

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Adult  
Drug Court Programs Published: 2000 – Present**

**PART ONE**

<b>#</b>	<b>Publication Date</b>	<b>Bibliographic Information</b>	<b>Focus of Study</b>	<b>Population Studied</b>	<b>Comparison Group</b>
1	2004	<i>Phase II Douglas County [Nebraska] Drug Court Evaluation Report.</i> Thomas J. Martin, Cassia C. Spohn, R.K. Piper, and Jill Robinson	Recidivism and cost benefit study comparing criminal justice outcomes of offenders in drug court with offenders in County Attorney's pre-trial diversion program and offenders in traditional adjudication	Drug court participants	offenders in County Attorney's pre-trial diversion program and offenders in traditional adjudication
2	September 2004	<i>Participation in Drug Treatment Court and Time to Rearrest.</i> Duren Banks and Denise C. Gottfredson. <i>Justice Quarterly.</i> Vol. 21, no. 3, September 2004. Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences	Review of arrest history of 139 drug court and 96 control group defendants re arrests for two year period following assignment to drug court (drug court participants randomly assigned to drug court; control group was eligible but randomly assigned to nondrug court treatment)	139 drug court participants randomly assigned to drug court; and 96 control group was eligible but randomly assigned to nondrug court treatment)	96 control group defendants who were eligible for drug court but randomly assigned to nondrug court treatment
3	January 29, 2004	<i>Cost Analysis of Anne Arundel County, Maryland Drug Court.</i> Prepared by: NPC Research, Inc., Portland, Oregon	Tracked sample (53) of Drug court participants who entered the drug court from 1997 – 1998 re recidivism and costs resulting	Sample (53) of drug court participants who entered drug court from 1997 -1998	Comparable defendants who did not enter the drug court during the same period
4	January 29, 2004	<i>Cost Analysis of Baltimore City, Maryland Drug Treatment Court: Includes Outcome Findings, Cost Analysis, and Summary and Conclusions, Only;</i> Prepared by NPC Research, Inc., Portland, Oregon	Tracked sample of 60 drug court participants from 2000 and comparable sample of 63 offenders who did not enter the drug court for 3 year period to determine possible cost savings for justice system, victimization, and for other areas	Sample of 60 drug court participants who entered program in 2000 compared with comparable sample of 63 offenders who did not enter the drug court	Comparable defendants from 2000 who did not enter the drug court
5	January 2004	<i>Kalamazoo County [MI] 9<sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit Court Office of Drug Treatment Court Programs: Statistical Report: 2003.</i> Prepared January 2004 - <i>Part One: Female Drug Court</i> - <i>Part Two: Male Drug court</i>	Updates previous annual report with 2003 data to cover 543 female enrollees and 506 male enrollees since program began	543 female enrollees and 506 male enrollees in Kalamazoo Drug Court since its inception	N/A

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Adult  
Drug Court Programs Published: 2000 – Present**

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	Focus of Study	Population Studied	Comparison Group
6	January 2004	<i>Oklahoma Drug Courts: Fiscal Years 2002 and 200.</i> Prepared by The Oklahoma Criminal Justice Resource Center.	Review of data from 19 adult drug and DUI courts operating in 21 counties in Oklahoma, including drug court participant characteristics at time of program entry; compliance with Oklahoma Drug Court Statute; use of sanctions; outcome, recidivism and costs	1,666 participants in 19 drug courts during period July 2001 – June 2003.  [findings reported for graduates only]	(1) successful standard probation drug offenders; and (2) released inmates who had drug convictions;
7	October 2003	<i>The New York State Adult Drug Court Evaluation: Policies, Participants and Impacts.</i> Center for Court Innovation. New York, New York.	Reviews operations, recidivism and other impacts in the following nine drug courts: Bronx, Brooklyn, Queens, Rochester, Suffolk Co., and Syracuse	Studied post-arrest recidivism of drug court participants for 3 years (Bronx, Manhattan, Queens, and Suffolk) and 4 years (Brooklyn and Rochester), compared with reconviction rates of similar defendants not entering the drug court;	Similar defendants not entering drug court
8	August 1, 2003	[OK] <i>Drug Court More Beneficial for Women</i> [author not provided]	Oklahoma female prison population Drug-Court Enrollments as of July 1, 2003	Oklahoma female drug court graduates	Oklahoma male drug court graduates
9	July 2003	<i>16<sup>th</sup> Judicial District of Tennessee (Rutherford Co.) Drug Court Program 2003 Process Evaluation.</i> Dana K. Fuller, Ph.D. July 2003	Studied 99 persons admitted to the program as of July 15, 2003	Studied 99 persons admitted to the program as of July 15, 2003	N/A – process evaluation with limited outcome data
10	June 1, 2003	<i>Recidivism Among [KY] Federal Probationers</i> Minor, Kevin; Wells, James; Sims, Crissy.	Individuals serving federal probation sentences in the Eastern District of Kentucky.	200 individuals sentenced from Federal Probation in the Eastern District of Kentucky between 1/96 and 6/99. Individuals were studied during a 2-year follow-up period between 1/96 and 6/99.	N/A

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Adult  
Drug Court Programs Published: 2000 – Present**

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	Focus of Study	Population Studied	Comparison Group
11	May 2003	<i>Coconino County [AZ] DUI/DRUG Court Evaluation.</i> Prepared by: Frederic I. Solop, Nancy A. Wonders, et. Al. Social Research Laboratory, Northern Arizona University	Outcome data compiled May 1, 2001 – October 31, 2002 for Drug court participants and control group with similar characteristics and processed through traditional criminal justice system	Participants in DUI Drug Court during May 1, 2001-October 31, 2002	Randomly assigned eligible offenders with similar characteristics processed through traditional criminal justice system
12	April 18, 2003	<i>Assessing the Efficacy of Treatment Modalities in the Context of Adult Drug Courts.</i> [CA, LA, MO, OK] Donald F. Anspach, Ph.D. and Andrew S. Ferguson.	Examines various issues relating to the delivery of treatment services in four drug court sites: Bakersfield, CA; St. Mary Parish LA.; Jackson Co., MO.; and Creek Co., OK.;	In addition to treatment and related staff, 2,357 offenders enrolled in the four programs between January 1997 and December 2000	N/A
13	April 15, 2003	<i>Bibb County [GA] Special Drug Court Program: Eight-Year Annual Report. April 15, 2003.</i> Prepared by Chief Judge Tommy Day Wilcox, Superior Courts, Macon Judicial Circuit and Jacqueline Duncan, Program Administrator	Review of program operations and analysis of graduates: 1994 – 2002	394 graduates of program from 1994 – 2002	N/A
14	March 2003	<i>Summary Report of Virginia's Drug Court Programs.</i> Office of the Supreme Court of Virginia and Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services.	Individuals in the Virginia drug court program between November 1995 and December 2002 were analyzed.	1727 Virginians admitted to the felony drug court program	N/A

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Adult  
Drug Court Programs Published: 2000 – Present**

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	Focus of Study	Population Studied	Comparison Group
15	March 2003	<i>Washington State's Drug Courts for Adult Defendants: Outcome Evaluation and Cost-Benefit Analysis.</i> Washington State Institute for Public Policy	Presents statistical summary of other drug court studies in U.S; describes Washington's outcome evaluation and cost-benefit analysis of the following 6 of Washington's adult drug courts (with implementation dates noted): King Co. (8/1/94); Pierce Col (10/11/94); Spokane Co. (1/1/95); Skagit Co. (4/1/97); Thurston Co. (5/1/98); and Kitsap Co. (2/1/99); and presents findings and recommendations (study conducted at direction of Washington Legislature)	Evaluated six adult drug courts in Washington operating during 1998 and 1999 to test whether Washington's drug courts reduce recidivism rates	Obtained individual-level data (gender, age, ethnicity, prior criminal history, and current offense) for defendants who entered drug court and, for four of the programs also obtained individual-level data for defendants screened for the drug court; then constructed comparison groups; used this information to construct comparison groups, using six different comparison groups and several sampling approaches, including: selecting cases filed in the same counties 2 years prior to start of drug court; selecting comparable cases from non-drug court counties filed at same time; tested drug court effectiveness using all six groups to provide a range of estimates for drug court outcomes
16	February 7, 2003	<i>Judicial Council of California. Administrative Office of the Courts. Report. Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee. Progress Report</i>	Evaluated cost and effectiveness of drug courts in state; Phase I: study of three courts	Participants who completed drug court	N/A; compared arrest rates two years following admission with arrest rates two years prior to admission
17	January 6, 2003	<i>Evaluating the Effectiveness of Drug Courts in Idaho: Report to Governor Dirk Kempthorne and the First Regular Session of the 57<sup>th</sup> Idaho Legislature.</i> Idaho Supreme Court	Review of developments of 30 drug courts in Idaho; data provided on participants in Districts 4 and 5 (6 programs with 206 participants)	6 programs in Districts 4 (Ada Co and Elmore Co.) and 5 (Mini-Cassia Minidoka Co and Twin Falls Co.)  [findings reported for graduates only]	N/A

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Adult  
Drug Court Programs Published: 2000 – Present**

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	Focus of Study	Population Studied	Comparison Group
18	January 2003	<i>Evaluating Treatment Drug Courts in Kansas City, Missouri and Pensacola, Florida: Final Reports for Phase I and Phase II.</i> Abt Associates. Prepared by Linda Truitt; Wm. Rhodes; N.G. Hoffman; Amy Maizell Seeherman; Sarah Kuck Jalbert; Michael Kane; Cassie P. Bacani; Kyla M. Carrigan; Peter Finn	Phase I: retrospective study of 1992-7 participants including case studies (process); and impact evaluation (survival analysis of recidivism); Phase II: study of 1999-2000 participants re program retention and participant perceptions	Phase I; 1992-7 and  Phase II: 1999-2000 participants in Escambia County, Florida (74 participants) and Jackson County, Kansas (182 participants)	Phase I: Recidivism: Defendants with similar criminal histories arrested before drug court started and defendants with similar criminal histories arrested between 1993-7 who participated and did not participate in the drug court Phase II: N/A
19	May 5, 2002	<i>From Whether to How Drug Courts Work: Retrospective Evaluation of Drug Courts in Clark County (Las Vegas) and Multnomah County (Portland), [Oregon].</i> John S. Goldkamp; Michael D. White; Jennifer B. Robinson.	Tracks implementation and development of drug court in Portland, Oregon (1991-98) and Las Vegas, Nevada (1992-1998), focusing on outcomes and possible impact of various factors relating to structure, operation, and various innovations introduced in these programs	75 Drug court participants from each year since program inception in Portland (except 143 defendants for 1997); and 100 participants for each year in Las Vegas, and similar groups of defendants who didn't enter drug court and whose cases were disposed of through the traditional process.	Two groups of comparable defendants in each site whose cases were disposed of through the traditional process: (a): defendants who failed to attend first drug court appearance; and (b) defendants who attended first drug court appearance but failed to attend treatment
20	March 2002	<i>Drug Court Partnership Act of 1998, Chapter 1007, [CA] Statutes of 1998. Final Report.</i> Prepared by The California Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs and the Judicial Council of California, Administrative Office of the Courts.	Present results of evaluation of 34 drug courts operating under Drug Court Partnership Act to demonstrate cost effectiveness of program	34 drug courts operating under Drug Court Partnership Act	
21	October 2001	<i>Kentucky Drug Court Outcome Evaluation: Behaviors, Costs, and Avoided Costs to Society.</i> Prepared by TK Logan, William Hoyt and Carl Leukefeld. Center on Drug and Alcohol Research. University of Kentucky	Outcome evaluation of drug court programs in Fayette, Jefferson and Warren Counties, Kentucky	Study of 745 drug court participants from three drug courts; studied graduates, program terminators and individuals assessed for the drug court but who did not enter	Individuals assessed for the drug court but did not enter

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Adult  
Drug Court Programs Published: 2000 – Present**

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	Focus of Study	Population Studied	Comparison Group
22	October 2000	<i>Tulsa County [OK] Adult Drug Court: Phase II Analysis.</i> Wright, David. O'Connell, Paul. Clymer, Bob. Simpson, Debbie.	Clients that had entered the Tulsa County Adult Drug Court Programs from 5/96 to 6/00.	117 adult non-violent felony offenders with substance abuse histories who had entered the drug court program were monitored from 5/96 to 6/00 within the Tulsa County Adult Drug Court system.	A sample of 113 individuals on probation was matched by criminal history and felony charge to the population studied.
23	May 1999	<i>Evaluation of the Hennepin County [Minneapolis, MN] Drug Court. Minnesota Citizens Council on Crime and Justice (R. Ericson; S. Welter and Thomas L. Johnson)</i>	Reviews program operations and outcomes of drug court participants during 1996-998 period; analyses treatment recidivism (readmission to new program after completing drug court treatment) and criminal recidivism (felony and gross misdemeanor charges and misdemeanor convictions occurring during 9 month follow up study period); also looked at employment status and improved parenting skills of participants while in program	Drug court participants whose cases were filed between August 1, 1997 and December 31, 1997 (with certain stated exceptions)	past drug offenders prior to drug court program implementation with similar demographic characteristics
24	October 2000	<i>North Carolina Drug Treatment Court Evaluation Final Report.</i> Craddock, Amy.	Data was collected from 534 individuals attending 4 pilot drug court treatment programs in North Carolina, monitored 12 months after graduation	Individuals attending the pilot drug court treatment programs in North Carolina	Eligible drug court treatment applicants not admitted to the program
25	October 2000	<i>Evaluation of Oklahoma Drug Courts, 1997-2000.</i> O'Connell, Paul. Wright, David. Clymer, Bob.	Individuals in the Oklahoma drug court program were monitored at 6, 9, 12, 18, and 24 months.	Oklahoma Drug Court Graduates	Probation offenders matched by criminal history and felony charge

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Adult  
Drug Court Programs Published: 2000 – Present**

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	Focus of Study	Population Studied	Comparison Group
26	October 2000	<i>1998 [FL] Drug Court Recidivism Report Update</i> . Administrative Office of the Courts, Dade County (Miami), Florida	Provides cumulative re-arrest rates for defendants who refused drug court, withdrew from drug court, and those who successfully completed probation.	Drug court graduates through 1998	Defendants who refused drug court withdrew from drug court, and those who successfully completed probation.
27	January 2001	<i>Final Report on the Polk County [IA] Adult Drug Court: Executive Summary and Summary of Findings</i> . Iowa Dept. of Human Rights. Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning. Statistical Analysis Center.	Study comparing clients entering program from its inception through September 30, 1998 with group of revoked probationers from FY96 and other offenders referred to the drug court who didn't enter	Drug court clients who entered program from inception through September 30, 1998  [findings reported for graduates only]	Group of revoked probationers from FY 96 and defendants who were referred to the drug court but didn't enter
28	July 2001	<i>NW HIDTA/DASA Washington State Drug Court Evaluation Project</i> . G. Cox, L. Brown, C. Morgan, M. Hansten. Alcohol and Drug Abuse Institute. University of Washington, Seattle, Wash.	Study of drug court processes and outcomes in King County, Pierce Co.; Spokane Co; Thurston Co; Skagit Co; Kitsap Co; and Snohomish County; focus on examining organizational structure and operational characteristics of each program and impact of program on re-arrests; convictions, incarceration rates, earned income of participants, and utilization of public resources including medical, mental health, treatment and vocational services	Drug court participants in each site  [findings reported for graduates only]	
29	December 2004	<i>Evaluation of Virginia's Drug Treatment Court Programs</i> . Office of the Executive Secretary, Supreme Court of Virginia	Process and outcome evaluation of drug court participant retention rates and graduate and nongraduate (terminated or withdrawn) recidivism rates; also analysis of severity and tonicity of offenses committed by participants prior to drug court entry to address the issue: are drug courts accepting only "light weight" offenders? Or more serious and chronic offenders?	3,216 adult felony Drug court participants admitted to the drug courts between November 1995 and December 2004, consisting of 2,002 graduates or current enrollees	Adult drug offenders studied by Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission (VCSC) in 1999 for recidivism rates and severity of offense history
30	October 2003	<i>South Central Judicial District Adult Drug Court Program (Bismarck, N.D.). Process Evaluation – Final Report</i> . October 2003. Jeffrey A. Bouffard. North Dakota State University. Department of Criminal Justice and Political Science.	Primarily a process evaluation of program operations compared with anticipated program process and services; also provides limited analysis of outcome info re recidivism (program was too young to do compile adequate data on this) and relationship between demographic chars. Of participants and program performance	Reviewed 105 applications of potential participants, 47 enrolled participants and 14 graduates (8 terminations).  [findings reported for graduates only]	N/A

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Adult Drug Court Programs Published: 2000 – Present**

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	Focus of Study	Population Studied	Comparison Group
			and outcomes		
31	July 2002	<i>Outcome Evaluation of Ohio's Drug Court Efforts. Final Report.</i> By Edward J. Latessa, Ph.D.; Deborah Koetzle Shaffer; Christopher Lowenkamp. Center for Criminal Justice Research. University of Cincinnati.	Study of adult and juvenile drug courts in Ohio to examine their effectiveness; primary focus is on effects of frequent court contacts and community based treatment on recidivism rates	Common Pleas: Sampled 788 drug court participants and 429 comparison group members from Hamilton, Butler, Erie, and Richland Counties Municipal Court: 556 drug court participants and 228 comparison group from Cuyahoga Co., Miami County and City of Akron; Juvenile Court: studied 310 participants and 134 comparison group members from Belmont, Summit and Montgomery Counties	Matched offenders eligible for drug court program re demographic characteristics and presence of substance abuse problem
32	2001	<i>Evaluation of the Bernalillo County [NM] Metropolitan DWI/Drug Court (Institute for Social Research conducted comparison study specifically for drug court graduates)</i>	Reviews background, recidivism, and incarceration costs for 450 offenders served by the DWI/Drug Court since its inception in July 1997 through July 31, 2001; recidivism info for 168 graduates who graduated between March 1998 – September 2000	560 offenders served by the drug court program  [findings reported for graduates only]	Recidivism and Cost comparisons: Similar group of probation clients
33	February 2005	<i>Adult Drug Courts: Evidence Indicates Recidivism Reductions and Mixed Results for Other Outcomes.</i> U.S Government Accountability Office	Review of 27 drug court evaluation reports of 39 adult drug court programs that met GAO methodological criteria for soundness	N/A – reviewed already completed evaluation reports but focus includes participants as well as graduates	N/A
34	April 2005	<i>Evaluation of the Outcomes in Three Therapeutic Courts: Anchorage [AK] Felony Drug Court; Anchorage felony DUI Court; Bethel Therapeutic Court.</i> Alaska Judicial Council.	Study for legislature which reviewed info about all participants in Anchorage Felony DUI Court; Anchorage Felony Drug Court; and Bethel Therapeutic Court for 1 years prior to entering drug court and 2 years after leaving drug court	Defendants in Anchorage Felony DUI Court, Anchorage Felony Dr Court and Bethel Therapeutic Court for 2 years prior and 2 years following drug court participation  [findings reported for graduates and active participants only]	Defendants who matched participants but didn't enter a therapeutic program.
35	April 2003	<i>The Kootenai and Ada County [Idaho] Drug Courts: Outcome Evaluation Findings. Final Report</i>	Focus is on (1) characteristics of offenders served by the drug court; (2) how drug court participants appear on various indicators of drug use; (3) whether drug court participation affects likelihood of individual recidivating; (4)	Drug court participants in Kootenai and Ada County Drug courts selected between February 1998 and July 2002: <u>Kootenai Co:</u> (45% in Phase I; under 1% in Phase 2, 27% in phase 3 and 25% in phase 4; 29% (41) had graduated and 52% (76) had been	Comparison group identified by each court of defendants similar to participants in demographics and drug use and who were eligible for the drug court but didn't receive drug court services (Kootenai Co.-



**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Adult  
Drug Court Programs Published: 2000 – Present**

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	Focus of Study	Population Studied	Comparison Group
			factors that predict likelihood of success/failure; and (5) outcomes for program graduates	terminated, followed up for 820 days (2 yrs, 3 mos) for drug court group and 677 days (1 year, 10 months for comparison group; <u>Ada Co.</u> : drug court participants between March 1999 – June 2002; 25.7% currently enrolled (56); 41.7% (91) graduates; and 32.6% (71) terminated.	133 and Ada Co. – 161)
36	July 2000	<i>The Hamilton County [Ohio] Drug Court: Outcome Evaluation Findings.</i> Shelley Johnson and Edward Latessa. University of Cincinnati.	Comparison of drug court participants with comparison cases to determine whether drug court participation is associated with differences in outcome	Defendants screened for program during January 1, 1997 – October 31, 1998	Comparison group identified by various data sources including demographics, case history, assessment information and judge's daily drug court docket containing disposition and outcome information; each participant must have a reported substance abuse problem and be eligible for the drug court; drug court group = 226; comparison group – 230
37	March 2005	<i>Analysis of Oklahoma Drug Courts: Fiscal Years 2002-2004.</i> Oklahoma Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services	Analyzed data from 25 adult drug and DUI courts operating in 30 counties in Oklahoma, including participants who were active July 1, 2001 – June 30, 2004, totaling 2,307 participants	2,307 participants active in 25 adult and dui drug courts during period July 1, 2001 – June 30, 2004  [findings reported for graduates only]	Recidivism rate of drug court graduates compared with that of successful standard probation offenders or released prison inmates
38	July 2001	<i>The Akron [OH] Municipal Drug Court: Outcome Evaluation Findings.</i> S. Listwam, D.K. Shaffer, and Edward J. Latessa. Center for Criminal Justice Research, University of Cincinnati	Studied participants in drug court and compared with those designated as comparison cases		Matched group of cases screened November 1997 – April 2000 with selected demographic characteristics, reported substance abuse problem, and eligible for the drug court
39	May 2003	<i>Coconino County [AZ] DUI/Drug Court Evaluation.</i> Frederic I. Solop, Nancy A. Wonders, K.K. Hagen, K McCarrier. Social Research Laboratory, Northern Arizona University.	Two year process and outcome evaluation of Coconino Co. DUI/Drug court program; used random assignment of eligible offenders to an experimental group that entered the DUI drug court and a control group that was processed through the traditional criminal justice system; collected from May 1, 2001 – October 31, 2002	Drug court participants in the DUI drug court from May 1, 2002 – October 31, 2002	DUI offenders randomly assigned to traditional adjudication process; data collected: May 1, 2001 – October 31, 2002

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Adult  
Drug Court Programs Published: 2000 – Present**

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	Focus of Study	Population Studied	Comparison Group
40	2005	<i>Recidivism of Violent Offenders in a Delaware Drug Court Program for Probation Violators.</i> Christine A. Saum, Ph.D. Univ. of Delaware.	Study of 452 sample of seriously crime-involved offenders and their success in drug court program for probation violators.	452 probation violators with serous criminal histories who entered probation-violator track of New Castle Co. (Wilmington), Delaware Superior Court drug court between October 1993 and March 1997	N/A
41	2004	<i>Kalamazoo County [MI] 9<sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit Court: Drug Treatment Court Programs. Statistical Report.</i> 2004	Review of demographics, progress, and recidivism of 1,967 females and 2,267 males referred to the drug court program (566 females and 581 males enrolled) from inception (1992 and 2997 respectively) through December 2004	Study of 1,967 females and 2,267 males referred to Kalamazoo drug court programs since inception (June 1992 and January 1997, respectively) through December 2004  [findings reported for graduates only]	N/A
42	April 2005	<i>Puerto Rico Drug Court Program: Outcome Evaluation Center for Addiction Studies, School of Medicine, Universidad Central del Caribe</i>	(1)Study of the status of participants in the Puerto Rico Drug Court Program one year after admission compared to their status immediately prior to admission; (2) comparison of outcomes of Drug Court Participants to participants in traditional diversion groups supervised by probation and TASC	Drug Court: 222 consecutive admissions from six judicial regions which had a drug court (Arecibo, Bayamon, Carolina, Guayama, Ponce, and San Juan) from March through August 2003; comparison group comprised 220 consecutive admissions from 12 regions	comparison group comprised 220 consecutive admissions from 12 regions in probation or TASC supervised programs
43	September 2005 (interim)	<i>California Drug Courts: Outcomes, Costs and Promising Practices: An Overview of Phase II Study Results.</i> NPC Research, Shannon M. Carey, Michael W. Finigan, David Crumpton, Mark Waller, Francine Byrne. (See No. 51 for final report)	Two research questions: (1) are drug courts cost-effective (cost-beneficial)? (2) what drug court practices appear most promising and cost-beneficial? Study of costs and benefits (opportunity resources); cost to taxpayers (public funds); and transactional cost analysis	Graduates and all participants in 9 California courts: Monterey, Los Angeles (El Monte); Orange County (Santa Ana) and Laguna Nigel); San Joaquin Co. and Stanislaus County	N/A
44	January 2005	<i>Malheur County [OR] Adult Drug Court (S.A.F.E. Court) Outcome Evaluation Final Report.</i> NPC Research. Shannon Carey and Gwen Marchand.	(1) does drug court participation reduce no. of re-arrests for participants? (2) does drug court reduce levels of substance abuse; (3) how success is program in bringing participants to graduation within expected timeframe? (4) what participant characteristics produce success? Termination?	Drug court participants enterring program since implementation in January 20001 and at least 6 months prior to evaluation. (125 participants) – 77 males and 48 females)	N/A

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Adult  
Drug Court Programs Published: 2000 – Present**

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	Focus of Study	Population Studied	Comparison Group
45	January 2005	<i>Marion County [OR] Adult Drug Court Outcome Evaluation Final Report.</i> NPC Research. Shannon Carey, Gwen Marchand.	(1) does drug court participation reduce no. of re-arrests for participants? (2) does drug court reduce levels of substance abuse; (3) how success is program in bringing participants to graduation within expected timeframe? (4) what participant characteristics produce success? Termination? (5) (5) how important is aftercare to successful outcomes?	62 drug court participants who entered program since implementation in April 2000 and at least 6 months prior to evaluation.	Persons arrested on drug court eligible charges during year prior to drug court implementation, matched to drug court participants on gender, ethnicity, age and criminal history in 2 years prior to drug court
46	July 2003	<i>A Detailed Cost Analysis in a Mature Drug Court Setting: A Cost-Benefit Evaluation of the Multnomah County [OR] Drug Court.</i> NPC Research, Inc. Shannon Carey, Michael Finigan	Study of investment costs and benefits of drug court program; compares use of public resources for drug court clients and for sample of drug court eligible “business as usual” serviced clients.		
47	March 2004	State of California Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs. <i>Comprehensive Drug Court Implementation Act of 1999: Interim Report to the Legislature.</i> Kathryn P. Jett, Director	Study mandated by Comprehensive Drug Court Implementation Act (CDCI) of 1999 describing interim programmatic progress achieved	Data collected from January 2001 – June 2003 for “new participants”, participants who completed (“completers”), and those who were terminated (total of more than 9,000, 7,790 of whom were adults; 3,563 completed program; 2,657 terminated	N/A
48	June 14, 2006	<i>Suffolk Co. (MA) Drug Court Evaluation.</i> Abt Associates. Wm. Rhodes, Ryan Kling and M. Shiveley	Impact of drug court program on drug court probationer participants	844 probation participants in four drug courts in Suffolk County; could get info for 794 participants; 13% active at time of study; 42% graduates, 11% had FTAs;	Other drug-involved probationers (but had less extensive criminal histories and less severe probation risk scores so inappropriate to use them as comparison group
49	May 20, 2006	<i>Outcome Evaluation of the Jackson County, Florida Drug Court.</i> Williams Consulting. Silver Spring, Md.		12 Drug court completers and 16 non-completers who entered program November 1, 2002 and left by October 31, 2005  [findings reported for graduates only]	12 Defendants with similar demographics sentenced during the same period as drug court participants (post conviction) entered program but who had different treatment
50	Spring 2006	<i>Long-Term effects of participation in the Baltimore City [MD] drug treatment court: Results from an experimental study.</i> Denise C. Gottfredson et al. U. of Maryland.	Using an experimental design, compares 235 offenders assigned either to drug court or traditional process	139 drug court participants (84 District and 55 Circuit) compared with 96 defendants processed through traditional system during 1997 and 1998	96 defendants processed through traditional system during 1997 and 1998

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Adult Drug Court Programs Published: 2000 – Present**

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	Focus of Study	Population Studied	Comparison Group
51	April 2005	<i>California Drug Courts: A Methodology for Determining Costs and Benefits: Phase II: Testing the Methodology.</i> NPC Research. Shannon Carey, Dave Crumpton, Michael Finigan and Mark Waller. (See No. 43 for interim report)	U.S. Dept. of Justice funded study to conduct statewide eval to develop methodology that could be used by drug courts throughout California for ongoing cost-benefit evaluation; and answer two policy questions: (1) are adult drug courts cost beneficial? And (2) what adult drug court practices appear most promising and cost-beneficial	All drug court participants who entered the nine drug courts from January 1998 – December 1999 regardless of whether they completed program.	Non-drug court Defendants in each site eligible to enter the 9 drug courts from January 1998 – December 1999
52	August 2001	<i>The Philadelphia [PA] Treatment Court, Its Development and Impact: The Second Phase (1998-2000).</i> John S. GoldKamp al. Crime and Justice Research Institute	Follows first phase that described pilot period for the drug court; focuses on providing aggregate and trend data (April 1997 – August 2000); one year follow up for all participants entering program January 1998 – August 1999 and 6-month follow-up for participants and comparison group from January 1998 – November 1999	All participants and comparison group entering court system from January 1998 – August 1999 and six month follow up for all participants and comparison group from January 1998 – November 1999	-defendants ordered to assessment but not assessed (never appeared); -defendants assessed but found not in need of treatment; -defendants assessed in need of treatment but who chose not to enter drug court; -defendants found to be ineligible for drug court after referral; and -defendants assessed who chose to enter the drug court
53	July 2005	<i>Malheur County [OR] Adult Drug Court (S.A.F.E. Court) Cost Evaluation: Final Report.</i> NPC Research.	<b>Outcome:</b> Compared study group behaviors two years prior to entering drug court to the time (12 months to 2 years) following program entry to determine whether drug court (1) reduced no. of re-referrals? (2) reduced substance abuse; (3) successfully completes program for participants; and (4) any participant characteristics predict success? <b>Cost:</b> compared costs to crj incurred by participant 2 years prior to drug court entry with costs over 2 years following drug court entry.	<b>Outcome:</b> All offenders who entered the drug court at least one year before the start of the evaluation  <b>Cost:</b> 89 drug court participants (57 males and 32 females); whose primary drug of choice was meth (51%), alcohol (41%). Average age at entry: 31.6; (32.5 – men; 30.3-women) Prior arrests: .47 (.17 drug related)	Not used
54	September 2006	<i>Kalamazoo County [MI] Adult Drug Treatment Court Outcome and Cost Evaluation Final Report.</i> NPC Research	Whether drug courts reduced substance abuse? Recidivism? Produced cost savings?	Sample of participants who entered drug court between January 2002 and December 2003	Persons referred to drug court but didn't enroll
55	September 2006	<i>Barry County, Michigan Adult Drug Court. Outcome and Cost Evaluation. Final Report.</i> NPC Research	Whether drug court reduced substance abuse? Recidivism? Produced cost savings?	Identified sample of participants who entered drug court between implementation in 2001 and July 1, 2004	(1) those eligible for drug court at time of program implementation but couldn't be admitted because of incapacity; and (2) those

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Adult  
Drug Court Programs Published: 2000 – Present**

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	Focus of Study	Population Studied	Comparison Group
					subsequently eligible but not participating
56	March 2004	<i>The Douglas County (Nebraska) Drug Court: Characteristics of Participants, Case Outcomes and Recidivisms.</i> Cassia Spohn and R.K. Piker. Final Report. March 2004	Describes characteristics of all offenders (255) bound over to Douglas County District Court and subsequently diverted to Douglas Co. Drug Court in 2001	255 offenders diverted to Douglas Co. drug court in 2001	Comparison group of 687 traditionally adjudicated offenders
57	November 2001	<i>Dallas County [TX] DIVERT Court Outcome Evaluation.</i> Monica Turley and Ashley Sibley.	To determine whether Dallas county DIVERT drug court successfully reduced recidivism of first time felony drug offenders	Sample of drug court clients in program between January 5, 2998 and April 30, 2000. (77 graduates; 101 noncompleters	78 control group
58	January 2003	<i>Initial Process and Outcome Evaluation of Drug Courts in Texas.</i> Criminal Justice Policy Council.	Legislatively mandated study to examine effectiveness of present drug courts when H.B. 1287 enacted requiring drug courts by September 1, 2002 in counties with over 550,000 population	Tracked 501 offenders entering drug courts in Dallas, Jefferson and Travis Counties between 1998 – 1999 for three years	285 offenders eligible for drug court but not participating
59	October 2003	<i>Douglas County (NE) Drug Court Targeted Capacity Expansion Grant. Year 1 Evaluation Report.</i> ISED Solutions.	Studied 64 participants in first year of drug court	64 participants in first year of drug court	N/A
60	December 2004	<i>Douglas County (NE) Drug Court Targeted Capacity Expansion Grant. Year 2 Evaluation Report.</i> ISED Solutions.	Documents second year of drug court services and outcomes and analysis of client characteristics associated with poorer /better outcomes	116 drug court clients	N/A
61	March 31, 2004	<i>Cost/Benefit Analysis of the Douglas County, NE, Drug Court.</i> R.K. Piper and Cassia Spohn	To provide administrators and policy makers with critical information for future policy and funding decisions re drug courts	Approximately 300 drug court participants in first two years of program	194 traditional adjudication offenders in Phase 2 and 309 traditional adjudication offenders in Phase 3
62	February 2007	<i>Recidivism in Alaska's Felony Therapeutic Courts.</i> Alaska Judicial Council.	Study of recidivism of graduates of Anchorage Felony DUI and Felony Drug Courts and Bethel Therapeutic Court	63 Graduates and 54 nongraduates of Anchorage Felony DUI Court (46%), Anchorage Felony Drug Court (23%); and Bethel Therapeutic Court (31%)	Comparison group of 97 offenders with similar characteristics
63	October 2006	<i>The Staten Island [NY] Treatment Court Evaluation: Planning, Implementation, and Impacts.</i> Kelly O'Keefe and Michael Rempel. Center for Court Innovation.	Process (completed December 2003 for first 19 months of program) and impact evaluation of recidivism for SITC participants in first 40 months of program (March 2002- June 2005)	First 146 SITC participants in program	Matched sample of 46 similar defendants arrested in Staten Island in the year before the SITC opened.

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Adult  
Drug Court Programs Published: 2000 – Present**

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	Focus of Study	Population Studied	Comparison Group
64	2007	<i>2005/2006 Tennessee Drug Court Annual Report</i> . Office of Criminal Justice Programs. Dept. of Finance and Administration.	Compilation of information submitted by 37 of existing 45 drug courts in the state to annual report of drug court activity and performance according to stated performance measures to be evaluated.	N/A	N/A
65	2007	<i>Wyoming Drug Court Performance Measures Project</i> . National Center for State Courts.	Collected demographic and performance measures data for Wyoming drug courts: retention; sobriety; in program recidivism and units of service for period January 1, 2005-June 30, 2005.	Drug court participants during January 1 – June 30, 2005	N/A
66	April 2007	<i>Multnomah County, Oregon: The Impact of a Mature Drug Court Over 10 Years of Operation: Recidivism and Costs</i> . NPC Research	Examined impact of drug court on total population of drug court-eligible offenders over 10 year period (1991-2001)- focus of study was on impact of drug court on target population over time (five years of follow up on all cohorts, with up to 10 years on some)	Entire population of offenders identified as eligible for drug court from 1991-2001 identified and tracked; 11,000 cases identified; 6,500 participated in drug court; 4600 had cases processed outside of drug court; data included cases during pretrial/ component (1991-1999) and post adjudication component (beginning in 2000)	Tracked all drug court eligible defendants from 1991-2001; cases processed outside of drug court; 6500 processed cases through drug court
67	April 2007	<i>Indiana Drug Courts: A Summary of Evaluation Findings in Five Adult Programs</i> . NPC Research	Process, outcome and cost study of five unnamed adult drug courts in the state that were operating for at least 12 months at the time of the stud	Participants enrolled sometime between January 2002 and June 2005; varied by program	NA
68	Fall 2005	<i>An Evaluation of Treatment in the Maine Adult Drug Courts</i> . Faye S. Taxman, April Pattavina and Jeffrey Bouffard.	Whether the Maine Drug Court curriculum advances the recovery of offenders and ways in which the drug court affects outcomes.	99 participants from 6 drug courts in different phases of treatment	NA
69	Spring 2008	<i>Substance Use, Drug Treatment, and Crime: An Examination of Intra-Individual Variation in a [Baltimore, MD] Drug Court population</i> . Denise C. Gottfredson, Brook W. Kearley, Shawn D. Bushway.	Whether (1) substance use increases crime; (2) drug treatment reduces substance use; (3) drug treatment reduces crime; and (4)the effect of drug treatment on crime is mediated by reductions in substance use	Interviews with 157 study participants 3 years following random assignment to Baltimore Drug court (additional 16 had died)	Random assignment control group
70	January 2008	<i>Strafford County [NH] Drug Treatment Court: Performance Evaluation 2</i> . New Hampshire Center for Public Policy Studies.	Issues for improvement identified earlier: (1) timeliness of substance abuse evaluations by LADC for new referrals; (2) lack of written standards for program termination for noncompliance; and (3)	Persons admitted since January 19, 2006 (start of program) through October 31, 2006	NA

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Adult Drug Court Programs Published: 2000 – Present**

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	Focus of Study	Population Studied	Comparison Group
			missed gender treatment groups which seemed to create difficulty for many female participants		
71	August 1, 2006	<i>A Process and Site-Specific Outcome Evaluation of Maine's Adult Drug Treatment Court Programs.</i> Andrew Ferguson et. Al. Dep't. Of Sociology., University of Southern Maine	Study of five adult drug courts (York County, Cumberland County, Androscoggin Co., Penobscot Co, and Washington Co.) re process and outcomes	Offender level date for 1,365 persons referred to drug court over 56-month period: April 1, 2001-November 30, 2005; assessed 195 adult drug court participants over two time frames: 84 admitted between December 1, 2004- November 30, 2005; and 111 admitted between December 1, 2003 and November 30, 2004.	Substance abusing offenders who didn't participate in the drug court
72	August 2007	<i>Benefit-cost calculations for three adult drug courts in Minnesota.</i> August 2007. Paul A. Anton. Wilder Research	Review of cost benefit of three drug courts (in St. Louis, STearns and Dodge Counties	203 participants in three county drug courts (see methodology), including both completers and noncompleters	Drug offenders in the counties in the years just prior to establishment of the drug court
73	September 2008	<i>California Drug Courts: Costs and Benefits: Superior Court of San Francisco County.</i> Shannon M. Carey et al. NPC Research	Focus on: (1) are drug courts cost-beneficial?; and (2) what drug court practices appear most promising and cost-beneficial?	221 participants who entered program January 1, 2005 – December 31, 2005 (64 graduated and 157 non-completers) 80% men/20% women: 47% African American; 22% Hispanic/Latino; 21% White; 6% Asian and 4% other; primary drug of choice was cocaine (39%), meth: 21%; heroin (17%);	Participants from 9 different counties analyzed in previous Phase I and II of the study
74	January 31, 2004	<i>Evaluation of Maine's Statewide Adult Drug Treatment Court Program. Interim Report.</i> Donald Anspach, Ph.D. U. of Southern Maine	Review of initial operational period of Maine's six adult drug court (in counties serving 2/3 of Maine's population)	800 persons referred to the drug court over 32 month period: April 2001-November 30, 2003; 345 offenders admitted to adult drug courts as of November 30, 2003	N/A- much of report is process oriented but some comparisons with nationally available data
75	March 2009	<i>Strafford County (New Hampshire): Drug Treatment Court: Final Performance Evaluation.</i> New Hamp Center for Public Policy Studies	Determine if drug court program is operating successfully and value of rug court in improving rehabilitation of drug abusing offenders	Participants in first three years of the program	Offenders with charges in 203-4 who would have likely been admitted to drug court if existed
76	January 2009	<i>Vermont Drug Courts: Rutland County Adult Drug Court Process, Outcome, and Cost Evaluation Final Report.</i> NPC Research.	Evaluate effectiveness of Rutland Drug Court in terms of effectiveness in reducing recidivism; determining cost benefits of drug court participation, and to evaluate the drug court processes; key policy questions to be answered: was program implemented as intended? Are services that were planned being	Participants who entered program between January 1, 2004 – July 31, 2007	Offenders eligible for drug court but received traditional court proceeding; matched on age, gender, ethnicity, prior criminal history and indications of drug use

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Adult Drug Court Programs Published: 2000 – Present**

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	Focus of Study	Population Studied	Comparison Group
			delivered to target population? Does program reduce recidivism? Is there a cost savings to taxpayers as a result of drug court participation		
77	April 2008	<i>To Treat or Not to Treat: Evidence on the Prospects of Expanding Treatment to Drug-Involved Offenders.</i> Urban Institute. [Avinash Singh Bhati, John K. Roman, Aaron Chalfin.] April 2008	Research using micro-level data compiled from three nationally representative sources (National Survey on Drug Use and Health (NSDUH), Arestee Drug Abuse Monitoring (ADAM) and Drug abuse Treatment Outcome Study (DATOS) used to construct a synthetic dataset defining using population profiles rather than sampled observation. Resulting synthetic dataset comprising of over 40,000 distinct profiles, permitted cost=benefit analysis of a limited number of simulated policy options	Created a synthetic data set from three nationally representative sources (National Survey on Drug Use and Health (NSDUH), Arestee Drug Abuse Monitoring (ADAM) and Drug abuse Treatment Outcome Study (DATOS) u	N/A
78	March 2008	<i>Michigan DUI Courts Outcome Evaluation Final Report (Oct. 2007)</i> Carey, S. M., Fuller, B. E., & Kissick, K. NPC Research	Evaluation of three drug courts in Michigan guided by five research questions. Goal to examine recidivism, reduction in alcohol and substance abuse, determine what traits lead to successful outcome of the program.	DUI court participants for a minimum of one year following either program completion or termination from DUI Court	comparison group of offenders who were eligible for DUI court in the year prior to DUI court implementation
79	April 2008	Crumpton, D., Mackin, J. R., Weller, J. M., Linhares, R., Carey, S. M., & Finigan, M. W. (July 2007). <i>Harford County [OR] Adult District Drug Court Process Evaluation. A report to the Maryland Judiciary, Office of Problem-Solving Courts. NPC Research: Portland, OR.</i>	NPC Research, under contract with the Administrative Office of the Courts of the State of Maryland, conducted a cost and outcome study of the Harford County District Court Adult Drug Court (HCADC) program. The report includes the cost of the program and the outcomes of participants as compared to a sample of similar individuals who received traditional court processing. Evaluation designed to answer three key policy questions of interest to program practitioners, researchers and Policymakers: 1. Do drug treatment court programs reduce recidivism? 2. Do drug treatment court programs reduce drug-related re-arrests?	Identified sample of participants who entered the HCADC between January 2002 and August 2005	comparison group of individuals who were arrested on a drug court-eligible charge between February 2002 and August 2005 and referred to drug court but received traditional court processing for a variety of reasons (for example, a perceived inability to meet program requirements or unwillingness to participate)



**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Adult Drug Court Programs Published: 2000 – Present**

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	Focus of Study	Population Studied	Comparison Group
			3. Do drug treatment court programs produce cost savings?		
80	March 2008	Carey, S. M., Finigan, M. W., & Pukstas, K. (March 2008). <i>Exploring the Key Components of Drug Courts: A Comparative Study of 18 Adult Drug Courts [CA, MI, OR, MD, Guam] on Practices, Outcomes and Costs</i> . NPC Research: Portland, OR	Examines how different drug court programs are implementing the 10 Key Components and, in particular, how practices vary across programs; also examines whether and how these practices have impacted participant outcomes and program costs including graduation rate, program investment costs, and outcome costs related to participant criminal justice recidivism	Eighteen of 30 evaluations conducted by NPC Research between 2000 and 2006 chosen to be highlighted in the paper for the following reasons. The evaluations included detailed process evaluations of adult drug court program operations and had at least some accompanying outcome data. All process evaluations used the same basic methodology and were designed to assess whether and to what extent the drug court programs had been implemented in accordance with the 10 Key Components	NA
81	April 2007	Finigan, M. W., Carey, S. M., & Cox, A. A. (2007). <i>The Impact of a Mature Drug Court [Multnomah Co., OR] Over 10 Years of Operation: Recidivism and Costs: Final Report</i> . NPC Research: Portland, OR.	This study was designed to look at the operations and outcomes of a single drug court in Multnomah County (Portland, Oregon) over a 10-year period of court operations through examining the entire population of drug court-eligible offenders over that period. By examining the entire population, rather than sampling, we hoped to describe for policymakers the effects of drug court on the system as it operated during that decade. By examining operations and outcomes, we hoped to add to our knowledge about external and internal changes and how they affect drug court success or failure	The entire population of offenders, identified as eligible for drug court by the Multnomah County District Attorney's Office over a 10-year period, from 1991 to 2001, was identified and tracked through a variety of administrative data systems. Approximately 11,000 cases were identified; 6,500 participated in the Drug Court program during that period and 4,600 had their case processed outside the drug court mode	N/A
82	March 2007	Carey, S. M., & Waller, M. (March 2007). <i>Guam Adult Drug Court Outcome Evaluation: Final Report</i> . NPC Research: Portland, OR.	There are two key policy questions that are of interest to program practitioners, researchers and policymakers that this evaluation was designed to answer. 1. Do drug treatment court programs reduce substance abuse? 2. Do drug treatment court programs reduce recidivism?	NPC Research identified a sample of participants who entered the Guam Adult Drug Court from the implementation of the program through August 2005, allowing for the availability of at least 12 months of outcome data post-program entry for all participants	A comparison group was selected from Probation data on drug offenders in the 2 years prior to the GADC implementation who had cases that would have been eligible for drug court had the program existed at the time
83	April 2007	Wiest, K. L., Carey, S. M., Martin, S. J., Waller, M. S., Cox, A. A., Linhares, R., & Crumpton, D. (April 2007).	This evaluation was designed to answer key policy questions that are of interest to program practitioners,	The following information includes data from the 132 participants who entered the program after	A sample of individuals who were eligible for drug court but chose not to attend MCDTC and

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Adult  
Drug Court Programs Published: 2000 – Present**

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	Focus of Study	Population Studied	Comparison Group
		<i>Indiana Drug Courts: Monroe County Drug Treatment Court Process, Outcome and Cost Evaluation: Final Report.</i> NPC Research: Portland, OR.	policymakers and researchers: 1. Has the MCDTC program been implemented as intended and are they delivering planned services to the target population? 2. Does the MCDTC reduce recidivism? 3. Does the MCDTC reduce substance use? 4. Is there a cost-savings to the taxpayer due to drug court participation? I	that date. The vast majority of these participants were white (97%) and male (76%). Forty-eight percent of the participants are single, 22% are married or living as married, 29% are divorced or separated, and 1% widowed. The mean age is 33 years with a range of 19 to 60 years	had similar demographic characteristics and prior criminal records
84	November 2006	Carey, S. M., Finigan, M. W., Crumpton, D., & Waller, M. S. (2006). <i>California Drug Courts: Outcomes, Costs and Promising Practices: An Overview of Phase II in a Statewide Study.</i> Journal of Psychoactive Drugs, 38 (4),345-356.	This study focused on creating a research design that can be utilized for statewide and national cost-assessment of drug courts by conducting in-depth case studies of the costs and benefits in nine adult drug courts in California. A Transactional Institutional Costs Analysis (TICA) approach was used, allowing researchers to calculate costs based on every individual's transactions within the drug court or the traditional criminal justice system	All participants who entered the drug court programs during a specified time period and were active in the drug court programs for at least two weeks were included in the study. It was necessary for drug court participant samples to be selected from years that had a reasonable amount of administrative data, while at the same time giving the individuals in the samples enough time for outcomes to occur. The drug court cohorts were selected from participants who entered the drug court programs between January 1998 and December 1999, which provided at least four years of outcome data. The participant cohorts from each site were selected from either the drug court database or from databases (such as electronic court records) that flagged drug court participants.	comparison offenders at each site were matched as closely as possible to the drug court participants using a propensity score matching technique based on demographics (gender, age, ethnicity), previous criminal justice involvement (in the two years prior to the drug court arrest: number of all arrests, number of drug related arrests, number of days in jail), and previous use of treatment services (number of treatment episodes in the two years prior to the drug court arrest)
85	September 2006	Marchand, G., Waller, M. S., & Carey, S. M. (Oct. 2006). <i>Barry County [MI] Adult Drug Court Outcome and Cost Evaluation: Final Report.</i> NPC Research: Portland, OR.	In 2005, the Michigan Supreme Court, State Court Administrative Office contracted with NPC Research to perform outcome and cost evaluations of two Michigan adult drug courts; the Kalamazoo Adult Drug Treatment Court and the Barry County Adult Drug Court. This document describes the evaluation and results for the Barry County Adult Drug Court (BCADC). There are three key policy questions that are of interest to program practitioners, researchers and	NPC Research identified a sample of participants who entered the BCADC from the implementation of the program through July 1, 2004 (allowing time for outcomes post program entry).	A comparison group was identified from two sources (1) those individuals who were eligible for Drug Court at the time of implementation, but whom could not be admitted into the program due to capacity issues at startup and (2) individuals arrested on a Drug Court eligible charge during the study period but who received traditional court processing for a variety of reasons

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Adult Drug Court Programs Published: 2000 – Present**

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	Focus of Study	Population Studied	Comparison Group
			<p>policy makers that this evaluation was designed to answer.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Do drug treatment court programs reduce substance abuse?</li> <li>2. Do drug treatment court programs reduce recidivism?</li> <li>3. Do drug treatment court programs produce cost savings (in terms of avoided costs)?</li> </ol>		
86	February 2006	<p>Pukstas, K., Weller, J. M., Brekhus, J., Crumpton, D., Carey, S. M., Mackin, J. R., &amp; Finigan, M. W. (Feb. 2006). <i>Maryland Drug Treatment Courts: Interim Report of the Effectiveness of Juvenile Drug Courts</i>. NPC Research: Portland, OR</p>	<p>The report includes the following</p> <p>A description of the characteristics of juvenile drug court programs and the problems that they are designed to address.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A discussion of the practices incorporated in Maryland’s juvenile drug court programs as compared with research-based best practices for juvenile substance abuse and criminal justice interventions.</li> <li>• A comparison of the criminal justice system experience of a statewide sample of youth before and after their participation in Maryland’s juvenile drug courts.</li> <li>• A comparison of the estimated program costs for juvenile drug court participants with those of individuals who participate in another intervention for similar juvenile offenders operated by DJS.</li> </ul>	<p>NPC selected a sample of juveniles who were placed in the Maryland juvenile drug court system between 2001 and 2004, and released prior to December 15, 2004,</p>	N/A
87	July 2005	<p>Carey, S. M., &amp; Marchand, G. (Jan. 2005). <i>Malheur County [OR] Adult Drug Court (S.A.F.E. Court) Outcome Evaluation: Final Report</i>. NPC Research: Portland, OR.</p>	<p>The goal of this design is to determine whether participation in S.A.F.E. Court was influential in changing behavior patterns established prior to S.A.F.E. Court entry</p>	<p>NPC Research identified all offenders who had entered the S.A.F.E. Court program at least one year before the start of the evaluation and compared their behaviors in the two years prior to entering S.A.F.E. Court to the time period (twelve months to two years) following their entry into the program</p>	N/A

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Adult Drug Court Programs Published: 2000 – Present**

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	Focus of Study	Population Studied	Comparison Group
88	July 2003	Carey, S. M. & Finigan, M. W. (July 2003). <i>A Detailed Cost Analysis in a Mature Drug Court Setting: A Cost-Benefit Evaluation of the Multnomah County [OR] Drug Court</i> . NPC Research: Portland, OR.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Collect and examine data from a mature drug court using a high-intensity cost assessment protocols developed specifically for this study and report these findings in a manner relevant to local policy makers.</li> <li>· Examine the differences between the proxy measures that we might have used in this study with the actual costs generated by our detailed cost assessment protocols.</li> <li>· Develop preliminary cost and cost offset assessment protocols that can be used by other drug court sites.</li> </ul>	N/A	N/A
89	February 2004	Carey, S. M. (Feb. 2004). <i>Clackamas County [OR] Juvenile Drug Court Outcome Evaluation: Final Report</i> . NPC Research: Portland, OR.	<p>Following is the list of research questions asked in this evaluation and the outcome results for these questions.</p> <p><i>Research question #1: Does participation in drug court, compared to traditional court processing, reduce the number of re-referrals for participants?</i></p> <p><i>Research question #2: Does participation in drug court reduce levels of substance abuse?</i></p> <p><i>Research question #3: How successful is the program in bringing program participants to completion and graduation within the expected time frame?</i></p> <p><i>Research Question #4: How has the program impacted the participants and their families?</i></p> <p><i>Research Question #5: What participant characteristics predict successful outcomes? What are the commonalities of clients terminated from the program? How do those terminated from the programs differ from those who have</i></p>	This report contains the CCJDC outcome evaluation performed by NPC Research. Because the CCJDC is relatively small and was implemented recently, the entire population of drug court participants (except for those who had started less than 6 months before the time of outcome data collection) was used in these analyses	The drug court participant outcomes were compared to outcomes for a matched group of offenders who were eligible for drug court during a time period before the CCJDC program was implemented.

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Adult  
Drug Court Programs Published: 2000 – Present**

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	Focus of Study	Population Studied	Comparison Group
			<i>graduated?</i>		
90	April 2007	Wiest, K. L., Carey, S. M., Martin, S. J., Waller, M. S., Cox, A. A., & Linhares, R. (April 2007). <i>Indiana Drug Courts: Vanderburgh County Day Reporting Drug Court Evaluation: Final Report</i> . NPC Research: Portland, OR.	This evaluation was designed to answer key policy questions that are of interest to program practitioners, policymakers and researchers: 1. <i>Has the VCDRDC program been implemented as intended and are they delivering planned services to the target population?</i> 2. <i>Does the VCDRDC reduce recidivism?</i> 3. <i>Does the VCDRDC reduce substance use?</i> 4. <i>Is there a cost-savings to the taxpayer due to drug court participation?</i> I	current participants	Terminated participants
91	April 2007	Wiest, K. L., Carey, S. M., Martin, S. J., Waller, M. S., Cox, A. A., Linhares, R., & Crumpton, D. (April 2007). <i>Indiana Drug Courts: Vigo County Drug Court Process, Outcome and Cost Evaluation: Final Report</i> . NPC Research: Portland, OR.	This evaluation was designed to answer key policy questions that are of interest to program practitioners, policymakers and researchers: 1. <i>Has the VCDC program been implemented as intended and are they delivering planned services to the target population?</i> 2. <i>Does the VCDC reduce recidivism?</i> 3. <i>Does the VCDC reduce substance use?</i> 4. <i>Is there a cost-savings to the taxpayer due to drug court participation?</i>	Current and graduated participants	Terminated participants
92	April 2007	Wiest, K. L., Carey, S. M., Martin, S. J., Waller, M. S., Cox, A. A., Linhares, R., & Crumpton, D. (April 2007). <i>Indiana Drug Courts: St. Joseph County Drug Court Program Process, Outcome and Cost Evaluation: Final Report</i> . NPC Research: Portland, OR.	This evaluation was designed to answer key policy questions that are of interest to program practitioners, policymakers and researchers: 1. <i>Has the SJCDC program been implemented as intended and are they delivering planned services to the target population?</i> 2. <i>Does the SJCDC reduce recidivism?</i> 3. <i>Does the SJCDC reduce substance use?</i> 4. <i>Is there a cost-savings to the taxpayer due to drug court participation?</i>	Current and graduated participants	Terminated Participants

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Adult Drug Court Programs Published: 2000 – Present**

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	Focus of Study	Population Studied	Comparison Group
93	November 2009	<i>Analysis of the Sisseton-Wahpeton Oyate Tribal Drug Court</i> [SD]	Analysis of successes and areas in need of improvement in the treatment court.	Current and Graduated Participants	Terminated participants
94	April 2010	<i>Associations with Substance Abuse Treatment Completion Among</i> [WI] <i>Drug Court Participants</i> . Randall Brown, M.D. U of WI's School of Medicine and Public Health	Study of factors associated with completion/noncompletion of all (573) participants in Dane County (Milwaukee) Drug Court 1996-2004	All (573) participants in Dane County (Milwaukee) Drug Court: 1996-2004	N/A
95	March 2009	<i>Evaluation of Denver's</i> [CO] <i>Reorganized Drug Court</i> . Omni Institute. Submitted to the Crime Prevention and Control Commission	Describes reorganization and reestablishment of Denver's drug court in 2007, eligibility criteria, and key differences between reorganized and former drug court re court processes and case supervision; six research questions addressed: (1) how many individuals and cases processed thru reorg drug court vs former drug court; (2) background of individuals in reorg drug court vs former dr court; (3) how are defendants processed in reorg dr ct vs former dr court? (4) how successful is reor dr ct vs former dr ct? (5) what offender chars predict successful completion of drug court; and (6) does reor dr ct reduce jail days?	Cases filed in first year or reor drug court compared to one year of cases filed in former drug court	One year of cases filed in Denver's "unfunded former drug court"
96	December 2008	<i>California Drug Courts: Costs and Benefits: DC-CSET Statewide Launch: Superior Court of Sacramento County</i> . Shannon M. Carey, et al. NPC Research	Site specific results for Sacramento Drug Court as part of multi-site evaluation of costs and benefits of California's drug courts.	401 participants who entered program from January 1, 2004 – December 31, 2005; 101 were graduated and 300 were noncompleters;	1,685 participants from 9 different counties which was an acceptable match although did not match the demographics exactly.
97	April 15, 2010	<i>Municipal Drug Court Program</i> [MO]: <i>Initial Evaluation Report</i> [Prepared for : City of Kansas City, MO. Kansas City Municipal Court Judicial Circuit 16 Regional Correction Center] Amber Pickman, MA; Kiet Luu, MUP. Resource Development Institute. Kansas City, MO	Report analyzed and reported on six measurable outcomes: -Increased length of court supervision -Increased number of UA's directed by the court -Increased number of clients obtaining housing -Increased wrap-around services -Increased knowledge by Drug Court staff -Recoup cost	173 clients referred to drug court or placed in treatment	N/A

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Adult Drug Court Programs Published: 2000 – Present**

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	Focus of Study	Population Studied	Comparison Group
98	February, 2010	<i>Grant County, Indiana Drug Court Evaluation Report.</i> [no author cited]	Appears to measure degree of achievement of Goals and Objectives listed in unspecified grant relating to increasing public safety: reduction in recidivism; and promoting positive change for participants and their families	participants who entered drug court in the first 4 years of the program (n=179)	N/A
99	July 2008	<i>Impact and Cost-Benefit Analysis of the Anchorage [AK] Wellness Court.</i> Urban Institute .John K. Roman et al.	To estimate costs and benefits of misdemeanor DUI Program in Anchorage Wellness Court (AWC) in terms of reducing prevalence and incidence of new criminal justice system contact	Compare outcomes for 277 individuals eligible for the AWC: 141 individuals who had no contact with 136 referred to the program; additional analysis for 91 participants – 44 graduates and 47 failures) with 45 who declined program and 141 in comparison group	141 individuals eligible for the AWC but had no contact with it
100	August 2009	<i>Statewide Process and Comparative Outcomes Study of 2003 Iowa Adult and Juvenile Drug Courts.</i> Michelle D. Cook et al. Iowa Department of Human Rights. Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning. Statistical Analysis Center. August 2009.	Statewide evaluation of the 6 adult and 3 juvenile drug courts in operation in 2003 to examine completion rates, recidivism, substance abuse treatment, and supervision and placement for juveniles, and costs	Participants in 6 adult drug courts operating in 2003	Adult offenders screened and declined or rejected for drug court in 2003 (referred) and sample of offenders starting probation in 2003
101	February 22, 2010	<i>Santa Barbara County [CA] Collaborative Courts. 2008-2009 Program Evaluation Report</i> By: Merith Cosden, Cristina Benki, Kristen Sullivan & Megan Donahue University of Southern California, Santa Barbara	Evaluation of the Substance Abuse Treatment Court (Drug Court) and the MARS-Methamphetamine Addiction Recovery System (Enhanced Drug Court)	113 participants in the Substance Abuse Treatment Court (SATC). 131 clients in the Methamphetamine Addiction Recovery System (MARS): Enhanced Drug Court during the first year (2009),including 56 follow up assessments at 6 months.	N/A
102	May 2004	<i>Fulton County New York Drug Court Outcome Evaluation of Goals and Objectives-Final Report.</i> Submitted by: Michael J. Kavanaugh, Industrial Psychologist, Professor of Management and Psychology, University at Albany	Evaluate the progress in achieving the goals and objectives established in February of 2003 for the FCDC.(in November 2002 a process evaluation was completed focusing on the measures and procedures used by the drug court program to determine their effectiveness. The purpose of this outcome evaluation is to determine if the internal management and monitoring of these activities has resulted in meeting the FCDC program goals: reduce crime and rearrest rates; promote public safety; produce criminal justice system savings through decreased length of incarceration ;and decreased	125 individuals selected to participate in the Drug Court.	N/A

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Adult  
Drug Court Programs Published: 2000 – Present**

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	Focus of Study	Population Studied	Comparison Group
			substance abuse in the target populations and objectives (see Section III)		
103	<i>Undated – sometime after June 1, 2006.</i>	<i>Crow Wing County, Minnesota Drug Court Evaluation.</i> [No author attribution.]	Both a process and outcome evaluation	The sample identified for this evaluation consists of the 25 program participants in the first Drug Court cohort. The Crow Wing Drug Court began on June 1, 2006 and individual clients were added as appropriate. The evaluation uses the term “cohort” loosely. Technically a cohort is a group of people going through an institutional process together. It should be noted that Drug Court participants did not all begin Drug Court on the same date but for purposes of this evaluation, these individuals are considered to have gone through the process together.	N/A
104	2008	<i>San Francisco [CA] Drug Court. 2008 Annual Report.</i> San Francisco’s Collaborative Courts. Maria McKee et al.	Summary report of performance evaluation of drug court in terms of (1) volume (referrals and participants); (2) case processing time; (3) time in program/time to graduation; (4) retention and completion rates; (5) participant characteristics at entry and exit; (6) recidivism; (7) cost analysis; and (8) evaluation of court policies and programs	Drug court clients entering program in 2008 as well as information on other program participants for past years	N/A
105	2008	<i>Examining the Differential Impact of Drug Court Services by Court Type: Findings from Ohio.</i> Drug Court Review, 6, 33-66. Shaffer DK et al. (2008).	To provide a multi-site impact study of both adult and juvenile drug courts in Ohio. This study examines the differences between drug court and comparison group members along a variety of measures. The current study will assess whether drug courts are effective in reducing recidivism and identify the factors associated with failure.	The current sample includes 788 drug court participants and 429 comparison group members in the common pleas court group; 556 drug court participants and 228 comparison group members in the municipal court group; and 310 participants and 134 comparison group members in the juvenile court group.	The criteria for inclusion in the comparison group were that each participant must have (1) a reported substance abuse problem and (2) be eligible for the drug court program. Common pleas group-429 Municipal Court group-228 Juvenile Court group-134



**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Adult Drug Court Programs Published: 2000 – Present**

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	Focus of Study	Population Studied	Comparison Group
106	<i>Not indicated</i>	<i>Adult and Juvenile Drug Courts.</i> Douglas B. Marlowe, J.D. Ph.D.	General overview of the drug court model. Covers the areas of recidivism, cost-effectiveness, outcomes, Target populations, testing, and the location of the drug court program within the courts judicial system.	*This study uses the concept of meta-analysis, using research from only scientifically defensible studies. The specific population is not known.	*N/A
107	<i>August 2008</i>	<i>Worcester County [MD] Adult Circuit and District Drug Treatment Courts-Process Evaluation.</i> NPC Research, Portland, Oregon;	This report also contains a process evaluation for the Worcester County Adult Circuit and District Drug Treatment Courts (WCADTC). The first section of this report is a description of the methods used to perform this process evaluation, including site visits and key stakeholder interviews. The second section contains the evaluation, including a detailed description of the drug court process. The final section of the report assesses this drug court program's implementation of the 10 Key Components of drug courts, and offers suggestions for improvement	Participants enrolled in the WCADTC between July 2007 and April 2008.	N/A
108	December 2009	<i>Wicomico County [MD] Circuit Court Adult Drug Treatment Court Program Outcome and Cost Evaluation.</i> NPC Research (for Maryland AOC).	Three key policy questions: 1. Does the DTC Reduce Substance Abuse Among Program Participants? 2. Does the DTC Program Reduce Recidivism Among Program Participants? 3. Does the DTC Result in Savings of Taxpayer Dollars?	All DTC participants who entered the program from November 2005 to December 2008 found in the statewide criminal justice databases (29 individuals were not found or did not have enough follow-up time). Final sample included 48 drug treatment court participants.	Offenders meeting eligibility criteria used by the program who had never attended the DTC, identified from a list of people arrested or on probation for a DTC-eligible charge and who also had a DTC-eligible criminal history. The DTC program participants and comparison group individuals were matched on age, gender, race/ethnicity, indication of a drug issue by their probation officer, and criminal history. Final sample included 88 comparison individuals.
109	January 2010	<i>Montgomery County [MD] Adult Drug Court Program Outcome and Cost Evaluation.</i> NPC Research (for Maryland AOC).	Three key policy questions: 1. Do ADC Participants Reduce their Substance Abuse During Program Participation? 2. Do ADC Participants Have Reduced Re-Arrest Rates After Program Entry? 3. Does the ADC Result in Savings of Taxpayer Dollars?	All ADC participants who entered the program from December 2004 to December 2008. Final sample included 76 adult drug court participants (34 graduates, 18 non-graduates, and 24 active participants).	Individuals, who were eligible for the program but did not participate, identified from a list of people arrested or on probation for an ADC eligible charge and who also had an ADC-eligible criminal history. The ADC program participants and comparison group individuals were

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Adult Drug Court Programs Published: 2000 – Present**

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	Focus of Study	Population Studied	Comparison Group
					matched on age, gender, race/ethnicity, indication of a drug issue by their probation officer and criminal history. Final sample included 99 comparison individuals.
110	January 2010	<i>Howard County [MD] District Court Drug Treatment Court Program Outcome and Cost Evaluation.</i> NPC Research (for Maryland AOC).	Three key policy questions: 1. Does the DTC Reduce Substance Abuse Among Program Participants? 2. Does the DTC Program Reduce Recidivism in the Criminal Justice System? 3. Does the DTC Result in Savings of Taxpayer Dollars?	All DTC participants who entered the program from August 2004 to September 2008 (27 individuals were not found in the statewide criminal justice databases or did not have enough follow-up time and were excluded from the study). Final sample included 50 Drug Treatment Court participants (16 graduates, 28 non-graduates, and 6 active participants).	Comparison group was created based on the eligibility criteria used by the program to select its participants. DTC program participants and comparison group individuals were matched on age, gender, race/ethnicity, indication of a drug issue by their probation officer and criminal history. Final sample included 89 comparison individuals.
111	June 2009	<i>Baltimore City [MD] District Court Adult Drug Treatment Court 10-Year Outcome and Cost Evaluation.</i> NPC Research.	To describe the program and its participants over time, evaluate the effectiveness of the DTC in reducing recidivism, and determine the cost-benefits of drug treatment court participation.	Cohort of district DTC participants who entered the program from January 1, 1995, to June 30, 1998. Included 694 DTC participants (193 graduates and 501 non-graduates).	Individuals arrested on a DTC-eligible charge who had DTC-eligible criminal histories. The DTC participants and comparison individuals were matched on age, gender, race/ethnicity, indication of prior drug use, type of charge for the eligible arrest (drug or other) within the study window and criminal history, including number of prior arrests and prior drug arrests, which included 860 comparison individuals.
112	October 2008	<i>Prince George's County [MD] Circuit Court Adult Drug Court Outcome and Cost Evaluation.</i> NPC Research (for Maryland AOC).	Three key policy questions that are of interest: 1. Do drug treatment court programs reduce recidivism? 2. Do drug treatment court programs reduce substance abuse? 3. Do drug treatment court programs produce cost savings?	A sample was chosen from PGCADC participants who entered the program between August 2002 and August 2005; 151 individuals in the sample.	189 participants similar to those individuals who have participated in drug court (e.g., similar demographics and criminal history), but have not participated in the drug court program.
113	April 2008	<i>Harford County [MD] District Court Adult Drug Court Outcome and Cost Evaluation.</i> NPC Research (for Maryland AOC).	Three key policy questions: 1. Do drug treatment court programs reduce recidivism? 2. Do drug treatment court programs reduce drug-related re-arrests? 3. Do drug treatment court programs produce cost savings?	A sample of 166 participants who entered the program between January 2002 and August 2005.	217 comparison group members selected by procuring a list of all drug court-eligible individuals who were matched to the drug court participants based on age, sex, race, prior arrest history (total arrests and drug-related arrests), and whether or

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Adult Drug Court Programs Published: 2000 – Present**

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	Focus of Study	Population Studied	Comparison Group
					not there was a previous indication of a drug problem..
114	December 2009	<i>Baltimore City [MD] Circuit Court Adult Drug Treatment Court and Felony Diversion Initiative: Outcome and Cost Evaluation Final Report.</i> NPC Research (for Maryland AOC).	1. Does participation in the Drug Treatment Court or Felony Diversion Initiative reduce the number of re-arrests for those individuals compared to traditional court processing? 2. Does participation in DTC or FDI reduce levels of substance abuse in terms of subsequent drug arrests? 3. To what extent are participants successful in completing these programs? 4. What participant and program characteristics predict successful outcomes for these two programs (program completion, decreased recidivism)?	All DTC participants and all FDI participants who entered their respective programs from April 1, 2004, to July 31, 2007, resulting in 685 DTC participants (188 graduates and 301 non-graduates with 196 active participants) and 122 FDI participants (46 graduates and 40 nongraduates with 36 active participants).	Individuals identified for each program from a list of people arrested on either a DTC-eligible charge who had a DTC-eligible criminal history or an FDI-eligible charge who had an FDI-eligible criminal history. Offenders had to have a Circuit Court case with both a drug charge and a felony charge, resulting in 683 DTC comparison individuals, and 153 FDI comparison group individuals.
115	December 2009	<i>Program Evaluation of Virginia's Drug Treatment Courts.</i> [No Author attribution]	Although the evaluation of Virginia's drug treatment courts is an ongoing process, primary tasks completed during this evaluation cycle included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitoring of data from the Supreme Court of Virginia's web based drug treatment court's database as well as supporting localities with data collection and data entry requirements</li> <li>• Analysis of performance measures for drug treatment courts, utilizing data from this system</li> <li>• Analysis of outcomes data from the drug treatment court database at SCV</li> <li>• Analysis of recidivism data for exiting drug treatment court participants, based upon supplementary data sources (e.g. Virginia State Police and the Virginia Department of Juvenile Justice)</li> </ul>	This evaluation includes two specific samples: 1. Adult, juvenile, and family drug treatment court participants who were active on or since July 1, 2007 through September 30, 2009, as well as a sample of non participants who were referred to the program, but not admitted, beginning July 1, 2007 through September 30, 2009 from the Supreme Court of Virginia Drug Court Database and 2. DUI drug treatment court offenders who were active on or after July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2009. A total of 4,411 individuals were referred to a Virginia drug treatment court program. Of these, 2,354 were admitted,	N/A

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Adult  
Drug Court Programs Published: 2000 – Present**

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	Focus of Study	Population Studied	Comparison Group
116	December 2009	<i>Maryland Problem-Solving Courts Evaluation, Phase III Integration of Results from Process, Outcome, and Cost Studies Conducted 2007-2009 Final Report.</i> NPC Research.	1.) Common and/or best practices for implementing the 10 Key Components and 16 juvenile strategies. 2.) Common challenges and recommendations. 3.) The average and range of recidivism outcomes for adult, DUI, and juvenile drug courts in Maryland. 4.) The average and range of program costs per transaction, per agency and overall. 5.) The average and range of outcome costs and benefits per transaction and overall, and the savings per agency.	Cohort of adult drug court participants from each site (Baltimore City Circuit Court - Drug Treatment Court, Baltimore City Circuit Court - Felony Diversion Initiative, Harford County District Court, Howard County District Court, Montgomery County Circuit Court, Prince George’s County Circuit Court, and Wicomico County Circuit Court).	Matched comparison group of offenders from the corresponding county who were eligible for adult drug court programs through their criminal history but who did not attend these programs.
117	June 2008	<i>Goodwill Industries of the Chesapeake Employment Enhancement Program at Baltimore City [MD] Drug Treatment Court Outcome &amp; Cost Evaluation.</i> NPC Research.	1. What are the characteristics of people who are referred to the GIC-EEP, compared to people who are not referred to the GIC-EEP? 2. What are the characteristics of GIC-EEP participants who were successful in obtaining employment? 3. Are Baltimore City drug treatment court participants who receive the GIC-EEP more likely to a) obtain employment, b) remain employed for longer periods of time, and c) earn higher wages than those drug treatment court participants who did not receive the GIC program? 4. Do GIC-EEP participants have a higher graduation rate from the drug treatment court, compared to other non-GIC-EEP? 5. Does participation in the GIC-EEP reduce the number of re arrests for those individuals compared to non-GIC-EEP drug treatment court participants? 6. What are the investment costs for the GIC-EEP? 7. What are the outcome costs for GIC-EEP participants compared to non-GIC-EEP drug treatment court participants?	Baltimore City drug treatment court participants who entered the GIC-EEP between February 2006 and September 2007. Final group size of 124 includes those referred to GIC-EEP and also received employment support services.	Baltimore City drug treatment court participants who had the potential to enter “Step III” of the drug treatment court program and thus could have been referred to GIC-EEP (but were not) between February 2006 and September 2007. Final group size of 214 includes those with potential Step III start dates between February 2006 and September 2007 to match the GIC-EEP group.
118	September 2010	<i>Drug Court Effectiveness: A Matched Cohort Study in the Dane County [Wisconsin] Drug Treatment Court.</i> Randall Brown MD, PhD.	Study sought to compare rates of recidivism for drug court participants to rates for a comparison group matched on potentially important characteristics. A dataset was constructed comprised of DTC participants and a matched	Wisconsin Circuit Court database (CCAP) of individuals with drug-related charges during 2004-2006 who also participated in drug treatment court (DTC group). Of the 2,370 individuals with drug-related charges, 137 participated in drug treatment court.	Each individual in the DTC group was matched to two individuals in the CCAP who were traditionally adjudicated (non-DTC, n=274).

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Adult  
Drug Court Programs Published: 2000 – Present**

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	Focus of Study	Population Studied	Comparison Group
			comparison group who might have been eligible for DTC participation but underwent typical adjudication. In this way, the study sought to overcome some of the bias concerns in previous studies such as: self-selection to supervisory conditions and potentially confounding factors (e.g. criminal justice history, socioeconomic factors).		
119	September 2010	<i>A Model for Success: A Report on New Jersey's Adult Drug Courts</i>	Study tracks number of participants in New Jersey drug courts, the recidivism rates of graduates, and the cost savings.	All participants of the New Jersey Adult Drug Court Program as of 9/30/2010	Recidivism rates are compared with the rate of re-arrest for drug offenders released from prison as reported by the New Jersey Department of Corrections.
120	April 2004	<i>Multiple Measures of Juvenile Drug Court Effectiveness: Results of a Quasi-Experimental Design.</i> Crime & Delinquency. Rodriguez, D. et al.	In this study, we examine the impact of juvenile drug courts on delinquency and substance use in Maricopa County, Arizona. First, we describe the sample of youth selected for drug treatment and use available data to predict their placement into drug court. By comparing those youth selected into drug court to those on standard probation (i.e., comparison group), we measure how legal variables, educational status, and family/guardian stability influenced drug court success. Last, we examine drug court completion and compare youths released from drug court to those released from standard probation.	Data for this study come from the Juvenile On-Line Tracking System(JOLTS), screening activity instruments and records, daily records of activities, drug court dockets, and periodic drug test results. Data collection took place during the first 3 years the juvenile drug courts were in operation (October 1997 to November 2000). In this study, we include the 114 youths placed in drug court and the 204 youths on standard probation who were screened for treatment.	204 youths on standard probation who were screened for treatment.
121	June 2000	<i>Evaluation of Oklahoma Drug Courts, 1997-2000.</i> Criminal Justice Resource Center. Wright, D., et al.	This document details the Phase II evaluation of the Oklahoma drug court program, including courts in: Tulsa, Creek, Oklahoma, Pontotoc, Seminole, Pottawatomie, and McClain counties. These courts are designed for adult non-violent felony offenders with a history of substance abuse. The information provided includes and updates previously gathered data: selected demographic variables of the participants, relapse, relapse drug, phase level, status, retention, current employment, sanctions,	The Phase II report updates drug court participant information detailed in the March 2000 report entitled "An Analysis of the Oklahoma Drug Courts." This report contains comparisons between the first and second cohorts, as well as information on the total drug court clients. Second cohort clients are those who entered a drug court since the time of Phase I evaluation. Extensive demographic analysis was completed on the second cohort. Table 1, presents the population of Oklahoma drug courts by status.	Numerous comparisons on a variety of variables are made between the first and second cohorts, and the total of all drug court participants. Additional comparisons are made between drug court graduates and those participants who were terminated. Moreover, recidivism results are examined among drug court graduates and are compared to a "control" group of probation offenders.

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Adult Drug Court Programs Published: 2000 – Present**

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	Focus of Study	Population Studied	Comparison Group
			and recidivism data (rearrests) in the case of graduates.		
122	2008	<i>Mitigating the Costs of Substance Abuse in Virginia. Report of the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission to the Governor and the General Assembly of Virginia.</i>	This section of a larger government report compares the imposed costs of drug court completers against non-completers, probation completers, and jail completers.	Drug Court populations from Richmond and Chesterfield Adult Drug Courts including completers (N=28) and non-completers (N=32).	Drug Court completers were compared with non-completers (N=32), Probation Completers (N=28), and Jail Completers (N=28).
123	2004	<i>A cost-benefit analysis of the St. Louis City [MO] Adult Felony Drug Court.</i> Institute of Applied Research. Loman, L.A.	The study was a cost-benefit analysis that compared the first 219 drug court graduates, who had completed drug court before 2001, with a carefully matched control group of 219 individuals charged with a drug crime who had pleaded guilty, had entered probation during the same period, were not offered drug court, and had successfully completed probation.	See "Focus of Study".	The control group contained no individuals who were sentenced to prison. For this reason, the estimates of this study are conservative since drug court graduates with class A and class B felonies and those who are prior and persistent offenders would most likely have been sentenced to prison terms had they not been accepted into Drug Court.
124	1998	<i>The Impact of treatment: The Jefferson County (Kentucky) Drug Court program.</i> Federal Probation. Vito, G.F. et al.	Presents the results of an impact evaluation of the Jefferson County Drug Court Program in Kentucky. Reduction of recidivism rates; Three phases of drug court treatment; Effectiveness of drug court treatment programs	First, we compare the demographic and social attributes of clients in the drug court program (N = 237) and those of persons who were screened for, but elected not to enter, the program (N = 76). This "self-drop" group serves as a comparison group (see Adams, 1975).	See "population studied"

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Adult  
Drug Court Programs Published: 2000 – Present**

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	Focus of Study	Population Studied	Comparison Group
125	December 2010; Re-release March 2011.	<p><i>Oregon Drug Court Cost Study: Phase III: Statewide Costs and Promising Practices.</i> NPC Research. Portland, Oregon.</p> <p><i>Oregon Drug Court Cost Study: Statewide Costs and Promising Practice, Final Report.</i> NPC Research. Portland, Oregon. March 2011.</p>	<p>The purposes of this statewide evaluation were to answer two critical drug court policy questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Are Oregon’s drug courts cost-beneficial?</li> <li>2. What are best practices for Oregon’s drug courts?</li> </ol> <p>(The re-release of this report contains the correction of an error in treatment costs for two of the 21 drug courts included in the cost portion of this study.)</p>	The Criminal Justice Commission (CJC) identified and provided to NPC Research a sample of all participants who entered the Oregon adult drug court programs that were operating at the time of the sample between January 2001 and December 2006.	A comparison group was identified from all offenders with drug court-eligible charges from the same time period who did not participate in drug court programs.
126	2011	<i>Montana Drug Courts: A Snapshot of Success and Hope.</i> Montana Supreme Court, Office of Court Administrator.	This report describes the accomplishments of Montana’s Drug Courts and includes performance data for 30 months (May 2008-October 2010)	795 total Drug Court participants entered during the data collection period; 235 participants remain active.	N/A
127	September 2010	<i>Georgia Department of Audits and Accounts Performance Audit Operations: Performance Audit 9-14.</i> Russell Hinton, State Auditor.	The audit determined: 1) whether drug courts provide a cost savings by diverting certain offenders from traditional sentencing options, 2) whether drug courts are effective, and 3) if drug courts are being used to their fullest extent.	A cohort of 2005 Georgia drug court participants	The 2005 cohort was extrapolated/compared with incarcerated individuals (4,000) who potentially would have met eligibility criteria for drug court.
128	November 2010	<i>Lycoming County [PA] Adult Treatment Court Sustaining Success: Restoring Lives and Community Cost Savings.</i> Robert A Kirchner, Ph.D., Thomas R. Kirchner, Ph.D., and Jill Glashow, MSW, LCSW	A process evaluation effort to assess the Lycoming Drug Court’s enhanced program’s effectiveness in fine-tuning its processes of implementation.	“From 1998 to October 2010, 434 drug offenders entered the LCATC”. Because it is not specified elsewhere, it is assumed that the entire drug court population was looked at.	N/A

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Adult Drug Court Programs Published: 2000 – Present**

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	Focus of Study	Population Studied	Comparison Group
129	June 2011	<i>The Multi-Site Adult Drug Court Evaluation: The Impact of Drug Courts.</i> [FL, IL, GA, NY, PA, SC, WA] Shelli B. Rossman, Michael Rempel, John K. Roman, Janine M. Zweig, Christine H. Lindquist, Mia Green, P. Mitchell Downey, Jennifer Yahner, Avinash S. Bhati, Donald J. Farole, Jr.	Test the hypotheses that drug court participants achieve better outcomes related to continued substance use and recidivism than similar offenders not exposed to drug courts. Isolate key individual and program factors that influence the outcomes. Test effects of variations in implementing the drug court model on participant outcomes.	1156 drug court participants from 23 drug courts - two courts in Florida, two courts in Illinois, two courts in Georgia, eight courts in New York, two courts in Pennsylvania, one court in South Carolina, and six courts in Washington.	625 offenders from 6 comparison courts - two sites in Florida, one site in Illinois, two sites in North Carolina, and one site in Washington.
130	April 16, 2009	<i>Evaluation of the Tarrant County [TX] DIRECT Program.</i> Dr. Richard Hoefler and Dr. Debra Woody.	Researchers used information downloaded from the DIRECT program's database in two rounds of data analysis. In the first round, detailing variables one or two at a time, researchers looked at all program clients for the years 2002-2006 in some analyses or 2003-2006 in other analyses. The second round of analysis used a random sample of 100 clients and advanced statistical methods to conduct multivariate tests of the data and to determine if findings were statistically significant.	533 clients who were admitted into the program between 2002 and 2006.	N/A
131	Second Quarter 2007	<i>Effectiveness and Impact of Thurston County, Washington Drug Court Program.</i> Robert A. Kirchner, Ellen Goodman, and Thomas R. Kirchner. Cognitive Behavioral Treatment Review. Volume 16, Number 2. 2007.	The outcomes and impact results of the Thurston County Drug Court Program for the period of May 1998 through May 2007.	An initial 106 drug court graduates.	223 drug offenders, who did not participate in the drug court program. This group comprised of probation completers.
132	December 2010 (DRAFT)	<i>Evaluation of the Van Buren County [MI] Unified Drug Treatment Court Program: Year 3.</i> Kristen E. DeVall. December 2010.	The focus of the outcome evaluation is on whether the VBCDTCP is meeting the goals/objectives. The outcome and impact evaluation consists of the data analysis of important program objectives. It should be noted that the emphasis is on the quantification of objectives.	The total number of participants who participated in the program during Years 1-3. Of the 146 participants in Years 1-3, 3.4% (n=5) entered the drug court program during Year 1, 49.3% (n=72) in Year 2, and 47.3% (n=69) entered the program during Year 3.  Crime and recidivism rates were calculated for those individuals who had been out of the program for at least twelve months (n=9).	The comparison group was comprised of individuals who were referred to the VBCDTCP, but refused to participate. The comparison group differed from the experimental group in that they received less supervision and less regular urine screens. Even more important, selection was certainly not random and the number of men/women in the comparison group is quite small, so comparisons



**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Adult  
Drug Court Programs Published: 2000 – Present**

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	Focus of Study	Population Studied	Comparison Group
					must be interpreted cautiously.
133	November 2009	<i>17<sup>th</sup> Judicial District Union/Snyder County [PA] Drug Treatment Court Baseline Process Evaluation.</i> Treatment Research Institute. November 2009.	The goal of the initial baseline report is to evaluate the DTC program and its clients during the first year of operations using both qualitative and quantitative methods. Although the one year analysis will examine difference in outcomes between DTC clients and a comparison sample, the baseline data will allow for examination of changes and maturity within the DTC over time.	A total of 18 clients who entered the DTC during the first year of operations (between July 1, 2008 and June 30, 2009).	N/A
134	December 2010	<i>17<sup>th</sup> Judicial District Union/Snyder County [PA] Drug Treatment Court Final Three Year Process and Outcome Evaluation.</i> Treatment Research Institute. December 2010.	This final evaluation used both qualitative and quantitative methods to: (1) reexamine court procedures and outcomes during the second year of operation, (2) compare year one and two procedures and outcomes, (3) identify key improvements, and (4) provide recommendations for further improvement.	A total of 118 eligible offenders (62 felony and 56 misdemeanor) were eligible for participation in the Drug Treatment Court program between July 1, 2009 and June 30, 2010. Of those eligible, a total of 8 new clients were recruited into the program. These data are presented along with data on the initial 18 clients recruited into the program between July 1, 2008 and June 30, 2010.	N/A
135	2011	<i>Evaluation of Montana's Seventh Judicial District Adult Treatment Court.</i> Snowy Range Research. Heck, Cary. 2011.	The purpose of this evaluation is to provide feedback to the Seventh Judicial District Adult Treatment Court Program (SJDATC) team regarding their progress toward meeting the goals identified by the team and in contracts with the State of Montana.	16 active participants.	N/A

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Adult Drug Court Programs Published: 2000 – Present**

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	Focus of Study	Population Studied	Comparison Group
136	August 2010	<i>Whatcom County [WA] Superior Court Therapeutic Courts Drug Court Overview, Demographic and Cost Benefit Analysis.</i> Ronald Helms, Brian Harris, and Brenda Davis. August 2010.	Whatcom County Adult Drug Court program overview.	Whatcom County Drug Court graduates and Whatcom County Drug Court participants.	Drug Offenders after incarceration.
137	March 2012	<i>Recidivism in Alaska's Therapeutic Courts for Addictions and Department of Corrections Institutional Substance Abuse Programs.</i> Teresa White Carns, Larry Cohn, and Stephanie Martin. Alaska Judicial Council. March 2012.	This report describes findings about two types of substance abuse treatment programs available to some offenders in the criminal justice system. Both the Alaska Court System (therapeutic courts) and the Department of Corrections (substance abuse treatment for incarcerated persons) offered programs in which participants were chosen through a combination of voluntary action on the part of the participant, and screening for various characteristics on the part of those offering the programs. The therapeutic courts have been operating since 1999; the DOC substance abuse treatment programs since mid-2009.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 322 therapeutic court participants who had been out of the therapeutic court for at least one year.</li> <li>• 326 DOC institutional substance abuse programs participants who had been released for at least one year.</li> </ul>	Offenders in matched samples drawn from the Council's recent study of recidivism among offenders returning to the community in 2008 and 2009. <sup>1</sup>  <sup>1</sup> Carns, Cohn and Martin, <i>Criminal Recidivism in Alaska 2008 and 2009</i> , November 2011, Alaska Judicial Council. Available at <a href="http://www.ajc.state.ak.us/reports/recid2011.pdf">http://www.ajc.state.ak.us/reports/recid2011.pdf</a> .
138	February 2, 2012	<i>Drug Courts' Effects on Criminal Offending for Juveniles and Adults.</i> Ojmarrh Mitchell, David B. Wilson, Amy Eggers, Doris L. MacKenzie. The Campbell Collaboration. February 2, 2012.	The objective of this review is to systematically review quasi-experimental and experimental (RCT) evaluations of the effectiveness of drug courts in reducing recidivism, including drug courts for juvenile and DWI offenders. This systematic review critically assesses drug courts' effects on recidivism in the short- and long-term, the methodological soundness of the existing evidence, and the relationship between drug court features and effectiveness.	One hundred fifty-four independent evaluations of drug courts met eligibility criteria; 92 of these assessed adult drug courts, 34 examined juvenile drug courts, and 28 investigated DWI drug courts.	N/A
139	June 2012	<i>Minnesota Statewide Adult Drug Court Evaluation.</i> State Court Administrator's Office, Minnesota Judicial Branch. June 2012.	All drug courts in Minnesota operational during the evaluation period are included in the evaluation. The evaluation measures drug court processes, compliance with the standards, outcomes for incarceration time served by	535 participants from 16 different courts. Half (51%) of participants enter drug courts in metro counties (7-county metro) and half (49%) enroll in non-metro counties - 40% of Cohort from Hennepin County.	The contemporaneous Comparison Group was selected from a random sample of felony cases disposed in 2007 and 2008 in all counties across Minnesota. With the assistance of probation agencies across

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Adult Drug Court Programs Published: 2000 – Present**

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	Focus of Study	Population Studied	Comparison Group
			participants, and recidivism rates of new charges and convictions. The comparison group includes court participants meeting drug court eligibility criteria (e.g. chemically dependent) and matching similar characteristics of the selected drug court participants (e.g. offenses, criminal history, and demographics).		Minnesota, data were collected to determine if participants were chemically dependent, thus eligible for inclusion in the Comparison Group. Once these participants were identified, a statistical technique of propensity score matching was applied to select a final comparison group. Key criteria used in the propensity scores included criminal history, originating offenses, and personal demographics.
140	October 18, 2012	<i>Virginia Adult Drug Treatment Court Evaluation.</i> Fred L. Cheesman, Tara Kunkel. Statewide Advisory Board. October 18, 2012.	To complete a two-phased cost-benefit analysis of Virginia’s felony adult drug treatment courts. Phase 1: Establish that Virginia’s Adult Drug Treatment Courts are demonstrating an impact on recidivism and achieving other program goals. Phase 2: Complete a cost-benefit analysis comparing the costs and benefits for participants in drug court versus defendants who are incarcerated or sentenced to probation.	748 drug court participants that had exited the program by September 2010.	807 defendants who were matched with drug court participants on prior criminal history, instant offense, gender, age, and race.
141	January 2013	<i>Montana Drug Courts: An Updated Snapshot of Success and Hope.</i> Produced by Montana Supreme Court, Office of Court Administrator. January 2013.	This report analyzes drug court data collected by the Office of Court Administrator from May 2008 through September 2012, a 53-month period.	1304 total admissions to the Montana drug courts during the 53-month period (350 were still active and 954 were discharged – graduated (442), terminated (366), or considered neutrals (146)).	N/A
142	September 2012	<i>Evaluation of Cumberland County [TN] DUI and Drug Court.</i> Samuel A. MacMaster, Rodney A. Ellis. September 2012.	This report summarizes analyses of all available data for the Cumberland County Adult Drug Court Program. Analyses are based on data drawn from information collected for clinical and reporting purposes from July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2012.	The sample consisted of all program participants (n=55) who entered the program between July 2009 and June 2012. In order to qualify for the program the individual had to be identified as an adult (over 18 years of age), a non-violent offender, and engaged in the appropriate judicial system.	N/A
143	July 2013	<i>Drug Court Outcomes: Outcomes of Adult Defendants Admitted to Drug Courts Funded by the Washington State Criminal Justice treatment Account.</i> Callie Black, MPH, Sharon Estee, PhD, Barbara E.M. Felver, MES, MPA, Jim Mayfield, MA. July	The Department of Social and Health Services’ Research and Data Analysis Division is conducting a series of analyses for the Division of Behavioral Health and Recovery (DBHR) examining the experiences of recipients of treatment funded by the Criminal Justice Treatment	The describes chemical dependency treatment participation and crime outcomes of 1,671 adults charged with felonies who were admitted to formally established drug courts in Washington State from July 2007 through June 2009.	Three-year outcomes are compared to a statistically matched comparison group of 1,671 adults charged with similar felonies in the same jurisdictions and two-year time period (July 2007 through June 2009), but who were not admitted to

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Adult  
Drug Court Programs Published: 2000 – Present**

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	Focus of Study	Population Studied	Comparison Group
		2013.	Account (CITA).		a drug court.
144	September 2012	<i>Colorado Statewide Process Assessment and Outcome Evaluation: Final Report.</i> Shannon M. Carey, Ph.D; Anna M. Malsch, Ph.D; Mary Beth Sanders, B.S. NPC Research. Portland, OR. September 2012.	This portion of the evaluation examined the characteristics of the population of individuals who participated in Colorado’s drug courts, graduation rates and program length of stay, what participant characteristics predicted whether or not they successfully complete the program, and whether drug court participants were re-arrested less often after their participation in drug court.	NPC selected the total number of participants (3,389) entered into the ICON/Eclipse data for Colorado’s ADC and DUI courts between July 2008 and October 2011. In addition, a subsample was selected for a time interval that allowed at least 24 months of follow up for every participant post drug court start. For this time period, there were 1,207 ADC participants and 100 DUI court participants who began the program. This was an intent-to-treat model. That is, all individuals who entered the program were included in the analysis, regardless of whether they graduated of how long they remained in the program.	N/A
145	June 2013	<i>A Statewide Evaluation of New York’s Adult Drug Courts: Identifying Which Policies Work Best.</i> Amanda B. Cissner, Michael Rempel, and Allyson Walker Franklin, Center for Court Innovation; John K. Rodman and Samuel Bieler, The Urban Institute; Robyn Cohen and Carolyn R. Cadoret, New York State Unified Court System. June 2013.	With funding from the Bureau of Justice Assistance, this study evaluated 86 adult drug courts in New York, the most sites ever included in a single drug court evaluation. The goal of the study was not primarily to examine whether these drug courts are successful on average, but to pinpoint why some drug courts are more successful than others.	The court sample includes 86 adult drug courts that were in operation as of 2006. Ten of those courts are located in New York City, 6 in the suburbs and 70 in upstate New York. Potential cases were identified using New York’s statewide drug court management information system, the Universal Treatment Application (UTA). Drug court participants who enrolled in one of the 86 drug courts in 2005 or 2006 were eligible. A total of 8,773 cases were eligible of which 86% (7,535) had sufficient identifying information to be merged with criminal history and recidivism data obtained from the NY Division of Criminal Justice Service (DCJS)	To be eligible for the comparison group, cases were required to meet the following criteria: felony or misdemeanor arrest in one of the same 86 city or county jurisdictions; Case was not a violent felony, an A level felony or sex offense case; Defendant was not screened for drug court in 2005 or 2006; and Case ended in a conviction.
146	December 10, 2012	Patricia M. Herman, ND, PhD, Beth L. Poindexter, ND, MPH. <i>Cost-Benefit Analysis of Pima County’s [AZ] Drug Treatment Alternative to Prison (DTAP) Program Final Report.</i> December 10, 2012.	This report covers the results of a cost-benefit analysis of the DTAP program based upon what is known to date about its first-year participants. The main CBA was conducted from the perspective of the State. This means that only costs and benefits to the State are included in this analysis-e.g., no costs paid by Pima County are included. We	The 20 first-year DTAP participants included in this CBA entered the program between 1/1/11 and 11/30/11.	...we identified a group of drug offenders in Pima County who were arrested in the period just before DTAP became available, and who were judged to have been eligible had DTAP existed at the time. We identified this control group by searching Pima County court case records starting from the date just

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Adult  
Drug Court Programs Published: 2000 – Present**

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	Focus of Study	Population Studied	Comparison Group
			also calculated the costs and benefits to the criminal justice system (CJS) as a whole; these results include County costs. It should be noted that the State perspective calculated in this report does not include all possible benefits to the State.		prior to the start of the DTA program (12/31/10) and working backward in time until we had 50 control cases.
147	September, 4, 2013	<i>Cumulative Second Year Cost-Benefit Analysis of Pima County's [AZ] Drug Treatment Alternative to Prison Program Report.</i> Maimon Research, LLC. September, 4, 2013.	The purpose of this study is to assess the costs and benefits or direct cost savings to the justice system of the Pima County DTAP program in the period, 1/1/11 to 6/30/13.	The assessment is based on the outcomes for the 52 entrants to DTAP who were enrolled in the period 1/1/11 to 12/31/12. By 6/30/13, 9 entrants had graduated from the intensive part of the program, 16 entrants had failed and been sent to prison and 27 were still in the program	Costs incurred by the justice system if those same individuals had rejected the DTAP plea bargain.
148	September, 2013	<i>Bexar County [TX] Felony Drug Court: Process, Outcome, and Cost Evaluation: Final Report.</i> NPC Research, Portland, OR. September, 2013.	In this evaluation both short and long term outcomes were assessed. Outcome measures examined include graduation rates & what participant characteristics are associated with successful completion of the program, whether drug court participants reduced their drug use, & whether drug court participants were re-arrested less often than similar individuals who did not participate in drug court. Lastly, drug court participants entering the program before and after the SAMHSA Enhancement grant were assessed in order to determine whether the changes made to the program have affected the short and long term outcomes of participants	NPC Research identified a sample of participants who entered the Bexar County Felony Drug Court (BCFDC) between January 2009 and December 2011, after the enhancement grant was implemented.	A comparison group was identified from a list of arrests for individuals arrested on a drug court eligible charge who have appropriate criminal histories (as defined by the legal eligibility criteria of the program) as well as other factors that would have made them eligible for drug court. These individuals did not come to the attention of the drug court team for various reasons and therefore were never offered drug court.