



# Kentucky's Pretrial Supervision Pilot

Testing the Swift, Certain, Fair Model

Dr. Jordan Holsinger, Jessica Hickman

March 2026

# Importance & Potential Impact

1

Growing need for balance between public safety concerns & rising detention rates

2

National interest in evidence-based pretrial supervision strategies

3

Kentucky's model & approach can be applied statewide and nationally

# Kentucky's Current Supervision Structure

## Current Pretrial Model

- Statewide pretrial agency, policies & procedures
- Validated risk assessment
- Non-financial release options
- Data-driven and risk-informed supervision levels

## Current Outcomes

- High detention rates, contributing to poor outcomes
- Reliance on traditional bond & financial capacity, not risk
- Inconsistent responses to supervision violations

# Core *Swift, Certain, Fair* Principles



## **Swift**

Responses to violations & successes



## **Certain**

Matrices with defined sanctions & rewards



## **Fair**

Proportionate, unbiased, transparent

# Support for the SCF Model

- ✓ Theoretical justification

---

- ✓ Positive results from the HOPE study

---

- ✓ Evidence for a structure of sanctions + rewards

---

- ✓ Structured guidance from professional associations (APPA)

---

- ✓ Available implementation support & examples

---

# Kentucky's Adaptation of the SCF Model



1. Designed for moderate to high-risk pretrial clients
2. Structured matrices connect graduated sanctions & rewards to specific behavior
3. Emphasizes immediate, consistent & proportionate responses

# Rewards

Positive Behavior	Reward	Response Level
Maintaining compliance with check-ins (30+days)	Reduced check-in frequency (monthly instead of biweekly)	Low Level Response
Negative drug screen results	Recognition from PSS (verbal or written) and potential reduction in drug testing frequency	Low Level Response
Attending all court dates (30+ days)	Recognition from PSS and potential reduced reporting	Low Level Response
Maintaining employment or obtaining a job	Increased program privileges (fewer check-ins, less restrictive curfew)	Moderate Level Response
Enrollment in school or vocational training	Increased privileges, recognition by the court or supervising PSS	Moderate Level Response
Consistent compliance over 90+ days	Eligibility for early completion	High Level Response

# Sanctions

Negative Behavior	Response	Response Level
Missed check-in (1st occurrence)	Verbal warning, potentially increased check-in frequency	Low Level Response
Missed check-in (2 <sup>nd</sup> occurrence)	24-48 hour curfew, increased monitoring	Moderate Level Response
Repeated missed check-ins	Judicial review, possible short-term detention	High Level Response
Non-negative drug screen (1 <sup>st</sup> occurrence)	Increased drug testing frequency	Low Level Response
Non-negative drug screen (2 <sup>nd</sup> occurrence)	Treatment referral, increased check-in frequency	Moderate Level Response
Arrest on New Offense	Judicial Review, possible program termination	High Level Response

# Kentucky's Approach for Successful Implementation

## Start Small

- 2 pilot sites
- Traditional supervision still available

## Engage Staff

- Early buy in from line staff
- Ongoing feedback loops

## Plan for Evaluation

- Performance measures identified first
- Built system for easy data collection

# The Upcoming Evaluation

## Purpose

- Test fidelity to the model
- Evaluate the impact on violations, court appearance & public safety
- Determine consistency across groups

## Questions to Answer

- Does SCF work better than Kentucky's traditional supervision?
- What elements drove success?
- Do outcomes differ across groups?
- How did clients perceive the program?

# Early Observations & Themes



## Wins

- Staff enthusiasm
- Clear, transparent structure
- Improved documentation & data quality



## Challenges

- Limited referrals
- Fidelity monitoring
- Timely violation responses



## Emerging Themes

- Judicial buy in supported by champion judges and snow-balling engagement

# Discussion



1. What part of Kentucky's pilot resonated with you most?
2. Have you tried something similar? If so, how's it going?
3. Is there any new approach or pretrial initiative you want to try, but don't know how to start?

# Choose Your Own Adventure!

Essential  
Components for  
an SCF pilot

Best Practices  
for  
Implementation

Best Practices  
for Data &  
Performance  
Measures

# Building a SCF Pilot

Clear behavior  
matrices and  
timelines

Strong data  
infrastructure

Buy in from judges,  
prosecutors,  
defense, and  
pretrial staff

Transparent  
communication  
with defendants

Structured pilot  
approach before  
statewide scale

# Implementing Successful Change



# Best Practices for Data & Performance Measurement

✓ Define clear goals and metrics

---

✓ Standardize data entry

---

✓ Collect only what you need

---

✓ Ensure data quality

---

✓ Share findings regularly

---

# Thank you!

## **CJI Contacts**

**Dr. Jordan Holsinger**

Jordan.Holsinger@cjinstitute.org

**Jessica Hickman**

jhickman@cjinstitute.org

## **Kentucky Pretrial Contact**

**Angela Swabey**

angelaswabey@kycourts.net