

october 2012

# aarin

arizona arrestee reporting information network

Maricopa County Adult Probation Office Report on

## **the comparison of maricopa county adult probationers among the arrestee population**

**ASU** Center for Violence Prevention  
and Community Safety

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

## Acknowledgements

The AARIN Project staff thanks Peter Ozanne and Amy Rex for their establishment of the AARIN project and for all of their hard work and assistance on the project. We also thank the Maricopa County Manager and the Board of Supervisors for their continued support for AARIN. Additionally, we would like to thank the officers and command staff of the Maricopa County Sheriff's Office, without whose cooperation, we would not be able to conduct the project.

This project was funded by Maricopa County. Opinions contained herein are those of the author and do not represent the position of either Maricopa County or Arizona State University.

## AARIN Project Staff

### **Charles M. Katz, Principal Investigator**

Watts Family Director  
Center for Violence Prevention & Community Safety  
Arizona State University

### **David E. Choate, Co-Principal Investigator**

Associate Director of Operations  
Center for Violence Prevention & Community Safety  
Arizona State University

### **Michael D. White, Co-Principal Investigator**

Associate Professor  
School of Criminology and Criminal Justice  
Arizona State University

### **Marisol Cortez**

AARIN Project Manager  
Center for Violence Prevention & Community Safety  
Arizona State University

### **Lidia Nuño, Research Analyst**

AARIN Project Manager  
Center for Violence Prevention & Community Safety  
Arizona State University

### **Jody Arganbright**

Business Operations Manager  
Center for Violence Prevention & Community Safety  
Arizona State University



In an effort to reduce our impact on the environment, we have chosen to distribute this report as a digital file.

© 2012 by the Arizona Board of Regents for and on behalf of Arizona State University and its Center for Violence Prevention and Community Safety. This document may be copied and transmitted freely. No deletions, additions, or alterations of contents are permitted without the expressed written consent of the Center for Violence Prevention and Community Safety.

### **Center for Violence Prevention and Community Safety**

500 N. 3<sup>rd</sup> Street, NHI-1, Suite 200 Phoenix, AZ 85069-7100  
(602) 496-1470 Web site: <http://cvpcs.asu.edu>

# Arizona Arrestee Reporting Information Network

**2012**

**Maricopa County Adult Probation  
Department Report**

**By  
Michael D. White, Ph.D.  
August 2012**

Suggested citation:

White, Michael D. (2012). *Arizona Arrestee Reporting Information Network: 2012 Maricopa County Adult Probation Department Report*. Phoenix, AZ: Center for Violence Prevention & Community Safety, Arizona State University.

## AARIN Program Overview

The Arizona Arrestee Reporting Information Network (AARIN) is a monitoring system that provides on-going descriptive information about drug use, crime, victimization, and other characteristics of interest among individuals arrested in Maricopa County, Arizona. Funded by the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors beginning in 2007, AARIN is modeled after the former National Institute of Justice (NIJ) national-level Arrestee Drug Abuse Monitoring Program (ADAM). In three facilities throughout the county, professionally trained interviewers conduct voluntary and confidential interviews with recently booked adult arrestees and juvenile detainees. Questions focus on a range of topics including education, employment and other demographics, patterns of drug use (lifetime and recent), substance abuse and dependence risk, criminal activity, gang affiliation, victimization, mental health, interactions with police, public health concerns, incarceration and probation, citizenship, and treatment experiences. Each interviewee also provides a urine specimen that is tested for the presence of alcohol and/or drugs. Arrestees who have been in custody longer than 48 hours are ineligible for participation in AARIN, due to the 72-hour time limitation for valid testing of urine specimen.

The instruments used and the reporting mechanism underwent a substantial revision in 2011. While maintaining all of the data elements from the previous core set of questions, the baseline interview expanded by more than 60%. Additionally, with the change in the core questionnaire, the project shifted its reporting strategy to focus reports to each of six key Maricopa County criminal justice agencies: Maricopa County Manager's Office, Maricopa County Sheriff's Office, Maricopa County Attorney's Office, the Office of the Public Defender, Adult Probation Department, and the Juvenile Probation Department.

Overall, AARIN serves as a near-real time information source on the extent and nature of drug abuse and related activity in Maricopa County, AZ. This information helps to inform policy and practice among police, courts and correctional agencies to increase public safety and address the needs of individuals who find themselves in the criminal justice system.

For information using the most recent set of data, please see the following reports:

- **Maricopa County Manager's Office** – Report detailing substance abuse and public health concerns among the Maricopa County arrestee population.
- **Maricopa County Sheriff's Office** – Reports broad characteristics of the entire AARIN sample and a detailed comparison of arrestees' perception of police in general, and use of force by and against police, by arresting agency.
- **Maricopa County Attorney's Office** – Detailed report covering street gangs using key core questionnaire elements and a comprehensive interpretation of the Gang Addendum.
- **Office of the Public Defender** – Report comparing arrestees who are at-risk for a mental health problem, substance abuse/dependence problem, a co-occurring disorder (both substance abuse/dependence and mental health), or not at risk.

- **Adult Probation Department** – Comprehensive summary of the core questionnaire comparing Maricopa County probationers to probationers from elsewhere and those arrestees who have not served probation.
- **Juvenile Probation Department** - Comprehensive summary of the core juvenile questionnaire comparing Maricopa County juvenile probationers to those who have served probation elsewhere and those detainees who have not served probation.

For other reports and more information about the project, visit the AARIN page of the Center for Violence Prevention & Community Safety's website: <http://cvpcs.asu.edu/> .

## Methodology: Sampling and Data Collection

In order to ensure representative results for the entire population of arrestees in Maricopa County, the AARIN project employs a systematic sampling protocol that includes the collection of data with target quotas each day. Data are collected during three cycles each calendar year – with interviews conducted during a continuous two-week period at the Central Intake of Maricopa County's Fourth Avenue Jail each collection cycle. Dispersing data collection cycles across three different four-month blocks helps control for possible seasonal variations in crime and arrest patterns, and conducting collections covering all seven days of the week account for possible differences between weekdays and weekends, or other day-to-day variations. The periodic data collection cycles combined with the sampling protocols ensures a representative sample of all Maricopa County arrestees. The same procedures employed by AARIN were tested under ADAM (Maricopa County was one of the sites used in the evaluation) comparing the selected sample to comprehensive jail census data to assess the representativeness of the sample to the population on key characteristics. The National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago was the national data manager for ADAM at the time and concluded that the periodic data collection cycles, sampling protocols and daily quotas would result in a scientifically representative sample of study participants that could be generalized to the whole of arrestees for the particular jurisdiction (i.e. Maricopa County arrestees).

Daily collection quotas call for 23 males and 7 females to be interviewed, including the completion of the core instrument, any and all addenda, and to provide a urine specimen. Potential participants are selected using a standardized procedure (described below) to ensure both a sufficiently randomized and representative sample of arrestees. Some of the potential participants are either unavailable or otherwise ineligible for participation. Most commonly this applies to those arrestees who have already been released from custody or transferred to another facility, but also includes those whose behavior constitutes a safety risk to the jail and/or interview staff. Upon initial contact, arrestees are read an informed consent script (see inset), to which they voluntarily either decline or agree to participate; typically more than 90% agree to participate.

### Consent Script:

Hello, my name is \_\_\_. I am working on a research project run by Arizona State University. The purpose of the project is to understand issues and problems confronted by people and to help give advice on how to provide services to individuals who have been arrested. I would like to ask you a series of questions that will take 15-45 minutes to answer. There are no foreseeable risks for participating in this research, and there are no benefits to you individually. Jail personnel will not have access to the information that you provide us. The information you provide is confidential and anonymous, and it will not help or hurt your case. If, for any

reason, you become distressed or anxious during the interview, you can request to speak with the facility's medical personnel or psychological counselors.

I will not write down your name or any other identifying information the questionnaire. You can refuse to answer any question, and you may stop the interview at any time for any reason. At the end of the interview I will ask you to provide a urine sample. If you listen to my questions, I will give you a candy bar. Do you have any questions?

During the data collection period, interviews are conducted during an eight-hour period each day, with arrestees who are randomly selected based on their booking time that yields a stratified random sample. Consistent with the ADAM sampling strategy, a *stock* (i.e., arrested and booked during non-data collection hours) and *flow* (i.e., during data collection hours) process is employed to ensure a representative sample of arrestees across any given 24-hour period. The stock sample is selected by starting with a list of all bookings processed from the 16-hours that range from when collection ended the previous day through the start-time of the current collection day. Eligible bookings are counted and divided by ten, which gives the selection interval. A random start-point is selected, and each *n*th (e.g. the value equal to the selection interval) arrestee is selected as a potential participant. A "nearest-neighbor" procedure is used to replace members of the stock list that are either found to be ineligible or unavailable, or whom decline to participate, until the daily quota of 10 completed and provided interviews is met. The flow sample is more straight-forward. Potential participants are randomly selected as they are booked into the facility as needed. A minimum of 13 completed and provided interviews are expected to meet daily quota.

## Survey Instrument

The core AARIN survey instrument is modeled after the ADAM and Drug Use Forecasting (DUF) instruments, and was developed with input from Maricopa County officials. Starting with the third collection cycle of 2011, AARIN began using a new core instrument. The new instrument included the same elements of the previous version, but expanded by more than 60% following extensive input from Maricopa County officials representing six key agencies related to the criminal justice system and the arrestee population – the County Manager's Office, Sheriff's Office, County Attorney, Public Defender, Adult Probation, and Juvenile Probation.

The instrument is broken down into a variety of sections that include: demographics and background information (sex, race/ethnicity, age, citizenship, educational level, methods of income), current and past drug use (ever, past 12 months, 30 days and three days), drug dependency and treatment, medical marijuana and marijuana acquisition, criminal history (ever, past 12 months), gang involvement, firearms possession, victimization (past 12 months, 30 days), police interactions, mental health issues (ever and past 12 months), correctional health services and public health concerns, and incarceration and probation history (ever and past 12 months). Additionally, the AARIN platform includes addenda instruments to the core set of questions. Addenda are used to collect more detailed information regarding a particular topic and/or population. Recently, both a police contact and gang addenda were used, collecting information from arrestees about police in general, use of force by and against the police (Police Contact Addendum), reasons and methods for joining and leaving a gang, gang organizational structure and criminal activities, and the respondents' perceptions of cohesion and connectedness to their gang (Gang Addendum).

## Urinalysis Testing

Once an interview is completed, the arrestee then submits a urine sample. The urine specimens are tested for alcohol and four illicit drugs: cocaine, marijuana, methamphetamine, and opiates. The testing is done using the enzyme-multiplied immunoassay technique (EMIT), which has shown a high degree of accuracy with very few false-positive results (Reardon, 1993). As a reliability check, all specimens that test positive with the EMIT methods are then tested again using Gas Chromatography with Mass Spectrum Detection (GC/MS). The EMIT technique with GC/MS confirmation procedures are well-established and offer highly reliable results for the illicit drugs under study here – cocaine, marijuana, methamphetamine, and opiates – for up to 72 hours after use. Unfortunately, these procedures offer high reliability results for alcohol for only 12-24 hours after use. The adoption of more sensitive alcohol screening procedures was cost-prohibitive, however.

# AARIN Program Overview

---

The Arizona Arrestee Reporting Information Network (AARIN) is a monitoring system that provides on-going descriptive information about drug use, crime, victimization, and other characteristics of interest among individuals arrested in Maricopa County, Arizona. Funded by the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors beginning in 2007, AARIN is modeled after the former National Institute of Justice (NIJ) national-level Arrestee Drug Abuse Monitoring Program (ADAM). In three facilities throughout the county, professionally trained interviewers conduct voluntary and confidential interviews with recently booked adult arrestees and juvenile detainees. Questions focus on a range of topics including education, employment and other demographics, patterns of drug use (lifetime and recent), substance abuse and dependence risk, criminal activity, gang affiliation, victimization, mental health, interactions with police, public health concerns, incarceration and probation, citizenship, and treatment experiences. Each interviewee also provides a urine specimen that is tested for the presence of alcohol and/or drugs. Arrestees who have been in custody longer than 48 hours are ineligible for participation in AARIN, due to the 72-hour time limitation for valid testing of urine specimen.

The instruments used and the reporting mechanism underwent a substantial revision in 2011. While maintaining all of the data elements from the previous core set of questions, the baseline interview expanded by more than 60%. Additionally, with the change in the core questionnaire, the project shifted its reporting strategy to focus reports to each of six key Maricopa County criminal justice agencies: Maricopa County Manager's Office, Maricopa County Sheriff's Office, Maricopa County Attorney's Office, the Office of the Public Defender, Adult Probation Department, and the Juvenile Probation Department.

Overall, AARIN serves as a near-real time information source on the extent and nature of drug abuse and related activity in Maricopa County, AZ. This information helps to inform policy and practice among police, courts and correctional agencies to increase public safety and address the needs of individuals who find themselves in the criminal justice system.

For information using the most recent set of data, please see the following reports:

- Maricopa County Manager's Office – Report detailing the arrestee population of Maricopa County.
- Maricopa County Sheriff's Office – Reports broad characteristics of the entire AARIN sample and a detailed comparison of arrestees' perception of police in general, and use of force by and against police, by arresting agency.
- Maricopa County Attorney's Office – Detailed report covering street gangs using key core questionnaire elements and a comprehensive interpretation of the Gang Addendum.
- Office of the Public Defender –

- Among juvenile detainees who at some point in their lives have been on probation with Maricopa County, 14.6 reported to (at some point in life) have used a gun to commit a crime and 13.1% reported to have used a gun to commit a crime in the past 12 months.
- 
- Adult Probation Department – Comprehensive summary of the core questionnaire comparing Maricopa County probationers to probationers from elsewhere and those arrestees who have not served probation.
- Juvenile Probation Department - Comprehensive summary of the core juvenile questionnaire comparing Maricopa County juvenile probationers to those who have served probation elsewhere and those detainees who have not served probation.

For other reports and more information about the project, visit the AARIN page of the Center for Violence Prevention & Community Safety's website: <http://cvpcs.asu.edu/>.

## **Methodology: Sampling and Data Collection**

In order to ensure representative results for the entire population of arrestees in Maricopa County, the AARIN project employs a systematic sampling protocol that includes the collection of data with target quotas each day. Data are collected during three cycles each calendar year – with interviews conducted during a continuous two-week period at the Central Intake of Maricopa County's Fourth Avenue Jail each collection cycle. Dispersing data collection cycles across three different four-month blocks helps control for possible seasonal variations in crime and arrest patterns, and conducting collections covering all seven days of the week account for possible differences between weekdays and weekends, or other day-to-day variations. The periodic data collection cycles combined with the sampling protocols ensures a representative sample of all Maricopa County arrestees. The same procedures employed by AARIN were tested under ADAM (Maricopa County was one of the sites used in the evaluation) comparing the selected sample to comprehensive jail census data to assess the representativeness of the sample to the population on key characteristics. The National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago was the national data manager for ADAM at the time and concluded that the periodic data collection cycles, sampling protocols and daily quotas would result in a scientifically representative sample of study participants that could be generalized to the whole of arrestees for the particular jurisdiction (i.e. Maricopa County arrestees).

Daily collection quotas call for 23 males and 7 females to be interviewed, including the completion of the core instrument, any and all addenda, and to provide a urine specimen. Potential participants are selected using a standardized procedure (described below) to ensure both a sufficiently randomized and representative sample of arrestees. Some of the potential participants are either unavailable or otherwise ineligible for participation. Most commonly this applies to those arrestees who have already been released from custody or transferred to another facility, but also includes those whose behavior constitutes a safety risk to the jail and/or interview staff. Upon initial contact, arrestees are read an

informed consent script (see inset), to which they voluntarily either decline or agree to participate; typically more than 90% agree to participate.

#### Consent Script:

Hello, my name is \_\_. I am working on a research project run by Arizona State University. The purpose of the project is to understand issues and problems confronted by people and to help give advice on how to provide services to individuals who have been arrested. I would like to ask you a series of questions that will take 15-45 minutes to answer. There are no foreseeable risks for participating in this research, and there are no benefits to you individually. Jail personnel will not have access to the information that you provide us. The information you provide is confidential and anonymous, and it will not help or hurt your case. If, for any reason, you become distressed or anxious during the interview, you can request to speak with the facility's medical personnel or psychological counselors.

I will not write down your name or any other identifying information the questionnaire. You can refuse to answer any question, and you may stop the interview at any time for any reason. At the end of the interview I will ask you to provide a urine sample. If you listen to my questions, I will give you a candy bar. Do you have any questions?

During the data collection period, interviews are conducted during an eight-hour period each day, with arrestees who are randomly selected based on their booking time that yields a stratified random sample. Consistent with the ADAM sampling strategy, a *stock* (i.e., arrested and booked during non-data collection hours) and *flow* (i.e., during data collection hours) process is employed to ensure a representative sample of arrestees across any given 24-hour period. The stock sample is selected by starting with a list of all bookings processed from the 16-hours that range from when collection ended the previous day through the start-time of the current collection day. Eligible bookings are counted and divided by ten, which gives the selection interval. A random start-point is selected, and each *n*th (e.g. the value equal to the selection interval) arrestee is selected as a potential participant. A "nearest-neighbor" procedure is used to replace members of the stock list that are either found to be ineligible or unavailable, or whom decline to participate, until the daily quota of 10 completed and provided interviews is met. The flow sample is more straight-forward. Potential participants are randomly selected as they are booked into the facility as needed. A minimum of 13 completed and provided interviews are expected to meet daily quota.

### **Survey Instrument**

The core AARIN survey instrument is modeled after the ADAM and Drug Use Forecasting (DUF) instruments, and was developed with input from Maricopa County officials. Starting with the third collection cycle of 2011, AARIN began using a new core instrument. The new instrument included the same elements of the previous version, but expanded by more than 60% following extensive input from Maricopa County officials representing six key agencies related to the criminal justice system and the arrestee population – the County Manager's Office, Sheriff's Office, County Attorney, Public Defender, Adult Probation, and Juvenile Probation.

The instrument is broken down into a variety of sections that include: demographics and background information (sex, race/ethnicity, age, citizenship, educational level, methods of income), current and past drug use (ever, past 12 months, 30 days and three days), drug dependency and treatment, medical marijuana and marijuana acquisition, criminal history (ever, past 12 months), gang involvement, firearms possession, victimization (past 12 months, 30 days), police interactions, mental health issues (ever and past 12 months), correctional health services and public health concerns, and incarceration and probation history (ever and past 12 months). Additionally, the AARIN platform includes addenda instruments to the core set of questions. Addenda are used to collect more detailed information regarding a particular topic and/or population. Recently, both a police contact and gang addenda were used, collecting information from arrestees about police in general, use of force by and against the police (Police Contact Addendum), reasons and methods for joining and leaving a gang, gang organizational structure and criminal activities, and the respondents' perceptions of cohesion and connectedness to their gang (Gang Addendum).

### **Urinalysis Testing**

Once an interview is completed, the arrestee then submits a urine sample. The urine specimens are tested for alcohol and four illicit drugs: cocaine, marijuana, methamphetamine, and opiates. The testing is done using the enzyme-multiplied immunoassay technique (EMIT), which has shown a high degree of accuracy with very few false-positive results (Reardon, 1993). As a reliability check, all specimens that test positive with the EMIT methods are then tested again using Gas Chromatography with Mass Spectrum Detection (GC/MS). The EMIT technique with GC/MS confirmation procedures are well-established and offer highly reliable results for the illicit drugs under study here – cocaine, marijuana, methamphetamine, and opiates – for up to 72 hours after use. Unfortunately, these procedures offer high reliability results for alcohol for only 12-24 hours after use. The adoption of more sensitive alcohol screening procedures was cost-prohibitive, however.

# Adult Probation Department Report

---

The analysis and report presented here is prepared specifically for the Maricopa County Adult Probation Department (APD) on behalf of the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors (BOS) and Maricopa County Manager as part of their support of the Arizona Arrestee Reporting Information Network (AARIN). The researchers at Arizona State University and its Center for Violence Prevention and Community Safety are the authors of this report and any errors, omissions and opinions are their own and do not necessarily reflect the other parties.

The analysis plan and the format of this report are derived from numerous meetings held over more than an eighteen month span with the AARIN project advisory board, Maricopa County leadership, and representatives from Maricopa County APD. Following the guidance of the advisory board, the dissemination strategy for the AARIN project shifted from a single, broadly scoped annual summary report supplemented by smaller topic-specific reports into shorter, individual reports tailored to the specific needs and wants of six key county criminal justice agencies. Meetings with APD representatives regarding their individualized report indicated they would be most interested in a broad analysis akin to the traditional AARIN annual reports. A key modification to this broad traditional analysis strategy, this report compares arrestees in three categories of probation history – never served probation (or not in the past 12 months), served probation in a county other than Maricopa, and served probation in Maricopa County, each defined for either lifetime or the past 12 months, ultimately yielding six analysis categories. Each of the three probation categories are mutually exclusive within a given time period (i.e. lifetime and past 12 months). Given the APD’s need for the broadly scoped analysis as opposed to a topically-focused and interpretive report, the report here primarily provides analyses across most of the core instrument elements, presented in tabular form, with a list of key findings and highlights.

## Key Findings

The analyses for this report are derived from the 1,340 arrestees who completed the interview (with or without a testable urine sample), including sufficient responses to critical probation related questions. Arrestees were asked whether they had been on probation ever and within the last 12 months, either under the jurisdiction of Maricopa County or another probation agency. Approximately half of arrestees (49.8%) indicated that they had been on probation in Maricopa County at some point in their life, and nearly one-quarter (23.6%) reported being under Maricopa County probation supervision in the past year (see Exhibit 1). An additional 13.8% reported being on probation for another agency, and 2.8% indicated that this “other” probation had occurred in the past 12 months. In sum, the majority of arrestees interviewed had been under probation supervision at some point in the past (63.4%; in Maricopa County or elsewhere), and more than one-quarter had been on probation within the last year (26.4%).

In general, results show that past Maricopa County probationers<sup>1</sup> have extensive criminal arrest histories with frequent and diverse criminal involvement; they also are active, long-term drug users with substantial dependence issues. Many are gang-involved, and nearly half have had mental health problems in their past. A comparison of past Maricopa County probationers to non-probationer arrestees demonstrates that the problems experienced by those previously under MCAPD supervision are far more extensive and severe than non-probationers. There are numerous similarities, however, between past Maricopa County probationers and those who have been under probation supervision elsewhere. More detailed findings are reported below.

**Exhibit 1: Sample of Arrestees by Probation Status**

	No Probation		Other Probation		Maricopa County		Total	
	Ever	12 Months	Ever	12 Months	Ever	12 Months	Ever	12 Months
<b>n</b>	487	986	185	38	666	316	1,338	1,340
<b>%</b>	36.4	73.6	13.8	2.8	49.8	23.6	100.0	100.0

## Characteristics of the Sample (Exhibit 2)

### Past Maricopa County Probationers

- The majority of past Maricopa County probationers were male (80.6% ever; 76.6% last 12 months), over age 25 (mean ages of 33.6 and 31.8, ever and past year, respectively), and non-white. Approximately 15% were Black, from 24-32% were Hispanic (past year and ever), 6% were Native American, and 8-11% reported their race/ethnicity as “other” (ever and past year). The vast majority reported US citizenship (97-99%).
- One-third of past Maricopa County probationers had less than a high school degree (33-34%); an additional 32% had post high school education. From 40-46% (past year and ever, respectively) reported working full or part time in the month before their arrest; about 15% reported income from illegal sources, and 10-12% reported no income (ever, past year).
- Though the vast majority of past Maricopa County probationers reported residing in a private residence in the month before their arrest (88-89%), well over one-third also reported that they

<sup>1</sup> The term “Past Maricopa County Probationers” is used to describe arrestees who self-reported being under Maricopa County Probation supervision, either in the last 12 months or at some point in their lives (i.e., ever).

were chronically homeless (37-38%).<sup>2</sup> Approximately 40% also reported having children in the home, and from 8-10% reported being a military veteran (ever, past year).

- Past Maricopa County probationers were most commonly arrested for “other” offenses<sup>3</sup> (37-47%), though 21-26% had been arrested for drug offenses (past year, ever), 19-21% were arrested for property offenses, and 13-17% were arrested for violent offenses (past year, ever). Also, most had prior arrests (62-72%, ever and past year, respectively) in the past year, though incarcerations were slightly less common (44-57%, ever and past year, respectively).

### **Past Maricopa County Probationers vs. Other and Non-Probationers**

- Past Maricopa County probationers were more likely than non-probationers to be male (80.6% vs. 67.4%, ever), older (33.62 v. 30.94, ever), white (44.0% v. 33.9%, past year), and US citizens (97.3% v. 81.8%, ever). Probationers were less likely to have been working full or part time at the time of their arrest (46.3% v. 56% for non-probationers – ever), and they were more likely to have experienced chronic homelessness (37.4% v. 21.4%, ever).
- Past probationers have more extensive prior arrest and incarceration histories than non-probationers (61.6% and 43.5% v. 29.6% and 16.5%, respectively – ever), though they were less likely to have been arrested for violent or drug charges.
- On most indicators, past Maricopa County probationers were similar to arrestees who had been under probation supervision elsewhere.

---

<sup>2</sup> Chronic homelessness is defined by AARIN using the definition provided by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Respondents are classified as having a chronic homelessness problem if they had no fixed residence or were residing/sleeping in a place not intended for human habitation and were either: 1) homeless for 12 continuous months; or 2) had experienced at least four (or more) episodes in the past three years.

<sup>3</sup> Offenses in the other/miscellaneous category typically include, but are not limited to: probation violation, failure to appear, failure to pay fines, prostitution, driving on a suspended license, and disorderly conduct.

**Exhibit 2: Characteristics of the Arrestee Population by Probation Status**

	No Probation		Other Probation		Maricopa County		Total	
	Ever	12 Months	Ever	12 Months	Ever	12 Months	Ever	12 Months
	n =							
	487	986	185	38	666	316	1,338	1,340
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<b>Sex *</b>								
Male	67.4	75.7	80.0	71.1	80.6	76.6	75.7	75.7
Female	32.6	24.3	20.0	28.9	19.4	23.4	24.3	24.3
<b>Age category *</b>								
15-20	16.0	11.8	18.9	13.5	4.7	7.3	10.8	10.8
21-25	24.2	21.7	24.9	32.4	22.3	27.2	23.3	23.3
26-30	16.2	17.6	17.3	18.9	21.1	22.2	18.8	18.7
31-35	14.2	13.9	11.9	8.1	12.9	11.7	13.2	13.2
36 & older	29.4	35.0	27.0	27.0	39.1	31.6	33.9	34.0
Mean *	30.94	32.47	30.47	29.86	33.62	31.77	32.21	32.23
<b>Race/ethnicity * †</b>								
White	31.4	33.9	40.0	36.8	38.9	44.0	36.3	36.3
Black	13.6	13.9	15.1	18.4	14.6	14.9	14.3	14.3
Hispanic	35.1	34.4	24.3	28.9	31.5	24.1	31.8	31.8
Native American	7.0	6.9	8.6	15.8	6.6	6.3	7.0	7.0
Other	12.9	11.0	11.9	0.0	8.4	10.8	10.5	10.6
<b>Citizenship Status *†</b>								
Illegal Alien	15.5	9.2	2.7	5.3	2.0	0.3	7.0	7.0
Legal Alien	2.7	1.8	1.1	0.0	0.8	0.6	1.5	1.5
US Citizen	81.8	89.0	96.2	94.7	97.3	99.1	91.5	91.5
<b>Highest educational attainment</b>								
Less than HS degree	29.2	31.9	37.2	32.4	33.4	34.1	32.4	32.4
HS Degree or GED	32.2	33.3	32.8	37.8	34.8	33.8	33.6	33.5
POST High school education	38.6	34.8	30.1	29.7	31.8	32.2	34.0	34.1

\* t test or Chi-square significant at  $p \leq .05$  for "Ever", † for "Past 12 Months".

**Exhibit 2 (cont): Characteristics of the Arrestee Population by Probation Status**

	No Probation		Other Probation		Maricopa County		Total	
	Ever	12 Months	Ever	12 Months	Ever	12 Months	Ever	12 Months
n =	487	986	185	38	666	316	1,338	1,340
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<b>Main source of income (past 30 days) * †</b>								
Working full time	39.4	36.6	32.4	30.6	29.3	23.3	33.4	33.3
Working part time	16.6	16.9	15.4	8.3	17.0	16.7	16.6	16.6
Other legal sources	29.2	27.6	29.1	44.4	29.3	32.7	29.3	29.3
Illegal sources	8.2	11.0	9.9	0.0	14.8	15.3	11.7	11.7
No income	6.7	7.9	13.2	16.7	9.6	12.0	9.0	9.1
<b>Income in past 30 days* †</b>								
No Income Reported	6.4	7.8	13.7	17.1	9.4	11.8	8.9	9.0
Legal Income Only	80.8	75.8	70.3	71.4	66.2	60.7	72.1	72.1
Illegal Income Only	4.5	5.8	6.3	2.9	8.2	9.2	6.6	6.6
Both Legal and Illegal Income	8.3	10.6	9.7	8.6	16.2	18.4	12.4	12.4
<b>Type of residence (past 30 days)</b>								
Private residence	92.4	90.2	87.6	94.7	88.7	88.3	89.9	89.8
Public or group housing	1.6	1.6	0.5	0.0	1.5	0.9	1.4	1.4
Hospital or care facility	0.2	0.3	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.2
Incarcerated	0.2	0.3	1.1	2.6	0.8	1.3	0.6	0.6
Shelter	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.0	0.6	0.6	0.4	0.4
No fixed residence or on the street	4.9	6.7	8.1	2.6	8.1	8.5	7.0	7.0
Other	0.4	0.5	1.1	0.0	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.4
<b>Chronic Homelessness * †</b>								
Yes	21.4	29.0	35.7	36.8	37.4	38.3	31.3	31.4
<b>Children in the home *</b>								
Yes	48.4	44.6	40.0	39.5	40.1	38.6	43.1	43.0

\* t test or Chi-square significant at p < .05 for "Ever", † for "Past 12 Months".

**Exhibit 2 (cont): Characteristics of the Arrestee Population by Probation Status**

	No Probation		Other Probation		Maricopa County		Total	
	Ever	12 Months	Ever	12 Months	Ever	12 Months	Ever	12 Months
	n =							
	487	986	185	38	666	316	1,338	1,340
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<b>Medical Insurance Coverage</b>								
Yes	46.4	43.1	43.2	55.3	43.5	47.5	44.5	44.5
<b>Veteran †</b>								
Yes	5.3	5.7	4.9	2.6	7.8	9.5	6.5	6.5
<b>Most serious offense at arrest * †</b>								
Violent	21.4	21.1	22.2	18.4	16.8	13.3	19.2	19.2
Drug	29.4	29.8	29.7	23.7	25.6	21.2	27.5	27.6
Property	21.6	22.5	23.2	15.8	20.8	18.7	21.4	21.4
Other	27.6	26.6	24.9	42.1	36.8	46.8	31.8	31.8
<b>Prior arrest (past 12 months) * †</b>								
Yes	29.6	39.2	48.1	81.6	61.6	71.9	48.1	48.1
<b>Prior incarceration (past 12 months) * †</b>								
Yes	16.5	22.2	25.1	45.9	43.5	57.3	31.1	31.1

\* t test or Chi-square significant at p < .05 for "Ever", † for "Past 12 Months".

# Drug and Alcohol Use Among of the Sample (Exhibit 3)

## Past Maricopa County Probationers

- Drug and alcohol use was common among past Maricopa County probationers. Nearly all reported marijuana use in their lifetime (93.8%), and 60-61% reported both lifetime methamphetamine and powder cocaine use. Moreover, 38% reported crack cocaine use and 27.6% report heroin/opiate use in their lifetime.
- There were indicators of recent drug use as well. From 32-37% of past probationers tested positive for marijuana at the time of their interview (past 12 months, ever on probation), and 40-42% tested positive for methamphetamine.
- Age of first use ranged from a low of 13-14 years old for alcohol and marijuana, to 21-23 years old for crack cocaine, heroin/opiates and methamphetamine.

## Past Maricopa County Probationers vs. Other and Non-Probationers

- Drug and alcohol use among non-probationers was less common than past Maricopa County probationers. For example, 75.1% of arrestees never on probation reported lifetime marijuana use, compared to 93.8% among past Maricopa County probationers. Moreover, lifetime methamphetamine use among past Maricopa County probationers was nearly double the rate of non-probationers (59.5% vs. 31.6%, ever).
- The higher drug and alcohol use rates among past Maricopa County probationers also were reflected in the indicators of more recent use. For example, 40.3% of past Maricopa County probationers (ever) tested positive for methamphetamine, compared to just 20.5% of non-probationers.
- Drug and alcohol use also was common among “other” probationers, with a few notable differences. For example, marijuana use was more common among “other” probationers, while methamphetamine use was more common among past Maricopa County probationers.

**Exhibit 3. Drug Use Results of Arrestees by Probation Status (n=1,260)**

	Lifetime				Probation Past 12 Months			
	Never on Probation	Other Probation	MCAPD Probation	Total	Not on Probation	Other Probation	MCAPD Probation	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<b>Alcohol</b>								
Lifetime *†	96.2	100.0	98.7	98.0	97.4	100.0	99.7	98.0
Past 12 month	78.8	85.2	77.1	78.8	80.3	72.2	75.0	78.8
Past 30 days	69.1	70.4	68.6	69.0	70.8	63.9	64.3	69.0
Past 3 days †	46.8	46.7	45.0	45.9	48.5	38.9	38.6	45.8
Positive UA *†	15.8	8.9	9.5	11.7	13.0	11.1	7.8	11.7
Age of first use (mean)	15.19	13.26	13.97	14.31	14.46	13.84	13.87	14.30
<b>Marijuana</b>								
Lifetime *†	75.1	96.4	93.8	87.4	84.8	94.4	94.5	87.4
Past 12 month *	46.4	68.0	57.4	54.9	55.4	55.6	53.2	54.8
Past 30 days *	37.7	60.4	49.4	46.7	46.9	47.2	45.5	46.6
Past 3 days *	25.8	48.5	35.5	33.8	34.7	33.3	30.8	33.7
Positive UA *	28.3	48.8	36.7	35.3	36.2	36.1	32.2	35.3
Age of first use (mean)	14.37	13.43	13.84	13.94	14.01	14.11	13.74	13.95
<b>Methamphetamine</b>								
Lifetime *†	31.6	50.9	59.5	48.2	44.0	52.8	60.7	48.3
Past 12 month *†	19.4	32.5	39.3	31.2	27.8	30.6	41.2	31.2
Past 30 days *†	15.5	29.6	34.2	26.8	23.6	30.6	35.7	26.8
Past 3 days *†	11.7	21.3	23.7	19.0	17.5	11.1	24.4	19.0
Positive UA *†	20.5	32.7	40.3	32.2	29.0	27.8	42.0	32.1
Age of first use (mean)	20.08	19.42	21.82	21.06	21.16	18.35	21.14	21.07

\* t test or Chi-square significant at  $p \leq .05$  for "Ever", † for "Past 12 Months".

**Exhibit 3 (cont.). Drug Use Results of Arrestees by Probation Status (n=1,260)**

	Lifetime				Probation Past 12 Months			
	Never on Probation	Other Probation	MCAPD Probation	Total	Not on Probation	Other Probation	MCAPD Probation	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<b>Crack</b>								
Lifetime*†	17.9	31.4	38.0	29.9	27.7	19.4	37.7	29.9
Past 12 month *	5.3	11.2	7.9	7.4	6.9	2.8	9.4	7.4
Past 30 days	3.5	4.7	6.3	5.1	4.6	2.8	6.8	5.1
Past 3 days	2.0	3.0	3.8	3.0	2.7	2.8	3.9	3.0
Positive UA	9.4	10.1	10.1	9.8	10.0	8.3	9.4	9.8
Age of first use (mean)	22.14	21.16	22.47	22.21	22.49	18.63	22.04	22.27
<b>Powder Cocaine</b>								
Lifetime *	44.6	58.0	60.1	54.2	52.7	44.4	59.4	54.1
Past 12 month	11.9	18.3	11.7	12.7	12.9	13.9	11.7	12.6
Past 30 days	8.2	13.0	7.7	8.6	8.5	11.1	8.4	8.6
Past 3 days *	4.6	5.3	2.2	3.5	3.9	5.6	1.9	3.5
Positive UA	9.4	10.1	10.1	9.8	10.0	8.3	9.4	9.8
Age of first use (mean)	19.02	16.81	18.52	18.42	18.59	17.22	18.04	18.42
<b>Heroin or other opiates</b>								
Lifetime *	13.2	32.5	27.6	23.1	21.3	25.0	27.9	23.1
Past 12 month *†	8.2	14.8	12.0	11.0	9.1	13.9	16.2	11.0
Past 30 days †	5.7	9.5	9.5	8.1	6.5	8.3	13.0	8.1
Past 3 days †	4.2	6.5	7.1	6.0	4.7	5.6	9.7	6.0
Positive UA †	8.2	13.7	12.0	10.9	9.6	11.1	15.0	11.0
Age of first use (mean)	21.97	20.22	23.02	22.26	22.66	20.44	21.50	22.26

\* t test or Chi-square significant at  $p \leq .05$  for "Ever", † for "Past 12 Months".

## Positive UA Results for the Sample – by Race/Ethnicity (Exhibit 4)

### Past Maricopa County Probationers

- Among past Maricopa County probationers, rates of drug and alcohol use differed notably by race/ethnicity. For those who had been on Maricopa County probation in their lifetime, White arrestees (49.8%) and Hispanic/Latino arrestees (42.4%) most commonly tested positive for methamphetamine. Marijuana and cocaine use were the drugs of choice among Black past probationers (40.4% and 27.7%, respectively), while alcohol use was most common among Native American past probationers (47.7%).

### Past Maricopa County Probationers vs. Other and Non-Probationers

- Many of the race/ethnicity differences noted above persisted for non-probationers. For example, methamphetamines were the most common drug among White non-probationers (35.0%), and marijuana use was frequent among Black non-probationers (32.8%).
- However, there also were notable differences between non-probationers and past Maricopa County probationers in terms of positive drug tests (see lifetime columns). For example, methamphetamine use was much less common among Black non-probationers, compared to Black past Maricopa County probationers (6.6% v. 20.2%). A similar pattern is seen with cocaine use among Black arrestees: 9.8% for non-probationers v. 27.7% for past Maricopa County probationers. Among Hispanic/Latino arrestees, methamphetamine use was much more common among past Maricopa County probationers than non-probationers (42.4% v. 14.6%, respectively).
- There are also some notable differences between “other” probationers and past Maricopa County probationers (lifetime columns). For White arrestees, methamphetamine use is less common among “other” probationers than past Maricopa County probationers (36.9% v. 49.8%). Marijuana use was more common among Hispanic “other” probationers compared to past Maricopa County probationers (48.8% v. 36.9%), and a similar pattern emerged with Native Americans and marijuana use (“other” probationers 57.1% v. 22.7% for past Maricopa County probationers).

**Exhibit 4. Positive UA Results by Probation Status and Race/Ethnicity of Arrestees**

	Lifetime (n=1,249)				Past 12 Months (n=1,251)			
	Never on Probation	Other Probation	MCAPD Probation	Total	Not on Probation	Other Probation	MCAPD Probation	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<b>White Arrestees</b>								
Alcohol	10.0	4.6	4.9	6.4	8.3	0.0	2.9	6.4
Marijuana*	27.9	47.7	34.7	34.4	36.9	15.4	30.7	34.4
Methamphetamine*	35.0	36.9	49.8	43.3	41.5	30.8	48.2	43.2
Cocaine	8.6	4.6	4.5	5.8	6.6	0.0	4.4	5.8
Opiates	17.1	23.1	20.4	19.8	18.3	23.1	23.4	20.0
<b>Black Arrestees</b>								
Alcohol	9.8	15.4	7.4	9.4	9.4	28.6	6.5	9.4
Marijuana	32.8	42.3	40.4	38.1	39.1	42.9	34.8	38.1
Methamphetamine	6.6	15.4	20.2	14.9	13.3	0.0	21.7	14.9
Cocaine	9.8	30.8	27.7	22.1	19.5	14.3	30.4	22.1
Opiates*	3.3	7.7	7.4	6.1	3.9	0.0	13.0	6.1
<b>Hispanic/Latino Arrestees</b>								
Alcohol*	15.8	4.7	8.1	10.8	12.0	0.0	6.8	10.8
Marijuana*	22.8	48.8	36.9	32.6	33.5	50.0	26.0	32.6
Methamphetamine*†	14.6	34.9	42.4	30.6	25.6	40.0	50.7	30.6
Cocaine	12.7	9.3	9.6	10.8	11.7	10.0	6.8	10.8
Opiates	4.4	7.0	6.6	5.8	5.7	10.0	5.5	5.8

\* t test or Chi-square significant at  $p \leq .05$  for "Ever", † for "Past 12 Months".

**Exhibit 4. Positive UA Results by Probation Status and Race/Ethnicity of Arrestees**

	Lifetime (n=1,249)				Past 12 Months (n=1,251)			
	Never on Probation	Other Probation	MCAPD Probation	Total	Not on Probation	Other Probation	MCAPD Probation	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<b>Native American Arrestees</b>								
Alcohol	65.6	28.6	47.7	51.1	54.7	33.3	45.0	51.1
Marijuana*	25.0	57.1	22.7	28.9	23.4	50.0	40.0	28.9
Methamphetamine	9.4	14.3	15.9	13.3	10.9	33.3	15.0	13.3
Cocaine	3.1	7.1	9.1	6.7	4.7	16.7	10.0	6.7
Opiates	0.0	7.1	6.8	4.4	3.1	0.0	10.0	4.4
<b>Other Race/Ethnicity</b>								
Alcohol	8.6	10.0	7.8	8.5	8.1	0.0	9.7	8.5
Marijuana	41.4	55.0	51.0	47.3	47.5	0.0	45.2	46.9
Methamphetamine*	22.4	50.0	45.1	35.7	33.3	0.0	41.9	35.4
Cocaine	5.2	5.0	7.8	6.2	6.1	0.0	6.5	6.2
Opiates	6.9	10.0	5.9	7.0	7.1	0.0	6.5	6.9
<b>Total</b>								
Alcohol*†	15.8	8.9	9.5	11.7	13.0	11.1	7.8	11.7
Marijuana*	28.3	48.8	36.7	35.3	36.2	36.1	32.2	35.3
Methamphetamine*†	20.5	32.7	40.3	32.2	29.0	27.8	42.0	32.1
Cocaine	9.4	10.1	10.1	9.8	10.0	8.3	9.4	9.8
Opiates†	8.2	13.7	12.0	10.9	9.6	11.1	15.0	11.0

\* t test or Chi-square significant at  $p \leq .05$  for "Ever", † for "Past 12 Months".

# Criminal Involvement of the Sample (Exhibit 5)

## Past Maricopa County Probationers

- Past Maricopa County probationers reported extensive and frequent criminal involvement. For example, at some point in their lives, 20.8% have stolen a car, 26.6% have committed a burglary, 40.6% have assaulted someone (without a weapon), and 36.1% have sold or made drugs (see the lifetime MCAPD probation columns).
- In many cases, past Maricopa County probationers reported monthly criminal activity. For example, past probationers reported an average of 11.67 stolen vehicles in the past year, and 11.04 threatened assaults (without a weapon). Past Maricopa County probationers reported an average of 38.01 assaults (without a weapon) in the past year, and they drove under the influence of drugs an average of 101.04 times in the past year. The most frequent crime involved making or selling drugs, occurring an average of 377.59 times in the past year (e.g., daily).

## Past Maricopa County Probationers vs. Other and Non-Probationers

- Criminal involvement among past Maricopa County probationers was far more extensive than non-probationers. For example, past probationer rates (ever) were three times higher for stealing property worth more than \$1,000 (17.0% v. 6.0%), stealing a car (20.8% v. 6.8%), committing a burglary (26.6% v. 9.5%), and committing a robbery (without a weapon; 11.1% v. 3.5%). Past Maricopa County probationers were also twice as likely as non-probationers to have attacked/assaulted someone (without a weapon; 40.6% v. 23.5%), and were twice as likely to make or sell drugs (36.1% v. 17.1%). These patterns also extended to frequency of crimes committed.
- Criminal involvement among past Maricopa County probationers and “other” probationers were generally similar, with a few notable differences. For example, 23.9% of “other” probationers reported illegal firearm possession (ever), compared to just 1.7% of past Maricopa County probationers.

**Exhibit 5: Criminal Involvement by Probation Status, Lifetime and Past 12 Months**

	Lifetime				Probation Past 12 Months			
	Never on Probation	Other Probation	MCJPD Probation	Total	Not on Probation	Other Probation	MCAJD Probation	Total
n =	53	8	137	198	91	7	100	198
<b>Written/drawn graffiti on neighborhood houses, walls, schools, stores etc?</b>								
Ever committed crime?	10.9 (n=53)	25.0 (n=46)	17.0 (n=113)	15.9 (n=212)	14.6 (n=144)	18.4 (n=7)	19.4 (n=61)	15.9 (n=212)
Done crime in past 12 months?	2.5	4.3	2.9	2.9	2.7	0.0	3.8	2.9
Mean # of times committed in past 12 months (SD)	50.25 (107.629)	84.38 (133.939)	41.58 (88.689)	53.03 (103.241)	65.78 (118.023)	.00 (.000)	24.33 (50.985)	53.03 (103.241)
Ever arrested for this crime?	1.0	4.9	2.9	2.5	2.2	2.6	3.2	2.5
Mean # of times arrested in past 12 months (SD)	.80 (.837)	.33 (.500)	.42 (1.170)	.45 (.971)	.59 (1.141)	.00 (.000)	.20 (.422)	.45 (.971)
<b>Destroyed property worth LESS than \$250?</b>								
Ever committed crime?	15.6 (n=76)	33.2 (n=61)	27.4 (n=182)	23.9 (n=319)	22.6 (n=222)	21.1 (n=8)	28.3 (n=89)	23.9 (n=319)
Done crime in past 12 months?	5.3	8.2	7.8	0.1	6.1	7.9	9.5	7.0
Mean # of times committed in past 12 months (SD)	2.58 (3.775)	1.50 (.855)	14.04 (54.745)	8.89 (41.456)	9.24 (47.613)	2.33 (.577)	8.87 (29.227)	8.89 (41.456)
Ever arrested for this crime?	4.3	10.3	11.7	8.8	7.6	10.5	12.4	8.8
Mean # of times arrested in past 12 months (SD)	.80 (.894)	.53 (.513)	.56 (.939)	.59 (.875)	.63 (.842)	.75 (.957)	.51 (.942)	.59 (.875)
<b>Destroyed property worth MORE than \$250?</b>								
Ever committed crime?	8.4 (n=41)	27.2 (n=50)	21.2 (n=141)	17.4 (n=232)	15.7 (n=154)	15.8 (n=6)	22.9 (n=72)	17.4 (n=232)
Done crime in past 12 months?	2.1	7.1	4.7	0.1	3.5	5.3	5.7	4.0
Mean # of times committed in past 12 months (SD)	2.10 (2.846)	1.77 (1.235)	15.93 (66.493)	9.85 (50.167)	14.38 (62.498)	1.00 (.000)	1.82 (1.185)	9.85 (50.167)
Ever arrested for this crime?	3.5	9.8	7.2	6.2	5.1	10.5	9.2	6.2
Mean # of times arrested in past 12 months (SD)	.50 (.632)	.44 (.616)	.36 (.895)	.41 (.787)	.42 (.871)	.25 (.500)	.41 (.682)	.41 (.787)

The values in parentheses following means are the standard deviations of that mean.

**Exhibit 5: Criminal Involvement by Probation Status, Lifetime and Past 12 Months**

	Lifetime				Probation Past 12 Months			
	Never on Probation	Other Probation	MCJPD Probation	Total	Not on Probation	Other Probation	MCAJD Probation	Total
n =	53	8	137	198	91	7	100	198
<b>Stolen property worth LESS than \$1000?</b>								
Ever committed crime?	25.5 (n=124)	44.3 (n=81)	44.4 (n=295)	37.5 (n=500)	33.8 (n=332)	34.2 (n=13)	49.5 (n=156)	37.5 (n=501)
Done crime in past 12 months?	11.5	19.1	15.2	14.4	13.6	13.2	17.1	14.4
Mean # of times arrested in past 12 months (SD)	20.34 (59.888)	16.83 (29.881)	40.19 (133.753)	29.93 (102.545)	34.25 (116.520)	20.80 (44.274)	18.98 (56.259)	29.77 (102.294)
Ever arrested for this crime?	10.1	22.4	22.3	17.8	15.1	31.6	25.1	17.9
Mean # of times arrested in past 12 months (SD)	.90 (1.475)	.78 (1.013)	.68 (.981)	.75 (1.105)	.84 (1.253)	.50 (.674)	.60 (.795)	.75 (1.102)
<b>Stolen property worth MORE than \$1000?</b>								
Ever committed crime?	6.0 (n=29)	15.3 (n=28)	17.0 (n=113)	12.7 (n=170)	10.5 (n=103)	13.2 (n=5)	19.7 (n=62)	12.7 (n=170)
Done crime in past 12 months?	2.9	3.8	6.2	4.6	3.7	7.9	7.3	4.6
Mean # of times arrested in past 12 months (SD)	3.71 (3.539)	1.4 (.548)	14.58 (40.882)	12.57 (35.317)	16.06 (42.965)	34.33 (56.871)	3.91 (3.449)	12.57 (35.317)
Ever arrested for this crime?	3.3	5.5	7.2	5.5	4.7	10.5	7.6	5.5
Mean # of times arrested in past 12 months (SD)	.69 (.479)	.40 (.966)	.58 (.794)	.58 (.759)	.59 (.832)	.50 (.577)	.58 (.654)	.58 (.759)
<b>Stolen a car or motor vehicle?</b>								
Ever committed crime?	6.8 (n=33)	21.7 (n=40)	20.8 (n=138)	15.8 (n=211)	14.6 (n=144)	13.2 (n=5)	19.7 (n=62)	15.8 (n=211)
Done crime in past 12 months?	1.6	2.7	2.4	2.2	2.0	2.6	2.5	2.2
Mean # of times arrested in past 12 months (SD)	1.75 (1.165)	1.40 (.548)	11.67 (25.894)	7.00 (19.343)	8.95 (22.670)	1.0 (.000)	2.29 (3.402)	7.00 (19.343)
Ever arrested for this crime?	4.7	11.4	14.3	10.4	9.6	10.5	13.0	10.4
Ever committed crime?	.30 (.470)	.29 (.463)	.27 (.590)	.28 (.551)	.29 (.543)	.00 (.000)	.22 (.571)	.28 (.551)

The values in parentheses following means are the standard deviations of that mean.

**Exhibit 5: Criminal Involvement by Probation Status, Lifetime and Past 12 Months**

	Lifetime				Probation Past 12 Months			
	Never on Probation	Other Probation	MCJPD Probation	Total	Not on Probation	Other Probation	MCAJD Probation	Total
n =	53	8	137	198	91	7	100	198
<b>Driven under the influence of alcohol [DUI]?</b>								
Ever committed crime?	49 (n=238)	64.1 (n=118)	59.5 (n=396)	56.3 (n=752)	56.1 (n=552)	60.5 (n=23)	56.8 (n=179)	56.4 (n=754)
Done crime in past 12 months?	23.9	32.1	17.0	21.6	23.3	26.3	15.6	21.5
Mean # of times arrested in past 12 months (SD)	12.82 (40.859)	18.91 (66.961)	40.01 (98.378)	24.72 (74.190)	24.72 (74.126)	7.60 (16.262)	28.38 (82.116)	24.72 (74.190)
Ever arrested for this crime?	24.3	27.7	28.6	26.9	27.2	36.8	24.4	26.9
Mean # of times arrested in past 12 months (SD)	.53 (.663)	.55 (.702)	.47 (1.097)	.50 (.921)	.52 (.977)	.57 (.646)	.43 (.751)	.50 (.921)
<b>Driven under the influence of drugs (not including alcohol)?</b>								
Ever committed crime?	33.5 (n=163)	57.1 (n=105)	54.9 (n=365)	47.4 (n=633)	44.6 (n=439)	55.3 (n=21)	55.6 (n=175)	47.5 (n=635)
Done crime in past 12 months?	21.2	34.2	22.6	23.7	23.6	23.7	23.8	23.6
Mean # of times arrested in past 12 months (SD)	98.18 (181.85)	121.74 (161.699)	101.04 (155.809)	104.32 (165.545)	113.45 (172.754)	26.22 (68.974)	84.72 (146.178)	104.32 (165.545)
Ever arrested for this crime?	3.9	7.1	8.0	6.4	5.3	5.3	9.8	6.4
Mean # of times arrested in past 12 months (SD)	.74 (.562)	.69 (.855)	.40 (.631)	.52 (.666)	.65 (.653)	.50 (.707)	.29 (.643)	.52 (.666)

The values in parentheses following means are the standard deviations of that mean.

**Exhibit 5: Criminal Involvement by Probation Status, Lifetime and Past 12 Months**

	Lifetime				Probation Past 12 Months			
	Never on Probation	Other Probation	MCJPD Probation	Total	Not on Probation	Other Probation	MCAJD Probation	Total
n =	53	8	137	198	91	7	100	198
<b>Broke into a house, store, or building to commit theft?</b>								
Ever committed crime?	9.5 (n=46)	27.2 (n=50)	26.6 (n=177)	20.4 (n=273)	18.1 (n=178)	15.8 (n=6)	28.3 (n=89)	20.4 (n=273)
Done crime in past 12 months?	2.7	5.4	5.0	4.2	3.9	0.0	5.7	4.2
Mean # of times committed in past 12 months (SD)	3.23 (3.678)	8.60 (13.393)	5.68 (10.176)	5.63 (9.758)	6.26 (10.661)	.00 (.000)	4.13 (7.256)	5.63 (9.758)
Ever arrested for this crime?	4.5	9.8	10.4	8.2	7.7	10.5	9.2	8.2
Mean # of times committed in past 12 months (SD)	.59 (.734)	.67 (1.970)	.37 (.790)	.46 (1.063)	.43 (.854)	2.00 (4.000)	.32 (.548)	.46 (1.063)
<b>Used someone's ID or identity to commit theft, forgery, or fraud?</b>								
Ever committed crime?	3.9 (n=19)	2.7 (n=5)	6.9 (n=46)	5.2 (n=70)	4.9 (n=48)	2.6 (n=1)	6.7 (n=21)	5.2 (n=70)
Done crime in past 12 months?	1.6	2.2	2.6	2.2	1.9	0.0	3.2	2.2
Mean # of times committed in past 12 months (SD)	18.88 (33.434)	3.25 (4.500)	52.06 (92.153)	36.17 (74.350)	22.47 (37.367)	.00 (.000)	62.20 (115.136)	36.17 (74.350)
Ever arrested for this crime?	2.3	3.3	4.4	3.4	3.8	2.6	2.5	3.4
Mean # of times committed in past 12 months (SD)	.91 (.944)	.83 (.753)	.34 (.614)	.54 (.751)	.51 (.731)	2.0 (.000)	.50 (.756)	.54 (.751)
<b>Sold or made drugs?</b>								
Ever committed crime?	17.1 (n=83)	34.8 (n=64)	36.1 (n=240)	29.0 (n=387)	25.6 (n=252)	21.1 (n=8)	40.3 (n=127)	28.9 (n=387)
Done crime in past 12 months?	8.0	15.8	16.5	13.3	12.1	7.9	17.8	13.3
Mean # of times committed in past 12 months (SD)	312.58 (881.783)	180 (333.252)	377.59 (851.636)	330.79 (797.335)	339.26 (793.637)	123.00 (209.581)	324.17 (832.563)	330.79 (797.335)
Ever arrested for this crime?	2.5	8.2	8.7	6.4	5.8	5.3	8.3	6.4
Mean # of times committed in past 12 months (SD)	.25 (.452)	.47 (.834)	.43 (.704)	.41 (.695)	.40 (.651)	.50 (.707)	.42 (.809)	.41 (.695)

The values in parentheses following means are the standard deviations of that mean.

**Exhibit 5: Criminal Involvement by Probation Status, Lifetime and Past 12 Months**

	Lifetime				Probation Past 12 Months			
	Never on Probation	Other Probation	MCJPD Probation	Total	Not on Probation	Other Probation	MCAJD Probation	Total
n =	53	8	137	198	91	7	100	198
<b>Threaten to attack someone without using a weapon?</b>								
Ever committed crime?	22.4 (n=109)	39.7 (n=73)	36.5 (n=243)	31.8 (n=425)	30.1 (n=296)	23.7 (n=9)	38.4 (n=121)	31.9 (n=426)
Done crime in past 12 months?	13.8	20.1	20.5	18.0	17.2	15.8	20.6	18.0
Mean # of times committed in past 12 months (SD)	21.35 (76.021)	22.28 (88.278)	11.04 (47.317)	15.72 (63.916)	18.44 (70.227)	68.83 (145.688)	3.13 (3.981)	15.72 (63.916)
Ever arrested for this crime?	4.3	10.3	7.2	6.6	5.9	7.9	8.9	6.7
Mean # of times committed in past 12 months (SD)	1.29 (2.053)	.68 (.671)	.68 (.887)	.83 (1.250)	1.0 (1.452)	.67 (.577)	.46 (.637)	.82 (1.246)
<b>Threaten to attack someone using a weapon?</b>								
Ever committed crime?	9.7 (n=47)	17.5 (n=32)	18.8 (n=125)	15.3 (n=204)	13.6 (n=134)	10.5 (n=4)	21.0 (n=66)	15.3 (n=204)
Done crime in past 12 months?	6.2	8.7	8.7	7.8	7.0	5.3	10.5	7.8
Mean # of times committed in past 12 months (SD)	2.9 (2.175)	15.00 (49.365)	2.18 (1.790)	4.26 (19.862)	5.49 (24.213)	1.50 (.707)	1.77 (1.334)	4.26 (19.862)
Ever arrested for this crime?	3.3	3.3	4.8	4.0	3.2	5.3	6.7	4.0
Mean # of times committed in past 12 months (SD)	.69 (.793)	.33 (.516)	.63 (1.431)	.61 (1.188)	.48 (.677)	.00 (.000)	.86 (1.711)	.61 (1.188)
<b>Committed domestic violence (including assault, disorderly conduct, criminal damage, etc.)?</b>								
Ever committed crime?	20 (n=97)	34.8 (n=64)	34.4 (n=229)	29.2 (n=390)	26.3 (n=259)	42.1 (n=16)	36.5 (n=115)	29.2 (n=309)
Done crime in past 12 months?	12.1	20.1	14.4	14.4	13.1	26.3	16.8	14.4
Mean # of times committed in past 12 months (SD)	3.12 (7.059)	16.92 (67.246)	1.99 (2.095)	5.21 (30.046)	6.85 (36.570)	1.90 (1.287)	1.85 (1.844)	5.21 (30.046)
Ever arrested for this crime?	15.2	27.2	28.6	23.5	20.9	31.6	30.5	23.5
Mean # of times committed in past 12 months (SD)	.82 (.866)	.98 (.742)	.71 (1.011)	.78 (.942)	.75 (.797)	1.25 (.866)	.78 (1.198)	.78 (.942)

The values in parentheses following means are the standard deviations of that mean.

**Exhibit 5: Criminal Involvement by Probation Status, Lifetime and Past 12 Months**

	Lifetime				Probation Past 12 Months			
	Never on Probation	Other Probation	MCJPD Probation	Total	Not on Probation	Other Probation	MCAJD Probation	Total
n =	53	8	137	198	91	7	100	198
<b>Attacked, assaulted or beaten-up someone without using a weapon?</b>								
Ever committed crime?	23.5 (n=114)	44.0 (n=81)	40.6 (n=270)	34.8 (n=465)	32.0 (n=315)	39.5 (n=15)	42.9 (n=135)	34.8 (n=465)
Done crime in past 12 months?	8.8	20.1	14.6	13.3	12.0	15.8	16.8	13.2
Mean # of times committed in past 12 months (SD)	3.79 (7.482)	9.19 (33.719)	38.01 (341.677)	23.59 (252.846)	5.07 (19.319)	6.50 (11.623)	68.10 (466.331)	23.59 (252.846)
Ever arrested for this crime?	4.9	12.5	10.5	8.8	7.8	13.2	11.1	8.8
Mean # of times committed in past 12 months (SD)	.50 (.511)	.52 (.593)	.55 (.738)	.53 (.665)	.45 (.551)	.60 (.548)	.71 (.860)	.53 (.665)
<b>Attacked, assaulted or beaten-up someone using a weapon?</b>								
Ever committed crime?	4.7 (n=23)	17.4 (n=32)	12.0 (n=80)	10.1 (n=135)	8.3 (n=82)	7.9 (n=3)	15.9 (n=50)	10.1 (n=135)
Done crime in past 12 months?	1.6	6.5	3.5	3.2	2.8	5.3	4.1	3.2
Mean # of times committed in past 12 months (SD)	2.50 (2.268)	12.67 (28.675)	1.91 (1.065)	5.10 (145.672)	6.71 (19.088)	1.50 (7.07)	1.92 (.996)	5.10 (15.672)
Ever arrested for this crime?	2.3	4.9	3.0	3.0	2.5	2.6	4.4	3.0
Mean # of times committed in past 12 months (SD)	.45 (.522)	.00 (.000)	.50 (.688)	.38 (.586)	.32 (.476)	.00 (.000)	.50 (.760)	.38 (.586)
<b>Possessed a firearm while prohibited (felony conviction, probation, underage, etc.)?</b>								
Ever committed crime?	8.0 (n=39)	23.9 (n=44)	1.7 (n=144)	17.0 (n=227)	15.3 (n=151)	13.2 (n=5)	22.5 (n=71)	17.0 (n=227)
Done crime in past 12 months?	3.5	10.3	10.5	7.9	6.9	10.5	10.8	7.9
Mean # of times committed in past 12 months (SD)	87.53 (142.665)	72.41 (141.41)	122.40 (162.921)	108.25 (156.281)	92.76 (149.134)	123.00 (209.578)	137.91 (166.560)	108.25 (156.281)
Ever arrested for this crime?	1.2	4.3	6.0	4.0	3.6	2.6	5.7	4.0
Mean # of times committed in past 12 months (SD)	.83 (.408)	.13 (.354)	.63 (.740)	.57 (.690)	.51 (.612)	1.0 (.000)	.67 (.840)	.57 (.690)

The values in parentheses following means are the standard deviations of that mean.

## Gang Involvement among the Sample (Exhibit 6)

### Past Maricopa County Probationers

- Approximately 30% of past Maricopa County probationers reported some level of gang involvement. For example, 7.0% of individuals who were on Maricopa County probation within the last year reported current gang membership. An additional 7.3% reported being formerly in a gang, and 14.4% reported having friends who were in a gang. Similar rates were reported among those who had been on Maricopa County probation at some point in their lives.

### Past Maricopa County Probationers vs. Other and Non-Probationers

- Gang membership was significantly more common among past Maricopa County probationers than non-probationers. For example, individuals who had been on probation in Maricopa County at some point in their lives were three times as likely to report active gang membership, compared to non-probationers (6.2% vs. 2.7% for non-probationers). Non-probationers also reported lower rates of former gang involvement (4.6% v. 8.5%) and friends in a gang (9.8% v. 15.2%).
- Rates of gang involvement among past Maricopa County probationers and “other” probationers were similar.

**Exhibit 6. Gang Involvement Among Arrestees by Probation Status (n=1,342)**

	Lifetime				Probation Past 12 Months			
	Never on Probatio	Other Probatio	MCPD Probatio	Total	Not on Probatio	Other Probatio	MCPD Probatio	Total
	n	n	n		n	n	n	
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<b>Relationship</b>								
None*	83.0	72.0	70.0	75.0	76.3	74.3	71.2	75.0
Current*	2.7	7.1	6.2	5.1	4.6	0.0	7.0	5.1
Former*	4.6	7.7	8.5	7.0	6.8	8.6	7.3	7.0
Friends*	9.8	13.2	15.2	13.0	12.3	17.1	14.4	12.9

\* t test or Chi-square significant at p < .05 for "Ever", † for "Past 12 Months".

# Substance Abuse/Dependence for the Sample (Exhibit 7)

## Past Maricopa County Probationers

- Past Maricopa County probationers demonstrated significant dependence on drugs and alcohol. Nearly half (44.4%, ever on MCAPD) reported that family and friends complained about their drug and alcohol use. One-third reported using more than one drug at a time, and 36.9% reported that they had neglected important work, social or other responsibilities because of their drug and alcohol use. From 45-48% of past Maricopa County probationers (lifetime, past year) were classified as having a “substantial risk of dependence” on the Drug Abuse Screening Test (DAST).

## Past Maricopa County Probationers vs. Other and Non-Probationers

- Dependence issues were more pronounced among past Maricopa County probationers than non-probationers. For example, 36.2% of past Maricopa County probationers (lifetime) reported feeling sick, shaky or depressed after stopping drinking/drug use, compared to just 21.9% of non-probationers.
- Past Maricopa County probationers were twice as likely to engage in illegal activities in order to obtain drugs/alcohol (27.0% v. 12.6% for non-probationers), they were more likely to engage in poly drug use (33.7% v. 20.1% for non-probationers) and to feel bad or guilty about their drug/alcohol use (53.2% v. 37.1% for non-probationers). Past Maricopa County probationers were also twice as likely to be classified as “substantial risk of dependence” (45.1% v. 22.5%).
- Past Maricopa County probationers and “other” probationers responded similarly to the substance abuse and dependence questions.

**Exhibit 7. Percentage of Arrestees Responding "yes" to Substance Abuse and Dependence Screening Questions**

	Lifetime (n=1,336)				Probation Past 12 Months (n=1,337)			
	Never on Probation	Other Probation	MCAPD Probation	Total	Not on Probation	Other Probation	MCAPD Probation	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Are you always able to stop using drugs or alcohol when you want to? *†	77.5	68.1	69.8	72.4	74.3	68.4	67.1	72.4
Have you ever felt sick, shaky, or depressed when you stopped drinking or using drugs? *†	21.9	34.6	36.2	30.8	27.5	34.2	40.2	30.7
Have you used drugs other than those required for medical reasons? *†	30.3	46.5	45.5	40.1	37.3	36.8	49.1	40.1
Does your family or friends ever complain about your involvement with drugs or alcohol? *	31.3	45.4	44.4	39.8	38.4	44.7	43.4	39.7
Have you continued to use alcohol or drugs despite problems caused by your use? *†	33.1	42.2	47.7	41.6	39.2	39.5	49.4	41.6
Have you ever engaged in illegal activities in order to obtain alcohol or drugs? *†	12.6	21.6	27.0	21.0	18.1	13.2	31.0	21.0
Do you abuse more than one drug at a time [of any type]? *	20.1	42.7	33.7	30.0	28.4	31.6	34.5	30.0
Have you ever had blackouts or flashbacks as a result of drug or alcohol use? *	17.6	28.1	21.5	21.0	20.2	28.9	22.5	21.0

\* t test or Chi-square significant at p < .05 for "Ever", † for "Past 12 Months".

**Exhibit 7. Percentage of Arrestees Responding "yes" to Substance Abuse and Dependence Screening Questions**

	Lifetime (n=1,336)				Probation Past 12 Months (n=1,337)			
	Never on Probation	Other Probation	MCAPD Probation	Total	Not on Probation	Other Probation	MCAPD Probation	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Do you ever feel bad or guilty about your drinking or drug use? *†	37.1	54.1	53.2	47.5	44.0	55.3	57.0	47.4
Have you ever neglected your family because of your alcohol or drug use? *†	21.3	30.8	34.7	29.3	26.5	31.6	37.7	29.3
Have you had medical problems as a result of your alcohol your drug use? *†	10.3	15.1	16.7	14.2	12.5	13.2	19.3	14.1
Has there ever been a time when you needed to increase the amount you drink or use more drugs to get the effect you want? *†	25.9	37.3	35.3	32.2	30.8	23.7	37.3	32.1
Have you neglected important work, social or recreational activities or responsibilities because of your alcohol or drug use? *†	20.2	31.4	36.9	30.1	27.6	34.2	37.1	30.0
DAST 10-Drug Abuse Screening Test for risk of abuse or dependence? *†								
No Problem	1.9	1.1	0.2	0.9	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.9
Low Level	44.5	23.2	20.2	29.4	33.5	23.7	18.0	29.5
Moderate-Risk of Abuse	31.1	34.1	34.6	33.3	32.7	36.8	34.5	33.2
Substantial-Risk of Dependence	22.5	41.6	45.1	36.4	32.7	39.5	47.5	36.4

\* t test or Chi-square significant at p < .05 for "Ever", † for "Past 12 Months".

## **Mental Health History for the Sample (Exhibit 8)**

### **Past Maricopa County Probationers**

- Past Maricopa County probationers have significant histories of mental health problems. Among those on Maricopa County probation in the last 12 months, 40.2% stated that, at some point in their lives, they had been told by a counselor, social worker or doctor that they had a mental health problem. Almost one-quarter had been given this diagnosis in the past year. Just over one-third of past Maricopa County probationers (34.2%; probation past year) had been prescribed medication for a mental illness at some point in their life, and 13.9% had been hospitalized for a mental health problem.
- Past Maricopa County probationers also expressed willingness to received help for their mental health problems. Among those under MCAPD supervision in the past year, 26.9% reported that they had sought help, while 42.1% stated that they believed they could use treatment (or medication) from a mental health professional.

### **Past Maricopa County Probationers vs. Other and Non-Probationers**

- Non-probationers reported fewer mental health problems than past Maricopa County probationers. For example, 24.9% of non-probationers stated that they had been diagnosed with a mental health problem at some point in their lives, compared to 35.0% of past Maricopa County probationers (lifetime columns). Also, 23.9% of non-probationers had received mental health treatment, compared to 31.2% of past Maricopa County probationers.
- Past Maricopa County probationers and “other” probationers responded similarly to the mental health questions.

**Exhibit 8. Mental Health History Among Arrestees by Probation Status**

	Lifetime (N=1,338)				Probation Past 12 Months (N=1,340)			
	Never on Probation	Other Probation	MCAPD Probation	Total	Not on Probation	Other Probation	MCAPD Probation	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<b>Have you been told by a counselor, social worker, or doctor that you have a mental health illness, or emotional problem?</b>								
Ever *†	24.9	34.1	35.0	31.2	28.5	26.3	40.2	31.2
Past 12 months *†	14.2	15.1	20.3	17.4	16.1	7.9	22.5	17.3
<b>Have you ever been treated by a counselor, social worker for a mental health problem?</b>								
Ever *	23.9	30.3	31.2	28.4	26.9	26.3	33.2	28.4
Past 12 months	12.6	14.6	17.4	15.3	14.1	10.5	19.3	15.2
<b>Have you ever been given or prescribed medication for a mental health or emotional or psychiatric problem by a mental health professional?</b>								
Ever *†	22.7	31.4	30.8	27.9	26.0	26.3	34.2	28.0
Past 12 months †	12.4	14.6	17.3	15.1	13.7	13.2	19.9	15.2
<b>Have you ever been hospitalized for a mental health problem?</b>								
Ever	9.3	11.9	12.9	11.5	10.5	15.8	13.9	11.4
Past 12 months	3.9	3.2	4.2	4.0	4.0	5.3	3.8	4.0

\* t test or Chi-square significant at p < .05 for "Ever", † for "Past 12 Months".

**Exhibit 8. Mental Health History Among Arrestees by Probation Status**

	Lifetime (N=1,338)				Probation Past 12 Months (N=1,340)			
	Never on Probation	Other Probation	MCAPD Probation	Total	Not on Probation	Other Probation	MCAPD Probation	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<b>Have you been diagnosed with Post Traumatic Stress Disorder, or PTSD?</b>								
Ever †	7.6	12.4	10.4	9.7	8.4	18.4	12.3	9.6
Past 12 months	4.9	5.4	5.1	5.1	5.2	5.3	4.7	5.1
<b>Have you been civilly committed for a mental health problem?</b>								
Ever	3.9	7.0	6.6	5.7	5.1	7.9	7.3	5.7
Past 12 Months-Refused	1.9	2.7	2.0	2.0	1.7	5.3	2.5	2.0
<b>Have you felt that you could use treatment, medication, or other help from a mental health professional?</b>								
Ever *†	22.1	32.4	36.3	30.6	26.6	39.5	42.1	30.6
Past 12 months *†	19.4	28.1	31.5	26.7	22.8	36.8	37.3	26.6
<b>Have you sought help for a mental problem?</b>								
Ever *	18.2	25.4	24.5	22.3	20.8	23.7	26.9	22.3
Past 12 months †	14.1	16.8	17.1	16.0	14.4	15.8	20.9	15.9

\* t test or Chi-square significant at p < .05 for "Ever", † for "Past 12 Months".

# About the Center for Violence Prevention & Community Safety

Arizona State University, in order to deepen its commitment to the communities of Arizona and to society as a whole, has set a new standard for research universities, as modeled by the New American University. Accordingly, ASU is measured not by whom we exclude, but by whom we include.

The University is pursuing research that considers the public good and is assuming a greater responsibility to our communities for economic, social, and cultural vitality. Social embeddedness – university-wide, interactive, and mutually-supportive partnerships with Arizona communities – is at the core of our development as a New American University.

Toward the goal of social embeddedness, in response to the growing need of our communities to improve the public's safety and well-being, in July 2005 ASU established the Center for Violence Prevention and Community Safety. The Center's mission is to generate, share, and apply quality research and knowledge to create "best practice" standards.

Specifically, the Center evaluates policies and programs; analyzes and evaluates patterns and causes of violence; develops strategies and programs; develops a clearinghouse of research reports and "best practice" models; educates, trains, and provides technical assistance; and facilitates the development and construction of databases.

For more information about the Center for Violence Prevention and Community Safety, please contact us using the information provided below.

## MAILING ADDRESS

Center for Violence Prevention and Community Safety  
College of Public Programs  
Arizona State University  
Mail Code 3120  
500 N. 3rd Street, Suite 200  
Phoenix, Arizona 85004-2135

## PHONE

602.496.1470

## WEB SITE

<http://cvpcs.asu.edu>



**ASU** Center for Violence Prevention  
and Community Safety

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY