

1997 Drug Court Survey Report: Executive Summary

October 1997

Caroline S. Cooper

This report was prepared by the OJP Drug Court Clearinghouse and Technical Assistance Project which is supported by Grant No. 95-DC-MX-K002 awarded by the Drug Courts Program Office, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. Points of view or opinions in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the United States Department of Justice.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword

Agencies Responding to Drug Court Clearinghouse 1997 Drug Court Survey

[I. Drug Court Program Developments and Activities: Major Observations](#)

[II. Who is the Drug Court Client?](#)

[III. Principal Findings](#)

[A. Volume One: Part I: Judicial Operations and Perspectives](#)

1. Program Goals
2. Targeted Offenses
3. Number and Length of Phases
4. Locus of Program in Judicial Process
5. Assignment of Cases to Drug Court Judge(s)
6. Participant Eligibility Criteria
7. Changes Programs Have Made in Eligibility Criteria Since Beginning
8. Program Capacity, Enrollments, and Characteristics of Client Population
9. Program Procedures
10. Screening and Assessment Process
11. Screening, Assessment, Case Management and Treatment Services
12. Nature and Frequency of Contact between Drug Court and Participant
13. Nature and Frequency of Court Contact with Defendant and Applicable Sanctions/Sentence Prior to Implementing Drug Court
14. Aftercare and Alumni Activities
15. Oversight/Advisory Committees
16. Program Costs and Funding

17. Justice System Cost Savings
18. Responses to Participant Progress and Relapse
19. Unsuccessful Termination of Participants
20. Successful Drug Court Program Completion and Graduation
21. Information and Monitoring Systems
22. Program Evaluation and Assessment
23. Tasks Needed to Institutionalize the Drug Court in the Responding Jurisdictions
24. Modifications and Enhancements Planned for Next Year
25. Program Operational and Planning Issues and Advice to Colleagues

B. Volume Two: Part Two: Perspectives of Prosecutors

1. Criteria Being Used to Assess Drug Court Effectiveness
2. Impact of Drug Court on Office's Capability to Handle Office's Criminal Caseload and Functions
3. Benefits Prosecutors Have Derived from Drug Court Program
4. Relationship of Drug Court Program with Community Prosecution Activities
5. Drug Caseload Activity Trends Since Drug Court Began
6. Costs for Drug Court Program
7. Savings Achieved
8. Program Operational and Planning Issues and Advice to Colleagues

C. Volume Two: Part Three: Perspectives of Defense Counsel

1. Criteria Being Used to Assess Effectiveness of Drug Court
2. Impact of Drug Court on Public Defender's Office's Capability to Handle its Criminal Caseload and Functions
3. Benefits Derived from Program
4. Costs to Indigent Defense Office for Drug Court
5. Savings Achieved
6. Program Implementation and Operational Issues and Advice to Colleagues

D. Volume Two: Part Four: Perspectives of Police/Law Enforcement Agency Officials

1. Criteria Being Used to Assess Effectiveness of the Drug Court
2. Impact of Drug Court on Agency's Capability to Respond to Criminal Activity and/or Carry Out its Functions
3. Impact of Program on Other Aspects of Agency Operations
4. Changes in Drug-Related Arrests Since Drug Court Began
5. Costs Incurred for Drug Court Program
6. Savings Achieved
7. Program Implementation and Planning Issues and Advice to Colleagues

E. Volume Two: Part Five: Perspectives of Correctional Agency Officials

1. Criteria Being Used to Assess Effectiveness of Drug Court
2. Impact of Drug Court on Agency's Capability to Respond to Criminal Activity and/or to Carry Out its Functions
3. Costs for Drug Court

4. Savings Achieved
5. Program Implementation and Planning Issues and Advice to Colleagues

F. Volume Three: Part Six: Treatment Provider Services and Perspectives

1. Program Phases
2. Providers of Drug Court Treatment and Related Services
3. Screening and Assessment and Case Management
4. Effect of Mental Disorders on Program Eligibility
5. Timeframe for Determining Eligibility for Treatment Following Determination of Drug Court Eligibility
6. Client Treatment Plans
7. Client Case Management
8. Drug Court Treatment and Rehabilitation Services
9. Addressing Mental Health Needs
10. Capability to Refer Participant to Inpatient Treatment
11. Medications Permitted
12. Use of Alcohol by Drug Court Participants
13. Adjuncts to Treatment Used
14. Child Care Services for Participants While Attending Treatment Sessions
15. Urine Testing
16. Costs for Drug Court Treatment Services
17. Total Program Capacity Annually
18. Nature and Frequency of Contacts with Drug Court Participants
19. Comparison of Drug Court Treatment Services With Treatment Services Provided to Typical Drug Court Participant Prior to Instituting the Drug Court
20. Treatment Program Requirements And Experience To Date
21. Program Follow-up and Aftercare
22. Criteria Used to Assess Effectiveness of the Drug Court Program
23. Funding Sources for Treatment Services
24. Impact of Managed Care on Drug Court Treatment Services
25. Program Operational and Planning Issues and Advice to Colleagues

G. Part Seven: Participant Comments

1. Introduction
2. Background of Respondents
3. Participant Comments Regarding Drug Court Experience
4. Participants' Comments Regarding Drug Court Components
5. Participants' Perceptions Regarding Significance of Potential Changes in Principal Components of Drug Court Program on their Retention

Appendices:

A. Drug Court Activity By State: October 1997

B. Perspectives of Judicial System Officials

1. Most Serious Problems Encountered in Regard to Drug Court Implementation and Strategies Used to Resolve Them
2. Unanticipated Issues That Have Arisen and Strategies to Address Them
3. Advice to Colleagues in Other Jurisdictions Contemplating the Implementation of a Drug Court

C. Perspectives of Prosecutors

1. Most Serious Problems Encountered in Regard to Drug Court Implementation and Strategies Used to Resolve Them
2. Unanticipated Issues That Have Arisen and Strategies to Address Them
3. Advice to Colleagues in Other Jurisdictions Contemplating the Implementation of a Drug Court

D. Perspectives of Defense Counsel

1. Most Serious Problems Encountered in Regard to Drug Court Implementation and Strategies Used to Resolve Them
2. Unanticipated Issues That Have Arisen and Strategies to Address Them
3. Advice to Colleagues in Other Jurisdictions Contemplating the Implementation of a Drug Court

E. Perspectives of Law Enforcement Agency Officials

1. Most Serious Problems Encountered in Regard to Drug Court Implementation and Strategies Used to Resolve Them
2. Unanticipated Issues That Have Arisen and Strategies to Address Them
3. Advice to Colleagues

F. Perspectives of Correctional Agency Officials

1. Most Serious Problems Encountered in Regard to Drug Court Implementation and Strategies Used to Resolve Them
2. Unanticipated Issues That Have Arisen and Strategies to Address Them
3. Advice to Colleagues

G. Perspectives of Treatment Providers

1. Most Serious Problems Encountered in Regard to Drug Court Implementation and Strategies Used to Resolve Them
2. Unanticipated Issues That Have Arisen and Strategies to Address Them
3. Advice to Colleagues

Foreword

The 1997 Drug Court Survey Report provides a comparative profile of ninety-three operating drug court programs and revises our *1996 Drug Court Profile* prepared for the State Justice Institute's 1995 National Symposium on the Implementation and Operation of Drug Courts, which reflected the experiences of 45 responding drug courts then in operation. The *1997 Drug Court Survey Report*, focusing on critical operational elements and implementation issues that have emerged, is designed to be updated, periodically, to reflect the continuing evolution of the drug court concept, as new programs emerge and existing programs refine their operations.

The information in the *1997 Drug Court Survey Report* was derived from responses from ninety-seven drug courts in operation as of January 1997 to a survey distributed by the Office of Justice Programs/U.S. Department of Justice's Drug Court Clearinghouse and Technical Assistance Project at American University. The 1997 survey, an expansion of previous drug court surveys, consisted of six sections to be completed by the principal agencies involved in the drug court operations in each of the jurisdictions surveyed: (1) general program information to be completed by the court; and more specific information relating to (2) prosecution activities; (3) defense activities; (4) law enforcement activities; (5) correctional agency activities; and (6) the treatment, rehabilitation and related services provided for the program.

The *1997 Drug Court Survey Report* is presented in four volumes: **Volume One** contains general program information provided primarily by drug court judges and judicial staff. **Volume Two** provides information relating to the activities and perspectives of prosecutors, public defenders, law enforcement officials and correctional agency administrators involved with drug courts in their local jurisdictions. **Volume Three** focuses on the treatment and rehabilitation services provided for drug courts programs and reflects the comments of treatment professionals providing services to drug courts in their respective jurisdictions. **Volume Four** provides the perspectives of 256 participants in the final phases of 53 drug court programs in 23 different states plus the District of Columbia regarding critical aspects of drug court

program operations.

This *Executive Summary Report* provides a synopsis of the major findings presented in the *1997 Drug Court Survey Report* volumes.

The ninety-three drug courts reflected in the *1997 Drug Court Survey Report* include ninety-one state courts, one tribal court and one federal district court. The reporting programs operate in 31 different states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and one federal district, and represent 72% of the 130 drug courts in operation at the time the survey was distributed. Between the time of the survey's distribution and the publication of this report, an additional 74 drug courts have become operational, for a total of 371 programs now in operation or being planned.

Special appreciation is extended to the following individuals who provided suggestions on issues to capture in the survey and/or reviewed the draft survey instrument and offered valuable suggestions for its improvement:

Steven Belenko, National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse, Columbia University, New York, New York;

John Carver, former Director of the District of Columbia Pretrial Services Agency and now associate with Justice Management Institute, Washington D.C. office;

John Goldkamp, Professor of Criminal Justice at Temple University and President of Crime and Justice Research Institute, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania;

Gabriel Guerrieri, Executive Director of Genesis Counseling Center, Collingswood, New Jersey, which provides treatment services to the Camden, New Jersey Drug Court;

Robin Kimbrough, Associate Director, Institute for Families in Society, University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina;

Barry Mahoney, President, Justice Management Institute, Denver, Colorado;

John Marr, Executive Director, Choices, Ltd., of Las Vegas, Nevada, which provides treatment services to the Las Vegas and Reno, Nevada adult and juvenile drug courts;

Judge Tomar Mason, Presiding Judge of the San Francisco, California Municipal Court;

Valerie Moore, Executive Director of InAct, Inc., of Portland, Oregon, which provides treatment services to the Multnomah County, Oregon Drug Court;

Judge John Parnham, Drug Court Judge for the adult and juvenile drug courts in Pensacola, Florida;

Dr. Roger Peters, Professor of Psychology at the University of South Florida, Tampa, Florida;

Marilyn Roberts and staff of the OJP Drug Courts Program Office, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington D.C.;

Dr. Michael Smith, Director of the Substance Abuse Clinic at Lincoln Hospital in New York, New York;

Judge Jeffrey Tauber and staff of the National Association of Drug Court Professionals, Alexandria, Virginia; and

Robin Wright, Drug Court Coordinator for the adult and juvenile drug courts, First Judicial Circuit, Pensacola, Florida.

Special thanks are extended to the staff of National TASC, who assisted in the development of the survey instrument focusing on treatment issues (Volume III), and to the following student interns who painstakingly assisted in the entering of the data which has formed the foundation for this report series: Ximena Marquez, Anne Marie O'Neill, Susan Puckhaber, and Melanie Vasquez. Joseph Trotter's ready willingness to review draft findings and his invaluable insights regarding their interpretation contributed immeasurably to these documents. It is impossible, however, to adequately thank Shanie Bartlett and Michelle Shaw for all they have done to prepare these documents for final publication from substantive critique and editorial suggestions to data verification, textual formatting and document presentation. Their patience, good humor, and enthusiasm through the many months of this survey development and reporting process were the critical ingredients to making possible the completion of this project.

It goes without saying that the information contained in the *1997 Drug Court Survey Report* was made possible by the special efforts of the more than 400 drug court officials in the reporting jurisdictions who offered their time and insights to provide the responses upon which this report is based. The names and addresses of many of these officials are listed in the Appendix which follows each section of the report. We extend our deep appreciation to each person who contributed to the survey responses. We are grateful for the insights and experience they have shared and for their considerable and enthusiastic assistance in advancing the "state of the art" and knowledge regarding drug court operations. Through their efforts, we have been able to develop the "profile" information presented in these volumes and to disseminate it to their colleagues in the field.

Caroline S. Cooper, Director

OJP Drug Court Clearinghouse and Technical Assistance Project

School of Public Affairs, American University, Washington D.C.

Agencies Responding to Drug Court Clearinghouse 1997 Drug Court Survey

Name of Court	St	Part 1 (Court)	Part 2 (Prosecutor)	Part 3 (Defense)	Part 4 (Law Enf.)	Part 5 (Corrections)	Part 6 (Treatment)	Part 7 (Participant)
Mobile	AL	Y	Y	Y	--	--	Y	Y
Tuscaloosa	AL	Y	--	--	--	--	--	--
Maricopa/ Phoenix	AZ	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Tucson	AZ	Y	--	Y	Y	Y	--	--
Little Rock	AR	Y	--	--	--	--	--	--
Bakersfield	CA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
El Monte/Rio Hondo	CA	Y	--	--	--	--	Y	Y
Los Angeles Mun.	CA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	--	Y
Oakland Mun.	CA	Y	--	--	--	--	--	--
Oakland Sup.	CA	Y	--	--	--	--	--	--
San Bernardino	CA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Laguna Niguel	CA	Y	--	--	--	--	Y	--
Pasadena	CA	Y	--	--	--	--	Y	Y
Roseville	CA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
San Francisco	CA	--	--	--	--	--	Y	--
Salinas	CA	Y	Y	--	--	--	Y	--
San Jose/ Santa Clara	CA	Y	Y	Y	--	Y	Y	Y
Santa Barbara	CA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Santa Maria	CA	Y	--	--	--	--	--	--
Santa Monica	CA	Y	--	--	--	--	Y	Y
Santa Rosa/ Sonoma	CA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Stockton	CA	Y	Y	Y	--	--	Y	Y
Woodland/ Yolo	CA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Modesto	CA	Y	--	--	--	Y	Y	Y
Richmond	CA	Y	--	--	--	--	Y	--
Santa Ana	CA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Denver	CO	Y						