



# Pretrial Release Decisions, Conditions, and Services RFP



**Arnold Ventures**

Criminal Justice Initiative

Pretrial Justice

NATIONAL PARTNERSHIP *for*  
**PRETRIAL JUSTICE**

---

 **Arnold Ventures**



# Table of Contents

---

Background .....	2
The Three Pretrial Research Topics:.....	3
<i>Topic #1: Release Decisions</i> .....	3
<i>Topic #2: Release Conditions</i> .....	3
<i>Topic #3: Pretrial Services</i> .....	4
RFP Application Instructions .....	5
Research Approaches and Data .....	6
Commitment to Racial Equity and Diversity .....	6
Grant Term and Deliverable Expectations.....	7
Initial Response to the RFP.....	7
Full LOI Application Submission .....	7
Full LOI Application Specifications.....	7
Jurisdiction LOI Application Submission.....	9
Jurisdiction LOI Application Specifications.....	9
Budget.....	9
Proposal Submission.....	10
Project and Award Timeframe .....	10
<i>Optional Conference Call</i> .....	10
Advisory Board.....	11
Statement on Transparency and Research Integrity .....	11

## BACKGROUND

Every day in this country over 400,000 people are held in pretrial detention awaiting to learn if they will be released on pretrial and what the terms of their release will be.<sup>1</sup> Despite the decrease in jail populations during the height of the COVID pandemic, jail populations across the country, primarily comprised of those held pretrial, are steadily increasing again.<sup>2</sup> Research on pretrial detention has demonstrated a fairly consistent pattern: many individuals experience poor case disposition, sentencing, pretrial, and long-term recidivism outcomes when detained, especially for extended periods.<sup>3</sup> In recent years, these findings have prompted legislative reforms on pretrial release and detention, both of which have become a primary focal point for policy advancement, modifications, and debate.

While efforts to evaluate, contest, and improve pretrial policies must continue, the reality of the pretrial system is that courts make the release or detention decision quickly, and with limited information, while trying to balance an individual's rights with the goals of ensuring court appearance and community safety. Given these dynamics, reliance on pretrial supervision and release conditions (e.g., electronic monitoring, drug testing) may seem like a viable and effective approach to improving pretrial outcomes, yet the evidence-base about their use and impact is limited. Much remains to be learned about the release decision and court-ordered conditions, as well as pretrial supervision and supportive services.

The purpose of this RFP is to fund rigorous research that will inform and understand the impact of policy and practice. **We are directly asking the field to help us figure out what works to improve pretrial outcomes.** We are interested in understanding the processes and outcomes associated with pretrial decisions, as well as what policies, practices, and responses have an impact on public safety and other outcomes, including:

- assignment to supervision with and without a pretrial assessment
- utilization, benefits, consequences, and costs of monitoring approaches and supportive services that target needs and barriers to court appearance and remaining arrest-free
- the effectiveness of financial conditions
- responses to lower-level offenses and technical violations
- monitoring/supervision enhancements and reductions

Collectively, we aim to expand and elevate the field's knowledge in these understudied topics and provide empirical support for policies that promote public safety and prioritize an equitable and just system. **The target audiences for this RFP are jurisdictions and researchers.** Jurisdictions may include courts, pretrial services entities,<sup>\*</sup> and criminal legal system offices (e.g., prosecution, public defense) that may have policies related to the release decision and conditions. Since the RFP is intended to produce robust and rigorous evidence and data-informed policy implications, jurisdictions and researchers will ultimately need to partner for projects. For jurisdictions who are interested in this opportunity, but do not have a research partner, we strongly encourage a letter of interest submission. The Arnold Ventures Pretrial Justice team will support jurisdictions by making connections and facilitating introductions to potential research partners as needed. The process for jurisdiction and researcher team letters of interest is described in detail below. Applicant teams comprised only of researchers with data available that can be analyzed in response to the RFP goals are also welcome to apply. Details on this are described below in the letter of interest section.

---

\* *Pretrial services entities may include: community non-profit, local, county, state, and federal. Pretrial services entities may be independent agencies with their own budget and authority, or they may be housed within the courts or probation departments.*

We are interested in funding proposals within three topic areas:

- Pretrial release decisions
- Release conditions
- Pretrial services – focusing on supervision and supportive service models and policies

## The Three Pretrial Research Topics:

This section provides a brief overview of the three pretrial research topics. For each of the three topics listed below, AV may select multiple proposals for funding. Proposals that examine more than one of the three topics within the same jurisdiction or multiple sites are strongly encouraged. The potential research topics below are provided as examples for an applicant team’s consideration, but teams are welcome to develop their own research questions that are intended to identify data-driven solutions to improve pretrial outcomes. Research questions highlighted below represent high priority topics that closely align with our research agenda and pretrial justice strategy.

### Topic #1: Release Decisions

Pretrial release decisions hinge significantly on judicial concerns about court appearance and community safety. Pretrial release policies, whether stemming from litigation or legislation, have revealed improved outcomes in terms of safely reducing the jail population, maintaining or improving court appearance, and avoidance of future pretrial arrests and long-term system contact.<sup>4</sup>

#### Priority Research Questions:

- What is the impact of new release decision policies that stem from litigation, legislation, and community on short- and long-term outcomes and racial equity?
- How does pretrial detention length influence individual and system outcomes, including guilty plea rates, case disposition and sentence, and long term criminal legal system involvement?
- What are the costs of the release decision relative to pretrial detention, court appearance, community safety, and individual outcomes?

**Potential Research Topics:** Examine the passage, enactment, implementation, and impact of new policies; evaluate how litigation, legislation, and community influence reforms and their effectiveness and sustainability. Assess prosecutor, pretrial services, and court policies and practices intended to increase court appearance rates and improve community safety; understand the costs associated with these policies and practices to promote or limit pretrial release, test the impact of financial conditions, and study stakeholder roles in the pretrial release decision making process, including practices such as sequential bail and jail population review policies to facilitate release.

### Topic #2: Release Conditions

Standard release conditions have two overarching goals: returning to court and avoiding future arrest. Some of these common conditions include assigning money bail, drug and alcohol testing/monitoring and treatment, electronic and location monitoring, and no contact orders.<sup>5</sup> Release conditions may also include reporting to pretrial services for supervision; however, not all conditions require reporting to pretrial services and not all jurisdictions have pretrial services. As such, we have separated out these topics – release conditions and pretrial services into two separate sections in this RFP. While the effectiveness of release conditions suffers from a limited and relatively weak research base, both descriptive and a few rigorous studies suggest the majority of people will be successful during the pretrial period.<sup>6</sup> Yet, recent research has produced mixed findings when examining release conditions. While not sufficiently robust, the evidence produced to date on electronic monitoring is mixed for pretrial populations<sup>7</sup> Evidence demonstrates sobriety monitoring may not improve court appearance

rates and has mixed results leading to fewer re-arrests.<sup>8</sup> Preliminary research indicates that financial conditions are not associated with improving court appearance or community safety rates. However, court reminders have been consistently linked with increased court appearances.<sup>9,10</sup> Overall, the state of the research lacks a solid understanding of how these decisions are made, such as assigning release conditions with the use of a pretrial assessment) and their impact, the determination, application, and effect of least restrictive conditions, and who may benefit from more intensive conditions and for what duration. For example, do the number and/or types of conditions (e.g., drug/alcohol testing, drug treatment, electronic monitoring) produce positive or negative pretrial outcomes? Research is also scant on the impact of policy and practice responses to missing court, violations of court orders, the impact of warrants and subsequent bond revocation, new charges and additional pretrial detention. Additionally, the costs associated with these conditions relative to their impact for the individual and the system is not widely understood or known.

#### **Priority Research Questions:**

- What is the impact of different release conditions on the individual, community, and system?
- Which release conditions (e.g., least restrictive in comparison to more intensive) are most effective at increasing court appearance, arrest avoidance, and racial equity?
- How does risk level and supervision intensity influence individual and system short- and long-term outcomes? (Note: We recognize that higher rates of technical violations and illegal behavior may be more likely to be observed with more intensive conditions and supervision, and that lower intensity supervision or conditions may not detect these behaviors due to the reduced monitoring. Given this issue, study designs and outcomes examined should aim to account for this – if possible.)
- Which system responses for failures to appear and pretrial rearrest lead to more positive outcomes (e.g., increasing release conditions and supervision intensity, supervision revocation and subsequent detention, bench warrants, supportive services)?
- Are some release conditions more cost effective than others relative to producing positive outcomes?

**Potential Research Topics:** Examine system policies and practices intended to increase court appearance and community safety rates; study the impact of assignment to supervision with and without a pretrial assessment, assess stakeholder roles in recommending and setting release conditions; evaluate the impact of individual release conditions (e.g., supportive services and referrals to community providers, electronic monitoring, drug testing), including least to more restrictive and their relative costs to the individual, community, and system; examine system actor responses to addressing compliance and alternatives that limit system contact, such as examining grace periods and delaying the issuance of a bench warrants, costs of various release conditions and the feasibility of such practices across rural, urban, and suburban jurisdictions.

### **Topic #3: Pretrial Services**

Pretrial release conditions may include directing an individual to a pretrial services entity. Pretrial services are typically charged with select court-ordered functions to supervise and/or support a person during the pretrial period. Some entities' supervision policies may be more tailored to monitoring and others may be more focused on supportive services, and there are models that have adopted a hybrid approach. For agencies that have a monitoring component, this may include variation in the levels of supervision intensity (based on pretrial assessment or other protocol), requirements on the frequency and nature of contacts, and these entities may be responsible for tracking court ordered conditions, responding to technical and law violations, and reporting issues with compliance to the court.<sup>11</sup> A recent study that compared no supervision to least restrictive supervision and moderate to intensive supervision found that lower intensity supervision in both comparisons is just as effective as higher intensity supervision in helping clients attend court and avoid new arrests.<sup>12</sup> Agencies that have a mentoring or supportive approach may focus on case management, identifying and responding to an individual's needs (e.g.



pretrial assessment approach), making referrals to community-based programs and services, addressing barriers to stability and success (e.g., housing, employment, education, financial, medical, mental health, substance abuse), and engaging with family and community members who play a critical role as an informal reentry mechanism for individuals transitioning back to the communities following pretrial detention. While pretrial services are expanding nationally, there is scarce research on the implementation, costs, outcomes, and impact of monitoring and supportive policies and practices.

#### Priority Research Questions:

- What are the varying models of pretrial services and the effectiveness of each?
- Are specific models more effective for certain populations?
- How do supervision intensity and different contact types impact individual and system outcomes, and racial equity?

**Potential Research Topics:** Assess models and approaches of pretrial services (including in rural, suburban, and urban communities) and supervision intensity and contact types (e.g., in person, video conference, kiosks) who is assigned to pretrial services, what services are applied to which individuals and their impact, how modifications to supervision models are made and their effect, how pretrial services responds to technical and law violations and the effectiveness of supervision enhancements and early discharges, and the costs associated with pretrial services models to further understand feasibility of such practices and approaches relative to their impact.

## RFP Application Instructions

Applicant teams should review the following sections closely, paying particular attention to letter of interest and proposal submission requirements and RFP timeframes.

We will consider proposals that:

- 1. Assess the impact of pretrial policies and decision-making practices that aim to change outcomes within one or more of these three primary research topics;**

*and/or*

- 2. Evaluate the costs of existing pretrial policies and practices for the system, community, families, and individuals relative to the outcomes produced;**

*and/or*

- 3. Document how, why, and for which groups one or more of the three primary topics is implemented, including assessing if the policies and practices are associated with racial disparities.**

For these three research topics (release decisions, release conditions, and pretrial services), we will prioritize funding research that evaluates specific policies and practices geared toward improving a variety of short- and long-term outcomes. We also welcome innovative ideas aimed to improve short- and long-term pretrial outcomes that can be rigorously tested. **All funded projects must include an examination of both short and long-term outcomes and produce deliverables related to each.** Short-term outcomes may include pretrial detention, detention length, bail amounts, bond type, pretrial supervision intensity, and public safety. Examples of long-term outcomes are case disposition, pretrial supervision discharge status (e.g., revoked, successful completion), sentencing, court appearance, pretrial and post-disposition arrest and offense types, and employment-housing-family stability and costs. All projects should have a clear policy-focus, with the goal of identifying which policies and practices are ineffective, costly, and harmful, and advancing policy that demonstrates positive impacts on case outcomes, community safety, racial equity, and court appearance.



## Research Approaches and Data

This RFP is guided by our pretrial justice [research agenda](#) as well as our values and [principles of pretrial justice](#); our [research philosophy](#); and [our mission](#) of maximizing opportunity and minimizing injustice. We aim to fund research that is both multi-faceted and inclusive and examines the effect, or estimated impact, of pretrial decision making across any combination of four key levels of research outcomes: individual, family, community, and system. Funded research should specifically analyze policies and practices in any (or a combination of) the three research topics: release decisions, release conditions, and pretrial services. **We strongly encourage the use of rigorous approaches that will estimate causal impact (e.g., regression discontinuity, difference-in-differences, interrupted time series, instrumental variables, etc.) and produce causal findings (randomized controlled trials)** but will consider other approaches especially for projects that are not well suited for more rigorous methods. Applicants are encouraged to adopt the most rigorous research methodologies possible to answer questions in their selected research topics. For studies that aim to estimate causal impact and RCTs, power calculations are required – including for subgroup analysis.

In response to this RFP, applicant teams must specify *policy relevant research questions* and clearly indicate which proposed outcomes will be studied.

We recognize that given the specified grant term (see below) and the scarcity of some data, applicant teams may only be able to examine relevant administrative case data. However, we welcome proposals that leverage other data sources, including qualitative data, and quantitative data relevant to quality of life; economic, residential, and social stability; and educational outcomes and opportunities. Applicant teams should identify the primary data sources and/or agencies to answer each of the proposed policy-relevant research questions and the need for data sharing agreements with partner agencies to acquire data.

## Commitment to Racial Equity and Diversity

Promoting diversity and equity in research practice is a key facet of AV's mission of maximizing opportunity and minimizing injustice. While racial disparities and bias persist at key decision-making points throughout the criminal justice system, there are too few researchers of color leading studies that are intended to result in successful policies and outcomes for children, adults, and communities of color. We are committed to funding work conducted by teams that are diverse and not only represent affected communities, but actively include community members in shaping and developing research. We believe that research should be conducted *with*, not for or to the community.

We strongly encourage applicant teams (universities, researchers, courts, and pretrial services staff, etc.) to include members of groups who are disproportionately impacted by the criminal justice system. The voices and expertise of practitioners and researchers of color as well as those directly impacted by the criminal justice system are fundamental to finding solutions that will be most beneficial for individuals most impacted and should therefore be actively and meaningfully included in all proposed work.

Applicant teams are encouraged to integrate community and impacted voices into any and all phases of the planning and research process: developing/defining the research questions, methods, outcomes of interest, and in describing the policy implications of the research results.

In addition, AV's commitment to building the field of scholarship means that applicants should propose teams that include early-career researchers and scholars with meaningful and active roles in the work. AV also equally welcomes new potential partners, both researchers and jurisdictions, and existing grantee partners to apply to this RFP.

Beyond elevating team diversity, we expect the research to also reflect a commitment to equity. Research projects should strongly consider inclusive methodologies (e.g., engagement with individuals who have lived experience) where appropriate. Assessments of racial disparities should be explored and analyzed wherever there is data to support this. Evaluations of pretrial policy and practice must also consider how those mechanisms may impact



equity. We expect all research teams to proactively identify all aspects of their proposed projects that demonstrate a commitment to racial equity and diversity.

## Grant Term and Deliverable Expectations

When submitting a Letter of Interest (LOI), applicant teams should develop their budget around a feasible timeline that does not exceed 30 months in length and should thoughtfully consider what projects can realistically be completed. There will likely be a need to assess data capacity, monitor data and technology improvements, and develop a project plan related to what can be accomplished within this project term. During the proposal stage, applicant teams will be required to develop a project timeline that allows for the evaluation of short-term outcomes and a deliverable associated with these results and likewise, also includes the evaluation of long-term outcomes and a related deliverable.

## Initial Response to the RFP

As a first step, applicant teams should submit a letter of interest (LOI.) There are two LOI applications depending on the composition of the applicant team. For applicant teams comprised of both research and practitioner/ jurisdiction partners, the full LOI application should be completed (labeled “Full LOI Application” below). **The due date for the Full LOI Application is June 30, 2023.** For applicant teams comprised of the jurisdiction partner(s) only (so no research partnership has been formed), please complete the LOI application below labeled, “Jurisdiction LOI Application”. **The due date for the Jurisdiction LOI Application is also June 30, 2023.** **For researchers who have access to or can obtain existing data that can be analyzed to respond to the RFP research objectives and/or to identify evidence-driven solutions to improve pretrial outcomes, are encouraged to submit a Full LOI. This means that the research team need not have a jurisdiction partner. Research teams with existing data should complete the Full LOI Application, and this will also be due on June 30, 2023.**

## Full LOI Application Submission

**Applicant teams comprised of both research and practitioner/jurisdiction partners or for individual researchers and research teams that are interested in responding to this RFP should first submit a Full LOI Application by 11:59 p.m. EDT June 30, 2023.** Please send the LOI to [PretrialRFP@arnoldventures.org](mailto:PretrialRFP@arnoldventures.org) with the subject line, “PRETRIAL RFP LOI.” All LOIs must adhere to the specifications. *Failure to meet any of these criteria within the specified timeframe may result in disqualification for further consideration of proposal submission.* AV may contact the project point of contact with questions following the LOI submission. Teams selected to submit full proposals will be notified on or about July 14, 2023.

## Full LOI Application Specifications

- **Page length:** LOIs are not to exceed 3 pages. Applicant teams are encouraged to only provide sufficient information to be responsive to these items below and are welcome to use bullet point lists rather than detailed narrative that would be better suited for a proposal.
- **Cover page:** All LOIs should include a cover page with names of primary researchers/investigators, organizational/ agency affiliation, contact information, anticipated and/or committed jurisdiction partners (if appropriate)\*\*, and title of proposed project. *Cover page does not count toward total page length.*

---

\*\* Anticipated jurisdiction partners are defined as potential sites where the research may be conducted. Committed jurisdiction partners have signed a letter of support to participate in the research. Letters of support by jurisdiction partners are not required in the LOI stage. Rather, letters of support must accompany proposal applications in the proposal stage.





- **Research objective(s):** Clearly state the problem to be studied, identify the topic(s) (release decision, release conditions, pretrial services) to be studied and specify the policy relevant research question(s); and how your findings may contribute to policy change at the office, local, state, or legislative level.
- **Study design and plan:** Provide a summary of the study design or methodological approach, and describe data necessary to conduct the study, specifying short and long term outcomes, follow-up timeframes, and an overview of the analytical strategy.
- **Written Deliverables:** Provide a brief list of project deliverables within their corresponding timeframes. Arnold Ventures encourages applicant teams to include at least two short, non-technical briefs for a general audience that summarize policies and practices; findings; and policy implications. One brief should be centered on short-term outcomes and the other should be based on long-term outcomes. Applicant teams are encouraged to explain what additional deliverables will provide the greatest benefit for target audiences, including researchers, community members, criminal justice agency stakeholders, policymakers, and practitioners. To understand if the research influenced policy and practice, **all final deliverables must include a description of any changes to policy and practice in the jurisdiction.** For example, if pretrial supervision levels are studied, and the findings indicate that lower risk groups are being over-supervised, the final deliverable should address if the jurisdiction is making changes to the supervision levels and what those changes are.
- **Transparency:** Provide a short statement on transparency. Please indicate whether or not partner agencies will disclose their intent to be identified. If jurisdiction partners have not committed to the project yet, then applicant teams should specify their goals related to transparency, including publishing findings, identifying partners (if jurisdiction partners agree) in published materials, and publishing de-identified data and programming/code and output if permitted through data sharing agreements. As a note, AV's expectation is that research team members and jurisdiction partners work together as findings and reports are being reviewed and finalized, so that results and policy implications reflect the data as well as any next steps by jurisdiction partners. For applicant teams comprised only of researchers, please specify if the data will be made publicly available at the completion of the project.
- **Team biographies:** Provide a brief biography for all applicant team members, specifying their roles and responsibilities for the project. *Team biographies do not count toward the total page length.*
- **Budget:** Specify the overall project cost, project timeline, and provide some detail on the anticipated drivers of this cost. Some examples include personnel time, data acquisition, and travel and administrative costs. Offer a budget that reflects the scope of the work proposed. *The budget does not count toward the total page length.* **Please refer to the “Budget” section for more detailed information on budget requirements and guidelines associated with this RFP.** If additional funding is anticipated, please provide a description and justification for these funds.

## Jurisdiction LOI Application Submission

The Arnold Ventures Pretrial Justice team is eager to hear from jurisdictions about your interest in participating in research to build a robust evidence base on pretrial policies and practices surrounding release decisions, release conditions, and pretrial services. Importantly, we hope to understand where data and research can best inform policies and practices in your jurisdiction. To do this, we have developed a LOI application that is uniquely tailored for this purpose. This customized LOI for jurisdictions will assist us in identifying potential research partners for your consideration. Additionally, we may seek to develop multi-jurisdiction projects to evaluate a specific policy or practice that is a priority for more than one jurisdiction. While we are unable to guarantee that jurisdictions and researchers can be successfully matched, we are committed to introducing jurisdictions and potential research candidates to determine if there is alignment for a research project.

Jurisdiction applicant teams should complete the LOI application below. **Jurisdiction LOI applications are due by 11:59 p.m. EDT June 30, 2023.** Please send the LOI to [PretrialRFP@arnoldventures.org](mailto:PretrialRFP@arnoldventures.org) with the subject line, “PRETRIAL RFP LOI.” All LOIs must adhere to the specifications below. *Failure to meet any of these criteria within*

*the specified timeframe may result in disqualification for further consideration of proposal submission.* AV may contact the project point of contact with questions following the LOI submission. Jurisdiction teams matched with researchers to submit full proposals will be notified on or about July 14, 2023. Note: the proposal notification date and the proposal submission due date may be moved to accommodate a longer timeframe for establishing jurisdiction and research partnerships.

## **Jurisdiction LOI Application Specifications**

- Jurisdiction teams have two options to complete their LOI application, through this Google [Link](#), or in writing. If submitting in writing, please respond to the following questions in a brief memo. Please copy each question into the memo along with providing a short response to each question. For questions that are not applicable, please note this by indicating N/A as your response.
  - What policies and practices does your jurisdiction have in place regarding release decisions? (Note: examples of this may include: bail schedule, pre-arraignment release, release on recognizance or mandatory release for lower-level charges, use of a pretrial assessment etc.)
  - What policies and practices does your jurisdiction have in place regarding release conditions? (Note: examples of this may include: assignment to electronic monitoring, drug testing, court reminders, etc.)
  - What policies and practices does your jurisdiction have in place regarding pretrial services? (Note: examples of this may include: varying levels of supervision intensity, use of a risk and/or needs assessment, differing check-in procedures – telephone, video conference, in-person, supervision fees, community-based/service provider referrals, voluntary treatment referrals, guidelines on responding to technical and law violations, early release/discharge protocol, etc.)
  - What are the top three pretrial policies and practices that are most important to your jurisdiction to evaluate? Please list these in a priority order, indicating which is most important to study for your jurisdiction and why.
  - What short- and long-term outcomes are most important to your jurisdiction? For each of these outcomes, specify if the jurisdiction collects data on these outcomes. If unknown, please state this. (Note: Please review the section above that provides examples of short- and long-term outcomes.)
  - What are the challenges with participating in research and what would be helpful to your jurisdiction to address these challenges? (Note: Examples of challenges with participating in research may be related to: data collection and availability, limited resources and capacity to extract data and/or participate in research, time commitment, urgency to complete study on a short timeframe, local support and buy-in from other jurisdiction partners, etc.)
  - What jurisdiction agency/agencies and partner(s) are committed to participating in a research project?
  - Please indicate the main point of contact for your jurisdiction and provide an email address and telephone number so that a member of the Arnold Ventures Pretrial Justice team may contact you directly to discuss your LOI.

## **Budget**

Applicant teams are encouraged to review this information during the LOI stage. If approved to move to the proposal stage, applicant teams will be given a budget template to complete.

When creating a budget and budget justification narrative, applicants should keep in mind the following guidelines:

- Budgets should not exceed \$350,000 for a single jurisdiction (e.g., pretrial services entity, court, locality, municipality, city, county). If additional jurisdictions are added, applicant teams may increase the budget as needed up to \$25,000 per jurisdiction. For statewide projects, budgets should not exceed \$500,000. For applicants



comprised of researchers only and where administrative data is readily available or will be acquired, the budget should not exceed \$350,000.

- In addition,
  - a subaward of up to \$25,000 may be included in the budget to provide support, where needed, to courts/pretrial services agencies to collect and extract data for the project;
  - a subaward of up to \$25,000 may be added to support a partnership with a community organization to define research goals; collaborate in the research and/or data collection; and participate in analysis and communication of the findings.

We recognize that there may be limitations in generalizing research findings when evaluations are completed in just one site. In recognition of this, Arnold Ventures is interested in the examination of similar policies and practices across a combination of multiple jurisdictions, courts and/or pretrial services entities.

**Applicant teams are encouraged to send questions to [PretrialRFP@arnoldventures.org](mailto:PretrialRFP@arnoldventures.org) to discuss their specific budget needs if they fall outside these guidelines.**

## Proposal Submission

Applicant teams selected to submit proposals will be contacted on or about July 14, 2023. **Proposals are due by 11:59 p.m. EDT on September 1, 2023**, and must be submitted via email to [PretrialRFP@arnoldventures.org](mailto:PretrialRFP@arnoldventures.org) using the subject line “PRETRIAL RESEARCH RFP PROPOSAL.” Proposal narrative, methods, and budget templates will be provided to all applicant teams if selected to move to the proposal stage. AV may contact the project point of contact with questions following the proposal submission. Letters of support from jurisdiction partners are required and should accompany proposal materials.

## Applicant Teams and Arnold Ventures Collaboration

- If a grant is awarded by AV, the institutions affiliated with the grant will be automatically enrolled as partners in the National Partnership for Pretrial Justice (NPPJ), an AV grant-funded community of practitioners whose work combines research, innovative policy development, and advocacy to reform our nation’s pretrial justice system.
- If selected for this award, as a stipulation of the grant agreement, AV expects all groups applying together (such as, but not limited to researchers, sub-awardees, and sites) to work collaboratively with each other and in partnership with our organization.
- Teams are expected to provide AV with regular updates, enlist us as necessary in solving problems and removing obstacles that may interfere with research objectives, and communicate with us about research results as they are obtained. The designated Primary Investigator(s) will be primarily responsible for organizing the agenda and updates for each call or meeting with AV.

## Project and Award Timeframe

### Optional Conference Call

**AV will answer questions related to this RFP during an optional Zoom call on June 1, 2023, at 1:00 EDT.** Potential applicant teams are encouraged to prepare for this conference call in advance by reviewing the research topics, and LOI and proposal requirements. We encourage you to RSVP to the call (in case of technical difficulties) by emailing us at [PretrialRFP@arnoldventures.org](mailto:PretrialRFP@arnoldventures.org). To join the call, please use the Zoom link sent to your inbox after you RSVP. Applicant teams are welcome to submit questions in advance by emailing [PretrialRFP@arnoldventures.org](mailto:PretrialRFP@arnoldventures.org) with “PRETRIAL RFP CALL” in the subject line. Following the call, all questions and responses will be posted on AV’s website on or about June 7, 2023. Applicant teams are encouraged to check the site and adhere to any changes made to the RFP.

## Advisory Board

Our AV Pretrial Team works with a Pretrial Policy and Research Advisory Board. The Advisory Board is comprised of researchers, practitioners, policymakers, and pretrial experts. The Advisory Board may be called upon to assist us in the review of select proposals, and may make recommendations to AV on awards for proposals that demonstrate quality and rigor based on the following criteria: (1) study design, (2) analytical strategy, (3) feasibility, (4) research expertise, and (5) benefit to the field/advancement of research, policy, and practice.

## Statement on Transparency and Research Integrity

AV is strongly committed to the principles of research transparency and integrity. To ensure the utmost in rigor, we require all funded research projects to be pre-registered on the [Open Science Framework website](#) or an alternative, such as [Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research](#) (ICPSR), and all non-confidential materials be open and freely available. In the case of confidential data, proposals should address the feasibility of publicly sharing a de-identified dataset for public use.

### ENDNOTES

- 1 <https://www.prisonpolicy.org/reports/pie2022.html>
- 2 Dashboard: Jail Population Trends 2020-2022. (2022). Jail Data Initiative. <https://jaildatainitiative.org/>
- 3 Core Correctional Solutions. (2022). The hidden costs of pretrial detention revisited. <https://craftmediabucket.s3.amazonaws.com/uploads/HiddenCosts.pdf>; DeMichele, M., Silver, I.A., Labrecque, Tueller, S., & Lattimore, P.K. (unpublished). Research brief: The benefits of early release from pretrial detention. Advancing Pretrial Policy & Research (APPR); Dobbie, W., Goldin, J., & Yang, C.S. (2018). The effects of pretrial detention on conviction, future crimes, and employment. *The American Economic Review*, 108 (2), 201-240; Heaton, P., Mayson, S.G., & Stevenson, M. (2017). The downstream consequences of misdemeanor pretrial detention, 69 *Stanford Law Review*, 711 [https://digitalcommons.law.uga.edu/fac\\_artchop/1148/](https://digitalcommons.law.uga.edu/fac_artchop/1148/);
- 4 Heaton, P. (2022). The effects of misdemeanor bail reform. Quattrone Center for the Fair Administration Justice. <https://www.law.upenn.edu/live/files/12290-the-effects-of-misdemeanor-bail-reformpdf>; Ferri, R. (2020). The benefits of live court date reminder phone calls during pretrial case processing. *J Exp Criminology* spell out, give rest of ref.. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11292-020-09423-0>; Fishbane, A., Ouss, A., & Shah, A. K. (2020). Behavioral nudges reduce failure to appear for court. *Science*. 370, 6517. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abb6591>
- 5 MDRC. 2022. Comparative Effectiveness Study-Effects of Varying Levels of Supervision. Unpublished research; Belur, J., Thornton, A., Tompson, L., Manning, M., Sidebottom, A., & Bowers, K. (2020). A systematic review of the effectiveness of electronic monitoring of offenders. *Journal of Criminal Justice*. 68. Page numbers?
- 6 Heaton, P. (2022). The effects of misdemeanor bail reform. Quattrone Center for the Fair Administration of Justice. <https://www.law.upenn.edu/live/files/12290-the-effects-of-misdemeanor-bail-reformpdf>; Moore, C., Ferguson, E. & Guerin, P. (2022). How accurate are rebuttable presumptions of pretrial dangerousness? A natural experiment from New Mexico. [https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=4143886](https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4143886); New Jersey Administrative Office of the Courts Graves Act Analysis. (2022). New Jersey Courts. <https://www.njcourts.gov/sites/default/files/public/graves03042022.pdf>; Grant, G. A. (2021). Annual report to the governor and the legislature. New Jersey Courts. <https://www.njcourts.gov/sites/default/files/courts/criminal/criminal-justice-reform/cjr2021.pdf>; Smith, S. (2021). The current state of bail reform in the United States: Results of a landscape analysis of bail reform in all 50 states. HKS Faculty Research Working Paper. <https://www.hks.harvard.edu/publications/current-state-bail-reform-united-states-results-landscape-analysis-bail-reforms-across>; Stemen, D. & Olson, D. (2019) Dollars and sense in Cook county: Examining the impact of general order 18.8a on felony bond court decisions, pretrial release, and crime. Safety and Justice Challenge - Loyola University Chicago. <https://safetyandjusticechallenge.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/Report-Dollars-and-Sense-in-Cook-County.pdf>;



- 7 MDRC. (2023). Effectiveness of Pretrial Conditions. <https://www.mdrc.org/publication/effectiveness-pretrial-special-conditions>; Starr, V. L. & Cohen, T. H. (2021). The use of location monitoring at the post-conviction state of supervision. *Federal Probation*, 85(3), 34-41. Rivera, R. (unpublished). Release, detain, or surveil? The effect of electronic monitoring on defendant outcomes. Working Manuscript. <https://econ.columbia.edu/e/roman-gabriel-rivera/>
  - 8 MDRC. (2023). Effectiveness of Pretrial Conditions. <https://www.mdrc.org/publication/effectiveness-pretrial-special-conditions>
  - 9 Ouss, A. & Stevenson, M. T. (2022). Does cash bail deter misconduct? Retrieved from: [https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=3335138](https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3335138)
  - 10 Cooke, B., Diop, B. Z., Fishbane, A., Hayes, J., Ouss, A., & Shah, A. (2018). Using behavioral science to improve criminal justice outcomes: Preventing failures to appear in court. University of Chicago Crime Lab. Ideas 42. <https://www.ideas42.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/Using-Behavioral-Science-to-Improve-Criminal-Justice-Outcomes.pdf>
  - 11 MDRC. (2023). Effectiveness of Pretrial Conditions. <https://www.mdrc.org/publication/effectiveness-pretrial-special-conditions>; Schnacke, T. R., Jones, M. R., & Wilderman, D. M. (2012). Increasing court-appearance rates and other benefits of live-caller telephone court-date reminders: The Jefferson County, Colorado, FTA pilot project and resulting court date notification program. <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1396&context=ajacourtreview>
  - 12 MDRC (2023). Effectiveness of Varying intensities in pretrial decisions. <https://www.mdrc.org/publication/effectiveness-varying-intensities-pretrial-supervision>
-