

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

PART THREE

#- Part Three	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Other Findings
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	Drug court results in average savings of over \$ 4,000 per felony drug-related case compared with traditional adjudication and sentencing; savings mainly attributable to reduced jail confinement, prison incarceration costs, and county and district court processing costs (e.g., police overtime costs for court testimony);	
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	None noted	None noted
3	January 29, 2004	<i>Cost Analysis of Anne Arundel County, Maryland Drug Court.</i> Prepared by: NPC Research, Inc., Portland, Oregon	\$ 2,571,894 less in Drug Treatment Court criminal justice system costs than comparison group for all participants studied, or 32.4% return on investment; Average cost per participant was \$ 2,109; average savings resulting from criminal justice system savings, victimization costs and income tax payment experience of participants was \$ 3,651; savings represent a \$ 1.74 return for every dollar spent for the program.	
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	Average of \$ 3,393 (24.2%) per person less in criminal justice system costs per participant than comparison group (30.9% less costs for Circuit Court participants); projected for all 758 drug court participants during the study period resulted in a savings of \$ 2,721, 894 total costs for criminal justice system expenses over 3 year study period; \$ 9,817 average savings in victimization costs than for comparison group; projected for all 758 drug court participants results in \$ 7,442,044 savings in victimization costs for 3 year period; \$ 3,000 less per person in criminal justice system costs by end of first year than for comparison group; \$ 3,791 saved for each participant (\$ 14,271 cost for traditional process - \$ 10,480 cost for drug court),	

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

#- Part Three	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Other Findings
5	January 2004	<p><i>Kalamazoo County [MI] 9th Judicial Circuit Court Office of Drug Treatment Court Programs: Statistical Report: 2003. Prepared January 2004</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Part One: Female Drug Court</i> - <i>Part Two: Male Drug court</i> 	<p>or 136.2% “return’ on investment</p> <p>During CY 2003:</p> <p>FEMALES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - restitution paid to victims totaled \$ 7,215.25 - urine screen fees totaled \$ 8,m020 - drug treatment court fees totaled % 5,150 <p>MALES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - paid restitution to victims of \$ 4,891.15 - paid urine screen fees totaling \$ 10,080 - paid drug treatment court fees totaling \$ 13,410. 	<p><u>Women:</u></p> <p>187 of 543 women successfully completed program 24 women still active in Phase I; 23 completed Phase I and in Phases 2 and 3\ 12 women on bench warrants; 36 women opted out of program 261 terminated for failure to perform of the 1887 who completed program, all were employed or attending school full time upon completion</p> <p>16% (29) of 187 women who completed program were rearrested on new misdemeanor of felony charge within 3 years of program completion;; 84% (158) have had no subsequent convictions within 3 years of program completion</p> <p><u>Male:</u></p> <p>160 of 506 men have successfully completed program 48 active in Phase I; 42 active in Phases 2-3 8 men on bench warrant status 33 men opted out of program 215 men terminated for failure to perform</p> <p>15% (24) of 160 men graduates convicted of new misdemeanor or felony within 3 years of program completion; 85% (136) had no subsequent convictions within 3 years of program completion.</p>
6	January 2004	<p><i>Oklahoma Drug Courts: Fiscal Years 2002 and 200. Prepared by The Oklahoma Criminal Justice Resource Center.</i></p>	<p>(1) If all 1,666 drug court participants studied would have served prison sentence, overall 4-year cost savings vs drug court vs prison was: \$ 45,552,798; (2) if all 1,666 drug court participants would have served standard probation sentences, 4-year costs of drug court were \$ 4,334,599 more than costs for standard probation</p>	<p>For Graduates: (1) 75.1% decrease in unemployment (reduced from (1) 50.4% increase in monthly income (from \$ 949.14 to \$ 1,426.55) (2) 13.6% decrease in percent of graduates without high school diploma (from 30.8% to 26.6%) (3) 19.1% increase in no. of graduates who had children living with them (from 120 (41.4%) to 143 (49.3%) (4) improvement in each of 7 components of ASI: - Medical: 56.3% decrease - Employment/Support: 71.4% decrease - Alcohol: 65.5% decrease - Drug: 65.5% decrease - Legal: 73.2% decrease - Family/Social: 68.6% decrease - psychiatric; 85% decrease</p>

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

#- Part Three	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Other Findings
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.	-Graduates significantly more likely to be employed at time of program completion -graduates in 5 of 9 programs significantly more likely to be attending school at time of program completion -some graduates of each court regained custody or visitation rights with their children; -some graduates of each court were volunteering in community at time of graduation, although no court mandated	<u>General:</u> -Positive long-term impact persisted beyond period of active judicial supervision; -Drug court graduates were FAR less likely than comparison defendants to recidivate in all six courts; however drug court failures were as likely, if not more so, as comparison defendants to recidivate in four of the six courts; therefore, benefits of drug court participation largely accrue to those who successfully graduate; <u>Predictors of recidivism:</u> -those with prior misdemeanor convictions and of younger age generally more likely than others to recidivate; - graduation less likely if primary drug was heroin (2 of 3 courts studied); - participants with property charges somewhat more likely to recidivate than those with drug charges - immediate engagement in treatment strongly predicted graduation - drug court graduation is key predictor of success (rather than length of time in treatment, etc.) - retention rates exceed national standard of 60% for 8 of 11 drug courts more than half of participants in 8 of 11 NY courts retained for at least 2 years (e.g., still participating or graduated)
8	August 1, 2003	[OK] <i>Drug Court More Beneficial for Women</i> [author not provided]	N/A	Monthly income of female drug-court graduates increased 130%. Monthly income of male drug-court graduates increased 31% despite prior higher income and rate of employment. Oklahoma sends more women to prison than any other state in the nation.
9	July 2003	<i>16th Judicial District of Tennessee (Rutherford Co.) Drug Court Program 2003 Process Evaluation.</i> Dana K. Fuller, Ph.D. July 2003		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20% of participants who did not have GED obtained GED while in drug court • four babies born drug free • 8% of 36 graduates employed at graduation
10	June 1, 2003	<i>Recidivism Among [KY] Federal Probationers</i> Minor, Kevin; Wells, James; Sims, Crissy.	N/A	Individuals who were not ordered to community service or individuals who underwent mental health treatment were more likely to violate their sentences. Over 56% had 1 violation. Over 80% had no more than 2 violations.
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	Average DUI drug court participant costs county approximately \$ 534/mo; average cost for traditional cjs processing is \$ 758/mo. (difference in cost primarily due to increased likelihood of control group members spending time in jail (\$80/day) or prison (\$ 53/day); total program costs were \$ 6,408 for DUI drug court (completed in 12 months) vs. \$ 22,740 for traditional process(requiring 2-3 years)	DUI Drug court participants averaged 6.7 treatment days/mo (compared with 1.2 for control group); worked more hours (32.1 hrs vs 29.8 hrs)/mo; and attended school more frequently (1.3 hrs/week vs. 0 hrs. for control group); and paid more money to the court each month (\$ 28.86vs. 7.34)

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

#- Part Three	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Other Findings
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.	NA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - program completion is most consistent variable associated with post program recidivism; (both in terms of frequency of and time to rearrest); - other factors associated with post program recidivism included: treatment attendance (parties with low attendance at treatment had greater likelihood of being arrested); race/ethnicity, with race and ethnic minorities more likely than white non-Hispanics to be arrested; and age at first arrest (participants with prior arrests at younger ages more likely to be rearrested); gender (males more likely to be rearrested); [numerous other findings re non-recidivism issues]
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	Estimated cost savings from jail time saved, both pre and post entry; other savings for law enforcement and defense (see “Cost Savings Memo”).	Other information relating to employment, and other program impacts
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.	Program saved \$5,487,330 in avoided incarceration for 303 graduates. Program saved \$33,000,000 in the birth of 44 drug-free babies. Cost benefits of individual courts are shown.	Recidivism rates for the individual drug courts are shown. The specifics of the recidivism rates are also shown.
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	Drug courts are more expensive to operate than regular criminal courts (e.g., \$ 3,891 more per participant); overall, drug courts produce more benefits than costs:...”We found that the five adult drug courts generate \$ 1.74 in benefits for each dollar of costs.	Not studied
16	February 7, 2003	<i>Judicial Council of California. Administrative Office of the Courts. Report. Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee. Progress Report</i>	Avoided criminal justice costs averaged approximately \$ 200,000 annually per court for each 100 participants; with 90 adult drug courts operating statewide as of 2002, and drug court caseloads conservatively estimated at 100 participants per year, annual statewide cost savings for adult drug courts suggested by data to be \$ 18 million per year; cost offset and cost avoidance estimated at \$ 43	Social outcome data, compiled from 28 counties for 2,892 participants, indicated that 70% of participants were employed upon completion of drug court compared with 62% unemployed at entry; 96% of drug tests were negative; 96% of babies born to program participants (132 babies) were born drug free;

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

#- Part Three	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Other Findings
			million predominately due to avoided jail and prison costs; with \$ 1 million in cost offset due to collection of fees/fines.	
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 57th Idaho Legislature. Idaho Supreme Court</i>	N/A	86% of participants gained or maintained employment 23% of graduates returned to school for GED or college average hourly wage rate increase of graduates was: \$ 4.89 average annual wage increase for graduates was: \$ 10,748.84
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	NA	As of September 2001, 28% of Jackson Co participants and 49% of Escambia Co. participants entering drug court between October 1999 and October 2000 had successfully completed and graduated the drug court; participants required up to 22 months to complete program but median length of stay for graduates was 13 months (Jackson Co. (and 12 months (Escambia Co); median length of stay for terminations was 7.5 months (Jackson Co.) and 8 months (Escambia Co.); 17% of participants (Jackson Co.) and 11% (Escambia Co.) absconded; median length of stay for absconders was 6 months (Jackson Co.) and 4 months (Escambia Co.); <u>Predictors of program success:</u> Jackson Co.: Probability of program success increased with age, education and employment. Males, blacks and participants who owned or rented homes more likely to be unsuccessful. Participants who injected drugs was only AOD use variable correlated with unsuccessful program completion. Participants with emotional problems or prior treatment experience had higher probability of success; participants who scored low on problem recognition factor of treatment motivation had higher probability of success; Escambia Co.: similar findings except males and participants who owned or rented homes had higher probability of success; males nearly 3 x more likely to graduate or remain active than females; participants who had previously been in detox or rehab and participants with high levels of drug dependency more likely to be unsuccessful. Three of the four treatment motivation factors (problem recognition, treatment readiness, and external pressures) associated with higher probability of successful program participation.
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;	NA	Extensive discussion of various possible factors, both internal and external to the drug court program, that might impact recidivism rates.

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

#- Part Three	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Other Findings
20	March 2002	<p>Jennifer B. Robinson.</p> <p><i>Drug Court Partnership Act of 1998, Chapter 1007, [CA] Statutes of 1998. Final Report.</i></p> <p>Prepared by The California Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs and the Judicial Council of California, Administrative Office of the Courts.</p>	<p>Total of 425,014 jail days avoided with an averted cost of approximately \$ 26 million; total of 227,894 prison days avoided, with an averted cost of approximately \$ 16 million; participants who completed paid almost \$ 1 million in fees and fines imposed by the court</p> <p>Fourteen million dollars in DCP program funds, combined with other funds supporting the programs, allowed cost offset and avoidance of approximately \$ 43 million.</p>	<p>Participants had long histories of drug use and multiple incarceration as well as serious social difficulties including homelessness, unemployment and limited education; more than 70% used drugs for 5 or more years with more than 40% using drugs for more than 10 years prior to entering drug court; 52% had a high school diploma or its equivalent and 13% had any college education; 62% were unemployed; on average each participant had been arrested twice and had one incident of conviction and incarceration in the two years prior to entering drug court; 70% of graduates employed at graduation; 11% obtained GED/high school diploma; 8% obtained vocational certificate and 1% of graduates completed college</p> <p>12% of graduates transitioned from homelessness to housing</p> <p>20% of graduates obtained drivers licenses and car insurance; 28% of graduates retained/regained custody of their children; 7% gained child visitation rights and 8% became current in child support payments; 31% were reunited with families; 95% of all babies born while mothers participated in drug court were drug-free;</p> <p>Incarceration rates for participants who completed drug court is 83% less during two years after admission than incarceration rate of those entering program during two years prior to entry</p> <p>While in drug court, participants engaged in low levels of drug use as indicated by high rates of negative urinalysis in comparison to prior drug use histories;</p> <p>Participants who successfully completed program improved substantially in all areas, showed decreased drug use and rearrests as well as improvement in employment and education; other areas of social functioning also improved including acquisition of stable housing and increased family involvement;</p>
21	October 2001	<p><i>Kentucky Drug Court Outcome Evaluation: Behaviors, Costs, and Avoided Costs to Society.</i></p> <p>Prepared by TK Logan, William Hoyt and Carl Leukefeld. Center on Drug and Alcohol Research. University of Kentucky</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual cost of a drug court graduate (\$ 2,642 accounting cost and \$ 4,140 accounting and opportunity (e.g., judge, police, jail, etc.) costs is much less than the annual cost of housing an individual in jail (\$ 9,600) or prison (\$ 14,691) and not much higher than the annual cost of supervising an individual on probation (\$ 1,237) in Kentucky; total avoided costs of “benefits” for graduates is estimated to be \$ 4,364,114 when earnings are considered, and \$ 2,584,562 without the earnings for a one year period... • For every dollar spent on a drug court graduate, there was an avoided cost savings of \$ 3.30 to \$ 5.58 	<p>Results for terminators were less pronounced than for the graduates. However, for most outcome measures, there does seem to be a gain...reductions in undesirable behavior and increases in desirable behavior, except for time in prison and child support deficits.</p>

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

#- Part Three	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Other Findings
			<p>per graduate in a one yea period when only accounting costs were considered, and a cost savings of \$ 2.11 to \$ 3.546 per graduate in a one yea period when opportunity costs were included.;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When both graduates and terminators were included there is an estimated savings of \$ 6,199 per client when earnings were included, and a savings of \$3,059 in a one year period without the earnings per client using accounting costs. When the opportunity costs for Drug Court program graduates and terminators combined were used, there was an estimated savings of \$ 4,826 per participant when earnings were included, and a savings of \$ 1,686 per participant without the earnings in a one year period. • For every dollar spent on a drug court participant (graduates and terminators) there was an avoided cost savings of \$ 2.26 to \$ 3.56 per participant in a one year period when only accounting costs were considered, and a cost savings of \$ 1.44 to \$ 2.27 per participant in a one yea period when opportunity costs were included. 	
22	October 2000	<i>Tulsa County [OK] Adult Drug Court: Phase II Analysis.</i> Wright, David. O’Connell, Paul. Clymer, Bob. Simpson, Debbie.	N/A	Re-arrest rates overestimate the actual level of criminality, while re-conviction rates underestimate the level of criminal activity.
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>	Drug court handled 31% of all felony cases filed in 1997 in Hennepin Co, with primarily one judicial officer and various clerical staff; previously, this workload had been spread across all judges of the Court; Given the increase in case processing speed achieved by the Drug court, the increase in judicial efficiency is readily apparent	Efficiencies in case processing achieved: average number of appearances was 3 (roughly half of the previous average); treatment completion rates were higher than other clients (54.5% vs. ;47.3%);as
24	October 2000	<i>North Carolina Drug Treatment Court Evaluation Final Report.</i> Craddock, Amy.	N/A	Most important predictor of recidivism is DTC graduation. Most common drug used is cocaine. 98.6% of participants are chemically dependent.

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

#- Part Three	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Other Findings
25	October 2000	<i>Evaluation of Oklahoma Drug Courts, 1997-2000.</i> O'Connell, Paul. Wright, David. Clymer, Bob.	NA	Drug court participants are more likely to be successful if they are older, Caucasian, better educated, employed, and less criminally active. Drug court participants are less likely to be successful if they are relatively young, African American, less educated, unemployed, and more criminally active.
26	October 2000	<i>1998 [FL] Drug Court Recidivism Report Update.</i> Administrative Office of the Courts, Dade County (Miami), Florida	NA	Other data that supports finding that drug court reduces recidivism
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.	Total correction system costs for drug court clients (\$26,021.59) was less than for comparison group(\$29,427.80) or referred group (\$ 39,776.75).; treatment costs were \$ 5,149 per client compared to \$ 3,949 for referred group;	Of the 134 drug court client sin the study, 44% graduated; graduation rate has risen during program's first 2 years to 50%; most of terminations due to noncompliance rather than new arrests; Graduation rates for white and nonwhite clients are disparate; nonwhite clients have achieved very low rates of completion of the drug court; graduation rate for methamphetamine addicts was markedly higher than for participants using marijuana or cocaine
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.	n/a	Graduates show systematic and substantial increases in income, with some tail-off in the third year; graduates were only group to show this improvement; rates for using vocation services b drug courts are very low (2% in King and Pierce Cos; 4% in Spokane Co.) Graduates had highest rate of use of Medicaid;
29	December 2004	<i>Evaluation of Virginia's Drug Treatment Court Programs.</i> Office of the Executive Secretary, Supreme Court of Virginia	n/a	Virginia adult drug courts have treatment retention rate (active participants plus graduates) of 62.25%; Virginia's adult drug court participants are chronic offenders prior to drug court entry; averaging 6.8 felony arrests and 5.6 misdemeanor arrests.
30	October 2003	<i>South Central Judicial District Adult Drug Court Program (Bismarck, N.D). Process Evaluation – Final Report. October 2003.</i> Jeffrey A. Bouffard.	❖ Program decreased incarceration time for nonviolent offenders by at least 75% and may be up to 88%	❖ No difference in program completion rates for: - men vs. women - felony vs. misdemeanor participants - DUI vs. drug-related offenders - participants of different racial/ethnic groups - those who received jail as a sanction and those who did not receive any jail time

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

#- Part Three	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Other Findings
		North Dakota State University. Department of Criminal Justice and Political Science.		as a program sanction ❖ There was no difference in rearrest rates for participants with different primary drugs of choice ❖ The program did not lower LSI (Level of Supervision Inventory risk scores of participants by 40% between time of program entry and program completion but did result in 32% declines in LSI scores for 14 program graduates by time of graduation ❖ The program maintained offenders in treatment and other maintenance programs for at least 12 months ❖ There was a large difference between average time to sentence for drug court participants (60.9 days average) vs. nonparticipants (168.8 days) ❖ Average time from arrest to program entry was not less than 42 days rather than 30 days as planned ❖ Program decreased incarceration time for nonviolent offenders by at least 75% and may be up to 88% ❖ Revocation of time for 8 terminated participants is 17% lower for drug court participants vs. average revocation rate of 32% for nondrug court participants in ND
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.	n/a	➤ Graduation: - Common Pleas graduated 31% of participants - Municipal drug courts graduated 44% of participants overall, 40% of participants graduated
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>	Total Cost Savings: <u>Jail Days:</u> Graduates: Jail days 914 days vs. 3,366 days = 2,451 days saved for 2,757 days saved (\$ 184,719) CCP days: 1,483 days vs. 3,103 days – 1,902 days saved (\$ 62,291; total cost savings - \$ 247,010 over 4 year period. Graduates spent 915 days in jail, costing \$ 61,305 in jail time (\$ 67/day); average is 5.45 days per graduate (\$ 365.15 per participant); graduates spent 1,483 days in Community Custody (\$ 32.75 per day) cost \$ 48,568 or 8.83 days average per participant or \$ 289.18 per participant.	➤ <u>Demographic characteristics:</u> - mean age at intake: 36.5 yrs - Ethnicity: 58.4% Hispanic; 22.7% White non-Hispanic; 16.9% Native American (Native Americans and Hispanics overrepresented in Drug Court compared with population for Bernalillo Co.) - gender: 84% males 16% females - education: 12 yrs for all clients (women have slightly less educ than men) - dependents: ½ have children - marital status: less than ¼ married at time of intake - employment status: 74.2% employed full time or part time - Primary drug: alcohol (93.8%) - prior misd convictions: 4.7 average for 304 participants; - prior DWI convictions: 2.7 mean (3.7% had no prior DWI convictions) - age at first use: 17.2 years

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

#- Part Three	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Other Findings
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - years of substance use: 12.7 yrs average (30% using over 15 years) - average stay: 282 days - reason for discharge: graduated: 56%; absconded: 17%; terminated: 17%; voluntarily terminated: 3.6% Other:6% - treatment and related services: graduates had average of 58.7% group sessions per client; 38 nongraduates attended an average of 33 group sessions per client; ½ graduates participated in indiv counseling (3.7 sessions each); 91.4% of clients had at least one acupuncture treatment; 63.7 urine screens average per client - sanctions: 1/3 of graduates spent time in jail during program (average 1.7 times; 1/3 of nongrads jailed average of 2.1 times
33	February 2005	<i>Adult Drug Courts: Evidence Indicates Recidivism Reductions and Mixed Results for Other Outcomes.</i> U.S Government Accountability Office	Four of seven adult drug court program evaluations provided sufficient cost and benefit data to estimate net benefits. Although cost of six of the programs was greater than costs to provide criminal justice services to comparison group., all seven programs yielded positive net benefits, primarily from reductions in recidivism affecting judicial system costs and avoided costs to potential victims. Financial cost savings for the criminal justice system (taking into account recidivism reductions) were found in two of the seven programs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ evidence about the effectiveness of adult drug courts in reducing participants' Substance use relapse limited to data from 8 drug courts: evaluations of these 8 drug courts reported mixed results on substance use relapse; drug test results generally showed significant reductions in use during participation in the program while self reported results generally showed no significant reductions in use. ➤ Completion rates ranged from 27 – 66%. Other than compliance with drug \ court program procedures, no other program factor consistently predicted participants' completion
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.	Overall: significant cost benefits including reductions in days of incarceration to graduates compared with comparison groups; also greater family stability, better education and employment; Specific impact(s) reported:-16% of graduates and 6% of active participants appeared to have improved child support situations – either able to pay more support to their children or were receiving more child support; -one graduate and one active participant reported birth of drug/alcohol-free babies -6% of graduates and 3% of active participants regained custody of their children -81% of graduates and 32% of active in the program had more stable family situations during or after program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Overall, defendants who graduates from program and who were active had fewer days of incarceration, fewer remands to custody and fewer convictions after beginning program than in 2 years preceding ➤ Defendants in comparison groups had significantly more mean days of incarceration after convictions for the evaluated offense than they did in the two years before ➤ Graduates from each of the courts spent an average of 452 days (15 months) in court before graduating (43 hearings for graduates; and average of 29 hearings for defendants who opted out)

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

#- Part Three	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Other Findings
			<p>-9% of graduates and 13% of active participants reported reduced domestic violence after program participation -63% of graduates and 46% of active participants holding steady job after program participation -41% of graduates and 21% of active participants had improved educational status after program participation -41% of graduates and 15% of active participants reported less debt after program participation</p>	
35	April 2003	<i>The Kootenai and Ada County [Idaho] Drug Courts: Outcome Evaluation Findings. Final Report</i>	NA	Factors associated with recidivism: <u>Kootenai County</u> : gender ,prior record and time at risk (males with prior record and at risk longer more likely to be rearrested; graduates less likely to be arrested for felony charge; none of graduates arrested more than once during follow up period vs. 30% of nongraduates and 24% of comparison group was; <u>Ada Co</u> : gender; employment and time
36	July 2000	<i>The Hamilton County [Ohio] Drug Court: Outcome Evaluation Findings.</i> Shelley Johnson and Edward Latessa. University of Cincinnati.	NA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Majority of drug court participants began treatment in the residential phase of the program and progressed to the outpatient phase ➤ 75% of participants completed the first phase and 84% [sic] completed the second phase ➤ typical offender had 3 status review hearings while in program but 30% had more than 5 ➤ factors associated with recidivism were race (African Americans) prior record, age (younger) and time at risk
37	March 2005	<i>Analysis of Oklahoma Drug Courts: Fiscal Years 2002-2004.</i> Oklahoma Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services	If all 2,307 offenders would have serviced their sentence in prison, overall 4-year cost savings of drug court vs. prison is \$ 64,805,293; ODMHSAS requested funding to increase drug court capacity in state from 1,575 by 3,229 to total 4,804 drug court slots and projects cumulative cost savings of \$ 314,250,347 over 4 years; [annual cost per drug court participant = \$ 2,325; annual cost for prison = \$ 16,842;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ retention rate for period was 83.1% for graduates, ➤ reduction in unemployment of 82.4%; ➤ 53.3% increase in income; ➤ 23.9% decrease in number without high school diploma; ➤ 20.8% increase in number of participants who had children living with them
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	n/a	<p><u>Completion Status:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ graduated: 129 (42.7%) ➤ terminated: 100 (33.1%) ➤ absconded: 62 (20.5%) ➤ other: 10 (3.3%) ➤ “expiration of term”: 1 (.3%)
39	May 2003	<i>Coconino County [AZ] DUI/Drug Court Evaluation.</i> Frederic I.	Average DUI drug court participant costs Coconino Co \$ 6,408 vs. \$ 22,740 for traditional cjs processing; DUI participant paid average of \$ 28.86 monthly to court vs. \$	DUI drug court participants make more positive contributions to society during an average month, working more hours each week (32.1 vs. 29.8) and spending more time in school (1.3 vs. 0) than offenders processed through the traditional process

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

#- Part Three	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Other Findings
		Solop, Nancy A. Wonders, K.K. Hagen, K McCarrier. Social Research Laboratory, Northern Arizona University.	7.34 by control group; therefore traditional cjs process is 3.5 times more costly than Co. Dui Drug Court.	
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.	n/a	n/a
41	2004	<i>Kalamazoo County [MI] 9th Judicial Circuit Court: Drug Treatment Court Programs. Statistical Report.</i> 2004	<p>Females: restitution paid to victims totaled \$ 9,023.72; urine screen fees paid totaled \$ 10,935.50; drug treatment court fees paid totaled: \$ 7,620</p> <p><u>Males:</u> restitution paid totaled \$ 10,254.15 Urine screen fees totaled \$ 24,005.75 Drug treatment court fees totaled \$ 13,74.800</p>	<p><u>Females:</u> 202 (36%) of female enrollees successfully completed the program; 38 opted out of the program; 276 (49%) were discharged due to repeated noncompliance; 47 (17%) were discharged due to new charges; average length of drug use was 10.5 years; youngest initial drug use was 7 yrs; oldest initial use was 46 years; 100% of women who completed the program and physically able were employed or attending school full time at time of program completion; 52.7% (298) had never received formal treatment services prior to enrolling in the drug court</p> <p><u>Males:</u> 183 (31%) successfully completed the program; 34 men opted out of the program; 259 (45%) were discharged due to repeated non-compliance with program rules; 35 (13.5%) were discharged due to new charges; 100% of men who were physically able were employed or attending school full time upon program completion; 55% (325) had never received formal substance abuse treatment prior to engaging in the drug court</p>
42	April 2005	<i>Puerto Rico Drug Court Program: Outcome</i> Evaluation Center for Addiction Studies, School of Medicine, Universidad Central del Caribe	n/a	<p>(1) drug court participants showed marked and statistically significant improvements found in reduction in drug use (from 86.5% to 33.5%) and participation in treatment (97.5% received treatment) and in reduction of antisocial and illegal behaviors among drug court participants; (2) percent of drug court participants considered <i>drug dependent</i> decreased from 41.4% prior to admission to 8% 12 months after admission, and, for alcohol dependence, from 9.5% to 2.5% (3) no statistically significant improvements found in other domains (employment and education, residential stability and family roles; physical and mental health</p> <p><u>Recommendations:</u> (1) only 40% of drug court participants studied appeared to be <u>drug dependent</u> at time of program entry –therefore need to review eligibility criteria and recruitment strategies to focus on those who are <u>drug dependent</u> (not simply drug using); (2) need to intensify efforts to assist participant in improving other domains, particularly: education; employment; familial roles; and mental health problems; 3) Need to register participants in drug court (and other diversion programs) in Department of Justice’s management information system to permit tracking of recidivism.</p>

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

#- Part Three	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Other Findings																																																																																																									
43	September 2005 (interim)	<p><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)</p>	<p>(1) Investment costs per participant not always much more than traditional court processing</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>CJ</th> <th>Invstmt/DC partic</th> <th>Invstmnt/nonDC</th> <th>Cost Ben</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Arrest</td> <td>192.91</td> <td>192.91</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Booking</td> <td>284.34</td> <td>284.34</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Court</td> <td>681.54</td> <td>678.50</td> <td>+ \$3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Treatment</td> <td>2,713.32</td> <td>2,009.18</td> <td>+704</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Jail</td> <td>1,610.89</td> <td>2,782.55</td> <td>-1,171</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Probation:</td> <td>513.64</td> <td>1,421.84</td> <td>- 908</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total cost</td> <td>5,927.80</td> <td>7,369.32</td> <td>-1,442</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>(2) average net investment cost per participant: \$ 1392</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>agency</th> <th>invst/per partic</th> <th>range</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>sup ct</td> <td>464</td> <td>(79) –(898)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>DA</td> <td>235</td> <td>103-(523)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pub D</td> <td>279</td> <td>(76) –(448)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Prob</td> <td>697</td> <td>2,143-(632)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Treat</td> <td>1918</td> <td>706-3808</td> </tr> <tr> <td>La Enf</td> <td>44</td> <td>1060-(1033)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Corrs.</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>(2) Net outcome benefits: \$ 11,000 per participant (\$ 3200 – 15,200 range)</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>agency</th> <th>avg net outc benef/partic</th> <th>range</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Sup. Ct</td> <td>(46)</td> <td>342-(277)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>DA</td> <td>(12)</td> <td>148-(106)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pub Def</td> <td>(19)</td> <td>171 – (103)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Prob</td> <td>(53)</td> <td>474 – (650)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Trmt</td> <td>637</td> <td>336- (59)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Law Enf</td> <td>(1,525)</td> <td>620 – (3,619)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Corrects</td> <td>(3,292)</td> <td>(541) – (5377)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	CJ	Invstmt/DC partic	Invstmnt/nonDC	Cost Ben	Arrest	192.91	192.91	0	Booking	284.34	284.34	0	Court	681.54	678.50	+ \$3	Treatment	2,713.32	2,009.18	+704	Jail	1,610.89	2,782.55	-1,171	Probation:	513.64	1,421.84	- 908	Total cost	5,927.80	7,369.32	-1,442	agency	invst/per partic	range	sup ct	464	(79) –(898)	DA	235	103-(523)	Pub D	279	(76) –(448)	Prob	697	2,143-(632)	Treat	1918	706-3808	La Enf	44	1060-(1033)	Corrs.	0	0	agency	avg net outc benef/partic	range	Sup. Ct	(46)	342-(277)	DA	(12)	148-(106)	Pub Def	(19)	171 – (103)	Prob	(53)	474 – (650)	Trmt	637	336- (59)	Law Enf	(1,525)	620 – (3,619)	Corrects	(3,292)	(541) – (5377)	<p><u>Promising Practices:</u> O single or overseeing treatment provider High drug court team attendance at staffing Court sessions start 1 every 2-3 weeks Treatment 2-3 times per eek (start) Drug tests 3 times per week (start) Judges voluntary with no fixed term (or at least 2 years) Minimum 6 months clean before graduation</p> <p><u>FTE's</u></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Monterey</th> <th>Or Co./Laguna Nig</th> <th>Or Co/Santa Ana</th> <th>Stanisl. Co.</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>DA; .</td> <td>28</td> <td>0</td> <td>1.00</td> <td>.20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pub Def</td> <td>.08</td> <td>.4</td> <td>1.00</td> <td>.25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Law Enf.:</td> <td>.00</td> <td>.50</td> <td>.00</td> <td>.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Prob.:</td> <td>1.00</td> <td>1.5</td> <td>4.00</td> <td>3.00</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Monterey	Or Co./Laguna Nig	Or Co/Santa Ana	Stanisl. Co.	DA; .	28	0	1.00	.20	Pub Def	.08	.4	1.00	.25	Law Enf.:	.00	.50	.00	.00	Prob.:	1.00	1.5	4.00	3.00
CJ	Invstmt/DC partic	Invstmnt/nonDC	Cost Ben																																																																																																										
Arrest	192.91	192.91	0																																																																																																										
Booking	284.34	284.34	0																																																																																																										
Court	681.54	678.50	+ \$3																																																																																																										
Treatment	2,713.32	2,009.18	+704																																																																																																										
Jail	1,610.89	2,782.55	-1,171																																																																																																										
Probation:	513.64	1,421.84	- 908																																																																																																										
Total cost	5,927.80	7,369.32	-1,442																																																																																																										
agency	invst/per partic	range																																																																																																											
sup ct	464	(79) –(898)																																																																																																											
DA	235	103-(523)																																																																																																											
Pub D	279	(76) –(448)																																																																																																											
Prob	697	2,143-(632)																																																																																																											
Treat	1918	706-3808																																																																																																											
La Enf	44	1060-(1033)																																																																																																											
Corrs.	0	0																																																																																																											
agency	avg net outc benef/partic	range																																																																																																											
Sup. Ct	(46)	342-(277)																																																																																																											
DA	(12)	148-(106)																																																																																																											
Pub Def	(19)	171 – (103)																																																																																																											
Prob	(53)	474 – (650)																																																																																																											
Trmt	637	336- (59)																																																																																																											
Law Enf	(1,525)	620 – (3,619)																																																																																																											
Corrects	(3,292)	(541) – (5377)																																																																																																											
	Monterey	Or Co./Laguna Nig	Or Co/Santa Ana	Stanisl. Co.																																																																																																									
DA; .	28	0	1.00	.20																																																																																																									
Pub Def	.08	.4	1.00	.25																																																																																																									
Law Enf.:	.00	.50	.00	.00																																																																																																									
Prob.:	1.00	1.5	4.00	3.00																																																																																																									

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

#- Part Three	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Other Findings
			- overall benefits combined for all 9 sites: 9,032,626	
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.	n/a	Factors associated with success: no correlation between success and age, marital status, race or years of education; small correlation between sex and success (females slightly more likely than males to be terminated); graduates more likely to report alcohol as primary drug of choice than other drug; over 60% of terminated participants were meth users vs. 41% of graduates; higher number of drug treatment (group and individual) sessions associated with lower number of re-arrests; lower rearrest rates for males associated with treatment readiness; females rarely rearrested regardless of whether they graduated or were terminated
45	January 2005	<i>Marion County [OR] Adult Drug Court Outcome Evaluation Final Report.</i> NPC Research. Shannon Carey, Gwen Marchand.	NA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Program retention rate is 71% (44 graduated or currently participating vs. 18 terminated or withdrew -Predictors of Success: Factors with no correlation: age, marital status, race, insurance source, employment status, number of arrests prior to entry; years of education; significant correlation between gender and success : females much less likely to graduate than males - nearly 78% of terminated clients were meth users vs 47% of graduates - terminated clients more likely to have at least one dependent child - readiness for treatment correlated with greater likelihood of graduating and less likelihood to recidivate - small negative correlation between days spent in aftercare and rearrests, particularly drug related rearrests – longer time spent in aftercare, reduced likelihood of being rearrested
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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Total investment cost per client in drug court was less (\$ 1,441.52) than investment cost per client in business as usual process. - money saved in outcome costs (\$ 2,328.89 per participant) although savings not spread equally among agencies; - total savings over 30 –month period, including victimization costs, averaged 4 4,788.88 per drug court participant 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) does it cost more for drug court than business as usual? No: total investment in drug court averaged \$ 5,927.80 per participant compared with 7,369.32 for business as usual. Business as usual offender cost \$ 1,441.52 more than drug court (2) do agencies save money upfront from drug court vs businesses usual/ Yes. Law enf /corrections and public defender receive immediate savings. All agencies saved money in outcomes. (3) Are there cost savings in outcomes due to drug court processing? Yes. When outcomes costs for drug court participants compared with outcome costs for business as usual offenders, drug court saved an average of \$ 2,328.89 per year per participant. With victimization costs added, average savings were \$ 3,596.92 per participant (4) What are total cost savings (investment and outcomes) attributed to drug court process? Combining outcome cost savings with investment savings over 30-month period, drug court saved average of 4 4,788.88 per participant including victimization costs. Multiplied by 300 participants who enter each year, this is \$ 1,434,000 in cost savings for local tax payers –which is the “bottom line” difference in cost to the system of drug court participants vs cost for nondrug court participants

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

#- Part Three	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Other Findings
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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 3,563 participants completed adult drug courts avoiding a total of 948,299 prison days, resulted in an averted cost of approximately \$ 34,233,593 to the state; - ratio of prison costs averted by participants to amount invested for the counties reporting was 1.53 to 1 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 618 adult criminals reported making child support payments regularly - 39% (7,790) of adult criminal participants obtained employment while in the program, thus contributing to California’s economy - 12% (966) new adult participants admitted to the program were homeless; 785 of them (81%) obtained housing during the study period - 990 adult criminal participants either enrolled or completed parenting classes - 1,358 adult criminal participants were reunified with family members - almost all participants (96%) had negative urinalysis while participating the program - adult and juvenile drug court participants completed 42, 788 hours of community service - 93% of females who gave birth during the period of program participation gave birth to drug free babies
48	June 14, 2006	<i>Suffolk Co. (MA) Drug Court Evaluation.</i> Abt Associates. Wm. Rhodes, Ryan Kling and M. Shiveley		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “the best evidence at our disposal indicates that the four drug courts in Suffolk Co. have increased the receipt of substance abuse treatment and reduced criminal recidivism for a population of otherwise recalcitrant, drug-involved offenders. ... Graduates of these drug courts are 33% less likely to be arrested than matched persons on traditional probation, have 47% fewer convictions, and are 70% less likely to be incarcerated.” - Drug court participants 24% less likely to be incarcerated; had 35% fewer incidents of incarceration; and 36% fewer suspensions and revocations - Drug court GRADUATES: were 70% less likely to be incarcerated; had 66% fewer incidents of incarceration and had 54% fewer suspensions and revocations <p>TREATMENT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - participants had 35% higher probability of receiving S.A. treatment - graduates were neither more or less likely to enter treatment than nondrug court probationers
49	May 20, 2006	<i>Outcome Evaluation of the Jackson County, Florida Drug Court.</i> Williams Consulting. Silver Spring, Md.	Program Costs: (1) treatment: \$ 28,200 for 12 graduates; urinalysis was \$ 16,200; total treatment costs were \$ 44,400 for 12 graduates; comparison group: cost of 18 months incarceration was \$ 38/day x 18 months = \$ 20,710 = 248,520 == Total cost savings if comparison group was enrolled in drug court would be \$ 204,120.00 (248,520-44,400) = 204,120.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Demographics of population studied: Gender: male: 73%; female: 37% Employed fulltime at entry: 38% Education: 45% HS Grads; 19% GED; 29% hs drop outs Prior treatment: 47% Children under 18: 62% (98 children of 51 parents Medical problems: 95% none; 15% had ADHD diabetes, depression, back and neck

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

#- Part Three	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Other Findings
				<p>pain, hepatitis, high blood pressure, migraines</p> <p>-GRADUATES: average age of 12 graduates studied was 33, all were male and employed; one was Afr. Am; the other 11 were white; 59% single; 25% divorced;; average prior arrests as 5</p> <p>- NON GRADS: (16): average age was 28; 57% male;38% employed; 53% unemployed;12% AM; 88% White;; most nongrads received sentences of 10-15 years</p>
50	Spring 2006	<p><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.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Quantity of drug treatment services received was related to lower recidivism rates - Treatment had sustained effect on recidivism reduction, even after serves were delivered - Recidivism lowest among participants who participate at higher levels of certified drug treatment, status hearings, and drug testing
51	April 2005	<p><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)</p>	<p>Eight of the nine sites show outcome cost benefits ranging from \$ 3,200 to over \$ 20,000 saved per participant; Monterey: showed no cost benefit over time; “actually loses money on drug court participants”. Stanislaus and El Monte produce very high returns on investment (1: 16 and 1:36) in part because of low investment costs. San Joaquin saves money immediately by having lower investment costs than standard court processing. Only Monterey has no positive return on investment because drug court did not produce positive outcome results, likely due to operational problems.</p> <p><u>Specific Findings:</u> Average cost per participant</p> <p><u>El Monte:</u> \$ 5,542.37 (\$ 2,275.50 for treatment, jail sanction next) vs \$ 5,283.51 traditional case process</p> <p><u>Monterey:</u> \$ 8,173.93 (largest cost is treatment, then jail day sanctions) vs. \$ 5,340.27</p> <p><u>Orange Co.-Laguna Niguel:</u> \$ 19,799.59 (jail days pre or post DC, then case management highest costs) vs. \$ 13,195.62- every dollar invested yields \$ 1.50 return</p> <p><u>Orange Co. – Santa Ana:</u> \$ 15,613.12 vs. 15,173.10; each \$ invested produced \$ 7.30 savings (in correctional costs)</p> <p><u>San Joaquin Co.:</u> \$ 12,214.76 vs. 12,701.34. (72% of cost is jail days)- drug court approach produces 25% reduction in standard case processing);\$4,801,427 saved each year at rate of 307 new participants annually)</p> <p>Stanislaus Co.: \$ 5,455.20 (treatment is largest cost) vs. \$</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No two drug courts function in the same manner; each operates in a different context, serves a different population and involves multiple agencies contributing varying levels of resources; each drug court has unique practices, policies and requirements. 2. Wide range in investment between jurisdictions and counties, and within counties, both in drug court process (\$ 5,000 – 19,000) per participant and traditional court process (just under \$ 5,000 to over \$ 15,000 per participant (differences largely attributable to jail costs) 3. Promising practices identified: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Those drug courts where more agency staff attended drug court meetings and court session tended to have more positive outcomes b. The courts that start participants at one court session every 2 or 3 weeks, 1 to 3 group treatment sessions per week and individual treatment sessions “as needed” appear to have the best outcomes c. Sites with either a single provider or with multiple referral options but a single overseeing provider had the most positive outcomes. d. Judges on voluntary assignment to drug court, with either no fixed term or a term of at least two years, help produce the most beneficial outcomes. e. The sites that required ap5rticipants to be “clean” for at least six months had lower costs and higher net benefits. f. Drug test frequency greater than 3 x per week didn’t appear to have added benefit; however lower frequencies were associated with less positive benefits. <p>Graduation Rates:</p> <p><u>Butte Co:</u> 68% (n=156)</p> <p><u>Los Angeles Co. – Central:</u> 36% (n=115)</p> <p><u>Los Angeles Co. El Monte:</u> 82% (n=127)- 60% overall (n=700)</p>

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

#- Part Three	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Other Findings
			4,518.24 (court costs and jail costs); greatest savings were in probation costs (-77%), victimization costs (-63%), bookings (-44%) and jail days (-42%); every \$ spent produced savings of \$ 16.00	<p><u>Monterey Co.:</u> 26% (n= 213) graduation rate (resulting from required \$ 14 fee for drug tests and many terminated for failure to test (39% overall – n=721)</p> <p><u>San Diego-East:</u> 65% (n=178)</p> <p><u>Orange Co.-Laguna Niguel:</u> 68% (n=124) (64% overall – n=343)</p> <p><u>Orange Co.-Santa Ana:</u> 45% (n=289) (overall 41% - n = 932)</p> <p><u>San Joaquin Co.:</u> 29% (n=202) (31% overall – n = 2,010)</p> <p><u>Stanislaus Co.:</u> 49% (n=399) (32% overall – n=1,320+)</p>
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		<p>40% of defendants referred for assessment were “no shows”; 47% found to be in need of treatment</p> <p>the 383 candidates actually entering Treatment Court represented 20% of the defendants referred ;</p> <p>Race/Ethnicity: 58% were Afr.Amer; 28% Hispanic and 13% while;</p> <p>Median age we 23</p> <p>83% male</p> <p>53% unemployed</p> <p>96% charged with drug felony</p> <p>46% had prior arrests; 16 had prior court convictions</p> <p>205 had at least one arrest as a juvenile</p> <p>42% didn’t complete Phase I of treatment</p> <p>9% of enrolled terminated for noncompliance</p> <p>participants averaged 9.28 days incarcerated</p>
53	July 2005	<i>Malheur County [OR] Adult Drug Court (S.A.F.E. Court) Cost Evaluation: Final Report.</i> NPC Research.	<p>Relatively low cost per participant compared with other programs (\$ 6,275) – 6,102 for males; 6,585 for females) compared with recidivism costs 9165.61-arrest; 10.00-booking; and 49.20-jail bed day.</p> <p>- females show decrease in costs after starting program while males (except for grads) show increase in costs due to more time spent in jail for new offenses</p> <p>-Average costs for females 2 years prior to drug court were \$ 2,312.34 compared with \$ 1,679.30 two years following drug court entry;</p> <p>-average costs for ALL male participants two years prior to entry were lower (1,205.36 vs 2,612.84) than following program entry but mainly due to terminated participants and jail costs entailed. Costs for male graduates were reduced from \$ 643.08 2 years prior to program entry to \$ 261.80 2 years following program entry.</p>	<p>-Level of substance abuse was reduced, based on both UR results and rearrests</p> <p>-Retention rate for both men and women is better than most standard (non-criminal justice related) treatment programs</p> <p>Factors associated with fewer rearrests were (1) greater number of treatment sessions;</p> <p>-graduates tended to have fewer arrest prior to program entry; were slightly more likely to be male, were less likely to use methamphetamine, were more likely to have had treatment prior to drug court, and more likely to score high on the “readiness-for-treatment scale”.</p> <p>-terminated participants were more likely to use methamphetamine, less likely to use alcohol or marijuana, attend fewer treatment sessions and scored lower on the readiness for treatment testing.</p>
54	September 2006	<i>Kalamazoo County [MI] Adult Drug Treatment Court Outcome and Cost Evaluation Final Report.</i>	<p>Substantial cost savings/avoided costs resulting from fewer re-arrests, less probation time and fewer new court cases.</p> <p>- combined programs saved total of \$ 593,154 over a two</p>	- drug use decreased over a 12 month period for both females and males

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

#- Part Three	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Other Findings
		NPC Research	year period for persons entering the program during two year study period (2002-3); savings can be anticipated to accrue over additional years.	
55	September 2006	<i>Barry County, Michigan Adult Drug Court. Outcome and Cost Evaluation. Final Report.</i> NPC Research	Cost savings for drug court participants of over \$ 3,000 per participant over 2 year period as a result of fewer re-arrests, less probation time and fewer new court cases. - multiplying cost savings by 108 participants since program implementation, total savings have been \$ 353,160. For foist two years sine program entry. - Can expect cost savings to continue following 2 year study period.	All participants (graduates and terminated) consistently showed less drug use than comparison group; for some time period, no positive drug tests for participants during same time period when positive drug tests for comparison group were might higher.
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		Males significant less likely than females to graduate; Drug court success also affected by age at which offender first used drug and by number of positive drug tests during first six months of prog4ram
57	November 2001	<i>Dallas County [TX] DIVERT Court Outcome Evaluation.</i> Monica Turley and Ashley Sibley.	--	Program retention predicted by age; average age of graduates was greater than dropouts; older participants (average of 35 years) more likely to successfully complete treatment than younger participants.
58	January 2003	<i>Initial Process and Outcome Evaluation of Drug Courts in Texas.</i> Criminal Justice Policy Council.	--	Drug court graduates had 3.4% incarceration rate 3 years following program entry vs. 21.4% for noncompleters and 26.6% for comparison group; incarceration rate for all drug court participants was 12%; Frequency of positive drug tests was 9% - 11% for drug court participants compared with 50% for ADAM tested offenders. The effectiveness of drug courts in reducing recidivism merits considering strategies to expand drug courts in Texas.
59	October 2003	<i>Douglas County (NE) Drug Court Targeted Capacity Expansion Grant. Year 1 Evaluation Report.</i> ISED Solutions.	--	Older participants experience lower rates of post-treatment drug use generally and fare better with respect to new arrests Participants with at least a high school education fare better than clients without in terms of being arrested after treatment Gender is not associated with differences in treatment outcomes Race/ethnicity is associated with few differences in outcomes and, where it does, differences exist for Hispanic clients who are more likely to have problems with FTA's and rearrests so may need additional services, particularly for those with limited language skills
60	December	<i>Douglas County (NE)</i>	-	Men and women have same treatment completion rate (60%)

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

#- Part Three	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Other Findings
	2004	<i>Drug Court Targeted Capacity Expansion Grant. Year 2 Evaluation Report.</i> ISED Solutions.		<p>Caucasians fare better in treatment than African Americans (75% vs. 53% retention)</p> <p>Completion of residential treatment associated with significant reductions in post-treatment drug use, general arrests and failure to appear</p> <p>Participants who successfully complete treatment more likely to graduate than those who don't (44% vs. 8%)</p> <p>Older participants and those with high school education have lower risk of failing to complete program</p>
61	March 31, 2004	<i>Cost/Benefit Analysis of the Douglas County, NE, Drug Court.</i> R.K. Piper and Cassia Spohn	<p>Average investment cost for drug court participants is \$ 4,803 vs \$ 9,224 for traditionally adjudicated offenders, resulting in cost benefit of \$ 4421 less for each drug court participants;</p> <p>Annual investment cost savings for drug court participants vs traditionally adjudicated offenders is \$ 1,326,414; greatest cost savings were for jail confinement \$ 622,098 and prison (\$1,125,642)</p> <p>Lesser 'up front' investment cost savings of \$ 125,703 for district Court and other agencies involved with prosecuting and processing drug offenders; additional savings of \$ 51,234 realized for County (Lower) courts and agencies at county court level;</p> <p>Reduced misdemeanor arrests resulted in outcome savings of \$ 346,129 and fewer felony arrests resulted in savings of \$ 533,468, with total annual outcome cost savings of \$ 899,597.</p> <p>Average annual outcome cost savings per drug court participant was \$ 2,999; total annual investment and outcome savings was \$ 2,226,011.</p> <p>Victimization costs (lost wages, medical and mental health care, etc.) savings resulting from reduced recidivism was \$ 1,120,886 for violent crimes reduction and \$ 64,823 for property crimes reduction, or total victimization cost savings of \$ 1,174,809</p>	
62	February 2007	<i>Recidivism in Alaska's Felony Therapeutic</i>		-The longer participants stayed in the program, the less likely they were to recidivate even if they did not graduate

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

#- Part Three	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Other Findings
		<i>Courts</i> . Alaska Judicial Council.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -54% of participants in the programs graduated - participants who were discharged or left voluntarily had same rate of recidivism as offenders charged with felonies in 1999 who didn't enter these programs - older participants less likely to be rearrested than younger participants (43% of graduates were 40+ ; 33% of terminated participants were 40+ - participants in Anchorage Felony DUI Court less likely to be rearrested than those in Anchorage Felony Drug Court and Bethel Therapeutic Court - native participants responded as well to therapeutic court programs as Caucasian participants; Blacks and other ethnicities did not do as well as Caucasian participants
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.	SITC successful in reducing the between arrest and initial plea date. (2,1 mos. Vs 4,2 av.; 1.5 med mos. Vs. 2.7 mos for comparison group).	Drug court failures significantly more likely to be sentenced to jail or prison than comparison group (96% vs. 27%) and averaged significantly more time sentenced to jail or prison (208 days vs. 39 days). "Therefore, there is some legal risk involved in entering the drug court." Graduating means the complete avoidance of a criminal record since cases are dismissed; but failing involves a longer average sentence than what would have, on average, been imposed had the case been processed using conventional methods.
64	2007	<i>2005/2006 Tennessee Drug Court Annual Report</i> . Office of Criminal Justice Programs. Dept. of Finance and Administration.	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Drug testing: 82,950 drug screens in FY 2006-2006; 2, 917 positive (3.5%) -overall retention rate of 56% for fiscal year (range between 31% and 82%) -1,713 graduates and 1, 289 participants terminated since inception of reporting programs; graduation rate is 57%.
65	2007	<i>Wyoming Drug Court Performance Measures Project</i> . National Center for State Courts.	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Drug Use Reported: Alcohol: (87.5%); marijuana (65.3%); meth (51.5%); cocaine (8.8%); hallucinogen (3.7%); prescript drug (2.7%); heroin (1%); crack (.3%) -Offenses: drug pos (43.4%); DUI (37%); prob rev (12.5%); property (9.1%); person (7.4%); drug sales (5.7%); Other (11%) -status of admissions: graduated: 48.1%; terminated 16.7%; active: 15.7%; absconded: 10.2%; withdrawn 9.3%) -retention rates: mean days in program: graduates : 402; terminated: 249 -sobriety: Percent positive drug test: 86 (2.1%) -gender: male76%; average age: 29 years at time of admission -average days in program: 439 Caucasian; 90%) GED/HS degree: 58% Employed: 65%; Single: 4% Prior record: no more than 2 prior arrests in past year: 63%
66	April 2007	<i>Multnomah County, Oregon: The Impact of a Mature Drug Court Over</i>	Investment costs in drug court were \$ 1,392 less than for 'business as usual' processing; savings due to reduced recidivism for drug court participants totaled more than \$	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -drug court judges who worked longer with the drug court had better participant outcomes - judges who rotated into drug court twice had better participant outcomes the

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

#- Part Three	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Other Findings
		<i>10 Years of Operation: Recidivism and Costs.</i> NPC Research	79 million over 10 year period; - investment cost per participant was \$ 5,16 vs. \$ 6,560 for nondrug court participant -greatest cost benefit due to less use of jail days.	second time - drug court was effective continuously except for two “rough periods” –(1) first 2 years of the program, during initial implementation period; and (2) in 1996 when drug court moved outside of the courthouse; -during “target Cities” period, comparison group (nondrug court participants)did better than in other periods -some judges showed greater reductions in recidivism than others (range was 4% to 42%) - no difference in recidivism when single court judge or multiple judges were presiding; - early drug court judges did not have as positive outcomes as judges who came later-perhaps attributed to formalization of procedures and training
67	April 2007	<i>Indiana Drug Courts: A Summary of Evaluation Findings in Five Adult Programs.</i> NPC Research	All 5 programs showed cost savings due to reduced recidivism; average cost savings for 2-year follow up period to local agencies and the state ranged between \$ 314 and \$ 7,040 per participant, based on fewer rearrests; fewer court cases; less probation time; less jail time and less prison time; doesn't count number of drug-free babies born; decrease in health care expenses and drug court participants' taxes resulting from employment. Overall: five courts resulted in savings of over \$ 7 million for the two years. Over time, return to tax payer for investment can be up to \$ 5.35 for every \$ 1.00 invested	-Program participant characteristics varied from program to program except for age (31-33 years) -Wide range of drugs used -similar graduation rates (50-56%) despite differences in populations
68	Fall 2005	<i>An Evaluation of Treatment in the Maine Adult Drug Courts.</i> Faye S. Taxman, April Pattavina and Jeffrey Bouffard.		58% of participants had some negative behavior resulting in a sanction; sanctions most frequently were incarceration, increased reporting or termination; few sanctions relied on treatment or intensification of treatment, written assignments, etc.; offenders given these sanctions more likely to be expelled than those who received treatment sanctions. Participants involved with DSAT program had reductions in depression, hostility and risk-taking behavior, could identify personal progress and had good relations with staff DSAT curriculum engages many of the participants and reflects a sound treatment approach Control sanctions (e.g. increased reporting, etc., can undermine the treatment program; treatment based sanctions may reinforce the drug court Judiciary should receive education in use of treatment based sanctions and value to the treatment court; Should also use different assessment tools to determine offenders that are less engaged in treatment and less committed to conformity.
69	Spring 2008	<i>Substance Use, Drug Treatment, and Crime: An Examination of Intra-Individual Variation in a</i>	NA	(1) persons who had any treatment last month had 11% probability of using alcohol this month compared with 17.3% for those who didn't receive treatment. (2) substance use is related to increased levels of crime but no correlation

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

#- Part Three	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Other Findings
		[Baltimore, MD] <i>Drug Court population</i> . Denise C. Gottfredson, Brook W. Kearley, Shawn D. Bushway.		between use of alcohol and whether subsequent crime was violent or income generating
70	January 2008	<i>Strafford County [NH] Drug Treatment Court: Performance Evaluation 2. New Hampshire Center for Public Policy Studies.</i>	Client load of 37 individuals costs \$ 43 per client per day for treatment, case management, court and administrative services: includes: \$ 15/day for case managers/coordinators; \$ 17/day for treatment and \$ 3/day for probation supervision; clients pay \$ 2 per day	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) median days for completion of LADC assessment decreased from 37 to 28 days [goal is 14 days]; overall time from referral to lea decreased from 57 to 53 days. So further work needed in this area (2) continued work to develop standards for termination to improve consistency and fairness (3) continued opportunity for female-only treatment groups now held on a weekly basis (4) other needed improvements now identified including: (a) clarifying procedures for clients who are not actively participating in group sessions, not fully prepared for treatment, or are under the influence of alcohol or drugs while in attendance; (b) enhanced use of Motivational Enhancement Therapy (5) 137 offenders referred to program of which 67 admitted; reasons for nonadmission most frequently were “can’t meet requirements or comply with rules (30%) or “pursing other program” (25%). (6) Program is 46% [sic female and 51% male; 16% had prior mental health diagnosis and treatment (7) 14 (21%) of all participants admitted have graduated; 13 have moved to final phase; 16 (24% have been terminated. (8) Now using database (enhancement of probation database) developed for program to monitor future operations; info entered by drug court coordinators and case managers and includes demographic data, treatment data and data on court proceedings
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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Adult drug court has generated net correctional savings of \$ 11,243,726 in cost savings based on incarceration costs that would have been incurred (for 169 participants) (2) For every dollar spent in drug court, overall net correctional savings of \$ 3.30 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) number of referrals and new admissions to the five adult drug court has declined by 27 % (referrals) and 24% (new admissions) (2) overall graduation rates are 60^ compared with national rate of 48% (3) average length of time from initial referral to admission is 85 days (same as previous year) (4) greater consistency in sanctioning of participants with similar infractions across sites using jail sanctions; 87% of sanctions for first positive test was 7 days or

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

#- Part Three	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Other Findings
		Southern Maine		<p>less</p> <p>(5) most drug court participants (57%) (able to access an array of ancillary services</p> <p>(6) observations indicated no consistency among the five drug courts in how they interact with participants in the courtroom</p> <p>(7) results of analysis on DSAT clinical pre/post treatment measures indicates many significant improvements in attitudes, coping behaviors and confidence in participants in ability to refrain from drug and alcohol use</p> <p>(8) Androscoggin Co.: older participants (over 27) three times ore likely to graduate than younger ones; first time offenders more likely to graduate and participants who receive “rewards” are nearly 10 times more likely to graduate</p> <p>(9) Penobscot Col: females with no high school education 10 times less likely to graduate</p>
72	August 2007	<i>Benefit-cost calculations for three adult drug courts in Minnesota.</i> August 2007. Paul A. Anton. Wilder Research	Estimate that the rug courts in Stearns, Dodge and St. Louis Counties generated \$ 5.08 of benefit for every dollar of cost.; total benefits were 4.8 million vs costs of 1.3 million for study period; savings based on costs of initial offense; cots of subsequent arrests; and costs of subsequent convictions (used \$ 1,522 cost per case produced by Washington State Institute of Public Policy in 2006; used \$85/day average for prison costs; incarceration costs saved for each program completer are over \$ 46,000; used Washington State Institute for Public Policy study figures of \$ 5,370 arrest costs for drug offenses and other nonviolent crimes and \$ 6,438 for violent crimes	n/a
73	September 2008	<i>California Drug Courts: Costs and Benefits: Superior Court of San Francisco County.</i> Shannon M. Carey et al. NPC Research	Average cost for drug court participant: \$ 9,757; average cost per Drug court graduate: \$ 18,295; vs average cost for traditional case process per person: \$ 16,378 (also provides breakdown in average costs per agency) and differential; net savings is \$ 6,622 per participant; also provides costs per person associated with recidivism, broken down by transaction:\$ 15,647 for graduates and 24,394 for participants vs 31,967 for comparison group; provides similar information broken down by agency	(1) average time in program was 7.2 months
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	N/A (but see Nos. 68 and 71 for follow up studies)	<p>1.Statewide graduation rate (50%)</p> <p>2. 20% increase in new admissions over past year</p> <p>3. participants who are tested more frequently more likely to graduate</p> <p>Participants who receive jail sanction 7 times LESS likely to graduate</p> <p>Length of time between referral and final admission increased form 71 days in 2002 to 78 days in 2003</p>
75	March 2009	<i>Strafford County (New Hampshire): Drug Treatment Court: Final</i>	N/A	<p>-32 (54%) of participants admitted in first two years graduated from the program;</p> <p>-27 (46%) of participants admitted in first two years terminated and sentenced</p>

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

#- Part Three	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Other Findings
		<i>Performance Evaluation.</i> New Hamp Center for Public Policy Studies		to incarceration (9 committed new offense while in program- shows most participants don't recidivate while in program -program enhancements of age-specific treatment groups; allowing clients tardy for treatment to participate, and access to transitional housing were important - continuing challenges: (1) length of time offenders wait to enter program (goal is 14 days for initial assessment: referral to plea is actually 2 months – further delays resulting from reduced availability of judge; (2) mental health needs of participants; data problems resulting from small number of participants; (3) smaller number of participants than planned (anticipated 60 clients; as of October 31, 2008 have 33 active participants plus 11 on second year of probation supervision; since January 2006: 221 offenders referred and 102 (46%) admitted. (34% for not being able to comply with rules or requirements)
76	January 2009	<i>Vermont Drug Courts: Rutland County Adult Drug Court Process, Outcome, and Cost Evaluation Final Report.</i> NPC Research.	Program investment cost was \$ 19,405 per drug court participant; cost due to recidivism (rearrests, new court cases, probation, incarceration and victimizations) over 3 years was \$ 48,277 per rug court participant vs. \$ 64,251 per comparison group member, with savings of \$ 15,977 per participant. Total criminal justice system cost per participant during the program is \$ 5,809 less than traditional court processing (\$ 9,749 if victimizations are included) If the program continues to enroll a cohort of 26 new participants annually, savings per participants over 3 years will be \$ 138,441 per cohort; after 5 years, the accumulated savings will be over \$ 2,000,000. Summary: \$ criminal justice system cost savings of \$ 15,977 Criminal justice system costs 59% less during program participation compared with costs for nondrug court participants Projected 150% return on investment after 5 years; Projected 300% return on investment after 10 years.	As of May 2008, 111 people entered program; 21-25 active participants at any one time; 32 graduated; 59 withdrew or were terminated, and 20 still active Average age of participants was 27 Years, 55% female 95% white; Most common drug of choice was heroin (50%), followed by prescription drugs (23%) which reportedly increased significantly in prior year, and cocaine (11%), as well as alcohol.
77	April 2008	<i>To Treat or Not to Treat: Evidence on the Prospects</i>	(1) Under current policy regime (which for the most part limits access to treatment for the population we ar5e	(1) for those at risk of drug dependence, longterm residential reduces recidivism by 34%, short term inpatient by 19%, outpatient methadone

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

#- Part Three	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Other Findings
		<p><i>of Expanding Treatment to Drug-Involved Offenders.</i> Urban Institute. [Avinash Singh Bhati, John K. Roman, Aaron Chalfin.] April 2008</p>	<p>studying to drug courts) there are about 55,000 individuals treated annually, about 32,000 are at risk of dependence, and 23,500 are at risk of drug abuse. (2) estimate that about \$ 515 million dollars is spent annually to treat those drug court clients and that this yields a reduction in offending which creates more than \$ 1 billion dollars in annual savings.</p> <p>(3) estimate that the current adult drug court treatment regime produces about \$ 2.21 in benefit for every \$ 1 in costs, for a net benefit to society of about \$ 624 million.</p> <p>(4) benefit-cost ratio is higher for those at risk of abuse (2.71) as compared to those at risk of dependence (1.84), even though the abuse group is less prevalent in the drug court population.</p> <p>(5) estimate that there are about twice as many arrestees eligible for drug court (109,922) than there are available drug court treatment slots (55,365). We simulate the effects of treating all of these currently eligible in the four treatment modalities studied by DATOS [Drug Abuse Treatment Outcome Study] and find that the costs of treating these additional clients about doubles, to slightly more than \$ 1 billion. We find that the expansion of drug treatment to this larger population remains cost-effective, although the benefit-cost ratio is fractionally reduced to 2.14 from 2.21. In total, this expansion of treatment yields a benefit to society of more than \$ 1.17 billion dollars....</p> <p>[Re potential value of expanding drug treatment courts]</p> <p>(5) estimate that expanding treatment access to those with a pending case is cost beneficial, with about \$ 1.65 billion in total benefits. In particular, allowing those with a pending case who are at risk of drug dependence is especially beneficial, with a benefit to cost ratio of 4.13:1.</p> <p>(6) allowing participants with past violence into court supervised treatment is as cost-beneficial as current practice, with a benefit to cost ratio of 2.15.</p> <p>(7) While the addition of those at risk of abuse with prior violence is cost beneficial (3.14:1), adding those at risk of drug dependence with prior violence is much less cost beneficial (1.38:1).</p> <p>(8) Expanding the program to include those with a history of failed treatment is also cost-beneficial</p>	<p>by 20%, and outpatient drug free by 30%.</p> <p>(2) For those at risk of drug abuse, recidivism reductions are large (27%); outpatient drug free is the most effective modality, reducing recidivism by 33%; long term inpatient reduces recidivism by 27%, short term inpatient by 20% and outpatient methadone by 16.%</p> <p>(3) Small or no reductions in crime observed for the most serious crimes. ,</p>

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

#- Part Three	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Other Findings
			<p>(2.09:1), especially for those at risk of drug abuse (2.29:1)</p> <p>(9) Allowing those with co-occurring alcohol problems into court supervised treatment is cost –beneficial for the entire group treated (1.783:1). For those at risk of dependence, the results are better, with the newly added group estimated to have a benefit to cost ratio of 1.43:1. However, adding those with co-occurring alcohol problems who are at risk of drug dependence is not cost-effective (.70:1).</p> <p>(10) Treating all at risk arrestees would cost more than \$ 13.7 billion and return benefits of about \$ 46 billion. We find that this approach would be cost-effective, with a benefit of \$ 3.36 for every dollar in cost.....”</p>	
78	March 2008	<p><i>Michigan DUI Courts Outcome Evaluation Final Report (Oct. 2007)</i> Carey, S. M., Fuller, B. E., & Kissick, K. NPC Research</p>	<p>Time enrolled in the program was higher for DUI court participants compared to time spent on probation in the comparison group also in two out of the three programs. Longer time spent in the program predicts success both in completing the program and in reducing recidivism. Overall, these results demonstrate that the DUI court is effective in reducing recidivism and reducing drug and alcohol use while using less criminal justice system resources to accomplish these goals.</p>	<p>DUI court participants were re-arrested significantly less often than comparison group offenders who were sentenced to traditional probation. In the example from one DUI court site shown in Figure A, the comparison offenders on traditional probation were re-arrested nearly six times more often in the first year after starting probation for the DUI charge than the DUI court</p> <p>participants and were re-arrested four times more often in the second year (2)</p> <p>Percent of positive drug tests were measured in three month intervals for DUI court participants. The example in Figure C shows that participants in the DUI Court significantly decreased the percent of positive drug tests over time (F = 5.340; p = .001). This provides support that the DUI Court was instrumental in reducing the amount of illegal drug use during the first year participants spend in the program</p> <p>In all three DUI courts showed that the rates for DUI court graduation and retention ranged from 54% to 84%. The program retention and completion rates are comparable or higher than the rates for programs following the drug court model in the nation. For example, a study of nine drug courts in California showed an average retention rate of 56% (Carey et al., 2005).1</p> <p>Data for all of the participants in the DUI Court program were examined to determine what characteristics predicted recidivism. Results showed that those with fewer dependents, lower numbers of previous misdemeanors and felonies, fewer days in treatment, higher number of jail days prior to program</p>

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

#- Part Three	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Other Findings
				start, a higher number of sanctions and being male were more likely to be re-arrested
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>	The total criminal justice system cost savings per participant after 2 years was \$2,767 per drug court participant, regardless of whether or not they graduated. When this figure is multiplied by the 4001 participants who have entered the drug court since its inception, it results in a total savings of \$1,106,800. If savings continue for each participant at the same rate (which has been shown to occur in other studies, e.g., Finigan, Carey, & Cox, 2007), after 10 years, the savings for these 400 participants will total over \$5.5 million (\$5,534,000)	HCADC participants had consistently fewer drug-related re-arrests following entrance into drug court. HCADC program participants were significantly less likely to be re-arrested than offenders who were eligible for the program but did not participate
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	<p>The drug court has a single treatment provider (that can make referrals to other treatment as needed).</p> <p>The treatment representative is expected to attend all drug court sessions.</p> <p>Factors that reduce costs</p> <p>The prosecution is expected to attend all drug court team meetings (participant progress meetings).</p> <p>The prosecution is expected to attend all drug court sessions.</p> <p>The defense attorney is expected to attend drug court team meetings (participant progress meetings).</p> <p>The drug court allows non-drug charges.</p> <p>The drug court expects 20 days or less to pass from a participant's arrest to drug court entry.</p> <p>The drug court maintains a caseload of less than 150 clients.</p> <p>The drug court program is expected to take one year or more for participants to complete.</p> <p>Drug court has guidelines on the frequency of group treatment sessions that a participant must receive.</p> <p>Drug court has guidelines on the frequency of individual treatment sessions that a participant must receive.</p> <p>In the first phase of drug court, tests are collected at least 2 times per week.</p> <p>Drug court staff generally has drug test results within 48 hours.</p>	Our analysis revealed that despite the availability of benchmarks through the National Association of Drug Court Professionals, drug courts still have a lot of discretion in how they implement the 10 Key Components. Under each of the 10 components, there were both similarities and differences in how drug courts were operated. Differences across drug courts are expected and should not be misinterpreted as negative findings

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

#- Part Three	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Other Findings
			<p>The drug court requires participants to have greater than 90 days “clean” before graduation.</p> <p>The drug court decreases the frequency of future treatment sessions as a reward.</p> <p>Only the judge can provide clients with tangible rewards.</p> <p>The judge is assigned to drug court for a term greater than 2 years (or indefinitely).</p> <p>In the first phase of drug court, participants appear before the judge in court once every 2 weeks or less.</p> <p>In the final phase of drug court, the clients appear before the judge in court at least once per month.</p> <p>The drug court maintains data critical to monitoring and evaluation in an electronic database (rather than paper files).</p> <p>The drug court collects program statistics and uses them to modify drug court operations.</p> <p>The drug court uses the results of program evaluations to modify drug court operations.</p> <p>The drug court has participated in more than one evaluation conducted by an independent evaluator.</p> <p>Team members received training in preparation for the implementation of the drug court.</p> <p>All new hires to the drug court complete a formal training or orientation.</p> <p>All members of the drug court team are provided with training.</p> <p>The drug court team includes a representative from law enforcement (not including probation)</p>	
81	April 2007	<p>Finigan, M. W., Carey, S. M., & Cox, A. A. (2007). <i>The Impact of a Mature Drug Court</i> [Multnomah Co., OR] <i>Over 10 Years of Operation: Recidivism and Costs: Final Report</i>. NPC Research: Portland, OR.</p>	<p>The data from over 10 years of operation show that the Multnomah County Drug Court actually costs less to operate than the cost of “business as usual.” The investment cost per participant for the STOP Program was \$5,168 while the cost per offender for “business as usual” was \$6,560, a difference of \$1,392. These data suggest that the finding in 2003 was not simply relevant to the specific time period. Overall, this means that, independent of avoided system costs accruing from positive outcomes, the Drug Court’s operation itself saved the taxpayer more than \$9 million</p>	<p>(1)While all judges showed reductions in re-arrests, some judges showed greater reductions than Others. The reductions in re-arrests ranged from 4% to a substantial 42%, demonstrating clear Differences. This suggests that drug court results may vary depending on the judge involved</p> <p>Figure 1 Overall, for the entire population of eligible offenders, the Drug Court significantly reduced the incidence and frequency of criminal recidivism for participants compared to offenders who did not participate. Including all offenders who were eligible for the Drug Court during the total 10-year period, over 5 years from the Drug Court petition hearing, the</p>

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

#- Part Three	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Other Findings
			<p>over the 10-year period. Sources of this investment cost savings include treatment and probation services.</p>	<p>incidence of re-arrest was reduced by nearly 30%.</p> <p>Figure 1 number of external changes from 1991 to 2001 that might have had an influence on court operations and outcomes were identified. These external changes were categorized as follows: criminal justice system changes, changes in the Multnomah County substance abuse treatment system, and changes in the Oregon managed care system. With one exception, these changes appeared to have no statistically significant impact on subsequent recidivism for this population (drug court and comparison group).</p>
82	March 2007	Carey, S. M., & Waller, M. (March 2007). <i>Guam Adult Drug Court Outcome Evaluation: Final Report</i> . NPC Research: Portland, OR.	N/A	n/a
83	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: Monroe County Drug Treatment Court Process, Outcome and Cost Evaluation: Final Report</i> . NPC Research: Portland, OR.	<p>Due to positive outcomes for drug court participants (including fewer re-arrests, less probation time and fewer new court cases), there were substantial avoided costs for MCDTC drug court participants.</p> <p>The average cost for the MCDTC Program was \$20,067 per participant. This amount is on the highest end of the costs found nationally in other drug courts (\$4,000 to \$20,000) studied by NPC Research (Carey & Finigan, 2004; Carey et al., 2005) and is mainly due to a large amount of resources invested in drug court case management. However, the outcome cost savings indicate that participation in drug court offers a cost-benefit to the Indiana taxpayer due to a low number of subsequent re-arrests and associated incarceration and victimizations.</p>	<p>MCDTC participants consistently showed less drug use as measured by percent positive urine drug screens over 12 months. Figure B illustrates the percent of positive drug tests over time for the drug court group, which includes graduates, terminated participants, and active participants. This figure shows a smaller percentage of positive drug tests for MCDTC participants following program entry. Further, the percent of positive drug tests is extremely small (3% or less) during the course of the program. The areas in which the MCDTC may wish to implement changes to enhance their services are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MCDTC may wish to consider offering more flexibility in the program by adding an additional testing schedule to better accommodate work schedules and school start times. • The drug court team should consider the optimal program dosage and intensity required to maximize accountability and oversight, while promoting successful participation. • Although the MCDTC has developed partnerships with community agencies, they may wish to increase or strengthen these partnerships in order to better meet the needs of participants. • The drug court should consider consistently having an independent

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

#- Part Three	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Other Findings
				<p>judge sentence terminated MCDTC participants.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The MCDTC team may want to discuss possible ways to decrease the time interval between participant identification and entry into the drug treatment court. • The hiring of a part-time Spanish interpreter may help the MCDTC reach more of its target population.
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.	Results in the nine sites showed that the majority of agencies save money in processing an offender through drug court. Overall, for these nine study sites, participation in drug court saved the state over \$9 million in criminal justice and treatment costs due to lower recidivism in drug court participants.	Overall, the results of this study demonstrate that drug courts are an effective approach to treating nonviolent drug addicted offenders. The offenders who participated in drug court programs, regardless of whether they completed the programs, had lower recidivism and produced more outcome savings over four years than similar offenders who did not participate. The net benefit, including investment and outcome costs, for the nine drug court programs in this study was over nine million dollars.
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.	Due to positive outcomes for drug court participants (including fewer re-arrests, less probation time and fewer new court cases), there were substantial avoided costs for drug court participants. Barry County Drug Court participants showed a cost savings of over \$3,000 per participant over a 2-year period. When this per participant savings is multiplied by the 1081 offenders who have participated in the Drug Court Program since implementation (in May 2001), the total Program cost savings (for outcomes over a 24-month period) is \$353,160.	BCADC participants consistently showed less drug use than the comparison group. Figure 1 illustrates the percent of positive drug tests over time for the Drug Court and comparison Groups. The participant group includes graduates, terminated participants, and active participants. This figure shows a consistently smaller percentage of positive drug tests for BCADC participants following program entry. In fact, for some time periods there are no positive drug tests for BCADC participants at all while positive drug tests for comparison group members remain much higher.
86	February 2006	Pukstas, K., Weller, J. M., Brekhus, J., Crumpton, D., Carey, S. M., Mackin, J. R., & Finigan, M. W. (Feb. 2006). <i>Maryland Drug Treatment Courts: Interim Report of the Effectiveness of Juvenile Drug Courts</i> . NPC Research: Portland, OR	Cost analysis of juvenile drug courts and youth centers clearly illustrates the cost savings of working with this population in the community whenever possible. Juvenile drug courts offer specialized intensive services that can result in huge payoffs in terms of future quality of life for participants, their families, and their communities	Preliminary pre-post analysis of juvenile drug court participants in Maryland illustrate substantial reductions in new adjudicated charges, as well as significant reductions in the proportion of youth categorized as chronic offenders (i.e., those youth creating the most serious system and community impacts in terms of cost and public safety).
87	July 2005	Carey, S. M., & Marchand, G. (Jan. 2005). <i>Malheur County [OR] Adult Drug Court (S.A.F.E. Court) Outcome</i>	In general, the S.A.F.E. Court is successfully keeping program costs down while decreasing overall recidivism for its participants. Re-arrests and their associated costs are lower for the majority of participants. Although jail costs increase for many men after S.A.F.E. Court entry,	Figure 3 shows that there was a significant reduction in drug-related re-arrests from the pre- S.A.F.E. Court period to 24 months following program entry. Generally, although males were rearrested for drug-related crimes more often than females, both genders had fewer drug-related rearrests after entering the S.A.F.E. Court Program. Females

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

#- Part Three	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Other Findings
		<i>Evaluation: Final Report.</i> NPC Research: Portland, OR.	male graduates and all females show a decrease in this taxpayer cost as well. Subsequent evaluation on a larger sample when the S.A.F.E. Court becomes a more mature program is needed to determine the validity of these results	demonstrated the most drastic and significant reduction in drug-related re-arrests. Taken together, these results indicate that participation in the S.A.F.E Court Program achieves the goal of reducing substance use as can be inferred by a reduction in drug-related recidivism
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</i> [OR] Drug Court. NPC Research: Portland, OR.	Does it cost more for drug court than for “business as usual”? A: No. The total investment cost by the agencies involved in drug court ² averaged \$5,927.80 per participant compared to \$7,369.32 for “business as usual.” The “business-as-usual” offenders cost \$1,441.52 more than the drug court participants. Thus, the drug court approach actually saved the taxpayer money in investment costs. This was in a large part due to the use of jail and probation time for “business as-usual” processing, and is also due to significant use of treatment and court resources.	Law enforcement/corrections and the public defender’s office received an immediate savings from the drug court approach. All agencies saved money in outcomes. Data on the utility of a number of less intensive means of gathering costs data showed that in many cases a medium intensity method, generally involving the use of client level administrative data, brought reasonable results
89	February 2004	Carey, S. M. (Feb. 2004). <i>Clackamas County</i> [OR] <i>Juvenile Drug Court Outcome Evaluation: Final Report.</i> NPC Research: Portland, OR.	N/A	This information, combined with the fact that the number of positive Uas was not correlated with program status (graduation vs. termination), implies that the program response to drug use is successful in guiding participants to reduce use so that they are able to graduate. That is, it is not necessary for participants to have already reduced use at the start of the program in order to graduate. The overall trend in outcomes for the CCJDC is consistently positive. The CCJDC program appears to be impacting its youth and families in the intended manner. Further outcome evaluation as the program continues to grow (e.g., through the enhancement grant received from BJA) will allow for a larger sample size and the ability to verify the positive preliminary results achieved in the current evaluation
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.	Due to positive outcomes for drug court participants (including fewer re-arrests, less probation time and fewer new court cases), there were substantial avoided costs for drug court participants. Over a 2-year period, the VCDRDC cost outcomes were \$6,656 per participant compared to \$8,044 per offender that did not participate in Drug Court. When this per participant savings is multiplied by the 203 offenders who have participated in	Using the 10 Key Components of Drug Courts (NADCP, 1997) as a framework, NPC examined the practices of the VCDRDC program. The VCDRDC fully satisfies many of the 10 Key Components through its current policies and structure. We found that VCDRDC: • Integrates alcohol and other drug treatment services effectively with justice system case processing, • Does an excellent job of using a non-adversarial approach between

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

#- Part Three	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Other Findings
			the Drug Court Program since implementation, the total current program cost savings (for outcomes over 24-month period from program entry) is \$281,764.	<p>prosecution and defense counsel,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides a very good continuum of treatment services, • Uses frequent alcohol/drug testing to monitor abstinence, • Has a consistent reward and sanction structure for responding to participant compliance, • Graduates participants within VCDRC's recommended timeframe, • Has had a continuously sitting judge since program implementation, and • Excels at developing partnerships with public and private community agencies and organizations.
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</i> : Final Report. NPC Research: Portland, OR.	<p>Due to positive outcomes for drug court participants (including fewer re-arrests, less probation time and fewer new court cases), there were substantial avoided costs for drug court participants.</p> <p>Over a 2-year period, the VCDC cost outcomes were \$3,684 per participant compared to \$7,935 per offender that did not participate in drug court. When this per participant savings of \$4,251 is multiplied by the 697 offenders who have participated in the drug court program since implementation, the total current program cost savings (for outcomes over 24-month period from program entry) is nearly \$3 million.</p>	<p>Using the <i>10 Key Components of Drug Courts</i> (NADCP, 1997) as a framework, NPC examined the practices of the VCDC program. The VCDC satisfies some of the 10 Key Components through its current policies and structures. We found that VCDC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses frequent alcohol/drug testing to monitor abstinence, • Has a consistent reward and sanction structure for responding to participant compliance, • Graduates participants within VCDC's recommended time-frame, • Has had a continuously sitting judge since program implementation, and • Excels at developing partnerships with public and private community agencies and organizations.
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</i> : Final Report. NPC Research: Portland, OR.	<p>Due to positive outcomes for drug court participants (including fewer re-arrests, less probation time and fewer new court cases), there were substantial avoided costs for drug court participants.</p> <p>Over a 2-year period, the SJCDP cost outcomes were \$3,838 per participant compared to \$7,971 per offender that did not participate in drug court, resulting in a savings of \$4,133 per drug court participant. When the 2-year per participant savings is multiplied by the 465 offenders who have participated in the drug court program since implementation, the total current program cost savings (for outcomes over 24-month period from program entry) comes to nearly \$2 million</p>	<p>Using the <i>10 Key Components of Drug Courts</i> (NADCP, 1997) as a framework, NPC examined the practices of the SJCDC program. The SJCDC satisfies many of the 10 Key Components through its current policies and structure. We found that SJCDC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrates alcohol and other drug treatment services effectively with justice system case processing, • Does an excellent job of using a non-adversarial approach between prosecution and defense counsel, • Provides a very good continuum of treatment services, • Uses frequent alcohol/drug testing to monitor abstinence, • Has had a continuously sitting Judge since program implementation, • Graduates participants within a recommended time frame, and • The SJCDC program completion and retention rates are high compared to other drug

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

#- Part Three	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Other Findings
				<p>court programs in the U.S.</p> <p>SJCDC participants consistently showed less drug use than the comparison group as measured by percent positive urine drug screens over 12 months. Figure B illustrates the percent of positive drug tests over time for the drug court and comparison group. The participant group includes graduates, terminated participants, and active participants. This figure shows a consistently smaller percentage of positive drug tests for SJCDC participants relative to the comparison group. An important trend over time is the decreasing positive urine screens for the drug court participants. Although the comparison group participants showed a trend of decreasing positive drug tests as well, their overall percentage of positive tests was significantly higher.</p>
93	November 2009	<i>Analysis of the Sisseton-Wahpeton Oyate Tribal Drug Court [SD]</i>	Average Sentence for treatment court participants is 5.2 years. Savings are described as obvious no actual hard number	<p>Added benefits of keeping families together Allows participants to keep working and add to the tribal economy.</p>
94	April 2010	<i>Associations with Substance Abuse Treatment Completion Among [WI] Drug Court Participants.</i> Randall Brown, M.D. U of WI's School of Medicine and Public Health	N/A	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Drug court participant sample more predominantly Caucasian (79%) than some other drug court samples though predominantly Caucasian samples are reported in the literature 2. criminal history and current charges are comparable with those of other study samples, with drug-related crime present in the majority of offenders 3. assignment to drug court took place of maximum jail penalties, ranging from 1 to 285 days 4. majority of drug court participants assigned to outpatient treatment (84.9%) 5. majority (322 (56.3%) completed program 6. those who dropped out before completion, number of days to drop out varied widely (mean was 140.3 days); 11% dropped out in less than one month into the treatment 7. Principal findings are that failure to complete treatment program associated with unemployed status, lower educational attainment, and presence of a cocaine use disorder; [cocaine use disorders have been associated with impulsive behavior] 8. Factors associated with failure to complete treatment associated with unemployment, lower educational attainment, history of prior offense, and presence of a cocaine use disorder (vs other substance use disorders) 9. Factors not statically significantly associated with treatment completion were: program year, gender, age, marital status, presence/absence of mental illness, number of prior misdemeanors, frequency of use, number of years of use, number of prior treatment contacts, presence/absence of children in the home, or history of injecting drugs

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

#- Part Three	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Other Findings
95	March 2009	<i>Evaluation of Denver's [CO] Reorganized Drug Court.</i> Omni Institute. Submitted to the Crime Prevention and Control Commission	Estimated cost savings of reorg dr ct vs. former dr ct was \$ 437.31 per nonbonded offender and \$ 340.56 per bonded offender when jail is running over capacity; and \$ 1,882.13 per nonbonded offender and \$ 1,465.73 for bonded offender when jail is at capacity (report indicates costs to house defendants when jail is over capacity is greater then when under capacity though no explanation is given – e.g., fines imposed?)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How many individuals and cases processed? March 2007 – March 2008: 747 individual (766 cases)- 49.3% of post sent dr related cases vs. March 2005 – March 2006: 1,141 indivs (1,186 cases)- 56.4% 2. Background of Participants? Few differences in demographics except: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - race/ethnicity: of 2005 sample evenly split between while (37.6), black (28.9%) and Hispanic (31.5%); 2007 sample more heavily white (51.8%) and fewer Hispanic (20.5%) - majority of participants were male, under 35 years with history of frequent unempl and low motivation to seek treatment; 20% needed mental health eval. 3. Processing: Reorg. Drug court more efficient; average time from arrest to sentencing for non bonded defendants decreased from 83 days to 14 days in reor dr court, aver time from arrest to sentencing for bonded participants decreased from 173.5 days to 63.1 days; average time from sentencing to first treatment contact decreased from 63.5 days to 18.4 days. 4. “success”: data not available for reorg drug court; graduates from both programs showed greater improvement on LSI inventory at key points re risk assessment; recidivism for 2005 graduates significantly lower than nongrads; no data available for 2007 group; 5. Offender chars predictive of successful completion? - predictors didn't differ between groups; graduates more likely to be female, while, employed and have lower scores at intake on measures of criminal risk and AOD use 6. Does drug court reduce jail days? -preliminary results indicate that average jail days for drug court participants were significantly lower for 2007 group vs. 2005 group, in large part due to changes in procedures
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	<p><u>Case Processing Cost Savings:</u></p> <p>Average Cost per participant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - arrest/booking: 311 - drug court appearances: 1,988 (9.28 aver) - case mgt : 2,257 (157.62 days) - indiv treatment: 288 (7.57 sessions) - group treatment: 3,109 - res treatment per day: 155 - drug tests: 513 (47.47 tests) - jail days as sanction: 558 (5.44 days) <p>TOTAL COSTS Per Graduate: \$ 17,959; aver cost per participant: 9, 178</p>	N/A

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

#- Part Three	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Other Findings
			<p>Average Cost per participant for traditional court processing: \$ 16,691</p> <p>Average Costs per Traditional Court: 16,691 – Average Cost per Drug Court participant = 9,178 = 7,513 savings</p> <p><u>Savings Associated with Recidivism Reductions:</u> Recidivism costs for Drug Court Participants per person = 24, 429 Recidivism costs associated with Comparison Group: = 31,034 Savings from recidivism reduction for drug court participants = \$ 6,605</p> <p>Total savings for total number of participants entering program since inception (3,067) – 20,257,535.</p>	
97	April 15, 2010	<p><i>Municipal Drug Court Program [MO]: 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</p>	N/A	<p>Since September 1, 2009, 173 clients have been referred to the program or placed into treatment. Over half of the 173 clients were male (56%), 64% were African American, and the remaining clients were Caucasian. Participant ages ranged from 19-59 with an average age of 38.</p> <p><u>Education level (of 125 clients):</u> -Less than HS 29%; -High School/GED 20%; -Vocational 3%; -One Yr. College 5% -Two Yrs. College 1%</p> <p>-40% indicated that they have children;-7% reported that they are employed -40% work part-time; -30% work full time; -20% work cash jobs; -10% on-call work</p> <p>-120 clients provided housing info.;-43% were homeless; -15% lived in a rented or owned apartment; -38% lived with friends or family; -2% were in transitional living</p> <p>-120 clients provided housing info.; -43% were homeless; -15% lived in a rented or owned apartment; -38% lived with friends or family; -2% were in transitional living</p> <p>Currently 41 clients are in treatment. Of the clients currently in treatment, 6 clients are in Phase 1, 23 are in Phase 2, 7 clients are currently in Phase 3, and 5 are in Phase 4. It should be noted that only clients that successfully completed the previous phase were included into the subsequent success rate. Due to the length of Phase 4, no clients have been in the program long enough to complete the phase.</p>

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

#- Part Three	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Other Findings
				<p>Success rates for clients not currently in treatment [not defined in report] are as follows: -79 clients (76%) are successful at Level 1; -42 clients (38%) are successful at Level 2 -9 clients (59%) are successful at Level 3; <u>Previous Criminal History:</u> -39% reported having a felony on record -Only clients with non-felony records were included in this report -37% reported having been on probation -16% were currently on probation -The majority of charges were for robbery, burglary, or stealing but also included panhandling, trafficking and public intoxication <u>Charges that Initiated DC participation</u> -stealing (52%); -Paraphernalia (50%); -Prostitution (18%); -Intentional Inflicting (18%) -Probation Violation (8%); -Assault (8%); -Trespassing (6%); -Drug Possession (4%) -DUI (4%); -Fleeing (4%); -Drunk in public (2%); -Property Damage (2%) -Resisting Arrest (2%); -Tampering with Property (2%)</p> <p><u>Substance Use:</u> -Alcohol (94%); -Crack (76%); -Opiates (7%); -Marijuana (52%); -PCP (13%); -Meth (13%); -Pills (7%)</p> <p>Currently 41 clients are in treatment. Of the clients currently in treatment, 6 clients are in Phase 1, 23 are in Phase 2, 7 clients are currently in Phase 3, and 5 are in Phase 4. It should be noted that only clients that successfully completed the previous phase were included into the subsequent success rate. Due to the length of Phase 4, no clients have been in the program long enough to complete the phase. Overall, since the treatment aspect of the program is scheduled for six months, higher success rates are expected as the program matures.</p> <p>-Since Sept. 2009 there have been 445 court appearances made by 88 DC clients</p>
98	February, 2010	<i>Grant County, Indiana Drug Court Evaluation Report. [no author cited]</i>	N/A	<p>-A total of 87 participants graduated during the first 4 years of the program -There was a significant increase in housing, employment, and family functioning (HEFF) scores</p> <p><u>Significant Predictors of Termination, Re-Arrest, and/or Graduation Termination</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LSI-R positively correlated with termination (r=.20, p < .01) • Baseline HEFF negatively associated with termination (r=-.20, p < .01)

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

#- Part Three	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Other Findings
				<p><i>Re-Arrest</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Age negatively correlated with new arrests ($r = -.24, p < .01$) • Education level negatively correlated with new arrests ($r = -.23, p < .01$) <p><i>Graduation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Age positively associated with graduation ($r = .21, p < .01$) • Education positively associated with graduation ($r = .23, p < .01$) • Baseline HEFF positively associated with graduation ($r = .27, p < .01$) • LSI-R negatively associated with graduation ($r = .30, p < .01$)
99	July 2008	<i>Impact and Cost-Benefit Analysis of the Anchorage [AK] Wellness Court.</i> Urban Institute .John K. Roman et al.	Opt-in group had savings of \$ 3.00 in benefits for each dollar spent; opt out group had worse outcomes on almost all measures	
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.	<p>Substance abuse treatment costs highest for judge model group (\$ 14,001.23 vs. Panel model: 6,337.72 vs. referred model (4,091.47) vs. probationer group (\$ 3,130.26)</p> <p>Average correctional supervision costs highest for referred group (\$ 30,616.76) vs. Judge model (30,275.09) vs. Panel model (27,603.78) vs. probationer group (20,955/83).</p> <p>Drug court graduates had by far the lowest average correctional supervision costs;</p> <p>Graduates in panel model had total cjs cost of 13, 443.; vs. graduates in judge model (14,452.00);</p> <p>Cost for panel model failures was: 38,579.23 and 51,452 for judge models.; majority of cost savings came from reduced jail and prison costs for graduates.</p>	<p>Over half of participants graduates from drug court; no clear reason for failure emerged</p> <p>Males more likely to graduate than females</p> <p>Whites more likely to graduate than minorities</p> <p>Participants under age 30 only slightly more likely to graduate than those 31 or over</p> <p>Participants who began drug use at older ages tended to graduate at slightly higher rates than those who started at younger ages</p> <p>Meth users much more likely to graduates than cocaine users; about half of marijuana and alcohol users graduates</p> <p>Higher percentage of those without an arrest before age 16 graduated compared with those who had an earlier arrest</p> <p>Those with prior felony 37rogrammati didn't do well in drug court, but referral on a current felony was a predictor of success</p> <p>*little difference in amount of treatment graduates and failures received</p> <p>Higher percentage of graduates subjected to drug testing than failures</p> <p>Judge model had higher graduate rate than community panel model</p>
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	N/A	<p>Outcomes for SATC Drug Court Participants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program completion at approximately 50% • Slightly lower levels than prior few years • May reflect service to more challenging populations (more with co-occurring disorders) • Differences in program completion found as a function of gender and age • Women less likely (41%) than men (66%) to complete treatment • Participants ages 26-60 were more likely to complete treatment (62%) than were younger clients 18-25 (38%) • No other personal characteristics associated with program completion. • Drug of Choice was methamphetamine, heroine and opiates.

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

#- Part Three	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Other Findings
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Average age of first drink or drug was 14-15 years old. • Demographics: 68% high school graduates. 28% employed. A high percentage of participants had other psychological problems. <p>MARS Outcomes & Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demographics: gender breakdown is 39% male and 61% female. Ethnicity breakdown is 55% latino, 45% non-latino. Age 18-64. • Reductions in substance abuse and related behaviors found • Reductions in trauma-related symptoms • Consumer satisfaction with program adequate and provided feedback to program • Increase in participants with co-occurring disorders may impact success rates • Concerns regarding assessments of clients who have experienced trauma and/or have serious emotional problems • Need to examine trauma-informed interventions at all levels of treatment.
102	May 2004	<i>Fulton County New York Drug Court Outcome Evaluation of Goals and Objectives-Final Report. Submitted by: Michael J. Kavanaugh, Industrial Psychologist, Professor of Management and Psychology, University at Albany</i>	For computation of reduced time of incarceration, the 367 days for similar offenders and the 5 days (maximum) of FCDC participants results in 98.6% reduced time of incarceration for the FCDC participants. There were 46 graduates from the FCDC program from February 1, 1998 to January 31, 2004, which equals 16,652 days (46 times 362 days) of incarceration costs saved. The cost per day for incarceration in the Fulton County Jail is \$75.02 per day. Based on these figures, the FCDC program has resulted in cost savings of \$1,249,233 from February 1, 1998 to January 31, 2004.	<p>95% of FCDC participants, enrolled for a period of 6 months or longer, have been drug free. This result exceeds the goal that 60% of FCDC participants, enrolled for a period of 6 months or longer, will be substance free.</p> <p><u>Other Findings:</u> Of the 235 individuals who were screened for the FCDC, 47 were female (28%) and 188 (80%) were male. Of the 125 individuals selected to participate in the FCDC program, 26 were female (20.8%) and 99 were male (79.2). In terms of the ages of the 235 individuals screened, 54 (22.9%) were 19 and 20 years of age; 59 (25.1%) were 21 to 25 years of age; 35 (14.9%) were 26-30 years of age; 22 (9.3%) were 31-35 years of age; and 65 (27.7%) were over 35. In terms of the ages of the 125 individuals selected to participate in FCDC, 26 (20.8%) were 19 and 20 years of age; 35 (28%) were 21-25 years of age; 20 (16%) were 26-30 years of age; 13 (10.4%) were 31-35 years of age; and 31 (24.8%) were over 35. It would appear that more individuals 30 years of age and younger were screened and selected to participate in FCDC-62.9% under the age of 31 screened and 64.8% selected for FCDC under the age of 31.</p>
103	<i>Undated – sometime after June 1, 2006.</i>	<i>Crow Wing County, Minnesota Drug Court Evaluation. [No author attribution.]</i>	The total cost of the Crow Wing County Drug Court was \$105,483 for the 2007 fiscal year (\$66,755 State Court dollars and \$28,728 County dollars). These costs include court personnel and operating costs. The per-client cost was \$4,219.32 for the 2007 fiscal year. The approximate daily operating cost of the Drug Court for the 2007 fiscal year is \$11.56 per client. The daily cost of incarceration in the Crow Wing County jail is approximately \$50 per day. One year in drug court costs the same as 804 days in jail.	<p>84% of participants used their first drug of choice daily and 56% used their second drug of choice daily</p> <p>64% (14) participants didn't use any substances while in the program;</p> <p>Other indicia noted re improved "social capital indicators" (upward movement in academic achievement; substantial gains in employment status;</p>

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

#- Part Three	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Other Findings
104	2008	<i>San Francisco [CA] Drug Court. 2008 Annual Report. San Francisco's Collaborative Courts. Maria McKee et al.</i>	<p>NPC Research study found that drug courts have saved San Francisco over \$48 million since 1995. Savings accrued from both reduced programmatic costs (\$ 22 million in savings) and reduced recidivism (\$ 26 million in savings) across the 3,359 offenders who participated in S.F. Drug Court since 1995</p> <p>On average, costs \$ 6,622 less per client to process a case through the S.F. Drug Court than through traditional criminal court; case costs include arrest, court appearances, treatment, case management, jail days and probation time</p> <p>Reduced recidivism associated with drug court participation results in a savings of \$ 7,675 per person, totaling \$ 25,780,325 for 3,359 clients</p> <p>Programmatic savings were ^ 6,622 per client for 3,359 clients, totaling \$ 22,243,298</p> <p>In total, SFDC costs S. F. \$ 14,297 less per offender than traditional criminal court</p>	<p>Time in program/time to graduation: on average, drug court clients exiting program in 2008 spent five months (157 days) in program; graduates spent average of 337 days in program</p> <p>Retention and Completion Rates: for clients entering in 2006, 17% had graduated in one year; 24% graduated in two years (by end of 2008)</p> <p>Participant characteristics: most 2008 clients are single, African American men with no dependent children; majority are marginally housed, with no source of income and daily users of cocaine; 51% cite cocaine as primary drug of choice; 20% cite heroin and 16% cite methamphetamine</p> <p>Transitional housing program which targets homeless drug court clients transitioning from jail to community improved program retention by 47%</p>
105	2008	<i>Examining the Differential Impact of Drug Court Services by Court Type: Findings from Ohio. Drug Court Review, 6, 33-66. Shaffer DK et al. (2008).</i>	<p>The findings indicate that the clients who receive drug court services, regardless of type of court, fare significantly better as a group than individuals who did not receive drug court services.</p>	
106	<i>Not indicated</i>	<i>Adult and Juvenile Drug Courts. Douglas B. Marlowe, J.D. Ph.D.</i>	<p>The results [of the meta analyses] indicated that adult drug courts significantly reduced criminal recidivism (typically measured by re-arrest rates) by an average of approximately 8 to 14%.</p> <p><u>Cost Effectiveness:</u></p> <p>A recent cost related meta-analysis concluded that drug courts produced an average of \$2.21 in direct benefits to the criminal justice system for every \$1.00 invested. These savings reflected measurable cost-offsets to the criminal justice system stemming from reduced re-arrests, law enforcement contacts, court hearings, use of jail or prison beds and tangible impacts of crime victimization. Studies have reported economic benefits ranging from approximately \$2.00 to \$27.00 for every \$1.00 invested. The result has been net economic benefits to local communities ranging from approx. \$3,000 to \$13,000 per drug court participant.</p>	<p>A substantial minority (22%) of the drug courts was found to have had minimal impact on recidivism and in a few instances some drug courts were associated with increases in recidivism by as much as 15%.</p>

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

#- Part Three	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Other Findings
107	August 2008	<i>Worcester County [MD] Adult Circuit and District Drug Treatment Courts- Process Evaluation.</i> NPC Research, Portland, Oregon;	N/A	Between July and December 2007 there were 10 participants in the Circuit Court DTC-5 were African American and 5 Caucasian; 5 were male and 5 were female. In the District Court DTC there were a total of 16 participants during the same time period-6 were African American and 10 Caucasian; 6 were male and 10 were female. As of April 2008...the WCADTC had enrolled 35 participants since implementation with 6 participants graduating, 5 terminated from the program and 3 leaving administratively.
108	December 2009	<i>Wicomico County [MD] Circuit Court Adult Drug Treatment Court Program Outcome and Cost Evaluation.</i> NPC Research (for Maryland AOC).	The cost for jail is by far the most expensive transaction for DTC participants. The most expensive transaction for comparison group members is prison. In effect, the jail and prison costs for DTC participants and comparison group members are reversed (\$9,716 in jail costs and \$5,764 in prison costs for DTC participants, and \$5,762 in jail costs and \$9,389 in prison costs for comparison group members). If the use of jail had been less for the DTC participants (and especially the DTC participants who did not successfully graduate), the overall cost savings due to program participation would have been substantially greater. The total average cost savings after 24 months is \$543 per DTC participant, combining graduates and non-graduates. The difference in average total cost between DTC graduates and the comparison group of \$13,814 after 24 months is an immediate return on the investment in the graduate group. However, it is important to remember that the graduates are not directly comparable to the comparison group as they are the most successful participants.	This program has a very long delay (almost a year) between the arrest that makes the participant eligible for drug treatment court and her/his program entry date. Key Component #3 urges programs to establish systems for identifying prospective participants early and paving a smooth path into the program.
109	January 2010	<i>Montgomery County [MD] Adult Drug Court Program Outcome and Cost Evaluation.</i> NPC Research (for Maryland AOC).	The program investment costs are \$34,646 per ADC participant. When program costs are divided by the average number of days in the program, the cost per day per participant for the ADC program is \$67.72, which is lower than the per day cost of both jail (\$142.00) and prison (\$85.15). The cost due to re-arrests over 24 months from program entry was \$16,924 per ADC participant compared to \$21,820 per comparison individual, resulting in a savings of \$4,896 per participant (regardless of whether they graduate). The vast majority of the cost in outcomes for ADC participants over the 24 months from ADC entry was due to time in jail (\$14,183), mostly for participants who were unsuccessful in completing the	

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

#- Part Three	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Other Findings
			program. If the ADC program continues to enroll a cohort of 90 participants annually, the savings of \$4,896 per participant over 24 months results in an annual savings of \$220,320 per year, which can then be multiplied by the number of years the program remains in operation and for additional new participant cohorts per year.	
110	January 2010	<i>Howard County [MD] District Court Drug Treatment Court Program Outcome and Cost Evaluation.</i> NPC Research (for Maryland AOC).	The outcome costs are higher for the overall DTC group than for the comparison sample. The average total cost for the DTC group (\$14,953 per participant) is 45% higher than that of the comparison group (\$10,327 per comparison group member). The total outcome cost per DTC graduate (\$7,694) is 75% of that of the comparison group. When jail days are excluded from the analysis, the outcome costs per DTC participant (\$5,850) is lower than that of the comparison group (\$7,398).	N/A
111	June 2009	<i>Baltimore City [MD] District Court Adult Drug Treatment Court 10-Year Outcome and Cost Evaluation.</i> NPC Research.	DTC participants had lower average criminal justice system outcome costs (\$61,756) after 10 years than comparison group members (\$64,701), for a total cost savings of \$2,945 per participant. DTC graduates had outcome costs of \$18,494 after 10 years.	Of the recidivism study cohort, 28% successfully graduated and 72% were not successful. Participants who started DTC later in the program's history and who remained for fewer months were more likely to graduate (there appears to be an important threshold of DTC service—13 to 14 months—after which the participants become less and less likely to graduate and more likely to re-offend).
112	October 2008	<i>Prince George's County [MD] Circuit Court Adult Drug Court Outcome and Cost Evaluation.</i> NPC Research (for Maryland AOC).	Over a 3-year period, recidivism-related costs associated with PGCADC participants were \$13,517 per participant as compared to \$24,883 per comparison group offender – a difference per participant of \$11,366 .	At the current rate of savings associated with lower recidivism costs and current program costs, state and local investments in the program are effectively repaid within 8 years. Potential improvements in participant outcomes could increase savings in future years and repay the program's investments even sooner.
113	April 2008	<i>Harford County [MD] District Court Adult Drug Court Outcome and Cost Evaluation.</i> NPC Research (for Maryland AOC).	The total criminal justice system cost savings per participant after 2 years is \$2,767 per drug court participant regardless of whether or not they graduate. When this figure is multiplied by the 400 participants who have entered the drug court since its inception, it results in a total savings of \$1,106,800 .	The only characteristic significantly related to program success was the age of first substance use, indicating that participants were 1.16 times more likely (p < .05) to graduate, or have 16% greater chance of graduation for each year older the participant was at their age of first substance use.
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).	The total average cost savings after 4 years is \$3,452 per DTC participant, regardless of whether or not the participant graduates. This savings of \$863 per participant per year results in a yearly savings of \$413,377 per cohort year. The total average cost savings after 4 years is \$5,540 per FDI participant, regardless of whether or not the participant graduates. This savings of \$1,385 per participant per year results in a yearly savings of \$173,125	The difference between the average number of jail days accumulated by DTC participants (68) compared to FDI participants (54) is statistically significant (DTC participants had more jail days on average than FDI participants from arrest to program entry). The difference in jail days between the DTC graduates and FDI graduates is not significant. For every dollar (\$1) spent on the DTC program, the taxpayers save \$1.20 in criminal justice system costs. If other system costs were included, such as health care, welfare and employment system costs, this cost-benefit ratio might increase dramatically.

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

#- Part Three	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Other Findings
			per cohort year.	
115	December 2009	<i>Program Evaluation of Virginia's Drug Treatment Courts.</i> [No Author attribution]	The annual cost of drug treatment court participation is estimated to range from slightly over \$6000 per participant for adult diversionary and to under \$11500 per participant for post-adjudication programs. The DUI program, which operates based largely upon offender fees, has a minimal estimated cost-to-taxpayer of \$48 annually per participant. Statewide, adult drug treatment court programs spent over \$2.7M to provide drug court services to participants. The next largest cost for the adult programs statewide was the cost of staffing (\$442196.12), followed by the cost of incarceration (\$334162.34), the cost of drug tests (\$169585.95). The DUI drug treatment court program spent over \$30000 on staffing, and around \$5000 on status hearings.	Fourteen Adult Drug Treatment Courts were visited and reviewed, with standard compliance scores ranging from 92% - 100%. Programs that were not 100% compliant lacked one or more of the following: (1) complete data entry into the drug treatment court database at SCV, (2) a statement of consent to enter data into the Drug Court Database on the confidentiality forms, or (3) a local advisory committee or a local advisory committee with all the members prescribed by statute 18.2-254.1.G.
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.	The results from seven Maryland Adult Drug Treatment Court Programs' cost evaluations show an average 24-month outcome cost savings of \$1,982 per drug treatment court participant when compared to the comparison group.	The results of this limited statewide evaluation indicate that the programs are mostly successful in reducing participant recidivism, with some programs having more success than others, and decreasing substance use. Programs are mixed in their ability to graduate participants but the average graduation rate across all sites is at the national average (51% for Maryland Adult Drug Treatment Courts compared to 50% nationally). Program participant characteristics across the seven sites show that most Maryland Adult Drug Treatment Court participants are male (73%), African American (63%), and in their early 30's (average age of 32.5).
117	June 2008	<i>Goodwill Industries of the Chesapeake Employment Enhancement Program at Baltimore City [MD] Drug Treatment Court Outcome & Cost Evaluation.</i> NPC Research.	Due to lower rates of recidivism, GIC-EEP participants initially experience slightly lower outcome costs when compared to the non-GIC-EEP participants (\$3,360 versus \$3,462 at 3 months; \$8,145 versus \$8,553 at 6 months), but at 9 months the GIC-EEP participants have more criminal justice system events and higher outcome costs than the non-GIC-EEP participants (\$13,033 versus \$12,218).	The average per participant cost to the taxpayer for the GIC-EEP is \$2,425 . When program costs are assessed in this manner (average cost per participant for all 70 participants), job readiness classes make up the highest program cost (\$905), with similar costs for the remaining three GIC-EEP transactions (case management, job placement services, and transitional employment). The total cost of the GIC-EEP services used (by all 70 participants) during the evaluation period was still \$169,782.45 using this method. This is the total cost of all four transaction areas, and includes all salaries, benefits, and indirect support and overhead costs (supplies, equipment, facilities, supervision, support staff, etc.).

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

#- Part Three	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Other Findings
118	September 2010	<i>Drug Court Effectiveness: A Matched Cohort Study in the Dane County [Wisconsin] Drug Treatment Court.</i> Randall Brown MD, PhD.		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Overall, drug treatment court is effective in reducing repeat criminal behavior and in increasing the time to repeat criminal behavior when it occurs. 2. DTC appears to be particularly effective for groups previously considered to be potentially inappropriate or of higher risk for failure (Minorities and those with more extensive criminal history). 3. There also appears to be an enhanced effectiveness for drug court among women and among older individuals (those over age 35).
119	September 2010	<i>A Model for Success: A Report on New Jersey's Adult Drug Courts</i>	<p>According to the Department of Corrections, the annual institutional cost per inmate is approximately \$38,900. The average annual cost for active Drug Court participants is approximately \$11,379. Costs per participant vary depending upon their phase in the program and whether they have completed formal treatment. The first year is generally the most expensive because the participants receive intensive substance-abuse treatment and must report to the Drug Court weekly once they are out of a residential program. Annual costs therefore range from approximately \$25,813 for the most intensive treatment during phase one to approximately \$3,133 during phase four when they remain under probationary supervision pending graduation. Approximately 20% of all new participants require the most intensive treatment regimen. Using the most conservative approach, last year the new admissions to Drug Court, who cost the most to treat, cost approximately \$13,000 less than the cost of state prison.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 31% of graduates were employed when they entered Drug Court. More than 87% were employed at the time of graduation. • 26% of all Drug Court graduates improved their level of education or vocational/employment skills while participating in the Drug Court program. • Payments made by the first 1,858 Drug Court graduates total \$3.86 million with an average per participant payment of approximately \$2,078.
120	April 2004	<i>Multiple Measures of Juvenile Drug Court Effectiveness: Results of a Quasi-Experimental Design.</i> Crime & Delinquency. Rodriguez, D. et al.		<p>Findings on drug use show no significant difference in marijuana use between youths in drug court and those on standard probation (see Table 4). Not surprisingly, the proportion of positive marijuana drug tests prior to screening had a significant and positive effect on the likelihood to test positive for marijuana. Also, youths who passed the SASSI and youths in higher school grades were more likely to use marijuana during treatment. Criminal history indicators, school enrollment, family/guardianship status, and length of time in program had no significant effect on marijuana use.</p>

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

#- Part Three	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Other Findings
121	June 2000	<i>Evaluation of Oklahoma Drug Courts, 1997-2000.</i> Criminal Justice Resource Center. Wright, D., et al.		Available recidivism data for the drug court graduates indicate that 14 percent were re-arrested during the 24 month follow-up, while 22 percent of the probation offenders in the comparison group were re-arrested. Furthermore, the recidivism results for the drug court graduates are better than most findings in nationwide studies. Additionally, the retention rate for the second cohort is 90 percent excluding AWOLs. Among the total drug court participants the retention rate is 74 percent, which is above the national average. In comparisons between graduates and terminations, success is more likely to be found among older, Caucasian, better educated, employed, less criminally active participants, while the risk of failure increases for younger, African American, less educated, unemployed, and more criminally active participants. Another finding of this study is that Oklahoma drug courts have a higher completion rate (54%) than traditional outpatient substance abuse treatment for probationers (39%).
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>	<p>The daily cost of each drug court completer after treatment was</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$18.78 less than each offender who did not complete drug court treatment, • \$10.16 less than each probationer who completed treatment, and • \$13.84 less than each jail inmate who completed treatment. <p>Even if treatment expenditures are taken into account, the daily cost imposed by drug court completers after treatment is still lower than for individuals in any of the three comparison groups, averaging</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$14.84 less than each offender who did not complete drug court treatment, • \$2.43 less than each probationer who completed treatment, and • \$7.28 less than each jail inmate who completed treatment. 	Drug court completers also had higher rates of employment than members of the three comparison groups. During the 18-month period after treatment, 79 percent of drug court completers had earnings while 72 percent of non-completers, 32 percent of probationers, and seven percent of jail inmates had earnings. Furthermore, drug court completers had substantially higher earnings than members of the three comparison groups, on average.

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

#- Part Three	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Other Findings
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.	Health care costs and mental health services were significantly different for the two groups. Other research has shown that a substantial benefit of drug and alcohol treatment is reduced health care costs. This was the finding of this study as well, since only a minority of probationers received alcohol and drug treatment services. Costs to victims and other costs to the criminal justice system of later crimes were estimated based on the type of crime and costing methods used in other studies. Later crimes of probation completers more often involved crimes against persons, such as assault and robbery, while the later crimes of graduates were almost exclusively drug crimes. Consequently, 24-month averages were \$104 in tangible costs per graduate versus \$212 per completer and \$376 in intangible costs per graduates versus \$1,572 per completer. The net savings for the first 24 months after drug court or probation may be calculated by subtracting the differences in program costs from the difference in benefits (\$889,961 - \$317,315). The savings attributable to drug court totaled \$572,646 for the entire group of 219 graduates.	Net savings of over four years after drug court or probation amounted to \$7,707 per drug court participant. This represents the expenses that would have been incurred by the taxpayer over a four year period had the drug court clients attended regular probation.
124	1998	<i>The Impact of treatment: The Jefferson County (Kentucky) Drug Court program.</i> Federal Probation. Vito, G.F. et al.	N/A	First, some explanation of why African Americans were more likely to complete the program must be determined. Perhaps, they are more amenable to change or more appreciative of the second chance that the drug court program provides. The best way to approach this question is to conduct exit interviews with the program graduates in the future. Second, daily marijuana users who did not complete the treatment program were most likely to recidivate. The treatment providers should explore why this group had a particular problem with recidivism. One would expect that cocaine users would be the worst risk. Finally, some attention should be given to the factors related to success in TASC programs (Inciardi & McBride, 1991). Overall, research findings showed that most of these programs effectively performed their designed functions. The research noted their ability to focus on the “critical elements” of TASC:

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

#- Part Three	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Other Findings
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 results from cost evaluations of 20 Oregon drug courts show an average 3-year outcome cost savings of \$6,812 per drug court participant when compared to the comparison group. When victimizations are included, the outcome cost savings over 3 years increase from \$6,812 per participant to \$16,933 per participant. The recidivism cost savings described in the cost results are those that have accrued in just the 3 years since drug court entry. Many of these savings are due to positive outcomes while the participant is still in the program. Therefore, it is reasonable to state that savings to the state and local criminal justice systems are generated from the time of participant entry into drug court.</p> <p>Overall, the cost findings in this report indicate that drug treatment court is both beneficial to participants and beneficial to Oregon taxpayers. Taking into account the investment of \$16,411 per person, after 5 years, the net payer savings for just the cohorts included in the study at these 21 drug court sites comes to nearly \$120 million.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Drug Courts that included law enforcement on the drug court team had 33% less recidivism. 2. Programs that had at least 6 team members attend staffing had less than half the recidivism. 3. Drug courts that used a standardized assessment to determine eligibility for the program had 40% lower recidivism. 4. Programs where treatment providers performed home visits had graduation rates 15% higher and those that had the coordinator perform home visits had almost half the recidivism and 33% higher cost savings. 5. Drug courts that require participants to pay program fees to graduate had 40% lower recidivism. 6. Drug courts that trained staff on strength-based philosophy had 25% lower recidivism and double the taxpayer savings.
126	2011	<p><i>Montana Drug Courts: A Snapshot of Success and Hope.</i> Montana Supreme Court, Office of Court Administrator.</p>	<p>When investment, outcome and societal-impact (victimization) costs are combined, the total estimated annual cost avoidance for 40 participants due to their participation in Drug Court is estimated to be \$81,879 per participant and \$3,275,186 for 40 participants. (Quoting from a sample research project for Cascade Co., Montana)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Graduates reported a 17.6% increase in employment from admission to graduation. Family Drug Court graduates report a 61.8% increase in employment from admission to graduation. 2. Participants reported a 21.4% increase in adults getting a high school education, GED or attending some technical school/college. For the 86 Juvenile Drug Court cases there was a 350% increase in the number of participants receiving a high school diploma/GED or some college.
127	September 2010	<p><i>Georgia Department of Audits and Accounts Performance Audit Operations: Performance Audit 9-14.</i> Russell Hinton, State Auditor.</p>	<p>With the exception of a sentence to probation, the \$13.54 average daily cost of drug court is 72% to 80% less than the average daily cost of traditional sentencing options. A sentence to drug court ranges from \$10,293 less than the cost of a state prison sentence.</p>	

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

#- Part Three	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Other Findings
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	1998 through October 2010: community service completed valued at \$217,097. “Detention costs of \$18,240,000 have been saved by supervising clients in Drug Court.” “126,960 (jail) days saved for a saving of \$7,236,720.” “Considering the 226 graduates to date, determined that, with an average of 688 days in the program, an average of \$32,020 in cost savings per graduate resulted.”	“The program is most successful over time with clients 40 years of age and over”. “employment is important, with terminators only employed at 58% vs 80% of the graduates are employed. Unemployment rate for Terminators twice that of graduates.” “Delivered 320,000 client days....at an average cost of \$12 a day per client”
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.	Findings suggest that the average drug court participant still does more harm to society than benefit. However, participating in drug court appears to lower this harm by more than \$6,000 per participant. This difference, though, is not statistically significant. This is due mainly to the considerable variation in outcomes. We note that additional tests, including the Wilcoxon Rank Sum Test, suggest that there is a positive benefit of drug court, even if the aggregate net benefits are not significantly different. We also note that although the largest outliers are all within the comparison group, removal of these outliers does not meaningfully change our results.	We replicated a traditional cost-benefit analysis of drug courts and estimated court-level net benefits using our data where we first test for group differences in each cost/benefit category (i.e., court, health, etc.). We then summed the mean differences in each category to estimate the aggregate effect of drug court. Following that strategy, which is a common one, we estimated that drug court participation costs roughly \$6,533. If you compare this figure to the \$12,520 benefits of drug court that accrue from the most commonly studied drug court benefits, we estimate that the net benefits of drug court participation are \$5,987 per participant, which is very close to our final estimate of net benefits. The corresponding benefit-cost ratio is 1.92:1.
130	April 16, 2009	<i>Evaluation of the Tarrant County [TX] DIRECT Program.</i> Dr. Richard Hoefler and Dr. Debra Woody.	During the years from 2002 to 2006, a total of nearly two million dollars was spent (\$1,969,363). In 2002, the total spent was \$363,515, in 2003, program costs were \$320,895; in 2004, the program costs were \$441,236; in 2005, a total of \$496,796 was spent and in 2006, the program spent \$346,921. This trend indicates rising expenditures from 2002 until 2005, with a decrease in 2006. While the researchers have not estimated how much it costs to incarcerate one of these clients for a typical amount of time for a felony, it seems safe to say that it would be more than the cost of a successful graduate. While there are costs that accrue to treat the unsuccessful clients, the researchers hypothesize that the program is cost-effective, saving considerable amounts of money for taxpayers because most of the clients do graduate.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Almost all the clients in the program (more than 90%) have been charged with a felony, as compared to being charged with a misdemeanor. This holds true for all years in the analysis. • Graduation rates by race show a large difference between Whites and Hispanics, with a success rate over two-thirds of all entering the program, and Blacks, with a success rate of only one-third. • Graduation rates do not differ for men and women - gender does not seem to affect this first level of success. • Older clients (40 years and up) may be more likely to graduate from the program than other age groups. • The higher the phase the participants are able to reach, the less likely they are to be rearrested for drug crimes. Around 87% of those who terminated during Phase 1 were rearrested. This dropped to 71% of those who reached Phase 2, and further dropped to 53% of those who reached Phase 3. • Over half of all clients who enter the program have not been re-arrested during the time period of the study up to now. The rate varies somewhat by year.

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

#- Part Three	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Other Findings
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.	N/A	An analysis of program graduates and those who were unsuccessfully terminated from the program displayed an unexpected result: 47% of the 214 terminated participants did not reoffend, compared to 73% of the 229 participants who graduated from the program.
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.	N/A	<p>The mean age at which participants began using alcohol was 17.4 years, with a median and modal age of 16 years. The range was 5-46 years of age. Twenty-four participants did not report any alcohol use and therefore were excluded from this analysis. The mean age at which participants in Years 1-3 began using drugs was 18.2 years with a median and modal age of 16 years. The range was 9-45 years of age. Sixteen participants did not report any drug use and therefore were excluded from this analysis.</p> <p>41.1% (n=60) of participants in Years 1-3 reported that their drug of choice prior to entry into the VBCDTCP was methamphetamine. In terms of prevalence among participants during Years 1-3, other drugs of choice are as follows: alcohol [24.0%, n=35], marijuana [11.0%, n=16], poly drug use [10.3%, n=15], and cocaine [3.4%, n=5] and heroin [3.4%, n=5].</p>
133	November 2009	<i>17th Judicial District Union/Snyder County [PA] Drug Treatment Court Baseline Process Evaluation.</i> Treatment Research Institute. November 2009.	N/A	<p>11 DTC participants completed Phase1, taking a mean of 23.5 weeks, and 4 completed Phase 2, taking a mean of 44 weeks to complete this phase. To date no participants have graduated from the program.</p> <p>Across the first 17 weeks of the program, participants achieved a mean percentage of 92% drug-free urine tests. (SD = 10.3).</p>

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

#- Part Three	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Other Findings
134	December 2010	<i>17th Judicial District Union/Snyder County [PA] Drug Treatment Court Final Three Year Process and Outcome Evaluation.</i> Treatment Research Institute. December 2010.	N/A	<p>The majority of offenders who entered the DTC program during its first two years of operation (year 1 n = 18; year 2 n = 8) were primarily young Caucasian males. Overall, DTC clients had a fairly high level of criminogenic risk (e.g., over half of clients having prior felony convictions, average age of criminal onset was slightly under 16 years of age) and a clinical need (e.g., 2.6 prior treatment attempts, mean age of onset of drug use of approximately 17 years of age, 92% of the sample reported opiates as their primary drug of abuse).</p> <p>A substantially higher proportion of clients in the year 2 sample completed Phase 1 (87%) compared to the year 1 sample (61%) and about a quarter of the individuals in each sample completed Phase 2. In addition, the number of weeks to phase completion was slightly shorter in year 2 relative to year 1. Across both samples, no client graduated within either 15-month time frame.</p>
135	2011	<i>Evaluation of Montana's Seventh Judicial District Adult Treatment Court.</i> Snowy Range Research. Heck, Cary. 2011.	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The retention rate for the SJDATC was approximately 70%, over the 1 year period of review. • The average number of clean days reported by SJDATC graduates was 497, over the 1 year period of review. • Of 752 urine tests administered to participants during the 1 year period of review, 23 were positive (97% were negative).
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 Superior Court Drug Court from 2002-2008, has provided services for 264 participants. When compared to the projected path of straight incarceration for these 264 participants, Drug Court has saved Whatcom County \$3,676,552.50 and resulted 26.2% less recidivism.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost for individual that graduates from drug court and does not re-offend: 541 days × \$15.25 = \$8250.25 total program expenditures • Cost for individual that graduates from drug court and does reoffend: \$8250.25 drug court costs + \$1400.00 Attorney fees + \$24,820.00 one year incarceration = \$34,470.25 • Costs for individual that does not complete drug court who does not reoffend: 363 days × \$15.25 = \$5535.75 • Costs for individual that does not complete drug court who does reoffend: \$31,755.75 drug court termination + 1400.00 Attorney fees + \$24,820.00 one year incarceration = \$57,975.75 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • After drug court, participants that are terminated are charged with a felony, and upon conviction are incarcerated. The cost of this process is as follows: \$5535.75 + \$1400.00 Attorney fees + \$24,820.00 one year incarceration = \$31,755.75 • Costs for individual that is eligible for drug court but opts for straight sentencing and does not reoffend: \$1400.00 Attorney fees + \$24,820.00 one year incarceration = \$26,200.00 • Costs for individual that is eligible for drug court but opts for straight sentencing and does reoffend: \$1400.00 Attorney fees + \$24,820.00 one year incarceration + \$1400.00 Attorney fees + \$24,820.00 one year incarceration = \$52,440.00

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

#- Part Three	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Other Findings
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.	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Misdemeanants in therapeutic courts were convicted of a variety of offenses, including violent, alcohol and drug, and other or unknown types of offenses. The graduation rate for the misdemeanants in therapeutic courts was 53%, compared to a graduation rate of 62% for the felons in therapeutic courts. • Almost all felons in therapeutic courts were convicted of alcohol and drug offenses. • The completion rate for the misdemeanor participants in DOC substance abuse programs was 45%, compared to a completion rate of 66% for the felons in DOC substance abuse programs. DOC staff noted that it was less likely that felons would be transferred to another institution or released before having an opportunity to complete the substance abuse program. Transfers to other institutions and disciplinary measures including segregation accounted for most of the non-completions of programs.
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.	N/A	N/A
139	June 2012	<i>Minnesota Statewide Adult Drug Court Evaluation.</i> State Court Administrator's Office, Minnesota Judicial Branch. June 2012.	<p>Overall, the incarceration costs are lower for the Drug Court Cohort through two and one half years from drug court start. Over two and one half years, an average of \$3,189 less per participant was spent on incarcerating drug court participants.</p> <p>Prison costs are much higher per participant for the Comparison Group (\$3,961 more per participant). Jail costs are higher, per participant, for the Drug Court Cohort than the Comparison Group (\$772 more per participant). When jail costs are analyzed separately for participants outside of Hennepin County jail costs are \$879 lower for the non-Hennepin County drug court participants than the non-Hennepin County comparison group participants.</p>	<p>One in five drug court participants (19%) are charged with a new offense during drug court as compared to almost one-third (29%) of comparison group participants.</p> <p>Drug court participants are also re-convicted at a lower rate (14%) than the Comparison Group (24%) during drug court.</p>

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

#- Part Three	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Other Findings
140	October 18, 2012	<i>Virginia Adult Drug Treatment Court Evaluation.</i> Fred L. Cheesman, Tara Kunkel. Statewide Advisory Board. October 18, 2012.	Virginia’s Drug Courts save \$19,234 per person as compared to “business as usual” processing.	N/A
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.	In Fiscal Year 2012, the average cost per drug court participant/admission was \$4,412.	For the total number of discharges to date, 142 re-offenses (58.2%) of the total 244 re-offenses occurred during the first 24 months after discharge for a total re-offense rate of 14.9%. Of these 142 re-offenses, 17 were felonies and 125 were misdemeanors.
142	September 2012	<i>Evaluation of Cumberland County [TN] DUI and Drug Court.</i> Samuel A. MacMaster, Rodney A. Ellis. September 2012.	N/A	It is important to note that there are several other measurable outcomes of the court’s success. Seven individuals were able to have their driver’s license restored. Two individuals had their parental rights restored, and two individuals regained custody of their children. Importantly, in terms of the lasting impact of these services, a drug free child was born to one of the program participants, whose life is forever improved by these services.
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 2013.	The reductions in crime observed in this analysis translate into a net benefit to tax payers and society of approximately \$22,000 per participant – or about \$4.02 in benefits per dollar spent	Nearly universal participation in chemical dependency treatment was obtained by drug court participants (97% versus 46% in comparison group) Drug court participants were over 3 times more likely to enter treatment within 90 days and 4 times more likely to be in treatment – primarily outpatient – for 90 or more days
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.	N/A	Taken as a whole, the programs have graduation rates that are equivalent to, or better than, the national average. (Graduation rate for ADC programs was 47% and that of DUI courts was 61% which is close to or above the national average of 50%) These programs are graduating participants within the specified intended length of stay in the program. An examination of participant characteristics that predict graduation or termination from the programs show that drug court graduates were significantly more likely to be white, while non-graduates were more likely to be black (for adult drug courts) or American Indian (for DUI courts)

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

#- Part Three	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Other Findings
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.		Drug courts produced generally similar effects regardless of their participants' estimated addiction severity and need for treatment – except that drug courts that admit participants who exclusively use marijuana performed worse than drug courts that limited eligibility to offenders whose addictions include drugs other than marijuana. Drug courts that created greater legal leverage produced larger impacts than other drug courts. Drug courts that engaged in more certain sanctioning and adhered to a formal sanctions schedule produced larger impacts than others. Drug courts that used more intensive initial treatment modalities outperformed drug courts that relied on less intensive options, particularly among highly addicted, high need participants. Drug courts that assessed for trauma and used cognitive behavioral therapy for criminal thinking were particularly effective with less addicted participants. Drug Courts with dedicated prosecutors and public defenders on their drug court team and in staffing meetings produced larger impacts than others.
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.	When all relevant costs are considered, all DTAP participants have an average cost of \$21,235 per participant as compared with the prison control group average cost per person of \$30,059. The difference in the average costs between the two groups represents a cost savings of \$8,807 per participant. As can be seen, including County costs for hearing increases the costs for the DTAP participants to an average of \$22,837 per participant. However, this amount is still less than the costs of the prison control group (\$30,162). Assuming that that State incurs no net cost for probation or parole, the net benefit of the program is \$9,978 per participant.	N/A
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.	DTAP program cost savings to the justice system for those entering in the first two years were estimated to be \$109,141 or \$19,406 per entrant. If DTAP program costs and cost savings are projected out for the full 3 years for those in the program together with incarceration costs, then the DTAP program generates an overall cost savings of \$1,683,404 or \$32,373 per entrant.	In the period to 6/30/13 the DTAP program had a success rate of 69.2% with 36 entrants still in the program. A majority of the participants interviewed (both ongoing and graduates) perceived the most helpful aspects of the DTAP program to be the treatment and ongoing support and sense of community from the STAP team. Most saw it as their “last chance” to address their addiction and self-destructive habits and were motivated to achieve their recovery.

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

#- Part Three	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Other Findings
148	September, 2013	<i>Bexar County [TX] Felony Drug Court: Process, Outcome, and Cost Evaluation: Final Report.</i> NPC Research, Portland, OR. September, 2013.	Drug court participants use fewer criminal justice system resources than the comparison group with fewer re-arrests, new court cases, days on probation, days in jail, and days in prison. Total cost of recidivism over 3 years for BCFDC per participant was \$7,250, while the cost per comparison group member was \$10,658. The difference between drug court and the comparison group represents a benefit of \$3,408 per participant. When victimization costs are added, the difference jumps substantially with drug court participants costing a total of \$9,404 less per participant. Projection these cost savings just 2 more years the savings come to \$15,673 per participant, resulting in a cost-benefit ratio of 1:1.09. This represents a 109% return on investment after 5 years and a 219% return after 10 years	Graduates were significantly more likely to be older, lower risk and need, employed at program entry, and have at least a high school or GED education at program entry. Graduates were also significantly more likely to identify methamphetamines as a drug of choice, and have fewer arrests in the 2 years before drug court entry Participants entering the program after the SAMHSA enhancements were implemented (2009 and afterward) were re-arrested significantly less frequently than participants entering in 2007 and 2008