

2021

Ignition Interlock Training for Criminal Justice Professionals

FY 2021 TRAINING SUMMARY REPORT

TEXAS A&M TRANSPORTATION INSTITUTE

Table of Contents

Introduction	15
COVID-19 Impact on IITCJP Trainings	16
Curriculum.....	16
Location Selection.....	19
Participants	20
Probation Officers	20
Prosecutors	21
Judges.....	21
Test Scores	23
Pre-Tests	23
Post-Tests.....	24
Change in Knowledge.....	25
Course Evaluations.....	26
Probation Officers	26
Prosecutors	27
Judges.....	27
Future Activities.....	28
References.....	30
Appendix A: Ignition Interlock Training for Criminal Justice Professionals – Uvalde County	
Probation Officers.....	31
Location.....	31
Training	31
Recruitment	31
Registration.....	31
Participation.....	32
Test Scores	32
Pre-Tests	32
Post-Tests.....	33
Change in Knowledge	33
Course Evaluations.....	33
Probation Departments Contacted and Invited to Participate	35

Appendix B: Ignition Interlock Training for Criminal Justice Professionals – Cross Timbers

Region Probation Officers36

- Location..... 36
- Training 36
 - Recruitment 36
 - Registration..... 36
 - Participation..... 37
- Test Scores 37
 - Pre-Tests 37
 - Post-Tests..... 38
 - Change in Knowledge 38
- Course Evaluations..... 39
- Probation Departments Contacted and Invited to Participate 40

Appendix C: Ignition Interlock Training for Criminal Justice Professionals – El Paso County

Probation Officers.....41

- Location..... 41
- Training 41
 - Recruitment 41
 - Registration..... 41
 - Participation..... 42
- Test Scores 42
 - Pre-Tests 42
 - Post-Tests..... 43
 - Change in Knowledge 43
- Course Evaluations..... 43
- Probation Departments Contacted and Invited to Participate 45

Appendix D: Ignition Interlock Training for Criminal Justice Professionals – El Paso County

Probation Officers.....46

- Location..... 46
- Training 46
 - Recruitment 46
 - Registration..... 46
 - Participation..... 47
- Test Scores 47
 - Pre-Tests 47
 - Post-Tests..... 48
 - Change in Knowledge 48

Course Evaluations.....	49
Probation Departments Contacted and Invited to Participate.....	50
Appendix E: Ignition Interlock Training for Criminal Justice Professionals – Pecos County	
Probation Officers.....	51
Location.....	51
Training	51
Recruitment	51
Registration.....	51
Participation.....	52
Test Scores	52
Pre-Tests	52
Post-Tests.....	53
Change in Knowledge	53
Course Evaluations.....	54
Probation Departments Contacted and Invited to Participate.....	55
Appendix F: Ignition Interlock Training for Criminal Justice Professionals – Kaufman County	
Probation Officers.....	56
Location.....	56
Training	56
Recruitment	56
Registration.....	56
Participation.....	57
Test Scores	57
Pre-Tests	57
Post-Tests.....	58
Change in Knowledge	58
Course Evaluations.....	58
Probation Departments Contacted and Invited to Participate.....	60
Appendix G: Ignition Interlock Training for Criminal Justice Professionals – Panhandle	
Probation Officers.....	61
Location.....	61
Training	61
Recruitment	61
Registration.....	63
Participation.....	63
Test Scores	63

Pre-Tests	64
Post-Tests.....	64
Change in Knowledge	65
Course Evaluations.....	65
Probation Departments Contacted and Invited to Participate.....	66
Appendix H: Ignition Interlock Training for Criminal Justice Professionals – Panhandle	
Probation Officers.....	67
Location.....	67
Training	67
Recruitment	67
Registration.....	67
Participation.....	68
Test Scores	68
Pre-Tests	69
Post-Tests.....	69
Change in Knowledge	70
Course Evaluations.....	70
Probation Departments Contacted and Invited to Participate.....	72
Appendix I: Ignition Interlock Training for Criminal Justice Professionals – Uvalde County	
Prosecutors	73
Location.....	73
Training	73
Recruitment	73
Registration.....	73
Participation.....	74
Test Scores	74
Pre-Tests	75
Post-Tests.....	75
Change in Knowledge	76
Course Evaluations.....	76
Prosecutor’s Offices Contacted and Invited to Participate.....	77
Appendix J: Ignition Interlock Training for Criminal Justice Professionals – Kaufman County	
Prosecutors	79
Location.....	79
Training	79
Recruitment	79
Registration.....	79

Participation.....	80
Test Scores	80
Pre-Tests	81
Post-Tests.....	81
Change in Knowledge	82
Course Evaluations.....	82
Prosecutor’s Offices Contacted and Invited to Participate.....	84
Appendix K: Ignition Interlock Training for Criminal Justice Professionals – Cross Timbers	
Region Prosecutors	86
Location.....	86
Training	86
Recruitment	86
Registration.....	86
Participation.....	87
Test Scores	87
Pre-Tests	87
Post-Tests.....	88
Change in Knowledge	89
Course Evaluations.....	89
Prosecutor’s Offices Contacted and Invited to Participate.....	90
Appendix K: Ignition Interlock Training for Criminal Justice Professionals – Panhandle	
Prosecutors	93
Location.....	93
Training	93
Recruitment	93
Registration.....	93
Participation.....	94
Test Scores	94
Pre-Tests	95
Post-Tests.....	95
Change in Knowledge	96
Course Evaluations.....	96
Prosecutor’s Offices Contacted and Invited to Participate.....	97
Appendix L: Ignition Interlock Training for Criminal Justice Professionals – El Paso County	
Prosecutors	100
Location.....	100

Training	100
Recruitment	100
Registration.....	100
Participation.....	101
Test Scores	101
Pre-Tests	101
Post-Tests.....	102
Change in Knowledge	102
Course Evaluations.....	102
Prosecutor’s Offices Contacted and Invited to Participate.....	104
Appendix M: Ignition Interlock Training for Criminal Justice Professionals – Panhandle	
Prosecutors	105
Location.....	105
Training	105
Recruitment	105
Registration.....	105
Participation.....	106
Test Scores	106
Pre-Tests	106
Post-Tests.....	107
Change in Knowledge	107
Course Evaluations.....	108
Prosecutor’s Offices Contacted and Invited to Participate.....	109
Appendix N: Ignition Interlock Training for Criminal Justice Professionals – Pecos County	
Prosecutors	111
Location.....	111
Training	111
Recruitment	111
Registration.....	111
Participation.....	112
Test Scores	112
Pre-Tests	112
Post-Tests.....	112
Change in Knowledge	113
Course Evaluations.....	113
Prosecutor’s Offices Contacted and Invited to Participate.....	114

Appendix O: Ignition Interlock Training for Criminal Justice Professionals – El Paso County

Prosecutors 116

- Location..... 116
- Training 116
 - Recruitment 116
 - Registration..... 116
 - Participation..... 117
- Test Scores 117
 - Pre-Tests 117
 - Post-Tests..... 118
 - Change in Knowledge 118
- Course Evaluations..... 118
- Prosecutor’s Offices Contacted and Invited to Participate..... 119

Appendix P: Ignition Interlock Training for Criminal Justice Professionals – Uvalde County

Judges 121

- Location..... 121
- Training 121
 - Recruitment 121
 - Registration..... 121
 - Participation..... 122
- Test Scores 122
 - Pre-Tests 123
 - Post-Tests..... 123
 - Change in Knowledge 124
- Course Evaluations..... 124
- Courts Contacted and Invited to Participate 125

Appendix Q: Ignition Interlock Training for Criminal Justice Professionals – Kaufman County

Judges 127

- Location..... 127
- Training 127
 - Recruitment 127
 - Registration..... 127
 - Participation..... 128
- Test Scores 128
 - Pre-Tests 129
 - Post-Tests..... 129
 - Change in Knowledge 130

Course Evaluations.....	130
Courts Contacted and Invited to Participate	131
Appendix R: Ignition Interlock Training for Criminal Justice Professionals – Cross Timbers	
Region Judges.....	135
Location.....	135
Training	135
Recruitment	135
Registration.....	135
Participation.....	136
Test Scores	136
Pre-Tests	137
Post-Tests.....	137
Change in Knowledge	138
Course Evaluations.....	138
Courts Contacted and Invited to Participate	139
Appendix S: Ignition Interlock Training for Criminal Justice Professionals – El Paso County	
Judges	143
Location.....	143
Training	143
Recruitment	143
Registration.....	143
Participation.....	144
Test Scores	144
Pre-Tests	144
Post-Tests.....	145
Change in Knowledge	145
Course Evaluations.....	145
Courts Contacted and Invited to Participate	146
Appendix T: Ignition Interlock Training for Criminal Justice Professionals – Panhandle Judges.....	148
Location.....	148
Training	148
Recruitment	148
Registration.....	148
Participation.....	149
Test Scores	149
Pre-Tests	150

Post-Tests.....	150
Change in Knowledge	150
Course Evaluations.....	151
Courts Contacted and Invited to Participate	152
Appendix U: Ignition Interlock Training for Criminal Justice Professionals – Panhandle Judges	155
Location.....	155
Training	155
Recruitment	155
Registration.....	155
Participation.....	156
Test Scores	156
Pre-Tests	157
Post-Tests.....	157
Change in Knowledge	157
Course Evaluations.....	158
Courts Contacted and Invited to Participate	159
Appendix V: Ignition Interlock Training for Criminal Justice Professionals – Pecos County	
Judges	161
Location.....	161
Training	161
Recruitment	161
Registration.....	161
Participation.....	162
Test Scores	162
Pre-Tests	162
Post-Tests.....	163
Change in Knowledge	164
Course Evaluations.....	164
Courts Contacted and Invited to Participate	165
Appendix W: Ignition Interlock Training for Criminal Justice Professionals – El Paso County	
Judges	167
Location.....	167
Training	167
Recruitment	167
Registration.....	167
Participation.....	168

Test Scores	168
Pre-Tests	168
Post-Tests.....	169
Change in Knowledge	169
Course Evaluations.....	169
Courts Contacted and Invited to Participate	170

List of Tables

Table 1. Ignition Interlock Training Program for Probation Officers Training Sessions.....	18
Table 2. Ignition Interlock Training Program for Prosecutors Training Sessions	18
Table 3. Ignition Interlock Training Program for Judges Training Sessions	18
Table 4. Ignition Interlock Training Program Dates and Locations in 2021	19
Table 5. Number of Criminal Justice Stakeholders Who Were Invited, Attended, and Completed IITCJP across all Trainings	21
Table 6. Cumulative Pre-Test Averages Across Stakeholder Groups.....	23
Table 7. Cumulative Pre-Test Most Frequently Missed Questions.....	23
Table 8. Cumulative Post-Test Averages Across Stakeholder Groups	24
Table 9. Cumulative Post-Test Most Frequently Missed Questions	24
Table 10. Percent of Knowledge Gained across Groups	25
Table 11. Probation Officers’ Course Evaluations.....	26
Table 12. Probation Officers’ Instructor Evaluations.....	27
Table 13. Prosecutors’ Course Evaluations.....	27
Table 14. Prosecutors’ Instructor Evaluations	27
Table 15. Judges’ Course Evaluations	28
Table 16. Judges’ Instructor Evaluations.....	28
Table A1. Training Recruitment, Registration, Participation, and Completion.....	31
Table A2. Test Scores	32
Table A3. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Pre-Test.....	32
Table A4. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Post-Test.....	33
Table A5. Course Evaluations Completed by Probation	34
Table A6. Instructor Evaluations Completed by Probation.....	34
Table A7. Course Comments Completed by Probation	34
Table B1. Training Recruitment, Registration, Participation, and Completion.....	36
Table B2. Test Scores	37
Table B3. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Pre-Test.....	38
Table B4. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Post-Test	38
Table B5. Course Evaluations Completed by Probation	39
Table B6. Instructor Evaluations Completed by Probation.....	39
Table B7. Course Comments Completed by Probation.....	39

Table C1. Training Recruitment, Registration, Participation, and Completion.....	41
Table C2. Test Scores	42
Table C3. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Pre-Test.....	42
Table C4. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Post-Test	43
Table C5. Course Evaluations Completed by Probation	44
Table C6. Instructor Evaluations Completed by Probation.....	44
Table C7. Course Comments Completed by Probation.....	45
Table D1. Training Recruitment, Registration, Participation, and Completion	46
Table D2. Test Scores.....	47
Table D3. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Pre-Test	47
Table D4. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Post-Test.....	48
Table D5. Course Evaluations Completed by Probation	49
Table D6. Instructor Evaluations Completed by Probation	49
Table D7. Course Comments Completed by Probation	50
Table E1. Training Recruitment, Registration, Participation, and Completion	51
Table E2. Test Scores.....	52
Table E3. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Pre-Test.....	52
Table E4. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Post-Test	53
Table E5. Course Evaluations Completed by Probation.....	54
Table E6. Instructor Evaluations Completed by Probation	54
Table E7. Course Comments Completed by Probation.....	55
Table F1. Training Recruitment, Registration, Participation, and Completion	56
Table F2. Test Scores.....	57
Table F3. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Pre-Test	57
Table F4. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Post-Test	58
Table F5. Course Evaluations Completed by Probation.....	59
Table F6. Instructor Evaluations Completed by Probation	59
Table F7. Course Comments Completed by Probation.....	59
Table G1. Training Recruitment, Registration, Participation, and Completion	63
Table G2. Test Scores.....	64
Table G3. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Pre-Test	64
Table G4. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Post-Test.....	65
Table G5. Course Evaluations Completed by Probation	65
Table G6. Instructor Evaluations Completed by Probation	66
Table G7. Course Comments Completed by Probation	66
Table H1. Training Recruitment, Registration, Participation, and Completion	68
Table H2. Test Scores.....	69
Table H3. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Pre-Test	69
Table H4. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Post-Test.....	70
Table H5. Course Evaluations Completed by Probation	70
Table H6. Instructor Evaluations Completed by Probation	71
Table H7. Course Comments Completed by Probation	71
Table I1. Training Recruitment, Registration, Participation, and Completion.....	74
Table I2. Test Scores	74

Table I3. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Pre-Test.....	75
Table I4. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Post-Test	75
Table I5. Course Evaluations Completed by Prosecutors	76
Table I6. Instructor Evaluations Completed by Prosecutors.....	76
Table I7. Course Comments Completed by Prosecutors	77
Table J1. Training Recruitment, Registration, Participation, and Completion.....	79
Table J2. Test Scores	80
Table J3. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Pre-Test.....	81
Table J4. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Post-Test.....	81
Table J5. Course Evaluations Completed by Prosecutors	82
Table J6. Instructor Evaluations Completed by Prosecutors	83
Table J7. Course Comments Completed by Prosecutors	83
Table J1. Training Recruitment, Registration, Participation, and Completion.....	87
Table J2. Test Scores	87
Table J3. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Pre-Test.....	88
Table J4. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Post-Test.....	88
Table J5. Course Evaluations Completed by Prosecutors	89
Table J6. Instructor Evaluations Completed by Prosecutors	89
Table J 7. Course Comments Completed by Prosecutors	90
Table K1. Training Recruitment, Registration, Participation, and Completion.....	94
Table K2. Test Scores	94
Table K3. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Pre-Test.....	95
Table K4. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Post-Test	95
Table K5. Course Evaluations Completed by Prosecutors	96
Table K6. Instructor Evaluations Completed by Prosecutors.....	97
Table K7. Course Comments Completed by Prosecutors	97
Table L1. Training Recruitment, Registration, Participation, and Completion	100
Table L2. Test Scores.....	101
Table L3. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Pre-Test	101
Table L4. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Post-Test.....	102
Table L5. Course Evaluations Completed by Prosecutors.....	103
Table L6. Instructor Evaluations Completed by Prosecutors.....	103
Table L7. Course Comments Completed by Prosecutors.....	103
Table M1. Training Recruitment, Registration, Participation, and Completion.....	106
Table M2. Test Scores	106
Table M3. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Pre-Test	107
Table M4. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Post-Test.....	107
Table M5. Course Evaluations Completed by Prosecutors	108
Table M6. Instructor Evaluations Completed by Prosecutors	108
Table M7. Course Comments Completed by Prosecutors	108
Table N1. Training Recruitment, Registration, Participation, and Completion	112
Table N2. Test Scores.....	112
Table N4. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Post-Test.....	113
Table N5. Course Evaluations Completed by Prosecutors.....	113

Table N6. Instructor Evaluations Completed by Prosecutors	114
Table N7. Course Comments Completed by Prosecutors	114
Table O1. Training Recruitment, Registration, Participation, and Completion	116
Table O2. Test Scores.....	117
Table O3. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Pre-Test	117
Table O4. Most Frequently Missed Question on Post-Test	118
Table O5. Course Evaluations Completed by Prosecutors	119
Table O6. Instructor Evaluations Completed by Prosecutors.....	119
Table O7. Course Comments Completed by Prosecutors.....	119
Table P1. Training Recruitment, Registration, Participation, and Completion.....	121
Table P2. Test Scores	122
Table P3. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Pre-Test.....	123
Table P4. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Post-Test	123
Table P5. Course Evaluations Completed by Judges.....	124
Table P6. Instructor Evaluations Completed by Judges.....	125
Table P7. Course Comments Completed by Judges.....	125
Table Q1. Training Recruitment, Registration, Participation, and Completion	127
Table Q2. Test Scores.....	128
Table Q3. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Pre-Test	129
Table Q4. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Post-Test.....	129
Table Q5. Course Evaluations Completed by Judges	130
Table Q6. Instructor Evaluations Completed by Judges	131
Table Q7. Course Comments Completed by Judges	131
Table R1. Training Recruitment, Registration, Participation, and Completion.....	136
Table R2. Test Scores	136
Table R3. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Pre-Test.....	137
Table R4. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Post-Test	137
Table R5. Course Evaluations Completed by Judges.....	138
Table R6. Instructor Evaluations Completed by Judges.....	139
Table R7. Course Comments Completed by Judges.....	139
Table S1. Training Recruitment, Registration, Participation, and Completion	143
Table S2. Test Scores.....	144
Table S3. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Pre-Test	144
Table S4. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Post-Test	145
Table S5. Course Evaluations Completed by Judges.....	146
Table S6. Instructor Evaluations Completed by Judges	146
Table S7. Course Comments Completed by Judges	146
Table T1. Training Recruitment, Registration, Participation, and Completion	149
Table T2. Test Scores.....	149
Table T3. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Pre-Test	150
Table T4. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Post-Test	150
Table T5. Course Evaluations Completed by Judges.....	151
Table T6. Instructor Evaluations Completed by Judges	151
Table T7. Course Comments Completed by Judges.....	151

Table U1. Training Recruitment, Registration, Participation, and Completion	156
Table U2. Test Scores	156
Table U3. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Pre-Test	157
Table U4. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Post-Test.....	157
TableU 5. Course Evaluations Completed by Judges	158
Table U6. Instructor Evaluations Completed by Judges	158
Table U7. Course Comments Completed by Judges	158
Table V1. Training Recruitment, Registration, Participation, and Completion.....	162
Table V2. Test Scores	162
Table V3. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Pre-Test.....	163
Table V4. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Post-Test.....	163
Table V5. Course Evaluations Completed by Judges	164
Table V6. Instructor Evaluations Completed by Judges.....	164
Table V7. Course Comments Completed by Judges.....	165
Table W1. Training Recruitment, Registration, Participation, and Completion	167
Table W2. Test Scores	168
Table W3. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Pre-Test	168
Table W4. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Post-Test.....	169
Table W5. Course Evaluations Completed by Judges	170
Table W6. Instructor Evaluations Completed by Judges	170
Table W7. Course Comments Completed by Judges	170

Introduction

Alcohol-impaired driving is one of the leading causes of motor vehicle crashes in Texas (Texas Impaired Driving Task Force [TxIDTF], 2021). Texas must continue to implement effective countermeasures that reduce incidences of impaired driving. One such way the criminal justice system intervenes is by ordering the use of ignition interlock devices (IIDs), which are recognized by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) as an effective countermeasure (Richard et al., 2018). IIDs inhibit a vehicle from starting unless the driver provides a breath sample with a blood alcohol concentration (BAC) below a pre-set level, which is usually 0.02 BAC (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [CDC], 2020).

An abundance of evidence supports the use of these devices as an effective countermeasure for reducing alcohol-impaired driving fatalities and recidivism (Robertson et al. 2018). A systematic review evaluating the effectiveness of IIDs for preventing alcohol-impaired driving found that interlocks reduce the incidence of impaired driving when the device is installed (Elder et al. 2011). Furthermore, a recent study suggests that strong IID programs are associated with a decrease in alcohol-related crash fatalities (Teoh et al. 2018). Based on the body of research and the goal of reducing alcohol-impaired driving, all 50 states have implemented laws that require the use of IIDs for certain offenders (Governor's Highway Safety Association [GHSA], 2020).

In Texas, offenders may be ordered to have an interlock installed on their car as a condition of bond or probation. Texas law requires repeat offenders to install an IID as a condition of bond, as are offenders charged with Intoxication Assault or Intoxication Manslaughter (Texas Code of Criminal Procedure [CCP] 17.441). In addition, Texas law mandates an IID be installed as a condition of probation for all repeat offenders, first offenders with a blood alcohol concentration (BAC) of 0.15 or higher, and first offenders under the age of 21 (CCP 42A.408). If convicted of Intoxication Assault or Manslaughter, an IID must be ordered as a condition of probation for first offenders with a blood alcohol concentration (BAC) of 0.15 or higher and all subsequent offenses (CCP 42A.408).

NHTSA recommends that all members of the criminal justice community be provided with ongoing educational opportunities to increase knowledge and awareness about the requirements of the IID law and associated regulations (NHTSA, 2013). Specifically, in Texas, the 86th Legislative Session implemented new laws that directly affect the application of IIDs, and the State has identified a need to continue to educate criminal justice professionals with the legislative changes. To meet this need, the Texas A&M Transportation Institute (TTI) provided an Ignition Interlock Training for Criminal Justice Professionals (IITCJP) to probation officers,

prosecutors, and judges across Texas in fiscal year (FY) 2021. This report provides details of the IITCJP in FY 2021.

COVID-19 Impact on IITCJP Trainings

Due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, all trainings were held virtually via live webinars for FY 21. Due to the virtual format, TCOLE credit could not be offered for law enforcement officers. Therefore, the training was not offered for law enforcement this year. There were a total of 24 trainings held for probation, prosecutors, and judges.

Curriculum

In FY 2017, TTI developed curriculums for four stakeholders in the criminal justice system – law enforcement, prosecutors, judges, and probation officers. These tailored curriculums are unique to each stakeholder’s role with the use of ignition interlock devices and the implementation of evidence-based ignition interlock programs. Since the curriculum’s development, only minor modifications have been made based on student and instructor feedback.

During FY 2019, Texas held the 86th Legislature Session. Since the Session was held while trainings were ongoing, the curriculum was not changed at that time. However, instructors informed the students of specific bills to follow and eventually created a handout that explained changes regarding DWI laws and ignition interlock laws.

After the FY 2019 trainings were completed, the instructors made several modifications to the curriculum based on student feedback and updates from new studies and laws. Curriculum changes included reordering of slides to enhance the flow of the presentation, increasing readability of information on slides, updating content with latest research information, and adding new and relevant laws, such as the elimination of the Driver Responsibility Act and the addition of Deferred Adjudication for DWI charges. Finally, additional content was added to BAC laws, effects of alcohol on the body, and the technology information section was updated with the latest products. While most of these changes were minor, this was the most substantial update to the curriculum since its development in FY 2017.

Table 1, Table 2, and Table 3 outline the sessions included in the curriculum for probation officers, prosecutors, and judges, respectively. For each curriculum, specific sessions, lesson plans, and handouts were developed.

For FY 2020, a section was added that highlighted the impaired driving in the host county. However, this section was removed in FY 2021. As trainers at TTI made the transition from in-person to virtual, trainers also recognize the issues with webinar-fatigue. To improve knowledge retention and decrease fatigue associated with webinars, the decision was made to

exclude that section from this year's curriculum. Trainers also recognized that webinar-based trainings have less back-and-forth dialogue, so TTI was able to cut the training from four hours down to three. Based on the feedback received both through the evaluations and during the live trainings, the three-hour course had a good balance of knowledge shared and length.

Historically, at the end of each training cycle, TTI staff and trainers will discuss potential changes to move forward with. Some of these changes are based on new technology, trends, and laws. Other examples of what influences changes consist of the questions being asked in the trainings, comments on evaluations, and frequency of what test questions are being missed. After evaluation of these types of factors, TTI staff has decided no changes are currently necessary to the existing curriculum.

Table 1. Ignition Interlock Training Program for Probation Officers Training Sessions

Ignition Interlock Training Program for Probation Officers
1. Welcome & Introduction
2. Effects of Alcohol
3. Texas IID Laws
4. Implementation of IID Programs and Strategies
5. IID Technology
6. IID Data
7. Violations and Reporting
8. IID Challenges and Concerns
9. Wrap-Up

Table 2. Ignition Interlock Training Program for Prosecutors Training Sessions

Ignition Interlock Training Program for Prosecutors
1. Welcome & Introduction
2. Effects of Alcohol
3. Texas IID Laws
4. Implementation of IID Programs and Strategies
5. IID Technology
6. IID Data
7. Violations and Reporting
8. IID Challenges and Concerns
9. Wrap-Up

Table 3. Ignition Interlock Training Program for Judges Training Sessions

Ignition Interlock Training Program for Judges
1. Welcome & Introduction
2. Effects of Alcohol
3. Texas IID Laws
4. Implementation of IID Programs and Strategies
5. IID Technology
6. IID Data
7. Violations and Reporting
8. IID Challenges and Concerns
9. Wrap-Up

Location Selection

At the start of FY 2021, TTI began the process of selecting locations for the training sessions. TTI was charged with conducting eight virtual trainings for each of the three stakeholder groups. TTI’s project team began the location selection process by consulting the Texas Department of Transportation’s (TxDOT’s) list of 25 counties with the highest number of alcohol-related fatal and serious injury (KA) crashes in the state. After consulting this list, TTI staff met with ignition interlock industry partners and took into consideration training locations from previous years, areas with underserved training opportunities, and counties that have requested the training. TTI and industry partners also wanted to include training locations that were geographically diverse and representative of Texas.

Based on these considerations and in consultation with ignition interlock industry partners and TxDOT’s list of 25 counties with the highest number of alcohol-related KA crashes, project staff compiled a list of seven proposed counties and/or regions and worked in concert with TxDOT for review and approval.

The TTI team reached out to 7 of the proposed counties and/or regions to gauge interest in receiving the training and ultimately selected 6 geographical areas to deliver the trainings. These included:

1. Cross Timbers Region
2. El Paso County
3. Kaufman County
4. Panhandle Region
5. Pecos County
6. Uvalde County

IITCJP trainings were scheduled based on TTI and industry partner staff availability. **Table 4** lists the training dates for the 24 IITCJP trainings in 2021. Note: two trainings were held for each stakeholder group for the Panhandle and El Paso trainings; all other locations had one training per stakeholder group.

Table 4. Ignition Interlock Training Program Dates and Locations in 2021

Training Dates	Stakeholder Group	Location
March 24, 2021	Probation	Uvalde
April 7, 2021	Probation	Cross Timbers
May 4, 2021	Probation	El Paso
May 5, 2021	Probation	El Paso
May 27, 2021	Probation	Pecos
May 28, 2021	Probation	Kaufman
July 7, 2021	Prosecutors	Uvalde

July 8, 2021	Prosecutors	Kaufman
July 8, 2021	Judges	Uvalde
July 9, 2021	Judges	Kaufman
August 5, 2021	Probation	Panhandle
August 5, 2021	Prosecutors	Cross Timbers
August 6, 2021	Judges	Cross Timbers
August 18, 2021	Prosecutors	Panhandle
August 19, 2021	Judges	Panhandle
August 19, 2021	Judges	El Paso
August 20, 2021	Prosecutors	El Paso
August 24, 2021	Probation	Panhandle
August 24, 2021	Judges	Panhandle
August 25, 2021	Prosecutors	Panhandle
August 25, 2021	Prosecutors	Pecos
August 26, 2021	Prosecutors	Pecos
August 26, 2021	Judges	El Paso
August 27, 2021	Judges	El Paso

Participants

The TTI project team identified and invited criminal justice professionals to participate in the IITCJP based on geographical proximity to the locations listed in **Table 4**. Potential participants were recruited to via email and phone from 85 counties. Overall, participants who attended these trainings represented 63 counties.

In advance of these trainings, 301 individuals registered and 279 completed a pre-test. Registration and pre-test completion indicates the intent to attend the training, but it does not mean the registrant showed up for the virtual training. There were 219 participants who attended the trainings, and 216 of them successfully completed the course. Course completion was based on the submission of a post-test at the end of the course. **Table 5** displays the number of criminal justice stakeholders who were invited, attended, and completed the IITCJP across all trainings, as further discussed in the subsequent sections.

Probation Officers

TTI staff contacted and invited probation officers from 17 community supervision and corrections departments (CSCDs) to attend the IITCJP. In advance of the training, 123 probation officers registered, and 122 completed pre-tests were submitted.

There were 108 probation officers who attended the training, and all of them completed the course by completing a post-test. Participating probation officers represented 18 CSCDs and 22 counties. The complete list of agencies in attendance is organized by training in the appendices.

Prosecutors

TTI staff contacted and invited 1653 prosecutors and other staff from the targeted counties. In advance of the training, 105 prosecutors and other staff registered, and 98 completed pre-tests were submitted.

Sixty-five prosecutors and other staff attended the training, and 64 completed pre-tests were submitted. The participants represented 28 offices and 33 counties. The complete list of agencies in attendance is organized by training in the appendices.

Judges

TTI staff contacted and invited 588 members of the judiciary to attend the IITCJP. Seventy-three judges registered and 59 completed a pre-test in advance of the training.

Forty-six judges attended the training, and 44 of them completed the training by submitting a post-test. The participating judges represented 40 courts and 28 counties. The complete list of agencies in attendance is organized by training in the appendices.

Table 5. Number of Criminal Justice Stakeholders Who Were Invited, Attended, and Completed IITCJP across all Trainings

	Invited	Registered	Pre-Tests	Attended	Post-Tests	Evaluations
Probation Officer	17 CSCDs	123	122	108	108	102
Prosecutors	1653	105	98	65	64	67
Judges	588	73	59	46	44	51

Test Scores

Both a pre-test and a post-test were administered prior to and following each training. The pre-test gauges a participant's knowledge related to ignition interlock prior to attending the course. The pre-test consists of 10 questions and is completed online via Qualtrics. The post-test gauges a participant's knowledge related to ignition interlock after attending the course. The post-test consists of 10 questions, including 6 of the same questions on the pre-test, and is completed immediately following the training via Qualtrics.

Pre-Tests

A 10-question pre-test was administered online via Qualtrics. Registrants were asked to complete the pre-test at the end of the registration process.

Participants who registered to attend the training and completed a pre-test scored an average of 72.2 on the pre-test. In general, not everyone who registered and completed a pre-test attended the training. Conversely, not everyone who attended the training completed a pre-test. However, all registrants' scores were included in the pre-test average because the pre-test was submitted anonymously. Each pre-test question was worth 10 points.

Table 6 displays the average pre-test scores across all stakeholder groups. Prosecutors scored the lowest with an average of 71.2, while probation officers scored the highest with an average of 73.2.

Table 6. Cumulative Pre-Test Averages Across Stakeholder Groups

All	Probation Officers	Prosecutors	Judges
72.2	73.2	71.2	71.9

Table 7 outlines the most frequently missed questions on the pre-test. Over half of the registrants missed the question concerning what an interlock does to the vehicle when alcohol is detected.

Table 7. Cumulative Pre-Test Most Frequently Missed Questions

Question	Number of Registrants Who Attempted the Question	Number of Registrants Who Missed the Question	Percent Who Missed the Question
Q2. The ignition interlock device will shut the engine off if an offender provides a breath sample with alcohol present.	279	149	53.4%

Question	Number of Registrants Who Attempted the Question	Number of Registrants Who Missed the Question	Percent Who Missed the Question
Q3. When must an ignition interlock device be ordered as a condition of bond?	279	133	47.7%
Q5. If an offender violates an Occupational Drivers License order, the violation is a	279	132	47.7%

Post-Tests

At the end of the course material, a 10-question post-test was administered to determine participants' level of knowledge about IIDs. Each test question was worth 10 points.

Participants who completed the training had an average post-test score of 89.7. **Table 8** outlines the average post-test score by participant background. Judges had the highest average post-test score of 91.1.

Table 8. Cumulative Post-Test Averages Across Stakeholder Groups

All	Probation Officers	Prosecutors	Judges
89.7	90.0	89.8	91.1

Table 9 lists the most frequently missed questions on the post-test. Nearly one-third of participants missed the question concerning the steps to start a car equipped with an ignition interlock; it was not a pre-test question.

Table 9. Cumulative Post-Test Most Frequently Missed Questions

Question	Number of Registrants Who Attempted the Question	Number of Registrants Who Missed the Question	Percent Who Missed the Question
Q6. What are the steps, in order, to start a vehicle equipped with an ignition interlock device?	216	63	29.2%
Q10. What is the average elimination rate of alcohol of an adult male?	216	51	23.6%
Q2. If a breath sample with alcohol present is provided during a rolling retest, the vehicle will immediately shut off. *	216	30	13.9%

* Question was on the pre-test

Change in Knowledge

Change in knowledge is calculated to determine if participants' knowledge changed after completing the course. Change in knowledge is calculated by:

$$(\text{Post-test Score} - \text{Pre-test Score} / \text{Pre-test Score}) \times 100$$

A direct comparison of performance on the pre- and post-tests cannot be made because the post-test contained additional questions not asked in the pre-test. However, change in knowledge can still be calculated to determine if the participants gained additional knowledge at the completion of the course. For this evaluation, the additional questions were included in the calculation of change of knowledge to demonstrate the results are not biased by priming knowledge of the participants on the pre-test.

Participants in the IITCJP experienced an average 24.2 percent knowledge gain. **Table 10** displays the percent of knowledge gained across all stakeholder groups.

Table 10. Percent of Knowledge Gained across Groups

Measure	All	Probation	Prosecutors	Judges
Average Pre-Test Score	72.2	73.2	71.2	71.9
Average Post-Test Score	89.7	90.0	89.8	91.1
Percent Knowledge Gained	24.2%	23.0%	26.1%	26.7%

The appendices contain a detailed summary of the pre-test scores, post-test scores and percent knowledge gain for each training.

Course Evaluations

To further evaluate the IITCJP and IITCJP instructors, end-of-course evaluations were administered. The course evaluation included sections to rate the course content, to rate the course instructors, and to provide feedback and comments. There was a total of 220 course evaluations received. Of note, there were more evaluations received than IITJCP attendees. However, since all evaluations were submitted anonymously, all scores are included in the averages.

Each participant was asked to rate the course content/program on a five-point rating scale ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree.” Participants were asked to evaluate several criteria such as how likely they are to use the provided information in their job duties, if the workshop was a valuable use of time, and the quality of the topics covered in the course. The same scale was used to rate the performance of course instructors. Some participants did not have both industry representatives (Dottie McDonald and Erin Garza) as instructors, so their scores may be based off fewer evaluations.

To analyze the course evaluations, each rating was assigned a point value, with “strongly disagree” assigned the lowest point value of 1 and “strongly agree” assigned the highest point value of 5. The ratings were averaged to determine an average score for each question.

This section provides information about the course evaluations completed for each stakeholder group. Overall, the course received very favorable reviews and comments from participants.

Probation Officers

There were 102 course evaluations received from probation officers. **Table 11** presents the average scores for the course evaluation questions. **Table 12** presents the average scores for each of the three instructors of the course. All comments received from probation officers who attended the trainings are presented in the corresponding appendix for each training.

Table 11. Probation Officers’ Course Evaluations

Question	Average Score
The information provided on ignition interlock devices was applicable to my job duties.	5.0
I am likely to use the information provided today in my daily job duties.	4.9
Attending the ignition interlock training program was a good use of my time.	5.0
I felt the format of the workshop, pace of instruction, and schedule were appropriate for the material presented.	4.9
I felt the topics covered, PowerPoint presentation and videos enhanced the instructors’ presentation.	5.0

Table 12. Probation Officers' Instructor Evaluations

Instructor	Average Score
Cody Stewart	4.9
Industry Representative– Dottie*	4.7
Industry Representative– Erin**	4.8

* Based off 62 evaluations

** Based off 47 evaluations

Prosecutors

There were 67 evaluations received from prosecutors. **Table 13** presents the average scores for the course evaluation questions. **Table 14** presents the average scores for each of the three instructors of the course. All comments received from prosecutors who attended the trainings are presented in the corresponding appendix for each location.

Table 13. Prosecutors' Course Evaluations

Question	Average Score
The information provided on ignition interlock devices was applicable to my job duties.	4.7
I am likely to use the information provided today in my daily job duties.	4.7
Attending the ignition interlock training program was a good use of my time.	4.8
I felt the format of the workshop, pace of instruction, and schedule were appropriate for the material presented.	4.8
I felt the topics covered, PowerPoint presentation and videos enhanced the instructors' presentation.	4.8

Table 14. Prosecutors' Instructor Evaluations

Instructor	Average Score
Cody Stewart	4.8
Industry Representative– Dottie*	4.7
Industry Representative– Erin**	4.8

* Based off 33 evaluations

** Based off 40 evaluations

Judges

There were 51 course evaluations received from judges. **Table 15** presents the average scores for the course evaluation questions. **Table 16** presents the average scores for each of the three instructors of the course. All comments received from members of the judiciary who attended the trainings are presented in the corresponding appendix for each location.

Table 15. Judges' Course Evaluations

Question	Average Score
The information provided on ignition interlock devices was applicable to my job duties.	4.9
I am likely to use the information provided today in my daily job duties.	4.7
Attending the ignition interlock training program was a good use of my time.	4.9
I felt the format of the workshop, pace of instruction, and schedule were appropriate for the material presented.	4.8
I felt the topics covered, PowerPoint presentation and videos enhanced the instructors' presentation.	4.9

Table 16. Judges' Instructor Evaluations

Instructor	Average Score
Cody Stewart	4.7
Industry Representative– Dottie*	4.8
Industry Representative– Erin**	4.7

* Based off 12 evaluations

** Based off 23 evaluations

Future Activities

Due to complications stemming from COVID-19, the TTI project staff had to pivot to virtual trainings for FY 2021 to ensure the health and safety of both instructors and students. Even with changes to the training format, the IITCJP for probation officers, prosecutors, and judges was well attended and positive course evaluations were received. The feedback received indicates that the curriculum continues to be relevant and useful through its updates from year to year.

For FY 2022, TTI will continue to conduct ignition interlock trainings for criminal justice system personnel. Instructors will continue to use evaluations and student comments to improve each of the three curriculum packages. No current changes have been identified, but current federal proposals on infrastructure bills might push certain alcohol detection technologies forward, which would be worth mentioning in the technology section.

This year, to improve feedback received from course evaluations, TTI made modifications to solicit more feedback and assess knowledge retention. In previous years, the evaluation asked for "additional comments." In FY 2021, participants were asked to leave more specific comments about:

- the course and content,
- the instructors; and

- the workshop and/or IIDs in general

More comments were received in the evaluations than previous years. Information from these evaluations will continue to serve as a vehicle for updating the curriculum packages.

TTI is also aware that complications stemming from COVID-19 may impact the instructors' ability to provide face-to-face trainings again in FY 2022. In that case, TTI will work with TxDOT to explore available options to continue hosting the trainings virtually.

Finally, TTI also has plans for FY22 to develop a short course that would be self-taught and accessible online. This course would not be a replacement, but rather a refresher course that can be taken after the main training to help remind staff of the broader points of ignition interlock devices, laws, and report monitoring.

References

- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [CDC]. (2020). Sobering Facts: Alcohol-Impaired Driving in Texas. Retrieved from <https://www.cdc.gov/motorvehiclesafety/pdf/impaired-driving-new/CDC-impaired-driving-fact-sheet-Texas.pdf>
- Elder, R. W., Voas, R., Beirness, D., Shults, R. A., Sleet, D. A., Nichols, J. L., & Compton, R. (2011). Effectiveness of ignition interlocks for preventing alcohol-impaired driving and alcohol-related crashes: A community guide systematic review. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 40(3), 362-376.
- Governor's Highway Safety Association. (2020). Alcohol Impaired Driving Laws by State. Retrieved from https://www.ghsa.org/sites/default/files/2020-07/DrunkDrivingLaws_0720.pdf.
- National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. (2013). *Model Guideline for State Ignition Interlock Programs*. Report No. DOT HS 811 859.
- Richard, C. M., Magee, K., Bacon-Abdelmoteleb, P., & Brown, J. L. (2018). *Countermeasures That Work: A Highway Safety Countermeasure Guide for State Highway Safety Offices, Ninth edition* (Report No. DOT HS 812 478). Washington, DC: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.
- Robertson, R. D., Vanlaar, W., & Hing, M. M. (2018). *Annual Ignition Interlock Survey 2016 and 2017: United States*. Washington, DC: Traffic Injury Research Foundation USA, Inc.
- Teoh, E. R., Fell, J. C., Scherer, M., & Wolfe, D. E. R. (2018). *State Alcohol Ignition Interlock Laws and Fatal Crashes*. Arlington, VA: Insurance Institute for Highway Safety.
- Texas Impaired Driving Task Force. (2021). 2021 Texas Impaired Driving Plan. Retrieved from <https://www.texasimpaireddrivingtaskforce.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/FY-2021-Texas-Impaired-Driving-Plan.pdf>
- Texas Code of Criminal Procedure, Article 17.441. Conditions Requiring Motor Vehicle Ignition Interlock. Retrieved from <https://statutes.capitol.texas.gov/Docs/CR/htm/CR.17.htm>
- Texas Code of Criminal Procedure. Article 42A.408 Use of an Ignition Interlock Device. Retrieved from <https://statutes.capitol.texas.gov/Docs/CR/pdf/CR.42A.pdf>.

Appendix A: Ignition Interlock Training for Criminal Justice Professionals – Uvalde County Probation Officers

Location

A 2021 ignition interlock training program was held virtually via Webex on March 24th, 2021, from 1:00 PM – 4:00 PM for probation officers in Uvalde County. Due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, all trainings are being held virtually via live webinars for FY 21.

Training

Recruitment

The Texas A&M Transportation Institute (TTI) project team identified and invited probation officers from Uvalde County to participate in the training program. Potential participants were recruited via a combination of emails and phone calls to departments in the following county:

- Uvalde

The TTI project team contacted 1 probation department. Of note, the TTI project team invited probation officers to the trainings by contacting their county adult probation department, (i.e., once each was contacted, the agency/department further disseminated the training information internally to staff). Conversely, the TTI project team reached out to prosecutors and judges on an individual basis to invite them to the trainings.

Registration

Participants registered online prior to the training, submitting basic contact information. Participants were also asked to complete an anonymous pre-training test. In advance of the trainings, there were 27 registrants and 27 completed pre-tests. The breakdown of registrants is shown in Table A1. Registration and pre-test completion indicates the intent to attend the training, but it does not mean the registrant showed up for the virtual training. Attendance and completion of the training is based off a returned post-test. Participants are also asked to complete an evaluation form, but these are submitted anonymously.

Table A17. Training Recruitment, Registration, Participation, and Completion

Probation	
# Recruited	1 (Department)
# Registered	27
# Pre-Tests Completed	27
# Post-Tests Completed	22
# Evaluations	17

Participation

There were 22 participants who attended the training and returned a post-test. Participating agencies and counties represented are shown below.

- Dimmit CSCD – Dimmit County
- Maverick CSCD – Maverick County
- Medina CSCD – Medina County
- Uvalde CSCD – Uvalde County
- Val Verde Districts CSCD – Val Verde County
- Zavala CSCD – Zavala County

Test Scores

Both a pre-test and a post-test are administered prior to and following each training. The pre-test gauges a participant’s knowledge related to ignition interlock prior to attending the course. The pre-test consists of 10 questions and is completed online via Qualtrics. The post-test gauges a participant’s knowledge related to ignition interlock after attending the course. The post-test consists of 10 questions – including 6 of the same questions on the pre-test – and is completed immediately following the training via Qualtrics. Table A2 shows the test scores for the training.

Table A18. Test Scores

Pre-Test Score	Post-Test Score	Change in Knowledge (% Gain)
75.6	90.0	19.0%

Pre-Tests

The average pre-test score was a 75.6. Not all registrants who complete the pre-tests end up attending the training. However, because the pre-tests are submitted anonymously, all registrants’ pre-test scores are calculated in the pre-test average.

Table A3 shows the most frequently missed questions on the pre-test. Nearly half of participants missed the question pertaining to conditions of bond.

Table A19. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Pre-Test

Question	Number Missed	Percent Who Missed Question
Q3. When must an ignition interlock device be ordered as a condition of bond?	13	48.2%

Question	Number Missed	Percent Who Missed Question
Q7. What is a goal of ignition interlock?	12	44.4%
Q4. When must an ignition interlock device be ordered as a condition of probation?	10	37.0%

Post-Tests

Following the completion of the training course material, a 10-question post-test is administered to determine participants' level of knowledge regarding ignition interlock devices. Each test question is worth 10 points. Participants who completed the training had an average post-test score of a 90.0.

Table A4 lists the most frequently missed questions on the post-test. The most frequently missed question concerned alcohol elimination rates; this question was not a pre-test question.

Table A20. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Post-Test

Question	Number Missed	Percent Who Missed Question
Q10. What is the average elimination rate of alcohol of an adult male?	7	31.8%
Q6. What are the steps, in order, to start a vehicle equipped with an ignition interlock device?	6	28.6%
Q2. If a breath sample with alcohol present is provided during a rolling retest, the vehicle will immediately shut off. *	3	14.3%

* Question was on the pre-test

Change in Knowledge

Change in knowledge is calculated to determine if there was a change in participants' knowledge after completing the course. Change in knowledge is calculated by:

$$= (\text{Post-Test Score} - \text{Pre-Test Score}) / \text{Pre-Test Score}$$

Participants experienced a 19.0 % gain in knowledge.

Course Evaluations

At the end of the training, participants complete an evaluation. The evaluation includes a section to rate the training content and instructors, and to provide feedback and comments. Participants are asked to rate the items based on a five-point rating scale between "strongly disagree" and "strongly agree."

Some participants did not have both industry representatives (Dottie McDonald and Erin Garza) as instructors, so their scores may be based off fewer evaluations.

Each rating is assigned a point value -- with “strongly disagree” assigned the lowest point value of 1 and “strongly agree” assigned the highest point value of 5. An average is calculated for each evaluative component.

Course evaluations were received from 17 out of 22 probation officers who attended the training in Uvalde County and surrounding areas. Table A5 displays the average course evaluation scores. Table A6 is the average instructor evaluation scores. Table A7 is additional comments received from probation officers.

Table A21. Course Evaluations Completed by Probation

Question	Average Score
The information provided on ignition interlock devices was applicable to my job duties.	5.0
I am likely to use the information provided today in my daily job duties.	4.9
Attending the ignition interlock training program was a good use of my time.	5.0
I felt the format of the workshop, pace of instruction and schedule were appropriate for the material presented.	5.0
I felt the topics covered, PowerPoint presentation and videos enhanced the instructors’ presentation.	5.0

Table A22. Instructor Evaluations Completed by Probation

Instructor	Average Score
Cody Stewart	4.8
Industry Representative – Dottie	4.7
Industry Representative – Erin *	4.7

* This average score is based off 7 evaluations.

Table A23. Course Comments Completed by Probation

Comments
I was actually engaged and learned a lot from today's training
Instructors were amazing!

Comments

Training was extreme informative and I am glad that it was made available to us. I hope that more training's are provide as devices and/or laws change. Thank you for providing this training.

Good information

Probation Departments Contacted and Invited to Participate

COMMUNITY SUPERVISION AND CORRECTION DEPARTMENTS – 1

- Uvalde CSCD

Appendix B: Ignition Interlock Training for Criminal Justice Professionals – Cross Timbers Region Probation Officers

Location

A 2021 ignition interlock training was held virtually via Webex on April 7th, 2021, from 1:30 PM – 4:30 PM for probation officers in the Cross Timbers region. Due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, all trainings are being held virtually via live webinars for FY 21.

Training

Recruitment

The Texas A&M Transportation Institute (TTI) project team identified and invited probation officers from the Cross Timbers region to participate in the training program. Potential participants were recruited via a combination of emails and phone calls to community supervision departments in the following counties:

- Montague
- Young
- Wise

The TTI project team contacted 3 probation departments. Appendix A contains a listing of all invited criminal justice professionals. Of note, the TTI project team invited probation officers to the trainings by contacting their adult probation department, (i.e., once each was contacted, the agency/department further disseminated the training information internally to staff). Conversely, the TTI project team reached out to prosecutors and judges on an individual basis to invite them to the trainings.

Registration

Participants registered online prior to the training, submitting basic contact information. Participants were also asked to complete an anonymous pre-training test. In advance of the trainings, there were 11 registrants and 9 completed pre-tests. The breakdown of registrants is shown in Table B1 Registration and pre-test completion indicates the intent to attend the training, but it does not mean the registrant showed up for the virtual training. Attendance and completion of the training is based off a returned post-test. Participants are also asked to complete an evaluation form, but these are submitted anonymously. Note, one participant attended the training and submitted a post-test but did not register for the training.

Table B24. Training Recruitment, Registration, Participation, and Completion

Probation	
# Recruited	3 (Departments)
# Registered	11
# Pre-Tests Completed	9

Probation	
# Post-Tests Completed	10
# Evaluations	9

Participation

There were 10 participants who attended the probation officer training. Participating agencies and counties represented are shown below.

- Clay CSCD – Clay County
- Erath CSCD – Erath County
- Medina CSCD – Medina County
- Montague CSCD - Montague County

Test Scores

Both a pre-test and a post-test are administered prior to and following each training. The pre-test gauges a participant’s knowledge related to ignition interlock prior to attending the course. The pre-test consists of 10 questions and is completed online via Qualtrics. The post-test gauges a participant’s knowledge related to ignition interlock after attending the course. The post-test consists of 10 questions – including 6 of the same questions on the pre-test – and is completed immediately following the training via Qualtrics. Table B2 shows the test scores for training.

Table B25. Test Scores

Pre-Test Score	Post-Test Score	Change in Knowledge (% Gain)
80.0	95.0	18.8%

Pre-Tests

The average pre-test score was an 80.0. Not all registrants who complete the pre-tests end up attending the training. However, because the pre-tests are submitted anonymously, all registrants’ pre-test scores are calculated in the pre-test average.

Table B3 shows the most frequently missed questions on the pre-test. Over 75 percent of participants missed the question pertaining to conditions of bond.

Table B26. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Pre-Test

Question	Number Missed	Percent Who Missed Question
Q3. When must an ignition interlock device be ordered as a condition of bond?	7	77.8%
Q7. What is a goal of ignition interlock?	4	44.4%
Q10. What is the purpose of an ignition interlock device?	3	33.3%

Post-Tests

Following the completion of the training course material, a 10-question post-test is administered to determine participants' level of knowledge regarding ignition interlock devices. Each test question is worth 10 points. Participants who completed the training had an average post-test score of a 95.0.

Table B4 lists the most frequently missed questions on the post-test. The most frequently missed question concerned the steps to start a car equipped with an ignition interlock; it was not a pre-test question.

Table B27. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Post-Test

Question	Number Missed	Percent Who Missed Question
Q6. What are the steps, in order, to start a vehicle equipped with an ignition interlock device?	2	30.0%
Q3. When must an ignition interlock device be ordered as a condition of bond? *	1	10.0%
Q10. What is the average elimination rate of alcohol of an adult male?	1	10.0%

* Question was on the pre-test

Change in Knowledge

Change in knowledge is calculated to determine if there was a change in participants' knowledge after completing the course. Change in knowledge is calculated by:

$$= (\text{Post-Test Score} - \text{Pre-Test Score}) / \text{Pre-Test Score}$$

Participants experienced an 18.8% gain in knowledge.

Course Evaluations

At the end of the training, participants complete an evaluation. The evaluation includes a section to rate the training content and instructors, and to provide feedback and comments. Participants are asked to rate the items based on a five-point rating scale between “strongly disagree” and “strongly agree.” Some participants did not have both industry representatives (Dottie McDonald and Erin Garza) as instructors, so their scores may be based off fewer evaluations.

Each rating is assigned a point value -- with “strongly disagree” assigned the lowest point value of 1 and “strongly agree” assigned the highest point value of 5. An average is calculated for each evaluative component.

Course evaluations were received from 9 out of 10 probation officers who attended the training. Table B5 is the average course evaluation scores. Table B6 is the average instructor evaluation scores. Table B7 is additional comments received from probation officers.

Table B28. Course Evaluations Completed by Probation

Question	Average Score
The information provided on ignition interlock devices was applicable to my job duties.	4.9
I am likely to use the information provided today in my daily job duties.	4.9
Attending the ignition interlock training program was a good use of my time.	4.8
I felt the format of the workshop, pace of instruction and schedule were appropriate for the material presented.	4.8
I felt the topics covered, PowerPoint presentation and videos enhanced the instructors’ presentation.	5.0

Table B29. Instructor Evaluations Completed by Probation

Instructor	Average Score
Cody Stewart	4.9
Industry Representative – Dottie *	3.8
Industry Representative – Erin	4.7

* This average score is based off 5 evaluations.

Table B30. Course Comments Completed by Probation

Comments
I thought it was great. Thank you!

Comments
Thank you for answering questions that were asked. The information provided was exactly why I attended the training/presentation.
Some internet lagging was annoying and somewhat distracting.
It would be beneficial to have yearly Interlock trainings (even if its only a short training), just to keep us refreshed on the SmartStart process.
Thank you for taking the time and efforts for this training. However, the slide shows were too large to visibly follow during the PowerPoint presentation – without me printing the PP slide deck it would have been very difficult to follow.
Accidentally clicked on the Dottie part when we didn't have her. The instructors we had were great.
Both trainers did a good job, especially during the Zoom meeting era.
Good information presented

Probation Departments Contacted and Invited to Participate

COMMUNITY SUPERVISION AND CORRECTION DEPARTMENTS – 3

- Montague CSCD
- Young CSCD
- Wise CSCD

Appendix C: Ignition Interlock Training for Criminal Justice Professionals – El Paso County Probation Officers

Location

A 2021 ignition interlock training was held virtually via Webex on May 4th, 2021, from 8:00 AM – 11:00 AM for probation officers in El Paso County. Note, two trainings for El Paso County probation officers were held; this report details the first of the two trainings. Due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, all trainings are being held virtually via live webinars for FY 21.

Training

Recruitment

The Texas A&M Transportation Institute (TTI) project team identified and invited probation officers from El Paso County to participate in the training program. Potential participants were recruited via a combination of emails and phone calls to departments in the following county:

- El Paso County

The TTI project team contacted 1 probation department. Appendix A contains a listing of all invited criminal justice professionals. Of note, the TTI project team invited probation officers to the trainings by contacting their adult community supervision department, (i.e., once contacted, the agency/department further disseminated the training information internally to staff). Conversely, the TTI project team reached out to prosecutors and judges on an individual basis to invite them to the trainings.

Registration

Participants registered online prior to the training, submitting basic contact information. Participants were also asked to complete an anonymous pre-training test. In advance of the trainings, there were 11 registrants and 15 pre-tests completed. The breakdown of registrants is shown in Table C1. Registration and pre-test completion indicates the intent to attend the training, but it does not mean the registrant showed up for the virtual training. Attendance and completion of the training is based off a returned post-test. Participants are also asked to complete an evaluation form, but these are submitted anonymously.

Table C31. Training Recruitment, Registration, Participation, and Completion

	Probation
# Recruited	1 (Department)
# Registered	11
# Pre-Tests Completed	15
# Post-Tests Completed	9
# Evaluations	10

Participation

A total of 9 participants attended the training and returned a post-test. The participating agency and county represented is shown below.

- El Paso CSCD – El Paso County

Test Scores

Both a pre-test and a post-test are administered prior to and following each training. The pre-test gauges a participant’s knowledge related to ignition interlock prior to attending the course. The pre-test consists of 10 questions and is completed online via Qualtrics. The post-test gauges a participant’s knowledge related to ignition interlock after attending the course. The post-test consists of 10 questions – including 6 of the same questions on the pre-test – and is completed immediately following the training via Qualtrics. Table C2 shows the test scores for the probation officers who registered and attended the training.

Table C32. Test Scores

Pre-Test Score	Post-Test Score	Change in Knowledge (% Gain)
70.0	93.3	33.3%

Pre-Tests

The average pre-test score was a 70.0. Not all registrants who complete the pre-tests end up attending the training. However, because the pre-tests are submitted anonymously, all registrants’ pre-test scores are calculated in the pre-test average.

Table C3 shows the most frequently missed questions on the pre-test. Most participants missed the question pertaining to the goal of an ignition interlock device.

Table C33. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Pre-Test

Question	Number Missed	Percent Who Missed Question
Q7. What is a goal of ignition interlock?	11	73.3%

Q5. If an offender violates an Occupational Drivers License order, the violation is a	10	66.7%
Q2. The ignition interlock device will shut the engine off if an offender provides a breath sample	7	46.7%

Post-Tests

Following the completion of the training course material, a 10-question post-test is administered to determine participants' level of knowledge regarding ignition interlock devices. Each test question is worth 10 points. Participants who completed the training had an average post-test score of a 93.3.

Table C4 lists the most frequently missed questions on the post-test. The most frequently missed questions concerned alcohol elimination rates; this question was not a pre-test question.

Table C34. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Post-Test

Question	Number Missed	Percent Who Missed Question
Q10. What is the average elimination rate of alcohol of an adult male?	3	33.3%
Q9. What is a Circumvention?	2	22.2%
Q6. What are the steps, in order, to start a vehicle equipped with an ignition interlock device?	1	11.1%

* Question was on the pre-test

Change in Knowledge

Change in knowledge is calculated to determine if there was a change in participants' knowledge after completing the course. Change in knowledge is calculated by:

$$= (\text{Post-Test Score} - \text{Pre-Test Score}) / \text{Pre-Test Score}$$

Participants experienced an 33.3% gain in knowledge.

Course Evaluations

At the end of the training, participants complete an evaluation. The evaluation includes a section to rate the training content and instructors, and to provide feedback and comments. Participants are asked to rate the items based on a five-point rating scale between "strongly disagree" and "strongly agree."

Some participants did not have both industry representatives (Dottie McDonald and Erin Garza) as instructors, so their scores may be based off fewer evaluations.

Each rating is assigned a point value -- with “strongly disagree” assigned the lowest point value of 1 and “strongly agree” assigned the highest point value of 5. An average is calculated for each evaluative component.

There were 10 course evaluations received, although only 9 probation officers attended the training. However, because the evaluations are submitted anonymously, all scores are calculated in the course evaluation averages. Table C5 is the average course evaluation scores. Table C6 is the average instructor evaluation scores. Table C7 is additional comments received from El Paso probation officers.

Table C35. Course Evaluations Completed by Probation

Question	Average Score
The information provided on ignition interlock devices was applicable to my job duties.	5.0
I am likely to use the information provided today in my daily job duties.	5.0
Attending the ignition interlock training program was a good use of my time.	5.0
I felt the format of the workshop, pace of instruction and schedule were appropriate for the material presented.	4.9
I felt the topics covered, PowerPoint presentation and videos enhanced the instructors’ presentation.	4.8

Table C36. Instructor Evaluations Completed by Probation

Instructor	Average Score
Cody Stewart	4.8
Industry Representative – Dottie *	4.6
Industry Representative – Erin **	4.5

* This average score is based off 6 evaluations.

** This average score is based off 3 evaluations.

Table C37. Course Comments Completed by Probation

Comments
Thanks
Great training. Useful information
I feel like the instructor was too far. I would have liked for him to be closer to the camera.
Good presentation
Tone and attitude was great. overall great presentation
I learn additional information regarding the requirement with State of Texas for Probationer required to have an ignition interlock device
Great training!
I learned a great deal, very informative!
Very helpful

Probation Departments Contacted and Invited to Participate

COMMUNITY SUPERVISION AND CORRECTION DEPARTMENTS – 1

- El Paso CSCD

Appendix D: Ignition Interlock Training for Criminal Justice Professionals – El Paso County Probation Officers

Location

A 2021 ignition interlock training was held virtually via Webex on May 5th, 2021, from 1:00 PM – 4:00 PM for probation officers in El Paso County. Note, two trainings for El Paso County probation officers were held; this report details the second of the two trainings. Due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, all trainings are being held virtually via live webinars for FY 21.

Training

Recruitment

The Texas A&M Transportation Institute (TTI) project team identified and invited probation officers from El Paso County to participate in the training program. Potential participants were recruited via combination of emails and phone calls to the adult probation department in the following county:

- El Paso County

The TTI project team contacted 1 probation department. Appendix A contains a listing of all invited criminal justice professionals. Of note, the TTI project team invited probation officers to the trainings by contacting their adult community supervision department, (i.e., once contact was made, the agency/department further disseminated the training information internally to staff). Conversely, the TTI project team reached out to prosecutors and judges on an individual basis to invite them to the training.

Registration

Participants registered online prior to the training, submitting basic contact information. Participants were also asked to complete an anonymous pre-training test. In advance of the trainings, there were 24 registrants and 20 pre-tests completed. The breakdown of registrants is shown in Table D1. Registration and pre-test completion indicates the intent to attend the training, but it does not mean the registrant showed up for the virtual training. Attendance and completion of the training is based off a returned post-test. Participants are also asked to complete an evaluation form, but these are submitted anonymously. Note, one participant attended the training and submitted a post-test but did not register for the training.

Table D38. Training Recruitment, Registration, Participation, and Completion

Probation	
# Recruited	1 (Department)
# Registered	24
# Pre-Tests Completed	20

Probation	
# Post-Tests Completed	25
# Evaluations	23

Participation

There were a total of 25 participants who attended the training. The participating agency and county represented are shown below.

- El Paso CSCD – El Paso County

Test Scores

Both a pre-test and a post-test are administered prior to and following each training. The pre-test gauges a participant’s knowledge related to ignition interlock prior to attending the course. The pre-test consists of 10 questions and is completed online via Qualtrics. The post-test gauges a participant’s knowledge related to ignition interlock after attending the course. The post-test consists of 10 questions – including 6 of the same questions on the pre-test – and is completed immediately following the training via Qualtrics. Table D2 shows the test scores for the probation officers who registered and attended the training.

Table D39. Test Scores

Pre-Test Score	Post-Test Score	Change in Knowledge (% Gain)
66.5	87.2	31.1%

Pre-Tests

The average pre-test score was a 66.5. Not all registrants who complete the pre-tests end up attending the training. However, because the pre-tests are submitted anonymously, all registrants’ pre-test scores are calculated in the pre-test average.

Table D3 shows the most frequently missed questions on the pre-test. Most participants missed questions pertaining to how the ignition interlock functions and bond conditions.

Table D40. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Pre-Test

Question	Number Missed	Percent Who Missed Question
Q2. The ignition interlock device will shut the engine off if an offender provides a breath sample	16	80.0%

Question	Number Missed	Percent Who Missed Question
Q3. When must an ignition interlock device be ordered as a condition of bond?	16	80.0%
Q5. If an offender violates an Occupational Drivers License order, the violation is a...	12	60.0%

Post-Tests

Following the completion of the training course material, a 10-question post-test is administered to determine participants' level of knowledge regarding ignition interlock devices. Each test question is worth 10 points. Participants who completed the training had an average post-test score of a 87.2 . Of note, one participant submitted a post-test without answering any questions resulting in a score of 0, thus, skewing the group average down.

Table D4 lists the most frequently missed questions on the post-test. The most frequently missed questions concerned circumvention; this question was not a pre-test question.

Table D41. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Post-Test

Question	Number Missed	Percent Who Missed Question
Q9. What is a Circumvention?	9	36.0%
Q6. What are the steps, in order, to start a vehicle equipped with an ignition interlock device?	7	28.0%
Q10. What is the average elimination rate of alcohol of an adult male?	5	20.0%

* Question was on the pre-test

Change in Knowledge

Change in knowledge is calculated to determine if there was a change in participants' knowledge after completing the course. Change in knowledge is calculated by:

$$= (\text{Post-Test Score} - \text{Pre-Test Score}) / \text{Pre-Test Score}$$

Participants experienced a 31.1% gain in knowledge.

Course Evaluations

At the end of the training, participants complete an evaluation. The evaluation includes a section to rate the training content and instructors, and to provide feedback and comments. Participants are asked to rate the items based on a five-point rating scale between “strongly disagree” and “strongly agree.” Some participants did not have both industry representatives (Dottie McDonald and Erin Garza) as instructors, so their scores may be based off fewer evaluations.

Each rating is assigned a point value -- with “strongly disagree” assigned the lowest point value of 1 and “strongly agree” assigned the highest point value of 5. An average is calculated for each evaluative component.

Course evaluations were received from 23 out of 25 probation officers who attended the training. Table D5 is the average course evaluation scores. Table D6 is the average instructor evaluation scores. Table D7 is additional comments received from probation officers.

Table D42. Course Evaluations Completed by Probation

Question	Average Score
The information provided on ignition interlock devices was applicable to my job duties.	5.0
I am likely to use the information provided today in my daily job duties.	4.9
Attending the ignition interlock training program was a good use of my time.	5.0
I felt the format of the workshop, pace of instruction and schedule were appropriate for the material presented.	4.9
I felt the topics covered, PowerPoint presentation and videos enhanced the instructors’ presentation.	5.0

Table D43. Instructor Evaluations Completed by Probation

Instructor	Average Score
Cody Stewart	4.9
Industry Representative – Dottie *	4.3
Industry Representative – Erin **	4.2

* This average score is based off 6 evaluations.

** This average score is based off 5 evaluations.

Table D44. Course Comments Completed by Probation

Comments
The blinking was very distracting. Very good presentation overall. Very informative.
Great information, especially about truths vs. myths and the process when getting the vehicle serviced.
I greatly appreciate handouts and powerpoint
Very informative. Loved the real life examples given.
Great presentation, very informative.
Great Information!
MR. STEWART WAS EXCELLENT! GOOD PRESENTATION AND INFORMATION PROVIDED. HANDOUTS WERE EXCELLENT AND WILLBE BENEFICIAL TO ME. THANK YOU ONCE AGAIN!!
Instructor is a true expertise in this field. All info is completely relevant and useful in our profession.
Presenter was very knowledgeable and was able to answer all kinds of questions and provide up to date information
Cody was the only presenter
Unsure why you have a camera so far away from you standing up. It usually easier to follow when we are able to see you sitting down and controlling the presentation with pointers/highlights etc..
You waste a lot of time going back and forth to the computer standing up. If you like standing up, you may want to place your camera pointing at you with presentation on a projector on your back.
Presentation was great, good tone, proper sound.
Recommend using zoom or MS Teams.
Good information. I thought I knew everything there was to know about the IDD. I learned a lot.
Excellent real life examples and recommendations for working with probationers.
GREAT TRAINING! INFORMATION RECEIVED WAS GREAT. ALL QUESTIONS ANSWERED AND HANDOUTS EXTREMELY HELPFUL. THANK YOU.

Probation Departments Contacted and Invited to Participate COMMUNITY SUPERVISION AND CORRECTION DEPARTMENTS – 1

- El Paso CSCD

Appendix E: Ignition Interlock Training for Criminal Justice Professionals – Pecos County Probation Officers

Location

A 2021 ignition interlock training was held virtually via Webex on May 27th, 2021, from 1:30 PM – 4:30 PM for probation officers in Pecos County. Due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, all trainings are being held virtually via live webinars for FY 21.

Training

Recruitment

The Texas A&M Transportation Institute (TTI) project team identified and invited probation officers from Pecos County to participate in the training program. Potential participants were recruited via a combination of emails and phone calls to the adult probation department in the following county:

- Pecos County

The TTI project team contacted 1 probation department. Appendix A contains a listing of all invited criminal justice professionals. Of note, the TTI project team invited probation officers to the trainings by contacting their adult community supervision department, (i.e., once contacted, the agency/department further disseminated the training information internally to staff). Conversely, the TTI project team reached out to prosecutors and judges on an individual basis to invite them to the trainings.

Registration

Participants registered online prior to the training, submitted basic contact information. Participants were also asked to complete an anonymous pre-training test. In advance of the trainings, there were 11 registrants and 10 completed pre-tests. The breakdown of registrants is shown in Table E1. Registration and pre-test completion indicates the intent to attend the training, but it does not mean the registrant showed up for the virtual training. Attendance and completion of the training is based off a returned post-test. Participants are also asked to complete an evaluation form, but these are submitted anonymously.

Table E45. Training Recruitment, Registration, Participation, and Completion

Probation	
# Recruited	1 (Department)
# Registered	11
# Pre-Tests Completed	10
# Post-Tests Completed	11
# Evaluations	12

Participation

There were 11 participants who attended the training and returned a post-test. Participating agencies and counties represented are shown below.

- Galveston CSCD – Galveston County
- Pecos CSCD – Brewster, Jeff Davis, Presidio Counties
- Permian Basin CSCD – Pecos County
- Permian Basin CSCD – Reagan County
- Permian Basin CSCD – Sutton County

Test Scores

Both a pre-test and a post-test are administered prior to and following each training. The pre-test gauges a participant’s knowledge related to ignition interlock prior to attending the course. The pre-test consists of 10 questions and is completed online via Qualtrics. The post-test gauges a participant’s knowledge related to ignition interlock after attending the course. The post-test consists of 10 questions – including 6 of the same questions on the pre-test – and is completed immediately following the training via Qualtrics. Table E2 shows the test scores for the training.

Table E46. Test Scores

Pre-Test Score	Post-Test Score	Change in Knowledge (% Gain)
75.0	92.7	23.6%

Pre-Tests

The average pre-test score was a 75.0. Not all registrants who complete the pre-tests end up attending the training. However, because the pre-tests are submitted anonymously, all registrants’ pre-test scores are calculated in the pre-test average.

Table E3 shows the most frequently missed questions on the pre-test. Over half of participants missed the question pertaining to conditions of bond.

Table E47. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Pre-Test

Question	Number Missed	Percent Who Missed Question
Q3. When must an ignition interlock device be ordered as a condition of bond?	6	60.0%

Question	Number Missed	Percent Who Missed Question
Q4. When must an ignition interlock device be ordered as a condition of probation?	4	40.0%
Q7. What is a goal of ignition interlock?	3	30.0%

Post-Tests

Following the completion of the training course material, a 10-question post-test is administered to determine participants' level of knowledge regarding ignition interlock devices. Each test question is worth 10 points. Participants who completed the training had an average post-test score of a 92.7.

Table E4 lists the most frequently missed questions on the post-test. The most frequently missed question concerned how to start a vehicle with an ignition interlock device installed; this question was not a pre-test question.

Table E48. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Post-Test

Question	Number Missed	Percent Who Missed Question
Q6. What are the steps, in order, to start a vehicle equipped with an ignition interlock device?	5	45.5%
Q10. What is the average elimination rate of alcohol of an adult male?	1	9.1%
Q2. If a breath sample with alcohol present is provided during a rolling retest, the vehicle will immediately shut off. *	1	9.1%
Q7. The ignition interlock device may detect residual mouth alcohol. *	1	9.1%

* Question was on the pre-test

Change in Knowledge

Change in knowledge is calculated to determine if there was a change in participants' knowledge after completing the course. Change in knowledge is calculated by:

$$= (\text{Post-Test Score} - \text{Pre-Test Score}) / \text{Pre-Test Score}$$

Participants experienced a 23.6% gain in knowledge.

Course Evaluations

At the end of the training, participants complete an evaluation. The evaluation includes a section to rate the training content and instructors, and to provide feedback and comments. Participants are asked to rate the items based on a five-point rating scale between “strongly disagree” and “strongly agree.” Some participants did not have both industry representatives (Dottie McDonald and Erin Garza) as instructors, so their scores may be based off fewer evaluations.

Each rating is assigned a point value -- with “strongly disagree” assigned the lowest point value of 1 and “strongly agree” assigned the highest point value of 5. An average is calculated for each evaluative component.

There were 12 course evaluations were received, although only 11 probation officers attended the training. However, because the evaluations are submitted anonymously, all scores are calculated in the course evaluation averages. Table E5 is the average course evaluation scores. Table E6 is the average instructor evaluation scores. Table E7 is additional comments received from probation officers.

Table E49. Course Evaluations Completed by Probation

Question	Average Score
The information provided on ignition interlock devices was applicable to my job duties.	5.0
I am likely to use the information provided today in my daily job duties.	5.0
Attending the ignition interlock training program was a good use of my time.	5.0
I felt the format of the workshop, pace of instruction and schedule were appropriate for the material presented.	5.0
I felt the topics covered, PowerPoint presentation and videos enhanced the instructors’ presentation.	5.0

Table E50. Instructor Evaluations Completed by Probation

Instructor	Average Score
Cody Stewart	5.0
Industry Representative – Dottie	4.8
Industry Representative – Erin *	5.0

* This average score is based off 6 evaluations.

Table E51. Course Comments Completed by Probation

Comments
Power point was awesome and the handouts were very informative.
I would love for the course to be offered in every county to probation officers. I actually found the course just doing research online trying to find resources and trainings available to probation officers to better understand interlocks. I don't believe probation agencies know about the training that's available to us through your program and it is a shame because you guys answered all the questions new probation officers have starting out. Plus you even provided information that seasoned probation officers do not know. If the goal is to get the training program in every county please contact CJAD to spread the word and make the training a part of our curriculum.
Great workshop. Even better since it was a webinar. Both of the instructors did an amazing job. Great refresher course, i tend to forget a few interlock things and this always helps. I also learned a few things. Glad to hear Dotties voice, Brewster County misses you Miss Dottie. Thank you.
Great vibes. Keep me engaged.
I liked the instructors, they did not read the power point and were knowledgably about what they were teaching. Great vocal variety.
Instructors were easy to understand and kept the training moving. Great information.

Probation Departments Contacted and Invited to Participate

COMMUNITY SUPERVISION AND CORRECTION DEPARTMENTS – 1

- Pecos County CSCD

Appendix F: Ignition Interlock Training for Criminal Justice Professionals – Kaufman County Probation Officers

Location

A 2021 ignition interlock training was held virtually via Webex on May 28th, 2021, from 9:00 AM – 12:00 PM for probation officers in Kaufman County. Due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, all trainings are being held virtually via live webinars for FY 21.

Training

Recruitment

The Texas A&M Transportation Institute (TTI) project team identified and invited probation officers from Kaufman County to participate in the training program. Potential participants were recruited via a combination of emails and phone calls to the adult probation department in the following county:

- Kaufman County

The TTI project team contacted 1 probation department. Appendix A contains a listing of all invited criminal justice professionals. Of note, the TTI project team invited law enforcement and probation officers to the trainings by contacting their adult community supervision department, (i.e., once contacted, the agency/department further disseminated the training information internally to staff). Conversely, the TTI project team reached out to prosecutors and judges on an individual basis to invite them to the trainings.

Registration

Participants registered online prior to the training, submitted basic contact information. Participants were also asked to complete an anonymous pre-training test. In advance of the trainings, there were 18 registrants and 20 completed pre-tests. The breakdown of registrants is shown in Table F1. Registration and pre-test completion indicates the intent to attend the training, but it does not mean the registrant showed up for the virtual training. Attendance and completion of the training is based off a returned post-test. Participants are also asked to complete an evaluation form, but these are submitted anonymously.

Table F52. Training Recruitment, Registration, Participation, and Completion

Probation*	
# Recruited	1 (Department)
# Registered	18
# Pre-Tests Completed	20
# Post-Tests Completed	16
# Evaluations	16

Participation

There were 16 participants who attended the training. Participating agencies and counties represented are shown below.

- Kaufman CSCD – Kaufman County

Test Scores

Both a pre-test and a post-test are administered prior to and following each training. The pre-test gauges a participant’s knowledge related to ignition interlock prior to attending the course. The pre-test consists of 10 questions and is completed online via Qualtrics. The post-test gauges a participant’s knowledge related to ignition interlock after attending the course. The post-test consists of 10 questions – including 6 of the same questions on the pre-test – and is completed immediately following the training via Qualtrics. Table F2 shows the test scores for the training.

Table F53. Test Scores

Pre-Test Score	Post-Test Score	Change in Knowledge (% Gain)
78.3	86.9	11.0%

Pre-Tests

The average pre-test score was a 78.3. Not all registrants who complete the pre-tests end up attending the training. However, because the pre-tests are submitted anonymously, all registrants’ pre-test scores are calculated in the pre-test average.

Table F3 shows the most frequently missed questions on the pre-test. Nearly half of participants missed questions pertaining to how an ignition interlock device will function when alcohol is detected, and conditions of bond.

Table F54. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Pre-Test

Question	Number Missed	Percent Who Missed Question
Q2. The ignition interlock device will shut the engine off if an offender provides a breath sample with alcohol present.	9	45.0%
Q3. When must an ignition interlock device be ordered as a condition of bond?	9	45.0%

Question	Number Missed	Percent Who Missed Question
Q4. When must an ignition interlock device be ordered as a condition of probation?	6	30.0%

Post-Tests

Following the completion of the training course material, a 10-question post-test is administered to determine participants' level of knowledge regarding ignition interlock devices. Each test question is worth 10 points. Participants who completed the training had an average post-test score of a 86.9.

Table F4 lists the most frequently missed questions on the post-test. The most frequently missed question concerned alcohol elimination rates; this question was not a pre-test question.

Table F55. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Post-Test

Question	Number Missed	Percent Who Missed Question
Q10. What is the average elimination rate of alcohol of an adult male?	7	43.8%
Q6. What are the steps, in order, to start a vehicle equipped with an ignition interlock device?	5	31.3%
Q3. When must an ignition interlock device be ordered as a condition of bond?*	3	18.8%

* Question was on the pre-test

Change in Knowledge

Change in knowledge is calculated to determine if there was a change in participants' knowledge after completing the course. Change in knowledge is calculated by:

$$= (\text{Post-Test Score} - \text{Pre-Test Score}) / \text{Pre-Test Score}$$

Participants experienced an 11.0% gain in knowledge.

Course Evaluations

At the end of the training, participants complete an evaluation. The evaluation includes a section to rate the training content and instructors, and to provide feedback and comments. Participants are asked to rate the items based on a five-point rating scale between "strongly disagree" and "strongly agree." Some participants did not have both industry representatives (Dottie McDonald and Erin Garza) as instructors, so their scores may be based off fewer evaluations.

Each rating is assigned a point value -- with “strongly disagree” assigned the lowest point value of 1 and “strongly agree” assigned the highest point value of 5. An average is calculated for each evaluative component.

Course evaluations were received from all 16 participants. Table F5 is the average course evaluation scores. Table F6 is the average instructor evaluation scores. Table F7 is additional comments received from probation officers.

Table F56. Course Evaluations Completed by Probation

Question	Average Score
The information provided on ignition interlock devices was applicable to my job duties.	4.9
I am likely to use the information provided today in my daily job duties.	4.8
Attending the ignition interlock training program was a good use of my time.	4.9
I felt the format of the workshop, pace of instruction and schedule were appropriate for the material presented.	4.9
I felt the topics covered, PowerPoint presentation and videos enhanced the instructors’ presentation.	4.9

Table F57. Instructor Evaluations Completed by Probation

Instructor	Average Score
Cody Stewart	4.8
Industry Representative – Dottie	4.8
Industry Representative – Erin *	4.8

* This average score is based off 5 evaluations.

Table F58. Course Comments Completed by Probation

Comments
The instructors provided all the information that was listed and provided examples in order to understand topics.
It was a great training with useful information.
The class was very informative and this information will come in handy for me.

Probation Departments Contacted and Invited to Participate
COMMUNITY SUPERVISION AND CORRECTION DEPARTMENTS – 1

- Kaufman County CSCD

Appendix G: Ignition Interlock Training for Criminal Justice Professionals – Panhandle Probation Officers

Location

A 2021 ignition interlock training was held virtually via Webex on August 5th, 2021, from 9:00 AM – 12:00 PM for probation officers in the Panhandle. Due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, all trainings are being held virtually via live webinars for FY 21.

Training

Recruitment

The Texas A&M Transportation Institute (TTI) project team identified and invited probation officers from the Panhandle to participate in the training program. Potential participants were recruited via mailed letters and a combination of emails and/or phone calls to departments that serve the following counties:

- **Childress**
- Carson
- Collingsworth
- Donley
- Hall
- **Deaf Smith**
- Oldham
- **Gray**
- **Moore**
- Dallam
- Hartley
- Sherman
- **Potter**
- Armstrong
- Randall
- **Wheeler**
- Hemphill
- Lipscomb
- Roberts
- **Floyd**
- Briscoe
- Dickens
- Motley
- **Hale**
- Castro
- Swisher
- **Bailey**
- Parmer

The TTI project team contacted 9 probation department, which are bolded above. Of note, the TTI project team invited probation to the trainings by contacting their adult supervision departments, (i.e., once each was contacted, the agency/department further disseminated the training information internally to staff). Conversely, the TTI project team reached out to prosecutors and judges on an individual basis to invite them to the trainings.

Registration

Participants registered online prior to the training, submitting basic contact information. Participants were also asked to complete an anonymous pre-training test. In advance of the trainings, there were 3 registrants and 3 completed pre-tests. The breakdown of registrants is shown in Table G1. Registration and pre-test completion indicates the intent to attend the training, but it does not mean the registrant showed up for the virtual training. Participants are also asked to complete an evaluation form, but these are submitted anonymously.

Table G59. Training Recruitment, Registration, Participation, and Completion

	Probation*
# Recruited	1 (Department)
# Registered	3
# Pre-Tests Completed	3
# Attended	3
# Post-Tests Completed	3
# Evaluations	3

Participation

There were 3 participants who attended the training. The participating agency and counties represented are shown below.

- Potter CSCD – Potter, Randall, & Armstrong Counties

Test Scores

Both a pre-test and a post-test are administered prior to and following each training. The pre-test gauges a participant’s knowledge related to ignition interlock prior to attending the course. The pre-test consists of 10 questions and is completed online via Qualtrics. The post-test gauges a participant’s knowledge related to ignition interlock after attending the course. The post-test consists of 10 questions – including 6 of the same questions on the pre-test – and is completed immediately following the training via Qualtrics. Table G2 shows the test scores for the training.

Table G60. Test Scores

Pre-Test Score	Post-Test Score	Change in Knowledge (% Gain)
60.0	73.3	22.2%

Pre-Tests

The average pre-test score was a 60.0.

Table G3 shows the most frequently missed questions on the pre-test. All the participants missed the questions pertaining to conditions of bond, and the type of violation when an offender violates an occupational driver license order.

Table G61. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Pre-Test

Question	Number Missed	Percent Who Missed Question
Q3. When must an ignition interlock device be ordered as a condition of bond?	3	100.0%
Q5. If an offender violates an Occupational Drivers License order, the violation is a...	3	100.0%
Q2. The ignition interlock device will shut the engine off if an offender provides a breath sample with alcohol present.	2	66.7%

Post-Tests

Following the completion of the training course material, a 10-question post-test is administered to determine participants' level of knowledge regarding ignition interlock devices. Each test question is worth 10 points. Participants who completed the training had an average post-test score of a 73.3.

Table G4 lists the most frequently missed questions on the post-test.

Table G62. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Post-Test

Question	Number Missed	Percent Who Missed Question
Q2. If a breath sample with alcohol present is provided during a rolling retest, the vehicle will immediately shut off. *	2	66.7%
Q6. What are the steps, in order, to start a vehicle equipped with an ignition interlock device?	2	66.7%
Q10. What is the average elimination rate of alcohol of an adult male?	2	66.7%

* Question was on the pre-test

Change in Knowledge

Change in knowledge is calculated to determine if there was a change in participants' knowledge after completing the course. Change in knowledge is calculated by:

$$= (\text{Post-Test Score} - \text{Pre-Test Score}) / \text{Pre-Test Score}$$

Participants experienced a 22.2% gain in knowledge.

Course Evaluations

At the end of the training, participants complete an evaluation. The evaluation includes a section to rate the training content and instructors, and to provide feedback and comments. Participants are asked to rate the items based on a five-point rating scale between "strongly disagree" and "strongly agree."

Each rating is assigned a point value -- with "strongly disagree" assigned the lowest point value of 1 and "strongly agree" assigned the highest point value of 5. An average is calculated for each evaluative component.

Course evaluations were received from all 3 of the probation officers who attended the training. Table G5 is the average course evaluation scores. Table G6 is the average instructor evaluation scores. Table G7 is additional comments received from probation officers.

Table G63. Course Evaluations Completed by Probation

Question	Average Score
The information provided on ignition interlock devices was applicable to my job duties.	5.0
I am likely to use the information provided today in my daily job duties.	5.0
Attending the ignition interlock training program was a good use of my time.	5.0

Question	Average Score
I felt the format of the workshop, pace of instruction and schedule were appropriate for the material presented.	5.0
I felt the topics covered, PowerPoint presentation and videos enhanced the instructors' presentation.	5.0

Table G64. Instructor Evaluations Completed by Probation

Instructor	Average Score
Cody Stewart	4.7
Industry Representative – Dottie	N/A
Industry Representative – Erin	N/A

Table G65. Course Comments Completed by Probation

Comments
The ignition interlock training was presented very well and the material was very informative. I feel that I learned a lot of useful knowledge from this presentation.

Probation Departments Contacted and Invited to Participate

COMMUNITY SUPERVISION AND CORRECTION DEPARTMENTS – 9

- Bailey CSCD
- Childress CSCD
- Deaf Smith CSCD
- Floyd CSCD
- Gray CSCD
- Hale CSCD
- Moore CSCD
- Potter CSCD
- Wheeler CSCD

Appendix H: Ignition Interlock Training for Criminal Justice Professionals – Panhandle Probation Officers

Location

A 2021 ignition interlock training was held virtually via Webex on August 24th, 2021, from 9:00 AM – 12:00 PM for probation officers in the Panhandle. Due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, all trainings are being held virtually via live webinars for FY 21.

Training

Recruitment

The Texas A&M Transportation Institute (TTI) project team identified and invited probation officers from the Panhandle to participate in the training program. Potential participants were recruited via a combination of emails and phone calls to adult probation departments that serve the following counties:

- | | |
|----------------------|--------------------|
| 1. Childress | 14. Armstrong |
| 2. Carson | 15. Randall |
| 3. Collingsworth | 16. Wheeler |
| 4. Donley | 17. Hemphill |
| 5. Hall | 18. Lipscomb |
| 6. Deaf Smith | 19. Roberts |
| 7. Oldham | 20. Floyd |
| 8. Gray | 21. Briscoe |
| 9. Moore | 22. Dickens |
| 10. Dallam | 23. Motley |
| 11. Hartley | 24. Hale |
| 12. Sherman | 25. Castro |
| 13. Potter | 26. Swisher |
| 27. Bailey | |
| 28. Parmer | |

The TTI project team contacted 9 probation departments, which are bolded above. Of note, the TTI project team invited probation officers to the trainings by contacting their adult community supervision department, (i.e., once each was contacted, the agency/department further disseminated the training information internally to staff). Conversely, the TTI project team reached out to prosecutors and judges on an individual basis to invite them to the trainings.

Registration

Participants registered online prior to the training, submitting basic contact information. Participants were also asked to complete an anonymous pre-training test. In advance of the trainings, there were 18

registrants and 18 completed pre-tests. The breakdown of registrants is shown in Table H1. Registration and pre-test completion indicates the intent to attend the training, but it does not mean the registrant showed up for the virtual training. Participants are also asked to complete an evaluation form, but these are submitted anonymously.

Table H66. Training Recruitment, Registration, Participation, and Completion

	Probation*
# Recruited	1 (Department)
# Registered	18
# Pre-Tests Completed	18
# Attended	12
# Post-Tests Completed	12
# Evaluations	12

Participation

There were 12 participants who attended the training. Participating agencies and counties represented are shown below.

- Deaf Smith CSCD – Deaf Smith County
- Orange CSCD – Orange County
- Parmer CSCD – Parmer County
- Potter CSCD – Potter County
- Upshur CSCD – Upshur County

Test Scores

Both a pre-test and a post-test are administered prior to and following each training. The pre-test gauges a participant’s knowledge related to ignition interlock prior to attending the course. The pre-test consists of 10 questions and is completed online via Qualtrics. The post-test gauges a participant’s knowledge related to ignition interlock after attending the course. The post-test consists of 10 questions – including 6 of the same questions on the pre-test – and is completed immediately following the training via Qualtrics. Table H2 shows the test scores for the training.

Table H67. Test Scores

Pre-Test Score	Post-Test Score	Change in Knowledge (% Gain)
72.8	85.8	17.9%

Pre-Tests

The average pre-test score was a 72.8. Not all registrants who complete the pre-tests end up attending the training. However, because the pre-tests are submitted anonymously, all registrants' pre-test scores are calculated in the pre-test average.

Table H3 shows the most frequently missed questions on the pre-test. The most frequently missed question concerned how an ignition interlock device works when alcohol is detected.

Table H68. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Pre-Test

Question	Number Missed	Percent Who Missed Question
Q2. The ignition interlock device will shut the engine off if an offender provides a breath sample with alcohol present.	11	61.1%
Q3. When must an ignition interlock device be ordered as a condition of bond?	10	55.6%
Q7. What is a goal of ignition interlock?	10	55.6%

Post-Tests

Following the completion of the training course material, a 10-question post-test is administered to determine participants' level of knowledge regarding ignition interlock devices. Each test question is worth 10 points. Participants who completed the training had an average post-test score of a 85.8.

Table H4 lists the most frequently missed questions on the post-test. The most missed question concerned how to start a vehicle with an ignition interlock device installed; this was not a pre-test question.

Table H69. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Post-Test

Question	Number Missed	Percent Who Missed Question
Q6. What are the steps, in order, to start a vehicle equipped with an ignition interlock device?	6	50.0%
Q3. When must an ignition interlock device be ordered as a condition of bond?*	3	25.0%
Q9. What is a Circumvention?	3	25.0%
Q10. What is the average elimination rate of alcohol of an adult male?	3	25.0%

* Question was on the pre-test

Change in Knowledge

Change in knowledge is calculated to determine if there was a change in participants' knowledge after completing the course. Change in knowledge is calculated by:

$$= (\text{Post-Test Score} - \text{Pre-Test Score}) / \text{Pre-Test Score}$$

Participants experienced a 17.9% gain in knowledge.

Course Evaluations

At the end of the training, participants complete an evaluation. The evaluation includes a section to rate the training content and instructors, and to provide feedback and comments. Participants are asked to rate the items based on a five-point rating scale between "strongly disagree" and "strongly agree." Some participants did not have both industry representatives (Dottie McDonald and Erin Garza) as instructors, so their scores may be based off fewer evaluations.

Each rating is assigned a point value -- with "strongly disagree" assigned the lowest point value of 1 and "strongly agree" assigned the highest point value of 5. An average is calculated for each evaluative component.

Course evaluations were received from all 12 of the probation officers who attended the training. Table H5 is the average course evaluation scores. Table H6 is the average instructor evaluation scores. Table H7 is additional comments received from probation officers.

Table H70. Course Evaluations Completed by Probation

Question	Average Score
The information provided on ignition interlock devices was applicable to my job duties.	5.0

Question	Average Score
I am likely to use the information provided today in my daily job duties.	5.0
Attending the ignition interlock training program was a good use of my time.	5.0
I felt the format of the workshop, pace of instruction and schedule were appropriate for the material presented.	4.9
I felt the topics covered, PowerPoint presentation and videos enhanced the instructors' presentation.	5.0

Table H71. Instructor Evaluations Completed by Probation

Instructor	Average Score
Cody Stewart	4.8
Industry Representative – Dottie	N/A
Industry Representative – Erin	4.9

Table H72. Course Comments Completed by Probation

Comments
Great training! I learned several different things that I didn't previously know.
This training answered several of my questions and thank you for your hard work in helping many w/ becoming more knowledgeable w/ the ignition interlock device. It is truly a life saving device.
Very good information!
I enjoyed to course, very well taught.
Learned a lot. Thank You!
They were both great!
You were both very knowledgeable w/ the material and thank you for keeping it interesting. We appreciate you both.
Good information provided by the instructors, seemed knowledgeable on the topic covered.
Very knowledgeable, very easy to listen and interactive.
Erin was very knowledgeable.
The IID is an effective device!

Comments

This was very valuable information that is applicable to our job duties. I'm glad to have attended this training. Thank you.

Good webinar training, good information, this topic is very much needed to be covered more in the trainings due to IID's being more popular within the court system.

enjoyed!

Good training. Especially liked the myths and how the interlocks are used for our probationers. I liked how it was shown how to read the reports. overall great training!

Probation Departments Contacted and Invited to Participate

COMMUNITY SUPERVISION AND CORRECTION DEPARTMENTS – 9

- Bailey CSCD
- Childress CSCD
- Deaf Smith CSCD
- Floyd CSCD
- Gray CSCD
- Hale CSCD
- Moore CSCD
- Potter CSCD
- Wheeler CSCD

Appendix I: Ignition Interlock Training for Criminal Justice Professionals – Uvalde County Prosecutors

Location

A 2021 ignition interlock training was held virtually via Webex on July 7th, 2021, from 1:30 PM – 4:50 PM for prosecutors in Uvalde and surrounding counties. Due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, all trainings are being held virtually via live webinars for FY 21.

Training

Recruitment

The Texas A&M Transportation Institute (TTI) project team identified and invited prosecutors from Uvalde and surrounding counties to participate in the training program. Potential participants were recruited via emails sent to prosecutors in the following 11 counties:

- Bandera
- Edwards
- Frio
- Kerr
- Kinney
- Maverick
- Medina
- Real
- Uvalde
- Val Verde
- Zavala

The TTI project team contacted 59 criminal justice professionals from 19 prosecutor offices. Of note, the TTI project team invited probation officers to the trainings by their department, (i.e., once each was contacted, the department further disseminated the training information internally to staff). Conversely, the TTI project team reached out to prosecutors and judges on an individual basis to invite them to the trainings.

Registration

Participants registered online prior to the training, submitting basic contact information. Participants were also asked to complete an anonymous pre-training test. In advance of the trainings, there were 21 registrants and 20 completed pre-tests. The breakdown of participants is shown Table I1. Registration and pre-test completion indicates the intent to attend the training, but it does not mean the registrant showed up for the virtual training. Participants are also asked to complete an evaluation form, and these are submitted anonymously.

Table 173. Training Recruitment, Registration, Participation, and Completion

	Prosecutors
# Recruited	59 (19 offices)
# Registered	21
# Pre-Tests Completed	20
# Attended	12
# Post-Tests Completed	12
# Evaluations	15

Participation

There were 12 participants who attended the training. Participating offices and counties represented are shown below.

- Dallas County District Attorney’s Office– Dallas County
- 216th Judicial District Attorney’s Office – Kerr County
- Kerr County Attorney’s Office – Kerr County
- Maverick County Attorney’s Office – Maverick County
- 38th Judicial District Attorney’s Office – Uvalde & Real Counties
- 63rd Judicial District Attorney’s Office – Val Verde, Kinney, & Terrell Counties
- Val Verde County Attorney’s Office – Val Verde County
- 81st Judicial District Attorney’s Office – Wilson, Atascosa, Karnes, Frio, & LaSalle Counties

Test Scores

Both a pre-test and a post-test are administered prior to and following each training. The pre-test gauges a participant’s knowledge related to ignition interlock prior to attending the course. The pre-test consists of 10 questions and is completed online via Qualtrics. The post-test gauges a participant’s knowledge related to ignition interlock after attending the course. The post-test consists of 10 questions – including 6 of the same questions on the pre-test – and is completed immediately following the training via Qualtrics. Table 12 shows the test scores for the training.

Table 174. Test Scores

Pre-Test Score	Post-Test Score	Change in Knowledge (% Gain)
72.0	86.7	20.4%

Pre-Tests

The average pre-test score was a 72.0. Not all registrants who complete the pre-tests end up attending the training. However, because the pre-tests are submitted anonymously, all registrants' pre-test scores are calculated in the pre-test average.

Table I3 shows the most frequently missed questions on the pre-test. Most participants missed the question pertaining to how the ignition interlock device works when alcohol is detected.

Table I75. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Pre-Test

Question	Number Missed	Percent Who Missed Question
Q2. The ignition interlock device will shut the engine off if an offender provides a breath sample with alcohol present.	17	85.0%
Q5. If an offender violates an Occupational Drivers License order, the violation is a...	10	50.0%
Q6. What causes an ignition interlock device violation?	7	35.0%

Post-Tests

Following the completion of the training course material, a 10-question post-test is administered to determine participants' level of knowledge regarding ignition interlock devices. Each test question is worth 10 points. Participants who completed the training had an average post-test score of an 86.7.

Table I4 lists the most frequently missed questions on the post-test. The most frequently missed question concerned how to start a vehicle with an ignition interlock device installed; this question was not a pre-test question.

Table I76. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Post-Test

Question	Number Missed	Percent Who Missed Question
Q6. What are the steps, in order, to start a vehicle equipped with an ignition interlock device?	5	41.7%
Q10. What is the average elimination rate of alcohol of an adult male?	3	25.0%
Q3. When must an ignition interlock device be ordered as a condition of bond? *	3	25.0%

* Question was on the pre-test

Change in Knowledge

Change in knowledge is calculated to determine if there was a change in participants' knowledge after completing the course. Change in knowledge is calculated by:

$$= (\text{Post-Test Score} - \text{Pre-Test Score}) / \text{Pre-Test Score}$$

Participants experienced a 20.4% gain in knowledge.

Course Evaluations

At the end of the training, participants complete an evaluation. The evaluation includes a section to rate the training content and instructors, and to provide feedback and comments. Participants are asked to rate the items based on a five-point rating scale between "strongly disagree" and "strongly agree." Some participants did not have both industry representatives (Dottie McDonald and Erin Garza) as instructors, so their scores may be based off fewer evaluations.

Each rating is assigned a point value -- with "strongly disagree" assigned the lowest point value of 1 and "strongly agree" assigned the highest point value of 5. An average is calculated for each evaluative component.

There were 15 course evaluations received. Table I5 is the average course evaluation scores. Table I6 is the average instructor evaluation scores. Table I7 is additional comments received.

Table I77. Course Evaluations Completed by Prosecutors

Question	Average Score
The information provided on ignition interlock devices was applicable to my job duties.	4.9
I am likely to use the information provided today in my daily job duties.	4.9
Attending the ignition interlock training program was a good use of my time.	4.9
I felt the format of the workshop, pace of instruction and schedule were appropriate for the material presented.	4.9
I felt the topics covered, PowerPoint presentation and videos enhanced the instructors' presentation.	4.8

Table I78. Instructor Evaluations Completed by Prosecutors

Instructor	Average Score
Cody Stewart	4.8
Industry Representative – Dottie *	4.7
Industry Representative – Erin **	4.6

* This average score is based off 12 evaluations.

** This average score is based off 11 evaluations

Table 179. Course Comments Completed by Prosecutors

Comments
This was a very useful and informative course.
Only critique is the installation video of the IID was not an actual installation video, but rather where to get it installed, how long it would take, and what to do in that time.
Thank you for the information.
It is good information.
The workshop was great! All of the information provided was relevant to what we do and explained very well. Thank you!

Prosecutor's Offices Contacted and Invited to Participate

PROSECUTORS – 59

Bandera County CA – 2

- County Attorney – 1
- Legal Assistant – 1

Edwards County CA – 1

- County Attorney – 1

Edwards County DA – 1

- 452nd Judicial District Attorney – 1

Frio County CA – 2

- County Attorney – 1
- County Attorney's Investigator – 1

Frio County DA – 1

- 81st District Attorney – 1

Kerr County DA – 12

- 198th Asst. District Attorney – 1
- 198th District Attorney – 1
- 216th Asst. District Attorney – 2
- 216th District Attorney – 1
- District Attorney's Investigator – 2

- Legal Assistant – 5

Kerr County CA – 6

- Asst. County Attorney – 3
- County Attorney – 1
- County Attorney's Office – 2

Kinney County CA – 1

- County Attorney – 1

Maverick County CA – 1

- County Attorney – 1

Maverick County DA – 7

- Asst. District Attorney – 2
- District Attorney's Investigator – 5

Medina County DA – 2

- 38th Judicial District Attorney – 2

Medina County CDA – 7

- Asst. Criminal District Attorney – 4
- Criminal District Attorney's Investigator – 3

Real County CADA – 1

- District & County Clerk – 1

Uvalde County CA – 3

- County Attorney – 1
- County Attorney’s Investigator – 1
- County Attorney’s Key Personnel – 1

Uvalde County DA – 5

- Asst. District Attorney – 1
- District Attorney's VAC – 1
- Investigator – 2
- Office Manager – 1

Val Verde County CA – 4

- Asst. County Attorney – 1
- County Attorney – 1
- County Attorney’s Key Personnel – 2

Val Verde County DA – 1

- 63rd Judicial District Attorney – 1
- Asst. District Attorney – 2
- Investigator – 2
- Legal Secretary – 3

Zavala County CA – 1

- County Attorney – 1

Zavala County DA – 1

- 293rd District Attorney – 1

Appendix J: Ignition Interlock Training for Criminal Justice Professionals – Kaufman County Prosecutors

Location

A 2021 ignition interlock training was held virtually via Webex on July 8th, 2021, from 8:30 AM – 11:50 AM for prosecutors in Kaufman and surrounding counties. Due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, all trainings are being held virtually via live webinars for FY 21.

Training

Recruitment

The Texas A&M Transportation Institute (TTI) project team identified and invited prosecutors from Kaufman and surrounding counties to participate in the training program. Potential participants were recruited via emails sent to prosecutors in the following 9 counties:

- Dallas
- Ellis
- Henderson
- Hunt
- Kaufman
- Navarro
- Rains
- Rockwall
- Van Zandt

The TTI project team contacted 624 criminal justice professionals from 12 prosecutor offices. Of note, the TTI project team invited probation officers to the trainings by their department, (i.e., once each was contacted, the department further disseminated the training information internally to staff). Conversely, the TTI project team reached out to prosecutors and judges on an individual basis to invite them to the trainings.

Registration

Participants registered online prior to the training, submitting basic contact information. Participants were also asked to complete an anonymous pre-training test. In advance of the trainings, there were 50 registrants and 46 completed pre-tests. The breakdown of participants is shown Table J1. Registration and pre-test completion indicates the intent to attend the training, but it does not mean the registrant showed up for the virtual training. Participants are also asked to complete an evaluation form, and these are submitted anonymously.

Table J80. Training Recruitment, Registration, Participation, and Completion

Prosecutors	
# Recruited	624 (12 offices)

Prosecutors	
# Registered	50
# Pre-Tests Completed	46
# Attended	29
# Post-Tests Completed	29
# Evaluations	30

Participation

There were 29 participants who attended the training. Participating offices and counties represented are shown below.

- Dallas County CDA – Dallas County
- Ellis County CADA – Ellis County
- Henderson County CA – Henderson County
- Kaufman County CDA – Kaufman County
- Navarro County CDA – Navarro County
- Rockwall County CDA – Rockwall County
- 81st District Attorney’s Office – Wilson County

Test Scores

Both a pre-test and a post-test are administered prior to and following each training. The pre-test gauges a participant’s knowledge related to ignition interlock prior to attending the course. The pre-test consists of 10 questions and is completed online via Qualtrics. The post-test gauges a participant’s knowledge related to ignition interlock after attending the course. The post-test consists of 10 questions – including 6 of the same questions on the pre-test – and is completed immediately following the training via Qualtrics. Table J2 shows the test scores for the training.

Table J81. Test Scores

Pre-Test Score	Post-Test Score	Change in Knowledge (% Gain)
72.4	91.4	34.5%

Pre-Tests

The average pre-test score was a 72.4. Not all registrants who complete the pre-tests end up attending the training. However, because the pre-tests are submitted anonymously, all registrants' pre-test scores are calculated in the pre-test average.

Table J3 shows the most frequently missed questions on the pre-test. Over half of participants missed the question pertaining to how the ignition interlock device works when alcohol is detected.

Table J82. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Pre-Test

Question	Number Missed	Percent Who Missed Question
Q2. The ignition interlock device will shut the engine off if an offender provides a breath sample with alcohol present.	28	60.9%
Q5. If an offender violates an Occupational Driver License order, the violation is a...	26	56.5%
Q3. When must an ignition interlock device be ordered as a condition of bond?	19	41.3%
Q7. What is a goal of ignition interlock?	19	41.3%

Post-Tests

Following the completion of the training course material, a 10-question post-test is administered to determine participants' level of knowledge regarding ignition interlock devices. Each test question is worth 10 points. Participants who completed the training had an average post-test score of a 91.4.

Table J4 lists the most frequently missed questions on the post-test. The most frequently missed question concerned how to start a vehicle with an ignition interlock device installed; this question was not a pre-test question.

Table J83. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Post-Test

Question	Number Missed	Percent Who Missed Question
Q6. What are the steps, in order, to start a vehicle equipped with an ignition interlock device?	6	20.7%

Question	Number Missed	Percent Who Missed Question
Q10. What is the average elimination rate of alcohol of an adult male?	5	17.2%
Q2. If a breath sample with alcohol present is provided during a rolling retest, the vehicle will immediately shut off. *	4	13.8%

* Question was on the pre-test

Change in Knowledge

Change in knowledge is calculated to determine if there was a change in participants' knowledge after completing the course. Change in knowledge is calculated by:

$$= (\text{Post-Test Score} - \text{Pre-Test Score}) / \text{Pre-Test Score}$$

Participants experienced a 34.5% gain in knowledge.

Course Evaluations

At the end of the training, participants complete an evaluation. The evaluation includes a section to rate the training content and instructors, and to provide feedback and comments. Participants are asked to rate the items based on a five-point rating scale between "strongly disagree" and "strongly agree." Some participants did not have both industry representatives (Dottie McDonald and Erin Garza) as instructors, so their scores may be based off fewer evaluations.

Each rating is assigned a point value -- with "strongly disagree" assigned the lowest point value of 1 and "strongly agree" assigned the highest point value of 5. An average is calculated for each evaluative component.

There were 30 course evaluations received. Table J5 is the average course evaluation scores. Table J6 is the average instructor evaluation scores. Table J7 is additional comments received.

Table J84. Course Evaluations Completed by Prosecutors

Question	Average Score
The information provided on ignition interlock devices was applicable to my job duties.	4.7
I am likely to use the information provided today in my daily job duties.	4.7
Attending the ignition interlock training program was a good use of my time.	4.8
I felt the format of the workshop, pace of instruction and schedule were appropriate for the material presented.	4.7
I felt the topics covered, PowerPoint presentation and videos enhanced the instructors' presentation.	4.8

Table J85. Instructor Evaluations Completed by Prosecutors

Instructor	Average Score
Cody Stewart	4.8
Industry Representative – Dottie *	4.8
Industry Representative – Erin **	4.8

* This average score is based off 18 evaluations.

** This average score is based off 24 evaluations

Table J86. Course Comments Completed by Prosecutors

Comments
Cody needs to slow down a little when speaking. He talks really fast.
Great content and well explained.
The questions/answers in the chat were a nice touch.
The part about how drinking works was odd. I thought that information was universal knowledge among people who have been to a college orientation. I guess not though, so it's worth keeping. It's the part I would cut if you were ever trying to make it shorter.
Very interesting information
Enjoyed the presentation; I would like for the time to maybe be different.
This was so helpful, many thanks to all the presenters!
If there's any way to condense the information, it would be amazing to have this in a 2 hour training instead of the full morning block.
A lot of helpful information presented! It was nice to actually have someone from Smart Start go through an example report.
I was unaware of a lot of this and appreciate the time and effort put into educating us on this simple but effective part of prosecution
Great job!
The only recommendation I have is to possibly make the training shorter, but there wasn't anything presented that wasn't useful so shortening it would be hard. Thank you!
Great training

Prosecutor's Offices Contacted and Invited to Participate

PROSECUTORS – 624

Dallas County CDA – 433

- Appellate Attorney – 1
- Asst. Criminal District – 268
- Caseworker – 6
- Child Abuse Liaison – 1
- Claims Evaluator – 1
- Clerk 1 – 4
- Criminal District Attorney – 1
- Crim. District Attorney's Investigator – 66
- Crim. District Attorney's Office – 70
- Crim. District Attorney's Office – 2
- Crim. District Attorney's VAC – 3
- Juvenile Victim Witness Coordinator – 1
- Legal Assistant – 1
- Legal Secretary – 2
- Misdemeanor Division Chief – 1
- Misdemeanor Prosecutor -1
- Program Clinician I – 1
- Public Information Officer – 1
- Sgt. Investigator – 2

Ellis County CADA – 29

- Asst. County & District Attorney – 18
- Civil Chief – 1
- Clerk – 3
- County & District Attorney – 1
- County & District Attorney's Investigator – 5
- Office Manager – 1

Henderson County CA – 10

- Asst. County Attorney – 4
- County Attorney – 1
- County Attorney's Investigator – 1
- County Attorney's Office – 2

- County Attorney's VAC -1
- Court Coordinator I – 1

Henderson County DA – 13

- 173rd Judicial District Attorney – 1
- Asst. District Attorney – 6
- Administrative Asst. – 2
- District Attorney's Investigator – 2
- District Attorney's VAC – 1
- Office Manager – 1

Hunt County CA – 14

- Asst. County Attorney – 7
- County Attorney – 1
- County Attorney's Investigator – 2
- County Attorney's Office – 2
- Legal Assistant – 2

Hunt County DA – 12

- 196th Judicial District Attorney – 1
- Asst. District Attorney – 5
- District Attorney's Investigator – 2
- District Attorney's Office – 3
- District Attorney's VAC – 1

Hunt Municipal Court – 1

- Prosecutor – 1

Kaufman County CDA – 41

- Appellate Chief – 1
- Asst. Criminal District Attorney – 17
- Criminal District Attorney – 1
- Crim. District Attorney's Investigator – 7
- Crim. District Attorney's Office – 8
- Crim. District Attorney's VAC – 1
- Paralegal – 6

Navarro County CDA – 15

- Asst. Criminal Attorney – 7
- Criminal District Attorney – 1
- Criminal District Attorney’s Investigator – 2
- Criminal District Attorney’s VAC – 1
- Office Manager – 1
- Paralegal – 3

Rains County CADA – 5

- Asst. County & District Attorney – 1
- County & District Attorney – 1
- County & District Attorney’s Investigator – 1
- County & District Attorney’s VAC – 1
- Legal Assistant – 1

Rockwall County CDA – 39

- Asst. Criminal District Attorney – 19
- Clerk – 5
- Crim. District Attorney – 1
- Crim. District Attorney’s Investigator – 7
- Crim. District Attorney’s Office – 4
- Crim. District Attorney’s VAC – 2
- Misdemeanor Chief – 1

Van Zandt County CDA – 12

- Asst. Criminal District Attorney – 5
- Clerk – 2
- Criminal District Attorney – 1
- Criminal District Attorney’s Investigator – 1
- Criminal District Attorney’s VAC – 1
- Legal Assistant – 2

Appendix K: Ignition Interlock Training for Criminal Justice Professionals – Cross Timbers Region Prosecutors

Location

A 2021 ignition interlock training was held virtually via Webex on August 5th, 2021, from 1:30 PM – 4:50 PM for prosecutors in the Cross Timbers region. Due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, all trainings are being held virtually via live webinars for FY 21.

Training

Recruitment

The Texas A&M Transportation Institute (TTI) project team identified and invited prosecutors from the Cross Timbers region to participate in the training program. Potential participants were recruited via emails sent to prosecutors in the following 17 counties:

- Archer
- Baylor
- Clay
- Cooke
- Denton
- Eastland
- Erath
- Hood
- Jack
- Montague
- Palo Pinto
- Parker
- Stephens
- Tarrant
- Throckmorton
- Wise
- Young

The TTI project team contacted 590 criminal justice professionals from 29 prosecutor offices. Of note, the TTI project team invited probation officers to the trainings by their agency and department, (i.e., once each was contacted, the agency/department further disseminated the training information internally to staff). Conversely, the TTI project team reached out to prosecutors and judges on an individual basis to invite them to the trainings.

Registration

Participants registered online prior to the training, submitting basic contact information. Participants were also asked to complete an anonymous pre-training test. In advance of the trainings, there were 7 registrants and 6 completed pre-tests. The breakdown of registrants is shown in Table J1. Registration and pre-test completion indicates the intent to attend the training, but it does not mean the registrant showed up for the virtual training. Participants are also asked to complete an evaluation form, but these are submitted anonymously.

Table J87. Training Recruitment, Registration, Participation, and Completion

Prosecutors	
# Recruited	590 (29 Offices)
# Registered	7
# Pre-Tests Completed	6
# Attended	4
# Post-Tests Completed	4
# Evaluations	2

Participation

There were 4 participants who attended the training and returned a post-test. Participating offices and counties represented are shown below.

- Denton County District Attorney’s Office – Denton County
- Parker County District Attorney’s Office – Parker County

Test Scores

Both a pre-test and a post-test are administered prior to and following each training. The pre-test gauges a participant’s knowledge related to ignition interlock prior to attending the course. The pre-test consists of 10 questions and is completed online via Qualtrics. The post-test gauges a participant’s knowledge related to ignition interlock after attending the course. The post-test consists of 10 questions – including 6 of the same questions on the pre-test – and is completed immediately following the training via Qualtrics. Table J2 shows the test scores for the training.

Table J88. Test Scores

Pre-Test Score	Post-Test Score	Change in Knowledge (% Gain)
71.7	87.5	22.0%

Pre-Tests

The average pre-test score was a 71.7. Not all registrants who complete the pre-tests end up attending the training. However, because the pre-tests are submitted anonymously, all registrants’ pre-test scores are calculated in the pre-test average.

Table J3 shows the most frequently missed questions on the pre-test. Nearly all participants missed the question pertaining to conditions of bond.

Table J89. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Pre-Test

Question	Number Missed	Percent Who Missed Question
Q3. When must an ignition interlock device be ordered as a condition of bond?	5	83.3%
Q2. The ignition interlock device will shut the engine off if an offender provides a breath sample with alcohol present.	2	33.3%
Q5. If an offender violates an Occupational Drivers License order, the violation is a...	2	33.3%
Q7. What is a goal of ignition interlock?	2	33.3%
Q8. The ignition interlock device will detect residual mouth alcohol.	2	33.3%

Post-Tests

Following the completion of the training course material, a 10-question post-test is administered to determine participants' level of knowledge regarding ignition interlock devices. Each test question is worth 10 points. Participants who completed the training had an average post-test score of an 87.5.

Table J4 lists the most frequently missed questions on the post-test. The most frequently missed questions concerned how to start a vehicle with an ignition interlock device installed and the definition of circumvention; these questions were not pre-test questions.

Table J90. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Post-Test

Question	Number Missed	Percent Who Missed Question
Q6. What are the steps, in order, to start a vehicle equipped with an ignition interlock device?	2	50.0%
Q9. What is a Circumvention?	2	50.0%
Q3. When must an ignition interlock device be ordered as a condition of bond?*	1	25.0%

* Question was on the pre-test

Change in Knowledge

Change in knowledge is calculated to determine if there was a change in participants' knowledge after completing the course. Change in knowledge is calculated by:

$$= (\text{Post-Test Score} - \text{Pre-Test Score}) / \text{Pre-Test Score}$$

Participants experienced a 22.0% gain in knowledge.

Course Evaluations

At the end of the training, participants complete an evaluation. The evaluation includes a section to rate the training content and instructors, and to provide feedback and comments. Participants are asked to rate the items based on a five-point rating scale between "strongly disagree" and "strongly agree." For this training, industry partners did not participate.

Each rating is assigned a point value -- with "strongly disagree" assigned the lowest point value of 1 and "strongly agree" assigned the highest point value of 5. An average is calculated for each evaluative component.

There were 2 course evaluations received. Table J5 is the average course evaluation scores. Table J6 is the average instructor evaluation scores. Table J7 is additional comments received from prosecutors.

Table J91. Course Evaluations Completed by Prosecutors

Question	Average Score
The information provided on ignition interlock devices was applicable to my job duties.	4.5
I am likely to use the information provided today in my daily job duties.	4.5
Attending the ignition interlock training program was a good use of my time.	5.0
I felt the format of the workshop, pace of instruction and schedule were appropriate for the material presented.	5.0
I felt the topics covered, PowerPoint presentation and videos enhanced the instructors' presentation.	5.0

Table J92. Instructor Evaluations Completed by Prosecutors

Instructor	Average Score
Cody Stewart	5.0
Industry Representative – Dottie	N/A
Industry Representative – Erin	N/A

Table J 93. Course Comments Completed by Prosecutors

Comments

* No comments received

Prosecutor's Offices Contacted and Invited to Participate

PROSECUTORS – 590

Archer County CA – 1

- County Attorney – 1

Baylor County CA – 2

- County Attorney – 1
- Administrative Assistant – 1

Baylor County DA – 3

- 50th Judicial District Attorney – 1
- Administrative Assistant – 1
- Asst. District Attorney – 1

City of Valley View Municipal – 1

- Prosecutor – 1

Clay County CA – 1

- County Attorney – 1

Cooke County CA – 7

- Asst. County Attorney – 1
- County Attorney – 1
- County Attorney Investigator – 1
- County Attorney's Key Personnel – 4

Cooke County DA – 8

- 235th Judicial District Attorney – 1
- Asst. District Attorney – 2
- District Attorney's Investigator – 1
- District Attorney's Key Personnel – 2
- District Attorney's VAC – 2

Denton County CDA – 136

- Administrative Assistant – 13
- Asst. Criminal District Attorney – 70

- Criminal District Attorney's Investigator – 23
- Criminal District Attorney's Office – 21
- Criminal District Attorney's VAC – 7
- Criminal District Attorney – 1
- Paralegal – 1

Eastland County CDA – 6

- Administrative Assistant – 1
- Asst. Criminal District Attorney – 3
- Criminal District Attorney – 1
- Criminal District Attorney's VAC – 1

Eastland County CA – 4

- Asst. County Attorney – 1
- County Attorney – 1
- County Attorney's Key Personnel – 1
- County Attorney's VAC – 1

Eastland County DA – 6

- 266th Judicial District Attorney – 1
- Asst. District Attorney – 2
- District Attorney's Investigator – 1
- District Attorney's VAC – 1
- Legal Assistant – 1

Hood County CA – 6

- Asst. County Attorney – 2
- County Attorney – 1
- County Attorney's Key Personnel – 1
- County Attorney's VAC – 1
- Office Manager – 1

Hood County DA – 13

- 355th Judicial District Attorney – 1
- Asst. District Attorney – 5

- District Attorney's Investigator – 3
- District Attorney's VAC – 1
- Intake Coordinator – 1
- Legal Secretary – 1
- Office Manager – 1

Jack County CA – 2

- County Attorney – 1
- County Attorney's VAC – 1

Montague County CA – 2

- County Attorney – 1
- County Attorney's VAC – 1

Montague County DA – 5

- 97th Judicial District Attorney – 1
- District Attorney's Investigator – 2
- District Attorney's Key Personnel – 1
- District Attorney's VAC – 1

Municipal Court – 5

- Prosecutor – 5

Palo Pinto County CA – 3

- County Attorney – 1
- County Attorney's Investigator – 1
- Office Manager – 1

Palo Pinto County DA – 3

- 29th Judicial District Attorney – 1
- District Attorney's VAC – 1
- Legal Assistant – 1

Parker County CA – 25

- Asst. County Attorney – 9
- County Attorney – 1
- County Attorney's Key Investigator – 4
- County Attorney's Key Personnel – 1
- County Attorney's VAC – 1
- County Clerk – 1
- Legal Secretary – 8
- Paralegal – 1

Parker County DA – 15

- 43rd & 415th Judicial District Attorney – 1
- Asst. District Attorney – 6
- District Attorney's Investigator – 2
- District Attorney's Key Personnel – 4
- District Attorney's VAC – 1
- District Clerk – 1

Stephens County CA – 2

- County Attorney – 1
- County Attorney's Key Personnel – 1

Tarrant County CDA – 309

- Asst. Criminal District Attorney – 178
- Criminal District Attorney's Investigator – 46
- Criminal District Attorney's Key Personnel – 29
- Criminal District Attorney's Office – 49
- Criminal District Attorney's VAC – 5
- Criminal District Attorney – 1
- Office Clerk – 1

Throckmorton County CA – 2

- County Attorney – 1
- County Attorney's VAC – 1

Throckmorton County DA – 1

- 39th Judicial District Attorney – 1

Wise County CA – 7

- Asst. County Attorney – 1
- County Attorney – 1
- County Attorney's Investigator – 1
- County Attorney's Key Personnel – 3
- County Attorney's VAC – 1

Wise County DA – 7

- 271st Judicial District Attorney – 1
- Asst. District Attorney – 3
- District Attorney's Investigator – 2
- District Attorney's Key Personnel – 1

- District Attorney's VAC – 1

Young County CA – 3

- County Attorney – 1
- County Attorney's Key Personnel – 2

Young County DA – 5

- 90th Judicial District Attorney – 1
- Asst. District Attorney – 1
- District Attorney's Investigator – 1
- District Attorney's Key Personnel – 1
- District Attorney's VAC – 1

Appendix K: Ignition Interlock Training for Criminal Justice Professionals – Panhandle Prosecutors

Location

A 2021 ignition interlock training was held virtually via Webex on August 18, 2021, from 1:30 PM – 4:50 PM for prosecutors in the Panhandle. Due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, all trainings are being held virtually via live webinars for FY 21.

Training

Recruitment

The Texas A&M Transportation Institute (TTI) project team identified and invited prosecutors from the Panhandle to participate in the training program. Potential participants were recruited via emails sent to prosecutors in the following 24 counties:

- Briscoe
- Carson
- Castro
- Childress
- Collingsworth
- Dallam
- Deaf Smith
- Donley
- Gray
- Hansford
- Hartley
- Hemphill
- Hutchinson
- Lipscomb
- Moore
- Ochiltree
- Oldham
- Parmer
- Potter
- Randall
- Roberts
- Sherman
- Swisher
- Wheeler

The TTI project team contacted 170 criminal justice professionals from 30 prosecutor offices. Of note, the TTI project team invited probation officers to the trainings by their agency and department, (i.e., once each was contacted, the agency/department further disseminated the training information internally to staff). Conversely, the TTI project team reached out to prosecutors and judges on an individual basis to invite them to the trainings.

Registration

Participants registered online prior to the training, submitting basic contact information. Participants were also asked to complete an anonymous pre-training test. In advance of the trainings, there were 15 registrants and 15 completed pre-tests. The breakdown of registrants is shown in Table K1. Registration and pre-test completion indicates the intent to attend the training, but it does not mean the registrant showed up for the virtual training. Participants are also asked to complete an evaluation form, but these are submitted anonymously.

Table K94. Training Recruitment, Registration, Participation, and Completion

Prosecutors	
# Recruited	170 (30 Offices)
# Registered	15
# Pre-Tests Completed	15
# Attended	12
# Post-Tests Completed	12
# Evaluations	12

Participation

There were 12 participants who attended the training. Participating offices and counties represented are shown below.

- 47th District Attorney’s Office – Potter County
- Briscoe County Attorney’s Office – Briscoe County
- Deaf Smith County District Attorney’s Office – Deaf Smith
- Potter County Attorney’s Office – Potter County
- Randall Criminal District Attorney’s Office – Randall County
- Roberts County Attorney’s Office – Roberts County

Test Scores

Both a pre-test and a post-test are administered prior to and following each training. The pre-test gauges a participant’s knowledge related to ignition interlock prior to attending the course. The pre-test consists of 10 questions and is completed online via Qualtrics. The post-test gauges a participant’s knowledge related to ignition interlock after attending the course. The post-test consists of 10 questions – including 6 of the same questions on the pre-test – and is completed immediately following the training via Qualtrics. Table K2 shows the test scores for the training.

Table K95. Test Scores

Pre-Test Score	Post-Test Score	Change in Knowledge (% Gain)
70.0	87.5	25.0%

Pre-Tests

The average pre-test score was a 70.0. Not all registrants who complete the pre-tests end up attending the training. However, because the pre-tests are submitted anonymously, all registrants' pre-test scores are calculated in the pre-test average.

Table K3 shows the most frequently missed questions on the pre-test. Over half of participants missed the question pertaining to how an ignition interlock works when alcohol is detected.

Table K96. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Pre-Test

Question	Number Missed	Percent Who Missed Question
Q2. The ignition interlock device will shut the engine off if an offender provides a breath sample with alcohol present.	10	66.7%
Q3. When must an ignition interlock device be ordered as a condition of bond?	9	60.0%
Q8. The ignition interlock device will detect residual mouth alcohol.	7	46.7%

Post-Tests

Following the completion of the training course material, a 10-question post-test is administered to determine participants' level of knowledge regarding ignition interlock devices. Each test question is worth 10 points. Participants who completed the training had an average post-test score of an 87.5.

Table K4 lists the most frequently missed questions on the post-test. The most frequently missed question concerned how to start a vehicle with an ignition interlock installed; this question was not a pre-test question.

Table K97. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Post-Test

Question	Number Missed	Percent Who Missed Question
Q6. What are the steps, in order, to start a vehicle equipped with an ignition interlock device?	5	41.7%
Q10. What is the average elimination rate of alcohol of an adult male?	4	33.3%

Question	Number Missed	Percent Who Missed Question
Q2. If a breath sample with alcohol present is provided during a rolling retest, the vehicle will immediately shut off.	2	16.7%

* Question was on the pre-test

Change in Knowledge

Change in knowledge is calculated to determine if there was a change in participants' knowledge after completing the course. Change in knowledge is calculated by:

$$= (\text{Post-Test Score} - \text{Pre-Test Score}) / \text{Pre-Test Score}$$

Participants experienced a 25.0% gain in knowledge.

Course Evaluations

At the end of the training, participants complete an evaluation. The evaluation includes a section to rate the training content and instructors, and to provide feedback and comments. Participants are asked to rate the items based on a five-point rating scale between "strongly disagree" and "strongly agree." Some participants did not have both industry representatives (Dottie McDonald and Erin Garza) as instructors, so their scores may be based off fewer evaluations.

Each rating is assigned a point value -- with "strongly disagree" assigned the lowest point value of 1 and "strongly agree" assigned the highest point value of 5. An average is calculated for each evaluative component.

There were 12 course evaluations received. Table K5 is the average course evaluation scores. Table K6 is the average instructor evaluation scores. Table K7 is additional comments received from prosecutors.

Table K98. Course Evaluations Completed by Prosecutors

Question	Average Score
The information provided on ignition interlock devices was applicable to my job duties.	4.6
I am likely to use the information provided today in my daily job duties.	4.5
Attending the ignition interlock training program was a good use of my time.	4.8
I felt the format of the workshop, pace of instruction and schedule were appropriate for the material presented.	4.8
I felt the topics covered, PowerPoint presentation and videos enhanced the instructors' presentation.	4.7

Table K99. Instructor Evaluations Completed by Prosecutors

Instructor	Average Score
Cody Stewart	4.7
Industry Representative – Dottie *	4.5
Industry Representative – Erin	N/A

* Based off 2 evaluations

Table K100. Course Comments Completed by Prosecutors

Comments
Great course

Prosecutor’s Offices Contacted and Invited to Participate

PROSECUTORS – 170

Briscoe County CA – 2

- County Attorney – 1
- County Attorney’s Office – 1

Carson County CA – 2

- County Attorney – 1
- County Attorney’s Office – 1

Castro County CADA – 3

- County & District Attorney – 1
- County & District Attorney’s Investigator – 1
- Office Administrator – 1

Childress County CA – 1

- County Attorney – 1

Collingsworth County CA – 1

- County Attorney – 1

Collingsworth County DA – 7

- 100th Judicial District Attorney
- Asst. District Attorney – 1

- District Attorney’s Investigator – 3
- District Attorney’s Office – 2
- District Attorney’s VAC – 1

Dallam County CA – 1

- County Attorney – 1

Deaf Smith County CDA – 9

- Asst. Criminal District Attorney – 2
- Criminal District Attorney – 1
- Criminal District Attorney’s Investigator – 1
- Criminal District Attorney’s Office – 4
- Criminal District Attorney’s VAC – 1

Donley County CA – 1

- County Attorney – 1

Gray County CA – 2

- County Attorney – 1
- Administrative Assistant – 1

Gray County DA – 5

- Asst. District Attorney – 1
- District Attorney’s Investigator – 1
- District Attorney’s Office – 2
- District Attorney’s VAC – 1

Hansford County CA – 1

- County Attorney – 1

Hartley County CA – 2

- County Attorney – 1
- County Attorney’s Key Personnel – 1

Hemphill County CA – 1

- County Attorney – 1

Hutchinson County CA – 3

- County Attorney – 1
- Secretary – 2

Hutchinson County DA – 3

- 84th Judicial District Attorney – 1
- Asst. District Attorney – 1
- District Attorney’s Investigator – 1

Lipscomb County CA – 2

- County Attorney – 1
- County Attorney’s VAC – 1

Moore County CA – 2

- County Attorney – 1
- County Attorney’s VAC – 1

Moore County DA – 6

- 69th Judicial District Attorney – 1
- Administrative Assistant – 3
- District Attorney’s Investigator – 1
- District Attorney’s Office – 1

Ochiltree County CADA – 3

- County & District Attorney – 1
- Key Personnel – 1
- Legal Assistant – 1

Oldham County CADA – 2

- County & District Attorney – 1
- County & District Attorney’s Investigator – 1

Palmer County CA – 2

- County Attorney – 1
- Secretary – 1

Palmer County DA – 3

- 287th Judicial District Attorney – 1
- Asst. District Attorney – 1
- District Attorney’s Investigator – 1
- District Attorney’s VAC – 1

Potter County CA – 30

- Asst. County Attorney – 8
- County Attorney – 1
- County Attorney’s Investigator – 8
- County Attorney’s Office – 13

Potter County DA – 37

- 47th Judicial District Attorney – 1
- Asst. District Attorney – 16
- District Attorney’s Investigator – 7
- District Attorney’s Office – 10
- District Attorney’s VAC – 3

Randall County CDA – 32

- Asst. Criminal District Attorney – 13
- Criminal District Attorney – 1
- Criminal District Attorney’s Investigator – 6
- Criminal District Attorney’s Office – 10
- Criminal District Attorney’s VAC – 2

Roberts County CA – 1

- County Attorney – 1

Sherman County CA – 1

- County Attorney's Assistant – 1

Swisher County CADA – 3

- County & District Attorney – 1
- County & District Attorney's Investigator – 1
- County & District Attorney's VAC – 1

Wheeler County CA – 2

- County Attorney – 1
- Legal Assistant – 1

Appendix L: Ignition Interlock Training for Criminal Justice Professionals – El Paso County Prosecutors

Location

A 2021 ignition interlock training was held virtually via Webex on August 20th, 2021, from 8:00 AM – 11:20 AM (MT) for prosecutors in El Paso. Due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, all trainings are being held virtually via live webinars for FY 21.

Training

Recruitment

The Texas A&M Transportation Institute (TTI) project team identified and invited prosecutors from El Paso and surrounding counties to participate in the training program. Potential participants were recruited via emails sent to prosecutors in the following 3 counties:

- Culberson
- El Paso
- Hudspeth

The TTI project team contacted 156 criminal justice professionals from 4 prosecutor offices. Of note, the TTI project team invited probation to the trainings by their agency and department, (i.e., once each was contacted, the agency/department further disseminated the training information internally to staff). Conversely, the TTI project team reached out to prosecutors and judges on an individual basis to invite them to the trainings.

Registration

Participants registered online prior to the training, submitting basic contact information. Participants were also asked to complete an anonymous pre-training test. In advance of the trainings, there were 3 registrants and 3 completed pre-tests. The breakdown of registrants is shown in Table L1. Registration and pre-test completion indicates the intent to attend the training, but it does not mean the registrant showed up for the virtual training. Participants are also asked to complete an evaluation form, but these are submitted anonymously.

Table L101. Training Recruitment, Registration, Participation, and Completion

	Prosecutors
# Recruited	156 (4 Offices)
# Registered	3
# Pre-Tests Completed	3
# Attended	2
# Post-Tests Completed	2

Prosecutors	
# Evaluations	2

Participation

There were 2 participants who attended the training. The participating office and county represented is shown below.

- 34th Judicial District Attorney's Office – El Paso County

Test Scores

Both a pre-test and a post-test are administered prior to and following each training. The pre-test gauges a participant's knowledge related to ignition interlock prior to attending the course. The pre-test consists of 10 questions and is completed online via Qualtrics. The post-test gauges a participant's knowledge related to ignition interlock after attending the course. The post-test consists of 10 questions – including 6 of the same questions on the pre-test – and is completed immediately following the training via Qualtrics. Table L2 shows the test scores for the training.

Table L102. Test Scores

Pre-Test Score	Post-Test Score	Change in Knowledge (% Gain)
63.3	95.0	50.1%

Pre-Tests

The average pre-test score was a 63.3. Not all registrants who complete the pre-tests end up attending the training. However, because the pre-tests are submitted anonymously, all registrants' pre-test scores are calculated in the pre-test average.

Table L3 shows the most frequently missed questions on the pre-test. All participants missed the question pertaining to how an ignition interlock device works when alcohol is detected.

Table L103. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Pre-Test

Question	Number Missed	Percent Who Missed Question
Q2. The ignition interlock device will shut the engine off if an offender provides a breath sample with alcohol present.	3	100.0%

Question	Number Missed	Percent Who Missed Question
Q5. If an offender violates an Occupational Driver License order, the violation is a...	2	66.7%
Q7. What is a goal of ignition interlock?	2	66.7%
Q8. The ignition interlock device will detect residual mouth alcohol.	2	66.7%

Post-Tests

Following the completion of the training course material, a 10-question post-test is administered to determine participants' level of knowledge regarding ignition interlock devices. Each test question is worth 10 points. Participants who completed the training had an average post-test score of 95.0 percent.

Table L4 lists the most frequently missed questions on the post-test. The only missed question concerned alcohol elimination rates; this question was not a pre-test question.

Table L104. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Post-Test

Question	Number Missed	Percent Who Missed Question
Q10. What is the average elimination rate of alcohol of an adult male?	1	50.0%

* Question was on the pre-test

Change in Knowledge

Change in knowledge is calculated to determine if there was a change in participants' knowledge after completing the course. Change in knowledge is calculated by:

$$= (\text{Post-Test Score} - \text{Pre-Test Score}) / \text{Pre-Test Score}$$

Participants experienced a 50.1% gain in knowledge.

Course Evaluations

At the end of the training, participants complete an evaluation. The evaluation includes a section to rate the training content and instructors, and to provide feedback and comments. Participants are asked to rate the items based on a five-point rating scale between "strongly disagree" and "strongly agree." Industry representatives did not instruct in this training.

Each rating is assigned a point value -- with “strongly disagree” assigned the lowest point value of 1 and “strongly agree” assigned the highest point value of 5. An average is calculated for each evaluative component.

There were 2 course evaluations received. Table L5 is the average course evaluation scores. Table L6 is the average instructor evaluation scores. Table L7 is additional comments received from prosecutors.

Table L105. Course Evaluations Completed by Prosecutors

Question	Average Score
The information provided on ignition interlock devices was applicable to my job duties.	5.0
I am likely to use the information provided today in my daily job duties.	4.5
Attending the ignition interlock training program was a good use of my time.	5.0
I felt the format of the workshop, pace of instruction and schedule were appropriate for the material presented.	5.0
I felt the topics covered, PowerPoint presentation and videos enhanced the instructors’ presentation.	4.5

Table L106. Instructor Evaluations Completed by Prosecutors

Instructor	Average Score
Cody Stewart	5.0
Industry Representative – Dottie	N/A
Industry Representative – Erin	N/A

Table L107. Course Comments Completed by Prosecutors

Comments
Excellent presentation & i will recommend everyone in the office take the class
Great presentation!!!
This subject matter is integral to my job. I really appreciate the webinar on this subject. This area of the law gets very complex, especially because it is always evolving. It's very easy to forget a new change in the statutes governing this because of that complexity.
Very useful information

Prosecutor's Offices Contacted and Invited to Participate

PROSECUTORS – 156

Culberson County CA – 2

- County Attorney – 1
- County Attorney's Key Personnel – 1

El Paso County CA – 53

- Asst. County Attorney – 38
- County Attorney – 1
- County Attorney's Investigator – 4
- County Attorney's Key Personnel – 7
- County Attorney's VAC – 2
- Paralegal – 1

El Paso County DA – 99

- 34th Judicial District Attorney – 1
- Administrative Assistant – 1
- Asst. District Attorney – 55
- District Attorney's Investigator – 13
- District Attorney's Key Personnel – 3
- District Attorney's Office – 14
- District Attorney's VAC – 6
- Paralegal – 6

Hudspeth County CA – 2

- County Attorney – 1
- County Attorney's Key Personnel – 1

Appendix M: Ignition Interlock Training for Criminal Justice Professionals – Panhandle Prosecutors

Location

A 2021 ignition interlock training was held virtually via Webex on August 25, 2021, from 8:30 AM – 11:50 AM for prosecutors in the Panhandle. Due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, all trainings are being held virtually via live webinars for FY 21.

Training

Recruitment

The Texas A&M Transportation Institute (TTI) project team identified and invited prosecutors from the Panhandle to participate in the training program. Potential participants were recruited via emails sent to prosecutors in the following 24 counties:

- Briscoe
- Carson
- Castro
- Childress
- Collingsworth
- Dallam
- Deaf Smith
- Donley
- Gray
- Hansford
- Hartley
- Hemphill
- Hutchinson
- Lipscomb
- Moore
- Ochiltree
- Oldham
- Parmer
- Potter
- Randall
- Roberts
- Sherman
- Swisher
- Wheeler

The TTI project team contacted 170 criminal justice professionals from 30 prosecutor offices. Of note, the TTI project team invited probation to the trainings by their agency and department, (i.e., once each was contacted, the agency/department further disseminated the training information internally to staff). Conversely, the TTI project team reached out to prosecutors and judges on an individual basis to invite them to the trainings.

Registration

Participants registered online prior to the training, which submitted basic contact information. Participants were also asked to complete an anonymous pre-training test. In advance of the trainings, there were 5 registrants and 4 completed pre-tests. The breakdown of registrants is shown in Table M1. Registration and pre-test completion indicates the intent to attend the training, but it does not mean the registrant showed up for the virtual training. Participants are also asked to complete an evaluation form, but these are submitted anonymously.

Table M108. Training Recruitment, Registration, Participation, and Completion

Prosecutors	
# Recruited	170 (30 Offices)
# Registered	5
# Pre-Tests Completed	4
# Attended	4
# Post-Tests Completed	4
# Evaluations	5

Participation

There were 4 participants who attended the training and returned a post-test. Participating offices and counties represented are shown below.

- 31st Judicial District – Gray, Wheeler, Hemphill, Roberts, Lipscomb
- Loving County Attorney’s Office – Loving County
- Sherman County Attorney’s Office – Sherman County
- Wheeler County Attorney’s Office – Wheeler County

Test Scores

Both a pre-test and a post-test are administered prior to and following each training. The pre-test gauges a participant’s knowledge related to ignition interlock prior to attending the course. The pre-test consists of 10 questions and is completed online via Qualtrics. The post-test gauges a participant’s knowledge related to ignition interlock after attending the course. The post-test consists of 10 questions – including 6 of the same questions on the pre-test – and is completed immediately following the training via Qualtrics. Table M2 shows the test scores for the training.

Table M109. Test Scores

Pre-Test Score	Post-Test Score	Change in Knowledge (% Gain)
65.0	95.0	46.2%

Pre-Tests

The average pre-test score was a 65.0. Not all registrants who complete the pre-tests end up attending the training. However, because the pre-tests are submitted anonymously, all registrants’ pre-test scores are calculated in the pre-test average.

Table M3 shows the most frequently missed questions on the pre-test. All participants missed the question pertaining to how an ignition interlock device works when alcohol is detected.

Table M110. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Pre-Test

Question	Number Missed	Percent Who Missed Question
Q2. The ignition interlock device will shut the engine off if an offender provides a breath sample with alcohol present.	4	100.0%
Q3. When must an ignition interlock device be ordered as a condition of bond?	3	75.0%

Post-Tests

Following the completion of the training course material, a 10-question post-test is administered to determine participants' level of knowledge regarding ignition interlock devices. Each test question is worth 10 points. Participants who completed the training had an average post-test score of 95.0.

Table M4 lists the most frequently missed questions on the post-test. The only missed questions concerned alcohol elimination rates and how an ignition interlock device works when alcohol is detected.

Table M111. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Post-Test

Question	Number Missed	Percent Who Missed Question
Q2. If a breath sample with alcohol present is provided during a rolling retest, the vehicle will immediately shut off. *	1	25.0%
Q10. What is the average elimination rate of alcohol of an adult male?	1	25.0%

* Question was on the pre-test

Change in Knowledge

Change in knowledge is calculated to determine if there was a change in participants' knowledge after completing the course. Change in knowledge is calculated by:

$$= (\text{Post-Test Score} - \text{Pre-Test Score}) / \text{Pre-Test Score}$$

Participants experienced a 46.2% gain in knowledge.

Course Evaluations

At the end of the training, participants complete an evaluation. The evaluation includes a section to rate the training content and instructors, and to provide feedback and comments. Participants are asked to rate the items based on a five-point rating scale between “strongly disagree” and “strongly agree.” Some participants did not have both industry representatives (Dottie McDonald and Erin Garza) as instructors, so their scores may be based off fewer evaluations.

Each rating is assigned a point value -- with “strongly disagree” assigned the lowest point value of 1 and “strongly agree” assigned the highest point value of 5. An average is calculated for each evaluative component.

There were 5 course evaluations received. Table M5 is the average course evaluation scores. Table M6 is the average instructor evaluation scores. Table M7 is additional comments received from prosecutors.

Table M112. Course Evaluations Completed by Prosecutors

Question	Average Score
The information provided on ignition interlock devices was applicable to my job duties.	5.0
I am likely to use the information provided today in my daily job duties.	4.8
Attending the ignition interlock training program was a good use of my time.	4.8
I felt the format of the workshop, pace of instruction and schedule were appropriate for the material presented.	5.0
I felt the topics covered, PowerPoint presentation and videos enhanced the instructors’ presentation.	5.0

Table M113. Instructor Evaluations Completed by Prosecutors

Instructor	Average Score
Cody Stewart	4.6
Industry Representative – Dottie	N/A
Industry Representative – Erin	4.8

Table M114. Course Comments Completed by Prosecutors

Comments
I think Erin’s demonstration of the equipment was very useful. It seems silly, but I think that some of the hesitation sometimes is not understanding the equipment well enough.

Prosecutor's Offices Contacted and Invited to Participate

PROSECUTORS – 170

Briscoe County CA – 2

- County Attorney – 1
- County Attorney's Office – 1

Carson County CA – 2

- County Attorney – 1
- County Attorney's Office – 1

Castro County CADA – 3

- County & District Attorney – 1
- County & District Attorney's Investigator – 1
- Office Administrator – 1

Childress County CA – 1

- County Attorney – 1

Collingsworth County CA – 1

- County Attorney – 1

Collingsworth County DA – 7

- 100th Judicial District Attorney
- Asst. District Attorney – 1
- District Attorney's Investigator – 3
- District Attorney's Office – 2
- District Attorney's VAC – 1

Dallam County CA – 1

- County Attorney – 1

Deaf Smith County CDA – 9

- Asst. Criminal District Attorney – 2
- Criminal District Attorney – 1
- Criminal District Attorney's Investigator – 1
- Criminal District Attorney's Office – 4

- Criminal District Attorney's VAC – 1

Donley County CA – 1

- County Attorney – 1

Gray County CA – 2

- County Attorney – 1
- Administrative Assistant – 1

Gray County DA – 5

- Asst. District Attorney – 1
- District Attorney's Investigator – 1
- District Attorney's Office – 2
- District Attorney's VAC – 1

Hansford County CA – 1

- County Attorney – 1

Hartley County CA – 2

- County Attorney – 1
- County Attorney's Key Personnel – 1

Hemphill County CA – 1

- County Attorney – 1

Hutchinson County CA – 3

- County Attorney – 1
- Secretary – 2

Hutchinson County DA – 3

- 84th Judicial District Attorney – 1
- Asst. District Attorney – 1
- District Attorney's Investigator – 1

Lipscomb County CA – 2

- County Attorney – 1
- County Attorney's VAC – 1

Moore County CA – 2

- County Attorney – 1
- County Attorney’s VAC – 1

Moore County DA – 6

- 69th Judicial District Attorney – 1
- Administrative Assistant – 3
- District Attorney’s Investigator – 1
- District Attorney’s Office – 1

Ochiltree County CADA – 3

- County & District Attorney – 1
- Key Personnel – 1
- Legal Assistant – 1

Oldham County CADA – 2

- County & District Attorney – 1
- County & District Attorney’s Investigator – 1

Palmer County CA – 2

- County Attorney – 1
- Secretary – 1

Palmer County DA – 3

- 287th Judicial District Attorney – 1
- Asst. District Attorney – 1
- District Attorney’s Investigator – 1
- District Attorney’s VAC – 1

Potter County CA – 30

- Asst. County Attorney – 8
- County Attorney – 1

- County Attorney’s Investigator – 8
- County Attorney’s Office – 13

Potter County DA – 37

- 47th Judicial District Attorney – 1
- Asst. District Attorney – 16
- District Attorney’s Investigator – 7
- District Attorney’s Office – 10
- District Attorney’s VAC – 3

Randall County CDA – 32

- Asst. Criminal District Attorney – 13
- Criminal District Attorney – 1
- Criminal District Attorney’s Investigator – 6
- Criminal District Attorney’s Office – 10
- Criminal District Attorney’s VAC – 2

Roberts County CA – 1

- County Attorney – 1

Sherman County CA – 1

- County Attorney’s Assistant – 1

Swisher County CADA – 3

- County & District Attorney – 1
- County & District Attorney’s Investigator – 1
- County & District Attorney’s VAC – 1

Wheeler County CA – 2

- County Attorney – 1
- Legal Assistant – 1

Appendix N: Ignition Interlock Training for Criminal Justice Professionals – Pecos County Prosecutors

Location

A 2021 ignition interlock training Program was held virtually via Webex on August 25th, 2021, from 1:30 PM – 4:50 PM for prosecutors in Pecos and surrounding counties. Due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, all trainings are being held virtually via live webinars for FY 21.

Training

Recruitment

The Texas A&M Transportation Institute (TTI) project team identified and invited prosecutors from Pecos and surrounding counties to participate in the training program. Potential participants were recruited via emails sent to prosecutors in the following 14 counties:

- Brewster
- Crane
- Crockett
- Jeff Davis
- Loving
- Pecos
- Presidio
- Reagan
- Reeves
- Sutton
- Terrell
- Upton
- Ward
- Winker

The TTI project team contacted 54 criminal justice professionals from 18 prosecutor offices. Of note, the TTI project team invited probation officers to the trainings by their agency and department, (i.e., once each was contacted, the agency/department further disseminated the training information internally to staff). Conversely, the TTI project team reached out to prosecutors and judges on an individual basis to invite them to the trainings.

Registration

Participants registered online prior to the training, which submitted basic contact information. Participants were also asked to complete an anonymous pre-training test. In advance of the trainings, there was 1 registrant and 0 completed pre-tests. The breakdown of registrants is shown in Table N1. Registration and pre-test completion indicates the intent to attend the training, but it does not mean the registrant showed up for the virtual training. Participants are also asked to complete an evaluation form, but these are submitted anonymously.

Table N115. Training Recruitment, Registration, Participation, and Completion

Prosecutors	
# Recruited	54 (18 Offices)
# Registered	1
# Pre-Tests Completed	0
# Attended	1
# Post-Tests Completed	1
# Evaluations	1

Participation

There was 1 participant who attended the training. The participating office and county represented is shown below.

- Tarrant County District Attorney’s Office – Tarrant County

Test Scores

Both a pre-test and a post-test are administered prior to and following each training. The pre-test gauges a participant’s knowledge related to ignition interlock prior to attending the course. The pre-test consists of 10 questions and is completed online via Qualtrics. The post-test gauges a participant’s knowledge related to ignition interlock after attending the course. The post-test consists of 10 questions – including 6 of the same questions on the pre-test – and is completed immediately following the training via Qualtrics. Table N2 shows the test scores for the training.

Table N116. Test Scores

Pre-Test Score	Post-Test Score	Change in Knowledge (% Gain)
N/A	90.0	N/A

Pre-Tests

There were no pre-tests completed prior to the training.

Post-Tests

Following the completion of the training course material, a 10-question post-test is administered to determine participants’ level of knowledge regarding ignition interlock devices. Each test question is worth 10 points. Participants who completed the training had an average post-test score of 90.0.

Table N4 lists the most frequently missed question on the post-test. The only missed question concerned how to start a vehicle with an ignition interlock device; this question was not a pre-test question.

Table N117. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Post-Test

Question	Number Missed	Percent Who Missed Question
Q6. What are the steps, in order, to start a vehicle equipped with an ignition interlock device?	1	100.00%

* Question was on the pre-test

Change in Knowledge

Change in knowledge is calculated to determine if there was a change in participants' knowledge after completing the course. Change in knowledge is calculated by:

$$= (\text{Post-Test Score} - \text{Pre-Test Score}) / \text{Pre-Test Score}$$

A pre-test was not submitted, so change in knowledge cannot be calculated.

Course Evaluations

At the end of the training, participants complete an evaluation. The evaluation includes a section to rate the training content and instructors, and to provide feedback and comments. Participants are asked to rate the items based on a five-point rating scale between "strongly disagree" and "strongly agree." Some participants did not have both industry representatives (Dottie McDonald and Erin Garza) as instructors, so their scores may be based off fewer evaluations.

Each rating is assigned a point value -- with "strongly disagree" assigned the lowest point value of 1 and "strongly agree" assigned the highest point value of 5. An average is calculated for each evaluative component.

There was 1 course evaluation received. Table N5 is the average course evaluation scores. Table N6 is the average instructor evaluation scores. Table N7 is additional comments received from prosecutors.

Table N118. Course Evaluations Completed by Prosecutors

Question	Average Score
The information provided on ignition interlock devices was applicable to my job duties.	4.0
I am likely to use the information provided today in my daily job duties.	4.0
Attending the ignition interlock training program was a good use of my time.	5.0

Question	Average Score
I felt the format of the workshop, pace of instruction and schedule were appropriate for the material presented.	5.0
I felt the topics covered, PowerPoint presentation and videos enhanced the instructors' presentation.	5.0

Table N119. Instructor Evaluations Completed by Prosecutors

Instructor	Average Score
Cody Stewart	5.0
Industry Representative – Dottie	5.0
Industry Representative – Erin	N/A

Table N120. Course Comments Completed by Prosecutors

Comments
The course was well organized and the presenters where knowledgeable and effective.

Prosecutor's Offices Contacted and Invited to Participate

PROSECUTORS – 54

Brewster County CA – 3

- County Attorney – 1
- County Attorney's Office – 1
- County Attorney's VAC – 1

Brewster County DA – 3

- Asst. District Attorney – 2
- District Attorney's Investigator – 1

Crane County CA – 3

- Administrative Assistant – 2
- County Attorney – 1

Crockett County CA – 3

- County Attorney – 1
- County Attorney's Investigator – 1

- County Attorney's Office – 1

Crockett County DA – 3

- District Attorney's Investigator – 1
- District Attorney's VAC – 1
- Legal Assistant – 1

Jeff Davis County CA – 2

- County Attorney – 1
- County Attorney VAC – 1

Loving County CA – 1

- County Attorney – 1

Pecos County CA – 6

- County Attorney – 1
- County Attorney's Investigator – 1

- County Attorney's VAC – 1
- Legal Assistant – 3

Pecos County DA – 6

- 83rd Judicial District Attorney – 1
- 112th Judicial District Attorney – 1
- District Attorney's Investigator – 1
- Legal Assistant – 3

Presidio County CA – 4

- Administrative Assistant – 2
- County Attorney – 1
- County Attorney's VAC – 1

Reagan County CA – 2

- County Attorney – 1
- Secretary – 1

Reeves County CA – 3

- County Attorney – 1
- County Attorney's VAC – 1
- Legal Assistant – 1

Reeves County DA – 5

- 143rd Judicial District Attorney – 1
- Asst. District Attorney – 1
- District Attorney's Investigator – 1
- District Attorney's VAC – 1
- Legal Assistant – 1

Sutton County CA – 2

- County Attorney – 1
- County Attorney's VAC – 1

Terrell County CA – 2

- County Attorney – 1
- County Attorney's VAC – 1

Upton County CA – 2

- County Attorney – 1
- County Attorney's VAC – 1

Ward County CA – 3

- County Attorney – 1
- County Attorney's VAC – 1
- Legal Secretary – 1

Winkler County DA – 1

- 109th Judicial District Attorney – 1

Appendix O: Ignition Interlock Training for Criminal Justice Professionals – El Paso County Prosecutors

Location

A 2021 ignition interlock training was held virtually via Webex on August 26th, 2021, from 1:00 PM – 4:20 PM (MT) for prosecutors in El Paso and surrounding counties. Due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, all trainings are being held virtually via live webinars for FY 21.

Training

Recruitment

The Texas A&M Transportation Institute (TTI) project team identified and invited prosecutors from El Paso and surrounding counties to participate in the training program. Potential participants were recruited via emails sent to prosecutors in the following 3 counties:

- Culberson
- El Paso
- Hudspeth

The TTI project team contacted 156 criminal justice professionals from 4 prosecutor offices. Of note, the TTI project team invited probation officers to the trainings by their agency and department, (i.e., once each was contacted, the agency/department further disseminated the training information internally to staff). Conversely, the TTI project team reached out to prosecutors and judges on an individual basis to invite them to the trainings.

Registration

Participants registered online prior to the training, submitting basic contact information. Participants were also asked to complete an anonymous pre-training test. In advance of the trainings, there were 3 registrants and 4 completed pre-tests. The breakdown of registrants is shown in Table O1. Registration and pre-test completion indicates the intent to attend the training, but it does not mean the registrant showed up for the virtual training. Of note, not all attendees submit a completed post-test. Participants are also asked to complete an evaluation form, but these are submitted anonymously.

Table O121. Training Recruitment, Registration, Participation, and Completion

	Prosecutors
# Recruited	156 (4 Offices)
# Registered	3
# Pre-Tests Completed	4
# Attended	1
# Post-Tests Completed	0

Prosecutors	
# Evaluations	0

Participation

There was 1 participant who attended the training. The participating office and county represented is shown below.

- 34th Judicial District Attorney's Office – El Paso County

Test Scores

Both a pre-test and a post-test are administered prior to and following each training. The pre-test gauges a participant's knowledge related to ignition interlock prior to attending the course. The pre-test consists of 10 questions and is completed online via Qualtrics. The post-test gauges a participant's knowledge related to ignition interlock after attending the course. The post-test consists of 10 questions – including 6 of the same questions on the pre-test – and is completed immediately following the training via Qualtrics. Table O2 shows the test scores for the training.

Table O122. Test Scores

Pre-Test Score	Post-Test Score	Change in Knowledge (% Gain)
70.0	N/A	N/A

Pre-Tests

The average pre-test score was a 70.0. Not all registrants who complete the pre-tests end up attending the training. However, because the pre-tests are submitted anonymously, all registrants' pre-test scores are calculated in the pre-test average.

Table O3 shows the most frequently missed questions on the pre-test.

Table O123. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Pre-Test

Question	Number Missed	Percent Who Missed Question
Q2. The ignition interlock device will shut the engine off if an offender provides a breath sample with alcohol present.	4	75.0%
Q3. When must an ignition interlock device be ordered as a condition of bond?	4	75.0%

Question	Number Missed	Percent Who Missed Question
Q5. If an offender violates an Occupational Driver License order, the violation is a...	4	75.0%

Post-Tests

Following the completion of the training course material, a 10-question post-test is administered to determine participants' level of knowledge regarding ignition interlock devices. Each test question is worth 10 points. The only attendee did not complete a post-test.

Table O124. Most Frequently Missed Question on Post-Test

Question	Number Missed	Percent Who Missed Question

* Post-test was not received

Change in Knowledge

Change in knowledge is calculated to determine if there was a change in participants' knowledge after completing the course. Change in knowledge is calculated by:

$$= (\text{Post-Test Score} - \text{Pre-Test Score}) / \text{Pre-Test Score}$$

Change in knowledge could not be calculated because the only attendee did not submit a post-test.

Course Evaluations

At the end of the training, participants complete an evaluation. The evaluation includes a section to rate the training content and instructors, and to provide feedback and comments. Participants are asked to rate the items based on a five-point rating scale between "strongly disagree" and "strongly agree." Some participants did not have both industry representatives (Dottie McDonald and Erin Garza) as instructors, so their scores may be based off fewer evaluations.

Each rating is assigned a point value -- with "strongly disagree" assigned the lowest point value of 1 and "strongly agree" assigned the highest point value of 5. An average is calculated for each evaluative component.

There were 0 course evaluations received. Table O5 is the average course evaluation scores. Table O6 is the average instructor evaluation scores. Table O7 is additional comments received from prosecutors.

Table O125. Course Evaluations Completed by Prosecutors

Question	Average Score
The information provided on ignition interlock devices was applicable to my job duties.	N/A
I am likely to use the information provided today in my daily job duties.	N/A
Attending the ignition interlock training program was a good use of my time.	N/A
I felt the format of the workshop, pace of instruction and schedule were appropriate for the material presented.	N/A
I felt the topics covered, PowerPoint presentation and videos enhanced the instructors' presentation.	N/A

Table O126. Instructor Evaluations Completed by Prosecutors

Instructor	Average Score
Cody Stewart	N/A
Industry Representative – Dottie	N/A
Industry Representative – Erin	N/A

Table O127. Course Comments Completed by Prosecutors

Comments

* No comments received

Prosecutor's Offices Contacted and Invited to Participate

PROSECUTORS – 156

Culberson County CA – 2

- County Attorney – 1
- County Attorney's Key Personnel – 1

- County Attorney's Key Personnel – 7
- County Attorney's VAC – 2
- Paralegal – 1

El Paso County CA – 53

- Asst. County Attorney – 38
- County Attorney – 1
- County Attorney's Investigator – 4

El Paso County DA – 99

- 34th Judicial District Attorney – 1
- Administrative Assistant – 1
- Asst. District Attorney – 55
- District Attorney's Investigator – 13

- District Attorney's Key Personnel – 3
- District Attorney's Office – 14
- District Attorney's VAC – 6
- Paralegal – 6

Hudspeth County CA – 2

- County Attorney – 1
- County Attorney's Key Personnel – 1

Appendix P: Ignition Interlock Training for Criminal Justice Professionals – Uvalde County Judges

Location

A 2021 ignition interlock training was held virtually via Webex on July 8th, 2021, from 1:30 PM – 4:50 PM for judges in Uvalde and surrounding counties. Due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, all trainings are being held virtually via live webinars for FY 21.

Training

Recruitment

The Texas A&M Transportation Institute (TTI) project team identified and invited judges from Uvalde and surrounding counties to participate in the training program. Potential participants were recruited via emails sent to judges in the following 11 counties:

- Bandera
- Edwards
- Frio
- Kerr
- Kinney
- Maverick
- Medina
- Real
- Uvalde
- Val Verde
- Zavala

The TTI project team contacted 68 judges. Of note, the TTI project team invited probation officers to the trainings by their department, (i.e., once each was contacted, the department further disseminated the training information internally to staff). Conversely, the TTI project team reached out to prosecutors and judges on an individual basis to invite them to the trainings.

Registration

Participants registered online prior to the training, submitting basic contact information. Participants were also asked to complete an anonymous pre-training test. In advance of the trainings, there were 16 registrants and 13 completed pre-tests. The breakdown of participants is shown Table P1. Registration and pre-test completion indicates the intent to attend the training, but it does not mean the registrant showed up for the virtual training. Of note, not all attendees submitted a completed post-test. Participants are also asked to complete an evaluation form, and these are submitted anonymously.

Table P128. Training Recruitment, Registration, Participation, and Completion

Judges	
# Recruited	68
# Registered	16

Judges	
# Pre-Tests Completed	13
# Attended	14
# Post-Tests Completed	13
# Evaluations	12

Participation

There were 14 participants who attended the training. Participating courts and counties represented are shown below.

- Justice of the Peace – Bandera County
- Maverick County Court – Maverick County
- Justice of the Peace – Medina County
- Real County Court – Real County
- Sabinal Municipal Court – Uvalde County
- Val Verde County Court at Law – Val Verde County
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 2 – Val Verde County
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 4 – Val Verde County
- Val Verde County Court – Val Verde County

Test Scores

Both a pre-test and a post-test are administered prior to and following each training. The pre-test gauges a participant’s knowledge related to ignition interlock prior to attending the course. The pre-test consists of 10 questions and is completed online via Qualtrics. The post-test gauges a participant’s knowledge related to ignition interlock after attending the course. The post-test consists of 10 questions – including 6 of the same questions on the pre-test – and is completed immediately following the training via Qualtrics. Table P2 shows the test scores for the training.

Table P129. Test Scores

Pre-Test Score	Post-Test Score	Change in Knowledge (% Gain)
76.2	90.8	19.2%

Pre-Tests

The average pre-test score was a 76.2. Not all registrants who complete the pre-tests end up attending the training. However, because the pre-tests are submitted anonymously, all registrants' pre-test scores are calculated in the pre-test average.

Table P3 shows the most frequently missed questions on the pre-test. Over half of participants missed the question pertaining to how the ignition interlock device works when alcohol is detected.

Table P130. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Pre-Test

Question	Number Missed	Percent Who Missed Question
Q2. The ignition interlock device will shut the engine off if an offender provides a breath sample with alcohol present.	8	61.5%
Q7. What is a goal of ignition interlock?	7	53.9%
Q3. When must an ignition interlock device be ordered as a condition of bond?	5	38.5%
Q5. If an offender violates an Occupational Drivers License order, the violation is a	5	38.5%

Post-Tests

Following the completion of the training course material, a 10-question post-test is administered to determine participants' level of knowledge regarding ignition interlock devices. Each test question is worth 10 points. Participants who completed the training had an average post-test score of 90.8.

Table P4 lists the most frequently missed questions on the post-test. The most frequently missed questions concerned how to start a vehicle with an ignition interlock device installed and alcohol elimination rates; these questions were not pre-test questions.

Table P131. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Post-Test

Question	Number Missed	Percent Who Missed Question
Q6. What are the steps, in order, to start a vehicle equipped with an ignition interlock device?	3	25.0%
Q10. What is the average elimination rate of alcohol of an adult male?	3	25.0%

Question	Number Missed	Percent Who Missed Question
If a breath sample with alcohol present is provided during a rolling retest, the vehicle will immediately shut off. *	2	16.7%

* Question was on the pre-test

Change in Knowledge

Change in knowledge is calculated to determine if there was a change in participants' knowledge after completing the course. Change in knowledge is calculated by:

$$= (\text{Post-Test Score} - \text{Pre-Test Score}) / \text{Pre-Test Score}$$

Participants experienced a 19.2% gain in knowledge.

Course Evaluations

At the end of the training, participants complete an evaluation. The evaluation includes a section to rate the training content and instructors, and to provide feedback and comments. Participants are asked to rate the items based on a five-point rating scale between "strongly disagree" and "strongly agree." Some participants did not have both industry representatives (Dottie McDonald and Erin Garza) as instructors, so their scores may be based off fewer evaluations.

Each rating is assigned a point value -- with "strongly disagree" assigned the lowest point value of 1 and "strongly agree" assigned the highest point value of 5. An average is calculated for each evaluative component.

There were 12 course evaluations received. Table P5 is the average course evaluation scores. Table P6 is the average instructor evaluation scores. Table P7 is additional comments received.

Table P132. Course Evaluations Completed by Judges

Question	Average Score
The information provided on ignition interlock devices was applicable to my job duties.	4.9
I am likely to use the information provided today in my daily job duties.	4.8
Attending the ignition interlock training program was a good use of my time.	4.9
I felt the format of the workshop, pace of instruction and schedule were appropriate for the material presented.	4.9
I felt the topics covered, PowerPoint presentation and videos enhanced the instructors' presentation.	4.9

Table P133. Instructor Evaluations Completed by Judges

Instructor	Average Score
Cody Stewart	4.6
Industry Representative – Dottie	N/A
Industry Representative – Erin *	4.7

* This average score is based off 11 evaluations.

Table P134. Course Comments Completed by Judges

Comments
Very well presented. Speakers were knowledgeable and power point was effective.
A very informative training on the general knowledge of the IID technology, violations, reporting and challenges.
Very good information. This information definitely needs to be offered for newly elected JP's training.
I felt it was very concise but highly comprehensive as is.

Courts Contacted and Invited to Participate

JUDGES – 68

Bandera County – 6

- Bandera County Court
- Bandera Municipal Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 2
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 3
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 4

Edwards County – 3

- 452nd District Court
- Edwards County Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1

Frio County – 7

- 81st District Court
- Dilley Municipal Court
- Frio County Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1

- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 2
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 3
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 4

Kerr County – 9

- 189th District Court
- 216th District Court
- County Court at Law
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 2
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 3
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 4
- Kerr County Court
- Kerrville Municipal Court

Kinney – 2

- Justice of the Peace
- Kinney County Court

Maverick – 7

- 365th District Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 2
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 3, Pl. 1
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 3, Pl. 2
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 4
- Maverick County Court

Medina – 8

- 454th District Court
- County Court at Law
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 2
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 3
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 4
- Medina County Court
- Natalia Municipal Court

Real – 2

- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1
- Real County Court

Uvalde – 9

- 38th District Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1

- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 2
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 3
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 4
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 6 Pl. 1
- Sabinal Municipal Court
- Uvalde County Court
- Uvalde Municipal Court

Val Verde – 9

- 63rd District Court
- 83rd District Court
- County Court at Law
- Del Rio Municipal Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1 Pl. 1
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 2 Pl. 1
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 3 Pl. 1
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 4 Pl. 1
- Val Verde County Court

Zavala – 6

- 293rd District Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 2
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 3
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 4
- Zavala County Court

Appendix Q: Ignition Interlock Training for Criminal Justice Professionals – Kaufman County Judges

Location

A 2021 ignition interlock training was held virtually via Webex on July 9th, 2021, from 8:30 AM – 11:50 AM for judges in Kaufman and surrounding counties. Due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, all trainings are being held virtually via live webinars for FY 21.

Training

Recruitment

The Texas A&M Transportation Institute (TTI) project team identified and invited judges from Kaufman and surrounding counties to participate in the training program. Potential participants were recruited via emails sent to judges in the following 9 counties:

- Dallas
- Ellis
- Henderson
- Hunt
- Kaufman
- Navarro
- Rains
- Rockwall
- Van Zandt

The TTI project team contacted 156 judges. Of note, the TTI project team invited probation officers to the trainings by their department, (i.e., once each was contacted, the department further disseminated the training information internally to staff). Conversely, the TTI project team reached out to prosecutors and judges on an individual basis to invite them to the trainings.

Registration

Participants registered online prior to the training, submitting basic contact information. Participants were also asked to complete an anonymous pre-training test. In advance of the trainings, there were 14 registrants and 13 completed pre-tests. The breakdown of participants is shown Table Q1. Registration and pre-test completion indicated the intent to attend the training, but it does not mean the registrant showed up for the virtual training. Participants are also asked to complete an evaluation form, and these are submitted anonymously.

Table Q135. Training Recruitment, Registration, Participation, and Completion

Judges	
# Recruited	156
# Registered	14
# Pre-Tests Completed	13

Judges	
# Attended	10
# Post-Tests Completed	10
# Evaluations	10

Participation

There were 10 participants who attended the training. Participating courts and counties represented are shown below.

- 283rd District Court – Dallas County
- County Criminal Court, No. 7 – Dallas County
- County Criminal Court, No. 8 – Dallas County
- Duncanville Municipal Court – Dallas County
- Seagoville Municipal Court – Dallas County
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1 – Ellis County
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 3 – Ellis County
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 4 – Kaufman County
- Justice of the Peace – Kerr County
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 2 – Rockwall County
- Del Rio Municipal Court – Val Verde
- Wills Point Municipal Court – Van Zandt County

Test Scores

Both a pre-test and a post-test are administered prior to and following each training. The pre-test gauges a participant’s knowledge related to ignition interlock prior to attending the course. The pre-test consists of 10 questions and is completed online via Qualtrics. The post-test gauges a participant’s knowledge related to ignition interlock after attending the course. The post-test consists of 10 questions – including 6 of the same questions on the pre-test – and is completed immediately following the training via Qualtrics. Table Q2 shows the test scores for the training.

Table Q136. Test Scores

Pre-Test Score	Post-Test Score	Change in Knowledge (% Gain)
66.9	93.0	39.0%

Pre-Tests

The average pre-test score was a 66.9. Not all registrants who complete the pre-tests end up attending the training. However, because the pre-tests are submitted anonymously, all registrants' pre-test scores are calculated in the pre-test average.

Table Q3 shows the most frequently missed questions on the pre-test. Over 75 percent of participants missed the questions pertaining to how the ignition interlock device works when alcohol is detected, and the type of violation for an occupational driver license order violation.

Table Q137. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Pre-Test

Question	Number Missed	Percent Who Missed Question
Q2. The ignition interlock device will shut the engine off if an offender provides a breath sample with alcohol present.	10	76.9%
Q5. If an offender violates an Occupational Drivers License order, the violation is a...	10	76.9%
Q7. What is a goal of ignition interlock?	6	46.2%
Q4. When must an ignition interlock device be ordered as a condition of probation?	5	38.5%

Post-Tests

Following the completion of the training course material, a 10-question post-test is administered to determine participants' level of knowledge regarding ignition interlock devices. Each test question is worth 10 points. Participants who completed the training had an average post-test score of 93.0

Table Q4 lists the most frequently missed questions on the post-test. There was not a post-test question that was missed by more than one participant.

Table Q138. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Post-Test

Question	Number Missed	Percent Who Missed Question
Q1. The ignition interlock device is alcohol-specific and cannot detect other drugs in the body. *	1	10.0%

Question	Number Missed	Percent Who Missed Question
Q2. If a breath sample with alcohol present is provided during a rolling retest, the vehicle will immediately shut off. *	1	10.0%
Q3. When must an ignition interlock device be ordered as a condition of bond? *	1	10.0%
Q6. What are the steps, in order, to start a vehicle equipped with an ignition interlock device?	1	10.0%
Q7. The ignition interlock device may detect residual mouth alcohol. *	1	10.0%
Q9. What is a Circumvention?	1	10.0%
Q10. What is the average elimination rate of alcohol of an adult male?	1	10.0%

* Question was on the pre-test

Change in Knowledge

Change in knowledge is calculated to determine if there was a change in participants' knowledge after completing the course. Change in knowledge is calculated by:

$$= (\text{Post-Test Score} - \text{Pre-Test Score}) / \text{Pre-Test Score}$$

Participants experienced a 39.0% gain in knowledge.

Course Evaluations

At the end of the training, participants complete an evaluation. The evaluation includes a section to rate the training content and instructors, and to provide feedback and comments. Participants are asked to rate the items based on a five-point rating scale between "strongly disagree" and "strongly agree." Some participants did not have both industry representatives (Dottie McDonald and Erin Garza) as instructors, so their scores may be based off fewer evaluations.

Each rating is assigned a point value -- with "strongly disagree" assigned the lowest point value of 1 and "strongly agree" assigned the highest point value of 5. An average is calculated for each evaluative component.

There were 10 course evaluations received. Table Q5 is the average course evaluation scores. Table Q6 is the average instructor evaluation scores. Table Q7 is additional comments received.

Table Q139. Course Evaluations Completed by Judges

Question	Average Score
The information provided on ignition interlock devices was applicable to my job duties.	4.8

Question	Average Score
I am likely to use the information provided today in my daily job duties.	4.6
Attending the ignition interlock training program was a good use of my time.	4.9
I felt the format of the workshop, pace of instruction and schedule were appropriate for the material presented.	4.8
I felt the topics covered, PowerPoint presentation and videos enhanced the instructors' presentation.	4.9

Table Q140. Instructor Evaluations Completed by Judges

Instructor	Average Score
Cody Stewart	4.6
Industry Representative – Dottie	N/A
Industry Representative – Erin **	4.6

** This average score is based off 8 evaluations.

Table Q141. Course Comments Completed by Judges

Comments
Well paced and informative
Great info and presentation
Very good presentation. Thank you.
Wonderful webinar
Very precise and understanding
Enjoyed the overall format and depth of class. Good to know the whys and hows.
Again, very good. Thank you.

Courts Contacted and Invited to Participate

JUDGES – 156

Dallas County – 72

- 14th District Court
- 44th District Court
- 68th District Court
- 95th District Court
- 101st District Court
- 116th District Court

- 134th District Court
- 160th District Court
- 162nd District Court
- 192nd District Court
- 193rd District Court
- 194th District Court
- 195th District Court
- 203rd District Court
- 204th District Court
- 254th District Court
- 255th District Court
- 256th District Court
- 265th District Court
- 282nd District Court
- 283rd District Court
- 291st District Court
- 292nd District Court
- 298th District Court
- 301st District Court
- 302th District Court
- 303rd District Court
- 304th District Court
- 305th District Court
- 330th District Court
- 363rd District Court
- 378th District Court
- County Court at Law, No. 1
- County Court at Law, No. 3
- County Court at Law, No. 4
- County Court at Law, County Criminal Court 1
- County Court at Law, County Criminal Court 2
- County Court at Law, County Criminal Court 3
- County Court at Law, County Criminal Court 4
- County Court at Law, County Criminal Court 5
- County Court at Law, County Criminal Court 6
- County Court at Law, County Criminal Court 7
- County Court at Law, County Criminal Court 8
- County Court at Law, County Criminal Court 9
- County Court at Law, County Criminal Court 10
- County Court at Law, County Criminal Court 11
- County Court at Law, County Criminal Court of Appeals 1
- County Court at Law, County Criminal Court of Appeals 2
- Criminal District Court, No. 1
- Criminal District Court, No. 2
- Criminal District Court, No. 3
- Criminal District Court, No. 4
- Criminal District Court, No. 5
- Criminal District Court, No. 6
- Criminal District Court, No. 7
- Dallas County Court
- Dallas Municipal Court
- DeSoto Municipal Court
- Duncanville Municipal Court
- Farmers Branch Municipal Court
- Glenn Heights Municipal Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1 Pl. 1
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1 Pl. 2
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 2 Pl. 1
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 2 Pl. 2
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 3 Pl. 1
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 3 Pl. 2
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 4 Pl. 1
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 4 Pl. 2
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 5 Pl. 1
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 5 Pl. 2
- Lancaster Municipal Court
- Richardson Municipal Court
- Seagoville Municipal Court

Ellis County – 13

- 40th District Court
- 443rd District Judge
- County Court at Law, No. 1
- County Court at Law, No. 2
- County Court at Law, No. 3
- Ellis County Court
- Ferris Municipal Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 2
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 3
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 4
- Midlothian Municipal Court
- Palmer Municipal Court

Henderson County – 15

- 3rd District Court
- 173rd District Court
- 392nd District Court'
- Brownsboro Municipal Court
- County Court at Law, No. 2
- Chandler Municipal Court
- Coffee City Municipal Court
- Frankston Municipal Court
- Henderson County Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 2
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 4
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 5
- Malakoff Municipal Court
- Seven Points Municipal Court

Hunt County – 12

- 196th District Court
- Caddo Mills Municipal Court
- Commerce Municipal Court
- Greenville County Court
- Greenville Municipal Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1 Pl. 1
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1 Pl. 2
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 2
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 3
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 4

- Lone Oak Municipal Court
- West Tawakoni Municipal Court

Kaufman – 14

- 86th District Court
- 422nd District Court
- City of Terrell Municipal Court
- County Court at Law, No. 1
- County Court at Law, No. 2
- Crandall Municipal Court
- Forney Municipal Court
- Kaufman County Court
- Kaufman Municipal Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 2
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 3
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 4
- Oak Ridge Municipal Court

Navarro – 7

- 13th District Court
- Kerens Municipal Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 2
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 3
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 4
- Navarro County Court

Rains – 4

- East Tawakoni Municipal Court
- Justice of the Peace
- Rains County Court
- Rains Municipal Court

Rockwall – 9

- 382nd District Court
- 439th District Court
- County Court at Law, No. 1
- County Court at Law, No. 2
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 2
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 3

- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 4
- Rockwall County Court

Van Zandt – 10

- 294th District Court
- Canton Municipal Court
- County Court at Law

- Grand Saline Municipal Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 2
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 3
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 4
- Van Zandt County Court
- Wills Point Municipal Court

Appendix R: Ignition Interlock Training for Criminal Justice Professionals – Cross Timbers Region Judges

Location

A 2021 ignition interlock training was held virtually via Webex on August 6th, 2021, from 8:30 AM – 11:50 AM for judges in Cross Timbers. Due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, all trainings are being held virtually via live webinars for FY 21.

Training

Recruitment

The Texas A&M Transportation Institute (TTI) project team identified and invited judges from the Cross Timbers region to participate in the training program. Potential participants were recruited via emails sent to judges in the following 17 counties:

- Archer
- Baylor
- Clay
- Cooke
- Denton
- Eastland
- Erath
- Hood
- Jack
- Montague
- Palo Pinto
- Parker
- Stephens
- Tarrant
- Throckmorton
- Wise
- Young

The TTI project team contacted 187 judges. Of note, the TTI project team invited probation officers to the trainings by their department, (i.e., once each was contacted, the department further disseminated the training information internally to staff). Conversely, the TTI project team reached out to prosecutors and judges on an individual basis to invite them to the trainings.

Registration

Participants registered online prior to the training, submitting basic contact information. Participants were also asked to complete an anonymous pre-training test. In advance of the trainings, there were 14 registrants and 8 completed pre-tests. The breakdown of participants is shown Table R1. Registration and pre-test completion indicates the intent to attend the training, but it does not mean the registrant showed up for the virtual training. Of note, not all attendees submit a completed post-test. Participants are also asked to complete an evaluation form, and these are submitted anonymously.

Table R142. Training Recruitment, Registration, Participation, and Completion

Judges	
# Recruited	117
# Registered	14
# Pre-Tests Completed	8
# Attended	7
# Post-Tests Completed	6
# Evaluations	10

Participation

There were 7 participants who attended the training. Participating courts and counties represented are shown below.

- Justice of the Peace – Archer County
- Denton Municipal Court – Denton County
- Ranger Municipal Court– Eastland County
- 43rd Judicial District Court– Parker County
- Justice of the Peace – Parker County
- Weatherford Municipal Court – Weatherford County

Test Scores

Both a pre-test and a post-test are administered prior to and following each training. The pre-test gauges a participant’s knowledge related to ignition interlock prior to attending the course. The pre-test consists of 10 questions and is completed online via Qualtrics. The post-test gauges a participant’s knowledge related to ignition interlock after attending the course. The post-test consists of 10 questions – including 6 of the same questions on the pre-test – and is completed immediately following the training via Qualtrics. Table R2 shows the test scores for the training.

Table R143. Test Scores

Pre-Test Score	Post-Test Score	Change in Knowledge (% Gain)
81.3	86.7	6.6%

Pre-Tests

The average pre-test score was an 81.3. Not all registrants who complete the pre-tests end up attending the training. However, because the pre-tests are submitted anonymously, all registrants' pre-test scores are calculated in the pre-test average.

Table R3 shows the most frequently missed questions on the pre-test. Half of the participants missed the question pertaining to how the ignition interlock device works when alcohol is detected.

Table R144. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Pre-Test

Question	Number Missed	Percent Who Missed Question
Q2. The ignition interlock device will shut the engine off if an offender provides a breath sample with alcohol present.	4	50.0%
Q7. What is a goal of ignition interlock?	3	37.5%
Q5. If an offender violates an Occupational Driver License order, the violation is a	2	25.0%
Q8. The ignition interlock device will detect residual mouth alcohol.	2	25.0%

Post-Tests

Following the completion of the training course material, a 10-question post-test is administered to determine participants' level of knowledge regarding ignition interlock devices. Each test question is worth 10 points. Participants who completed the training had an average post-test score of 86.7.

Table R4 lists the most frequently missed questions on the post-test. Half of participants missed the question concerning how the ignition interlock device works when alcohol is detected; this question was on the pre-test.

Table R145. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Post-Test

Question	Number Missed	Percent Who Missed Question
Q2. If a breath sample with alcohol present is provided during a rolling retest, the vehicle will immediately shut off. *	3	50.0%
Q3. When must an ignition interlock device be ordered as a condition of bond?	2	33.3%

Question	Number Missed	Percent Who Missed Question
Q10. What is the average elimination rate of alcohol of an adult male?	2	33.3%

* Question was on the pre-test

Change in Knowledge

Change in knowledge is calculated to determine if there was a change in participants' knowledge after completing the course. Change in knowledge is calculated by:

$$= (\text{Post-Test Score} - \text{Pre-Test Score}) / \text{Pre-Test Score}$$

Participants experienced a 6.6% gain in knowledge.

Course Evaluations

At the end of the training, participants complete an evaluation. The evaluation includes a section to rate the training content and instructors, and to provide feedback and comments. Participants are asked to rate the items based on a five-point rating scale between "strongly disagree" and "strongly agree." Industry representative trainers did not participate in this training.

Each rating is assigned a point value -- with "strongly disagree" assigned the lowest point value of 1 and "strongly agree" assigned the highest point value of 5. An average is calculated for each evaluative component.

There were 10 course evaluations received, although only 7 participants attended the training. However, since evaluations are anonymous, all evaluations are included in this report. Table R5 is the average course evaluation scores. Table R6 is the average instructor evaluation scores. Table R7 is additional comments received.

Table R146. Course Evaluations Completed by Judges

Question	Average Score
The information provided on ignition interlock devices was applicable to my job duties.	4.8
I am likely to use the information provided today in my daily job duties.	4.8
Attending the ignition interlock training program was a good use of my time.	4.9
I felt the format of the workshop, pace of instruction and schedule were appropriate for the material presented.	4.7
I felt the topics covered, PowerPoint presentation and videos enhanced the instructors' presentation.	4.7

Table R147. Instructor Evaluations Completed by Judges

Instructor	Average Score
Cody Stewart	4.8
Industry Representative – Dottie	N/A
Industry Representative – Erin	N/A

Table R148. Course Comments Completed by Judges

Comments
This presentation should be done at the annual TMCEC Judicial Training seminar so that more judges are familiar with the material.
I do arraignments at the jail and this was extremely helpful information. And I did learn a lot that I didn't know!
Thanks for the printouts for reference material.
I felt it was very concise but highly comprehensive as is.

Courts Contacted and Invited to Participate

JUDGES – 187

Archer County – 6

- Archer County Court
- Holiday City Municipal Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 2
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 3
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 4

Baylor County – 5

- 50th Judicial District Court
- Baylor County Court
- Seymour Municipal Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 2

Clay County – 2

- Clay County Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1

Cooke County – 7

- 235th Judicial District Court
- 236th Judicial District Court
- Gainesville County Court
- Gainesville Municipal Court
- City of Lindsay Municipal Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 2

Denton County – 42

- 16th Judicial District Court
- 158th Judicial District Court
- 211th Judicial District Court
- 362nd Judicial District Court
- 367th Judicial District Court
- 393rd Judicial District Court
- 431st Judicial District Court
- 422nd Judicial District Court

- 462nd Judicial District Court
- 467th Judicial District Court
- Denton County Court
- County Court at Law, No. 1
- County Court at Law, No. 2
- County Criminal Court at Law, No. 1
- County Criminal Court at Law, No. 2
- County Criminal Court at Law, No. 3
- County Criminal Court at Law, No. 4
- County Criminal Court at Law, No. 5
- Argyle Municipal Court
- Copper Canyon Municipal Court
- Highland Village Municipal Court
- Justin Municipal Court
- Northlake Municipal Court
- Krum Municipal Court
- Lake Dallas Municipal Court
- Little Elm Municipal Court
- Pilot Point Municipal Court
- Ponder Municipal Court
- Roanoke Municipal Court
- Sanger Municipal Court
- Shady Shores Municipal Court
- Westlake Municipal Court
- Corinth Municipal Court
- Providence Village
- Flower Mound Municipal Court
- Trophy Club Municipal Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 2
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 3
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 4
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 5
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 6

Eastland County – 6

- Eastland County Court
- Cisco Municipal Court
- Eastland/Rising Star Municipal Court
- Ranger Municipal Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 2

Erath County – 7

- 266th Judicial District Court
- Stephenville County Court
- County Court at Law
- Dublin Municipal Court
- Stephenville Municipal Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 2

Hood County – 8

- 355th Judicial District Court
- Granbury County Court
- County Court at Law
- Granbury Municipal Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 2
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 3
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 4

Jack County – 3

- Jack County Court
- Jacksboro Municipal Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1

Montague County – 5

- 97th Judicial District Court
- Montague County Court
- Bowie Municipal Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 2

Palo Pinto County – 8

- 29th Judicial District Court
- Palo Pinto County Court
- Mineral Wells Municipal Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 2
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 3
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 4
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 5

Parker County – 11

- 43rd Judicial District Court
- 415th Judicial District Court
- Parker County Court
- County Court at Law, No. 1
- County Court at Law, No. 2
- Aledo Municipal Court
- Willow Park Municipal Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 2
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 3
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 4

Stephens County – 3

- Stephens County Court
- Breckenridge Municipal Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1

Tarrant County – 54

- 17th Judicial District Court
- 48th Judicial District Court
- 67th Judicial District Court
- 96th Judicial District Court
- 141st Judicial District Court
- 213th Judicial District Court
- 233rd Judicial District Court
- 236th Judicial District Court
- 297th Judicial District Court
- 322nd Judicial District Court
- 324th Judicial District Court
- 325th Judicial District Court
- 342nd Judicial District Court
- 348th Judicial District Court
- 352nd Judicial District Court
- 371st Judicial District Court
- 372nd Judicial District Court
- Fort Worth County Court
- County Court at Law, No. 1
- County Court at Law, No. 3
- Criminal District Court – Fort Worth, District 1

- Criminal District Court – Fort Worth, District 3
- Fort Worth County Court
- County Criminal Court at Law 2
- County Criminal Court at Law 3
- County Criminal Court at Law 4
- County Criminal Court at Law 5
- County Criminal Court at Law 6
- County Criminal Court at Law 7
- County Criminal Court at Law 9
- County Criminal Court at Law 10
- City of Southlake Municipal Court
- Colleyville Municipal Court
- Crowley Municipal Court
- Edgecliff Village Municipal Court
- Euless Municipal Court
- Grapevine Municipal Court
- Hurst Municipal Court
- Lakeside Municipal Court
- Mansfield Municipal Court
- North Richland Hills Municipal Court
- Richland Hills Municipal Court
- River Oaks Municipal Court
- Saginaw Municipal Court
- Sansom Park Municipal Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 2
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 3
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 4
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 5
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 6
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 7
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 8

Throckmorton County – 3

- 39th Judicial District Court
- Throckmorton County Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1

Wise County – 12

- 271st Judicial District Court
- Wise County Court

- Alvord, Chico & Runaway Bay Municipal Court
- Aurora & Edgecliff Village/Lake Worth/White Settlement (Tarrant) Municipal Court
- Boyd & Bridgeport Municipal Court
- Decatur Municipal Court
- New Fairview Municipal Court
- Newark Mansfield Municipal Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1

- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 2
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 3
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 4

Young County – 5

- 90th Judicial District Court
- Young County Court
- Graham Municipal Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 3

Appendix S: Ignition Interlock Training for Criminal Justice Professionals – El Paso County Judges

Location

A 2021 ignition interlock training was held virtually via Webex on August 19th, 2021, from 1:00 PM – 4:50 PM MT for judges in El Paso and surrounding counties. Due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, all trainings are being held virtually via live webinars for FY 21.

Training

Recruitment

The Texas A&M Transportation Institute (TTI) project team identified and invited judges from El Paso and surrounding counties to participate in the training program. Potential participants were recruited via emails sent to judges in the following 3 counties:

- Culberson
- El Paso
- Hudspeth

The TTI project team contacted 24 judges. Of note, the TTI project team invited probation officers to the trainings by their department, (i.e., once each was contacted, the department further disseminated the training information internally to staff). Conversely, the TTI project team reached out to prosecutors and judges on an individual basis to invite them to the trainings.

Registration

Participants registered online prior to the training, submitting basic contact information. Participants were also asked to complete an anonymous pre-training test. In advance of the trainings, there were 5 registrants and 4 completed pre-tests. The breakdown of participants is shown Table S1. Registration and pre-test completion indicates the intent to attend the training, but it does not mean the registrant showed up for the virtual training. Participants are also asked to complete an evaluation form, and these are submitted anonymously.

Table S149. Training Recruitment, Registration, Participation, and Completion

	Judges
# Recruited	24
# Registered	5
# Pre-Tests Completed	4
# Attended	2
# Post-Tests Completed	2

Judges	
# Evaluations	2

Participation

There were 2 participants who attended the training. Participating courts and counties represented are shown below.

- County Court at Law #2 – El Paso County
- County Criminal Court #4 – El Paso County

Test Scores

Both a pre-test and a post-test are administered prior to and following each training. The pre-test gauges a participant’s knowledge related to ignition interlock prior to attending the course. The pre-test consists of 10 questions and is completed online via Qualtrics. The post-test gauges a participant’s knowledge related to ignition interlock after attending the course. The post-test consists of 10 questions – including 6 of the same questions on the pre-test – and is completed immediately following the training via Qualtrics. Table S2 shows the test scores for the training.

Table S150. Test Scores

Pre-Test Score	Post-Test Score	Change in Knowledge (% Gain)
75.0	90.0	20.0%

Pre-Tests

The average pre-test score was 75.0 percent. Not all registrants who complete the pre-tests end up attending the training. However, because the pre-tests are submitted anonymously, all registrants’ pre-test scores are calculated in the pre-test average.

Table S3 shows the most frequently missed questions on the pre-test. All participants missed the question pertaining to the type of violation for an occupational driver license order violation.

Table S151. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Pre-Test

Question	Number Missed	Percent Who Missed Question
Q5. If an offender violates an Occupational Driver License order, the violation is a...	4	100.0%
Q6. What causes an ignition interlock device violation?	3	75.0%

Post-Tests

Following the completion of the training course material, a 10-question post-test is administered to determine participants' level of knowledge regarding ignition interlock devices. Each test question is worth 10 points. Participants who completed the training had an average post-test score of 90.0.

Table S4 lists the most frequently missed questions on the post-test. The most frequently missed questions concerned how to start a vehicle with an ignition interlock device installed, and alcohol elimination rates; these questions were not on the pre-test.

Table S152. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Post-Test

Question	Number Missed	Percent Who Missed Question
Q6. What are the steps, in order, to start a vehicle equipped with an ignition interlock device?	1	50.0%
Q10. What is the average elimination rate of alcohol of an adult male?	1	50.0%

* Question was on the pre-test

Change in Knowledge

Change in knowledge is calculated to determine if there was a change in participants' knowledge after completing the course. Change in knowledge is calculated by:

$$= (\text{Post-Test Score} - \text{Pre-Test Score}) / \text{Pre-Test Score}$$

Participants experienced a 20.0% gain in knowledge.

Course Evaluations

At the end of the training, participants complete an evaluation. The evaluation includes a section to rate the training content and instructors, and to provide feedback and comments. Participants are asked to rate the items based on a five-point rating scale between "strongly disagree" and "strongly agree." Industry representative trainers did not participate in this training.

Each rating is assigned a point value -- with "strongly disagree" assigned the lowest point value of 1 and "strongly agree" assigned the highest point value of 5. An average is calculated for each evaluative component.

There were 2 course evaluations received. Table S5 is the average course evaluation scores. Table S6 is the average instructor evaluation scores. Table S7 is additional comments received.

Table S153. Course Evaluations Completed by Judges

Question	Average Score
The information provided on ignition interlock devices was applicable to my job duties.	5.0
I am likely to use the information provided today in my daily job duties.	4.5
Attending the ignition interlock training program was a good use of my time.	4.5
I felt the format of the workshop, pace of instruction and schedule were appropriate for the material presented.	4.5
I felt the topics covered, PowerPoint presentation and videos enhanced the instructors' presentation.	5.0

Table S154. Instructor Evaluations Completed by Judges

Instructor	Average Score
Cody Stewart	4.5
Industry Representative – Dottie	N/A
Industry Representative – Erin	N/A

Table S155. Course Comments Completed by Judges

Comments
There was a lot of content, I felt like some of it was a little rushed
I've been on the bench for over twenty years and had never had such a course focused solely on the IID. It was a very informative presentation. I just wish it had been sent out to all the judges. I found out through another judge, but did not receive the invitation myself.

Courts Contacted and Invited to Participate

JUDGES – 24

Culberson County – 4

- Culberson County Court
- Van Horn Municipal Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 2
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 3

El Paso County – 16

- 34th Judicial District Court
- 41st Judicial District Court
- 120th Judicial District Court
- 168th Judicial District Court
- 171st Judicial District Court

- 205th Judicial District Court
- 210th Judicial District Court
- 409th Judicial District Court
- El Paso County Court
- Socorro Municipal Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 2
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 3
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 4

- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 6
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 7

Hudspeth County – 4

- Hudspeth County Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 2
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 3
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 4

Appendix T: Ignition Interlock Training for Criminal Justice Professionals – Panhandle Judges

Location

A 2021 ignition interlock training was held virtually via Webex on August 19th, 2021, from 8:30 AM – 11:50 AM for judges in the Panhandle. Due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, all trainings are being held virtually via live webinars for FY 21.

Training

Recruitment

The Texas A&M Transportation Institute (TTI) project team identified and invited judges from the Panhandle to participate in the training program. Potential participants were recruited via emails sent to judges in the following 25 counties:

- Armstrong
- Briscoe
- Carson
- Castro
- Childress
- Collingsworth
- Dallam
- Deaf Smith
- Donley
- Gray
- Hall
- Hansford
- Hemphill
- Hutchinson
- Lipscomb
- Moore
- Ochiltree
- Oldham
- Parmer
- Potter
- Randall
- Roberts
- Sherman
- Swisher
- Wheeler

The TTI project team contacted 99 judges. Of note, the TTI project team invited probation officers to the trainings by their department, (i.e., once each was contacted, the department further disseminated the training information internally to staff). Conversely, the TTI project team reached out to prosecutors and judges on an individual basis to invite them to the trainings.

Registration

Participants registered online prior to the training, which submitted basic contact information. Participants were also asked to complete an anonymous pre-training test. In advance of the trainings, there were 12 registrants and 8 completed pre-tests. The breakdown of participants is shown Table T1. Registration and pre-test completion indicates the intent to attend the training, but it does not mean

the registrant showed up for the virtual training. Participants are also asked to complete an evaluation form, and these are submitted anonymously.

Table T156. Training Recruitment, Registration, Participation, and Completion

	Judges
# Recruited	99
# Registered	12
# Pre-Tests Completed	8
# Attended	7
# Post-Tests Completed	7
# Evaluations	10

Participation

There were 7 participants who attended the training. Participating courts and counties represented are shown below.

- Castro County Court – Castro County
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1 & 3 – Gray County
- Justice of the Peace – Hartley County
- Justice of the Peace – Oldham County
- Roberts County Court – Roberts County
- Sherman County Court – Sherman County
- Swisher County Court – Swisher County

Test Scores

Both a pre-test and a post-test are administered prior to and following each training. The pre-test gauges a participant’s knowledge related to ignition interlock prior to attending the course. The pre-test consists of 10 questions and is completed online via Qualtrics. The post-test gauges a participant’s knowledge related to ignition interlock after attending the course. The post-test consists of 10 questions – including 6 of the same questions on the pre-test – and is completed immediately following the training via Qualtrics. Table T2 shows the test scores for the training.

Table T157. Test Scores

Pre-Test Score	Post-Test Score	Change in Knowledge (% Gain)
61.3	91.4	49.1%

Pre-Tests

The average pre-test score was a 61.3. Not all registrants who complete the pre-tests end up attending the training. However, because the pre-tests are submitted anonymously, all registrants' pre-test scores are calculated in the pre-test average.

Table T3 shows the most frequently missed questions on the pre-test. Nearly all participants missed the question concerning how an ignition interlock device works when alcohol is detected.

Table T158. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Pre-Test

Question	Number Missed	Percent Who Missed Question
Q2. The ignition interlock device will shut the engine off if an offender provides a breath sample with alcohol present.	7	87.5%
Q5. If an offender violates an Occupational Drivers License order, the violation is a	5	62.5%
Q6. What causes an ignition interlock device violation?	5	62.5%

Post-Tests

Following the completion of the training course material, a 10-question post-test is administered to determine participants' level of knowledge regarding ignition interlock devices. Each test question is worth 10 points. Participants who completed the training had an average post-test score of 91.4.

Table T4 lists the most frequently missed questions on the post-test. The most missed question concerned how an ignition interlock device works when alcohol is detected; this was also the most missed question on the pre-test.

Table T159. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Post-Test

Question	Number Missed	Percent Who Missed Question
Q2. If a breath sample with alcohol present is provided during a rolling retest, the vehicle will immediately shut off. *	2	28.6%

* Pre-test question

Change in Knowledge

Change in knowledge is calculated to determine if there was a change in participants' knowledge after completing the course. Change in knowledge is calculated by:

$$= (\text{Post-Test Score} - \text{Pre-Test Score}) / \text{Pre-Test Score}$$

Participants experienced a 49.1% gain in knowledge.

Course Evaluations

At the end of the training, participants complete an evaluation. The evaluation includes a section to rate the training content and instructors, and to provide feedback and comments. Participants are asked to rate the items based on a five-point rating scale between “strongly disagree” and “strongly agree.” Some participants did not have both industry representatives (Dottie McDonald and Erin Garza) as instructors, so their scores may be based off fewer evaluations.

Each rating is assigned a point value -- with “strongly disagree” assigned the lowest point value of 1 and “strongly agree” assigned the highest point value of 5. An average is calculated for each evaluative component.

There were 10 course evaluations received. Table T5 is the average course evaluation scores. Table T6 is the average instructor evaluation scores. Table T7 is additional comments received.

Table T160. Course Evaluations Completed by Judges

Question	Average Score
The information provided on ignition interlock devices was applicable to my job duties.	5.0
I am likely to use the information provided today in my daily job duties.	4.9
Attending the ignition interlock training program was a good use of my time.	5.0
I felt the format of the workshop, pace of instruction and schedule were appropriate for the material presented.	5.8
I felt the topics covered, PowerPoint presentation and videos enhanced the instructors’ presentation.	4.9

Table T161. Instructor Evaluations Completed by Judges

Instructor	Average Score
Cody Stewart	4.8
Industry Representative – Dottie	4.7
Industry Representative – Erin	N/A

Table T162. Course Comments Completed by Judges

Comments
Thank you SO much for the proper place to send our copies of Order of IID to DPS.

THANK YOU FOR PROVIDING THIS TRAINING. I FEEL LIKE I CAME AWAY WITH INFORMATION THAT WILL BE VERY USEFUL.

The presentation was easy to understand. I listened on the phone. Thanks for the opportunity to join and listen.

Learned to report to DPS that interlock was Ordered

The statistics of other countries laws regarding drinking while intoxicated were extremely interesting.

Very good Webinar

I learned things about interlock I didn't know it was very useful

Courts Contacted and Invited to Participate

JUDGES – 99

Armstrong County – 2

- Armstrong County Court
- Claude Municipal Court
- Justice of the Peace

Briscoe County – 4

- 110th Judicial District Court
- Briscoe County Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 2

Carson County – 6

- 100th Judicial District Court
- Carson County Court
- Groom Municipal Court
- Panhandle Municipal Court
- White Deer Municipal Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1

Castro County – 3

- Castro County Court
- Hart Municipal Court
- Justice of the Peace

Childress County – 3

- Childress County Court
- Childress Municipal Court

- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1

Collingsworth County – 3

- Collingsworth County Court
- Wellington Municipal Court
- Justice of the Peace

Dallam County – 4

- 69th Judicial District Court
- Dallam County Court
- Dalhart Municipal Court
- Texline Municipal Court

Deaf Smith County – 3

- 222nd Judicial District Court
- Deaf Smith County Court
- Justice of the Peace

Donley County – 3

- Donley County Court
- Claredon Municipal Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1

Gray County – 4

- Gray County Court
- Lefors Municipal Court
- Pampa Municipal Court

- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 2

Hall County – 6

- Hall County Court
- Estelline Municipal Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 2
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 3
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 4

Hansford County – 2

- Hansford County Court
- Spearman Municipal Court

Hartley County – 2

- Hartley County Court
- Justice of the Peace

Hemphill County – 2

- Hemphill County Court
- Justice of the Peace

Hutchinson County – 4

- 316th Judicial District Court
- Fritch Municipal Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 2

Lipscomb County – 3

- 31st Judicial District Court
- Lipscomb County Court
- Justice of the Peace

Moore County – 5

- Moore County Court
- Moore County Court at Law
- Dumas Municipal Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 2

Ochiltree County – 2

- Ochiltree County Court

- Justice of the Peace

Oldham County – 2

- Oldham County Court
- Justice of the Peace

Parmer County – 7

- 287th Judicial District Court
- Parmer County Court
- Bovina Municipal Court
- Friona Municipal Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 2
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 3

Potter County – 12

- 47th Judicial District Court
- 108th Judicial District Court
- 181st Judicial District Court
- 320th Judicial District Court
- Potter County Court
- County Court at Law, No. 1
- County Court at Law, No. 2
- Amarillo Municipal Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 2
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 3
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 4

Randall County – 6

- Randall County Court
- Canyon Municipal Court
- Lake Tanglewood Municipal Court
- Timbercreek Canyon Municipal Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 4

Roberts County – 1

- Justice of the Peace

Sherman County – 3

- Stratford Municipal Court

- Texhoma Municipal Court
- Justice of the Peace

Swisher County – 4

- Happy Municipal Court
- Kress Municipal Court
- Tulia Municipal Court
- Justice of the Peace

Wheeler County – 3

- Wheeler County Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 2

Appendix U: Ignition Interlock Training for Criminal Justice Professionals – Panhandle Judges

Location

A 2021 ignition interlock training was held virtually via Webex on August 24th, 2021, from 1:30 PM – 4:50 PM for judges in the Panhandle. Due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, all trainings are being held virtually via live webinars for FY 21.

Training

Recruitment

The Texas A&M Transportation Institute (TTI) project team identified and invited judges from the Panhandle to participate in the training program. Potential participants were recruited via emails sent to judges in the following 25 counties:

- Armstrong
- Briscoe
- Carson
- Castro
- Childress
- Collingsworth
- Dallam
- Deaf Smith
- Donley
- Gray
- Hall
- Hansford
- Hemphill
- Hutchinson
- Lipscomb
- Moore
- Ochiltree
- Oldham
- Parmer
- Potter
- Randall
- Roberts
- Sherman
- Swisher
- Wheeler

The TTI project team contacted 99 judges. Of note, the TTI project team invited probation officers to the trainings by their department, (i.e., once each was contacted, the department further disseminated the training information internally to staff). Conversely, the TTI project team reached out to prosecutors and judges on an individual basis to invite them to the trainings.

Registration

Participants registered online prior to the training, submitting basic contact information. Participants were also asked to complete an anonymous pre-training test. In advance of the trainings, there were 5 registrants and 6 completed pre-tests. The breakdown of participants is shown Table U1. Registration

and pre-test completion show intent to attend the training, but it does not mean the registrant showed up for the virtual training. Participants are also asked to complete an evaluation form, and these are submitted anonymously.

Table U163. Training Recruitment, Registration, Participation, and Completion

Judges	
# Recruited	99
# Registered	5
# Pre-Tests Completed	6
# Attended	4
# Post-Tests Completed	4
# Evaluations	4

Participation

There were 4 participants who attended the training. Participating courts and counties represented are shown below.

- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 2 – Carson County
- Hutchinson County Court – Hutchinson County
- Weatherford Municipal Court – Parker County
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 4 – Pecos County

Test Scores

Both a pre-test and a post-test are administered prior to and following each training. The pre-test gauges a participant’s knowledge related to ignition interlock prior to attending the course. The pre-test consists of 10 questions and is completed online via Qualtrics. The post-test gauges a participant’s knowledge related to ignition interlock after attending the course. The post-test consists of 10 questions – including 6 of the same questions on the pre-test – and is completed immediately following the training via Qualtrics. Table U2 shows the test scores for the training.

Table U164. Test Scores

Pre-Test Score	Post-Test Score	Change in Knowledge (% Gain)
75.0	100.0	33.3%

Pre-Tests

The average pre-test score was a 75.0. Not all registrants who complete the pre-tests end up attending the training. Of note, there were more pre-tests submitted than registrations – likely registrants submitted more than one pre-test. However, because the pre-tests are submitted anonymously, all registrants' pre-test scores are calculated in the pre-test average.

Table U3 shows the most frequently missed questions on the pre-test. Over half of participants missed questions concerning how an ignition interlock device works when alcohol is detected, and when an interlock must be ordered as a condition of probation.

Table U165. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Pre-Test

Question	Number Missed	Percent Who Missed Question
Q2. The ignition interlock device will shut the engine off if an offender provides a breath sample with alcohol present.	4	66.7%
Q4. When must an ignition interlock device be ordered as a condition of probation?	4	66.7%
Q3. When must an ignition interlock device be ordered as a condition of bond?	3	50.0%

Post-Tests

Following the completion of the training course material, a 10-question post-test is administered to determine participants' level of knowledge regarding ignition interlock devices. Each test question is worth 10 points. Participants who completed the training had an average post-test score of 100.0

Table U4 lists the most frequently missed questions on the post-test. There were no missed questions.

Table U166. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Post-Test

Question	Number Missed	Percent Who Missed Question
----------	---------------	-----------------------------

* No missed questions

Change in Knowledge

Change in knowledge is calculated to determine if there was a change in participants' knowledge after completing the course. Change in knowledge is calculated by:

$$= (\text{Post-Test Score} - \text{Pre-Test Score}) / \text{Pre-Test Score}$$

Participants experienced a 33.3% gain in knowledge.

Course Evaluations

At the end of the training, participants complete an evaluation. The evaluation includes a section to rate the training content and instructors, and to provide feedback and comments. Participants are asked to rate the items based on a five-point rating scale between “strongly disagree” and “strongly agree.” Some participants did not have both industry representatives (Dottie McDonald and Erin Garza) as instructors, so their scores may be based off fewer evaluations.

Each rating is assigned a point value -- with “strongly disagree” assigned the lowest point value of 1 and “strongly agree” assigned the highest point value of 5. An average is calculated for each evaluative component.

There were 4 course evaluations received. Table U5 is the average course evaluation scores. Table U6 is the average instructor evaluation scores. Table U7 is additional comments received.

Table U167. Course Evaluations Completed by Judges

Question	Average Score
The information provided on ignition interlock devices was applicable to my job duties.	4.75
I am likely to use the information provided today in my daily job duties.	4.25
Attending the ignition interlock training program was a good use of my time.	4.75
I felt the format of the workshop, pace of instruction and schedule were appropriate for the material presented.	4.75
I felt the topics covered, PowerPoint presentation and videos enhanced the instructors’ presentation.	4.75

Table U168. Instructor Evaluations Completed by Judges

Instructor	Average Score
Cody Stewart	4.75
Industry Representative – Dottie	N/A
Industry Representative – Erin	4.75

Table U169. Course Comments Completed by Judges

Comments
enjoyed the class and thank you for the print outs
Excellent course

I never was aware about the work vehicle and not required to have installation on them. I always told the defendants they had to be in front of interlock device in any vehicle they drive.

Courts Contacted and Invited to Participate

JUDGES – 99

Armstrong County – 2

- Armstrong County Court
- Claude Municipal Court
- Justice of the Peace

Briscoe County – 4

- 110th Judicial District Court
- Briscoe County Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 2

Carson County – 6

- 100th Judicial District Court
- Carson County Court
- Groom Municipal Court
- Panhandle Municipal Court
- White Deer Municipal Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1

Castro County – 3

- Castro County Court
- Hart Municipal Court
- Justice of the Peace

Childress County – 3

- Childress County Court
- Childress Municipal Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1

Collingsworth County – 3

- Collingsworth County Court
- Wellington Municipal Court
- Justice of the Peace

Dallam County – 4

- 69th Judicial District Court
- Dallam County Court
- Dalhart Municipal Court
- Texline Municipal Court

Deaf Smith County – 3

- 222nd Judicial District Court
- Deaf Smith County Court
- Justice of the Peace

Donley County – 3

- Donley County Court
- Claredon Municipal Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1

Gray County – 4

- Gray County Court
- Lefors Municipal Court
- Pampa Municipal Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 2

Hall County – 6

- Hall County Court
- Estelline Municipal Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 2
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 3
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 4

Hansford County – 2

- Hansford County Court
- Spearman Municipal Court

Hartley County – 2

- Hartley County Court

- Justice of the Peace

Hemphill County – 2

- Hemphill County Court
- Justice of the Peace

Hutchinson County – 4

- 316th Judicial District Court
- Fritch Municipal Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 2

Lipscomb County – 3

- 31st Judicial District Court
- Lipscomb County Court
- Justice of the Peace

Moore County – 5

- Moore County Court
- Moore County Court at Law
- Dumas Municipal Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 2

Ochiltree County – 2

- Ochiltree County Court
- Justice of the Peace

Oldham County – 2

- Oldham County Court
- Justice of the Peace

Parmer County – 7

- 287th Judicial District Court
- Parmer County Court
- Bovina Municipal Court
- Friona Municipal Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 2
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 3

Potter County – 12

- 47th Judicial District Court
- 108th Judicial District Court
- 181st Judicial District Court
- 320th Judicial District Court
- Potter County Court
- County Court at Law, No. 1
- County Court at Law, No. 2
- Amarillo Municipal Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 2
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 3
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 4

Randall County – 6

- Randall County Court
- Canyon Municipal Court
- Lake Tanglewood Municipal Court
- Timbercreek Canyon Municipal Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 4

Roberts County – 1

- Justice of the Peace

Sherman County – 3

- Stratford Municipal Court
- Texhoma Municipal Court
- Justice of the Peace

Swisher County – 4

- Happy Municipal Court
- Kress Municipal Court
- Tulia Municipal Court
- Justice of the Peace

Wheeler County – 3

- Wheeler County Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 2

Appendix V: Ignition Interlock Training for Criminal Justice Professionals – Pecos County Judges

Location

A 2021 ignition interlock training was held virtually via Webex on August 26th, 2021, from 8:30 AM – 11:50 AM for judges in Pecos and surrounding counties. Due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, all trainings are being held virtually via live webinars for FY 21.

Training

Recruitment

The Texas A&M Transportation Institute (TTI) project team identified and invited judges from Pecos and surrounding counties to participate in the training program. Potential participants were recruited via emails sent to judges in the following 13 counties:

- Brewster
- Crane
- Crockett
- Jeff Davis
- Loving
- Pecos
- Presidio
- Reagan
- Reeves
- Sutton
- Terrell
- Upton
- Ward

The TTI project team contacted 54 judges. Of note, the TTI project team invited probation officers to the trainings by their department, (i.e., once each was contacted, the department further disseminated the training information internally to staff). Conversely, the TTI project team reached out to prosecutors and judges on an individual basis to invite them to the trainings.

Registration

Participants registered online prior to the training, submitting basic contact information. Participants were also asked to complete an anonymous pre-training test. In advance of the trainings, there were 2 registrants and 2 completed pre-tests. The breakdown of participants is shown Table V1. Registration and pre-test completion indicates the intent to attend the training, but it does not mean the registrant showed up for the virtual training. Participants are also asked to complete an evaluation form, and these are submitted anonymously.

Table V170. Training Recruitment, Registration, Participation, and Completion

	Judges
# Recruited	54
# Registered	2
# Pre-Tests Completed	2
# Attended	2
# Post-Tests Completed	2
# Evaluations	2

Participation

There were 2 participants who attended the training. Participating courts and counties represented are shown below.

- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1 – Ward County
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 4 – Ward County

Test Scores

Both a pre-test and a post-test are administered prior to and following each training. The pre-test gauges a participant’s knowledge related to ignition interlock prior to attending the course. The pre-test consists of 10 questions and is completed online via Qualtrics. The post-test gauges a participant’s knowledge related to ignition interlock after attending the course. The post-test consists of 10 questions – including 6 of the same questions on the pre-test – and is completed immediately following the training via Qualtrics. Table V2 shows the test scores for the training.

Table V171. Test Scores

Pre-Test Score	Post-Test Score	Change in Knowledge (% Gain)
50.0	75.0	50.0%

Pre-Tests

The average pre-test score was a 50.0. Not all registrants who complete the pre-tests end up attending the training. However, because the pre-tests are submitted anonymously, all registrants’ pre-test scores are calculated in the pre-test average.

Table V3 shows the most frequently missed questions on the pre-test.

Table V172. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Pre-Test

Question	Number Missed	Percent Who Missed Question
Q2. The ignition interlock device will shut the engine off if an offender provides a breath sample with alcohol present.	2	100.0%
Q3. When must an ignition interlock device be ordered as a condition of bond?	2	100.0%
Q5. If an offender violates an Occupational Driver License order, the violation is a	2	100.0%
Q6. What causes an ignition interlock device violation?	2	100.0%
Q7. What is a goal of ignition interlock?	2	100.0%
Q8. The ignition interlock device will detect residual mouth alcohol.	2	100.0%

Post-Tests

Following the completion of the training course material, a 10-question post-test is administered to determine participants' level of knowledge regarding ignition interlock devices. Each test question is worth 10 points. Participants who completed the training had an average post-test score of 75.0.

Table V4 lists the most frequently missed questions on the post-test. The most frequently missed question concerned how to start a vehicle with an ignition interlock device installed; this question was not on the pre-test.

Table V173. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Post-Test

Question	Number Missed	Percent Who Missed Question
Q6. What are the steps, in order, to start a vehicle equipped with an ignition interlock device?	2	100.0%
Q2. If a breath sample with alcohol present is provided during a rolling retest, the vehicle will immediately shut off. *	1	50.0%
Q5. What is the purpose of an ignition interlock device? *	1	50.0%
Q10. What is the average elimination rate of alcohol of an adult male?	1	50.0%

* Question was on the pre-test

Change in Knowledge

Change in knowledge is calculated to determine if there was a change in participants' knowledge after completing the course. Change in knowledge is calculated by:

$$= (\text{Post-Test Score} - \text{Pre-Test Score}) / \text{Pre-Test Score}$$

Participants experienced a 50.0% gain in knowledge.

Course Evaluations

At the end of the training, participants complete an evaluation. The evaluation includes a section to rate the training content and instructors, and to provide feedback and comments. Participants are asked to rate the items based on a five-point rating scale between "strongly disagree" and "strongly agree." Some participants did not have both industry representatives (Dottie McDonald and Erin Garza) as instructors, so their scores may be based off fewer evaluations.

Each rating is assigned a point value -- with "strongly disagree" assigned the lowest point value of 1 and "strongly agree" assigned the highest point value of 5. An average is calculated for each evaluative component.

There were 2 course evaluations received. Table V5 is the average course evaluation scores. Table V6 is the average instructor evaluation scores. Table V7 is additional comments received.

Table V174. Course Evaluations Completed by Judges

Question	Average Score
The information provided on ignition interlock devices was applicable to my job duties.	5.0
I am likely to use the information provided today in my daily job duties.	5.0
Attending the ignition interlock training program was a good use of my time.	5.0
I felt the format of the workshop, pace of instruction and schedule were appropriate for the material presented.	5.0
I felt the topics covered, PowerPoint presentation and videos enhanced the instructors' presentation.	5.0

Table V175. Instructor Evaluations Completed by Judges

Instructor	Average Score
Cody Stewart	5.0
Industry Representative – Dottie	5.0
Industry Representative – Erin	N/A

Table V176. Course Comments Completed by Judges

Comments
Very informative. Every county could benefit from this training. I had questions in the recent past over much of what was covered that no agency in the county and a couple others could answer. Thank you for offering this to us.
Would have been nice for more to have attended the program presented, but very informative.
Cody Stewart and Dottie McDonald presented the Interlock program very well, we were open with questions and they took their time to answer them all without rushing us and that was great for them to do so.

Courts Contacted and Invited to Participate

JUDGES – 54

Brewster County – 5

- Brewster County Court
- Alpine Municipal Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 2
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 3

Crane County – 4

- 109th Judicial District Court
- Crane County Court
- Crane Municipal Court
- Justice of the Peace

Crockett County – 2

- Crockett County Court
- Justice of the Peace

Jeff Davis County – 2

- Jeff Davis County Court
- Justice of the Peace

Loving County – 2

- Loving County Court
- Justice of the Peace

Pecos County – 8

- 83rd Judicial District Court
- 112th Judicial District Court
- Pecos County Court
- Fort Stockton Municipal Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 3
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 4
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 6

Presidio County – 4

- Presidio County Court
- Presidio Municipal Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 2

Reagan County – 3

- Reagan County Court
- Big Lake Municipal Court
- Justice of the Peace

Reeves County – 7

- 143rd Judicial District Court
- Reeves County Court
- County Court at Law
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 2

- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 3
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 4

Sutton County – 3

- Sutton County Court
- Sonora Municipal Court
- Justice of the Peace

Terrell County – 5

- Palo Pinto County Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 2
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 3
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 4

Upton County – 5

- Upton County Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 2
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 3
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 4

Ward County – 4

- Ward County Court
- Monahans Municipal Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 2

Appendix W: Ignition Interlock Training for Criminal Justice Professionals – El Paso County Judges

Location

A 2021 ignition interlock training was held virtually via Webex on August 27th, 2021, from 8:00 AM – 11:20 AM MT for judges in El Paso and surrounding counties. Due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, all trainings are being held virtually via live webinars for FY 21.

Training

Recruitment

The Texas A&M Transportation Institute (TTI) project team identified and invited judges from El Paso and surrounding counties to participate in the training program. Potential participants were recruited via emails sent to judges in the following 3 counties:

- Culberson
- El Paso
- Hudspeth

The TTI project team contacted 24 judges. Of note, the TTI project team invited probation officers to the trainings by their department, (i.e., once each was contacted, the department further disseminated the training information internally to staff). Conversely, the TTI project team reached out to prosecutors and judges on an individual basis to invite them to the trainings.

Registration

Participants registered online prior to the training, submitting basic contact information. Participants were also asked to complete an anonymous pre-training test. In advance of the trainings, there were 5 registrants and 5 completed pre-tests. The breakdown of participants is shown Table W1. Registration and pre-test completion show intent to attend the training, but it does not mean the registrant showed up for the virtual training. Participants are also asked to complete an evaluation form, and these are submitted anonymously.

Table W177. Training Recruitment, Registration, Participation, and Completion

	Judges
# Recruited	24
# Registered	5
# Pre-Tests Completed	5
# Attended	1
# Post-Tests Completed	1

Judges	
# Evaluations	1

Participation

There was 1 participant who attended the training. The participating court and county represented is shown below.

- Justice of the Peace – Carson County

Test Scores

Both a pre-test and a post-test are administered prior to and following each training. The pre-test gauges a participant’s knowledge related to ignition interlock prior to attending the course. The pre-test consists of 10 questions and is completed online via Qualtrics. The post-test gauges a participant’s knowledge related to ignition interlock after attending the course. The post-test consists of 10 questions – including 6 of the same questions on the pre-test – and is completed immediately following the training via Qualtrics. Table W2 shows the test scores for the training.

Table W178. Test Scores

Pre-Test Score	Post-Test Score	Change in Knowledge (% Gain)
78.0	100.0	28.2%

Pre-Tests

The average pre-test score was a 78.0. Not all registrants who complete the pre-tests end up attending the training. However, because the pre-tests are submitted anonymously, all registrants’ pre-test scores are calculated in the pre-test average.

Table W3 shows the most frequently missed questions on the pre-test. Most participants missed the question concerning how an ignition interlock device works when alcohol is detected.

Table W179. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Pre-Test

Question	Number Missed	Percent Who Missed Question
Q2. The ignition interlock device will shut the engine off if an offender provides a breath sample with alcohol present.	4	80.0%
Q4. When must an ignition interlock device be ordered as a condition of probation?	2	40.0%

Question	Number Missed	Percent Who Missed Question
Q5. If an offender violates an Occupational Driver License order, the violation is a	2	40.0%

Post-Tests

Following the completion of the training course material, a 10-question post-test is administered to determine participants' level of knowledge regarding ignition interlock devices. Each test question is worth 10 points. Participants who completed the training had an average post-test score of 100.0.

Table W4 lists the most frequently missed questions on the post-test. The participant did not miss any questions.

Table W180. Most Frequently Missed Questions on Post-Test

Question	Number Missed	Percent Who Missed Question
----------	---------------	-----------------------------

** No missed questions*

Change in Knowledge

Change in knowledge is calculated to determine if there was a change in participants' knowledge after completing the course. Change in knowledge is calculated by:

$$= (\text{Post-Test Score} - \text{Pre-Test Score}) / \text{Pre-Test Score}$$

Participants experienced a 28.2% gain in knowledge.

Course Evaluations

At the end of the training, participants complete an evaluation. The evaluation includes a section to rate the training content and instructors, and to provide feedback and comments. Participants are asked to rate the items based on a five-point rating scale between "strongly disagree" and "strongly agree." Industry representative trainers did not participate in the training.

Each rating is assigned a point value -- with "strongly disagree" assigned the lowest point value of 1 and "strongly agree" assigned the highest point value of 5. An average is calculated for each evaluative component.

There were 1 course evaluation received. Table W5 is the average course evaluation scores. Table W6 is the average instructor evaluation scores. Table W7 is additional comments received.

Table W181. Course Evaluations Completed by Judges

Question	Average Score
The information provided on ignition interlock devices was applicable to my job duties.	5.0
I am likely to use the information provided today in my daily job duties.	4.0
Attending the ignition interlock training program was a good use of my time.	5.0
I felt the format of the workshop, pace of instruction and schedule were appropriate for the material presented.	5.0
I felt the topics covered, PowerPoint presentation and videos enhanced the instructors' presentation.	5.0

Table W182. Instructor Evaluations Completed by Judges

Instructor	Average Score
Cody Stewart	5.0
Industry Representative – Dottie	N/A
Industry Representative – Erin	N/A

Table W183. Course Comments Completed by Judges

Comments
* No comments were received

Courts Contacted and Invited to Participate

JUDGES – 24

Culberson County – 4

- Culberson County Court
- Van Horn Municipal Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 2
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 3

El Paso County – 16

- 34th Judicial District Court
- 41st Judicial District Court
- 120th Judicial District Court

- 168th Judicial District Court
- 171st Judicial District Court
- 205th Judicial District Court
- 210th Judicial District Court
- 409th Judicial District Court
- El Paso County Court
- Socorro Municipal Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 2
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 3
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 4

- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 6
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 7

Hudspeth County – 4

- Hudspeth County Court
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 1

- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 2
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 3
- Justice of the Peace, Pct. 4