictions is significantly related to pretrial crime (Table 26).

Two indicators had different significance levels but the same direction for the two
different racial categories: whites with a felony charge *not* on the Judicial Review list was
significantly related to more pretrial crime while for non-whites this indicator was not
significant. Conversely, employment status was not significant for white defendants and
it was significant for non-white defendants. For non-whites being employed less than 20
hours per week was significantly related to more pretrial crime.

Both models correctly classify a large number of defendants (93% for whites and
88% for non-whites) although, again, the classification is much better at determining who
would not fail during the pretrial window than predicting those that would fail. Both
models are significant but they explain very little of the total variance of these outcomes
and they do slightly better for white defendants (12%) than non-white defendants (7%).

One additional analysis tested but not presented here was the effect of adding the
probation override to these models. For both whites and non-whites, adding this
information did not change or improve the odds of predicting who would commit pretrial
crime.

Table 26. Testing the Parsimonious Model for Pretrial Crime for each Racial Category						
Independent Variables	Whites			Non-whites		
	Coef.	*SE*	*Sig.*	*Coef.*	*SE*	*Sig.*
Was the offense on the Judicial Review list?	-.361	.294	.220	-.361	.207	.081
Was the Main Charge a felony but not on the Judicial Review list?	.602	.286	.035	.126	.224	.575
Employment status of defendant	.342	.244	.161	.387	.171	.023
Failed to appear within the last 3 years?	.929	.252	.000	.654	.173	.000
Total prior conviction history score	.032	.009	.000	.021	.006	.001
Constant	-3.177	.222	.000	-2.529	.197	.000
Sample Size	1,218			1,417		
Nagelkerke R-squared	11.7%			6.7%		
Model Chi-square	58.24, df=5,sig.=.000			51.26, df=5, sig.=.000		
Percent correctly classified	93.0%			88.3%		

Failure to Appear

Three indicators are significant for both whites and non-whites in predicting a missed court appearance pretrial: whether the offense was on the Judicial Review list, employment status of the defendant and the history of prior failing to appear (see Table 27 below). For both whites and non-whites, having a main charge on the Judicial Review list decreased the odds of failing to appear for a hearing, being employed less than 20 hours per week increased the odds of this failure and having a history of prior failures also increased the odds of missing a court appearance pretrial for both types of defendants.

Both models were significant and both correctly classified 75% to 79% of the defendants. For both whites and non-whites about one quarter of the variance was explained by the indicators in this model.

One additional test that was analyzed but not presented here was the effect of adding the probation override indicator. For non-whites, this additional variable had no effect. In other words, the probation override did not improve or increase our odds of predicting who would fail to make a court appearance during their pretrial window of time. For whites, however, this indicator did help to increase our odds of knowing who would miss an appearance but the added explanatory information was not very large (without knowing a probation override we could explain 22% of the variance and with it we could explain 23% of the total variance).

Table 27. Testing the Parsimonious Model for Pretrial Failure to Appear for each Racial Category						
Independent Variables	Whites			Non-whites		
	Coef.	*SE*	*Sig.*	*Coef.*	*SE*	*Sig.*
Was the offense on the Judicial Review list?	-.668	.182	.000	-1.352	.154	.000
Was the Main Charge a felony but not on the Judicial Review list?	.290	.194	.135	.205	.163	.209
Employment status of defendant	.602	.162	.000	.379	.130	.004
Failed to appear within the last 3 years?	1.672	.172	.000	1.264	.131	.000
Total prior conviction history score	.014	.007	.058	.008	.006	.155
Constant	-1.799	.133	.000	-1.007	.133	.000
Sample Size	1,218			1,417		
Nagelkerke R-squared	21.6%			25.1%		
Model Chi-square	183.04, df=5, sig.=.000			287.13, df=5, sig.=.000		
Percent correctly classified	79.3%			74.8%		

Summary and Discussion

Predictive Ability of the Model

The current pretrial evaluation scale does a better job of predicting the outcome variables than the previous scale used in this jurisdiction or than other models tested by the previous research, but even the current scale does a poor job of explaining the variation in pretrial failure. The scale does a slightly better job of predicting failure to appear pretrial than predicting a new crime pretrial. Only five of the nine indicators are actually necessary to predict pretrial crime and the likelihood of missing a court appearance. These indicators are related to the main charge (was the offense on the Judicial Review list, was it not on the list but still at the felony level), the employment situation (knowing whether the defendant was employed 20 hours or more per week), and prior history (knowing the prior criminal history score and prior failures to appear within the previous three years).

Four indicators on the scale are not significant predictors of pretrial crime and failure to appear: whether the defendant is a Minnesota resident, whether the defendant lives alone, the age of the defendant when booked for the main charge, and whether or not a weapon was used during the main offense.

Racial Bias of the Scale Items

Three of the scale indicators are correlated with race but are not correlated with committing a new offense while on pretrial status or missing a court appearance: using a weapon during the main offense, living alone and being under the age of 21 at the

booking for the main charge. Living alone and using a weapon were indicators added to the scale for policy reasons and not because the previous statistical work indicated that they were important; furthermore neither of these variables ended up being significant indicators in the full logistic regression models.

Prior research suggests being under the age of 21 at the point of booking for the main charge is a statistically significant indicator for both outcome variables.[10]   In the current study it was related to failing to appear but is not related to pretrial crime. There are fewer defendants who are 21 or younger during our study years compared to the previous research, and this indicator was not significant in the full model.

Adding race to the five significant indicators shows that knowing the racial background helps to better predict pretrial crime and failure to appear although the amount of additional explanatory information is small. Dr. Ericson talks about the problems with interpreting race as an explanatory variable in her study, she says:

> *The interpretation of the significance of race is fraught with difficulties. Three possible interpretations are given below to illustrate the complexity of the problem. First, since there were no reliable measures of income for the sample, race may be a proxy for socio-economic status. Second, race may be a reflection of police behavior. Let us assume that blacks and whites have equal propensity to be involved in criminal activity. If the police patrol more heavily in black communities their very presence could detect criminal activity and result in a higher number of black arrests. Defining the pretrial crime variable such that it is based on convictions, rather than arrests, does not improve matters. If the variable is more a reflection of crime detection than propensity and no other racial effects are present following arrest through disposition, blacks would still be over-represented in terms of participation in criminal activity. Third, the significance of race may be the result of racial differences in criminality.[11] Given the present data, it is not possible to disentangle cause and effect relationships.*

When whites and non-whites are examined separately, very similar results occurred in terms of the type of indicators that predicted failure during the pretrial window and the direction of the prediction. Given that the same indicators are significant

---

[10] Goodman, Becky, (1992) Hennepin County Bureau of Community Corrections, Planning and Evaluation, *Pretrial Release Study*.
Goldkamp, John, (1987) "Prediction in Criminal Justice Policy Development" in *Prediction and Classification: Criminal Justice Decision Making,* ed. Don Gottfredson and Michael Tonry. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
[11] These differing possible interpretations of race (and other predictors correlated with race) are discussed in more detail in Joan Petersilia and Susan Turner, (1987), 'Guideline-based Justice: Prediction and Racial Minorities," in *Prediction and Classification : Criminal Justice Decision Making, ed. Don Gottfredson and Michael Tonry*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

for white and non-white defendants and that three of the four non-significant indicators are correlated to race, it is recommended that these indicators be dropped from the scale or replaced with indicators that improve the ability to predict pretrial failures.

Has the average scale score increased recently?

Since 1992 when the scale was developed, there have been many discussions as to whether or not the average score for defendants was increasing. Some of the arguments have been that the aging population had had more time to gain prior offenses which would increase the prior history points and raise the overall score. In addition, others speculated that more sophisticated data information systems made it easier to gain information about prior offenses from other jurisdictions and that also could raise the overall score. In reality, the average scale score has not changed over the five years of this study and is also very similar to when the scale was developed 14 years ago.

Probation Overrides

Probation officers only agreed with the scale score in slightly more than 53% of the cases; in another 11% of the cases they recommended a less restrictive release option than the scale suggested, and in 36% of the cases they recommended a more restrictive release decision than the scale. This research had no quantitative data on the reasons for the probation override but it is recommended that these reasons be studied to see if there is some aspect of risk that is intuitive to the probation officers and that they believe the scale is missing.

When probation officers recommended a more restrictive release policy than was suggested by the pretrial scale, it was more often for white defendants than for non-white defendants and this was true for both pretrial crime and failure to appear. However, the difference was only statistically significant for pretrial crime whether or not the defendant actually did commit a crime while in pretrial status. For failure to appear, probation officers asked for more restrictive overrides for white defendants who did not fail to show up for a pretrial appearance significantly more than for similar non-white defendants (52% versus 28%). There were no significant differences in how probation officers asked for overrides for defendants who did *not* fail to appear. Since we don't know what the court did actually order we don't know for sure that the override request was granted, but if it was, the override suggestion was successful.

Probation overrides improved the failure to appear equation for whites and, when added to the significant indicators from the Pretrial Evaluation Scale, the odds of predicting who would fail to make a court appearance pretrial increased. The overrides did not improve the odds of predicting non-white failure to appear and also does not improve the prediction of who would commit pretrial crime regardless of race.

A content analysis of the reasons for the overrides suggests that probation officers find other indicators on the full bail evaluation but not on the Pretrial Scale itself to be the driving force behind the overrides. The most common reasons given for less restrictive

recommendations was that the prior offenses were very old or that the defendant had been clean for the last 5-10 years, the victim was not in fear for his or her safety, or that the number of prior failure to appears was small or the history was old.

On the 'Override More' side probation officers cite victim safety, chemical dependency issues, mental health issues or refusal by the defendant to stay on his/her medication as reasons to request a more restrictive override. In addition probation officers often ask for more restrictive release decisions when they do not have all of the information available to them, such as when they have not seen the police report, have not been able to contact the victim or when they are unable to determine whether a weapon was used in the commission of the crime. Moreover, for some lower level crimes (gross and common misdemeanor crimes) the scale does not differentiate whether the defendant had one or ten prior offenses and the same was true for failure to appear – six points are added to the scale score for one missed appearances or ten missed appearances. For defendants with multiple past low level convictions or multiple failures to appear probation the probation officers would ask for more restrictive overrides. Finally, when defendants had a number of the issues listed above they would ask for an override. Meetings with the Pretrial unit corroborated these content analysis findings.

Next Steps

A workgroup was convened by the Chief Judge Lucy Wieland and Director of Community Corrections Fred LaFleur to discuss and revise the current scale. Representatives from Hennepin County Community Corrections (probation) and the court will review the results of this research, conduct a more thorough analysis of other pretrial tool evaluations and work to revise and improve the pretrial tool that is being used in the Fourth Judicial District.

Bibliography

Aldrich, John and Forrest Nelson, (1984), Linear Probability, Logit, and Probit Models. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications

Demaris, Alfred. (1992) Logit Modeling: Practical Applications. Newbury Park, California: Sage publications

Field, Andy. (2005) Discovering Statistics Using SPSS. London, England: Sage Publications

Goodman, Becky, (1992) Hennepin County Bureau of Community Corrections, Planning and Evaluation, *Pretrial Release Study*. Internal Report.

Goldkamp, John, (1987) "Prediction in Criminal Justice Policy Development" in *Prediction and Classification: Criminal Justice Decision Making,* ed. Don Gottfredson and Michael Tonry. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Goldkamp, John, et. al (1981) Bail Decision Making: A Study of Policy Guidelines; NYC Criminal Justice Agency, (2005), Predicting the Likelihood of Pretrial Re-Arrest: An Examination of New York City Defendants.

Hennepin County Internal Memo, September 28, 2005 from Brad Kaeter, Principal Planning Analyst to Richard Johnson, Deputy County Administrator; Subject: Follow-up to the Daily Jail Population Study.

Petersilia, Joan and Susan Turner, (1987), 'Guideline-based Justice: Prediction and Racial Minorities," in *Prediction and Classification : Criminal Justice Decision Making,* ed. Don Gottfredson and Michael Tonry. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

HC 11561
7/30/92

Screening Date:_____

Hennepin County Pretrial Services Point Scale

Name:_____ Date of Birth ___/___/___
      Last   First   Middle Name

Address:_____

Charge:_____
(If more than one use most serious as defined by Sentencing Guidelines Commission)

Public Defender: ____Eligible   ____Ineligible

I.   Present Offense/Main Charge Requiring Judicial Review
_____ A. See reverse side for list of offenses   +9
_____ B. Weapon used   +9
       (Pursuant to Minnesota Statute §609.11, Subd. 4 and 5)

II.   Present Offense/Main Charge
       Not Requiring Judicial Review
_____Other felony offense not on judicial review list +3
_____Gross/misdemeanor/traffic offense 0

III.   Current Minnesota Residence
_____Three months or less +1
_____Over three months 0

IV.   Living Situation
_____Living alone +1
_____Living with relatives or any other unrelated person 0

V.   Employment/Income
    Employed less than 20 hours per week
    Unemployed or not a student
_____Not receiving public assistance/other entitlements +3

    Employed 20 hours or more per week
    Full time student
_____Receiving public assistance/other entitlements 0

VI.   Age (as of date of booking)
_____Age 21 or under +3
_____Age 22 or over 0

VII. Failure to Appear (including present offense)
_____Failure to appear within last three years +6
    (documented by bench warrant(s))
_____No prior failure to appear 0

VIII. Prior Criminal Record
_____A. Felony/gross misd. person convictions
    (violent, assaultive, C.S.C.) 9 points each
_____B. Misdemeanor person convictions 6 points each
_____C. 1 or more other felony convictions +3
_____D. 1 or more other gross/misd. convictions
    (excluding other non-alcohol related traffic) + 1
_____E. No prior convictions 0

Recommendation:
    NBR (0-8)   _____
    CR (9-17)   _____
    Review Required-Score (18 or above) _____
    Holds   _____
    Detainer   _____

Verified: _____ Yes   _____ No   Total Score: _____

Comments/Rationale: _____

Probation Officer Override: _____ Yes _____ No

Probation Officer's Signature: _____ Date: _____

LIST OF OFFENSES REQUIRING JUDICIAL REVIEW FOR PRE-TRIAL RELEASE

SENTENCES
609.11	Minimum Terms of Imprisonment

HOMICIDE
609.185	Murder in the 1st Degree
609.19	Murder in the 2nd Degree
609.195	Murder in the 3rd Degree
609.20	Manslaughter in the 1st Degree
609.205	Manslaughter in the 2nd Degree
609.21	Criminal Vehicular Operation

CRIMES AGAINST THE PERSON
609.221	Assault in the 1st Degree .
609.222	Assault in the 2nd Degree
609.223	Assault in the 3rd Degree
609.2231	Assault in the 4th Degree
609.224	Assault in the 5th Degree (Domestic Assault)
609.245	Aggravated Robbery
609.24	Simple Robbery .
609.25	Kidnapping
609.251	Double Jeopardy, Kidnapping
609.255	False Imprisonment
609.377	Malicious Punishment Of A Child
518B.01 Subd 14	Violation of Orders for Protection

CRIMES AGAINST UNBORN CHILDREN
609.2661	Murder of Unborn Child in the 1st Degree
609.2662	Murder of Unborn Child in the 2nd Degree
609.2663	Murder of Unborn Child in the 3rd Degree
609.2664	Manslaughter of an Unborn Child in the 1st Degree
609.2665	Manslaughter of an Unborn Child in the 2nd Degree
609.267	Assault of an Unborn Child in the 1st Degree
609.2671	Assault of an Unborn Child in the 2nd Degree
609.2672	Assault of an Unborn Child in the 3rd Degree

SEX CRIMES
243.166	Failure To Register As A Sex Offender
609.322	Solicitation, Inducement & Promotion of Prostitution
609.323	Receiving Profit Derived from Prostitution
609.342	Criminal Sexual Conduct in the 1st Degree
609.343	Criminal Sexual Conduct in the 2nd Degree
609.344	Criminal Sexual Conduct in the 3rd Degree
609.345	Criminal Sexual Conduct in the 4th Degree
609.3451	Fifth Degree Criminal Sexual Conduct
609.352	Solicitation of Children to Engage in Sexual Conduct

CRIMES AGAINST THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE
609.485	Escape From Justice
	Fugitive From Justice

DAMAGE TO PROPERTY
609.561	Arson in the 1st Degree
609.562	Arson in the 2nd Degree
609.582 Subd 1 & 2	Burglary in the 1st & 2nd Degree

HC3311 (2/86) HENNEPIN COUNTY PRETRIAL EVALUATION

Screen Date	Div	SIP #		Case #		SID/FBI #			

Name (Last)	(First)	(Middle)	D.O.B.	Age [ ]	Sex	Race

Street Address	Apt #	City	State	Zip

Telephone #	Currently Living With	[ ]	Most Recent Prior Address

Social Security #	Aliases		Birth Place	Marital Status S M D Sep W	# Kids:	# Dep:

Income Sources/School Status Full Time ☐ Part Time ☐ (Hrs per Week)	[ ]	Income $	Assets/Spouses Income

Chemical Abuse History. Admits ☐ Denies ☐	Prior Treatment: Yes ☐ No ☐	Present Use:

Time	Mental Health Issues	Voluntary Turn In Y/N	PD ELIG. Yes ☐ No ☐	PD Repay: Yes ☐ No ☐

| Arrest Type | Main Charge

Other Charges | [ ] | Bail: | Offense Level:

F   GM   M |
|---|---|---|---|---|

| Lives in [ ] Minnesota.

___ mos.
___ yrs
___ life | Weapon Used: [ ] Yes ☐ No ☐ UNK ☐ | SCALE SCORE:

Verified Y/N | RECOMMENDATION:

NBR   ☐
NBR Denied   ☐
CR   ☐ | Level Of Supervision Admin. ☐ Regular ☐ Intensive ☐ | Cond. of Release: |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Holds/Type Yes ☐ No ☐	Over-Ride Rationale

Complaint/Police Report Read? Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A ☐	Victim Name: Victim Address: Comments:	Victim Phone:

| On Probation/Parole County: P.O. Name/#: | Verification Name Phone #: Relationship. Comments | Other Comments.

P.O. |
|---|---|---|

Fourth Judicial District Research Division   43