

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

PART TWO

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results		
			Re-Arrests	Convictions	Time Followed
1	2004	N/A	Offenders assigned to drug court significantly less likely to be rearrested than offenders who go through traditional adjudication (including felony arrests) Offenders assigned to drug court more likely to be rearrested than offenders in pretrial diversion (including felony arrests) <u>–[NOTE: pretrial diversion is for lower risk offenders]</u>	N/A	N/A
2	September 2004	Survival analysis of 139 drug court participants and 96 defendants eligible for drug court but randomly assigned to non drug court program	-A significantly greater proportion of the drug court sample (33%) survived throughout the follow up period compared with less than one fifth of the control sample (18%) -both samples experienced their sharpest decline between months 0 and 4 when each lost about one third of its members to failure (e.g., arrest). - half of the control sample failed by 5.1 months while the drug court sample did not lose half of its members until 11.1 months - drug court sample members who had greater exposure to the drug court components of drug treatment, drug testing, and status hearings were rearrested significantly less often than those with less exposure to these components.	N/A	24 months from time of program entry
3	January 29, 2004	Tracked sample of drug court participants (53) in District Court and comparable group of non drug court participants for recidivism and costs and possible cost savings resulting	Over 4 year period, drug court participants had 12.3% fewer arrests than comparison group; PROPERTY OFFENSES: Drug court participants had 18.8% fewer arrests for property crime than comparison group; CRIMES AGAINST PERSONS: Drug court participants had 73.3% fewer arrests for crimes against persons than comparison group, so that victimization costs (e.g., medical costs, lost time from work, etc.) were substantially reduced; non-graduates had 1.17	N/A	Four years following program entry

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

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results		
			Re-Arrests	Convictions	Time Followed
4	January 29, 2004	Tracked sample of drug court participants (60) in Circuit and District Courts and comparable group of (63) non drug court participants for recidivism and resultant costs and possible cost savings resulting	- Over 3 year period, drug court participants had 31.4% fewer arrests overall than comparison group (Circuit Court participants had 44.2% fewer arrests); - DRUG OFFENSES: Drug court participants had 35.3% fewer arrests than comparison group (62.3% fewer arrests for Circuit Court participants); -PROPERTY OFFENSES: Drug court participants had 68.8% fewer arrests for property crimes than comparison group (71.9% fewer arrests for Circuit Court participants) -CRIMES AGAINST PERSONS: drug court participants had 48% fewer crimes against person than comparison group (Circuit Court participants had 70% fewer), with resultant reductions in victimization costs (medical expenses, lost pay, etc.) as well as criminal justice system costs	N/A	3 years following program entry
5	January 2004	Updated previous annual report to follow 543 female enrollees since program inception		N/A	N/A
6	January 2004	N/A		Of 425 drug court graduates, 8 (1.9% recidivated*; of 3,405 successful standard probation offenders, 113 (3.3% recidivated); of 3,334 released inmates, 262 (7.9%) recidivated. Drug court graduates almost 2 times (73.7%) less likely to recidivate* than successful standard probation offenders; Drug Court graduates over 4 times (315.8%) less likely to recidivate than released <u>prison inmates</u> *recidivate: defined as offender becoming incarcerated in prison	First year following graduation
7	October 2003	Follows drug court participants in six NY programs and compares with similar defendants not entering drug court	(1) Recidivism reductions ranged from 13% to 47%, with average of 29% (2) (post program recidivism reduction from 19% to 52% (average is 32%))		(1)Following arrest (2) following program
8	August 1, 2003	N/A	-Women 14.2% -Men 21.4%	N/A	Within 36 months of graduating from drug court

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

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results		
			Re-Arrests	Convictions	Time Followed
9	July 2003	Process evaluation of 99 participants admitted to the program as of July 15, 2003	21% of participants admitted to program arrested while enrolled; 8% of 36 graduates arrested after graduation		December 2000 – July 2003
10	June 1, 2003	N/A	-30.5% had violated sentences within 2 years of being placed on probation.	N/A	N/A
11	May 2003	Process and outcome evaluation of 57 DUI drug court participants and 42 control group randomly assigned defendants with similar characteristics whose cases were processed in the traditional process	.01 offenses for DUI Drug Court participants compared with .03 for control group also: number of positive drug tests: - DUI drug court participants: 4% (6.1 average taken per month) - Control group: 18% (1 average taken per month)	N/A	18 months
12	April 18, 2003	Obtained re-arrest data for each of 2,357 participants in 4 drug courts studied for 12 months following discharge from program	Overall: - 9% rearrests for graduates; rearrests took average of 6.6 mos; - 41% rearrest for unsuccessful terminations; rearrests took average of 5.6 mos. Specific Programs: (p.9-4) -Bakersfield, Cal: 13%-grads; 53% terminated; St. Mary Parish, La.: 6%-graduates; 22%-terminated; Jackson Co., Mo.: 7%: grads; Creek Co., Okl: 20%	N/A	N/A
13	April 15, 2003	Review of rearrests for participants and graduates: 1994 – 2002	Participants: total rearrests were 140 (10.14%) of 1,380 participants	28 (7.11% of 394 graduates were convicted of offenses following graduation	N/A
14	March 2003	N/A	Felony -avg. 5.9% (0-12%) Misdemeanor -avg 10.1% (0-14.3 %) Recidivism defined as re-arrest.	N/A	N/A
15	March 2003	Using six different comparison groups, measured recidivism rates (criminal convictions for		In all counties except King Co., drug court reduced felony recidivism rates by 13%; 8 year felony reconviction rate is 45.8% for nondrug court participants and 39.9% for drug	Maximum of eight years

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

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results		
			Re-Arrests	Convictions	Time Followed
		new offenses) of drug court; pooled smaller counties (Kitsap, Skagit, Spokane and Thurston) and analyzed King and Pierce separately because they were larger		court participants. King Co. didn't reduce recidivism, with high rate of terminations for 1998-1999. Also found that this 13% reduction in recidivism was consistent with recidivism reductions reported in 30 drug court evaluations reviewed for other jurisdictions.	
16	February 7, 2003	Studied arrest rates, compiled from 17 counties for 1,945 participants who completed one of 3 drug courts in state	Declined by 85% in first two years after admission compared to two years prior to entry	Declined by 77% in two years following admission compared to two years prior to entry	Two years following entry
17	January 6, 2003	Statistical data on convictions of graduates after leaving program		Conviction rate for graduates was 11%	N/A
18	January 2003	Ph. I: case studies to document program dev, policies and procedures, lessons learned; and impact evaluation using survival analysis to measure recidivism Ph. II: program retention model using logistic regression to predict program status, and survival analysis to predict length of stay; and descriptive analyses (Escambia County) using court records and interviews re participant perceptions	(definition of recidivism as rearrests implied from discussion) <u>Escambia Co.:</u> drug court participation reduced recidivism for new felonies from roughly 40% to nearly 12% within two year follow-up period. (less impact if <u>any</u> rearrest is considered)- drug court reduced recidivism for felonies but not new misdemeanor arrests; males had higher probability of recidivism than females; blacks had higher probability of recidivism than whites; recidivism rates decreased with age; offenders more likely to recidivate if they had more serious criminal records; timing of recidivism not affected by drug court participation <u>Jackson County:</u> probability for recidivism fell and time to rearrest increased with drug court participation; drug court participation reduced recidivism from approximately 50% to 35% for both felonies and misdemeanors; probability of eventually recidivating fell with drug court participation and time to rearrest increased. Participation reduced recidivism for new felonies or misdemeanors from 65% to 45%.; recidivism rates same for men and women but higher for blacks than for whites; recidivism rates dropped as age increased and rose for offenders with more		24 months (implied from date of arrest)

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

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results		
			Re-Arrests	Convictions	Time Followed
			serious criminal records		
19	May 5, 2002	Obtained rearrest data for group of drug court participants at each site from date of program inception through 1998 and rearrest data for comparison group of defendants	<p>Portland: 1991-97 Dr. Ct. partics: 37.4% rearrest at 1 year, compared with non drug court defendants group A (never appeared at first hearing) 53.3% and B (appeared at first hearing but not at treatment) 50.8%; 46.4% of drug ct partics rearrested after 2 yrs compared with 57.8% and 59% of comparison groups; 49.9% of drug ct partics rearrested after 3 years compared with 60.1% and 60.3% of nondrug court defs.</p> <p>Las Vegas: 1993-97: -52% drug court partics compared with 65% of compare group rearrested after one year; 62% of drug court partics vs. 74% of nondrug court arrested after 2 years; 65% of drug court partics vs. 79% of nondrug court defs rearrested after 3 years.</p>		3 years
20	March 2002		A substantial number of drug court participants (approximately 3,0090) completed drug court during the study period; participants who completed drug court as compared to aggregate of all entering participants during study period, had very low rearrest, conviction and incarceration rates for the two years after admission to drug court. Arrest rate for participants who completed drug court is 85% less during the two years after admission than arrest rate for those entering program during the two year prior to entry	Conviction rate for participants who competed drug court is 77% less during two years after admission than conviction rate of those entering program during the two years prior to entry;	2 years following drug court admission
21	October 2001	Studied client files, local jail and prison data; NCIC data, child support collections, traffic accidents, mental health service utilization , employment data and random interviews of drug court graduates and terminators		12 months following graduation, graduates less likely to have had felony or misdemeanor conviction, or been in prison or jail; graduates had significantly more days to first misdemeanor charge but significantly fewer days to first felony charge than other groups (terminators and nonentry defendants)	12 months after graduation or termination
22	October 2000	Individuals were tracked with rap sheets in order to produce results.	6 months -6% DC -7% Comp. 12 months	N/A	At 6,12,18, and 24 months after release

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

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results		
			Re-Arrests	Convictions	Time Followed
			-9% DC -21% Comp. 18 months -10% DC -26% Comp. 24 months -11% DC -27% Comp. = 11% recidivism rate Recidivism was defined as any contact with the law.		
23	May 1999	Tracked drug court cases filed between August 1, 1997 0- December 31, 1997 and predrug court comparison group for 9 month period; compiled data on offender characteristics, prior conviction history; length of case; reoffenses; and nature of drug addiction (for drug court participants only)	Drug court and predrug court defendants had similar recidivism rates	Drug court and predrug court defendants had similar recidivism rates	9 months following case filing
24	October 2000	Research compared DTC and non-DTC drug offenders	12 months -18% graduates -41% non-graduates -44% comp.	N/A	12 months after graduation
25	October 2000	N/A	6 months: -6% DC; -6% comp. 12 months: -10% DC; -14% comp. 18 months: -11% DC; -22% comp. 24 months: -14% DC; -22% comp. Recidivism was defined as re-arrest	N/A	N/A
25	October 2000	N/A	Those Refusing Drug Court: - 19.91% Those Who Withdrew From Drug Court: - 25.2% Successful Probationers: - 15.9% 1998 average for DC graduates: - 10.6%	N/A	N/A
27	January 2001	Tracked information re drug court participants and comparison group members re recidivism; completion rates; justice system and	(recidivism not defined): drug court graduates had lower total post program recidivism than comparison groups	Post program recidivism rate for gradates after 416 days follow up was 28%, with only one of the 15 convictions a felony; 85% of the new convictions were for misdemeanors; 40% drug court clients were convicted of crimes post	N/A

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

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results		
			Re-Arrests	Convictions	Time Followed
		treatment costs		program; 62% of the men entering the drug court were convicted of new crimes while only 33% of the women were convicted;)	
28	July 2001	Conducted interviews of program officials and tracked data on participants at each site; divided subjects into five outcome groups: ineligible; opt outs; did not finish; graduates; and active cases	Graduates have fewer re-arrests than any of the other outcome groups	Offenders who graduate from drug court less likely than offenders in any other group to be reconvicted in the three years following referral to drug court	Three years following referral to drug court
29	December 2004		Of 647 graduates of adult drug courts, 103 have been rearrested for felony offenses after graduation (15.9% recidivism rate); 59 graduates had misdemeanor arrests (9.1% recidivism rate; Of 2,056 nongraduates, 303 were arrested for felony offenses after leaving drug court (33% recidivism rate) and 72 were arrested for misdemeanors (7.8%). Felony recidivism rate of drug offenders studied by Va. Criminal Sentencing Commission (VCSC) in 1999, was 50% -- significantly higher than felony recidivism rate for graduates or nongraduates	N/A	N/A
30	October 2003	Used combination of interviews, surveys of program officials, and review of data maintained by the drug court coordinator	One of the 14 graduates has had arrest/conviction for new offense (7%)	One of the 14 graduates has had arrest/conviction for new offense (7%)	Not indicated
31	July 2002	Quasi-experimental matched comparison group design to estimate impact of drug courts on future criminal involvement; evaluated 3 distinct groups of participants: those in Common Pleas Court; Municipal Court; and Juvenile Drug Courts	32% of <u>Common Pleas</u> participants rearrested vs. 44% of comparison group (Offenders with prior record, less than High school education, unemployed and nondrug court participation more likely to be rearrested; <u>Municipal</u> drug court participants significantly less likely to be rearrested than comparison group members for new offense and for multiple times; 41% of Municipal drug court participants rearrested vs. 49% of comparison group; factors predicting rearrest were race, education, employment, time at		

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

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results		
			Re-Arrests	Convictions	Time Followed
			risk; and drug court participation; offenders who were nonwhite , had less than high school education, unemployed, a risk the longest were significantly more likely to be rearrested;; - completion of drug court was a significant predictor of new arrests; probability of rearrests for those offenders who completed a drug court program was 32% vs 55.5% for comparison group		
32	2001	Reviewed automated data collected by Bernalillo Co. Metropolitan Court; comparison data drawn from automated records maintained by court	<p>Within six mos graduation: 3.6% (6) vs. 14 (9%) for successful probation and 15 (9.7%) of unsuccessful probation</p> <p>Within 7-12 mos graduation: 9 (5.4%) vs. 14 (9%) successful probation vs 9 (5.8%) of unsuccessful probation</p> <p>After one year: 11 (6.5%) vs. 14 (9% of successful probation vs. 20 (13%) unsuccessful probation</p> <p>For DWI offenses: 21 (12.5%) vs. 26 (16.7%) for successful probation vs. 32 (20.8%) for unsuccessful probation</p> <p>for Violent Offense: 4 (2.4%) vs. 12 (7.7%) for successful probation vs 9 (5.8% for unsuccessful probation</p> <p>Total Recidivism: 26 (15.5%) vs. 42 (27%) for successful probation) vs. 44 (28.5%) for unsuccessful probation</p>		
33	February 2005	Reviewed 27 evaluation reports of 39 adult drug court programs that met criteria for methodological soundness and other attributes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lower percentage of drug court participants than comparison group members rearrested or reconvicted; - Program participants had fewer recidivism events than comparison group members - Recidivism reductions occurred for participants who had committed different types of offenses - Inconclusive evidence that specific drug court components, such as. Behavior of judge or amount of treatment received, affected participants' recidivism while in program -recidivism reductions also occurred for some 		N/A

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

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results		
			Re-Arrests	Convictions	Time Followed
			period of time after participants completed drug court program in most of programs reporting these data		
34	April 2005	Studied every person who opted into one of the courts even if only stayed brief time; data base included 154 defendants who participated in programs (32 graduated; 63 active and 59 terminated without graduation; comparison group derived from case coordinators and observation in court; data derived from court case files and therapeutic courts data base		<p><u>Drug Court:</u> Both graduates and active participants had significantly fewer convictions during 2 years after opting into the program; those not in program had slightly more convictions during the two years after while those who opted out (were terminated) had fewer convictions during the two years after.</p> <p><u>DUI Court:</u> graduates and those active had fewer convictions during period after opting into the program than they had in the preceding two years; for those active in the program, the difference was significant; those who opted out of the program and those who were not in the program also had fewer convictions</p> <p><u>Bethel Therapeutic Court:</u> all groups saw reduction in convictions during the 2 years after the plea/opt in date. Reduction was statistically significant for those active in the program and for those who dropped out/opted out of the program.</p>	Two years following drug court participation (compared with two years prior to drug court entry)
35	April 2003	Used quasi-experimental matched control group design to estimate impact of drug court involvement on future criminal behavior- reviewed info on drug court participants and comparison group selected by each drug court using court maintained and self reported data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PARTICIPANTS: <u>Kootenai Co.:</u> drug court participants less likely (41%) than comparison group (53%) to be rearrested - majority of arrests for drug related offense (46% for drug court group and 55% for comparison group; 55% of drug court arrests vs. 46% of comparison arrests were for felonies - -10% of drug court participants arrested multiple times during follow up period vs. 24% of comparison group members arrested multiple times; 15% of drug court participants arrested at least twice in follow up period vs. 29% of comparison members - <u>Ada Co.:</u> - - Fewer (38%) of drug court participants 		<p>Kootenai Co: 1006 days (115 days post program)</p> <p>Ada Co.: participants: 851 days (2 yrs 4 mos) for drug court group and 660 days (1 year 8 months) for comparison group; graduates: 1084 days 1003 (terminated); 660 days for comparison group – graduates followed 5502 days (1 yr and 4 months) post graduation</p>

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

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results		
			Re-Arrests	Convictions	Time Followed
			<p>arrested vs. comparison group (63%). And fewer arrested for drug charge;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 22% of drug court vs 51% of comparison group arrested multiple times - GRADUATES: <u>Kootenai Co.</u>: 41 graduates: 7 (20%) arrested for new offense during follow up period of 1006 days (115 days post graduation) vs. 60% arrest rate for non graduates and 53% arrest rate for comparison group - <u>Ada Co.</u>: 17 of 91 graduates (19%) arrested following graduation vs. 77% for nongraduates and 63% for comparison group; 29% of graduates arrested for felony vs. 85% of nongraduates and 81% of comparison group; 		
36	July 2000	<p>Quasi-experimental matched control group study to assess program outcomes among drug court participants compared to similar group of drug addicted adults who did not participate in the drug court; data obtained through the following pretrial data and court docket info: (1) Pretrial Services: demographic, current offense, disposition and criminal history info; (2) treatment needs and participation from ADAPT program; (3) court reported violations, fees, community service and recidivism data from Probation Department; (4) recidivism data compiled by court.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 13% of participants arrested for new charge; - offenders in treatment group less likely (29% [sic]) to be rearrested than comparison group (39%) – new charge frequently drug charge for both groups <p>Graduates: Overall: 31% of graduates rearrested during 18 month follow up period : 23% of July 1996 graduates vs. 31% of participants rearrested; 35% of the October 1996 graduates; 63% of the March 1997 graduates; 29% of the June 1997 graduates and 31% of the November 1997 graduates have been rearrested since graduating;</p> <p><u>Other:</u></p> <p>majority of participants in all classes not arrested more than once during follow up period rear rest by gender generally similar</p>	<p>significantly more drug court participants were convicted of the offense for which they were arrested than the comparison group</p>	
37	March 2005	N/A		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Drug court graduates 74% less likely to return to prison than successful standard probation offenders; - Drug court graduates more than four times 	N/A

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

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results		
			Re-Arrests	Convictions	Time Followed
				(316%) less likely to recidivate than released prison inmates [Note: recidivism not defined but assume refers to convictions because of reference to “return to prison”]	
38	July 2001	Quasi-experimental matched comparison group design to estimate impact of drug court on future criminal involvement; comparison group of participants that had reported substance abuse problem and were eligible for the drug court; comparison group screened between November 1997 and April 2000	40% of drug court treatment group rearrested during follow up period vs. 52% of comparison group;; significantly more individuals in control group arrested on felony charge;		N/A
39	May 2003	Random assignment of eligible offenders to an experimental group that entered the Co. DUI/Drug Court and a control group processes through traditional cjs processing.	Control group committed 3 times as many offenses as DUI drug court participants each month		N/A
40	2005	Tracked 452 participants in probation track of drug court for any contact with cjs system following discharge (successful or unsuccessful) from program.	Drug court participants had total of 1,726 contacts with cjs after discharge, resulting in over 4,000 charges. (1/4 of participants had a violent criminal charge) <u>One year after discharge:</u> (1) failed clients significantly more likely to have made some contact with cjs and have been arrested for felony crime than graduates; (2) four times as many of the failed clients had been incarcerated within the 12-month period than had program graduates <u>Three years after discharge:</u> similar findings; 80% of participants who failed program had some period of incarceration vs. 1/3 of the clients who graduated. Rates of overall arrests and types of charges didn’t differ by graduation status at either 12 month or 36 month period. Participants with violent criminal history: significantly more likely to recidivate with serious		Generally 12 months and 36 months but ranged from 5 months to over 6 years, depending upon how much time had elapsed since participant was discharged from program and time study was conducted.

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

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results		
			Re-Arrests	Convictions	Time Followed
			offenses during program participation than persons with nonviolent criminal history; at 12 month e=period, offenders with history of violent criminal offending significantly more likely to have any contact with cjs (67%) than participants with no previous violent criminal history (42%). Violent offenders, compared with nonviolent offenders, recidivate more and with more serious types of offenses during active program participation and after program discharge. However, violent offenders who graduated were significantly less likely to recidivate than their violent counterparts who didn't complete the program.		
41	2004	Tracked sources of referrals and demographics, progress and recidivism of enrollees in female and male drug court programs from inception through December 31, 2004	N/A	<u>Females:</u> 85%(172)of women who completed program had no subsequent convictions within 3 years of program completion; 15% (30) were convicted of new misdemeanor or felony offenses <u>Males</u> 156 (85%) of graduates had no subsequent convictions within 3 years of program completion; 27 (15%) were convicted of new misdemeanor or felony offense within 3 years of program completion	Females and Males: 3 years following program completion.
42	April 2004	Contacted participants 12 months after recruitment in the study; given two assessment tools; a face-to-face structured interview to collect demographic and other nonsensitive info and a self administered questionnaire, including questions relating to drug use and other sensitive info.	Current information system precluded tracking drug treatment court as well as comparison group participants for recidivism; Self reports from participants in study group of drug court participants indicated: (1) antisocial/illicit behavior reduced from 76.5% prior to admission to 17.5% 12 months after admission; (2) proportion of participants reporting possession, selling or distributing drugs reduced from 55.9% prior to admission to 7.5% after admission; (3) drug court participants showed significantly more improvement than comparison groups in reported illicit/antisocial behavior although there was a marked reduction in antisocial/illicit behaviors among both groups.	Current information system precluded tracking drug treatment court as well as comparison group participants for recidivism	One year after program entry

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

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results		
			Re-Arrests	Convictions	Time Followed
43	September 2005 (interim report)	Transactional and Institutional Cost Analysis- (1) determine flow/process; (2) identify transactions; (3) identify agencies involved; (4) determine resources used; (5) identify costs associates; (6) calculate cost results	17% for graduates 29% for all participants 41% for comparison group [- note: -not clear whether recidivism refers to arrests or convictions]		
44	January 2005	Examined participant info through existing administrative data bases (Oregon Drug Court Case Management System; Oregon Judicial Information System and data from treatment provider)	-Average no. or re-arrests for males and female participants in the 24 months following program entry less than corresponding period prior to entry (16% rearrested: 19% of men and 10% of women, compared with 100% arrests during prior 2 year period; - significant reduction in drug related re-arrests during 24 months following program entry; males rearrested for more drug related crimes than females but both genders had fewer drug related arrests	N/A	24 months following program entry
45	January 2005	Examined participant info through existing administrative data bases (Oregon Drug Court Case Management System; Oregon Judicial Information System and data from treatment provider)	13% of all 62 drug court participants were rearrested sometime within the 2 years after drug court entry compared with 27% (more than double) of the comparison group.	N/A	24 months following program entry
46	July 2003	-Tracked use of court, district attorney, public defender, law enforcement, correctional and probation services by drug court and comparison group; assesses costs overall and by agency; - detailed data collected by tracking drug and drug court-eligible offenders in terms of resources consumed in court sessions, attorney visits, and treatment sessions (using stop watches to time	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results		
			Re-Arrests	Convictions	Time Followed
		events)			
47	March 2004				
48	June 14, 2006	Compared receipt of alcohol and other drug treatment services; probation revocations; recidivism (new arrests and new convictions) and incarceration of drug court participants and comparison group	Drug court participants (graduates and nongraduates) were 13% less likely to be arrested; Drug court participants remained arrest free for 15% longer (410 days vs 356 for comparison group) GRADUATES: were 33% less likely to be arrested; remained arrest free for 25% longer time	Drug court participants had 34% fewer convictions GRADUATES had 47% fewer convictions	One year after entry into drug court
49	April 2006	Used data from Florida Department of Law Enforcement to obtain recidivism info; Dev. Cost analysis based on treatment costs vs costs of crime	16% (2) of the 12 grads arrested within 12 months for tech viol of prob; 8.3% (1) grad arrested 12 mos after grad. 12% (2) of 12 grads charged within 12 mos for tech violation of probation (83 % had no arrests for 12 mos).		One year following program termination (successful or unsuccessful)
50	Spring 2006	Experimental design using random assignment of 235 drug court-eligible defendants assigned to drug court and traditional adjudication during 1997 and 1998	78.4% of drug court participants rearrested during 3 year period compared with 87.3% for comparison group; <u>average no. Of new arrests:</u> 2.3 for drug court participants; 3.4 for comparison group <u>new violent or sex charge:</u> 14.4% for drug court participants; 24.7% for comparison group <u>new drug charge:</u> 55.5% for drug court participant; 68.4% for comparison group	58.3% drug court participants vs. 64.4% nondrug court participants average no. of convictions: 1.2 for drug court participants; 1.3 for comparison group	Three years following program entry
51	April 2005	Selected nine adult drug courts, based on “drug court maturity” and data collection capabilities and diversity of demographic and geographic representation.; used longitudinal data collection approach to track study participants over 4-year period; conducted	<u>El Monte:</u> .90 vs. 1.96 (-3%) <u>Monterey:</u> 3.65 vs. 3.05 (20% increase) <u>Orange Co.-Laguna Niguel:</u> 1.65 vs. 3.25: 30% decrease <u>Orange Co-Santa Ana:</u> 2.74 per drug court vs. 2.65 comparison group (3% greater) <u>San Joaquin Co.:</u> 3.27 vs. 4.54 (28% reduction) <u>Stanislaus Co. :</u> 1.89 vs. 2.53 (25% reduction)	N/A	Four years from time of program entry

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

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results		
			Re-Arrests	Convictions	Time Followed
		“transactional and Institutional Cost Analysis (TICA) entailing: 1. Document drug court and nondrug court processes; 2. Identify transactions occurring within each process; 3. Identify agencies involved in each transaction; 4. Determine resources used in each transaction; 5. Isolate cost of the resources; and 6. Calculate overall costs.			
52	August 2001	Initially used experimental design; then selected “post hoc comparison group of presumptively eligible defendants” after public defender objected to original design	Participants showed lowest rear rest rate: (21%) in a 6- month period Participants showed lowest rate of felony arrests Participants rearrested for drug offenses less often (17%) than defendants who declined treatment and 27% over a year period	N/A	Six and 12 months following arraignment
53	July 2005	Outcome: Used existing databases on criminal activity, treatment utilization to determine participants’ arrest histories prior to and following program entry Cost: used Or. Dr Ct Case Mgt Sys, and data from treatment provider	Drug court participation reduced recidivism; average number of rearrests for males and females during 24 month period following program entry less than rate prior to program entry; Reduction in rearrests greater for females who had more arrests prior to program entry than males	N/A	Up to 24 months following program entry (minimum of 12 months)
54	September 2006	Identified sample of participants entering drug court between January 2002 – December 2003 and developed comparison group of persons eligible but failed to participate; used data from multiple sources, including observations, team meetings, interviews, agency budgets, and other financial data bases and agency files.	Drug court participants significantly less likely to be rearrested than offenders eligible for drug court but not participating; -females rearrested more than males during first few months of program but significantly less likely to be rearrested in 2 years following program entry	N/A	24 months following program entry

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

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results		
			Re-Arrests	Convictions	Time Followed
55	September 2006	Identified sample of participants entering drug court from time of implementation in 2001 through July 1, 2004 and developed comparison group of persons eligible but (1) couldn't enter in 2001 because of program's incapacity; and (2) eligible subsequently but did not participate	All Drug court participants (graduates and terminated) significantly less likely to be rearrested than comparison group; Drug court participants rearrested less than half as often as comparison group members ; -graduates rearrested approximately one third as often as comparison groups and overall were rearrested very rarely - for first 21 months after program entry drug court graduates did not commit any new offenses - 4% of graduates and 26% of all participants were rearrested in 24 months following program entry compared with 50% of comparison group	N/A	24 months after program entry
56	March 2004	Compiled statistical data on drug court participants' demographics, criminal history and progress in drug court and comparable data for comparison group	-Drug court participants/graduates generally had lower recidivism rates than drug court failures and traditionally adjudicated offenders; - participants/graduates had a lower likelihood of arrest or conviction for failure to appear, a lower likelihood of arrest or conviction for a new felony offense and a lower likelihood of being incarcerated for a new crime. -Participants/graduates more likely than traditionally adjudicated offenders to be arrested for or convicted of a misdemeanor but less likely to be convicted of a felony	(see "re-arrests")	12 months following program entry
57	November 2001	Sample of drug court participants from January 5, 1998 – April 30, 2000 in two groups: 77 successful completers between February 23, 1999 and dropouts and 78 matched control group	<u>Overall:</u> Graduates had lowest rearrest rate (15.6%); dropouts' rearrest was 30.7%; control group had highest rearrests (48.7%) <u>Drug Charges:</u> Graduates had lowest rearrest rates for drug charges (9.1%) vs dropouts *(15.8%) and control group had highest (24.4%) <u>Length of Stay:</u> Participants who remained in program had .96 rearrests; participants who remained in 91-270 days had .42 arrests and participants who remained in treatment 270 or more days had .38 rearrests		27 months; overall recidivism 12 months following discharge for drug arrests

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

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results		
			Re-Arrests	Convictions	Time Followed
58	January 2003	Tracked 501 participants in drug courts in Dallas, Jefferson and Travis Counties between 1998-1999 and 285 offenders eligible but not participating in drug courts	Drug court graduates had 28.5% recidivism rates vs 65.1% for noncompleters and 56.8% for comparison group; rearrest for all drug court participants was 40.5%		Three years
59	October 2003	Tracks progress of 64 participants in Douglas County, Neb. Drug Court	Drug court participants who complete residential treatment component have lower rearrest rates		12 months following program entry
60	December 2004	Tracks progress of 116 participants in Douglas County, Neb. Drug Court	Completion of residential treatment is associated with significant reductions in general arrests as well as post-treatment drug use		24 months of program operation
61	March 31, 2004	Tracks cost benefits resulting from approximately 300 participants in Douglas County drug court	Drug court participants had 132 fewer misdemeanor and 60 fewer felony arrests than comparison group	--	24 months
62	February 2007	Compiled new arrests and convictions from the Alaska Department of Public Safety for each of the offenders who participated in the Anchorage DUI Court, the Anchorage Felony Drug Court and the Bethel Therapeutic Court for at least a one year period following program termination and, for comparison group, following service of sentence and any custody	13% of graduates rearrested within one year after completion vs. 32% rearrest rate for comparison offenders and 38% rearrest rate of offenders charged with felonies in 1999 Participants in the Anchorage Felony DUI Court less likely to be rearrested than those in the Anchorage Felony Drug Court and Bethel Therapeutic Court	No participants who were reconvicted within the first year were convicted of an offense at a more serious level than the one on which they entered the therapeutic courts vs. 3% of the comparison offenders and 15% for 1999 offenders No participant was convicted of a drug or sexual offense	One year following program termination
63	October 2006	Compiled “recidivism” data for first 146 SITC participants arrested from March 2002 – June 2005; obtained “recidivism” data through December 2005, resulting in all participants being tracked for at least months; 123 participants	SITC produced substantial reduction in recidivism at both 1-year and 18-month periods. - After 1 year, 26% of drug court participants vs. 48% of comparison group were rearrested; - after 18 months, 41% of SITC participants vs. 55% of comparison group were rearrested drug court participants averaged .63 rearrests over 18month period vs. 1.19 for comparison group. Drug court also appeared to delay onset of	-18 month reconviction rate was 23% for drug court participants and 45% for comparison group – drug court therefore reduced reconviction rate by 44%	6 months, 12 months and 18 months after arrest for drug court charge

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

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results		
			Re-Arrests	Convictions	Time Followed
		tracked for 1-year and 102 participants tracked for 18 months.; tracked comparison group for felony drug charges only; used NY State Div. of Criminal Justice Services (DCJS) arrest and conviction data but results are presented in terms of re-arrests.	recidivism for those that weren't arrested during the first year.		
64	2007	Tenn. Office of Crim Just Programs, Dept. of Finance and Admin., compiled data from 45 operating drug courts regarding performance standards identified for measurement	-Of 1,614 participants, 9% (146) arrested during FY 2005/2006; of the 5,958 participants served since inception, -413 arrested while in the program (7%) in all 37 programs responding. - 56 of the 188 (30%) graduates in 2004/2005 in 22 programs reporting were rearrested within one year of graduation. 2004-4: 61 (35%) graduates of the 174 total graduates (17 programs) rearrested within 2 years of graduation. [four juvenile drug courts reported overall 30% one year post graduation recidivism and 13% 2-year post graduation recidivism.		
65	2007	Compiled data from existing adult (and juvenile— reported separately) programs	Rearrested: 27.9% vs. graduates: 13.7%		January 1 – June 30, 2005
66	April 2007	Tracked data from 11,000 cases through various administrative data systems; focus of analysis was on overall impact of drug court on target population over time; cost analysis based on transactional method and overall investment of taxpayer money compared to benefits derived	Recidivism reduced for drug court participants up to 14 years after drug court entry compared with those who didn't participate; rearrests reduced by almost 30%; Recidivism reductions continued to be evidenced for up to 14 years after the petition hearing.		At least 5 years and, for some, up to 15 years following drug court entry

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

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results		
			Re-Arrests	Convictions	Time Followed
67	April 2007	Na	All graduates had substantially lower re-arrest rates and, at 4 of the 5 programs, all participants had significantly lower re-arrest rates. - # 1: 10% grads, 30% all parties, 39% compare. - # 2: 18%, 43%, 41% - # 3: 7%; 20%; 39% - # 4: 12%; 18%; 34% - # 5: 11%; 17%; 33%		Two years after program entry
68	Fall 2005	Conducted interviews with 99 participants selected to participate who were in different stages of treatment: 34 in motivation; 39 in intensive phase; 18 in maintenance phase; and 89 in post treatment phase	N/A	N/A	Nine months
69	Spring 2008	Review of data compiled in 2005 study and interviews with participants randomly assigned to drug court and alternative program 3 years following program participation	N/A	N/A	3 years following program participation
70	January 2008	Review of information compiled in data collection system; interviews with staff	N/A	N/A	N/A
71	August 1, 2006	Review of program operations of five adult drug court, including referrals, acceptances, time to program entry, sanctions, drug testing, etc.	Adult drug court participants less likely than comparison group to be rearrested on felony charges and less likely to commit violent crimes 17.5% recidivism among drug court participants vs. 33.1% in comparison group	N/A	12 months post program
72	August 2007	203 individual records of drug court participants who both successfully completed (79) as well as failed (50) the drug court program compared with control group (74)	St. Louis Co.: completers arrested less than half as often as control group; Dodge County: no arrests of any completers; Streams Co.: drug court completers arrested less than one fourth as frequently as control group; estimate drug court saved 133.7 arrests and 47.2 convictions during period	Convictions: Similar findings as for arrests	2 years post program

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

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results		
			Re-Arrests	Convictions	Time Followed
73	September 2008	Utilized web-based tool for self evaluation re costs an benefits developed for earlier phases of study; focus on measuring costs of events in drug court process, including court appearances and drug tests; number of group and individual sessions; number of days in residential treatment; number of jail days as sanction; outcome benefits measured in terms of rearrests, number of days on probation or in prison due to recidivism; number of new court cases, etc.	43% rearrest rate for graduates;57% rarest rate for all drug court participants; vs. 67% rearrest rate for comparison group	N/A	Two years following termination
74	January 1, 2004	Part of Maine’s ongoing review of drug court operations; analysis of offender characteristics and data associated with drug court performance; also interviews with judges, probation staff and others	N/A – see nos. 68 and 71 for follow up studies	N/A – see nos. 68 and 71 for follow up studies	N/A – see nos. 68 and 71 for follow up studies
75	March 2009	Analyzed drug court data collected by drug court case managers, including demographic data, treatment data, data on court proceedings and also gathered feedback from drug court staff	One graduate charged with new crime	N/A	First three years of program operation: focus primarily on program operations and period of participation
76	January 2009	Examined drug court processes to determine how well 10 key components were implemented; compared program practices to national data; collected info from staff interviews, drug court participant focus groups; observations and	23% of graduates and 61% of all participants were rearrested following entry into drug court vs. 84% of comparison group members. Drug court participants (including graduates) had: (1) 3 times fewer drug charges in the 3 years following program entry; (2) 3 times fewer violent charges; (3) nearly half as many re-arrests; and (4) significantly reduced drug use over time	N/A	36 months following program entry

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

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results		
			Re-Arrests	Convictions	Time Followed
		program documents, including handbook; Outcome analysis based on cohort of drug court participants who entered program been January 1, 2004 – July 31, 2007 and comparison group; tracked participants and comparison groups through criminal justice and treatment databases for up to 36 months post drug court entry.; Cost evaluation: used NPC’s Transactional and Institutional Cost Analysis approach (TICA), looking at transactions in which individual utilizes resources contributed from multiple agencies; also used a “cost to-taxpayer” approach			
77	April 2008	Extracted data from three nationally representative sources (National Survey on Drug Use and Health (NSDUH), Arestee Drug Abuse Monitoring (ADAM) and Drug abuse Treatment Outcome Study (DATOS) to develop a “synthetic dataset” from which cost benefit predictions could be made re various policy options to offer/expand drug court services	N/A	N/A	N/A
78	March 2008	Data were abstracted from several sources including site visits, the Criminal History Records (CHR) database maintained by the Michigan	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	N/A	Minimum 1 year

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

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results		
			Re-Arrests	Convictions	Time Followed
		State Police and the Michigan Judicial Warehouse (JDW). All of these data were entered into a database created in Microsoft Access.	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 participants and were re-arrested four times more often in the second year.		
79	April 2008	Both the participant and comparison groups were examined through existing administrative databases for a period up to 24 months from the date of drug court entry. The two groups were matched on age, sex, race, prior drug use history and criminal history (including total prior arrests and total prior drug arrests). The methods used to gather this information from each source are described in detail in the main report	HCADC program participants were significantly less likely to be re-arrested than offenders who were eligible for the program but did not participate. Figure A shows the average number of re-arrests for 24 months after entering the drug court program for HCADC graduates, all HCADC participants, and the comparison group. Drug court participants, regardless of graduation status, were re-arrested significantly less often than were the comparison group members.	N/A	24 months maximum, 6 months minimum
80	March 2008	For each drug court, NPC Research identified program samples of participants who enrolled in the adult drug court programs over a specified time period (at least 2 years). These were generally elected using the drug court program database. NPC also identified a sample of individuals eligible for drug court but who did not participate ² and received traditional court processing. Both groups were examined through existing administrative databases for a period of at least 24	N/A	N/A	24 months post drug court entry

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

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results		
			Re-Arrests	Convictions	Time Followed
		months post drug court entry.			
81	April 2007	Data on intermediate and long-term outcomes were gathered on each offender, with a particular emphasis on criminal recidivism (re-arrest) as a primary outcomes measure. The outcome data were drawn in late 2005 and early 2006, allowing a minimum of 5 years of follow-up on all cohorts and over 10 years on many cohorts. (For some individuals, over 14 years of follow-up data were available). Data on internal measures of Drug Court participation, internal changes in the Drug Court over the years and external changes in the criminal justice, court and substance abuse treatment systems were also gathered for the same period. Data on costs were gathered using a modified Transactional Cost Analysis Approach to allow us to conduct a cost-benefit analysis. Costs were calculated from a previous study on this program that involved intensive tracking of 155 individuals that entered the Multnomah County Court System on drug court-eligible charges. Costs were calculated in	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 incidence of re-arrest was reduced by nearly 30%. The Drug Court reduces the incidence of drug crimes substantially for up to 14 years after the petition hearing. The effect is statistically significant after controlling for age, gender, race, and 2 years of prior criminal history for all but year 14, where the number of cases available for the analysis drops to only 317	NA	Ten years

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

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results		
			Re-Arrests	Convictions	Time Followed
		terms of investment costs (transactions associated with the drug court-eligible case), outcome costs (transactions that occurred after participants entered the program, not associated with the drug court-eligible case) and total costs per participant.			
82	March 2007	Information was acquired for this evaluation from several sources, including observations of court sessions and team meetings during site visits, key informant interviews, and data collection from administrative databases used by the GADC program, Probation, and the Court.	GADC program participants were significantly less likely to come through the court system again than offenders who were eligible for the program but did not participate. Figure 2 provides the average number of new criminal court cases per year for GADC graduates, all participants, and the comparison group over a 3-year period. The differences between the groups are significant at all three time periods. Guam Adult Drug Court participants (regardless of whether they graduated from the program) came back through the court system 4 times less often than comparison group members who were eligible for drug court but did not attend. Graduates recidivated 15 times less often than the comparison group.	N/A	12 months
83	April 2007	Information was acquired from several sources, including observations of court sessions and team meetings during site visits, key informant interviews, focus groups, drug court database, plus state and county records. The methods used to gather this information are described in detail in the main report	The MCDTC reduced recidivism. MCDTC participants were significantly less likely to be re-arrested than offenders who were eligible for the program but did not participate	N/A	24 months
84	November 2006	A Transactional Institutional Costs Analysis (TICA) approach was used, allowing researchers to calculate costs	On average, drug court participants had a recidivism rate 12% lower than similar offenders who did not participate in the drug court program. The comparison groups of those who did not	N/A	The drug court cohorts were selected from participants who entered the drug court programs between January 1998 and

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

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results		
			Re-Arrests	Convictions	Time Followed
		based on every individual's transactions within the drug court or the traditional criminal justice system. This methodology also allows the calculation of costs and benefits by agency (e.g., Public Defender's office, court, District Attorney).	participate in drug court programs were more than twice as likely as drug court graduates to be re-arrested. This provides evidence that drug courts are successfully reaching their goal of reducing recidivism in drug-addicted offenders.		December 1999, which provided at least four years of outcome data.
85	September 2006	Information was acquired for this evaluation from several sources, including observations of court sessions and team meetings during site visits, key informant interviews, agency budgets and other financial documents. Data was also gathered from BCADC and other agency files and databases.	BCADC program participants were significantly less likely to be re-arrested than offenders who were eligible for the program but did not participate. Barry County Adult Drug Court participants (regardless of whether they graduate from the program) were re-arrested less than half as often as comparison group members who were eligible for drug court but did not attend. Graduates were re-arrested approximately a third as often as the comparison group, and overall were re-arrested very rarely.	N/A	24 months
86	February 2006	To make this determination, NPC obtained a dataset of juvenile drug court participants through the cooperation of the Department of Juvenile Services (DJS). This dataset provided records of all formal adjudicated charges that juvenile drug court participants accrued both before and after their experience in drug court.	In the year following their release from drug court, only 29% of these juveniles had any adjudicated charges added to their records. This result means that 70% of the juveniles had no adjudicated charges added to their records in the year after their release.	N/A	1year
87	July 2005	The cost study followed the pre-post program design started in the outcome evaluation	Overall, it appeared that participation in S.A.F.E. Court was beneficial to participants and to the criminal justice system. The average number of re-arrests for males and females combined in the	N/A	24 months pre and post Safe court

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

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results		
			Re-Arrests	Convictions	Time Followed
		due to difficulties in finding the data necessary to select an appropriate comparison group. Costs were determined using NPC Research's Transactional and Institutional Cost Analysis (TICA) methodology, which views offenders' interactions with the criminal justice system (e.g., court hearings, treatment sessions) as transactions during which system resources are consumed	24-month period following entry into the program is less than the corresponding period prior to their entry into the program. That is, S.A.F.E. Court participants are re-arrested less often after entering the program. (This difference is statistically significant at 6, 12, and 18 months.) This was particularly true for females who have, on average, more arrests prior to S.A.F.E. Court than the males but were re-arrested far fewer times after entry into the program than males.		
88	July 2003	The overall research design was to collect highly detailed data on a small, randomly selected sample of individuals who were eligible for drug court. These individuals (some of whom participated in drug court and some who received traditional court processing) would be tracked intensively through both the criminal justice and drug court treatment system for the purpose of collecting more detailed data than is generally available in administrative datasets. These highly detailed data would then be used to augment administrative data collected at an individual level on a much larger sample of drug court and non-drug	N/A-	N/A	30 months after program

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

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results		
			Re-Arrests	Convictions	Time Followed
		court participants. The detailed data were collected by tracking drug court eligible offenders into court sessions, attorney visits and treatment sessions			
89	February 2004	The research strategy used by NPC Research for this outcome evaluation was to identify a sample of participants who entered Drug Court and a matched historical comparison sample of individuals who were eligible for Drug Court but who received traditional court processing before the CCJDC program was implemented. Because this drug court is both small and relatively new (beginning late in 2001), the Drug Court sample consisted of the entire Drug Court participant population except for those who had entered the Drug Court less than 6 months from the time of the outcome data collection. Both groups were examined through existing administrative databases from the date of the initial contact with the Drug Court program (or the equivalent) through November 2003	Drug Court participants are re-referred much less often than individuals who did not participate in the Program. In the first three months, Drug Court participants are re-referred more than twice as often as the comparison group members.	N/A	18 months
90	April 2007	Information was acquired from several sources, including observations of court sessions and team meetings during site	The VCDRDC reduced recidivism as participants were significantly less likely to be rearrested than offenders who were eligible for the program but did not participate. As Figure A illustrates, VCDRDC participants	N/A	24 months

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

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results		
			Re-Arrests	Convictions	Time Followed
		visits, key informant interviews, focus groups, drug court database, plus state and county records	were re-arrested less often than comparison group members who were eligible for drug court but did not attend. The 24-month recidivism rate for drug court was 29.5% while the comparison group rate was 39.2%. Thus, drug court participants (regardless of graduation status) were 33% less likely to have had any arrests in the 24-month follow-up period relative to the comparison group (regardless of graduation status).		
91	April 2007	Information was acquired from several sources, including observations of court sessions and team meetings during site visits, key informant interviews, focus groups, drug court database, plus state and county records	The VCDC reduced recidivism as participants were significantly less likely to be rearrested than the comparison group. As Figure A illustrates, VCDC participants were re-arrested less often than comparison group members. The 24-month recidivism rate for drug court was 19.7% while the comparison group rate was 39.2%. Thus, drug court participants (regardless of graduation status) were 99% less likely to have had any arrests in the 24-month follow-up period relative to the comparison group. Even after excluding individuals with alcohol as their drug of choice from the VCDC (leaving mainly methamphetamine users), the number of re-arrests over 24 months was lower than for the comparison group.	N/A	24 months
92	April 2007	Information was acquired from several sources, including observations of court sessions and team meetings during site visits, key informant interviews, focus groups, Court Substance Abuse Program (CSAP) records which includes drug court data, plus arrest records.	The SJCDC significantly reduced recidivism. Participants were significantly less likely to be re-arrested than offenders who were eligible for the program but did not participate. As Figure A illustrates, St. Joseph County Drug Court Program participants were re-arrested less often than comparison group members who were eligible for drug court but did not attend. The 24-month recidivism rate for drug court was 18.2% while the comparison group rate was 33.6%. Thus, drug court participants (regardless of graduation status) were 54% less likely to have had any arrests in the 24 months following drug court entry than the comparison group.	N/A	24 months

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

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results		
			Re-Arrests	Convictions	Time Followed
93	November 2009	Residents were tracked and interviewed using court databases and personal interviews.	As of now only ten people in the program have recidivated/	N/A	One year Post graduate
94	April 2010	Variables in the drug court data base were examined; definitions of substance use variables were coded; “failure” rather than “success to complete” drug court was chose as basis for analysis for policy reasons because (1) failures are of particular policy interest to stakeholders; determining which subgroups may be most vulnerable to treatment failure may assist in identifying additional resources needed; (2) “not failing” is not necessarily equivalent to “succeeding”. Which may include persons who transfer to another track or who voluntarily withdraw	NA	NA	NA
95	March 2009	Samples extracted from comparisons between reorg and former drug courts based on case filing dates. 2007/08 drug court sample was all drug court cases filed in Denver between March 9, 2007 and March 9, 2008. The 2005-06 former drug court sample defined as all cases filed between March 9, 2005 and March 9, 2006. Primary data sources were Denver’s District Court and County Court databases; additional data from Denver Co. Jail, Probation and case	Recidivism rate (NOT DEFINED IN REPORT) for 2005 sample for graduates was 6.6%, significantly lower than rate for nongraduates (12.4%); no info available for 2007 sample	(Recidivism not defined in report)	One year

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

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results		
			Re-Arrests	Convictions	Time Followed
		filings from State AOC.			
96	December 2008	Application of NPC transactional and institutional cost analysis approach – views an individual’s interaction with publicly funded agencies as set of transactions in which individual utilizes resources contributed from multiple agencies; for drug courts, these include resources such as judge time, defense attorney time, court facilities, urine cups; court appearances and drug tests are transactions; questions to be answered include: total cjs costs invested in drug court? Costs to each agency? Cost-benefits associated with drug court? Benefits for each agency? Which expenditures provide taxpayers with best return on their money?	Drug court graduates: 17% All drug court participants: 47% Comparison group: 67%	N/A	Two years following termination
97	April 15, 2010	Kansas City Municipal Drug Court staff administered, collected, entered and stored all program instruments and data in the Drug Court Access Database. Program data were then provided to RDI for analysis and reporting of outcome measures. It should be noted that while results are presented using the word <i>clients</i> or <i>participants</i> , this wording can be misleading.	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results		
			Re-Arrests	Convictions	Time Followed
		Due to clients having multiple referrals or multiple admissions, results are actually presented by cases unless otherwise noted.			
98	February, 2010	The Grant County, IN study follows the participants of the drug court over the first 4 years of operation (January 2005-December 2008), using data available through the program	<p><u>Reduction in Recidivism Rates:</u> -Within the first 4 years, of the 179 participants who entered drug court, 78 (46.3%) had new arrests -Average time out for participants is 43 months compared to the comparison group (32.5 months) -31.9% reduction in recidivism</p> <p>Estimated prevention of re-arrest for 35 individuals</p> <p><u>Recidivism Rate for DC Graduates:</u> -Among 16 cohorts 87 (48.9%) of participants have graduated -Recidivism rate among graduates is 19.5% -Recidivism rate for discharged DC graduates was 80.3% -Results reiterate the importance of DC team persistence in promoting graduation of participants -No significant differences were observed between Caucasian and African-American participants in terms of program outcomes: termination, graduation and rearrest.</p>	N/A	<p>Appears to be four years from initial arrest prior to entry into drug court; <u>New Arrests for Graduates by Time on DC Program:</u> -<u>Among graduates in the program</u> -Less than one year-0/6 new arrests -In the program 12-16 months-6/32 had a new arrest -In the program 16 months or more-11/39 had a new arrest</p> <p><u>Temporal Recidivism Patterns for DC Participants:</u> - Within first 4 years-of the 74 total participants who were rearrested- - 4 (5.5%) had new arrests within six months of initial arrest -13 (17.8%) were rearrested within 1 year of initial arrest -37 (50.7%) were rearrested within 2 years of initial arrest -53 (72.6%) were rearrested within 3 years of initial arrest -The remaining 27.4% of rearrests occurred over 4 years after the initial arrest -Average time from initial arrest to rearrest was 775 days -Average lag time (from arrest to start of DC is 193 days</p>
99	July 2008	Compared results for 91 drug court participants (44 graduates and 47 failures) with 45 Opt out group of eligible indivs who didn't	Reduced recidivism and reconviction for treatment group but significantly higher costs to criminal justice system and victims; BUT: opt in group had significantly lower likelihood of rearrests and reconvictions and significantly fewer members		24, 30, 36 and 48 months

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

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results														
			Re-Arrests	Convictions	Time Followed												
		participate and 141 individuals in comparison group who were eligible but had no contact with program	rearrested and reconvicted throughout follow up period														
100	August 2009	Tracked participants in Iowa's 6 adult and 3 juvenile drug courts enrolled in 2003	<p>Graduates in judge model had 38% cumulative recidivism rate compared to 48% panel graduates; Panel graduates only had 6% cumulative felony recidivism rate vs. 17% for judge model graduates</p> <p>Graduates in both groups had far less likely to recidivate after drug court admission and had lower cumulative recidivism rates than failures.</p> <p>Successful drug court participants far less likely to recidivate after program admission and took longer to commit new felony offense than the other groups;</p> <p>Participants in judge model far less likely to recidivate faster drug court admission and took longer to commit new felony offense</p>		3 years												
101	February 22, 2010	Tracked participants of both programs over designated periods of time.	N/A	<p>Few completers had new jail days during the 12 months after leaving treatment; many non-completers also remained out of jail 12 months after leaving; explained by time in treatment for non-completers;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants who were successful averaged 600 days in treatment. • Participants who were unsuccessful averaged 288 days in treatment, with 73% spending three months or more in treatment; • Thus, many participants who were not successful still received a considerable amount of treatment and appear to have benefitted from it. <p>Jail Days during 12 months after SATC:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Successful (n=43)</th> <th>Unsuccessful (n=18)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>No jail days</td> <td>91%</td> <td>83%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1 or more</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Jail Days</td> <td>9%</td> <td>17%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Successful (n=43)	Unsuccessful (n=18)	No jail days	91%	83%	1 or more			Jail Days	9%	17%	<p>For the SATC-12 Months after graduation.</p> <p>For the MARS enhanced drug court: 131 clients followed during first year. 56 follow up assessments at 6 months.</p>
	Successful (n=43)	Unsuccessful (n=18)															
No jail days	91%	83%															
1 or more																	
Jail Days	9%	17%															

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

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results		
			Re-Arrests	Convictions	Time Followed
102	May 2004	Using the seven goals for the program , interviewed program coordinator and extracted data from (Office of Court Administration’s Universal Treat Application (UTA) data base..	Two of the 104 (subtracting the 21 “New DA, Ineligible arrest” cases) participants were re-arrested while still in the FCDC program. This represents .02% of participants. However, it is highly recommended that longer term data be collected to determine how many FCDC graduates are re-arrested after graduation.	N/A	N/A
103	<i>Dated sometime after June 1, 2006.</i>	Open ended qualitative interviews conducted with core team members; District Court Judge, Ninth District Public Defender, Assistant Crow Wing County Attorney, Investigator from the Crow Wing County Sheriff Department, Central Minnesota Community Corrections Agent, and Drug Court Coordinator. Data collected during the interviews organized around three primary process topics (1) alignment between program design and program implementation, (2) alignment with the 10 Key Components, and (3) barriers to implementation and strategies to address those barriers.	As of the date of this evaluation, none of the 25 program participants have been re-arrested for new offenses. The recidivism rate is zero for the first cohort during the first year.	N/A	Clients were evaluated starting June 1, 2006 and were followed as the first “cohort.” [Information tends to indicate that clients were followed for one year, though it is not expressly written in the report.]
104	2008	Review of program information maintained by the program	Six year recidivism study of 2003 drug court clients found that, regardless of program outcome, participant arrest rates declined 37%; drug court graduates experienced a 73% decrease in arrest rates	N/A	N/A
105	2008	utilized a quasi-experimental matched comparison group design to estimate the impact of drug courts on future criminal involvement. Three distinct types of drug courts were evaluated: 1) Common	For each court type, drug court clients fared significantly better than comparison group members in terms of re-arrest. Approximately 32% of the common pleas drug court clients were re-arrested versus 44% of the comparison group.	N/A	provides a snapshot of participants processed through ten courts between 1997 and 2000; average follow-up period was 21.4 months for the common pleas courts, 25.6 months for municipal drug courts, and 27.7 months for the juvenile

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

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results		
			Re-Arrests	Convictions	Time Followed
		pleas (felony); 2) Municipal (misdemeanor); and 3) juvenile. Random assignments to groups was not feasible; however, in order to develop the comparison group, the groups were matched with regard to selected demographic characteristics as well as the presence of a substance abuse problem.			courts.
106	<i>Not indicated</i>	Five meta-analyses were performed on the effects of adult drug courts. These meta analyses included several randomized controlled trials and dozens of quasi-experimental studies.	N/A	N/A	N/A
107	2008	Information obtained for the process evaluation component from several sources, including observations of a court session and a team meeting during a site visit, key stakeholder interviews, a focus group with participants, and program materials. The methods used to gather information from each source are described [in the report].	N/A	N/A	N/A
108	December 2009	Univariate analysis of variance was performed to compare the mean number of re-arrests for the DTC and comparison groups. The means comparing the DTC and comparison groups were adjusted for any differences	In the 12 months following entry into the program, 16% of all DTC participants and 6% of graduates were re-arrested, while 40% of the comparison group members were re-arrested. At the 24-month time period, the pattern continued, with 30% of all program participants having been re-arrested and 17% of graduates and compared to 48% of comparison group individuals.	N/A	2 year period

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

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results		
			Re-Arrests	Convictions	Time Followed
		between the groups on gender, age at eligible arrest, race/ethnicity, number of prior arrests, type of prior arrests, type of eligible arrest, and time at risk to re-offend. Crosstabs were run to examine differences in recidivism rates, i.e., the percentage of individuals re-arrested, between the DTC and comparison groups. Chi-square analyses were used to identify any significant differences in re-arrest rates between DTC and comparison groups.			
109	January 2010	Univariate analysis of variance was performed to compare the mean number of re-arrests for ADC and comparison groups. The means comparing the ADC and comparison groups were adjusted for any differences between the groups on gender, age at eligible arrest, race/ethnicity, number of prior arrests, type of prior arrests present, type of eligible arrests present, and time at risk to re-offend. Crosstabs were run to examine differences in re-arrest rates, i.e., the percentage of individuals rearrested, between ADC and comparison groups. Chi-square analyses were used to identify any significant differences in re-arrest rates between ADC and	ADC participants had lower re-arrest rates and average number of re-arrests per person than the comparison group. In the 2 years after drug court entry, drug court participants were rearrested half as often as the comparison group In the 12 months following entry to the program, 17% of all ADC participants and 3% of graduates were re-arrested, while 43% of the comparison group members were re-arrested. At the 24-month time period, the pattern continued, with 41% of all program participants having been re-arrested and 24% of graduates and compared to 61% of comparison group individuals.	N/A	2-year period from program entry

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

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results		
			Re-Arrests	Convictions	Time Followed
		comparison groups.			
110	January 2010	Univariate analysis of variance was performed to compare the mean number of re-arrests for DTC and comparison groups. Crosstabs were run to examine differences in recidivism rates, i.e., the percentage of individuals re-arrested, between DTC and comparison groups. Chi-square analyses were used to identify any significant differences in re-arrest rates between DTC and comparison groups.	In the 12 months following entry to the program, 31% of all DTC participants and 13% of graduates were re-arrested, while 44% of the comparison group members were re-arrested. At the 24-month time period, the pattern continued, with 44% of all program participants having been re-arrested and 8% of graduates and compared to 54% of comparison group individuals.	N/A	2-year period
111	June 2009	Univariate analysis of variance was performed to compare the mean number of re-arrests for all DTC participants with the comparison group. Crosstabs were run to examine differences in recidivism rates between DTC and the comparison groups. Chi-square analyses were used to identify any significant differences in re-arrest rates between DTC and comparison group participants.	In almost all analyses, DTC graduates had better outcomes (lower recidivism rates, fewer new arrests) than non-graduates and the comparison group. When looking at all DTC participants (graduates and non-graduates together) the results were less consistent.	N/A	10-year follow-up of a cohort of DTC participants who entered the program between 1995 and 1998.
112	October 2008	The comparison group was matched to the drug court group on age, sex, race, drug of choice, an indication of drug abuse history from the probation staff, and criminal	Of participants for whom 24 months of complete data are available, 13% of graduates, 30% of all drug court participants and 30% of comparison group members were re-arrested. For those individuals with 36 months of complete data, 19% of the graduates, 35% of all drug court participants,	N/A	24 months, some for 36 months

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

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results		
			Re-Arrests	Convictions	Time Followed
		history—including number of total prior arrests and number of prior drug arrests for 24 months prior to the study period. The study period for all groups was a period of 24 months from the date of drug court entry (or, in the case of the comparison group, an equivalent date calculated to be comparable to the drug court participant entry date based on their court case filing date). Those individuals with available data were examined for 36 months.	and 34% of comparison group members were re-arrested following entrance into the drug court program.		
113	April 2008	a sample of participants who entered the HCADC between January 2002 and August 2005 compared with comparison group who were arrested on drug court-eligible charges and met eligibility requirements for the program in Harford County. The two groups were matched on age, sex, race, an indication of prior drug use, and criminal history—including prior arrests and prior drug arrests. All groups were examined through existing administrative databases for a period up to 24 months from the date of drug court entry.	Graduates were re-arrested approximately half as often as the comparison group. Overall, only 13% of the graduates and 18% of the all drug court participants were re-arrested following entrance into the drug court program, while 31% of the comparison group were re-arrested in the 2-year period.	N/A	24 months
114	December 2009	Re-arrests are defined in this study as any criminal arrest (this study does not include non-criminal events, such as	DTC Recidivism Rates: At 36 months post drug court entry a smaller percentage of DTC participants were re-arrested compared to the comparison group, at 12 and 24 months, this	N/A	4-year period.

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

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results		
			Re-Arrests	Convictions	Time Followed
		traffic citations). NPC Research staff identified participants who entered the DTC or FDI between April 2004 and July 2007. This time frame allowed for the availability of at least 1 year of recidivism data post program entry for all study participants.	percentage was higher than the comparison group and at 48 months there was no difference between the two groups. FDI Recidivism Rates: At 12 and 24 months post drug court entry, a smaller proportion of FDI participants were re-arrested compared to the FDI comparison group. A significantly smaller percentage of all FDI participants had been re-arrested by 12 months post program entry compared to all DTC participants.		
115	December 2009	Both qualitative and quantitative data were collected through a variety of methods for a cohort of individuals who had become engaged with adult, juvenile, DUI, or family drug treatment courts.	Recidivism data revealed lower rearrest rates for adult and juvenile drug court program graduates, as compared to non-participants, at the 12 month follow up. Completers in the adult diversion model had a rearrest rate of 17% as compared to 32% for non participants. Completers in the post adjudication model had a rearrest rate of 15% versus 21% for non participants.	N/A	12 months
116	December 2009	Univariate analysis of variance was performed to compare the mean number of re-arrests for program participants and their corresponding comparison groups at each site. Crosstabs were run to examine differences in recidivism rates, i.e., the percentage of individuals re-arrested, between program participants and comparison groups at each site. Chi square analyses were used to identify any significant differences in re-arrest rates between program participant and comparison groups.	Re-arrest rates ranged from 18% to 60% within the programs, compared to re-arrest rates of 30% to 60% for comparison groups. The average re-arrest rate in 24 months for Maryland Adult Drug Treatment Courts was 39%, compared to an average of 48% for comparison groups.	N/A	For at least 24 months post program entry (and a similar time period for the comparison group).
117	June 2008	Univariate analysis of variance was used to determine if a difference in outcome means, such as number of subsequent	Of the 318 drug court participants who had sufficient follow-up time, 198 (62%) did not have any criminal justice events in the follow-up time period, compared with 120 (38%) who had at least one criminal justice event in the follow-up time	N/A	9 months

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

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results		
			Re-Arrests	Convictions	Time Followed
		arrests, between two groups could be attributed to a group characteristic, such as GIC-EEP versus non-GIC-EEP, when controlling for other demographic and program characteristics.	period. There was no significant difference by group when comparing GIC-EEP and non-GIC-EEP participants with recidivism outcomes at the bivariate level.		
118	September 2010	An initial sample n=2,370 from CCAP database yielded 137 individuals who participated in drug treatment court (DTC group). Each individual in the DTC group was then matched to two individuals in CCAP sample who were traditionally adjudicated (non-DTC, n=274). Subjects were matched on age, gender, ethnicity, criminal history, and the index drug-related offense. Recidivism subsequent to the index offense was also determined via CCAP. The “period of observation” extended from the date of the index offense through 12/31/2009. Kaplan-Meier curves of time to recidivism were examined for DTC vs non-DTC. To adjust for frequent early drop-out, Wilcoxon testing was used to evaluate the difference between the curves.	Testing, via Wilcoxon testing of Kaplan-Meier curves, indicated statistically significantly longer time to recidivism for the DTC group. For those committing crime, the mean time to recidivism in the DTC group was 614 days and in the non-DTC group was 463 days. The effect for drug court also appears to be “dose-related” yielding an even more statistically significant difference between drug court graduates and non-drug court participants. Reductions in recidivism were also found to be significant for each of the following groups: 1) Individuals with a history of prior felony and/or felony plus prison 2) Women 3) Minority individuals 4) Individuals over age 35 Reductions in recidivism were found to be statistically <i>insignificant</i> for Individuals under the age of 25	N/A	The “period of observation” extended from the date of the index offense through 12/31/2009.
119	June 2010	The Administrative Office of the Court collects outcome data on all Drug Court graduates. This involves data collection at the time of sentence to Drug Court and	The rate at which NJ Drug Court graduates are re-arrested for a new indictable offense is currently at 16%. The rate of re-arrest for drug offenders released from prison was reported as 54%.	The rate at which NJ Drug Court graduates are re-convicted for a new indictable offense is 8% and the rate of incarceration in a state prison is 4%. The re-conviction rate for drug offenders released from prison was 43%.	

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

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results		
			Re-Arrests	Convictions	Time Followed
		at the time of program discharge.			
120	April 2004	In this study, we use data from 3 years to examine how legal and social variables affect delinquency and drug use patterns once in drug court treatment. By using a comparison group comprised of youth on standard probation, we measure how demographic (e.g., gender, age, and race/ethnicity), legal (e.g., most serious offenses in history record and number of prior delinquent complaints), and social variables (e.g., attending school or not, current school grade, family/guardian stability) impact treatment effectiveness. Length of time in program, number of drug tests administered, and results from both urinalyses and the standardized substance abuse screening tool serve as controls within these assessments. To further explore drug court effect, we compare youths successfully released from drug court to those on standard probation.	Findings reveal that youths in drug court were less likely than those in the comparison group to commit a subsequent delinquent act. This finding is consistent with the majority of previous studies on adult and juvenile drug courts. Demographic data show that boys and Hispanic youth committed a higher number of delinquent complaints once in treatment. Interestingly, drug offenses as the most serious offense in a youth's prior record had a significant and negative effect on the overall number of delinquent offenses. As expected, youths who were not attending school committed a higher number of delinquent complaints during treatment. Contrary to our expectations, the number of changes in guardianship status had no significant impact on delinquency. Also, we expected youths who spent more time under supervision and treatment to benefit from such services but found that the number of days spent in the program significantly increased the number of delinquent offenses. This finding may indicate the difficulty youths have in adapting to levels of supervision and treatment plans implemented by drug court and standard probation. Also, the sample of youths selected for drug court screening had extensive prior contact with the juvenile court system placing these youths at a greater risk of recidivating than those with less serious criminal histories. Treatment programs with intensive and stringent criteria, such as the one included in this particular juvenile drug court, may find that youths are unable to comply with program requirements and continue to commit delinquent offenses regardless of the time spent in the program.	N/A	October 1997 to November 2000
121	April 2004	tests administered, and results from both urinalyses and the standardized substance abuse screening	Recidivism for both Drug Court Graduates and probationary offenders is identical after 6 months with 6 percent of the drug court graduates and the comparison group rearrested. At nine months and	N/A	1997-2000

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

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results		
			Re-Arrests	Convictions	Time Followed
		tool serve as controls within these assessments. To further explore drug court effect, we compare youths successfully released from drug court to those on standard probation.	beyond, recidivism for the comparison group is higher than that of the drug court graduates. More specifically, recidivism for the drug court graduates compared to the comparison group in six month intervals is as follows: 10 percent compared to 14 percent at 12 months, 11 percent compared to 22 percent at 18 months, and 14 percent compared to 22 percent at 24 months. The overall difference between drug court graduates and probation offenders is statistically significant (p<.01). Furthermore, at times recidivism for the graduates is half as much as that of the comparison group.		
122	2008	Source: Staff analysis of 2003-2007 data supplied by the Compensation board, DOC, DCJS, DJJ, DMAS, DMHMRSAS, Richmond City and Chesterfield County Adult Drug Court Programs, DSS, VEC and Virginia State Police	Drug court completers experienced significantly better outcomes in the criminal justice system after treatment ended than the three comparison groups. With the exception of probationers, drug court completers were arrested, convicted, and incarcerated much less frequently. No drug court completer was convicted of a felony or violent offense during the 18-month period after treatment while nine percent of non-completers and 18 percent of jail treatment completers were convicted of these offenses. Moreover, no drug court completer went to prison after treatment, whereas a portion of every comparison group was imprisoned. Drug court non-completers had substantially higher rates of incarceration after treatment ended because, as previously indicated, many were sentenced to jail for not completing the program. Re-arrest percentages were as follows: Drug Court completers (14%), Non-completers (38%), Probation completers (14%), and Jail completers (36%). These findings are consistent with a study conducted by the General Accountability Office, which reviewed the research performed on drug court programs between 1997 and 2004 and concluded that most programs led to reductions on most measures of recidivism.	Conviction rates after Treatment were as follows: Drug Court completers (14%), Non-completers (22%), Probation completers (4%), and Jail completers (25%)	2003-2007
123	2004	Collected data on costs and benefits from a wide variety of objective data sources at the state and local level.	Other variables tracked included the costs of subsequent arrests and incarcerations. Graduates were incarcerated for shorter periods after graduation with costs averaging \$104 per graduate	N/A	2 years in program and 2 years after program.

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

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results		
			Re-Arrests	Convictions	Time Followed
		These included: wages, welfare, Medicaid, drug and alcohol treatment, mental health treatment, criminal arrests, criminal convictions, time in jail, prison sentences, court hearings and other court activities, administration and supervision in drug court and probation programs, and births of drug-exposed infants.	compared to \$214 per completer.		
124	1998	Compared performance of both groups regarding reconviction rates over a maximum follow-up period of 1 year. Unlike the previous studies, we used reconviction for a felony (or a probation violation for a new felony) as the outcome measure of effectiveness. Data were collected from the files of the Jefferson County (Kentucky) District and Circuit Courts. Here, the experimental group was subdivided into two subgroups according to their program completion status. This breakdown reflects how drug court defendants responded to the treatment program and thus gives a more comprehensive indication of program performance.	N/A	Drug court graduates outperformed their counterparts. About 13 percent of the graduates were reconvicted while the non-graduates and the members of the self-drop comparison group had similar failure rates (59.5 and 55.4 percent).	Maximum follow-up period of 1 year.

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

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results		
			Re-Arrests	Convictions	Time Followed
125	December 2010	The recidivism study used a quasi-experimental design with a cohort of all drug court participants who were matched with a comparison sample of individuals who were arrested for similar, drug court-eligible charges who did not participate in a drug court program.	The recidivism results showed a reduction in recidivism for drug court participants compared to similar offenders who do not participate in drug court, an average of 44% reduction in number of re-arrests and an average of 23% reduction in recidivism rate. Although there were drug court programs that had a negative effect size, there were only two programs out of the 20 that had these results.	N/A	Both groups were examined through existing administrative databases for a period at least 3 years from the date of drug court entry. For comparison group members, an equivalent “entry date” was calculated by creating an avg. of the number of days from arrest to drug court entry and adding that mean number of days to the arrest date for comparison group members.
126	January 2011	The rates of reoffense were determined through an interface between the admission and discharge forms (InfoPath) and the Montana’s court case management system (Full Court) through SharePoint software.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. During 30-month period there was a reoffense rate of 15.47%. 2. While in the program there was a reoffense rate of 4.7%. 3. After discharge, there was a reoffense rate of 15.6%. 4. 6 months after discharge, there was a reoffense rate of 16.8%. 5. Drug Court graduates had less than half the rate of reoffense than early terminations. 	N/A	30-month period (May 2008 – October 2010)
127	September 2010	Analyzed felony reconviction data for sample of drug court participants and for offenders sentenced to other traditional options	N/A	Only 7% of drug court participants in sample recidivated within 2 years of completing their sentence compared to 29% of substance-abusing offenders who served their sentences in state prison.	2005-2009
128	November 2010	Interview, focus groups, and structured instruments to capture quantitative and qualitative info	Post-program recidivism (for graduates) was 28%	N/A	12 year period: “covering its initiation in 1998 through October 2010”
129	June 2011	We collected a wealth of offender participation and outcome data, extending well beyond the restriction of most previous studies to official recidivism impacts only. The design included a baseline and two follow-up waves of offender surveys at 6- and 18-months post-	In the first six months of follow up, we found that drug court offenders were significantly less likely than the comparison group to report engaging in any criminal behavior (28 percent vs. 40 percent, $p < .05$); and drug court offenders averaged significantly fewer total instances of such behavior (12.8 vs. 34.1 criminal acts, $p < .001$). We detected additional significant differences in the prevalence of drug-related, DWI/DUI, and property-related criminal behavior.	N/A	18 months.

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

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results		
			Re-Arrests	Convictions	Time Followed
		enrollment, as well as official crime records at 24 months, which allowed us to examine whether drug court effects are durable or recede over time. Additionally, the multi-wave design enabled us to (1) model the relationship between offender program experiences and attitudes during the first 6 months with outcomes at the 18- and 24-month marks and (2) compare drug court effects on resource allocations to courts.	During the following year (the one-year period prior to the 18-month survey), the same patterns persisted. Specifically, drug court offenders were significantly less likely to engage in any criminal behavior (40 percent vs. 53 percent), drug-related crime (36 percent vs. 50 percent), DWI/DUI (19 percent vs. 27 percent), and property crime (4 percent vs. 10 percent). Among drug crimes, drug court offenders were significantly less likely to engage in both drug possession and drug sales offenses.		
130	April 16, 2009	Researchers used information downloaded from the DIRECT program's database in two rounds of data analysis. For the first round, detailing variables one or two at a time, researchers looked at all program clients for the years 2002 - 2006 in some analyses or 2003 - 2006 in other analyses. Researchers also broke out these demographic variables year-by-year to see if changes were occurring in the program. The second round of analysis used a random sample of 100 clients and advanced statistical methods to conduct multivariate tests of the data and to determine if findings were statistically significant.	Only data from the graduates were used to look more specifically at recidivism. About 18% of the graduates in this sample were re-arrested sometime after graduation for drug related crimes such as drug possession, public intoxication, driving while intoxicated, etc. These data were collected though the Tarrant County Main Frame. This percentage for the sample is somewhat higher than for the total population of graduates.	N/A	Not specified.

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

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results		
			Re-Arrests	Convictions	Time Followed
131	Second Quarter 2007	The work of the Washington State Institute for Public Policy (WSIPP) established standards for evaluating drugs courts and other programs that aim to impact recidivism throughout the State of Washington. WSIPP worked with Glacier Consulting, Inc. – the drug court’s independent evaluator – using their database to assemble a comparison group for this outcome evaluation and to gather recidivism data.	N/A	<p>Overall Recidivism Rates: Of the initial 106 program graduates, 21 had committed at least one new offense of any type for a recidivism rate of 20%. Of the 223 comparison group members, 101 had committed at least one new offense, for a recidivism rate of 45.29%. This was statistically significant at the 0.001 level.</p> <p>Felony Drug Offense Recidivism Rate: Of the 106 program participants, 11 committed at least one new felony offense, for a recidivism rate of 10% and only 7% committed a felony drug offense. Of the 223 comparison group members, 77 committed at least one new felony offense for a recidivism rate of 35% and 16% of the new offenses were drug felony. The felony drug offense rates were statistically significant at the 0.001 level.</p>	Minimum of 3 years.
132	December 2010 (DRAFT)	This analysis is limited to misdemeanors and felonies with a guilty or no contest adjudication in the adult court system. Therefore, cases that did not include an adjudication on the ICHAT report (either for missing data, cases with a suspended sentence, diversion cases, etc.) were not included in this analysis. The adult adjudication information was obtained from the Internet Criminal History Access Tool (ICHAT), as the Law Enforcement Information Network (LEIN) information was not available to the evaluators.	N/A	<p>The total number of adjudicated crimes committed by these participants prior to their entry in the program was 52. The total number of adjudicated crimes committed by these participants while they were enrolled in the program was one. The total number of adjudicated crimes committed by these participants in the one year post-program period was four.</p> <p>Therefore, the data suggest that there was a dramatic decrease in the total number of adjudicated crimes between the pre-program period (52) and the while-enrolled period (1), however there was a slight increase in the number of crimes committed in the one year post-program period (4).</p>	<p>The time periods were determined as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the pre-program period was any time prior to their entry in the program; • the while-enrolled period began with their entry into the VBCUDTCP and ended when they either graduated or were unsuccessfully discharged; • the one year post-program period was the one year following their graduation or unsuccessful discharge from the program.

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

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results		
			Re-Arrests	Convictions	Time Followed
133	November 2009	The quantitative analyses were performed using TRI-CEP, RANT, and TRI-CA data collected between July 1, 2008 and Sept. 30, 2009. Descriptive statistics were calculated to characterize DTC clients on demographic and other baseline variables, status hearing attendance and compliance, phase completion, case management session attendance, treatment attendance, medication compliance, and objectively verified substance use.	N/A	N/A. However, as of September 30, 2009, a total of 13 clients remained active in the DTC and 5 clients had been terminated.	3 months following the first year of the program.
134	December 2010	Quantitative data were collected using the TRI-Court Evaluation Program (TRI-CEP), the Risk and Needs Triage tool, (RANT), and TRI Client Assessment (TRI-CA) systems. These systems collect client information including programmatic data, criminogenic risk and clinical need, and perceptions and experiences with the DTC.	N/A	N/A However, a total of 5 clients from the year 1 sample were terminated as of September 30, 2009. No clients from the year 2 sample have been terminated as of September 30, 2010.	These data are presented along with data on the initial 18 clients recruited into the program between July 1, 2008 and June 30, 2010.
135	2011	The research that provides the foundation for this report is derived from two surveys. The first of these related to operations and court activities. The second survey was a request for client data, which was analyzed.	During the year SJDATC participants were followed, there was only been one arrest of a drug court participant. This arrest was for possession of cocaine. The one arrest creates a recidivism rate of 6%.	N/A	September 1, 2010 to September 1, 2011.

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

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results		
			Re-Arrests	Convictions	Time Followed
136	August 2010	Not specified.	<p>Recidivism among Whatcom County Drug Court graduates (37 reoffenders/151 graduates): 24.5%</p> <p>Recidivism among Whatcom County Drug Court participants (107 reoffenders/264 participants): 40.5%</p> <p>Recidivism among Drug Offenders after incarceration: 66.7%</p>	N/A	Not specified.
137	March 2012	<p>The Judicial Council and ISER reviewed data provided by the Department of Corrections about participants in DOC institutional substance abuse programs during FY 2010, and data provided by the Alaska Court System about participants in therapeutic courts from January, 2000 through June 2010. Data about offenders' prior criminal histories, rearrests and reconvications, and release dates were obtained from the Department of Public Safety APSIN system and Department of Corrections ACOMs system.</p> <p>The data was analyzed by gender, ethnicity, institution, type of program, type of underlying offense for which the participant was incarcerated, and prior criminal history.</p>	<p>Therapeutic Courts –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Misdemeanants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Graduates and non-graduates combined: 36% • Graduates: 23% • Non-graduates: 51% • Comparison: 36% • Felons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Graduates and non-graduates combined: 26% • Graduates: 25% • Non-graduates: 29% • Comparison: 36% <p>Department of Corrections institutional substance abuse programs –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Misdemeanants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed and non-completed combined: 46% • Completed the program: 35% • Did not complete the program: 54% • Comparison: 53% • Felons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed and non-completed combined: 30% • Completed the program: 28% • Did not complete the program: 34% • Comparison: 30% 	<p>Therapeutic Courts -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Misdemeanants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Graduates and non-graduates combined: 24% • Graduates: 9% • Non-graduates: 11% • Comparison: 25% • Felons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Graduates and non-graduates combined: 16% • Graduates: 12% • Non-graduates: 21% • Comparison: 23% <p>Department of Corrections institutional substance abuse programs –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Misdemeanants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed and non-completed combined: 22% • Completed the program: 19% • Did not complete the program: 24% • Comparison: 35% • Felons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed and non-completed combined: 14% • Completed the program: 12% • Did not complete the program: 18% • Comparison: 20% 	During first year after release.
138	February 2, 2012	A multi-pronged search strategy was used to identify eligible studies. Researchers searched bibliographic	Relative to a 50% recidivism rate in the comparison group (a typical value), the recidivism rate for adult drug courts is 37.6%.	N/A	12 months.

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

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results		
			Re-Arrests	Convictions	Time Followed
		<p>databases, websites of several research organizations involved in drug court research, and the references of eligible evaluations and prior reviews.</p> <p>Evaluations eligible for inclusion in this review were evaluations of drug courts that used an experimental and quasi-experimental comparison group design. Studies must also have had an outcome that examined criminal or drug-use behavior (recidivism).</p>			
139	June 2012	The evaluation is focused on the aggregation of all drug court participants in the 16 courts included in the evaluation. DWI participants are excluded for several reasons, including differences in outcomes for DWI offenders.	Two and one half years after drug court start, one quarter (26%) of drug court participants are charged with a new offense compared to 41% of the comparison group. These results are statistically significant and represent a 37% reduction in recidivism for the Drug Court Cohort.	17% of the Drug Court Cohort is re-convicted within two and one half years as compared to 32% of the Comparison Group. These results are also statistically significant and represent a 47% reduction in recidivism for the Drug Court Cohort.	Two and one half years.
140	October 18, 2012	Unknown	N/A	Participation in drug court decreases the odds of recidivism by 55 percent relative to the comparison group.	Unknown
141	January 2013	N/A	N/A	<p>Re-offense rate while in the drug court program during the 53-month period: 5.2% (1% felony, 4.2% Misd.)</p> <p>Re-offense rate after discharge from drug court during the 53-month period: 25.6% (2.7% felony, 22.8% Misd.)</p>	53-month period
142	September 2012	The data for both arrest and drug screen were bivariate, and were therefore analyzed using simple calculation of	Over the course of the study eleven individuals had graduated for a year or more, and one individual had graduated for two or more years. Arrests were followed on all graduates. Five individuals were	See Re-Arrests to the left.	July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2012

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

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results		
			Re-Arrests	Convictions	Time Followed
		percentages.	rearrested within the first year cohort and two were convicted. Within this cohort 91% of graduates were arrest free for the first year post graduation. No one during the study period was arrested or convicted at the two-year threshold.		
143	July 2013	Arrests, incarceration rates, and treatment participation over a three-year follow-up period are examined, as are net benefits associated with reductions in crime	Controlling for other factors leading to arrest, drug court participants were twice as likely to remain free of arrest as those in the comparison group (30% versus 15%)	Drug court participants were less likely to be incarcerated during the follow-up period than individuals in the comparison group (17% versus 23%)	Three year follow-up period
144	September 2012	Paired samples t-tests were performed to compare the mean number of re-arrests for all drug court participants 24 months before and 24 months after drug court entry. Crosstabs were run to examine recidivism rate for drug court participants for 24 months following program start. To examine differences in recidivism for specific charges, paired samples t-tests were performed to compare the means of all drug-related charges for treatment court participants 24 months before and 24 months after drug court entry.	On average, the recidivism rate for participants who successfully complete adult drug court programs in Colorado is 4.6% in the year after program completion. This is lower than the average recidivism rate of 6.7% for probationers who successfully complete probation across all supervision levels. Further, the target population for most Colorado adult drug courts is composed of high risk/high need individuals who would be on med. to high supervision. The recidivism rate for adult drug court completers of 4.6% is less than the recidivism rate of 9.8% and 14.9% for adult probationers who successfully completed the med. to high levels of probation supervision, respectively.	Compared to before their participation in the program, drug court program participants (regardless of whether they graduated from the program) had significantly lower recidivism in the 24 months after entry into the program. This includes: significantly fewer arrests with new charges and new DUI charges, significantly fewer person charges, significantly fewer misdemeanor and felony charges.	The program participants were examined through existing administrative databases for a period of up to 24 months from the date of drug court entry.
145	June 2013	The study compared recidivism and sentencing outcomes between statistically matched samples drawn from 86 drug courts and conventional courts in the same jurisdiction. The samples came from cases that either enrolled in a drug	New York drug courts significantly reduced the incidence and prevalence of re-arrest after one-, two-, and three-year tracking periods. However, the effect sizes were relatively modest (below nationwide averages), and their magnitude diminished over time. The drug court impact varied greatly across sites. Some sites produced sizable reductions in re-arrest, others had no impact, and still others increased re-	New York Drug courts also significantly reduced re-conviction rates. New York drug courts significantly reduced the use of prison on the initial case (4% vs. 8%). Drug court participants also spent significantly less time incarcerated on instant case sentences (49% vs. 64.5% days) as well as sentences stemming either from the instant case or from re-arrests over three years (143.7	

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

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results		
			Re-Arrests	Convictions	Time Followed
		court or were resolved in a conventional court in 2005 or 2006.	<p>arrest.</p> <p>Consistent with <i>Risk Principle</i>, drug courts were most effective with med. and high risk defendants. Drug courts increased re-arrest among low-risk defendants.</p> <p>Drug courts that served more felony-level defendants – who tend to face longer jail or prison sentences in the vent of failing –reduced re-arrest by more than drug courts that served primarily misdemeanor defendants. In addition, participants facing drug-related charges experienced greater reductions in re-arrest than did participants facing property or other charges...</p> <p>More frequent supervision in the form of judicial status hearings and drug testing did no significantly reduce re-arrest; more frequent case management meetings were effective in reducing re-arrest – but only among high risk participants.</p> <p>Specifically, 36% of drug court graduates and 64% of those who failed the program were re-arrested, as contrasted with 44% in the comparison group.</p>	vs. 168.2 days)	
146	December 10, 2012	<p>In brief, a CBS estimates the dollar value of both the costs and benefits of a program so that these costs and benefits can be directly compared to ascertain whether benefits exceed costs (i.e., net benefits > 0).</p> <p>The costs and benefits included in this CBA begin at the point in time when the two groups debate in their interactions with the CJS. This deviation point occurs just after those in both groups accept their pleas and the DTAP participant is transported to the residential treatment facility to begin their 90-day program while the control counterpart</p>	N/A	N/A	Almost one full year of data or longer on all participants.

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

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results		
			Re-Arrests	Convictions	Time Followed
		awaits sentencing either out of custody or after being transported back to jail.			
147	September, 4, 2013	The cost savings from the DTAP program are estimated by comparing the DTAP costs to the costs incurred by the justice system if those same individuals had rejected the DTAP plea bargain. This would have resulted in incarceration and associated costs.			January 1, 2011 to June 30, 2013
148	September, 2013	The evaluation team utilized administrative databases and data sources, to determine whether there was a difference in re-arrests, incarceration and other outcomes of interest between the drug court and comparison group.	Drug court participants had nearly 3 times fewer re-arrests each year than similar offenders who did not participate in drug court. Recidivism rates were also significantly lower for drug court participants every year for 3 years from drug court entry. The number of re-arrests with drug charges for drug court participants is roughly ¼ that of the comparison group members at every time point. Drug court participants had 4 times fewer drug and person charges, half as many felony charges and roughly 1/3 as many property charges.		The timeframe used allowed for the availability of at least 12 months (and up to 3 years) of recidivism data post-program entry for all program participants. Both groups were examined through existing administrative databases for a period of up to three years from the date of drug court entry.