

Webinar Questions and Answers

HOPE Demonstration Field Experiment

Edited transcript from June 2 and 7 webinar sessions. Multiple questions and questions that were asked in both sessions may have been combined or deleted.

[June 2 Session: What is the Hawaii HOPE model](#)

[June 7 Session: How Will the demonstration field experiment be evaluated?](#)

[Solicitation Questions and Answers by NIJ and BJA Staff](#)

June 2 session: “What is the Hawaii HOPE model?”

Answers by Judge Steven S. Alm and Ms. Cheryl Inouye, Chief Probation Officer, ICSS, First Circuit Court Honolulu, Hawaii.

Q1. How long did it take to get all of the players on board (i.e., DA, Police, Sheriff, etc.)?

A: We started meeting in July and started the program October 1 with 34 offenders. Everything was basically in place at that time. At the end of the first year, I [Judge Alm] met with the Police Chief to ask the police to dedicate more resources to warrant service for HOPE. The basic components came together in a few months.

Q2. How would the model work with someone who is just a low-level violent offender without much drug involvement or sex offending?

A: HOPE works for every condition of probation. Probationers have to show up for treatment, meet with the probation officer, meet curfew, and take a polygraph for sex offenders. For probationers who do not comply, they receive a sanction for each violation.

Q3. What treatment, other than drug treatment, (e.g., criminal thinking, gang membership) is available for probation clients and how do you determine what treatment is appropriate?

A: Domestic violence offenders go to Domestic Violence Inventory (DVI); sex offenders get sex offender treatment. There are also parenting classes, etc. The best way to think of HOPE is modification to probation; HOPE is not tied to a specific treatment program.

Q4. Are there checklists or other fidelity checks that are in place for PO [probation officers] prosecutors, defenders, and the judge to assure fidelity to the model?

A: If people [who administer and operate the program] know that researchers are looking at their records they tend to “step-it-up” and comply with the program. The evaluation helps make sure people stick to the program, but leadership is important as well. For example, in 2004, I [Judge Alm] started having meetings with key personnel among the researchers and probation officers once a month.

Q5. Does participation in HOPE reduce the average amount of time on probation?

A: HOPE produces more positive outcomes in probationers. They may have probation reduced after they serve at least half the time. You don't want to have them off too soon because probation provides the structure for pro-social behavior.

Q6. Do you have a set number of violations for probation before you determine that a participant is not succeeding in the HOPE program?

A: If people [offenders] abscond twice, they go to prison. The worst offenders are usually not going to participate anyway. If they are violating their drug tests repeatedly but are still participating, they may be referred to drug court for more intensive treatment.

Q7. How many probationers were in the first HOPE model group?

A: The initial pilot started with 34 offenders.

Q8. Under HOPE, how does the judge handle nonpayment of financial conditions?

A: If an offender is not looking for a job, then they would go to jail for failure to pay restitution. Likewise if an offender has a job but is not making any effort to pay, they will get jail time for that, too. If an offender is actively trying to look for a job, they will usually get consideration.

Q9. In Hawaii, how quickly do the offenders get into court after going to jail?

A: Dr. [Angela] Hawken [who evaluated the Hawaii program] found that 75% of hearings were held within 72 hours. Most judges here [in Hawaii] have one day dedicated to sentencing and hearings and four days set aside for trial. Sometimes the hearings have to be delayed for scheduling and logistics.

Q10. What type of training did probation officers who participated in Hawaii HOPE receive?

A: [Cheryl Inouye]: The POs received training on the risk assessments, motivational interviewing, cognitive behavioral therapy, and case management. But we always wanted to develop a plan to hold the offender accountable and use these skills. For HOPE we created one initial three-hour training, but the follow-up was crucial.

Q11. Our high-risk probationers are already required to report weekly and nearly all are drug tested at every appointment. Is it still necessary to have a call-in system to pick a random day for drug testing?

A: [Cheryl Inouye]: Our drug testing schedule is linked to the classification level. Most probationers are tested four to six times a month. We stagger the tests so offenders don't know when to expect it. Tests can occur two days in a row, so offenders need to call the hotline every day. This helps teach personal responsibility.

Q12. How did Hawaii determine their “high-risk” population, by a standardized risk assessment of criminogenic factors, or can it be defined by other factors, such as high risk to relapse or high risk to reoffend as indicated by criminal history and age? Can we define high risk, or is that defined by risk assessment tools?

A: We use the LSI-R and the ASIS, and who is failing at probation. We also use different assessments for DV and sex offenders.

Q13. In Hawaii HOPE, does a "motion to modify" trigger a hearing in court, and does the defense have the ability to contest the modification before the probationer is jailed?

A: There is due process built into HOPE. HOPE staff makes copies of the motion to modify and defense attorneys can contest this. Prosecutors can file motions to revoke probation as well.

Q14. Can you explain what the “motion to modify” is asking for - what is being modified? What if judges don’t have this option?

A: Motions to modify alter the original conditions of probation to allow for brief sanction. In jurisdictions where judges cannot issue a motion to modify, a motion to revoke may allow you to impose the sanction and send the probationer back to the PO [probation officer]. Motions to modify were the easiest way for Hawaii to do this.

Q15. How has HOPE impacted county budgets (county governments fund 100% of all jail expenses in my state)?

A: It has actually saved money throughout the system. Each PO [probation officer] is saving the state budget about \$4,000 each. As far as the county jail, the jail bed days are neutral.

Q16. Were defense attorney’s resistant to HOPE?

A: At the very beginning, the Public Defender’s Office realized that a system that had no sanctions for repeated violations and then a drastic revocation of probation was not fair, so there was little resistance.

Q17. What parts of the HOPE program can be supported outside of the jurisdiction?

A: HOPE does have a lab in Arizona verify contested drug tests. That is the only component outside of the jurisdiction.

Q18. When do HOPE probationers receive day treatment?

A: HOPE does not have a day treatment component. If HOPE probationers request treatment, or if it is shown that they cannot desist from using, they will complete an assessment and are sent to the appropriate treatment. This may be residential or outpatient. When they are in residential, they are not on the hotline. When in outpatient, they are being monitored.

Q19. Do HOPE probationers receive short sanctions for reoffending as well as drug violations and missed appointments?

A: If a HOPE probationer commits a misdemeanor, I [Judge Alm] would look to see if they had received a consequence in municipal court. If not, I would give a consequence. If it is a felony I would keep the new offense separate. They are presumed innocent of the new felony. The probationer may be in custody awaiting trial for the new felony anyway.

Q20. Are there any restrictions on what probationers can participate in HOPE?

A: No. Most programs have criteria on who cannot participate. We are looking for those most likely to fail probation as usual, and we want to watch them closely and help them succeed. It is hard to think who is a bad person to be put on HOPE.

Q21. How has the level of sanctions changed since the program started? Is there a grid that you use for different violations?

A: At the beginning I [Judge Alm] gave a week in jail for first violation and two weeks for second. But as time went on, I have found that is not needed. It is the immediacy of the sanction, not the duration. If they are still violating, then I will give a longer sanction. In Hawaii there cannot be a grid for sanctions; judges have to have discretion.

Q22. How has the perception of HOPE changed among POs [probation officers] and Court staff?

A: The POs were frustrated with the system and ready for something new. It was very easy to implement HOPE among the POs. The Court staff came up with good ideas for modifications that were incorporated into the program, particularly with bench warrants and booking. This helped with buy-in among both the Court staff and the Sheriff's Office.

Q23. Our jurisdiction requires at least seven days of notice to a probationer and counsel prior to a surrender/violation hearing? Is this acceptable to the HOPE model?

A: We believe that is too long. If the person is in custody, as they should be, that waiting period may be longer than what the Judge would issue as a sanction. If the person is not in custody, that is too long between the violation (i.e., not swift) and the hearing; a number of offenders won't show up for the hearing. If possible, change the time required. In Hawaii, it is 48 hours.

Q24. Has this model been tried in more rural settings (counties with less than 65,000 and less than 300 felony cases per year)?

A: Yes. Arizona is doing several HOPE pilots in rural settings (e.g., with populations of 10,000).

Q25. Does your Drug Court accept sex offenders and/or violent felony offenders? If not, what do you do with these probationers if they don't follow through on treatment plan if you send others to Drug Court?

A: Our Drug Court is evolving; from now on it will be accepting violent felony offenders. If sex offenders have completed sex offender treatment, they will be considered as well. If offenders eventually fail

HOPE and are not absconding, they will be considered for Drug Court. If they fail HOPE by repeatedly absconding, they will be going to prison.

Q26. How much information do probation officers give clients about the HOPE model up front (when clients are first enrolled)?

A: All of it. Judge Alm also tried his best to explain HOPE at the Warning Hearing. As he tells the offenders, it's not rocket science. It's all about choices.

Q27. How many prosecutors and public defenders are assigned to HOPE caseload? How often do they meet? Are there problems that arise when non-public defenders represent clients?

A: In the past, deputy prosecutors and public defenders handled their own assigned cases for HOPE. That meant literally dozens of attorneys. Now, each office has one attorney assigned. The law clerk slides the private counsel in between public defender hearings as appropriate.

Q28. What percent of HOPE participants appear before Judge Alm for a violation?

A: Virtually all of the felony probationers on HOPE (1,700+) are assigned to Judge Alm. The average HOPE hearing is 7.5 minutes long.

Q29. Does Hawaii HOPE accept mentally ill probationers or treat them any differently? Does the Hawaii HOPE model require mental health certified treatment providers for residential treatment? If so, are there problems with waiting lists?

A: HOPE works well with generally all probationers including those with mental health issues. HOPE's simplicity and clarity appears to be particularly well-suited for this population. We have several co-occurring disorder treatment programs available (though not necessarily mental health certified). Probationers may be excluded on a case-by-case basis, depending on their mental functioning, e.g., developmentally delayed, actively psychotic, etc.

Q30. Has the HOPE model been used for misdemeanor offenders, and if so, has the shortened length of sentences in misdemeanor cases affected the implementation of the program or its success?

A: There are approximately 130 domestic violence misdemeanor offenders (assault-related and protective order violations) in HOPE (in a separate courthouse). They are showing similar success as the felons.

Q31. Is the prosecutor's presence at the hearings absolutely essential? Could a jurisdiction do the program with the prosecutor's knowledge and approval of the program, but not their presence at court hearings?

A: This was raised by our prosecutors several years ago but was rejected. Given the speed of the hearings, there is no way the prosecutor could meaningfully contribute at a hearing, even in writing, and it was felt that without the prosecutor's presence, it would be less of a hearing and not as meaningful for the offender. Our prosecutors believe strongly in HOPE and are contributing to its success.

Q32. In Hawaii HOPE, what other hierarchical responses do you have to non-compliance besides placement in jail?

A: Jail is the typical sanction. In addition, more frequent probation officer appointments or a higher level of substance abuse treatment (i.e., residential rather than outpatient) may be initiated.

Q33. In Hawaii, how many panels are your drug screens? Does it matter if your state employs a determinate sentencing structure instead on indeterminate as used in Hawaii?

A: Our screens are typically six panels (methamphetamine, opiates, THC, cocaine, benzodiazepines, Oxycodone). We occasionally run screens of 10 when prescription drugs is the drug of choice (includes the additional testing for amphetamines, barbiturates, methadone, PCP, propoxyphene). Offenders may also be tested for alcohol use (ETG).

If the state uses determinate sentencing and has prison time followed by probation, HOPE will work fine (just as the two pilots for parole are doing). That is similar to our offenders who are sentenced to five years probation with a year in jail as a condition of probation. They do their year, then start their HOPE supervision in the community.

Q34. Did HOPE, in effect, replace prison time for high-risk offenders with in-patient drug treatment ordered for repeated HOPE violators?

A: No. Judges have tremendous discretion in Hawaii regarding prison or probation at sentencing. If a judge decides on probation, then we want to put those most likely to fail at probation into HOPE. Offenders on probation-as-usual were sometimes ordered to inpatient substance abuse treatment as well. HOPE increases the likelihood that they will attend and complete treatment. HOPE helps offenders to redouble their efforts at treatment (knowing jail time is a consequence for failure). HOPE also helps offenders when they step down from residential to outpatient treatment by providing structure and a reason for offenders to resist the temptation to use when they run into their "drug-using" friends on the street.

Q35. Does Hawaii statute allow for incarceration as a condition of probation?

A: Yes. All felony probation sentences are five years. Most allow up to a year in jail as a condition of probation, occasionally up to 18 months.

Q36. How would you suggest a state probation department initiate/build a multi-faceted team and market this program for testing?

A: Call Cheryl Inouye to discuss (808) 441-8941. You will need to get an interested judge to lead the whole effort. Have them call Judge Alm at (808) 539-4646.

Q37. If this works so well for the offenders in this program, why not apply it across the board to all probationers?

A: We agree. Following evidence-based practices, we are actively supervising approximately 4,000 of our 8,000 felony probationers (the remainder being banked). HOPE currently numbers more than 1,700 of those 4,000 and is continuing to grow.

Q38. How was the Hawaii program originally funded and what was the breakdown for the financial breakdown for each agency?

A: We started HOPE with zero extra funding (our probation department already had some funding for treatment on probation-as-usual). We started small (34 offenders) and asked all the partners and agencies to work smarter and harder. This included judges and staff, probation, law enforcement, prosecutor and defense.

Q39. Is there a large recovery (AA) community in Hawaii? What factors are unique to Hawaii that may prove difficult in other jurisdictions?

A: We don't know how large our recovery community is compared to other jurisdictions, but it seems pretty robust here. We believe HOPE can be successful anywhere. While we do live on an island, our population is about 1 million. If an offender moves to the other side of the island and doesn't use a credit card, he or she is really a needle in a haystack. We have found that many offenders in Hawaii will simply go back to their neighborhood, and we suspect that will be true everywhere. Where there is a will, there is a way.

Q40. Were separate analyses completed for violent probationers or for those offenders with more severe drug problems?

A: No.

Q41. How did the crystal meth problem make Hawaii's probationer/parole population unique?

A: We don't think it made our population unique, just challenged. Our treatment providers tell us long-time meth users may need more detox and treatment time, however.

Q42. Some jails incur fairly large costs at the start of each term of incarceration, however short. For example, each new inmate may need a full medical screening, including things like blood tests. Did Hawaii have these kinds of up-front costs? Was any way found to reduce them?

A: When Oahu Community Correctional Center (our jail) receives a custody (HOPE or otherwise), they do medical, mental health and dental screening. Positive responses will lead to follow-up questions and referrals. If somebody has been there before (including some HOPE clients), there will be prior records and charts to review. Depending on the type of test in question (i.e., TB), the chart will illustrate whether a test result is still valid or whether a new test is indicated.

Q43. Do probationers initiate the weekday calls? Do probationers receive reminder calls after which they called in, or did the system initiate the call and deliver the color?

A: Probationers are given a color and are told to call after 4:00 a.m. each weekday. If their color is listed, they should come to the courthouse for testing between 7:45 a.m. and 2:00 p.m. Early morning testing - between 6:30 a.m. and 7:45 a.m. - is available for probationers with paycheck jobs or verified job training, school, etc.

Q44. What is the relationship between the judiciary and parole/probation in Hawaii? Are probation officers judiciary employees? If they are, can this still work when they are separate state entities?

A: Probation officers in Hawaii are judiciary employees. HOPE can certainly work if probation officers are in another branch of government, such as the county. It is going to come back to the question of leadership and commitment to change and try something new.

June 7 Session: "How will the demonstration field experiment (DFE) be evaluated?"

Answers by Angela Hawken, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Public Policy, Pepperdine University

Q1. Did any of the data collected become a record of the Court?

A: We never shared any data with the Court; the Court was sharing data with us. We never shared individual level data with either the Court or POs [probation officers].

Q2. How long is the HOPE intervention?

A: The project period will be 24 months, and the evaluation will extend 12 months after the project period ends.

Q3. Will probationers in the HOPE group return to probation as usual when the "project period" ends?

A: It depends upon the jurisdiction. If the jurisdiction finds success with HOPE, we would like to see them continue the program.

Q4. In distributing preliminary findings, did you give participating stake-holders preliminary results on whether offenders in HOPE had better outcomes than offenders in the control?

A: We did. We found it to be helpful to maintain fidelity, and it also helped with motivation.

Q5. Will separate sites for treatment and control be an advantage to avoid contamination?

A: I think it will be. However, we need to be concerned if one site is more highly functioning than the other. Other jurisdictions may not have the resources to dedicate sites specifically to HOPE or probation as usual (PAU). Researchers need to think hard on this issue. Separate sites would deal with contamination but may become problematic in other areas.

Q6. In Hawaii, if a probation officer suspected a violation, was any notice given to the probationer before a bench warrant was issued (for the HOPE probationers)?

A: Since HOPE offenders all attended the warning hearing, they knew exactly what to expect after a violation. If the PO [probation officer] suspected there was another violation outside of missing appointments or failing tests that was dealt with on a case-by-case basis. The judges had a harder time dealing with issues like lack of employment than dirty drug tests.

Q7. Did your study include organizational surveys, interviews, or non-participant observation of POs [probation officers] and other staff? Were these surveys pre- and post-evaluation?

A: Yes, we interviewed 200 probationers, all probation officers, prosecutors, public defenders, and private lawyers. The surveys were done along the course of the evaluation; we did not have pre- and post-evaluation surveys. We did, however, hold focus groups with POs and judges to get a sense of their impression of HOPE and successes and failures.

Q8. To what extent were you able to require (or successfully convince) your site to collect case-level data that it might not otherwise have collected? What kind of data did you get collected (or want but not get collected)?

A: We had enormous access to data because the jurisdiction came to us. POs gave us access to paper and electronic files. However, we have found that there is a great deal of variation in the quality of data across sites. I recommend to be prepared to study the sites closely before budgeting funds, in some sites you may need to construct databases.

Q9. Were probation officers identifying high-risk offenders for the study using validated risk-assessment tools? If yes, which one(s)? If no, how did you control for the discretion?

A: Following Joan Petersillia, we used the jurisdictions' own tools. We asked jurisdictions what they considered high-risk.

Q10. What was the budget of the evaluation?

A: The total cost of the RCT evaluation was approximately \$220,000 in public and private funds. We also had numerous in-kind contributions, such as meetings with Judge Alm and regular phone calls to key players that are not reflected in this approximation.

Q11. What was the mechanism for randomization? How was it actually conducted?

A: We had a batch randomization. We created a stratified random sample based on race/ethnicity and prior history. This may look different in studies where the subjects trickle in. Randomization should be handled by the evaluation team.

Q12. Why did you have an imbalanced ratio assignment to the HOPE and control groups in the original evaluation (2/3 and 1/3)?

A: The Hawaii legislature wanted to see if there were differences among different sex and race/ethnicity categories. To see the differences, we needed a slightly larger HOPE group.

Q13. Should we expect the number of HOPE judges to vary by location?

A: It may not matter if there is only one judge or multiple. We recommended to Hawaii to have one dedicated HOPE court. Keep in mind the economies of scale with having everything concentrated in one location. There are advantages in the timing of trials and sanctions for having a dedicated HOPE courtroom and staff.

Q14. Were drug test results reliably tracked in case files and/or electronic files?

A: Yes, we had multiple records of drug tests. HOPE had dedicated drug testers. It is important for the PO [probation officer] not to be responsible for the random testing. If the probationer tested dirty, there is no chance for negotiation between offender and PO.

Q15. How long are probationers expected to participate in the HOPE program?

A: The study went for one year, but offenders were assigned for longer and were in probation for the duration of supervision. Jurisdictions have a great deal of variation on probation terms, but make sure that subjects have at least 1-2 years on probation at the outset of the study.

Q16. What was the average length of remaining time on probation for subjects?

A: In Hawaii, they have up to 5 year probation terms.

Q17. Did HOPE probation officers serve only HOPE probationers or did their caseloads include business as usual participants and probationers who were not part of the DFE [demonstration field experiment] study sample?

A: Hawaii had three groups of probationers: HOPE, control, and non-study. Initially, HOPE probationers were not dedicated to particular POs [probation officers]. We were concerned about issues with a PO operator effect. We found the same among judges as well; we did not identify an operator effect.

Q18. With the issue of jail overcrowding being prevalent in many jurisdictions, how was HOPE able to deal with jails when sanctions were imposed for violations of probation?

A: At the start of the study, I assumed HOPE would burden the jails. But it turns out that this is not the case. Since jail sentences in HOPE are relatively brief, it does not add substantial amounts of inmates in jail. The jail processing (in and out) is more of an issue. If you can resolve the jail turnover issue, jails tend not to be impacted.

Q19. Are offenders who are employed under the table treated the same as those who have "paycheck" jobs?

A: We didn't have any employment information going in and were not able to get formal employment record during the study. The judges would try to accommodate paid work in imposing sanctions.

Q20. How was informed consent obtained?

A: We did not obtain informed consent among probationers unless we planned to contact them. The jurisdiction determines who is eligible, and participating in the study is not a choice for the offender. You do not need informed consent at the outset, since the jurisdiction is imposing the conditions of the study.

Q21. Was HOPE docketed daily?

A: In our study, HOPE was docketed Monday through Friday. But there are other HOPE sites that have three dedicated HOPE days, and this seems to be working well also. Offenders are confined in the interim. Often judges then release the probationers, with credit for time served, on the day of the modification hearing.

Q22. Did the same probation officers supervise both HOPE and non-HOPE probationers? Or did they have separate POs for the two groups?

A: In our study, the POs supervised HOPE and non-HOPE cases. There are other HOPE sites that use dedicated HOPE POs, and this seems to be working well also.

Q23. Was Judge Alm's courtroom excluded from the study sample?

A: No. We had 10 felony judges overseeing HOPE cases. Judge Alm was one of the 10 judges. We analyzed outcomes by judge. There was no operator effect, i.e., all judges had similar outcomes.

Q24. In Oregon, probation officers have authority to impose intermediate sanctions for non-compliance. Do you have any thoughts on whether the HOPE model would fit under such circumstances?

A: NIJ and BJA are hoping to test “pure” HOPE replications through this solicitation, as such, it would be better for certain violations to be taken before a judge (e.g., a positive drug test, a no-show for a probation appointment, another arrest). There are other violations that probation officers can deal with on their own. An example might be a probationer with a work condition who is not making a satisfactory attempt to secure employment. In a case like this, the PO may decide how best to motivate the probationer. It is important for sites to settle on a list of “non-negotiables” (those violations that must be referred to the judge for a sanction). This list should include positive drug tests, missed appointments and new arrests.

Q25. In the Hawaii HOPE evaluation, what measures were used to determine “consistency” of sanctions?

A: We used two checks on consistency. First, was every non-negotiable violation met with a sanction? Second, were similar violations receiving similar sanctions? We compared sentences given for a first, second, third violations, etc. This is a key process measures that needs to be monitored very closely, particularly during the first six months after implementation. The model is very quickly undermined if probationers perceive that there might be no consequence if they violate. Probationers talk. If sanctions are inconsistent, it undermines the reputation of HOPE as being a fair program. Inconsistent sanctions also annoy the probation officers and undermine morale. Delivering consistent sanctions is a very good reason to keep a close eye on absconders. The research team will need to monitor bench warrants closely. If they start to pile up, all the key players need to be brought together very quickly, to put pressure on law enforcement to prioritize those bench warrants.

**Solicitation Questions and Answers
by BJA and NIJ Staff**

Q1. For the grant application, is the budget limited to probation officers or can the Court ask funding for other positions related to the program such as warrant officers?

A: If an application includes a request to pay for a person's overtime or part of their salary for this demonstration field experiment, this cost must be explained and justified in the application. BJA will decide if this is an allowable cost.

Q2. For the grant application, is the match required in cash or in kind?

A: For this solicitation, a match is not required. But at least an "in-kind" match is being requested.

Q3. Can you identify the key team members for the program?

A: The key members of the HOPE team and their responsibilities are listed on page 8 of the [BJA HOPE DFE solicitation](#).

Q4. We do not have an onsite UA facility or a county attorney available for hearings. Will this disqualify us from participating in the grant?

A: The goal is for sites to strictly replicate the key components of the original HOPE in a way to allow for scientific evaluation. Any adaptations from the Hawaii HOPE model should be explained and justified in your application.

Q5. If you do not obtain sites that can fulfill the rigorous requirements, will you consider some modifications to the stringent requirements while still achieving integrity in the experiment?

A: The goal is for sites to strictly replicate the key components of the original HOPE in a way to allow for scientific evaluation. Any adaptations from the Hawaii HOPE model should be explained and justified in your application.

Q6. How does this model fit with some evidence-based practices (EBP) models of graduated sanctions, starting with the least restrictive?

A: Hawaii HOPE is considered a promising model. BJA and NIJ are conducting this replication and test of Hawaii HOPE to add to the evidence related to the HOPE model.

Q7. Is there a minimum number of probationers that need to be randomized in the first year?

A: Yes. 400 probationers for the entire study period. 200 for HOPE, 200 for the control group.

Q8. Is this solicitation intended only to fund probation replications, or can a site also apply to try HOPE with related populations, such as technical parole violators (as opposed to probationers)?

A: This solicitation is meant for a strict replication of the original HOPE model, focusing on probationers.

Q9. Who will have responsibility for costs associated with the local research coordinator?

A: The costs of the research coordinators at each site will be the responsibility of the evaluation team. There will also be a project coordinator position that will be covered by BJA funding.

Q10. Does the 24-month implementation period include the 6-month pilot, or does the 24 months start after the pilot period ends?

A: The 24 month period includes the 6-month planning period.

Q11. Where can I find a copy of the Project HOPE bench book?

A: It is available at <http://bit.ly/benchbook>.