

Promising Practices of Drug Courts: An Update on Drug Court Research & Resources

Pat Sekaquaptewa & Donna Humetewa

1

Why should we care about the research?

- o What is our “why” for doing this work? (who is this for and why does it matter?)
- o Do we care if what we do works?
- o Do we care how much it costs?
- o Do we want to be able to obtain more support and funding for this important work?

2

Types of research we should care about

- o Process Evaluation
 - o Purpose: to establish whether the program has the basic components needed to implement an effective drug court AND the extent to which the program is implementing the Key Components and the best practices
- o Performance Evaluation
 - o Purpose: to determine whether the drug court program is retaining its participants, whether they are maintaining longer stretches of sobriety, whether they are re-offending less (both in-program and post graduation), and whether the court and treatment are using the appropriate types and amounts of treatment services
- o Outcome Evaluation
 - o Purpose: to determine whether the drug court program has improved participant outcomes (e.g., does participation in drug court reduce the number of re-arrests for those individuals compared to traditional court processing?)
- o Cost Evaluation
 - o Purpose: To evaluate the costs and benefits of the drug court program (how much does the program cost and what is the cost impact on the criminal justice system of sending offenders through a drug court program compared to the tribal court criminal, juvenile, or dependency court process?)

3

Definitions

- o “investment costs” – the resources that each agency and the program overall spend to run the drug court, including program and affiliated agency staff time, costs to pay for drug testing, etc.
- o “recidivism costs” – the expenses related to the measures of participant outcomes, such as re-arrests, jail time, probation, etc. (successful programs low these costs)

4

Where do we get the promising practices?

- o Looking at tribal and state process, outcome, and cost evaluations of operating drug court programs
 - o For state drug court evaluation reports see ...
 - o www.npcresearch.com/publications_drug_treatment_courts.php
 - o For tribal healing to wellness court evaluation reports see ...
 - o Gottlieb, Karen (2005). Lessons Learned in Implementing the First Four Tribal Wellness Courts. Washington, DC: US. Department of Justice. National Institute of Justice
 - o www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/231168.pdf
 - o www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/231167.pdf
 - o For other useful drug court resources go to ...
 - o www.ndci.org/research
 - o www.ndci.org/publications
 - o www.drugcourtonline.org

5

A Review of Promising Practices by Component

- o Tribal Key Component & Focus
- o State Assessments & Research
- o Gottlieb/NIJ Wellness Court Study Findings & Recommendations

6

Key Component #1: Individual and Community Healing Focus

- o Tribal Healing to Wellness Court brings together alcohol and drug treatment, community healing resources, and the tribal justice process by using a team approach to achieve the physical and spiritual healing of the individual participant and to promote Native nation building and the well-being of the community.
- o Focuses on :
 - o Alcohol and Drug Treatment / Community Healing Resources & Tribal Justice Process
 - o Team Approach
 - o Physical & Spiritual Healing of Individual / Well-being of Community
 - o Native Nation Building
- o Observed Challenges for Tribes:
 - o Communication between team members (especially regarding confidentiality policies)
 - o High team member turnover
 - o More limited access to diverse treatment and habilitation services

7

Key Component #1: Individual and Community Healing Focus

- o Focus in state drug court program evaluations ...
 - o *Has an integrated drug court team emerged (integration of treatment services with traditional case processing)?*
- o State Assessment & Research
 - o Greater representation of team members from collaborating agencies at team meetings and court hearings is correlated with positive outcomes for clients, including reduced recidivism and reduced costs at follow-up
 - o (Carey, Finigan, Waller, Lucas & Crumpton, 2005; Carey, Finigan, & Pukstas, 2008; Carey, Waller, & Weller, 2010)
 - o Greater law enforcement involvement increases graduation rates and reduces outcome costs
 - o (Carey, Finigan, & Pukstas, 2008)
 - o Drug treatment courts with one central agency coordinating treatment resulted in more positive participant outcomes including higher graduation rates and lower recidivism costs
 - o (Carey et al., 2005; Carey, Finigan, & Pukstas, 2008)

8

Findings from NJ Wellness Court Study: Component #1

Problems Identified:

- (1) Wellness teams had a great deal of member turnover.
- (2) Wellness courts had communication issues between the team and the treatment providers due to intrinsic differences in the confidentiality of patient records versus court records.
- (3) Recidivism (post-program arrests) for alcohol or drug related offenses for a 3-year period following wellness court participation ranged from 50-59% in the adult courts and over 90% in the juvenile courts.

Lesson Learned #1 – Develop a Strong Structure for the Wellness Court Team

- Use an “informed consent” approach with potential participants to ensure their due process rights are protected. In this approach, all benefits, risks, and alternatives of the wellness court are communicated clearly to the offender.
- Develop a strong structure for your wellness court by building the wellness court team based on roles, not on individuals, to avoid the disintegration of the team due to staff turnover.
- Detail the responsibilities of team members from various agencies in written policies and procedures, such as memoranda of understanding, to ensure the team’s integrity.

Taken from: “Lessons Learned in Implementing the First Four Tribal Wellness Courts,” Karen Gottlieb, Ph.D., JD, Electronic Publication (NCJ 231168) on National Criminal Justice Reference Service, U.S. Department of Justice website <http://www.ncjrs.gov> (2005), p 5.

9

Key Component #2: Referral Points and Legal Process

- o Participants enter Tribal Healing to Wellness Court through various referral points and legal processes that promote tribal sovereignty and the participant’s due (fair) process rights.
- o Focuses on:
 - o Program Eligibility
 - o Referral Points / Legal Processes
 - o Notice / Advisements / Fairness
- o Observed Challenges for Tribes:
 - o Lack of public defender involvement
 - o Lack of fully informed participant consent
 - o Need for written/updated policies and procedures manuals and participant handbooks with frequent in-program review

10

Key Component #2: Referral Points and Legal Process

- o Focus in state drug court program evaluations ...
 - o *Are the Defense Attorney and Prosecuting Attorney satisfied that the mission of each (use of a non-adversarial process in drug court with continued promotion of public safety and protection of individual rights) has not be compromised by drug treatment court?*
- o State Assessment & Research
 - o Participation by the prosecuting and defense attorneys in team meetings and at drug treatment court status review hearings had a positive effect on graduation rates and recidivism costs
 - o (Carey et al., 2008, Carey et al., 2010)
 - o Drug treatment courts that allowed non-drug-related charges showed lower recidivism costs
 - o (Carey et al., in process as of December 2011)
 - o Allowing participants into the drug treatment court program only post-plea was associated with lower graduation rates and higher investment costs while drug courts that mixed pre-trial and post-trial offenders had similar outcomes as drug courts that keep those populations separate
 - o (Carey et al., in process as of December 2011)

//

Findings from NIJ Wellness Court Study: Component #2

Problems Identified:

- (1) *Participants seemed surprised by the huge time commitment required by the wellness court and did not fully comprehend the wellness court requirements (no public defender or public defender did not advise participant of his options before entering the wellness court).*
- (2) *Recidivism (post-program arrests) for alcohol or drug related offenses for a 3-year period following wellness court participation ranged from 50-59% in the adult courts and over 90% in the juvenile courts.*

Lesson Learned #2 - Use the Informed Consent Model for Wellness Court Admittance

- Review the wellness court rules regularly with the participant while in the program.

Taken from: "Lessons Learned in Implementing the First Four Tribal Wellness Courts," Karen Gottlieb, Ph.D., JD, Electronic Publication (NCJ 231168) on National Criminal Justice Reference Service, U.S. Department of Justice website <http://www.ncjrs.gov> (2005), p 12

12

Key Component #3: Screening and Eligibility

- o Eligible court-involved substance-abusing parents, guardians, juveniles, and adults are identified early through legal and clinical screening for eligibility and are promptly placed into the Tribal Healing to Wellness Court.
- o Focuses on:
 - o Program Eligibility
 - o Legal & Clinical Screening
 - o Prompt Placement in Wellness Court [Treatment]
- o Observed Challenges for Tribes:
 - o High recidivism rates
 - o Lack of clear written eligibility criteria
 - o Lack of screening for suitability in addition to legal and clinical screening ("suitability" = assessing readiness and motivating for success)
 - o Lack of clear written termination policies

13

Key Component #3: Screening and Eligibility

- o Focus in state drug court program evaluations ...
 - o *Are the eligibility requirements being implemented successfully?*
 - o *Are potential participants being placed in the program quickly?*
 - o *Is the original target population being served?*
- o State Assessment & Research
 - o Courts that accepted pre-plea offenders and included misdemeanors as well as felonies had both lower investment and outcome costs
 - o (Carey, Finigan, and Pukstas, (2008))
 - o Courts that accepted non-drug-related charges also had lower outcome costs, though their investment costs were higher
 - o (Carey, Finigan, and Pukstas, (2008))
 - o Those courts that expected 20 days or less from arrest to drug treatment court entry had higher savings than those courts that had a longer time period between arrest and entry
 - o (Carey, Finigan, and Pukstas, (2008))
 - o Drug treatment courts that included a screen for suitability and excluded participants who were found unsuitable had the same outcomes (same graduation rates) as drug treatment courts that did not screen for suitability and did not exclude individuals based on suitability
 - o (Carey & Perkins, 2008)

14

Findings from NIJ Wellness Court Study: Component #3

Problems Identified:

- (1) Wellness Courts as a rule were more inclusive than exclusive in determining participant eligibility in an effort to make the wellness court available to as many people as possible. The wellness court team members were more focused on whether the participant needed help rather than if the participant wanted help with his substance abuse problem.
- (2) Recidivism (post-program arrests) for alcohol or drug related offenses for a 3-year period following wellness court participation ranged from 50-59% in the adult courts and over 90% in the juvenile courts.

Lesson Learned #3 – Assess Readiness for Change in Potential Participants

- Choose participants who are motivated and ready to change their substance abuse behavior to maximize scarce resources and increase wellness court success. Participants who enter wellness court only to avoid incarceration may or may not “get with the program” and work to change their behavior.
- Have a clear termination policy to weed out participants who are not working the program after a reasonable time if an inclusive admittance policy is used.

Taken from: "Lessons Learned in Implementing the First Four Tribal Wellness Courts," Karen Gottlieb, Ph.D., JD, Electronic Publication (NCJ 231168) on National Criminal Justice Reference Service, U.S. Department of Justice website <http://www.ncjrs.gov> (2005), pp. 13, 14, & 19.

15

Key Component #4: Treatment and Rehabilitation

- o Tribal Healing to Wellness Court provides access to holistic, structured, and phased alcohol and drug abuse treatment and rehabilitation services that incorporate culture and tradition.
- o Focuses on:
 - o Phase System
 - o Individualized Assessments/Treatment
- o Observed Challenges for Tribes:
 - o Limited access to needed levels of care (residential, outpatient, etc.) and a diverse range of treatment and habilitation services
 - o Fewer established partnerships to access self-help (AA, NA, etc.) and habilitation services (school, employment, etc.)
 - o Integration of culture versus religion

16

Key Component #4: Treatment and Rehabilitation

- Focus in state drug court program evaluations ...
 - *Are diverse and specialized treatment services available (tailored to the target population)?*
- State Assessment & Research
 - Programs that have requirements for the frequency of group and individual treatment sessions (e.g., group sessions 3 times per week and individual sessions 1 time per week) have lower investment costs and substantially higher graduation rates and improved recidivism costs
 - (Carey et al., 2005; Carey et al., 2008)
 - Clients who participate in group treatment sessions two or three times per week have better outcomes
 - (Carey et al., 2005)
 - Drug treatment court that include a focus on relapse prevention were shown to have higher graduation rates and lower recidivism than drug treatment courts that did not
 - (Carey et al. 2010)
 - Having a single agency that oversees all providers is correlated with more positive participant outcomes, including lower recidivism and lower recidivism related costs
 - (Carey et al., 2008)
 - Discharge and transitional services planning is a core element of substance abuse treatment – the longer drug abusing offenders remain in treatment and the greater the continuity of care following treatment, the greater their chance for success
 - (SAMHSA/CSAT, 1994; Lurigio, 2000)

17

Findings from NIJ Wellness Court Study: Component #4

Problems Identified:

(1) *Recidivism (post-program arrests) for alcohol or drug related offenses for a 3-year period following wellness court participation ranged from 50-59% in the adult courts and over 90% in the juvenile courts.*

Relevant Lesson Learned #4 – Integrate Culture, not Religion, into the Wellness Court

- Integrate cultural tradition into treatment, but do not require participants to do activities that can be perceived as religious rather than cultural because many tribes are religiously diverse.
- Emphasize culture – how to build a sweat lodge, not religion – participating in a sweat lodge ceremony, to avoid conflict with individual religious beliefs.

Taken from: "Lessons Learned in Implementing the First Four Tribal Wellness Courts," Karen Gottlieb, Ph.D., JD, Electronic Publication (NCJ 231168) on National Criminal Justice Reference Service, U.S. Department of Justice website <http://www.ncjrs.gov> (2005), p 24.

18

Key Component #5: Intensive Supervision

- o Tribal Healing to Wellness Court participants are monitored through intensive supervision that includes frequent and random testing for alcohol and drug use, while participants and their families benefit from effective team-based case management.
- o Focuses on:
 - o Team Based Case Management
 - o Participant Monitoring
 - o Frequent & Random Testing
- o Observed Challenges for Tribes:
 - o Difficulty in intensively supervising/monitoring participants due to shortage of probation officers/law enforcement officers
 - o Particularly in conducting alcohol/drug testing during times of likely use (evenings/weekends)

19

Key Component #5: Intensive Supervision

- o Focus in state drug court program evaluations ...
 - o *Compared to other drug courts, and to research findings on effective testing frequency, does this court test frequently?*
- o State Assessment & Research
 - o Drug testing that occurs randomly, at least 3 times per week, is the most effective model
 - o (Carey et al., 2005)
 - o Outcomes for programs that tested more frequently than 3 times per week were no better or worse than outcomes for those that tested 3 times per week
 - o (Carey et al., 2005)
 - o Less frequent testing resulted in less positive outcomes
 - o (Carey et al., 2005)
 - o It is important to ensure that drug testing is random, unexpected, and fully observed during sample collection
 - o (NPC Research, Oregon Drug Courts, Final Report, 2011)

20

Findings from NIJ Wellness Court Study: Component #5

Problems Identified:

- (1) Difficulty in maintaining intensive supervision and monitoring because of shortage of probation officers, the relatively expensive cost of the drug testing supplies.
- (2) Recidivism (post-program arrests) for alcohol or drug related offenses for a 3-year period following wellness court participation ranged from 50-59% in the adult courts and over 90% in the juvenile courts.

Lesson Learned #5 – Monitor During Times When Illegal Acts are Likely to Occur

- Monitor participants using team member probation officers during the hours when illegal acts are most likely to occur. Probation officers need to be out in the community monitoring their clients and conducting alcohol and drug tests frequently and at unexpected times.

Taken from: "Lessons Learned in Implementing the First Four Tribal Wellness Courts," Karen Gottlieb, Ph.D., JD, Electronic Publication (NCJ 231168) on National Criminal Justice Reference Service, U.S. Department of Justice website <http://www.ncjrs.gov> (2005), p 29.

Key Component #6: Incentives and Sanctions

- o Progressive rewards (or incentives) and consequences (or sanctions) are used to encourage participant compliance with the Tribal Healing to Wellness Court requirements.
- o Focuses on:
 - o Wellness Court Hearing Process
 - o Incentives
 - o Sanctions
- o Observed Challenges for Tribes:
 - o Lack of written policies on application of sanctions and incentives which are tied to specific behaviors
 - o Inconsistent application of sanctions and incentives
 - o Judge/Team reliance on hearsay to sanction/incentivize
 - o Overuse of sanctions (particularly incarceration)
 - o Not enough use of incentives

22

Key Component #6: Incentives and Sanctions

- o Focus in state drug court program evaluations ...
 - o *Do program staff work together as a team to determine sanctions and rewards?*
 - o *Are there standard or specific sanctions and rewards for particular behaviors?*
 - o *Is there a written policy on how sanctions and rewards work?*
 - o *How does this drug court's sanctions and rewards compare to what other drug courts are doing nationally?*
- o State Assessment & Research
 - o The drug treatment court judge is legally and ethically required to make the final decision regarding sanctions or rewards, based on expert and informed input from the drug treatment court team
 - o (NPC Research, Oregon Drug Courts, Final Report, 2011)
 - o All drug treatment courts surveyed in an American University study reported that they had established guidelines for their sanctions and rewards policies, and nearly two thirds (64%) reported that their guidelines were written
 - o (Cooper, 2000)
 - o Drug treatment courts that responded to infractions immediately, particularly by requiring participants to attend the next scheduled court session, had twice the cost savings
 - o (Carey et al., 2008; Carey et al., 2010)
 - o Drug treatment courts that had their guidelines for team responses to participant behavior written and proved to the team had higher graduation rates and higher costs savings due to lower recidivism
 - o (Carey et al., 2008; Carey et al., 2010)

23

Findings from NJ Wellness Court Study: Component #6

Problems Identified:

- (1) Incarceration was often too readily used as a sanction and participants could serve more time while in wellness court than if they had served their original sentence.
- (2) Participants complained that hearsay evidence was used in determining noncompliant behavior.
- (3) Participants complained about inconsistent application of sanctions and incentives (lack of graduated sanctions and incentives tied to specific behaviors).
- (4) Too much focus on sanctioning negative behavior and not enough focus on rewarding positive behavior.
- (5) Using incarceration to readily, rather than thinking of more therapeutic alternatives.
- (6) Recidivism (post-program arrests) for alcohol or drug related offenses for a 3-year period following wellness court participation ranged from 50-59% in the adult courts and over 90% in the juvenile courts.

Lesson Learned #6 - Reward Positive Behavior

- Reward compliant behavior with incentives rather than emphasizing punishing noncompliant behavior with sanctions.
- Be judicious in levying non-therapeutic sanctions such as incarceration that are antithetical to the holistic healing philosophy underlying wellness courts.

Taken from: "Lessons Learned in Implementing the First Four Tribal Wellness Courts," Karen Gottlieb, Ph.D., JD, Electronic Publication (NCJ 231168) on National Criminal Justice Reference Service, U.S. Department of Justice website <http://www.ncjrs.gov> (2005), p 35.

24

Key Component #7: Judicial Interaction

- o Ongoing involvement of a Tribal Healing to Wellness Court Judge with the Tribal Wellness Court team and staffing, and ongoing Tribal Wellness Court Judge interaction with each participant are essential.
- o Focuses on:
 - o Ongoing involvement of Wellness Court Judge with Team
 - o Ongoing involvement of Wellness Court Judge @ Staffing
 - o Ongoing involvement of Wellness Court Judge with each Participant in Wellness Hearings
- o Observed Challenges for Tribes:
 - o Chosen judge is not a team player
 - o Frequent turnover in Wellness Court Judge position

25

Key Component #7: Judicial Interaction

- o Focus in state drug court program evaluations ...
 - o *Compared to other drug courts, and to effective researched-based practices, do this court's participants have frequent contact with the judge?*
 - o *What is the nature of this contact (is the judge providing the authority to ensure that appropriate treatment recommendations from trained treatment providers are followed)?*
- o State Assessment & Research
 - o The American University Drug Court Survey reported that most drug court programs require weekly contact with the judge in Phase I, contact every 2 weeks in Phase II, and monthly contact in Phase III
 - o (Cooper 2000)
 - o On average, participants have the most positive outcomes if they attend approximately one court appearance every 2 weeks in the first phase of their involvement in the program
 - o (Carey et al., 2005; 2008; 2010; & in process as of December 2011)
 - o Bi-weekly court sessions were more effective for high risk offenders, whereas less frequent sessions (e.g., monthly) were as effective for low risk offenders
 - o (Marlowe et al., 2006)
 - o Programs in which the judge remained on the bench for at least 2 years had the most positive participant outcomes
 - o (Carey et al., 2005; Finigan, Carey, & Cox, 2007)

26

Findings from NIJ Wellness Court Study: Component #7

Problems Identified:

- (1) The original judge left and was replaced by a judge who did not practice wellness court principles or who was not a team player.
- (2) Recidivism (post-program arrests) for alcohol or drug related offenses for a 3-year period following wellness court participation ranged from 50-59% in the adult courts and over 90% in the juvenile courts

Lesson Learned #7 – Choose a Wellness Court Judge Who Can Be Both a Leader and a Team Player

- Choose a judge for wellness court who understands and practices wellness court philosophy. The judge makes or breaks the wellness court; not every judge can relinquish the traditional role of sole arbiter and be a team player.

Taken from: "Lessons Learned in Implementing the First Four Tribal Wellness Courts," Karen Gottlieb, Ph.D., JD, Electronic Publication (NCJ 231168) on National Criminal Justice Reference Service, U.S. Department of Justice website <http://www.ncjrs.gov> (2005), p 40.

27

Key Component #8: Monitoring and Evaluation

- o Process and performance measurement and evaluation are tools used to monitor and evaluate the achievement of program goals, identify needed improvements to the Tribal Healing to Wellness Court and to tribal court process, determine participant progress, and provide information to governing bodies, interested community groups, and funding sources.
- o Focuses on:
 - o Process Measures & Evaluations
 - o Performance Measures & Evaluations
- o Observed Challenges for Tribes:
 - o Lack of team developed evaluation plans
 - o Lack of automated record-keeping systems tailored to the evaluation plan
 - o Lack of consistent data collection, entry and reporting

28

Key Component #8: Monitoring and Evaluation

- o Focus in state drug court program evaluations ...
 - o *Are evaluation and monitoring integral to the program?*
- o State Assessment & Research
 - o Programs with evaluation processes in place had better outcomes
 - o (Carey, Finigan, & Pukstas, 2008; Carey et al., 2009)
 - o Four types of evaluation processes were found to save the program money with a positive effect on outcome costs:
 - o (1) maintaining electronic records that are critical to participant case management and to an evaluation
 - o (2) the use of program statistics by the program to make modifications in drug treatment operations
 - o (3) the use of program evaluation results to make modification to drug treatment court operations
 - o (4) the participation of the drug treatment court in more than one evaluation by and independent evaluator

21

Findings from NIJ Wellness Court Study: Component #8

Problems Identified:

- (1) *The purpose and goals of the wellness courts were not well known to their communities at large.*
- (2) *Lack of automated (computerized) wellness records.*
- (3) *Wellness court ended once the federal funding ended.*
- (4) *Recidivism (post-program arrests) for alcohol or drug related offenses for a 3-year period following wellness court participation ranged from 50-59% in the adult courts and over 90% in the juvenile courts.*

Lesson Learned #8 – Collect Automated Wellness Court Information Systematically from Day One

- Begin systematic and automated data collection on Day One of the wellness court to allow for rigorous internal and external evaluations.
- Do not wait until the wellness court is underway and retrospectively collect the information.

Taken from: "Lessons Learned in Implementing the First Four Tribal Wellness Courts," Karen Gottlieb, Ph.D., JD, Electronic Publication (NCJ 231168) on National Criminal Justice Reference Service, U.S. Department of Justice website <http://www.ncjrs.gov> (2005), p 46.

Key Component #9: Continuing Interdisciplinary and Community Education

- o Continuing interdisciplinary and community education promote effective Tribal Healing to Wellness Court planning, implementation, and operation.
- o Focuses on:
 - o Continuing Inter-disciplinary Education
 - o Continuing Community Education
- o Observed Challenges for Tribes:
 - o High rates of team member turnover
 - o Lack of written/updated policies and procedures manuals and agreements
 - o Lack of written/updated curriculum to train new team members

31

Key Component #9: Continuing Interdisciplinary and Community Education

- o Focus in state drug court program evaluations ...
 - o *Is the program continuing to advance its training and knowledge?*
- o State Assessment & Research
 - o Drug treatment court programs requiring all new hires to complete formal training or orientation, and requiring all drug treatment court team members to attend regular trainings were associated with higher graduation rates and greater cost savings due to lower recidivism
 - o (Carey et al., 2008; & in process as of December 2011)

32

Findings from NIJ Wellness Court Study: Component #9

Problems Identified:

- (1) Wellness teams had a great deal of member turnover.
- (2) Recidivism (post-program arrests) for alcohol or drug related offenses for a 3-year period following wellness court participation ranged from 50-59% in the adult courts and over 90% in the juvenile courts.

Lesson Learned #9 – Develop a Written Curriculum for Wellness Court Staff

- Develop a written curriculum for wellness court staff – a wellness court handbook that includes educational information on substance abuse, the wellness court philosophy, and specific information on the policies and procedures of your court. This curriculum can be used to educate new members and help to institutionalize the wellness court even as staff turnover occurs.

Taken from: "Lessons Learned in Implementing the First Four Tribal Wellness Courts," Karen Gottlieb, Ph.D., JD, Electronic Publication (NCJ 231168) on National Criminal Justice Reference Service, U.S. Department of Justice website <http://www.ncjrs.gov> (2005), p 51.

33

Key Component #10: Team and Community Interaction

- o The development and maintenance of ongoing commitments, communication, coordination, and cooperation among Tribal Healing to Wellness Court team members, service providers and payers, the community, and relevant organizations, including the use of formal written procedures and agreements, are critical for Tribal Wellness Court success.
- o Focuses on:
 - o Formal Written Policies, Procedures, & Agreements
- o Observed Challenges for Tribes:
 - o Lack of written agreements (inter-governmental, inter-agency, treatment and habitation services, self-help services, etc.)

34

Key Component #10: Team and Community Interaction

- o Focus in state drug court program evaluations ...
 - o *Compared to other drug courts, has this court developed effective partnerships across the community?*
- o State Assessment & Research
 - o Responses to American University's National Drug Court Survey show that most drug courts are working closely with community groups to provide support services for their drug court participants (examples: self-help groups such as AA and NA, medical providers, local education systems, employment services, faith communities, and Chambers of Commerce)
 - o (Cooper, 2000)
 - o Drug courts that had formal partnerships with community agencies that provide services to drug court participants had better outcomes than drug courts that did not have these partnerships
 - o (Carey et al., 2005; Carey et al., 2010)

35

Findings from NIJ Wellness Court Study: Component #10

Problems Identified:

- (1) Wellness teams had a great deal of member turnover.
- (2) recidivism (post-program arrests) for alcohol or drug related offenses for a 3-year period following wellness court participation ranged from 50-59% in the adult courts and over 90% in the juvenile courts.

Lesson Learned #1 – Develop a Strong Structure for the Wellness Court Team

- Develop a strong structure for your wellness court by building the wellness court team based on roles, not on individuals, to avoid the disintegration of the team due to staff turnover.
- Detail the responsibilities of team members from various agencies in written policies and procedures, such as memoranda of understanding, to ensure the team's integrity.

Taken from: "Lessons Learned in Implementing the First Four Tribal Wellness Courts," Karen Gottlieb, Ph.D., JD, Electronic Publication (NCJ 231168) on National Criminal Justice Reference Service, U.S. Department of Justice website <http://www.ncjrs.gov> (2005), p 87

References

- Carey, S.M., & Finigan, M.W. (2004). A detailed cost analysis in a mature drug court setting: a cost-benefit evaluation of the Multnomah County Drug Court. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 20(3), 292-338.
- Carey, S.M., Mackin, J.R., and Finigan, M.W. (in press). What Works? The 10 Key Components of Drug Courts: Research Based Best Practices. In press with the *Drug Court Review*, to be published in February 2012.
- Carey, S.M. & Waller, M.S. (2011). Benton County Adult Drug Treatment Court Process, Outcome, and Cost Evaluation. Final Report. Submitted to the Benton County Adult Drug Treatment Court, December 2011.
- Carey, S.M. & Waller, M.S. (2010). Oregon Drug Courts: Statewide Costs and Promising Practices. Submitted to the Oregon Criminal Justice Commission and the U.S.D.O.J. Bureau of Justice Assistance, December 2010.
- Carey, S.M., Waller, M.S., & Weller, J.M. (2010). California Drug Court Cost Study: Phase III: Statewide Costs and Promising Practices, final report. Submitted to the California Administrative Office of the Courts, April 2010.
- Carey, S.M., Finigan, M.W., & Pukstas K. (2008). Exploring the Key Components of Drug Courts: A Comparative Study of 18 Adult Drug Courts on Practices, Outcomes and Costs. Submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice, May 2008. NIJ Contract 2005M114.
- Carey, S.M., Finigan, M.W., Waller, M.S., Lucas, L.M., & Crumpton, D. (2005). California drug courts: A methodology for determining costs and benefits, Phase II: Testing the methodology, final report. Submitted to the California Administrative Office of the Courts, November 2004. Submitted to the USDJ Bureau of Justice Assistance in May 2005.
- Carey, S.M., & Perkins, T. (2008). Methamphetamine Users in Missouri Drug Courts: Program Elements Associated with Success. Final Report. Submitted to the Missouri Office of the State Court Administrator, November 2008.
- Carey S.M., Waller, M.S., & Weller, J.M. (2010 in process). California Drug Court Study: Phase III: Statewide Costs and Promising Practices, final report. To be submitted to the California Administrative Office of the Courts.
- Cooper, C. (2000). 2000 drug court survey report: Program operations, services and participant perspectives. American University Web site: <http://spa.american.edu/justice/publications/evexsum.pdf>

37

References (continued)

- Finigan, M.W., Carey, S.M., & Cox, A. (2007). The impact of a mature drug court over 10 years of operation: Recidivism and costs. Final report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice, July 2007. NIJ Contract 2005M073.
- Lurigio, A.J. (2000). Drug treatment availability and effectiveness. *Studies of the general and criminal justice populations. Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 27(4), 495-528.
- Marlowe, D.B., Festinger, D.S., Lee, P.A., Dugosh, K.L., & Benasutti, K.M. (2006). Matching Judicial Supervision to Client Risk Status in Drug Court. *Crime and Delinquency*, 52(1), 52-76.
- SAMHSA/CSAT Treatment Improvement Protocols (1994). TIP 8: Intensive outpatient treatment for alcohol and other drug abuse.

38