STATE OF ARIZONA
OFFICE OF THE
AUDITOR GENERAL

A PERFORMANCE AUDIT
of

THE PIMA AND MARICOPA COUNTY TREATMENT ALTERNATIVES TO STREET CRIME PROGRAMS

AUGUST 1980

A REPORT TO THE
ARIZONA STATE LEGISLATURE

REPORT 80-2

DOUGLAS R. NORTON, CPA
AUDITOR GENERAL

STATE OF ARIZONA
OFFICE OF THE
AUDITOR GENERAL

August 14, 1980

The Honorable Bruce Babbitt, Governor
Members of the Arizona Legislature
Ms. Patricia A. Mehrhoff, Pima County TASC Director
Ms. Barbara Zugor, Maricopa County TASC Executive Director
Mr. Steven Radvick, Statewide TASC Coordinator
Mr. Kenneth P. Geis, CODAC, Executive Director

Transmitted herewith is a report of the Auditor General, A Performance Audit of the Pima and Maricopa County Treatment Alternatives to Street Crime Programs. This report is in response to Senate Bill 1226 of the 34th Legislature, First Regular Session.

A summary of this report is found on the blue pages at the front of the report. Responses to this report by the TASC Directors, the Statewide TASC Coordinator, and the Executive Director of CODAC are found on the yellow pages preceding the appendices.

My staff and I will be happy to meet with appropriate legislative committees, individual legislators or other State officials to discuss or clarify any items in the report or to facilitate implementation of the recommendations.

Respectfully submitted,

Douglas R. Norton
Auditor General

Staff: Gerald A. Silva
Jerry L. Mills

OFFICE OF THE AUDITOR GENERAL

A PERFORMANCE AUDIT OF THE PIMA AND MARICOPA COUNTY TREATMENT ALTERNATIVES TO STREET CRIME PROGRAMS

REPORT TO THE
ARIZONA STATE LEGISLATURE

REPORT 80-2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY 1

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND 5

FINDINGS

FINDING I

TASC participation did not result in reduced recidivism. 13

CONCLUSION 22

RECOMMENDATION 22

FINDING II

Improvements needed in client record-keeping procedures for the Maricopa and Pima County TASC programs. 23

CONCLUSION 24

RECOMMENDATIONS 25

OTHER PERTINENT INFORMATION 26

A Statistical Profile of TASC Clients

A Survey of Persons Involved in the Maricopa and Pima County Criminal Justice Systems Revealed that TASC is Perceived as an Important Adjunct of those Systems.

WRITTEN RESPONSES TO THE AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT 47

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A - March 14, 1980, letter from the Pima County TASC Director regarding ancillary services performed by TASC personnel

APPENDIX B - Maricopa County TASC client form

APPENDIX C - Maricopa County TASC 4" x 6" client card

APPENDIX D - Sample of survey form used to survey criminal justice system elements

APPENDIX E - A glossary of terms

SUMMARY

In accordance with Senate Bill 1226 of the 34th Legislature, First Regular Session, the Office of the Auditor General has conducted a performance audit of the Treatment Alternatives to Street Crimes (TASC) programs in Pima and Maricopa Counties.

TASC was conceived by two Federal agencies, the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention and the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, as a means of interrupting the arrest-release-rearrest cycle experienced by many drug-dependent persons. The TASC concept is comprised of the following major assumptions:

- Many drug abusers commit crimes in order to obtain the money required to support their drug habit.
- If arrested and subsequently released to the community while awaiting trial, drug abusers not channeled into treatment are likely to continue abusing drugs and committing crimes to support their habit.
- Providing treatment and removing a drug abuser's need to obtain money for the purchase of drugs would solve related criminality problems.
- A formalized mechanism is needed to identify arrested drug abusers, refer them to appropriate treatment programs and monitor their treatment progress.
- Progress in treatment should be monitored and reported to the court, so that drug abusers may be inspired to perceive a real incentive to succeed in treatment.
- If treatment is successful, there will be less crime in the community than there would be otherwise, since former drug abusers will no longer commit crimes.
- If treatment is successful, the processing burdens on the criminal justice system will be reduced, since former drug abusers will no longer be part of the arrest-release-rearrest cycle.

Accordingly, TASC programs generally perform three basic functions:

- Identifying drug abusers in contact with the criminal justice system and offering those eligible the opportunity of TASC participation.
- Diagnosing the drug abuser's problems and treatment needs and recommending appropriate treatment.
- Monitoring the performance of TASC clients (according to locally determined treatment objectives and criminal justice system obligations) and returning violators of the conditions of program participation to the criminal justice system for appropriate action.

The Pima County TASC program began operation in July 1975 and, as of March 1980, has served 1,083 clients. The Pima County TASC 1980-81 budget is $187,876. The Maricopa County TASC program began operation in July 1977 and, as of March 1980, has served 805 clients. The Maricopa County 1980-81 budget is $195,000.

Our review of the Pima and Maricopa County TASC programs revealed that: 1) there was no significant difference in recidivism between Maricopa County TASC clients and a comparable non-TASC group, and 2) the Pima County TASC clients had a higher rate of recidivism than a comparable non-TASC group. In addition, a detailed analysis of the Pima and Maricopa County TASC programs and clients revealed that the primary causes for the difference in recidivism between the two programs appear to be: 1) Pima County has used residential care as a treatment modality far more extensively than Maricopa County, and 2) Maricopa County is far more restrictive than Pima County regarding TASC eligibility. (page 20)

Our review of the Maricopa and Pima County TASC programs also revealed a need within both programs for formal written criteria regarding client terminations. In addition, each TASC program has developed independently some valuable client record-keeping procedures that should be adopted by the other program. (page 23)

The report contains a statistical profile of the 411 Pima County TASC clients who entered the program between July 1975 and December 1977 and the 247 Maricopa County TASC clients who entered the program between July 1977 and December 1978, which revealed that:

- The vast majority were heroin abusers. (Table 7)
- Most were arrested for burglary or possession of drugs. (Table 8)
- Most of the TASC clients who were arrested more than once were rearrested for burglary or possession of drugs. (Table 9)
- Years of substance abuse varied from less than one year to 40 years, with the average being 6.1 years. (Table 10)
- The most frequently used drug treatment modality was drug-free out-patient. (Table 11)
- Approximately 28 percent of Pima County TASC clients received employment counseling from TASC personnel. (Table 12)
- More than half the TASC participants were in TASC for less than three months. (Table 13)
- Less than 20 percent of TASC participants successfully completed their treatment programs. (Table 14)
- Approximately 80 percent had an arrest record before entering TASC. (Table 15)
- Approximately 14 percent of Pima County TASC clients and eight percent of Maricopa County TASC clients were arrested while still in TASC. (Table 16)
- Approximately 17 percent of Pima County TASC clients and four percent of Maricopa County TASC clients were program repeaters. (Table 17)
- Approximately 75 percent of Pima County TASC clients and 61 percent of Maricopa County TASC clients had been in drug treatment before entering TASC. (Table 18)
- Approximately half the Pima County TASC clients and one fourth of Maricopa County TASC clients were arrested after entering TASC. (Table 19)

- Approximately 33 percent of Pima County TASC clients and 19 percent of Maricopa County TASC clients were arrested within one year after terminating from TASC. (Table 20)
- Thirty-seven percent of Pima County TASC clients and 17 percent of Maricopa County TASC clients were convicted of a crime after entering TASC. (Table 21)
- Approximately 24 percent of Pima County TASC clients and ten percent of Maricopa County TASC clients were convicted of a crime within one year after terminating from TASC. (Table 22)

Finally, the report contains the results of a survey of persons involved in the Maricopa and Pima County criminal justice systems which revealed that TASC is perceived as an important adjunct of those systems. (page 37)

It is recommended that:

- The Director of the Pima County TASC program consider:
  1) Referring TASC clients to residential treatment programs only after other drug treatment modality options have been exhausted, and
  2) Adopting more stringent TASC eligibility requirements.

- The Directors of the TASC programs in Pima and Maricopa Counties and the Statewide TASC Coordinator develop formal, written criteria regarding client terminations. Such criteria should be specific regarding length of TASC participation, number and frequency of required urine samples, percentage of required clean urine samples, frequency of TASC counseling and subsequent arrests.

- Pima County TASC adopt the client form and 4" x 6" card filing system developed by Maricopa County TASC.

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

In accordance with Senate Bill 1226 of the 34th Legislature, First Regular Session, the Office of the Auditor General has conducted a performance audit of the Treatment Alternatives to Street Crimes (TASC) programs in Pima and Maricopa Counties.

TASC was conceived by two Federal agencies, the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention and the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, as a means of interrupting the arrest-release-rearrest cycle experienced by many drug-dependent persons. The TASC concept is comprised of the following major assumptions:

- Many drug abusers commit crimes in order to obtain the money required to support their drug habit.
- If arrested and subsequently released to the community while awaiting trial, drug abusers not channeled into treatment are likely to continue abusing drugs and committing crimes to support their habit.
- Providing treatment and removing a drug abuser's need to obtain money for the purchase of drugs would solve related criminality problems.
- A formalized mechanism is needed to identify arrested drug abusers, refer them to appropriate treatment programs and monitor their treatment progress.
- Progress in treatment should be monitored and reported to the court, so that drug abusers may be inspired to perceive a real incentive to succeed in treatment.
- If treatment is successful, there will be less crime in the community than there would be otherwise, since former drug abusers will no longer commit crimes.
- If treatment is successful, the processing burdens on the criminal justice system will be reduced, since former drug abusers will no longer be part of the arrest-release-rearrest cycle.

Accordingly, TASC programs generally perform three basic functions:

- Identifying drug abusers in contact with the criminal justice system and offering those eligible the opportunity of TASC participation.
- Diagnosing the drug abuser's problems and treatment needs and recommending appropriate treatment.
- Monitoring the performance of TASC clients (according to locally determined treatment objectives and criminal justice system obligations) and returning violators of the conditions of program participation to the criminal justice system for appropriate action.

The basic TASC model involves three components: 1) a screening unit which attempts to identify drug abusers entering the criminal justice system, 2) an intake unit to which eligible persons are referred for diagnosis of the drug problem involved and referral to an appropriate treatment program, and 3) a tracking unit to monitor the progress of TASC clients and ensure their compliance with success/failure criteria of their respective programs.*

Nationally, the TASC concept has been an evolutionary one. Originally designed for opiate abusers only, some TASC programs now also accept persons with other drug abuse problems. In addition, the major thrust of TASC has, by necessity, changed a diversion program to an intervention program.

Diversion

Diversion is a program which diverts criminal cases from the usual criminal justice processing and disposes of them in a nontrial, nonconviction setting. Usually, prosecution is deferred, pending a defendant's compliance in the certain established conditions of a pretrial probation. If the defendant complies, the case is, in effect, malle prosse, and the record of the arrest is expunged.

* TASC personnel are also involved in several community activities not directly related to TASC. Appendix A is a statement from the Director of the Pima County TASC program regarding these ancillary activities.

In order to be eligible for diversion a person must: 1) have no prior felony convictions, and 2) enter into a signed agreement with the County Attorney that stipulates the duration and conditions of TASC-monitored drug treatment. In return, the County Attorney agrees to join with the arrested persons' attorney in a petition to the court to have arrest charges dismissed.

Intervention

TASC intervention can be applied on a pretrial or post-trial basis. Pretrial intervention occurs when a potential TASC client is identified soon after arrest, screened for eligibility, released from custody on his or her own recognizance and diagnosed for referral to treatment. While the client is in treatment, TASC monitors his progress and reports such progress to appropriate criminal justice system officials. If the client is brought to trial and found guilty, TASC-documented treatment progress is provided for consideration in sentencing. Claimed benefits of pretrial intervention to the criminal justice system are a reduction in the pretrial detention population and the provision of close supervision for an arrestee population awaiting trial. A corollary benefit of pretrial supervision is the opportunity to test the stability of the offender within the community prior to trial and possible sentencing. The benefits to the defendant are release from custody and a rehabilitation opportunity prior to trial.

Post-trial intervention is similar to pretrial except that TASC involvement begins after the client's trial has been completed. Prospective clients may be referred to TASC for diagnosis and development of a treatment recommendation which the court may consider in making the sentencing decision; they may be referred by the court or probation department after sentencing; or they may be referred by the parole department after incarceration.

In all cases, TASC conducts its diagnostic activities, refers the client to appropriate treatment, monitors progress and reports on client performance. The original TASC concept was a classic diversion model. However, on a national level the criminal justice system, particularly the prosecutor's office, has not been willing to divert drug-involved individuals. In effect, a diversion option for drug abusers has not been accepted by the criminal justice system. Thus, a vast majority of TASC involvement has been on an intervention basis, not diversion.

The Pima and Maricopa County TASC programs, like a vast majority of TASC programs in other states, have few diversion clients. For example, the Pima County TASC Diversion Program is restricted to first-time prescription pill offenders. In Pima and Maricopa Counties the County Attorney is the prosecuting arm of the criminal justice system and determines who is eligible for diversion. Both the Pima and Maricopa County Attorneys have adopted policies that significantly limit the availability of diversion for persons arrested for drug-related crimes. Thus, TASC clients in Pima and Maricopa County rarely qualify for diversion.

Pima County TASC

The Pima County TASC program began operation in July 1975. Organizationally, it is part of the Community Organization for Drug Abuse Control (CODAC) of Pima County, Inc., which is the designated umbrella agency in Pima County for drug programs. During its 1979 fiscal year, CODAC of Pima County, Inc. received $1,623,828 from the following sources:

Sources of CODAC Funding for the 1979 Fiscal Year	Percentage of Funding
The Arizona Department of Health Services	50%
The National Institute on Drug Abuse	30
The Arizona Department of Corrections	8
The City of Tucson	5
Pima County	5
Local community funds	2
	100%

As of March 1, 1980, the Pima County TASC program had interviewed 12,392 arrested persons, of whom 2,996 indicated they had a drug problem and 1,083 subsequently became TASC clients. Table 1 summarizes actual and budgeted expenditures for the Pima County TASC program from July 1, 1975, to June 30, 1981.

TABLE 1

SUMMARY OF ACTUAL AND BUDGETED EXPENDITURES
FOR THE PIMA COUNTY TASC PROGRAM FROM
JULY 1, 1975, TO JUNE 30, 1981

	EXPENDITURES				
	ACTUAL			BUDGETED	
Expense Items	7/1/75 to 11/30/76	12/1/76 to 6/30/78	7/1/78 to 6/30/79	7/1/79 to 6/30/80	7/1/80 to 6/30/81
Personnel	$173,339	$188,997	$ 92,467	$ 93,756	$112,272
Fringe benefits	8,601	10,345	5,104	5,600	6,780
Rent	11,607	15,295	10,080	10,920	11,200
Travel	10,918	8,533	4,527	5,000	6,224
Consultation and training	898		4,359	4,300	10,400
Telephone	5,668	5,028	2,434	2,400	2,640
Sustenance Fund*	6,825	6,300	2,415	2,500	2,700
Laboratory tests	7,745	16,427	7,516	10,000	23,400
Equipment	7,443	168			
Evaluation	9,954	12,500			
Residential detoxification	11,093	3,562			
Other	13,141	8,218	5,267	5,516	12,260
	$267,232	$275,373	$134,169	$139,992	$187,876

* Food, shelter and clothing for TASC client emergency needs.

Maricopa County TASC

The Maricopa County TASC program began operation in July 1977. Organizationally it is part of the Community Organization for Drug Abuse, Mental Health, and Alcoholism Services, Inc. (CODAMA). In 1977, CODAMA evolved from CODAC to become the designated umbrella agency in Maricopa County to function as the funding mechanism for mental health and alcohol abuse, as well as drug abuse, services. During its 1979 fiscal year CODAMA received $3,290,980 from the following sources:

Sources of CODAMA Funding for the 1979 Calendar Year	Percentage of Funding
Grants and contracts from governmental agencies	96%
Methadone revenues from subcontractors	3
Contributors, interest income and client fees	1
	100%

As of March 1, 1980, the Maricopa County TASC program had interviewed 13,079 arrested persons, of whom 891 indicated they had a drug problem and 805 subsequently became TASC clients. Table 2 summarizes actual and budgeted expenditures for the Maricopa County TASC program from July 1, 1977, to June 30, 1981.

TABLE 2

SUMMARY OF ACTUAL AND BUDGETED EXPENDITURES
FOR THE MARICOPA COUNTY TASC PROGRAM FROM
JULY 1, 1977, TO JUNE 30, 1981

	ACTUAL		BUDGETED	
Expense Items	7/1/77 to 11/30/78	12/1/78 to 2/14/80	2/15/80 to 6/30/80	7/1/80 to 6/30/81
Personnel	$146,479	$178,126	$44,323	$122,746
Fringe benefits	18,578	20,548	6,648	18,412
Travel	1,591	3,580	1,260	2,400
Equipment	5,594		850	1,680
Supplies		1,339	715	1,500
Contractual(1)	23,337	10,122	5,400	16,955
Accounting/audit fees				7,700
Rent(2)			5,115	13,012
Other operating expenses	26,418	43,293	10,495	10,595
	$221,997	$257,008	$74,806	$195,000

(1) Accounting fees, urinalysis,* auto lease, educational valuation system audit.

(2) Rent expense was included in "Other operating expenses" prior to 2/15/80.

* See Appendix E for a glossary of terms.

Audit Scope and Objectives

Senate Bill 1226 of the 34th Legislature, First Regular Session, states "...the Auditor General shall conduct program audits as provided in Title 41, Chapter 7, Article 10.1, Arizona Revised Statutes, on all (TASC) programs and report to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee on the results of the audits...."

In accordance with the above requirements, the Office of the Auditor General conducted audits of the Pima and Maricopa County TASC programs to:

- Provide the Legislature with a detailed analysis of TASC program clients, and
- Assess the effectiveness of these TASC programs by: 1) comparing the recidivism rate of TASC clients to a similar non-TASC group, and 2) surveying elements of the criminal justice system regarding these TASC programs.

The Office of the Auditor General expresses its gratitude to the following persons and entities for their cooperation, assistance and consideration throughout the course of our audit:

- The Directors and personnel of the TASC programs in Pima and Maricopa Counties,
- The Statewide TASC Coordinator,
- The Arizona Department of Public Safety, Criminal Information Section,
- The County Attorneys and their staffs in Pima and Maricopa Counties, and
- The Director and staff of the Pima County Pretrial Release Project, Correctional Volunteer Center.

FINDING I

TASC PARTICIPATION DID NOT RESULT IN REDUCED RECIDIVISM.

As part of our assessment of TASC effectiveness, a study was conducted to test the hypothesis that TASC reduces recidivism. The basic study design was to identify and determine rates of recidivism for: 1) Pima County TASC clients, 2) Maricopa County TASC clients, and 3) a comparable group of persons who met the eligibility criteria but did not participate in TASC. The results of this study were that: 1) there was no significant difference in recidivism between Maricopa County TASC clients and a comparable non-TASC group, and 2) the Pima County TASC clients had a higher rate of recidivism than a comparable non-TASC group. In addition, a detailed analysis of the Pima and Maricopa County TASC programs and clients revealed that the primary causes for the difference in recidivism between the two programs appear to be: 1) Pima County has used residential care as a treatment modality far more extensively than Maricopa County, and 2) Maricopa County is far more restrictive than Pima County regarding TASC eligibility.

Study Methodology

Several problems needed to be resolved in order to complete our study of TASC versus non-TASC recidivism. These problems were:

- Identifying a comparable non-TASC group.
- Obtaining criminal histories of the persons included in the study.
- Defining recidivism for the purposes of this study.

The methods used to resolve the above problems are detailed below.

A Comparable Non-TASC Group

Perhaps a lethal threat to the validity and integrity of our recidivism study was that members of a non-TASC group would not be comparable to TASC clients. As a result, great care was taken to ensure that the non-TASC group selected: 1) met all the TASC eligibility requirements, and 2) had the same opportunities to commit crimes during the period they were monitored as TASC clients had. In order to achieve those objectives the following procedures were followed.

One of the basic TASC functions is identifying drug abusers in contact with the criminal justice system and offering those eligible the opportunity of TASC participation. In order to facilitate that function TASC personnel in Pima County visit the Pima County jail every morning, seven days a week, and interview persons brought in during the previous 24 hours. Those persons interviewed are categorized as either TASC-eligible or TASC-ineligible in accordance with TASC eligibility criteria.* At the time of the screening interview an initial interview form is prepared, which includes information such as name, age, sex, date of arrest, date of birth, drug-usage history and previous arrests. When the initial interview form is completed, the TASC representative determines the interviewee's eligibility and a notation is made on the interview form indicating TASC eligibility or ineligibility.

The Pima County TASC program retains all initial interview forms, including forms for individuals who were identified as being eligible for TASC but, for unknown reasons, declined to participate in the program. Those persons formed the nucleus for our comparable non-TASC group. We initially identified 423 such persons who were interviewed by TASC personnel from July 1975 through December 1976.

The group of 423 persons eventually was reduced by 246 to arrive at 177 non-TASC participants who were comparable to the TASC clients in the study.

* See page 21 for an explanation of Pima and Maricopa County TASC eligibility criteria.

These 246 eliminations from our non-TASC study group were made to exclude those persons who were: 1) held in custody for more than 30 days after arrest, and 2) sentenced to incarceration as a result of their arrests. Additionally, the TASC study groups were similarly modified to eliminate those persons who were sentenced to incarceration as a result of their arrests.

It should be noted that the above eliminations were made to ensure that the non-TASC study group members and TASC clients were not only similar as to TASC eligibility but had the same opportunities to commit crimes during the follow-up period as well. Thus, theoretically, both groups were not incarcerated during the follow-up period; at least, not as a result of the arrest that caused them to be included in the study initially.

Obtaining Criminal
History Information

In order to measure recidivism, it was necessary to obtain information regarding subsequent arrests and convictions for TASC clients and the members of the comparable non-TASC group. This proved to be difficult in that arrest and conviction information is not easily obtainable. For example, the Department of Public Safety (DPS) maintains a computerized arrest information system (Criminal Identification System) into which is put arrest data received from the Federal Bureau of Investigation's National Criminal Information Center (NCIC). However, the DPS system was not sufficient for our purpose because, until June 1977, DPS input only one percent of the arrest data received from NCIC into its system, and DPS has not input any NCIC arrest information into its system since June 1977. This has occurred because DPS does not have personnel to input the NCIC information into its system, according to DPS officials.

As a result, it was necessary to refer to other sources and hand-search for criminal history information. These other sources included: DPS manual files, the Maricopa County Attorney's Office, the Pima County Attorney's Office, and the Pima County Pretrial Release Project, Correction Volunteer Center.

Defining Recidivism

Critical questions that needed answers in order to complete our recidivism study were: what is recidivism and how can it be equitably measured? With regard to a definition of recidivism, two options were available: rearrest or subsequent conviction.

Discussions with TASC personnel revealed that subsequent conviction was a more valid measure of recidivism than rearrest because rearrest charges, particularly for drug abusers, are often dropped or dismissed.

Further, it was concluded that the fairest way to measure recidivism was to place all persons being monitored on an equal time basis. Thus, each person in our study was monitored for one year, either after: 1) leaving TASC, for TASC participants, or 2) release from custody, for non-TASC participants.

Study Results

By employing the above procedures, the Office of the Auditor General calculated recidivism rates for: 1) Pima County TASC clients who entered the program between July 1975 and December 1977, 2) Persons eligible for TASC in Pima County from July 1975 through 1976 who did not participate (non-TASC), and 3) Maricopa County TASC clients who entered the program between July 1977 and December 1978.*

The results of this recidivism study are summarized below:

- There was no significant difference between Maricopa TASC clients and the non-TASC group. (Table 3)
- The non-TASC group had a lower rate of recidivism than Pima County TASC clients. (Table 3)
- Pima and Maricopa County TASC clients who successfully completed their TASC programs did have a lower rate of recidivism than the members of the non-TASC group. (Table 4)

* The Pima County TASC program began operation in July 1975, while the Maricopa County TASC program did not begin operation until July 1977.

TABLE 3

SUMMARY OF RECIDIVISM FOR PIMA AND MARICOPA COUNTY TASC CLIENTS AND A COMPARABLE NON-TASC GROUP

	Number of Convictions Within One Year of TASC Termination or Release From Custody			
Study Group	No Convictions	One Conviction	Two Convictions	Total
Percentage of Pima County TASC clients	76.5%	21.6%	1.9%	100.0%
Percentage of Maricopa County TASC clients	90.3	9.7		100.0
Percentage of Non-TASC	88.1	10.8	1.1	100.0

TABLE 4

SUMMARY OF RECIDIVISM RATES FOR PIMA AND MARICOPA COUNTY TASC CLIENTS WHO SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETED TASC AND A COMPARABLE NON-TASC GROUP

	Number of Convictions Within One Year of TASC Termination or Release From Custody			
Study Group	No Convictions	One Conviction	Two Convictions	Total
Percentage of Pima County TASC clients who successfully completed TASC	92.0%	8.0%		100.0%
Percentage of Maricopa County TASC clients who successfully completed TASC	92.3	7.7		100.0
Percentage of non-TASC	88.1	10.8	1.1	100.0

Additional Recidivism Analysis

Further analysis of Pima and Maricopa County TASC client recidivism revealed that:

- Years of drug abuse, drug treatment involvement before TASC, arrests prior to TASC, criminal justice system referral and prior TASC participation do not appear to be factors that are predictive of subsequent recidivism. (Table 5)
- Type of TASC termination and drug treatment modality appear to be factors that are predictive of subsequent recidivism. (Table 6)

TABLE 5

SUMMARY OF FACTORS THAT DO NOT APPEAR TO BE PREDICTIVE OF TASC CLIENT RECIDIVISM

	TASC CLIENTS CONVICTED WITHIN ONE YEAR OF TASC TERMINATION																		
	Number of Years of Drug Abuse							Previous Drug Treatment, Involvement Before TASC		Prior Arrests Before TASC*		Criminal Justice System Referral						Prior TASC Participation	
Study Group	1	2	3	4	5	6-10	More than 10	Yes	No	Yes	No	Pre Trial	Post Trial	Probation	Parole	Self-Referral	Police and Other Referrals	Yes	No
Percentage of Pima County TASC clients	27.7%	30.6%	31.2%	25.6%	22.9%	23.7%	19.0%	25.4%	26.7%	24.8%	27.3%	28.1%	27.8%	28.3%	21.3%	9.1%	23.1%	15.9%	27.2% ***
Percentage of Maricopa County TASC clients	14.3%	12.5%	21.4%	12.5%	11.8%	7.3%	9.7%	10.6%	12.1%	13.2%	4.2%	12.4%	0.0%**	4.3%	14.3%	0.0%	11.1%	11.1%	11.3%

* There is a significant difference in recidivism between the Maricopa County TASC clients who had and had not been arrested before TASC. However, that result was not duplicated in the Pima County Program.

** Only 1 client in this category

*** There is a significant difference in recidivism between the Pima County TASC clients who had and had not previously participated in TASC. However, that result was not duplicated in the Maricopa County Program.

TABLE 6

FACTORS THAT APPEAR TO BE PREDICTIVE OF TASC CLIENT RECIDIVISM

	TASC CLIENTS CONVICTED WITHIN ONE YEAR OF TASC TERMINATION												
	TYPE OF TASC TERMINATION							TYPE OF DRUG TREATMENT MODALITY					
Study Group	Successful Complete	Successful Incomplete	Neutral	Failure	Failure - Rearrest	Failure - Split	Death	Detoxification	Methodone Maintenance	Drug-Free Out Patient	Residential	Multiple	Other
Percentage of Pima County TASC clients	8.0%	20.0%	19.4%	21.1%	60.3%	28.8%	0.0%*	36.8%	10.0%	18.2%	33.6%	30.6%	0.0%
Percentage of Maricopa County TASC clients	7.7%	0.0%*	4.2%	13.0%	36.8%	50.0%	0.0%*	0.0%	11.7%	9.4%	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%

* Only 1 client in group

Additional analysis of the Pima and Maricopa County TASC programs revealed that the primary causes for the difference in recidivism between the TASC programs appear to be: 1) Pima County has used residential care as a treatment modality far more extensively than Maricopa County, and 2) Maricopa County is far more restrictive than Pima County regarding TASC eligibility.

As is indicated in Table 11, TASC clients in both programs who were placed in methadone-maintenance and drug-free outpatient care had relatively low recidivism rates, while patients placed in residential treatment had relatively high recidivism rates. The significance of this phenomenon lies in the fact that the Pima County TASC program has utilized residential treatment far more extensively than Maricopa County and, conversely, Maricopa County has used methadone-maintenance treatment far more extensively than Pima County, as shown below:

	Residential Treatment	Methadone Maintenance
Percentage of TASC clients placed in treatment:		
Pima County TASC	28.9%	2.5%
Maricopa County TASC	4.5	34.7

Further, it appears that Maricopa County TASC has been far less willing to accept clients than has Pima County TASC, as is shown below:

	Pima County TASC from October 1975 through December 1977		Maricopa County TASC from January 1977 through December 1978	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Interviewed by TASC personnel	7,240	100%	9,554	100%
Not eligible for TASC because interviewee was accused of committing a violent crime	-0-	-0-	4,702	49
Interviewee identified as drug abuser	1,775	25	303	3
Volunteered for TASC participation	1,067	15	299	3
Identified as TASC-eligible	1,067	15	245	11
Admitted to TASC	639	9	188	2

The reason for the significant difference between Pima and Maricopa Counties in the percentage of interviewees admitted to TASC shown above is that Maricopa County TASC eligibility criteria are more stringent than Pima County's. For example, Pima County TASC eligibility requirements are: 1) the client must admit that he or she has a substance abuse problem, and 2) the client must volunteer to enter TASC.

Maricopa County TASC, on the other hand, generally will not accept a pretrial person into TASC who has been arrested for any of the following offenses:

Aggravated assault,
Aggravated battery,
Armed robbery,
Child abuse,
Indecent assault upon a child,
Child molesting with violence,
Rape,
Kidnapping, and
Homicide (including manslaughter).

Because of Pima County TASC's paucity of client eligibility requirements, it appears that Pima County TASC can accept higher risk clients than Maricopa County TASC. Further, according to the Director of the Pima County Pretrial Release Project, Correctional Volunteer Center, many of these higher risk Pima County TASC clients would be put back on the street and placed in a position to commit additional crimes were it not for the TASC participation. Thus, by adopting stricter Pima County TASC eligibility requirements the risk of crime to the community may be lessened.

CONCLUSION

The results of a recidivism study to test the hypothesis that TASC reduces crime revealed that there was no significant difference in recidivism between Maricopa County TASC clients and a comparable non-TASC group and that Pima County TASC clients had a higher rate of recidivism than a comparable non-TASC group. In addition, it appears that the Pima County TASC program's frequent usage of residential drug treatment programs and relatively flexible eligibility requirements may account for its higher rate of recidivism.

RECOMMENDATION

- The Director of the Pima County TASC program should consider:
  1) Referring TASC clients to residential treatment programs only after other drug-treatment modality options have been exhausted, and
  2) Adopting more stringent TASC eligibility requirements.

FINDING II

IMPROVEMENTS NEEDED IN CLIENT RECORD-KEEPING PROCEDURES FOR THE PIMA AND MARICOPA COUNTY TASC PROGRAMS.

Our review of the Pima and Maricopa County TASC programs revealed a need within both programs for formal written criteria regarding all types of client terminations. In addition, each TASC program has developed independently some valuable client record-keeping procedures that should be adopted by the other program.

Client Terminations

Both the Pima and Maricopa County TASC programs classify client terminations as successful complete, successful incomplete, neutral, failure or failure rearrest. However, neither program has established formal written criteria to facilitate proper classifications for TASC terminations. As a result, client terminations within the Pima and Maricopa County TASC programs are classified inconsistently and comparisons are difficult to make between the two TASC programs regarding the relative percentages of successful versus unsuccessful clients.

For example, several instances were noted within both TASC programs in which identical termination circumstances resulted in different termination classifications.

Further, what may be a failure termination in one TASC program may be classified as a neutral or a successful incomplete termination in the other TASC program.

As a result, the usefulness of termination statistics generated by both TASC programs is diminished. Perhaps the need for established TASC termination criteria is best illustrated in the case of a TASC client who died of a drug overdose and was classified as a neutral termination.

Pima and Maricopa County

TASC Client Records

The Pima and Maricopa County TASC programs have independently developed unique client forms, records and filing procedures. Client records in both programs could be improved if some record-keeping aspects of each program were adopted by the other.

Both the Pima and Maricopa County TASC programs keep detailed information on each client who enters TASC. Both programs generally obtain client information such as client name, birthdate, sex, referral source, arrest charges, marital status, prior arrests and convictions, drug dependency, prior drug-treatment programs, name of attorney and vocational skills.

However, both programs either: 1) obtain client information that the other program does not, or 2) record client information in a more useable format than does the other program. For example, Pima County TASC records the date the client first and last used the substance of abuse, whereas Maricopa County TASC does not.

Maricopa County TASC, on the other hand, has developed a client form* that specifically asks for client information such as referral source, criminal justice status, court/judge, attorney, probation/parole officer, rearrest charges and sentencing. Maintaining such client information on a single form aids in: 1) ensuring that the information is recorded, and 2) obtaining a complete client profile. It should be noted that Maricopa County TASC has also adopted a 4" x 6" card filing system** that duplicates the information on the client form. This system allows for quick and easy retrieval of pertinent client information.

CONCLUSION

Both Pima and Maricopa TASC programs need to develop formal, written criteria regarding client terminations. In addition, both TASC programs have developed methods of recording client information that should be adopted by the other program.

* Appendix B is a sample of the Maricopa County TASC client form.

** Appendix C is a sample of the 4" x 6" card used by Maricopa County TASC.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that:

1. The Directors of the TASC programs in Pima and Maricopa Counties, and the Statewide TASC Coordinator, develop formal, written criteria regarding client terminations. Such criteria should be specific regarding length of TASC participation, number and frequency of required urine samples,* required percentage of clean urine samples, frequency of TASC counseling and subsequent arrests.

2. Pima County TASC adopt the client form and 4" x 6" card filing system developed by Maricopa County TASC.

* See Appendix E for a glossary of terms.

OTHER PERTINENT INFORMATION

A STATISTICAL PROFILE OF TASC CLIENTS.

Our audit of the Pima and Maricopa County TASC programs included a detailed review and analysis of the 411 Pima County TASC clients who entered the program between July 1975 and December 1977 and the 247 Maricopa County TASC clients who entered the program between July 1977 and December 1978.* This process generated a statistical profile of TASC clients which revealed that:

- The vast majority were heroin abusers. (Table 7)
- Most were arrested for burglary or possession of drugs. (Table 8)
- Most of the TASC clients who were arrested more than once were rearrested for burglary or possession of drugs. (Table 9)
- Years of substance abuse varied from less than one year to 40 years, with the average being 6.1 years. (Table 10)
- The most frequently used drug-treatment modality was drug-free out-patient. (Table 11)
- Approximately 28 percent of Pima County TASC clients received employment counseling from TASC personnel. (Table 12)
- More than half the TASC participants were in TASC for less than three months. (Table 13)
- Less than 20 percent of TASC participants successfully completed their treatment programs. (Table 14)
- Approximately 80 percent had an arrest record before entering TASC. (Table 15)
- Approximately 14 percent of Pima County TASC clients and eight percent of Maricopa County TASC clients were arrested while still in TASC. (Table 16)

* The Pima County TASC program began operation in July 1975 and the Maricopa County TASC program began operation in July 1977.

- Approximately 17 percent of Pima County TASC clients and four percent of Maricopa County TASC clients were program repeaters. (Table 17)
- Approximately 75 percent of Pima County TASC clients and 61 percent of Maricopa County TASC clients had been in drug treatment before entering TASC. (Table 18)
- Approximately half the Pima County TASC clients and one fourth of Maricopa County TASC clients were arrested after entering TASC. (Table 19)
- Approximately 33 percent of Pima County TASC clients and 19 percent of Maricopa County TASC clients were arrested within one year after terminating from TASC. (Table 20)
- Thirty-seven percent of Pima County TASC clients and 17 percent of Maricopa County TASC clients were convicted of a crime after entering TASC. (Table 21)
- Approximately 24 percent of Pima County TASC clients and ten percent of Maricopa County TASC clients were convicted of a crime within one year after terminating from TASC. (Table 22)

It should be noted that the data presented in the following tables is for informational purposes only and is not intended to compare the Pima County TASC Program with the Maricopa County TASC Program. Such a comparison would be inappropriate in view of the different time periods involved for each program. However, for the purpose of our recidivism study, both programs were based on an equal time basis. (See Finding I).

TABLE 7

PROFILE OF TASC CLIENTS BY TYPE OF DRUG ABUSED

	TYPE OF DRUG ABUSED									
	Heroin	Multiple Drug With Heroin	Alcohol	Barbituates	Amphetamines	Cocaine	Marijuana	Other Hallucinogen	Multiple Drugs	Total
Percentage of Pima County TASC clients	50.9%	45.5%	0.2%	0.7%	0.2%	0.0%	0.2%	0.2%	2.0%	100.0%
Percentage of Maricopa County TASC clients	73.5	5.7	1.6	2.4	0.4	0.4	2.4	0.4	13.2	100.0

TABLE 8

PROFILE OF TASC CLIENT ARREST CHARGES

	ARREST CHARGES												
	Burglary	Armed Robbery	Assault	Homicide	Possession Of Drugs	Prostitution	Shop Lifting	Possession of Drugs For Sale	Forgery	Other	DWI	Not Known	Total
Percentage of Pima County TASC clients	33.9%	1.3%	1.0%	0.5%	17.2%	0.8%	4.2%	20.9%	1.3%	14.4%	0.0%	4.4%	100.0%
Percentage of Maricopa County TASC clients	34.1	0.8	2.0	0.4	22.8	1.2	1.6	16.7	0.8	19.5	0.0	0.0	100.0

TABLE 9

PROFILE OF REARREST CHARGES FOR TASC CLIENTS

	REARREST CHARGES										
	Burglary	Armed Robbery	Assault	Homicide	Possession of Drugs	Prostitution	Violation of Probation	Possession of Drugs For Sale	Other	Charges Dropped	Total
Percent of Pima County TASC clients	40.4%	0.5%	4.9%	0.5%	18.2%	1.0%	11.3%	15.8%	0.5%	6.9%	100.0%
Percentage of Maricopa County TASC clients	45.8	0.0	1.7	3.4	25.4	5.1	1.7	10.2	0.0	6.8	100.0

TABLE 10

PROFILE OF THE NUMBER OF YEARS TASC CLIENTS HAVE ABUSED DRUGS

	NUMBER OF YEARS OF DRUG ABUSE									
	One Year or Less	Two Years	Three Years	Four Years	Five Years	Six to Ten Years	Eleven to Fifteen Years	Sixteen to Twenty Years	Twenty-one to Forty Years	Total
Percentage of Pima County TASC clients	11.5%	12.0%	11.8%	10.6%	11.8%	33.3%	3.8%	2.7%	2.3%	100.0%
Percentage of Maricopa County TASC clients	9.3	10.6	12.3	10.6	7.5	36.2	7.0	3.4	2.8	100.0

TABLE 11

PROFILE OF DRUG TREATMENT MODALITIES TO WHICH TASC CLIENTS WERE REFERRED

	TYPE OF DRUG TREATMENT MODALITY*						
	Detoxification	Methadone Maintenance	Drug-Free Out Patient	Residential	Other	Multiple Treatment	Total
Percentage of Pima County TASC clients	4.7%	2.5%	42.3%	28.9%	0.5%	21.1%	100.0%
Percentage of Maricopa County TASC clients	1.4	34.7	57.2	4.5	0.0	2.3	100.0

TABLE 12

PROFILE OF TASC CLIENTS WHO RECEIVED SUPPORTIVE SERVICES WHILE IN TASC

	TYPE OF SUPPORTIVE SERVICE PROVIDED*								
	Employment Counseling	Employment Placement	Educational Referral	Educational Placement	Housing Referral	Food Referral	Transportation	Welfare Referral	Emergency Funds
Percentage of Pima County TASC clients	28.5%	1.7%	1.5%	1.0%	2.2%	2.0%	2.7%	0.5%	5.6%
Percentage of Maricopa County TASC clients	7.3	7.3	1.2	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	.8

* See Appendix E for a glossary of terms.

TABLE 13

PROFILE OF THE NUMBER OF MONTHS OF TASC PARTICIPATION

	MONTHS OF TASC PARTICIPATION						
	Less Than One Month	One to Three Months	Three to Six Months	Six to Nine Months	Nine to Twelve Months	More Than Twelve Months	Total
Percentage of Pima County TASC clients	17.4%	36.6%	15.5%	9.3%	7.1%	14.0%	100.0%
Percentage of Maricopa County TASC clients	24.3	42.1	24.3	8.5	0.8	0.0	100.0

TABLE 14

PROFILE OF TASC CLIENT TERMINATION FROM TASC*

	TYPE OF TASC TERMINATION									
	Successful Complete	Successful Incomplete	Neutral	Failure	Failure Rearrest	Neutral Incarcerated	Failure Split	Death	Still Active in TASC	Total
Pima County TASC										
Numbers	75	15	62	114	58	8	73	2	2	409
Percentages	18.3%	3.7%	15.2%	27.9%	14.2%	2.0%	17.7 %	0.5%	0.5%	100.0%
Maricopa County TASC										
Numbers	39	1	72	100	19	13	2	1	0	247
Percentages	15.8	0.4	29.1	40.5	7.7	5.3	0.8	0.4	0.0	100.0

* See Appendix E for a Definition of Termination Terms: (See page 23 for a discussion of TASC termination classification inconsistencies).

TABLE 15

PROFILE OF TASC CLIENT ARREST HISTORIES

	Arrest Histories		
	Prior Arrest Record	No Prior Arrest Record	Total
Percentage of Pima County TASC clients	80.1%	19.9%	100.0%
Percentage of Maricopa County TASC clients	80.4	19.6	100.0

TABLE 16

PROFILE OF ELAPSED TIME BETWEEN TASC PARTICIPATION AND SUBSEQUENT ARRESTS

	ELAPSED TIME BETWEEN TASC AND SUBSEQUENT ARREST						
	No Rearrests	Arrested During TASC Treatment	Arrested 1-3 Months After TASC Treatment	Arrested 4-6 Months After TASC Treatment	Arrested 7-12 Months After TASC Treatment	Arrested 13 Months After TASC Treatment	Total
Percentage of Pime County TASC clients	50.6%	14.1%	10.2%	5.4%	8.5%	11.2%	100.0%
Percentage of Maricopa County TASC clients	74.9	7.7	3.6	3.2	5.3	5.3	100.0

TABLE 17

PROFILE OF TASC PROGRAM REPEATERS

	Previous TASC Participation		
	Yes	No	Total
Percentage of Pima County TASC clients	16.8%	83.2%	100.0%
Percentage of Maricopa County TASC clients	3.6	96.4	100.0

TABLE 18

PROFILE OF TASC CLIENTS WHO HAD BEEN IN DRUG TREATMENT PROGRAMS PRIOR TO ENTERING TASC

	Participated in Drug Treatment Programs Prior to Entering TASC		
	Yes	No	Total
Percentage of Pima County TASC clients	74.8%	25.3%	100.0%
Percentage of Maricopa County TASC clients	60.9	39.1	100.0

TABLE 19

SUMMARY OF TASC CLIENT ARRESTS AFTER ENTERING TASC

	Number of Arrests After Entering TASC							
	Zero	One	Two	Three	Four	Five	Seven	Total
Percentage of Pima County TASC clients*	50.4%	33.6%	10.2%	3.6%	1.0%	0.7%	0.5%	100.0%
Percentage of Maricopa County TASC clients**	75.3	24.7						100.0

TABLE 20

SUMMARY OF TASC CLIENT ARRESTS WITHIN ONE YEAR AFTER TERMINATING FROM TASC

	Number of Arrests After Terminating From TASC (Years)			
	Zero	One	Two	Total
Percentage of Pima County TASC clients*	62.5%	33.1%	4.4%	100.0%
Percentage of Maricopa County TASC clients**	80.6	19.4		100.0

* Clients who entered Pima County TASC from July 1975 through December 1977.

** Clients who entered Maricopa County TASC from July 1977 through December 1978.

TABLE 21

SUMMARY OF TASC CLIENT CONVICTIONS AFTER ENTERING TASC

	Number of Convictions							
	Zero	One	Two	Three	Four	Five	Six	Total
Percentage of Pima County TASC clients*	63.0%	28.5%	5.8%	1.5%	0.7%	0.2%	0.2%	100.0%
Percentage of Maricopa County TASC clients**	83.0	17.0						100.0

TABLE 22

SUMMARY OF TASC CLIENT CONVICTIONS WITHIN ONE YEAR AFTER TERMINATING FROM TASC***

	Number of Convictions			
	Zero	One	Two	Total
Percentage of Pima County TASC clients*	76.5%	21.6%	1.9%	100.0%
Percentage of Maricopa County TASC clients**	90.3	9.7		100.0

* Clients who entered Pima County TASC from July 1975 through December 1977.

** Clients who entered Maricopa County TASC from July 1977 through December 1978.

*** See Table 3.

A SURVEY OF PERSONS INVOLVED IN THE MARICOPA AND PIMA COUNTY CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEMS REVEALED THAT TASC IS PERCEIVED AS AN IMPORTANT ADJUNCT OF THOSE SYSTEMS.

As a means of evaluating the effectiveness of the Pima and Maricopa County TASC programs, the Office of the Auditor General surveyed* the following persons in the criminal justice system:

- Judges,
- County attorneys,
- Public defenders,
- Probation officers,
- Parole officers,
- Correctional volunteer center personnel (Pima County),
- Appearance and indigency determination personnel (Maricopa County), and
- Diversion personnel.

The results of the survey indicated strong support for the TASC program from all the respondents in both counties.

Survey Results

In March 1980, the Office of the Auditor General distributed 367 survey questionnaires regarding the Treatment Alternatives to Street Crime (TASC) programs to judges, county attorneys, public defenders, correctional volunteer center officers, probation officers, parole officers, appearance and indigency determination officers and diversion officers in Maricopa and Pima Counties. A total of 164 (45 percent) responded to the survey. The results of the survey follow.

* Appendix D contains a sample of the survey form used.

Overall High Ratings

The TASC survey revealed widespread support for TASC throughout the criminal justice systems surveyed. For example, of the survey respondents:

- 84 percent were either very familiar or adequately familiar with TASC,
- 96 percent said that TASC was essential, very important or moderately important,
- 88 percent rated TASC as either excellent or satisfactory, and
- only eight percent stated that discontinuance of the TASC program would be beneficial.

Table 23 summarizes the survey results regarding TASC familiarities, importance, performance and consequences of discontinuance.

TABLE 23

SUMMARY OF SURVEY RESPONSES REGARDING TASC FAMILIARITY, IMPORTANCE, PERFORMANCE AND CONSEQUENCES OF DISCONTINUANCE

Survey Questions	Survey Responses Regarding: FAMILIARITY				IMPORTANCE					PERFORMANCE				CONSEQUENCES OF DISCONTINUANCE	
	Very Familiar	Modestly Familiar	Not Very Familiar	Totally Unfamiliar	Essential	Very Important	Modestly Important	Not Important	Unnecessary	Excellent	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement	Poor	Adverse	Beneficial
How familiar are you with the TASC Program?															
Maricopa	34	57	10	14											
Pima	20	25	4												
How important do you feel a program such as TASC is to the Criminal Justice System?															
Maricopa					14	51	28	6							
Pima					18	18	12								
How do you rate the TASC program?															
Maricopa										40	42	11	3		
Pima										23	12	2			
What would be the consequences of discontinuing the TASC program?															
Maricopa														78	8
Pima														30	1
Combined Total	54	82	14	14	32	69	40	6	-	63	54	13	3	108	9
Maricopa County percentage	30	50	8	12	14	51	28	7	-	42	44	11	3	90	10
Pima County percentage	41	51	8	-	38	38	24	-	-	62	32	6	-	97	3
Combined percentage	33	51	8	8	22	47	27	4	-	47	41	10	2	92	8

Most Important TASC Functions

Of the survey respondents, 77 percent commented on the request, "Please list those TASC functions, if any, that you feel are the most important or helpful." The responses are summarized below into general categories with the number of respondents indicated in parentheses.

TASC furnishes an alternative to incarceration.	(5)
The TASC report furnishes the necessary information to rule on a motion of release without bond.	(1)
TASC provides pretrial supervision and reports to the court on the defendants' progress and attitudes.	(20)
TASC helps direct the lives of defendants with drug problems.	(2)
TASC interviews defendants at a time when they are most receptive to a self-help and guidance program. Information learned from such contact sometimes is helpful in deciding plea-bargain options.	(1)
TASC provides urinalysis for the clients.	(35)
TASC provides drug counseling for the clients.	(34)
TASC refers clients to the proper treatment programs. (Terros, etc.)	(17)
TASC helps with job referrals and job placement.	(19)
TASC helps give testimony in court.	(4)
TASC provides a diversion program alternative for criminal prosecution.	(1)
TASC advises the probation officer of urinalysis results and participation in counseling.	(4)
TASC assesses a client's substance abuse problem.	(12)
TASC issues monthly progress reports on clients to the parole officer.	(13)
TASC acts as a liaison between criminal justice agencies and the treatment programs.	(3)
TASC provides programs immediately that would take several weeks for probation officers to set up.	(1)

Clients may relate more information to a TASC member than they would to a probation officer.	(1)
TASC provides monetary support for emergencies.	(2)
TASC diverts drug users from crime and drug usage, thus reducing the crime rate.	(1)

One Phoenix defender stated that TASC "...provides a structural program for the repeat-related offender. It allows a person with a poor record but with good intentions to display his intentions through an agency that is part of the judicial system and is respected by the courts."

Least Important TASC Functions

Surveyed persons were asked:

> "Please list those TASC functions, if any, that you feel are the least important or unnecessary."

Responses to this question are summarized below:

Maricopa County

The TASC diversion program.	(2)
The recommendations of release status at i.a. (initial appearance) court.	(1)
TASC alcoholism treatment and referrals.	(1)
Postsentence supervision, excluding resource availability.	(1)
Duplication of efforts by existing agencies.	(1)
TASC referral services to the Maricopa skill center.	(1)

Pima County

Duplication of work of the Correctional Volunteer Center and lack of coordination of this effort.	(1)
The existing report forms for probation (which were characterized as nearly useless).	(1)
Duplication of information.	(2)

Consequences of Discontinuing TASC

Surveyed persons were asked to respond, in their own words, to the following question.

> "What in your opinion would be the consequences, either adverse or beneficial, of discontinuing the TASC program?"

Of 164 respondents, 57 percent answered the question. Their responses are summarized below into general categories and the number of respondents is indicated in parentheses.

Adverse Consequences

The courts would lack facts in the exercise of their discretion.	(4)
There still would be a need for alternative programs if TASC were discontinued.	(5)
It would remove counseling opportunities for rehabilitating the defendant.	(6)
There would be loss of an alternative to incarceration.	(7)
It would put a further burden on the criminal justice system.	(9)
There would be no place to refer clients who are awaiting trial for adjustments to drug problems.	(5)
More defendants would be in jail, and costs to the State would be higher.	(2)
Many defendants might never initiate contact with a drug rehabilitation center.	(2)
It would place a heavier burden on the probation department.	(10)
Less information would be available to the probation officer.	(3)
Presentence substance-abuse information would not be available.	(5)
There would be an increase in crime due to abusers having been in jail without counseling.	(1)

Beneficial Consequences

There would be financial savings by contracting work to other drug agencies. (1)

Release of parolees on their own recognizance who are under supervision would be stopped. (1)

Again, note that an increase in crime was identified by only one respondent as a consequence of discontinuing TASC.

Additional Comments

Regarding TASC

Surveyed persons were asked to list additional comments. Respondents' comments are summarized below.

Positive Comments

Maricopa County

TASC is beneficial to the community. (1)

TASC employees appear to be professional and competent. (3)

TASC is a very good program with qualified, dedicated staff. The program has a reputation of honest, open rapport with the probation department, a relationship which is uncommon with other drug agencies in Maricopa County. (1)

TASC provides a reliable biography of the defendant. (1)

TASC should be given more funding. (1)

Positive Comments

Pima County

A TASC staff member has been appointed to sit on the Joint Committee of the Adult Probation Department. This participation has significantly increased the effectiveness of the committee's actions. (1)

It is important that TASC is involved with the defendants early after the arrest, providing continuity as the client goes through the criminal justice system. (1)

TASC is the only program that terminates failures on a timely basis. (1)

TASC has kept satisfactory contact with probation officers when problems arise with the clients. (1)

TASC employees appear to be professional and competent. (1)

TASC should be given more funding. (1)

Negative Comments

Maricopa County

The program doesn't seem to be very accessible or prevalant. (1)

TASC handles a very small number of cases and has no effect on the criminal justice system. (1)

It is bureaucratic, political, nonessential and duplicates (the) county attorney deferred-prosecution program. (1)

The TASC diversion program needs to be dropped. (1)

The intake criteria are too restrictive. (1)

TASC needs better communication with the regulatory agencies. (1)

TASC needs to provide more detailed reports to the regulatory agencies. (1)

Negative Comments

Pima County

TASC should minimize client distance and travel time by diffusing into other areas of the city. (1)

One Maricopa County judge wrote, "TASC supplies a reliable biography of the defendants. A judgment based on fact and not conjecture is always preferable."

However, a Maricopa County public defender wrote, "The intake criteria are so restrictive that I have not had a single client qualify for the program - and as a public defender, approximately 1/2 of my practice deals with street crime."

CONCLUSION

In general, there is strong support within the criminal justice system for the TASC programs in Maricopa and Pima Counties. Surveyed respondents indicated many services that TASC provides are positive and helpful to the defendant, as well as to the entire criminal justice process. Programs were clearly identified as important links among the various criminal justice system entities.

TASC
Treatment Alternatives to Street Crime

"UNDER THE AUSPICES OF CODAC OF PIMA COUNTY, INC."

July 30, 1980

Mr. Gerald Silva
Manager, Performance Unit
Auditor General's Office
Arizona State Capitol
Legislative Wing, Suite 200
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Dear Mr. Silva:

In general, it appears that the draft report prepared by the Auditor General's office represents a detailed, well thought out and researched response to questions regarding the overall effectiveness of both Maricopa and Pima County TASC programs. I have a few minor points which I would like to raise as well as some comments on the stated TASC goals.

In the section entitled INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND, there is no mention made of the services provided to the Courts, probation departments, and the Arizona State Department of Corrections. Tucson TASC's caseload is currently made up of 66% referrals from Department of Corrections. Certainly, this was not the case five years ago, but by completely ignoring the service requirements of probationers, parolees, and clients on work furlough, the picture is not complete.

I have to take issue with the statement on page 3, "The original TASC concept was a classic diversion model." I assisted in preparing the grant for the first TASC project in the State and at no time was the TASC project intended to be a diversion project. In point of fact, it has only been recently that the local prosecutors have been willing to look at the possibilities of diversion for drug offenders. In Tucson, diversion is limited to prescription pill abusers who have no prior arrest record. I believe the time has come to expand this narrow and restrictive view, and perhaps this audit report will assist to help accomplish this.

At some point in the audit, it should clearly be pointed out that the Pima County TASC client pool included all clients during a time period of two years and five months, whereas Maricopa County TASC's time period is only one year and five months. I think that both projects should have been evaluated using, if not the same time period, then at the very least,

209 S. TUCSON BLVD. • SUITE B • TUCSON, ARIZONA 85716 • (602) 795-6430

comparable lengths of time. I believe the reasons for this (the nature of the client population, etc.) are obvious.

Table II (Profile of TASC Client Arrest Histories) is unclear as to whether the arrests refer only to misdemeanors or both. Additionally, the audit report later states, "Discussion with TASC personnel revealed that subsequent convictions was a more valid measure of recidivism than arrests because rearrest charges, particularly for drug abusers, are oftentimes subsequently dropped or dismissed." Therefore, I question whether Table II should even be included in the report since everyone agreed that arrest data, no matter if it be felony or misdemeanor, is not really useful information for assessing clients, either before entrance into TASC or after leaving TASC.

It should be noted also, that there is no data on Maricopa County persons who, for one reason or another having nothing to do with eligibility, did not enter the program. The TASC group is made up solely of Pima County residents and the Maricopa TASC project is being compared against these.

As to suggested improvements, it is unclear as to what is meant by a "lack of formal written criteria regarding client termination." I know that the Tucson TASC project has these, both in their grant applications as well as in our written policies and procedures. Even the example given in the audit report is not a very good one as we do not know the circumstances. Lastly, it should be kept in mind that since 1977, the year after which the auditors stopped at clients and program results, many changes have taken place. As mentioned previously, our target population has shifted from pre-trial to work furlough and parolees.

Our result in this change is that the number of residential placements has been drastically reduced. Since the study ends in 1977, this is not reflected. Currently, our drug-free outpatient referrals are by far the largest single category.

Perhaps, with the initiation of a statewide TASC program, uniform termination criteria will become a possibility. However, I would caution against all TASC's being carbon copies of each other. Each program must, by necessity, operate within certain constraints imposed by everyone from county attorneys to treatment agency eligibility requirements, from differing client populations and different judges. Each TASC should respond to the unique needs of the area in which it operates, and therefore, the unique needs of its clients.

Lastly, the National TASC concept initially embraced the idea of "reducing the cycle of drug use, arrest, release, and subsequent arrest." This concept was acceptable, indeed quite fashionable in the early 70's when the first TASC projects started in cities such as Philadelphia and Miami. Since those days, we have all come to realize that although occasionally

that might be a helpful, if not, desirable outcome, it is simply not a realistic goal for TASC in the 80's. The time has come to reassess the overall mission of TASC and re-state its policies and goals. I believe this audit report reinforces this conclusion.

In conclusion, this report represents the sum total of at least six months' effort by the Performance Unit of the Auditor General's office. It was a lengthy, exhausting and oftentimes overwhelming study to research and write, and I think that it presents a fairly honest and perceptive picture. The report will certainly be of assistance in future program planning and development, and the staff of the Performance Unit is to be commended for a job well done.

Sincerely,

Patricia A. Mehrhoff
Director

PAM:jao

Treatment Alternatives to Street Crime
of Maricopa County, Inc.
1313 N. 2nd Street, Suite 25
Phoenix, AZ 85004 Tel: (602) 254-7328

August 12, 1980

Mr. Douglas Norton
Auditor General
Arizona State Capitol
Legislative Wing, Suite 200
Phoenix, AZ 85007

This letter is written as a response to the performance audit of the Pima and Maricopa County Treatment Alternatives to Street Crime Programs.

As Executive Director of the Maricopa County TASC Program, I have grave concern for Finding I presented in the Audit that, "TASC participation did not result in reduced recidivism." The above finding was ascertained by comparing a Pima County TASC Control Group, a Maricopa County TASC Control Group and a Non-TASC Group.

TASC is a voluntary program designed to afford an opportunity to those individuals who are felony offenders involved with substance abuse. The purpose of TASC is to refer these individuals to treatment and monitor their progress for the Criminal Justice System. Great emphasis is placed on the fact that all TASC clients have VOLUNTEERED for the program. In the Audit, the Non-TASC Group which was used as the comparison group was composed of individuals identified as TASC eligible but "for unknown reasons declined to participate in the program." This fact in itself makes the Non-TASC Group different from the Pima County and Maricopa County TASC Groups, hence, it is my opinion that these groups should not have been compared to each other.

Many possibilities arise as to the differences between the Non-TASC Group and the Pima County and Maricopa County TASC Groups. For example, individuals in the Non-TASC Group may not have felt a need for TASC services or treatment. The Non-TASC Group may not have viewed TASC as a needed support system. Individuals in the Non-TASC Group may have viewed

their drug usage as situational, or an isolated incident, rather than an overwhelming problem of drug addiction. The point I am trying to make is that no one knows why the Non-TASC Group did not volunteer for the TASC Program. It is therefore my opinion that the composition of the Pima County and Maricopa County TASC Groups cannot and should not be compared to the Non-TASC Group, as these groups could be so vastly different, thereby negating the validity of the recidivism study.

The Auditor General's Office distributed a Criminal Justice Survey in Pima County and Maricopa County. The survey indicated that a vast majority of the respondents, 96% (including judges, county attorneys, public defenders, correctional volunteer center officers, probation officers, parole officers, appearance and indigency determination officers and diversion officers) said that "TASC was either essential, very important, or moderately important." The Office of the Auditor General also stated in their audit that "TASC is perceived as an important adjunct of those systems." (Criminal Justice System). This factual information is pertinent in that the key Criminal Justice representatives in Pima County and Maricopa County view TASC as an important functional program in their communities, serving the needs of an extremely difficult target population.

TASC, over the past several years, has served as a viable operational alternative to street crime. Had this not been the case, all the respondents to the Criminal Justice Survey would not have rated it so highly.

Sincerely,

Barbara Zugor

Barbara Zugor
Executive Director

BZ:te

cc: Jerry Silva
Jerry Mills

STATE OF ARIZONA
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

ELLIS C. MacDOUGALL
Director

BRUCE BABBITT
Governor

1601 WEST JEFFERSON
PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85007
TELEPHONE (602) 255-5536

August 12, 1980

Mr. Douglas Norton
Auditor General
Arizona State Capitol
Legislative Wing, Suite 200
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Dear Mr. Norton:

Thank you for letting me have a copy of the draft report of the audit of the Treatment Alternative to Street Crime programs in Pima and Maricopa Counties. It is a thoughtful document which shows the professional and skilled approach used by the auditors who have obviously got a good grasp of what is a complex subject. As always, when one is evaluating human behavior, its multifactorial nature makes quantification extremely difficult and perhaps inevitably controversial. I feel that your staff deserves congratulations for the way in which they handled this troublesome issue. I would like to make the following comments on the draft:

While great pains were taken to insure that the control group was truly representative in that they were identified as being eligible for TASC the fact that they declined to participate in the program does raise the possibility that they were inherently different with the comparison group volunteering for treatment while the control group did not. I feel that before conclusions can properly be drawn that the reasons why the control

AN AFFIRMATIVE ACTION / EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

group declined should be evaluated. I feel some of the reasons which come to mind include their not feeling that they need treatment; they did not have the time necessary for program participation (Perhaps because of work or school requirements) and that they had other support systems including employment and family which they felt lessoned the need for participation in TASC. These factors would, of course, reflect recidivism. Other factors in this context are the differences in when their involvement occurred. The control group was selected from eligible arrestees in Pima County only and from 1975 through 1977. One must therefore, question comparison with the Maricopa County group selected from TASC clients entering the program in 1977 and 1978.

Turning now to another aspect of evaluation, the question of recidivism being the major index used gives one pause. A different though obviously not necessarily better index might have been to assess compliance with the objectives outlined in the original funding proposal submitted in September 1977. By these criteria TASC programs achieved their goal.

Furthermore, I would like to draw attention to Table 16. This shows that the arrest rate for TASC clients while in TASC is 14.1% for Pima County and 9.7% for Maricopa County. Also, I believe that considering the TASC client population is made up of 91% heroin addicts (table 7), that an average recidivism rate of 7.5% (table 4) for those clients who successfully complete TASC and an average 15.6% recidivism (7.7 for Maricopa and 21.6 for Pima) for all TASC clients one year after termination from TASC is very encouraging.

Once again let me express my gratitude for this opportunity to comment on this draft report.

Sincerely,

Steve Radvick

Steve Radvick
Statewide TASC Coordinator

CODAC
Community Organization for Drug Abuse Control
CODAC CREATES ALTERNATIVES

Of Pima County, Inc.
151 S. Tucson Blvd. • Tucson, Arizona 85716 • (602) 327-4505

BOARD OF DIRECTORS
PAUL A. RICH
CHAIRMAN
SONJA ADAMS
1ST VICE-CHAIRMAN
JOHN DAVIS
2ND VICE-CHAIRMAN
CHRIS COCHRAN
TREASURER
DIANE CEIZYK
SECRETARY

E. LUIS AGUILAR, M. D.
CINDY ALIBRANDI, Ph. D.
*KAY BAKER
EDWARD G. BEJARANO
GLENDA BONIN
CEPHAS BOWLES
*RICHARD J. BOYKIN
*A. BATES BUTLER, III
JOSE CARDENAS
ERIC CARVER
NELBA CHAVEZ, Ph. D.
ARMANDO M. ESPINOZA
*KAREN FELDKAMP
CAROLYN FORD
ANN GEIGER
*STUART GHERTNER, Ph. D.
I. STEVEN GOLDSTEIN
PATRICIA GREEN
*PAT GREGORY
MARTI JONES
DAVID KENNON
JASPER KINSLEY
*TOM KORFF
*JON MILLER
STEPHEN NEELY
JOHN NEIS
*RAY NOVAK, M. D.
VICTOR ONG
Lt. Col. DONALD S. PALMER, USAF
*LAMOND B. PRESTON
SHELLEY RICH
*MARTY ROSS
ANTHONY ROSSETTI
*JOSE SANTIAGO, M. D.
SAT NAM SINGH
EVYE STRONG
*RUDY WAGNER
TOM WELCH

* EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

HONORARY MEMBERS
MARILYN BURKEL
HONORABLE JOHN P. COLLINS
HARRY DAVIS
SENATOR DENNIS DECONCINI
CHIEF WILLIAM GILKINSON
STEVEN W. LYNN
WESLEY MARSHALL
JUNE MORRISON, Ph. D.
MARCHA OLLASON
ANN SOELTER
JAMES WILKES

KENNETH P. GEIS
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

July 30, 1980

Mr. Gerald Silva
Manager, Performance Unit
Auditor General's Office
Arizona State Capitol
Legislative Wing, Suite 200
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Dear Mr. Silva:

I am in agreement with most of the comments made by Ms. Mehrhoff regarding the Auditor General's performance audit of both Pima and Maricopa County TASC programs. I would like to stress the importance of Ms. Mehrhoff's comment regarding the two different time frames used to evaluate performance, i.e., 29 months for Pima County TASC and 17 months for Maricopa County TASC. Obviously, data was available for a longer period here in Pima County since this TASC had been in operation several years prior to the establishment of that in Maricopa County. However, I think this issue is important in terms of Tucson TASC's higher recidivism rate. A good percentage of criminals are repeaters, and the longer you follow clients in the subpopulation, the higher percentage of recidivism you will obviously have.

Also, I think it is worth noting the difference in the choice of treatment modalities. Initially, Tucson TASC relied heavily on residential placements, which is the most structured and restrictive kind of treatment available for drug abusers. Residential treatment is considered the appropriate modality for clients who have no support system or a negative support system when coming into treatment. Obviously, these clients represent a higher risk category, and therefore, we should anticipate a higher failure rate when working with them.

One additional comment would be that I am somewhat suspicious of arrest records as an indication of criminal activity. Once a client is identified as a heroin abuser, especially a client who has been previously incarcerated, law enforcement officials are

CODAC is an EEO/AA Employer and does not discriminate on the basis of sex, age, race, religion, color, national origin, Vietnam Era veterans' status, or handicapping condition in its admission, treatment, employment and educational programs or acitivites.

often apt to pay very close attention to this individual. I would not go as far as to say that former addicts are often harrassed by the police, but they are many times picked up on suspicion of a crime and subsequently released. Since I think our judicial system is based on the premise that everyone is considered innocent until proven guilty, measuring convictions is a much more useful tool in this area.

I do think the report was well put together and will be very helpful to us in assessing possible programmatic adjustments in the coming months.

Yours sincerely,

Ken Geis

Kenneth P. Geis
Executive Director

KPG:jao

"UNDER THE AUSPICES OF CODAC OF PIMA COUNTY, INC."

MEMORANDUM

TO: Gerald Silva
Performance Unit Manager

DATE: March 14, 1980

FROM: Patricia A. Mehrhoff
Director

RE: TASC Program Audit

The Tucson TASC project performs a number of ancillary services which are not reflected in statistical compilations. It is the feeling of the staff that these services are an integral part of our project and are important enough to merit mention in your audit report.

One caseworker, Mr. Glenn Brasch, has been working one day per week at the Arizona Correctional Training Facility, the medium security prison. Working out of the Pre-Release Unit, Glenn acts as the Substance Abuse Specialist on the Review Committee which screens all applicants for work furlough. In addition, Glenn does staff development and training, large group information meetings for the residents, and conducts a weekly counseling group with residents who have had drug and alcohol problems.

The TASC Supportive Services Specialist, Mr. Gary Hardy, also works at the Arizona Correctional Training Facility one day per week. He does employability skills training and conducts workshops for both staff and residents. He also works on a one-to-one basis with residents who are getting ready to be released.

We have also done drug and alcohol education classes once a week at the Arizona Youth Center, the Department of Correction's main facility for juvenile male offenders. These were done at the request of the AYC psychologist as the facility did not have the knowledge and resources to deal with substance abuse information.

We offer a mini-diversion program for first time prescription pill offenders. Basically, the County Attorney's office contacted TASC and asked if we could assist then in dealing with these cases, as most of the defendants were "non-criminal" types who did not have histories of hard core drug abuse. By placing these people in TASC, the County Attorney's office felt that the

209 S. TUCSON BLVD. • SUITE B • TUCSON, ARIZONA 85716 • (602) 795-6430

needs of the criminal justice system would be met (diversion clears the court calendar) and the needs of the defendant would be met (treatment for the abuse problems would result in healthier, constructive lifestyles).

Since we see ourselves as the substance abuse resource for the Department of Corrections, we provide just about any service the Department asks for in this area. We do all of the urinalysis for all branches of the Department (institutions, juvenile and adult half-way houses, parole) and will do a diagnostic evaluation on any individual referred to TASC by Department of Corrections.

Whenever an individual is close to his/her parole date and is in need of a substance abuse program as part of the parole plan, we go to the institution, interview the person and work up an appropriate plan for release. Letters with this information are sent to the parole board, the parole office in the city where the person will be residing and the potential client.

Mr. Glenn Brasch also sits on the Pima County Adult Detention Center's Review and Classification Committee. The committee meets weekly to review and approve applications by inmates at the Detention Center for furlough releases. He is the resource person who prepares plans for individuals with a history of substance abuse.

In addition, Glenn sits on the Board of Directors for Alternatives to Incarceration, an agency which does pre-parole planning for all inmates. Again, he functions as a resource person for that agency providing their staff with information and resource ideas. He also is involved on a volunteer basis with the Victim-Witness Program and is on call to provide that agency with crisis counseling for appropriate drug and alcohol emergencies. He has been instrumental in the creation and maintenance of a local self-help support group called TROT (Teenagers Reaching Out Together) and in this way interfaces with the youth of our community.

I am currently a member of the Arizona State Behavioral Health Advisory Council and chair the Nominating Committee and the Services Committee. I am also a member of the Arizona State Task Force on Women and Behavioral Health and act as a resource person providing information about women in the criminal justice system.

Inconclusion, TASC, as an agency, does much more for the community than simply interview persons at the jail, place them in treatment and monitor their progress. It is our philosophy that we will make a greater impact on the substance abuse problems if we are involved at many different levels with our clients, the treatment programs, the criminal justice system and the community.

PAM:jao
Attachments

DRUG EDUCATION GROUP

The purpose of this group is to provide an environment where information can be shared in a non-judgemental fashion re substance use/abuse.

The format involves the use of a drug IQ survey to be completed by the group members and then used as a springboard to clarify some drug myths, provide factual information about drug's contents and effects, and examine group members' relationships with drugs.

The goal of this group is to provide as much factual information as possible to the members about drugs, in hopes of enabling them to make wiser and more responsible decisions concerning their future relationship with both licit and illicit substances.

Melissa Johnson

MELISSA JOHNSON, TASC CASE MANAGER

ALCOHOL EDUCATION/AWARENESS GROUP

The purpose of this group is threefold:

- Educate the members about alcoholism
- Educate the members about the psychological and physical effects of alcohol
- Encourage the members to examine their relationship with alcohol in hopes that they will choose to use it more responsibly

The group meets for four (4) sessions.

SESSION I: ORIENTATION:

Members view a film about an adolescent alcoholic and discuss various topics that arise from it.

Members discuss "What is alcoholism?"

Members discuss whether or not alcohol was a contributing factor to their being at Arizona Youth Center

SESSION II: PSYCHOLOGICAL ASPECTS:

Members are educated on the effects that alcohol has on various organs, emotions, inhibitions, behavior, and abilities.

Also discussed is the difference between use and abuse of alcohol and myths surrounding alcohol.

SESSION III: A PERSONAL VIEW OF ALCOHOL:

Members discuss where alcohol is in their lives and how it affects various aspects of living (i.e., family, school, community, work, health). Also discussed are the Steps of AA and why people drink.

SESSION IV: SUMMERIZATION:

Members are asked to discuss what they have learned in the group and whether this knowledge will have any effect on their future use of alcohol.

Also discussed are community resources for alcoholic related problems and any final questions are addressed.

Melissa Johnson

MELISSA JOHNSON, TASC CASE MANAGER

APPENDIX B

MARICOPA TASC CLIENT FORM

NAME
Last First M.I.

Office

TASC No.

Social Security Number

Case Worker

Sex ____ Age ____ D.O.B. / / Race ____

DATE	ADDRESS /zip code	PHONE
/ /		-
/ /		-
/ /		-
/ /		-
/ /		-
/ /		-

REFERRAL SOURCE
1. Jail Interview
2. Probation
3. Parole
4. Other ____

CRIMINAL JUSTICE STATUS
1. P.T.I.
2. Court Condition
3. Probation
4. Parole
5. Diversion
6. Other ____

CURRENT CHARGES/NUMBER OF COUNTS

NUMBER OF PRIOR ADULT: Arrests & Convictions
Misdemeanor
Felony

COURT/JUDGE

DATES	/ /	/ /	/ /	/ /

ATTORNEY Phone -

PROBATION/PAROLE OFFICER Phone -

DIVERSION REQUESTED
Approved
Not Approved

SPECIAL CONDITIONS:

REARREST NEW CHARGES / /

Comments:

MARITAL STATUS
1. Never married
2. Married
3. Separated
4. Divorced
5. Widowed

LIVING WITH: Relation ( )

EMPLOYMENT:
1. Unemployed
2. Disabled
3. Part-time
4. Full-time

EMPLOYER	ADDRESS	DATE
		/ /
		/ /
		/ /
		/ /
		/ /
		/ /

PRIOR TRADE TRAINING
Specify: ____

CURRENTLY IN SCHOOL:
0. None
1. Trade/Skill
2. General Studies

PRIMARY DRUG PROBLEM
1. Opiate
2. Alcohol only
3. Polydrug
4. Other ____

PRIOR TREATMENTS
Number
Last Location:

Program Referral /Modality	Counselor	Date
		/ /
		/ /
		/ /

PTI COMPLETION
Report Rating:
1. Very favorable
2. Favorable
3. No change
4. Unfavorable
5. Very unfavorable
Date / /

OUTCOME:
SENTENCE: ____
Continued TASC

C. J. Impact Comments:

APPENDIX C

MARICOPA COUNTY TASC
4" x 6" CLIENT CARD

Last | First | M.I. | Off. | TASC No.

DOB / / | Phone -

Address

street

city | state | zip code

Program Referral	IN	OUT	Day of Year
TASC		.....	
		Total	
		Client Days	

Comments:

Program | Sex | Age | Race/Ethnic | Marital Status | Employment | Ed./Voc. | Primary Drug | Prior Treats. | Ref. Source | C.J. Status | Felon Ref. | No. of Priors | P.T.I. Outcome | Termination | Case Manager | C. Tract | Days

CODAP No.

Current Charges/Number of Charges

P.T.I. Outcome | Date / /

Sentence: | Continued TASC?

Rearrest: New Charges: | Date / /

Follow-up:

SAMPLE OF SURVEY FORM USED
TO SURVEY CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM ELEMENT

OFFICE OF THE AUDITOR GENERAL
Survey Questionnaire
Concerning the Impact of
Treatment Alternatives to Street Crime (TASC)
on the Criminal Justice System

1. What is your involvement in the criminal justice system?

   - ☐ Judiciary
   - ☐ Prosecutor (County Attorney)
   - ☐ Defender (Public Defender)
   - ☐ Appearance and Indigency Determiniation
   - ☐ Probation
   - ☐ Parole
   - ☐ Diversion

2. How familiar are you with the TASC Program?

   - ☐ Very familiar
   - ☐ Moderately familiar
   - ☐ Not very familiar
   - ☐ Totally unfamiliar
     (If totally unfamiliar, disregard the remaining questions)

3. How important do you feel a program such as TASC is to the criminal justice system?

   - ☐ Essential
   - ☐ Very Important
   - ☐ Moderately Important
   - ☐ Not Important
   - ☐ Unnecessary

4. How would you rate the performance of the TASC Program?

   - ☐ Excellent
   - ☐ Satisfactory
   - ☐ Needs Improvement
   - ☐ Poor

5. Please list those TASC functions, if any, that you feel are the <u>most</u> important or helpful.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

6. Please list those TASC functions, if any, that you feel are the least important or unnecessary.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

7. What in your opinion would be the consequences, either adverse or beneficial, of discontinuing the TASC Program?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

8. Please list any additional comments you wish to make.

_____

_____

_____

_____

Please return the completed questionnaire in the enclosed, self-addressed stamped envelope by March 21, 1980, to:

Office of the Auditor General
112 North Central, Suite 600
Phoenix, Arizona 85004
Attn: Ms. Virginia Kotzmann

Thank you for your assistance.

OFFICE OF THE AUDITOR GENERAL
Survey Questionnaire
Concerning the Impact of
Treatment Alternatives to Street Crime (TASC)
on the Criminal Justice System

1. What is your involvement in the criminal justice system?

- ☐ Judiciary
- ☐ Prosecutor (County Attorney)
- ☐ Defender (Public Defender)
- ☐ Correctional Volunteer Center
- ☐ Probation
- ☐ Parole

2. How familiar are you with the TASC Program?

- ☐ Very familiar
- ☐ Moderately familiar
- ☐ Not very familiar
- ☐ Totally unfamiliar
  (If totally unfamiliar, disregard the remaining questions)

3. How important do you feel a program such as TASC is to the criminal justice system?

- ☐ Essential
- ☐ Very Important
- ☐ Moderately Important
- ☐ Not important
- ☐ Unnecessary

4. How would you rate the performance of the TASC Program?

- ☐ Excellent
- ☐ Satisfactory
- ☐ Needs Improvement
- ☐ Poor

5. Please list those TASC functions, if any, that you feel are the <u>most</u> important or helpful.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

6. Please list those TASC functions, if any, that you feel are the least important or unnecessary.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

7. What in your opinion would be the consequences, either adverse or beneficial, of discontinuing the TASC Program?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

8. Please list any additional comments you wish to make.

_____

_____

_____

_____

Please return the completed questionnaire in the enclosed, self-addressed stamped envelope by March 21, 1980, to:

Office of the Auditor General
112 North Central, Suite 600
Phoenix, Arizona 85004
Attn: Ms. Virginia Kotzmann

Thank you for your assistance.

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

A. Definitions of Termination Classifications:

1. Successful complete -
   A client who has successfully completed the requirements set by the TASC program.

2. Successful incomplete -
   A client who had been progressing towards a successful completion but did not finish the TASC program due to a positive reason such as dismissal of arrest charges.

3. Neutral -
   A client who has neither progressed in treatment nor violated TASC conditions for participation. This termination is given in order to qualify the client for TASC eligibility within one year after the termination date.

4. Failure -
   A client who has failed to meet TASC requirements.

5. Neutral incarcerated -
   A client who entered TASC but who receives an incarceration sentence from the court.

6. Failure split -
   A client who has agreed with TASC to enter a residential program and leaves without authorization prior to the stipulated date.

B. Types of Drug Treatment Modality:

1. Detoxification -
   Detoxification programs usually provide gradually decreasing dosages of methadone over a period of seven to 21 days in order to facilitate physical withdrawal from heroin. Such programs may be run on an outpatient, inpatient or residential basis. Sometimes detoxification is considered the first step in longer term treatment, such as residence in a therapeutic community or a program of periodic outpatient counseling. Other times detoxification constitutes the total treatment program, with detoxified addicts expected to maintain their heroin-free state without further intervention.

2. Methadone Maintenance -
Methadone maintenance programs stabilize clients on methadone, which is dispensed at the treatment clinic. Typically, clients must come to the clinic three to seven times per week to obtain methadone, which must be taken daily. Clients usually receive counseling at least once a week and are subject to random urine testing to check on drug-abuse activities. Although some methadone programs have adopted a goal of eventual detoxification from methadone and a completely drug-free life for their clients, other programs contend that clients probably will have to be maintained on methadone for life in order to avoid reversion to heroin addiction.

3. Drug-free Outpatient -
The client is allowed to live at home. He must submit to urine testing at the TASC office and must receive counseling at a drug-free outpatient center.

4. Residential -
A 24-hour-a-day drug-free treatment setting for drug abusers. Typically the programs use a variety of encounter and other group therapy techniques to achieve behavioral change among their patients. These programs usually require residency for periods ranging from six months to two years in order to complete the program successfully ("graduate").

5. Other -
   a. Jail treatment - if a client is rearrested during TASC he is terminated only if he does not return to the TASC office within 30 days of his arrest and/or if the probation officer requests the termination.
   b. TASC surveillance - A client may be permitted to provide urine samples and report on his/her status at the TASC office.

6. Multiple Treatment -
Any combination of the above modalities.

C. <u>Types of Supportive Services Provided</u>:
1. Employment counseling -
If the client needs a job, the Supportive Services Specialist assesses the client's job experience and training. The client is referred to jobs that the Specialist has developed or from the job bank. The Specialist will write a referral or give the client pertinent information such as the address of the job and how to fill out the job application correctly. The Specialist will provide transportation to and from job interviews if necessary. The Specialist will follow up the outcome of the client's interview.

2. Employment Placement -
Successful employment of a client who receives employment counseling from TASC.

3. Educational Referral -
If the client is interested in job training, the Supportive Services Specialist determines the field in which the client would like to be trained and also assesses the client's background, schooling and previous job training to help direct the client into a program in which he/she can succeed and develop a marketable skill. The Specialist then refers the client to an appropriate training facility to be tested or to fill out an application. The test is an in-depth evaluation of the client's abilities. It is not the determining factor as to whether or not the client is referred to training at the Skill Center, as the final decision lies with the Specialist, who at this time makes referral to the Skill Center or places the client on the training list for the Skill Center.

4. Educational Placement -
The placement of a client in an educational system.

5. Housing Referral -
Clients in need of shelter either will be referred to a contracted agency, or a Supportive Services Specialist will use other sources to help the client obtain adequate housing.

6. Food Referral, Transportation, Welfare Referral and Emergency Funds -
If the client is in need of supportive services such as food, clothing, driver's license or haircut for purposes of applying for or obtaining a job or other services the Specialist deems necessary, the Specialist will supply the client with them.

D. Standard Operating Procedure For Urinalysis of TASC Clients:
Clients are required to provide two specimens a week, on Monday and Thursday, unless otherwise directed by the case manager. Frequency of urinalysis at the TASC offices will depend on each client's length of time in TASC, his or her progress in treatment, frequency of urinalyses at his treatment agency and if special urinalysis requirements have been imposed by the referring criminal justice agency. TASC clients are required to submit to urinalysis on the day they sign a contract to enter the program.

A daily log is kept. It includes the date, client's name and TASC number, and whether urinalysis results were positive or negative. These results are noted in the Urinalysis Log as soon as they are available from the lab. Positive results are phoned in by the lab. Besides noting these positive results in the Urinalysis Log, the secretary also informs the client's case manager immediately. Clients with a positive drug-content report are required to come into the TASC offices as soon as possible to submit to another test and to meet with his or her case manager. It is the responsibility of the individual case manager to make sure that urinalysis information is included in the client's case notes.

When a client comes in for urinalysis, he or she should be instructed to fill the bottle almost to the top. Urinations are monitored by a staff member of the same sex as the client. Information is recorded in the Urinalysis Log. Before a sample is obtained, a label should be filled out and attached to the bottle. In the space for the name on the label, only the client's TASC number is used. The laboratory's control sheet is completed on each client as samples are taken. Samples are refrigerated as soon as they are collected.