

**U.S. District Court
District of Oregon
Portland Reentry Court
Process Evaluation Report
Portland, Oregon**

Submitted to:

Portland Reentry Court
1427 United States Courthouse
1000 Southwest Third Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204



Submitted by:

NPC Research
Portland, OR

June 2013



5100 SW Macadam Ave., Suite 575
Portland, OR 97239
(503) 243-2436
www.npcresearch.com

**U.S. District Court
District of Oregon
Portland Reentry Court
Process Evaluation Report
Portland, Oregon**

Submitted By

NPC Research

Adrian J. Johnson, M.S.W.

Shannon M. Carey, Ph.D.

www.npcresearch.com

For questions about this report or project, please contact Shannon Carey at
(503) 243-2436 x 104 or carey@npcresearch.com.

June 2013



Informing policy, improving programs

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

NPC Research thanks the District of Oregon Portland Reentry Court, for its support of this evaluation. This report is made possible by the great efforts, support, and participation of many people and organizations. In particular, we wish to express gratitude to:

- Judge Marco Hernandez – Reentry Court Judge
- Judge Paul Papak – Reentry Court Judge
- Sara Gnewikow – United States Probation Officer and Reentry Court Coordinator
- Kathleen Blackman - United States Probation Office Administrative Assistant
- Eric Suing – Chief of Probation, retired
- Will Blasher – Acting Chief of Probation
- Patrick Ehlers – Assistant Federal Public Defender
- Jennifer Paget – Federal Public Defender Legal Assistant
- John Laing – Assistant U.S. Attorney
- Casey Palmer, MAC, CADC III – Lifeworks Northwest
- Natalie Seibel, LPC, CADC I – Lifeworks Northwest
- Michelle Rawson, MPA – Courtroom Deputy Clerk
- Melissa Aubin – Legal Counsel/Attorney Advisor
- Reentry court program participants who participated in the focus groups

TABLE OF CONTENTS

BACKGROUND.....	1
Process Evaluation Description and Purpose.....	1
Process Evaluation Methods.....	1
Electronic Program Survey.....	2
Observation.....	2
Key Stakeholder Interviews.....	2
Focus Groups.....	2
Document Review.....	3
GENERAL SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	5
10 KEY COMPONENTS OF DRUG COURTS DETAILED EVALUATION RESULTS.....	11
Key Component #1: Drug courts integrate alcohol and other drug treatment services with justice system case processing.....	11
Key Component #2: Using a non-adversarial approach, prosecution and defense counsel promote public safety while protecting participants’ due process rights.....	15
Key Component #3: Eligible participants are identified early and promptly placed in the drug court program.	17
Key Component #4: Drug courts provide access to a continuum of alcohol, drug and other treatment and rehabilitation services.	21
Key Component #5: Abstinence is monitored by frequent alcohol and other drug testing..	24
Key Component #6: A coordinated strategy governs drug court responses to participants’ compliance.	27
Key Component #7: Ongoing judicial interaction with each participant is essential.	32
Key Component #8: Monitoring and evaluation measure the achievement of program goals and gauge effectiveness.	36
Key Component #9: Continuing interdisciplinary education promotes effective drug court planning, implementation, and operations.	38
Key Component #10: Forging partnerships among drug courts, public agencies, and community-based organizations generates local support and enhances drug court program effectiveness.	39
REFERENCES	43
APPENDIX A: GUIDE FOR USE OF NPC ASSESSMENT AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE REPORTS	45
APPENDIX B: LIST OF DATA ELEMENTS FOR PROGRAM SELF-MONITORING AND EVALUATION	49
APPENDIX C: LETTER FROM UNITED STATES DISTRICT ATTORNEY – DISTRICT OF OREGON.....	59

BACKGROUND

Drug courts are designed to guide offenders identified as drug-addicted into treatment that will reduce drug dependence and improve the quality of life for the offenders and their families. Benefits to society include substantial reductions in crime, resulting in reduced costs to taxpayers and increased public safety.

In the typical drug court program, participants are closely supervised by a judge who is supported by a team of agency representatives operating outside of their traditional roles. The team typically includes a drug court coordinator, case managers, substance abuse treatment providers, prosecuting attorneys, defense attorneys, law enforcement officers, and parole and probation officers who work together to provide needed services to drug court participants. Prosecuting and defense attorneys modify their traditional adversarial roles to support the treatment and supervision needs of program participants. Drug court programs blend the resources, expertise and interests of a variety of jurisdictions and agencies.

Drug courts have been shown to be effective in reducing criminal recidivism (GAO, 2005), improving the psycho-social functioning of offenders (Kralstein, 2010), and reducing taxpayer costs due to positive outcomes for drug court participants (including fewer re-arrests, less time in jail and less time in prison) (Carey & Finigan, 2004; Carey, Finigan, Waller, Lucas, & Crumpton, 2005). Some drug courts have been shown to cost less to operate than processing offenders through business-as-usual in the court system (Carey & Finigan; Carey et al., 2005).

With the success of adult drug courts in reducing recidivism, the application of drug court principles to other populations was the next logical step. Over the past 15 years, the drug court model has been expanded with some success to include a focus on populations such as juveniles (juvenile drug courts), families (family drug treatment courts), DWI offenders (DWI courts), offenders with mental health issues (mental health courts) and offenders reentering the community from incarceration (reentry courts).

Process Evaluation Description and Purpose

In June 2012, the U.S. District Probation Office (headquartered in Portland, Oregon) contracted with NPC research to perform a process evaluation of the Federal Reentry Courts in Portland and Eugene, Oregon. The reentry courts in Portland and Eugene focus on offenders who are involved with drugs; both programs are based on the drug court model, including the 10 Key Components of Drug Court (NADCP, 1997). The process evaluation performed in both programs therefore includes a particular focus on how the programs are implementing research-based best practices within the 10 Key Components. This report contains the evaluation results for the District of Oregon Portland Reentry Court.

Process Evaluation Methods

The information that supports the process evaluation was collected from an online program assessment, staff interviews, participant focus groups, observations of the reentry court sessions, and program documents such as the participant contract, staffing sheets, a monthly reentry court tracking sheet maintained by federal probation, and a previous evaluation completed by the U.S. District Court of Oregon and the University of Oregon. The methods used to gather information from each source are described below.

ELECTRONIC PROGRAM SURVEY

An electronic survey was used to gather program process information from key program staff. This survey, which provides a consistent method for collecting structure and process information from drug courts, was developed based on four main sources: NPC's extensive experience with drug courts, the American University Drug Court Survey, a published paper by Longshore et al. (2001), which lays out a conceptual framework for drug courts, and the 10 Key Components established by the National Association of Drug Court Professionals (1997). The survey covers a number of areas, particularly areas related to the 10 Key Components—including eligibility guidelines, specific drug court program processes (e.g., phases, treatment providers, urinalyses, fee structure, rewards/sanctions), graduation, aftercare, identification of drug court team members and their roles, and a description of drug court participants (e.g., general demographics, drugs of use). The use of an electronic survey allows NPC to begin building an understanding of the program, as well as to collect information that will support a thorough review of the data collected about the site.

OBSERVATION

NPC staff members made several visits to the District of Oregon Portland Reentry Court (PRC), to observe both of the program judges preside over staffing meetings and status review hearings, interview all staff members, and conduct focus groups with current and prior participants.

These observations, team member interviews, and focus groups provided information about the structure, procedures, and routines used in the reentry court.

KEY STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS

Key stakeholder interviews, conducted in person, were a critical component of the process study. NPC staff conducted detailed interviews with individuals involved in the administration of the reentry court, including the two judges, reentry court coordinator/probation officer, assistant U.S. attorney, assistant federal public defender, federal public defender's office legal assistant, two treatment representatives, staff attorney, chief probation officer and deputy chief of probation.

Interviews were conducted to clarify and expand upon information gained from the online assessment and to obtain a deeper and more comprehensive understanding of the PRC process. NPC's Drug Court Typology Interview Guide¹ was referenced for detailed questions about the program. This guide, developed from the same sources as the online survey, provides a consistent method for collecting structure and process information from different types of drug courts. The information gathered through the use of this guide assisted the evaluation team in focusing on the day-to-day operations as well as the most important and unique characteristics of the reentry court.

FOCUS GROUPS

NPC staff conducted focus groups with current participants and participants that did not successfully complete the program. The groups were a mix of both genders, with individuals who were in different phases of the program. The focus groups, which took place during February 2013, pro-

¹ The Typology Guide was originally developed by NPC Research under a grant from the Bureau of Justice Assistance and the Administrative Office of the Courts of the State of California. A copy of this guide can be found at the NPC Research Web site at

[www.npcresearch.com/Files/NPC_Research_Drug_Court_Typology_Interview_Guide_\(copyrighted\).pdf](http://www.npcresearch.com/Files/NPC_Research_Drug_Court_Typology_Interview_Guide_(copyrighted).pdf)

vided participants with an opportunity to share their experiences and perceptions regarding the reentry court process.

DOCUMENT REVIEW

In order to better understand the operations and practices of the PRC, the evaluation team also reviewed program documents including the Reentry Court Interagency Agreement, participant contract, program screening forms from probation and the federal defender, program applications, staffing sheets, a monthly reentry court tracking sheet maintained by probation, and a previous evaluation completed by the U.S. District Court for the District of Oregon and the University of Oregon.

GENERAL SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This section includes brief background information about the District of Oregon Portland Reentry Court and then a summary of the key results and recommendations. The section following this summary provides the detailed results and recommendations for each key component. *Please note that the commendations and recommendations in this summary do not include all commendations and recommendations and do not include the detailed information available in the main text of the report. Please see the main report later in this document for full information.*

The District of Oregon Portland Reentry Court (PRC) was established in 2005 in order to reduce recidivism among drug-involved offenders in the federal system, and was the second program of its kind when it began operation. Currently, there are two judges (an Article III judge and a magistrate judge), each serving in the role of PRC judge. Although the judges alternately preside over staffing and court sessions, both regularly attend sessions in which they are not presiding. The program is designed to take a minimum of 12 months to complete, with the average time in program for graduates estimated to be 13 months. The program population consists of adult drug-addicted offenders who were previously convicted and sentenced to prison or probation in a United States District Court and are serving a term of federal supervision. As of July 2012, there were a total of 164 participants who had entered the program with 86 graduates, 55 discharged unsuccessfully, 2 unable to complete the program (for medical or relocation issues) and 15 currently active.²

Overall, the PRC follows the guidelines and best practices within the 10 Key Components of Drug Courts. Among its many positive attributes, the program should be specifically commended for the following practices:

- **Representatives from many key stakeholders attend staffings and court sessions.** Research shows that each team member contributes an important perspective and can improve participant outcomes by being a part of the team (Carey, Mackin, & Finigan, 2012).
- **Excellent team member communication.** During observations, the team exhibited excellent communication skills, generally agreeing to a recommendation for each participant. At times there were differing opinions, but team members remained respectful and actively listened to one another, which led to productive conversation and resulted in decisions being made that were intended to change participant behavior.
- **A policy committee exists that has appropriate key stakeholders and meets regularly.** The PRC has a policy committee that meets regularly for the purpose of discussing and making decisions about policy issues. Policy meetings include all team members, as well as any other relevant personnel. The program may consider inviting appropriate community partners (employers, service agencies, etc.) as these meetings have an additional benefit of encouraging buy-in of those that attend. The committee is currently awaiting the results of this report to use as a guide for further program policy discussions.

² The number of graduates and unsuccessful discharges reported are the number of individual incidents. These numbers could include duplicates, as participants are able to participate in the PRC program more than once.

- **PRC has a dedicated assistant U.S attorney and assistant federal defender assigned to the program.** Best practices research indicates that having both a defense attorney and prosecutor present results in more positive participant outcomes including significantly lower recidivism and increased cost savings (Carey, Finigan, & Pukstas, 2008). Both attorneys are succeeding in taking a non-adversarial team approach while participating in the reentry court proceedings. They take a treatment-based approach to participant behavior and are clearly supportive of the reentry court concept. *The role of the prosecutor and defense attorney is discussed further in the main body of the report.*
- **Participants are connected with treatment services swiftly.** One of the goals of the reentry court is to connect individuals to services expeditiously and limit their time in the criminal justice system, so the program works to get participants into treatment within 1 week of their first reentry court session.
- **The program length is a minimum of 12 months, and has at least three phases.** Programs that have a minimum length of stay of at least 12 months had significantly higher reductions in recidivism. In addition, programs that had three or more phases showed greater reductions in recidivism (Carey et al., 2012).
- **A single agency provides treatment services.** PRC program participants primarily receive treatment through a single treatment agency. Research shows that having one to two agencies providing treatment is significantly related to better program outcomes including higher graduation rates and lower recidivism (Carey et al., 2012). The PRC is commended for following best practices in this area.
- **Child care services are available to participants during court sessions.** As some participants have children, child care can be difficult to obtain while trying to meet program requirements. It is commended that the PRC takes advantage of resources that allow the program to offer child care, as this practical assistance during court sessions allows the participants to be fully engaged with the program.
- **Rapid results from drug testing.** Research has shown that obtaining drug testing results within 48 hours of submission is associated with higher graduation rates and lower recidivism (Carey et al., 2008). The PRC is commended for adhering to this best practice and also for the frequency of testing required by the program.
- **Drug testing occurs at least 2 times per week in the first phase.** Research indicates that testing 2 or more times per week in the first phase leads to lower recidivism rates. This program is recognized as following best-practices in Phase I drug testing by requiring at least two weekly UAs and is encouraged to continue with this level of testing throughout the other phases.
- **Sanctions are imposed swiftly after noncompliant behavior.** In order for behavior change to occur, there must be a link between the behavior and consequences. Scheduling the noncompliant participant for the next upcoming court session rather than waiting until the participant's next scheduled session to have a sanction applied in court is optimal. The program understands that if a participant has engaged in a behavior that requires a sanction, the sanction must occur as close to the behavior as possible.
- **Both judges work collaboratively and maintain consistency in their responses to participants.** Although the PRC has a unique arrangement with two judges that alternate-

ly preside, because both judges regularly attend staffing and court together, they are able to maintain consistency and perform well together as a team. This was confirmed by multiple team members and participants, as well as observed during site visits.

- **The PRC has completed a previous evaluation and is participating in the current evaluation.** The PRC is commended for its interest in participating in research and evaluation, and its willingness to work on continuous program improvement. Courts that have participated in evaluation and made program modifications based on evaluation feedback have had twice the cost savings compared to courts that have not adjusted their program based on evaluation feedback (Carey et al., 2012).
- **The program has creatively and effectively addressed many participant needs.** The program is commended for thoughtfully coming up with solutions to program barriers faced by participants. The participants provided examples during the focus groups such as bus passes, job readiness training and medical services. This responsiveness helps the participants be more likely to succeed and helps them develop a trust in the program that it really is on their side and working in their best interest. The drug court team should continue discussing possible community connections and resources, and ideas for generating outside support to enhance the program and to be responsive to changes in the environment and participant needs.

Although this program is functioning very well, NPC's review of program operations resulted in some recommendations for program enhancements. It is recognized that it will not always be feasible to implement all of these recommendations due to budgetary, policy or infrastructure limitations. It is important for the team to be as flexible as possible and do what it can to work around the barriers that are not changeable, in order to accomplish the ultimate goal of doing what is best for the participants. The following recommendations represent the primary areas of suggested program improvement that arose in the staff and participant interviews and observations during the site visit. *Background information, more detailed explanations, more quotes from focus group participants and additional recommendations are presented within each of the 10 Key Components in the main body of the report.* Appendix A contains a document providing some suggestions for how to organize the recommendations and make plans to implement any changes.

- **Determine whether it is feasible to add a law enforcement representative to the team.** The PRC could benefit from having a law enforcement representative on the reentry court team. Research has shown that drug courts that include law enforcement as an active team member have higher graduation rates, lower recidivism and higher cost savings (Carey, Waller, & Weller, 2011). The role of law enforcement on the team could include assisting in conducting home visits to verify that participants are living in an environment conducive to recovery. Law enforcement representatives can learn to recognize participants on the street and can provide an extra level of positive supervision.
- **Create a policy and procedures manual.** A policy manual helps to ensure that all partners are operating under the same assumptions—and also helps in clarifying roles, responsibilities, and expectations. The policy manual can also be used as a part of the training process for new team members, to help clarify the expectations and duties associated with their role and to explain program process (i.e., procedures and policies). Much of the information that makes up a policy and procedure manual already exists, but having it centralized will allow the team to adjust program policy more easily, such as termination

guidelines (what behaviors result in termination, how long participants can remain in the program with no progress, etc.).

- **Create a participant handbook.** Creating a handbook specifically for participants would help clarify topics such as length/requirements of program phases, approved over-the-counter medications, and incentives given. Defining program minimums (group sessions, drug tests, etc.) would also help potential participants understand what exactly the program will entail and ensure that they are well informed about the program's expectations. If specific numbers of group and individual treatment sessions cannot be determined in advance because they depend on individual needs, then an average number should be offered as an example.

Similar to the policy and procedures manual, much of the information that makes up a participant handbook exists in various places, so having a central place for this information may be useful. For example, the Reentry Interagency Agreement and participant contract cover many topics that would typically be covered in a participant handbook, and can be used as a starting point. Also, as these documents were originally established to represent both the PRC and Eugene Reentry Court, it would benefit the PRC to create documents that better reflect their current mode of operation in Portland.

- **Review referral process.** It was observed during the evaluation process that there may not be buy-in from all individuals within the agencies that make referrals to the PRC. PRC team members noted that they were aware of this concern during a follow-up meeting to review the evaluation findings, and have already begun efforts to remedy this situation. This includes meetings with the federal court bench, supervisors within the federal probation office, and individuals that complete presentence investigations (PSI's). The overall message that will be conveyed is that the PRC should be considered as another response for addressing individuals involved in the criminal justice system (another "tool in the toolbox," as the team has stated).

The program has also decided to invite individuals within these agencies to attend a staffing and court session (as well as graduation ceremonies) to increase buy-in. This is also to learn about what questions or objections anyone may have. The team discussed whether it would be beneficial to have attendance by probation officers be mandatory at some point as well. Several other ideas were also mentioned, including providing more information to the local halfway house (where many individuals are sent when released from prison) and having more direct contact with the Residential Drug Abuse Program (RDAP) director to identify potential candidates.

- **Continue to work to increase program caseload.** At the time of the site visits, the program had 15 active participants, which is below its stated maximum capacity of 30. In addition to ideas such as making the program mandatory (an issue the program is aware of and will work to address some time in the future), the program stated that their expectation was that the anticipated increase in referrals (discussed above) should result in the program reaching its capacity of 30 participants in approximately one year. If the program does reach capacity at a later time, the program's policy committee should try to determine if the program has the resources for a larger number of clients that each judge could supervise and whether all team members would feel prepared to provide services as needed.

The PRC team is cognizant as a part of the referral process that the program will remain voluntary for now, and will work with these stakeholders in creating language that will

steer more individuals to the PRC but still provide an “out” for those not interested, ineligible, or otherwise have circumstances that prevent them from participating in the program. Overall, the program is being thorough and proactive with its current plans to address these issues and is encouraged to proceed with the strategies discussed.

- **Inform participants about the meeting with the PRC team as a part of the entry process.** The current process for informing prospective participants about the details of program participation works well in providing participants with the appropriate information in general. However, focus group participants felt that the initial meeting with the PRC team was intimidating and stressful. In addition to providing an explanation of the initial meeting in the participant handbook, at a meeting where the team reviewed the recommendations, the PRC team discussed having the probation officer brief participants on what to expect before the meeting occurs including a description of the reentry court team, who will be present, and what is going to happen at the meeting.
- **Consider additional locations where participants can submit drug tests.** The current location of the drug testing center was reported to be problematic for some participants, particularly those who use public transportation. They reported that the PRC will work with them on alternatives, such as providing a sample at the probation office, but that this does not work outside of the probation office’s regular hours or on weekends. When discussing this recommendation the PRC team agreed to consider whether different (or additional) testing centers can be utilized by participants, particularly if testing hours will be shortened. During the follow-up meeting, team members noted that due to the relatively small number of PRC participants, drug testing may be able to be completed at the federal probation office.
- **Streamline communication from drug testing collection site(s).** During a staffing, the team reported that they were still trying to confirm the date of a positive test that had been collected at an outside agency, but had yet to hear back despite several days passing. Due to the importance of receiving drug testing results (and details of those results) so the program can properly respond to a participant’s behavior, creating a memorandum of understanding (MOU) with the collection agency can establish reporting guidelines to the PRC and may increase accountability.
- **Announce the drug test color in morning and shorten window of time to give tests.** As detailed in the National Drug Court Institute’s (NDCI) Judicial Benchbook (2011), this strategy will limit the opportunity participants have to engage in sample tampering tactics by reducing the time between notification of a drug test and the time that the sample collection actually occurs. While there are numerous factors that constrain the court’s sample collection timing and a client’s ability to travel to the collection site, it is important to limit the interval between notification and collection. The more effective a court is at shrinking this time period (should be no longer than a few hours), the greater the success of the program’s deterrent and monitoring efforts.
- **Develop specific guidelines on the use of sanctions and rewards and give a printed copy to each team member.** Drug courts that have written guidelines for sanctions and rewards and that provide these guidelines to the team have double the graduation rate and 3 times the cost savings compared to drug courts that do not have written guidelines (Carrey et al., 2008, 2011). These guidelines should be considered a starting point for team discussion of rewards and sanctions during staffings and not hard and fast rules. They can

help the team in maintaining consistency across participants so that, when appropriate, similar behaviors result in similar sanctions. The guidelines also serve as a reminder of the various reward and sanction options available to the team so they do not fall into habits of using the same type of sanctions (e.g., community service) so frequently that they become ineffective. Written guidelines could also be helpful for new team members in learning about the program. During the discussion of this recommendation, the PRC team was quite interested in developing this set of guidelines.

- **Whenever possible, the judges and team should participate in regular trainings and conference opportunities on the drug court model and related topics.** Although the Article III judge has attended some training, we highly recommend that both judges and the team regularly attend (at least once per year) some formal drug court trainings when time and funding permits, so they can obtain the latest information on best practices. There are also informal (and free) methods of training that can be engaged more immediately. The National Drug Court Resource Center has training materials available at <http://www.ndcrc.org/content/training-technical-assistance>, including publications and free Webinars. Research has shown that drug courts that have formal training for all team members have higher graduation rates and lower recidivism (Carey et al., 2008, 2011). The judge sets an important precedent for the entire team by setting ongoing education as a top priority.
- **Conduct an outcome study.** Program leadership should invest in an outcome evaluation to determine program effectiveness in light of continuing program maturation and the application of program improvements. Implementing a full outcome evaluation can also help determine which components of the program are contributing to participant success and which may be barriers to success. The outcome evaluation should include a comparison of the program with the “business as usual” option (i.e., probation), including information on recidivism and a cost-benefit comparison. The outcome evaluation can also be used to demonstrate the PRC’s effectiveness to stakeholders and establish buy-in from the community. Having numbers based specifically on the PRC may also help the program obtain funding. The team is also aware of this need, and is considering options available to them to complete this recommendation.

Overall, the PRC has successfully implemented a program that incorporates the guidelines of the 10 Key Components of Drug Courts. The program is commended for implementing a program that follows many best drug court practices. The staff should set aside time to discuss the findings and recommendations in this report, both to enjoy the recognition of its accomplishments and to determine how to respond to the recommendations provided.

10 KEY COMPONENTS OF DRUG COURTS DETAILED EVALUATION RESULTS

The District of Oregon Portland Reentry Court (PRC) was established in 2005. There are two judges assigned to the PRC (an Article III judge and a magistrate judge), with each judge presiding over one court session each month. In the event of one judge's absence, the other is typically available to maintain continuity within the program, but both judges participate in staffing and court on a regular basis. This program is designed to take a minimum of 12 months to complete. Most participants successfully complete in an average of 13 months. The program only takes post-conviction offenders as participants. The target population is described as adult drug-addicted offenders who were previously convicted and sentenced to prison or probation in a United States District Court. The most common drug of choice is methamphetamine (47%), followed opiates/heroin (13%), alcohol (13%), and cocaine (13%). There are currently (as of June 2013) 29 active participants in the program.

KEY COMPONENT #1: DRUG COURTS INTEGRATE ALCOHOL AND OTHER DRUG TREATMENT SERVICES WITH JUSTICE SYSTEM CASE PROCESSING.

The focus of this key component is on the integration of treatment services with traditional court case processing. Practices that illustrate an adherence to treatment integration include the role of the treatment provider in the drug court system and the extent of collaboration of all the agencies involved in the program.

In the original monograph on the 10 Key Components (NADCP, 1997), drug court is described as a collaboration between ALL members of a team made up of treatment, the judge, the prosecutor, the defense attorney, the coordinator, case managers, and other community partners. Each team member sees the participant from a different perspective. Participation from all partners contributes to the strength of this model and is one of the reasons it is successful at engaging participants and changing behavior. It is important to keep team members engaged in the process by ensuring they have input on drug court policies and feel their roles and contributions are valued.

National Research

A plethora of research (Carey et al., 2005, 2008, 2011, 2012) has indicated that greater representation of team members from collaborating agencies (e.g., defense attorney, treatment, prosecuting attorney) at team meetings and court hearings is correlated with positive outcomes for participants, including reduced recidivism and, consequently, reduced costs at follow-up. Greater law enforcement involvement increases graduation rates, reduces recidivism and reduces outcome costs (Carey et al., 2008, 2012).

Research has also demonstrated that drug courts with one treatment provider or a single central agency coordinating treatment resulted in more positive participant outcomes including higher graduation rates and lower recidivism costs (Carey et al., 2005, 2008). Findings also indicated that when the treatment provider uses email to convey information to the team, the program has greater reductions in recidivism (Carey et al., 2012).

District of Oregon Portland Reentry Court Process

- The PRC team is composed of an Article III judge, a magistrate judge, a federal probation officer (who also serves as the reentry court coordinator), a federal probation admin-

istrative assistant, an assistant U.S. attorney, an assistant federal public defender, a federal public defender legal assistant, 2 treatment representatives, and a courtroom deputy clerk.

- There is currently no law enforcement representative on the PRC team. Home visits are conducted exclusively by the probation office, but it was noted that they do not occur as often as the team would prefer, due to the limited amount of time they have to complete them.
- Participant quote:*
(In describing team members)
“I think they are all supportive...”
- Staffing sessions, where participant progress is discussed, are held twice per month on Thursday mornings and generally last 2 hours. Those who regularly attend include both judges, federal probation officer, federal probation administrative assistant, assistant U.S. attorney, assistant federal public defender, federal public defender legal assistant, two treatment representatives, and the courtroom deputy clerk.
 - Every participant scheduled for court is discussed in staffing. The discussions center on employment, home visits, phase advancement, engagement in treatment, drug testing, and responding to participants positive and negative behaviors. The probation officer typically offers recommendations for a court response, and the rest of the team provides feedback before a consensus is reached. The judges have the authority to make the final decision (or to implement responses that differ from the team recommendations); however, it was observed that this practice occurs rarely and is used judiciously.
 - Reentry court sessions are held on Thursday afternoons (on the same day as staffing), twice per month and generally last 1-2 hours, with an average of 12-15 participants being seen by the judge. Team members that participate in staffing always attend court sessions. Court security officers are always present as well, although they are not considered members of the team. Community supporters and family/friends of participants are occasionally in attendance as well.
 - The PRC works directly with one outpatient treatment provider, Lifeworks Northwest, to provide treatment services to participants. Lifeworks is directly contracted with the federal probation office to provide treatment services to anyone under supervision (which includes PRC participants) and provides services for the majority of participants in the PRC. The PRC also uses inpatient treatment providers from time to time. The contract for treatment services is put out for bid every 3 years by the federal probation office, with the contract being awarded to the lowest bidder of services. Contract renewals then occur annually. Participants with private or other insurance coverage may receive services from other providers, but the PRC team noted this was a very small percentage of participants. In these situations, the probation officer maintains contact with the providers, mostly by phone. They do not regularly provide written progress reports, but may advise the probation officer of missed sessions or other issues.
 - The regular treatment provider representatives communicate with the probation officer via written progress reports prior to staffing sessions. The probation office’s contract with Lifeworks requires that monthly written progress reports be sent in for billing purposes. Once this information has been received by the appropriate personnel at the probation office, it is forwarded to the PRC probation officer to be used in staffings. The treatment provider also provides updates verbally during staffings (and in court sessions as needed). Ad-

ditionally, treatment provider representatives regularly communicate via email and telephone with the probation officer (as well the entire team) between court sessions for issues that need immediate attention. Team members reported that information from the treatment provider is always provided in a timely and efficient manner.

- The reentry court team has a formal policy committee that meets regularly outside of staffing on an as needed basis to discuss program issues. The committee consists of all active team members (those who attend staffing and court). Additional staff such as the chief of probation, deputy chief probation officer, attorney advisor or chief judge may attend when needed as well.
- The majority of drug testing is submitted at a local halfway house, Northwest Regional Re-entry Center. Focus group participants noted difficulties in going to the halfway house due to its location, particularly those that utilize public transportation. The halfway house is directly contracted by federal probation to collect drug tests on all individuals under federal supervision. Non-negative results (or issues such as suspected tampering) are reported immediately to the probation officer, who then informs the rest of the team. The federal probation office also collects drug tests on an as-needed basis for participants who can't make it out to the halfway house due to conflicts with work schedules, transportation issues to the halfway house, etc.
- Case management is primarily provided by the probation officer. However, the assistant federal defender, federal public defender's legal assistant, and treatment representatives will occasionally provide case management services in certain situations or when requested.

Commendations

- **Representatives from many key stakeholders attend staffings and court sessions.** Research shows that each team member contributes an important perspective and can improve participant outcomes by being a part of the team (Carey et al., 2012).
- **Stability among team members.** Having team members who remain in the program (their positions do not rotate) helps build efficiency, consistency and relationships and is a benefit to the participants. The PRC specifies this aspect of the team dynamic in its interagency agreement, and although it states that certain team members (probation officer, U.S. attorney, federal public defender) will be involved and appear for each court session, the PRC has had continuity among most of its team members, resulting in a cohesive team dynamic.
- **Excellent team member communication.** During observations, the team exhibited excellent communication skills, generally agreeing to a recommendation for each participant. At times there were differing opinions, but team members remained respectful and actively listened to one another, which led to productive conversation and resulted in decisions that were intended to change participant behavior.
- **Regular email communication.** Team members noted that updates occur regularly via email regarding participant behavior and court responses. Staff noted that information was timely and team members provide input as needed, and that protocols were in place to notify appropriate parties. Drug courts that shared information among team members through email had 65% lower recidivism than drug courts that did not use email (Carey et al., 2011).

- **A policy committee exists that has appropriate key stakeholders and meets regularly.** The PRC has a policy committee that meets regularly for the purpose of discussing and making decisions about policy issues. Policy meetings include all team members, as well as any other relevant personnel. The program may consider inviting appropriate community partners (employers, service agencies, etc.) as these meetings have an additional benefit of encouraging buy-in of those that attend. The committee is currently awaiting the results of this report to use as a guide for further program policy discussions.

Recommendations

- **Determine whether it is feasible to add a law enforcement representative to the team.** The PRC could benefit from having a law enforcement representative on the team. Research has shown that drug courts that include law enforcement as an active team member have higher graduation rates, lower recidivism and higher cost savings (Carey et al., 2011). The role of law enforcement on the team could include assisting in conducting home visits to verify that participants are living in an environment conducive to recovery. Law enforcement representatives can learn to recognize participants on the street and can provide an extra level of positive supervision.
- **Evaluate current process for receiving treatment updates.** Currently, Lifeworks is required to submit monthly progress reports to the contracts unit of the federal probation office for billing purposes. Once it has been received by the contracts unit, this information is ultimately passed on to the probation officer, who uses this information to update progress reports prior to staffing. We suggest that the probation officer receive this information without delay (perhaps have Lifeworks send an additional copy of the monthly progress report to the probation officer, or the probation officer could obtain a copy of the report once it's received by the contracts unit). The team should also consider the feasibility of receiving written progress reports prior to each staffing and court session (instead of just once per month). Lifeworks does verbally provide updates on participants during each court session, but providing more frequent, brief progress reports will allow the court to further document a participant's involvement in the program.
- **Create a policy and procedures manual.** A policy manual helps to ensure that all partners are operating under the same assumptions—and also helps in clarifying roles, responsibilities, and expectations. New representatives from the treatment provider have recently joined the PRC, and clarification around their role on the team would be helpful. This can serve as an opportunity to document and clarify *all* team member roles on the team, and also be used as a part of the training process for new team members. In addition, it will help explain the expectations and duties associated with their role and overall program processes (i.e., policies and procedures). Much of the information that makes up a policy and procedure manual already exists, but having it centralized will allow the team to adjust program policy more easily, such as termination guidelines (what behaviors result in termination, how long participants can remain in the program with no progress, etc.) or eligibility standards.
- **Create a participant handbook.** Creating a handbook specifically for participants would help clarify topics such as length/requirements of program phases, approved over-the-counter medications, and incentives given. Defining program minimums (group sessions, drug tests, etc.) would also help potential participants understand what exactly the program will entail and ensure that they are well informed about the program's

expectations. If specific numbers of group and individual treatment sessions cannot be determined in advance because they depend on individual needs, then an average number should be offered as an example.

Similar to the policy and procedures manual, much of the information that makes up a participant handbook exists in various places, so having a central place for this information may be useful. For example, the Reentry Interagency Agreement and participant contract cover many topics that would typically be covered in a participant handbook, and can be used as a starting point. Also, as these documents were originally established to represent both the PRC and Eugene Reentry Court, it would benefit the PRC to create documents that better reflect its current mode of operation in Portland.

KEY COMPONENT #2: USING A NON-ADVERSARIAL APPROACH, PROSECUTION AND DEFENSE COUNSEL PROMOTE PUBLIC SAFETY WHILE PROTECTING PARTICIPANTS' DUE PROCESS RIGHTS.

This key component is concerned with the balance of three important issues. The first issue is the nature of the relationship between the prosecution and defense counsel in drug court. Unlike traditional case processing, drug court case processing favors a non-adversarial approach. The second issue is to ensure the drug court remains responsible for promoting public safety. The third issue is to ensure the protection of participants' due process rights.

National Research

Research by Carey et al. (2008) and Carey et al. (2012) found that participation by the prosecution and defense attorneys in team meetings and at drug court status review hearings had a positive effect on graduation rates and recidivism³ costs.

In addition, drug courts that allowed non-drug-related charges also showed lower recidivism costs. Allowing participants into the drug court program only post-plea was associated with lower graduation rates and higher investment⁴ costs while drug courts that mixed pre-trial and post-trial offenders had similar outcomes as drug courts that keep those populations separate (Carey et al., 2012).

District of Oregon Portland Reentry Court Process

- A dedicated assistant federal public defender and assistant U.S. attorney have been permanently assigned to the PRC team and actively participate in all staffing and court sessions.
- Since the program only accepts post-conviction cases, the PRC assistant U.S attorney typically confers with those in his office that prosecuted cases the team has under consideration. This allows the assistant U.S. attorney to provide input and ultimately give approval to anyone entering the program.
- The assistant federal public defender maintains close contact with participants during their time in the program. The participants can contact the federal defender at any time

³ Recidivism costs are the expenses related to the measures of participant outcomes, such as re-arrests, jail time, probation, etc. Successful programs result in lower recidivism costs, due to reductions in new arrests and incarcerations, because they create less work for courts, law enforcement, and other agencies than individuals who have more new offenses.

⁴ Investment costs are 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.

with questions or to discuss any ongoing issues. The federal defender generally does not represent participants after they have been terminated from the program.

- The assistant federal public defender and assistant U.S. attorney are included on all PRC policy-related matters.
- The assigned assistant federal public defender has attended national drug court conferences and received drug court-specific training. The assistant U.S. attorney has not received drug court-specific training since being assigned to the team, reporting that the U.S. Attorney's Office does not have the funding to do so.
- Both attorneys are typically contacted and aware when a reentry court participant is sanctioned to jail for noncompliant behavior.
- The program may allow participants with non-drug charges, violent charges, drug dealing charges, or mental health issues into the program. However, the team conveyed that many times these issues must be considered on a case-by-case basis. For example, the team noted that the more recent a violent crime was committed or depending on the level of mental health services needed by an individual, the team will more carefully consider a case before accepting someone into the program.

Commendations

- **PRC has a dedicated assistant U.S attorney and assistant federal defender assigned to the program.** Best practices research indicates that having both a defense attorney and prosecutor present results in more positive participant outcomes including significantly lower recidivism and increased cost savings (Carey et al., 2008). Both attorneys are succeeding in taking a non-adversarial team approach while participating in the reentry court proceedings. They take a treatment-based approach to participant behavior and are clearly supportive of the reentry court concept.

It is important to remember that the goal of problem-solving courts is to change behavior by coercing treatment while protecting both participant rights and public safety. Punishment takes place at the initial sentencing. After punishment, the focus of the court shifts to the application of science and research to produce a clean healthy citizen where there was once an addicted criminal, while also protecting the constitutional rights of the participant. Having prepared counsel on both sides present in court allows for contemporaneous resolution, court response, and return to treatment.

The role of the defense counsel continues to be advocacy, as long as it does not interrupt the behavior modification principles of timely response to participant behavior. Advocacy takes different forms and occurs at different times, but it is equally powerful and critical in the drug court setting regardless of whether the program is pre-adjudication or post-adjudication. Drug courts are not due process shortcuts, they are the courts and counsel using their power and skills to facilitate treatment within constitutional bounds while monitoring the safety of the public and the client participant. Drug court clients are seen more frequently, supervised more closely, and monitored more stringently than other offenders. Thus, they have more violations of program rules and probation. Counsel must be there to rapidly address legal issues, settle violations, and move the case back to treatment and program case plans.

The role of the prosecution is still to protect public safety, including that of the client. Prosecutors have tremendous power, which can be used to facilitate the goals of the Court. The power can be used to praise, engage, and encourage participants in the Court. Prosecutors can be excellent participants in reinforcing incentives, or in instilling hope on “bad days.” Sometimes a simple “I am glad to see you” makes a difference when it comes from such an unusual source.

- **The program can admit participants with non-drug or violence charges.** Allowing a wide range of charges is commended, and allows reentry court services to be available to a large group of offenders that need them. Research shows that courts where charges in addition to drug-related charges are eligible for participation had lower recidivism and higher cost savings. In addition, research in 69 drug courts showed that programs that included offenders with violent charges had similar outcomes to those that did not include violent offenders, demonstrating that drug court is equally effective with varying degrees of high-risk participants (Carey et al., 2012).

Recommendations

- **Explore options for obtaining training on the drug court model and related topics for the assistant U.S. attorney.** We recommend that the PRC team explore ways to obtain training for any team member who have not had education as well as refreshers for those who have. These trainings should include education on the drug court model, incentives and sanctions, the program’s specific target population, collaboration and drug court roles.

KEY COMPONENT #3: ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANTS ARE IDENTIFIED EARLY AND PROMPTLY PLACED IN THE DRUG COURT PROGRAM.

The focus of this component is on the development and effectiveness of the eligibility criteria and referral process. Different drug courts have different eligibility and exclusion criteria. Some drug courts include criteria unrelated to the defendant’s criminal history or addiction severity, such as requiring that participants admit to a drug problem or meet other “suitability” requirements. Research reveals that the most effective drug courts have clearly defined eligibility criteria. It is advisable to have these criteria written and provided to all potential referral sources. Drug courts also differ in how they determine if a client meets entry criteria. While drug courts are always targeting clients with a substance use problem, the drug court may or may not use a substance abuse screening instrument to determine eligibility. The same may apply to mental health screens. A screening process that includes more than just an examination of legal eligibility may take more time, but also results in more accurate identification of individuals who are appropriate for the services provided by the drug court.

Related to the eligibility process is how long it takes a drug court participant to move through the system from arrest to referral to drug court entry. The goal is to implement an expedient process. The length of time that passes between arrest to referral and referral to drug court entry, the key staff involved in the referral process, and whether there is a central agency responsible for treatment intake are all factors that impact the expediency of program entry.

National Research

Carey et al. (2008) found that courts that accepted pre-plea offenders and included misdemeanors as well as felonies had both lower investment and outcome costs. Courts that accepted non-drug-related charges also had lower outcome costs, although their investment costs were higher.

Those courts that expected 50 days or less from arrest to drug court entry had higher savings than those courts that had a longer time period between arrest and entry (Carey et al., 2012).

Other research found that drug courts that included a screen for suitability and excluded participants who were found unsuitable had the same outcomes (e.g., the same graduation rates) as drug courts that did not screen for suitability and did not exclude individuals based on suitability (Carey & Perkins, 2008). Moreover, programs that did *not* exclude offenders with mental health issues had a significant cost savings compared with those that did (Carey et al., 2012).

District of Oregon Portland Reentry Court Process

- The target population of the PRC consists of people who were previously convicted and sentenced to prison or probation in a United States District Court. The program accepts substance abusers, as well as those that are substance dependent, and participants always enter the program in post-conviction status. The team reported that most candidates are moderate to high risk, based on their Post-Conviction Risk Assessment (PCRA) score. However, a multitude of other factors are also considered before admission including participant history, treatment needs, team member opinions of suitability (team member opinion of what makes them a good candidate, severity of substance use, etc.), and amenability to treatment services.
- Sex offenses, those under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Parole Commission, and individuals using certain narcotic medications (such as methadone) are not eligible for consideration to the reentry court. Team members reported that other factors (those with severe mental illness, violent offenses, etc.) do not necessarily disqualify potential participants, but are considered “red flags” that the team would have to discuss (and come to a consensus on) prior to their admission.
- The PRC eligibility requirements are written and most referring team agencies have copies of the eligibility criteria.
- Program referrals are primarily from the federal probation office. Any federal probation officer in the district can identify a high-risk client who is having issues on supervision (such as relapse), and refer him or her to the PRC. New supervision cases are also assigned to the PRC probation officer if the individual could potentially be a candidate for reentry court. There was a concern that not all probation officers were referring cases to the PRC and have not “bought in” to the idea of the program. Referrals may also come from defense attorneys, treatment providers, or by self-referral.
- After being referred to the program, the PRC probation officer will complete an interview with individuals using an in-house screening form that collects noncompliance/revocation history, drug testing history, employment information, and any potential mental health or medical issues. The probation officer will then explain the program requirements and expectations to participants. Information gathered from the interview, the pre-sentence investigation (PSI), and other documentation (as applicable) such as probation violation reports are then brought to the PRC team for consideration for entry to the program during staffing. The team discusses this information along with their history, appropriateness for program, and many other factors before deciding as a team to accept them into the program. Participants then meet directly with the team prior to their first court session. A brief discussion occurs with the team regarding such topics as their interest or motivation in coming to the program before they are officially accepted to the program.

- The estimated time between referral and program entry is 31 to 60 days.
- The program always assesses participants for risk through the Post-Conviction Risk Assessment (PCRA), as all potential participants have one completed by the probation office within 60 days of their release from federal prison.
- Lifeworks Northwest or another provider ensures that a full behavior health assessment has been performed on each offender. An individualized treatment plan is developed from the assessment, including group and individual therapy sessions.
- Approximately 93% of PRC participants are polysubstance users/abusers. The estimated percent of most participants' primary drug of choice is as follows: 47% methamphetamine, 13% opiates/heroin, 13% alcohol, 13% cocaine and 14% other.
- Team members noted that incentives for entering the program include a 1-year reduction of an individual's term of supervision upon graduation, avoidance of a probation violation hearing that may result in probation revocation, the direct interaction with the judges, and the support/guidance received from team members and treatment.
- The reentry court's capacity is reported to be approximately 30 participants. As of November 2012, the program had 16 active participants.

Participant quotes:

"(I)...needed to build up my support groups and that's something that increases as the program goes on. I felt that if I do that...if I continue, it would be good."

"I (wanted the) year off, but that was secondary. I needed the accountability...and the structure."

"I've been on probation too long...ready to be off and the program was a way to do that."

Commendations

- **Participants are connected with treatment services swiftly.** One of the goals of the reentry court is to connect individuals to services expeditiously and limit their time in the criminal justice system, so the program works to get participants into treatment within 1 week of their first reentry court session.

Recommendations

- **Confirm that team members (and respective agencies) have copies of the eligibility criteria.** The PRC should confirm that all referring agencies have received a copy of the most recent eligibility criteria. Any changes or updates made as a result of this evaluation should also be provided to these agencies.
- **Review referral process.** It was observed during the evaluation process that there may not be buy-in from all individuals within the agencies that make referrals to the PRC. PRC team members noted that they were aware of this concern during a follow-up meeting in which the evaluation recommendations were discussed, and have already begun efforts to remedy this situation. This includes meetings with the federal court bench, supervisors within the federal probation office, and individuals that complete presentence investigations (PSI's). The overall message that will be conveyed is that the PRC should be considered as another response for addressing individuals involved in the criminal justice system (another "tool in the toolbox," as the team has stated).

The program has also decided to invite individuals within these agencies to attend a staffing and court session (as well as graduation ceremonies) to increase buy-in. This is also to learn about what questions or objections anyone may have. The team discussed whether it would be beneficial to have attendance by probation officers be mandatory at some point as well. Several other ideas were also mentioned, including providing more information to the local halfway house (where many individuals are sent when released from prison) and having more direct contact with the Residential Drug Abuse Program (RDAP) to identify potential candidates.

- **Continue to work to increase program caseload.** At the time of the site visits, the program had 15 active participants, which is below its stated maximum capacity of 30. In addition to ideas such as making the program mandatory (an issue the program is aware of and will work to address some time in the future), the program stated that their expectation was that the anticipated increase in referrals (discussed above) should result in the program reaching its capacity of 30 participants in approximately one year. If the program does reach capacity at a later time, the program's policy committee should try to determine if the program has the resources for a larger number of clients that each judge could supervise and whether all team members would feel prepared to provide services as needed. (**Update:** In June 2013, the program reached 29 participants).

The PRC team is cognizant as a part of the referral process that the program will remain voluntary for now, and will work with these stakeholders in creating language that will steer more individuals to the PRC but still provide an "out" for those not interested, ineligible, or otherwise have circumstances that prevent them from participating in the program. Overall, the program is being thorough and proactive with their current plans to address these issues and is encouraged to proceed with the strategies discussed.

- **Avoid assessing for suitability.** PRC staff considers the suitability of participants (among many other factors) prior to admission. Specifically, the participants' perceived motivation level (participants are asked what makes them a good candidate), along with the seriousness/history of their substance abuse and openness to treatment. Research has shown that screening participants for suitability and excluding "unsuitable" participants has no effect on program outcomes including graduation and recidivism rates (Carey & Perkins, 2008; Carey et al., 2008, 2011). Removing the suitability criteria from eligibility guidelines may also help the program receive more referrals.
- **Inform participants about the meeting with the PRC team as a part of the entry process.** The current process for informing prospective participants about the details of program participation works well in providing participants with the appropriate information in general. However, focus group participants felt that the initial meeting with the PRC team was intimidating and stressful. In addition to providing an explanation of the initial meeting in the participant handbook, at a meeting where the team reviewed the recommendations, the PRC team discussed having the probation officer brief participants on what to expect before the meeting occurs including a description of the reentry court team, who will be present, and what is going to happen at the meeting.

KEY COMPONENT #4: DRUG COURTS PROVIDE ACCESS TO A CONTINUUM OF ALCOHOL, DRUG AND OTHER TREATMENT AND REHABILITATION SERVICES.

The focus of this key component is on the drug court's ability to provide participants with a range of treatment services appropriate to their clinical needs. Success under this component is highly dependent on success under the first component (i.e., ability to integrate treatment services within the program). Compliance with Key Component #4 requires having a range of treatment modalities or types of service available. However, drug courts still have decisions about how wide a range of treatment and habilitation services to provide, available levels of care, and which services are important for their target population.

National Research

Programs that took at least 12 months to complete had higher reductions in recidivism. In addition, programs that had three or more phases showed greater reductions in recidivism (Carey et al., 2012).

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 (Carey et al., 2005) and substantially higher graduation rates and improved recidivism costs (Carey et al., 2008, 2012). Clear requirements of this type may make compliance with program goals easier for participants and also may facilitate program staff in determining if participants have been compliant. They also ensure that participants are receiving the optimal dosage of treatment determined by the program as being associated with future success.

Research has found that participants who participate in group treatment sessions 2 or 3 times per week have better outcomes (Carey et al., 2005). Programs that require more than three treatment sessions per week may create a hardship for participants (such as with transportation, childcare, or employment), and may lead to participants having difficulty complying with program requirements and completing the program. Conversely, it appears that one or fewer sessions per week is too little service to demonstrate positive outcomes. In addition, drug courts that include a focus on relapse prevention were shown to have higher graduation rates and lower recidivism than drug courts that did not (Carey et al., 2011). Programs that offered mental health services, parenting services and family counseling showed greater reductions in recidivism (Carey et al., 2012) than programs that did not offer these services to participants.

The American University National Drug Court Survey (Cooper, 2000) showed that most drug courts have a single treatment provider agency. NPC, in a study of 18 drug courts in four different states (Carey et al., 2008), found that having a single provider or an agency that oversees all the providers is correlated with more positive participant outcomes, including lower recidivism and lower recidivism-related costs. More recent research supported this finding, revealing that reductions in recidivism decrease as the number of treatment agencies increase (Carey et al., 2012).

Participant quotes:

"They did explain that I would meet with the team and get accepted, but I didn't know who the 'team' was. I thought it was just going to be a couple people....then I walk in and it was like wow, there's a prosecutor, two judges... Everything is really quiet and they are all looking right at you."

"I didn't even know what it was. I just walked in a room and shook hands with a bunch of people...then one of them tells me he's a judge."

"I would have liked to know more about who was on the team and what the setting was going to be like. I already had a lot of anxiety before going in."

Discharge and transitional services planning is a core element of substance abuse treatment (SAMHSA/CSAT, 1994). The longer drug-abusing offenders remain in treatment and the greater the continuity of care following treatment, the greater their chance for success (Lurigio, 2000).

District of Oregon Portland Reentry Court Process

- The PRC is intended to last 12 months and has four phases, with program requirements progressively reduced over time. The team reported that participants typically spend an average of 13 months in the program.
- An individualized treatment plan is developed for each participant. On average, they attend group treatment twice a week. Individual sessions average 1-2 times per month at the beginning of the program as well. The amount of treatment/number of sessions is continually evaluated by the treatment provider and gradually decreases as participants progress through the program.
- Participants are also required to attend self-help meetings throughout the program. In the first two phases of the program, participants must attend two verified meetings per week. This increases to four meetings per week in the last two phases of the program. The PRC requires both substance abusers and those substance dependent to attend self-help meetings. However, team members stated that many of these meetings may not focus on substance dependence but instead provide substance abusers with an additional support system. AA/NA meetings are prominent, but participants may also attend meetings centered around overeating, co-dependency, family relationships, and cognitive thinking.
- The treatment provider, Lifeworks Northwest, works with individuals in two separate capacities within the agency. The first is the *addictions-alcohol and drug program*. The second is the *mental health-dual diagnosis program*. While each program has a specific focus and may work exclusively with certain participants, treatment counselors noted that overlap occurs within the curriculum and some participants will work with both programs if necessary.
- Participants are always screened by Lifeworks for co-occurring mental disorders as well as suicidal ideation after being admitted to the program. For those found to have co-occurring disorders, mental health treatment is required as part of their program-related treatment.
- Lifeworks completes an in-house assessment called the Behavioral Health Assessment on participants that determines their area(s) of need, including DSM-IV classifications. The *addictions-alcohol and drug program* also uses American Society of Addiction Medicine (ASAM) criteria to determine level of care, while the *mental health-dual diagnosis program* uses the Level of Care Utilization System (LOCUS). This information is then used to create an individualized treatment plan that must be consistent with participant needs and adjusted as appropriate during the program.
- *Services required for some participants are based on assessed level of care and include:* outpatient individual treatment sessions, outpatient group treatment sessions, self-help meetings, gender-specific treatment, residential treatment, mental health counseling, detox, referral-based psychotropic medication services, parenting classes/support, prenatal

Participant quotes:
 “I feel very supported by my counselor.”
 “They are very helpful...”

program, anger management/violence prevention, job/vocational training, employment assistance, GED/education assistance, housing/homelessness assistance, Moral Reconation Therapy, Living in Balance, Motivation Interviewing, and Recovery Training/Self Help. *Services offered to some participants, but not required include:* health care, dental care, transportation.

- Aftercare services are available through Lifeworks if a participant continues to be on federal probation after being discharged from the program. For those who continue on probation, any and all services that are normally provided are available.
- Limited child care services are available for participants with children through the Multnomah County CourtCare program. Through the program, child care is provided during court proceedings to any individual with a scheduled court appearance, including PRC participants.
- TriMet passes may be given to participants who are experiencing transportation difficulties, although a lack of funding greatly limits the number of passes provided.
- Transitional housing is provided for men and women by Northwest Regional Reentry Center, but team members noted delays occur frequently due to a high volume of individuals using their services.
- No fees are required or collected for the PRC, as funding from the District of Oregon U.S. Probation Department funds services for those on federal supervision.

Commendations

- **The program length is a minimum of 12 months, and has at least three phases.** Programs that have a minimum length of stay of at least 12 months had significantly higher reductions in recidivism. In addition, programs that had three or more phases showed greater reductions in recidivism (Carey et al., 2012).
- **A single agency provides treatment services.** PRC program participants primarily receive treatment through a single treatment agency. Research shows that having one to two agencies providing treatment is significantly related to better program outcomes including higher graduation rates and lower recidivism (Carey et al, 2012).
- **The program offers an array of treatment services and uses evidence-based programming.** As described above, the PRC offers a breadth of diverse and specialized services to program participants through its partnership with Lifeworks.
- **The program offers referrals to health and medical services for participants.** Key stakeholder and focus group participants reported that PRC team members have made referrals for health and medical care when needed. Meeting participant needs across the spectrum of issues affecting their lives can help them be more successful. In addition, appropriate medical care can help mitigate participant use of substances to self-medicate problems related to physical pain. Many programs have seen benefits with reduction in recidivism from offering health services.
- **The program provides relapse prevention education while participants are active in the program and an aftercare program following graduation.** Drug courts that provide relapse prevention education and aftercare have significantly improved participant

outcomes (Carey et al., 2012). Aftercare is also a clinical best practice, supporting individuals in their transition to a drug-free lifestyle.

- **Child care services are available to participants during court sessions.** As many participants have children, child care can be difficult to obtain while trying to meet program requirements. It is commended that the PRC takes advantage of resources that allow the program to offer child care, as this practical assistance during court sessions allows the participants to be fully engaged with the program.

Recommendations

- The program is following research-based best practices for drug courts within Key Component #4 and is using evidence-based treatment. There are no recommendations in this area at this time.

KEY COMPONENT #5: ABSTINENCE IS MONITORED BY FREQUENT ALCOHOL AND OTHER DRUG TESTING.

The focus of this key component is on the use of alcohol and other drug testing as a part of the drug court program. Drug testing is important both for court supervision and for participant accountability. It is generally seen as a key practice in participants' treatment process. This component encourages frequent testing but does not define the term "frequent" so drug courts develop their own guidelines on the number of tests required. Related to this component, the drug court must assign responsibility for these tests and the method for collection.

National Research

Research on drug courts in California (Carey et al., 2005, 2012) found that drug testing that occurs randomly, at least 2 times per week, is the most effective model. If testing occurs more frequently (that is, more than 2 times per week), the random component becomes less important as it is difficult to find time to use in between frequent tests. Drug test results that were returned in 2 days or less have been associated with greater cost savings and greater reductions in recidivism (Carey et al., 2012).

In addition to frequency of testing, it is important to ensure that drug testing is random, unexpected, and fully observed during sample collection, as there are numerous ways for individuals to predict when testing will happen and therefore use in between tests or submit a sample that is not their own. In focus groups with participants after they left their programs, individuals have reported many ways they were able to "get around" the drug testing process, including sending their cousin to the testing agency and bringing their 12-year-old daughter's urine to submit.

District of Oregon Portland Reentry Court Process

- Drug testing is randomized using a color code call-in system. Participants are required to call in every day to a recorded message that states the color for the day. The message is set each day at 12:01a.m. and participants may call in at any point after it is set. If the message states a participant's assigned color, they have from 8:00 a.m. – 8:00 p.m. to submit a urinalysis test. A participant's drug test color may change (to increase or decrease testing frequency) while participating in the program.
- Drug test collection is performed for the reentry court primarily by a halfway house, Northwest Regional Reentry Center, which is contracted with the federal probation office to collect the drug tests. The halfway house is always staffed by a male and female, and

tests are fully observed by a same-sex employee. The probation office noted that they occasionally collect participant drug tests in their office as well and follow the same procedures.

- Frequency of drug testing ranges from approximately 1-2 times per week in Phase I to once every 2 weeks during the last phase of the program. Drug testing is also done for cause (if there is suspicion or someone appears under the influence). Probation supervision conditions state that a participant may receive a maximum of eight drug tests per month (based on an appeals court ruling).
- Drug testing at the halfway house is mainly performed with a 8-panel on-site instant test cup, though breathalyzers are utilized on occasion. The probation office reported that they utilize breathalyzers, alcohol monitoring bracelets, and sweat patches when appropriate. They also reported that tests sent to a lab for additional testing (diluted tests, synthetic testing, EtG) are primarily collected at the probation office, and occurs infrequently due to high costs.
- Negative test results are tracked by the probation officer and reported to the team at each reentry court staffing. Staff at the halfway house report non-negative drug test results (positives, missed, etc.) to the probation officer, who then updates the rest of the reentry court team via email to determine if an immediate response is necessary. Non-negative results are also tracked and reported to the team during each staffing session.
- Participants are required to have a minimum of 180 days sober (negative drug tests) before graduation.

Commendations

- **Rapid results from drug testing.** Research has shown that obtaining drug testing results within 48 hours of submission is associated with higher graduation rates and lower recidivism (Carey et al., 2008). The PRC is commended for adhering to this best practice and also for the frequency of testing required by the program.
- **Drug testing occurs at least 2 times per week in the first phase.** Research indicates that testing 2 or more times per week in the first phase leads to lower recidivism rates. This program is recognized as following best-practices in Phase I drug testing by requiring at least two weekly UAs and is encouraged to consider this level of testing throughout other phases.
- **The program requires participants to be clean at least 180 days before graduation.** Drug courts where participants are expected to have greater than 90 days clean (negative drug tests) before graduation had 164% greater reductions in recidivism compared to programs that expected less clean time (Carey et al., 2012).

Recommendations

- **Send all drug test results to team members.** Sending daily (or as much as possible) updates containing drug test information to all team members (including negative test results) will ensure that everyone is aware of how often participants are being tested, along with their most recent test. The treatment provider noted that this will aid them greatly if they believe a participant may be using and can confirm the last test that was submitted. This may also benefit other team members as well. The PRC should consider the feasibility

ity of assigning this task to a staff member, while also determining the types of information that would be included (participant names, colors only, time test was taken, etc.).

- **Streamline communication from drug testing collection site(s).** During a staffing, the team reported that they were still trying to confirm the date of a positive test that had been collected at an outside agency, but had yet to hear back after several days. Due to the importance of receiving drug testing results (and details of those results) so the program can properly respond to a participant's behavior, creating a memorandum of understanding (MOU) with the collection agency can establish reporting guidelines to the PRC and may increase accountability.
- **Consider additional locations where participants can submit drug tests.** The current location of the drug testing center was reported to be problematic for some participants, particularly those that use public transportation. They reported that the PRC will work with them on alternatives, such as providing a sample at the probation office, but that this does not work outside of the probation office's regular hours or on weekends. When discussing this recommendation the PRC team agreed to consider whether different (or additional) testing centers can be utilized by participants, particularly if testing hours will be shortened. During the follow-up meeting, team members noted that due to the relatively small number of PRC participants, drug testing may be able to be completed at the federal probation office.
- **Consider announcing the drug test color in the morning and shortening the window of time to give tests.** As detailed in the National Drug Court Institute's (NDCI) Judicial Benchbook (2011), this strategy will limit the opportunity participants have to engage in sample tampering tactics by reducing the time between notification of a drug test and the time that the sample collection actually occurs. While there are numerous factors that constrain the court's sample collection timing and a PRC client's ability to travel to the current collection site, it is important to limit the interval between notification and collection. The more effective a court is at shrinking this time period, the greater the success of the program's deterrent and monitoring efforts.
- **Test for diluted urine samples.** Outside of confirmations for positive tests on the instant drug test cups, the drug test collection agency that is currently utilized by the PRC is unable to perform any additional testing unless orders are received to do so (which occurs rarely). It is recommended that the team explore ways to make the program's drug testing more reliable including testing for creatinine, as sample dilution is by far the most common tampering technique. Techniques for diluting urine are simple and cheap and are designed to produce a sample with a watered down drug concentration that will fall below the drug testing cutoff, thus fabricating a false negative result. Creatinine is a biological waste material that is produced by muscle metabolism. The measurement of creatinine allows the determination of the concentration of a client's urine sample. Dilute urine samples (with creatinine levels less than 20 mg/dL) are not normal occurrences. It is unusual for a healthy individual to produce a sample with a creatinine level of less than 20 mg/dL. Because the sample is dilute (more like water than urine), the drug test is not able to detect the presence of drugs that may be present because the drugs have been diluted to below the cutoff point. In cases of dilute samples, *negative* or *none detected* results should not be interpreted as indicating no drug use or abstinent behavior. Positive drug test results from

a dilute sample, however, are considered valid because the donor was apparently not able to dilute the sample sufficiently to deceive the test (NDCI Judicial Benchbook, 2011).

- Consider increasing the frequency of specialized testing.** Knowing that budget constraints limit programs greatly, the PRC should consider increasing the frequency of specialized testing to ensure participants are not using substances that do not show up on the standard drug tests currently used. The program should also try to perform additional testing on samples collected outside of the probation office, so participants are not aware of when a test may potentially be sent to a lab and when it will not.
- Consider maintaining a higher frequency of drug testing through at least the first three phases of the program.** The PRC should examine its current process of decreasing the frequency of drug testing (testing goes from an average of 8 per month in Phase I to an average of 2 per month in Phase IV) and ensure that the frequency does not decrease before other forms of supervision and program activities have been decreased successfully. National drug court researcher Doug Marlowe (Marlowe, 2008) suggests that the frequency of drug testing be the last thing that is ratcheted down as participants progress through phases. As treatment sessions and court appearances are decreased, checking for drug use becomes increasingly important to determine if the participant is being successful with more independence and less supervision. Drug tests should not be considered a sanction nor should decreasing the frequency of drug tests be considered a reward. Drug testing is one of the only objective measures of whether participation in the program is working for participants and also provides participants with a means of demonstrating their success to the team.

Participant quotes:

“Yeah, I got away with it (before). Not in reentry court, but regular probation...I was able to fake urine tests.”

“I got away with it once when I was on parole, just using fake urine too.”

KEY COMPONENT #6: A COORDINATED STRATEGY GOVERNS DRUG COURT RESPONSES TO PARTICIPANTS’ COMPLIANCE.

The focus of this component is on how the drug court team responds to participant behavior during program participation, including how the team works together to determine an effective, coordinated response. Drug courts have established a system of rewards and sanctions that determine the program’s response to acts of both noncompliance and compliance with program requirements. This system may be informal and implemented on a case-by-case basis, a formal system applied evenly to all participants, or a combination of both. The key staff involved in decisions about appropriate responses to participant behavior varies across courts. Drug court team members may meet and decide on responses, or the judge may decide on the response in court. Drug court participants may (or may not) be informed of the details on this system of rewards and sanctions, so their ability to anticipate a response from their team may vary significantly across programs.

Case management is integral to having a coordinated strategy to respond to participant behavior. Information from the case manager is key for the team to make informed decisions about incentives, sanctions and treatment responses.

National Research

The drug 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 court team. All drug 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 (Cooper, 2000). Other research has shown greater reductions in recidivism were related to the imposition of sanctions by the judge *only* (Carey et al., 2012).

Drug courts that responded to infractions immediately, particularly by requiring participants to attend the next scheduled court session, had twice the cost savings (Carey et al., 2012). In addition, research has found that drug courts that had their guidelines for team responses to participant behavior written and provided to the team had higher graduation rates and higher cost savings due to lower recidivism (Carey et al., 2008, 2011). Finally, programs that required participants to pay fees and have a job or be in school at the time of graduation had significant cost savings compared to programs that did not (Carey et al., 2012).

District of Oregon Portland Reentry Court Process

- Case management is primarily performed by the PRC probation officer. Participants have contact with their probation officer on a regular basis, with the frequency of contact set by requirements of the federal district. The majority of contacts made by the probation officer occur during office visits and court sessions, while in-home visits occur occasionally. Meetings with probation consist of reviewing progress, confirming program requirements (such as self-help meetings), discussing drug test results, and performing case management with participants (transportation needs, employment issues, etc.).
- Probation noted that they will communicate with a participant's employer, (if the employer is aware of the participant's court involvement), primarily by phone to confirm employment or communicate about program requirements. They complete in-person visits to employers on a rare basis, due to time constraints.
- Incentives to enter the program include early termination from probation (up to 1 year), reentry court team/group support, and access to more resources than standard probation. Charges that led participants to reentry court are not dismissed upon graduation, but some participants may avoid a probation violation hearing or have it deferred while participating in the program. Team members also remarked that after participants have been active

Participant quotes:

"I tried to go at 7:30am and they refused. Even at 8am, there is a shift change and the guys leaving don't want to do it, and the new shift has to read the log so they won't.... If they could do it earlier, it would be better, especially when I work or have other things early in the morning."

"There's no sidewalk there...and it's uphill."

"There used to be a path you could walk along to get down the hill.... I fell down that hill one time."

"Some people can't go down the path, and others can't make that walk. It's pretty inconvenient if you don't drive..."

"From the bus stop, you have to walk like a mile or more around to get there because there's no direct route..."

in the program for a brief time, the participants express that the structure of program is necessary for them to remain clean and be successful.

- Participants are not given a participant handbook upon entry into the program, but all participants sign a contract (and receive a copy) that outlines program requirements and expectations. The contract lists a number of possible sanctions a participant may receive for noncompliance.
- Participants are not given a list of rewards upon entering the program. The PRC does provide some rewards in a standardized manner, so participants know what kinds of behaviors lead to rewards. For example, participants receive a gift card each time they phase up in the program or a candy bar (a Kudos) for 30 days of continued sobriety.
- Participants receive intangible rewards (praise from the judge, applause,) and tangible rewards (gift cards, candy bars) through the court. Tangible rewards are given out by various team members (including the judge, federal defender and U.S. attorney) during court sessions. The PRC also holds a drawing for participants that results in rewards being given.
- One of the most common incentives the team utilizes is the “A-team.” Participants who have met all program requirements since their last court date are recognized at the beginning of the court session by the team and sit in the front row of the jury box. They are then called upon first during the court session. Participants reported that the “A-team” designation was especially meaningful to them, as they liked being called up first and acknowledged for doing well.
- Although there is no policy and procedure manual, there are some written guidelines (in the Reentry Court Memorandum of Understanding) for team members regarding the use of incentives and sanctions. Initial decisions are made during staffing meetings on a case-by-case basis and most often a team consensus, with the team always working to make responses individualized to the participant.
- Sanctions are graduated so that the severity increases with more frequent or more serious infractions. They are typically imposed at the next court session for noncompliant behavior, but depending on the severity of the behavior, the judges may issue orders for them to be imposed immediately by the probation officer.
- Participants are not given a written list of behaviors that lead to sanctions, but are given a list of possible sanctions in the participant contract.
- Team members reported that community service is the most commonly used sanction, along with home confinement (by GPS monitoring and/or curfew times). Team members also noted that jail is most often used as a last resort with participants. An agreement was reached with all agencies, and established with the Reentry Court MOU, that jail sanctions are not to exceed 7 days. Multiple team members expressed a desire to change the maximum jail sanction to more than 7 days, but not as a punitive response. It was report-

Participant quotes:

“She cares about you, and I can feel that. She is very helpful.”

“She’s been very understanding. She’s reasonable and always available.”

Participant quote:

“I like [the rewards]. I like the drawing especially.”

ed that limits on jail sanctions create difficulties in holding participants until services are available. In particular, finding an open spot at the local halfway house or any inpatient treatment facility can take up to several weeks.

- Team members noted that other sanctions include judicial reprimands, extending the term of the reentry program (by returning participants to the beginning of their current phase or possibly to an earlier phase), writing essays, increased number of self-help meetings. The probation officer tracks rewards and sanctions given to each participant over the course of the program. This information is provided during staffing each time a participant appears in court.
- Treatment plans are continuously evaluated throughout the program, and treatment responses may include residential treatment or increased treatment sessions involving relapse prevention and aftercare.
- Due to the PRC being a voluntary program, participants may choose to voluntarily withdraw from the program at any time, or the team may jointly decide that the program is not effectively working for an individual. In this situation, the participant can be transferred back to standard probation to continue their original term of supervision. If an individual was referred to the PRC while a probation violation was pending, the individual will be referred back for a hearing on the probation violation upon exiting the program.
- A participant who is unsuccessfully terminated (and does not withdraw) from the program may be charged with a formal violation of probation upon exiting the program.
- Major program violations that may result in a participant being removed from the program include: any new arrest, failure to appear in court with no excuse/multiple failures to appear, missing treatment sessions, multiple positive drug tests, continued substance use, lack of progress in the program, lack of progress in treatment, not reporting to the probation officer, and leaving the jurisdiction without permission and not returning. However, the team noted that these are not automatic termination criteria. Instead, all circumstances and issues would be considered before anyone was officially terminated from the program.
- Participants must complete the requirements for each phase, prepare and present a relapse prevention plan, be employed (or enrolled in school), be current on court-ordered financial obligations, maintain stable housing and be involved with a support group for at least 90 days before progressing to graduation. Participants must also have at least 180 days sober (as evidenced by negative drug tests) before graduating.
- Graduation occurs after regularly scheduled reentry court sessions. All participants are required to attend graduation ceremonies when they occur. Multiple team members speak about participants and present gifts such as a letters from political figures, a \$25 gift card, a card signed by all team members, and sobriety medallions. And finally, the graduates (and any family/friends in attendance) have a chance to address the court.

Participant quotes:

“I think being on the ‘A’ team is enough. The other stuff is nice, but I look forward to knowing I did everything I was supposed to.”

“There’s something about sitting in the back row that I don’t like.”

- Participants typically continue on probation for a period of time upon graduating from the program, depending on their original length of probation. Individuals may be discharged completely if their remaining term of supervision is 1 year or less.

Commendations

- **Good coordination of team response to participant compliance.** A variety of rewards are provided to participants in this court. Participants are rewarded for progress with praise from the judge, promotion to the next phase, reduction in frequency of court hearings, tokens, candy bars and gift cards. The PRC has an appropriate balance of sanctions and rewards, and treatment responses occur as soon as possible following the behavior. The team also differentiates treatment responses from sanctions.
- **Graduation ceremonies are celebrations of successful participants.** Graduation is a significant accomplishment for the graduate and it is important to have graduations be distinct from the regular drug court hearings, even if it occurs during a regular hearing. Graduations also provide an opportunity for community partners to witness program successes. Inviting community partners to observe and participate in graduations is a low-cost way to highlight the effectiveness of the program and garner interest for continued and future involvement with the program. Further, requiring program participants to attend drug court graduation ceremonies is a way to help create and strengthen a supportive environment among individual participants and serve to motivate current participants to progress to the graduation phase.
- **Sanctions are imposed swiftly after noncompliant behavior.** In order for behavior change to occur, there must be a link between the behavior and consequences. Scheduling the noncompliant participant for the next upcoming court session rather than waiting until the participant's next scheduled session to have a sanction applied in court is optimal. The program understands that if a participant has engaged in a behavior that requires a sanction, the sanction must occur as close to the behavior as possible.
- **The program focuses on using rewards for participants who are doing well to reinforce positive behaviors and encourage program compliance.** Incentives are important in shaping participant behavior, and the program has found incentives that are meaningful to its participants. Focus group feedback indicates that participants are aware of what leads to rewards, and that rewards are consistently being provided. Identifying the strengths of each participant and using them to build on can increase program engagement, identify individualized incentives to participation (e.g., a grocery store gift card may be more meaningful than a movie certificate for some and vice versa), and contribute to greater success. Research shows that it is not possible to overdo praise; people cannot become habituated to it. The program demonstrates its understanding of addiction and the reality of relapse (and associated behaviors) as part of the recovery process by identifying opportunities to acknowledge progress and offer incentives. The PRC judges should continue to emphasize positive behavior on a regular and consistent basis. Additional examples can be found at this National Drug Court Center Resource Center web site: http://www.ndcrc.org/search/apachesolr_search/incentives%20and%20sanctions.

Recommendations

- **Develop specific guidelines on the use of sanctions and rewards and give a printed copy to each team member.** Drug courts that have written guidelines for sanctions and

rewards and that provide these guidelines to the team have double the graduation rate and 3 times the cost savings compared to drug courts that do not have written guidelines (Carey et al., 2008, 2011). These guidelines should be considered a starting point for team discussion of rewards and sanctions during staffings and not hard and fast rules. They can help the team in maintaining consistency across participants so that, when appropriate, similar behaviors result in similar sanctions. The guidelines also serve as a reminder of the various reward and sanction options available to the team so they do not fall into habits of using the same type of sanctions (e.g., community service) so frequently that they become ineffective. Two examples of incentive and sanctions guidelines will be provided to the PRC team that can be used as a template for the PRC. Written guidelines could also be helpful for new team members in learning about the program.

KEY COMPONENT #7: ONGOING JUDICIAL INTERACTION WITH EACH PARTICIPANT IS ESSENTIAL.

The focus of this component is on the judge's role in drug court. The judge has an extremely important function for drug court in monitoring participant progress and using the court's authority to promote positive outcomes. While this component encourages ongoing interaction, drug courts must still decide more specifically how to structure the judge's role. Courts need to determine the appropriate amount of courtroom interaction between the participant and the judge as well as how involved the judge is with the participant's case. Outside of the court sessions, depending on the program, the judge may or may not be involved in team discussions, progress reports and policy-making. One of the key roles of the drug court judge is to provide the authority to ensure that appropriate treatment recommendations from trained treatment providers are followed.

National Research

From its national data, the American University Drug Court Survey (Cooper, 2000) 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. The frequency of contact decreases for each advancement in phase. Although most drug courts follow the above model, a substantial percentage reports less court contact.

Research in California, Oregon, Michigan, Maryland, Missouri, and Guam (Carey et al., 2005, 2008, 2011) demonstrated that, 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. Marlowe, Festinger, Lee, Dugosh, & Benasutti (2006) also demonstrated that bi-weekly court sessions were more effective for high-risk offenders, whereas less frequent sessions (e.g., monthly) were as effective for lower risk offenders. These findings were confirmed in more recent studies (Carey et al., 2012).

In addition, programs in which the judge remained on the bench for at least 2 years had the most positive participant outcomes. It is recommended that drug courts either avoid fixed terms, or require judges with fixed terms to serve 2 years or more, and that courts with fixed terms consider having judges rotate through the drug court more than once, as experience and longevity are correlated with more positive participant outcomes and cost savings (Carey et al., 2005; Finigan, Carey, & Cox, 2007; Carey et al., 2012). When the average number of minutes for each court appearance was 3 or more, programs experienced a reduction in recidivism 2½ times greater than programs with shorter court appearances (Carey et al., 2012).

District of Oregon Portland Reentry Court Process

- There are two judges currently assigned to the PRC (an Article III judge and a magistrate judge). The magistrate judge was previously involved in the reentry court as a substitute/back-up judge, and was assigned to preside over the reentry court upon the retirement of the original reentry court judge. The Article III judge was assigned to the program by the chief federal judge approximately two years ago, and it has been a collaborative effort since that time. Each judge presides over one of the two court sessions held each month. In the event of one judge's absence, the other is typically available to cover any needed judicial duties; however, both judges participate in staffing and court on a regular basis.
- Reentry court participants typically attend court sessions once every 2 weeks in Phase I (minimum of 90 days). Court attendance is then reduced to once per month for the remainder of the program (Phase II, III, and IV), but can be increased based upon participant progress.
- Staffing begins at 8:30 a.m. and typically last 1½-2 hours, with the team discussing an average of 15 participants and any new potential admissions.
- Staffing is primarily facilitated by the probation officer, along with the presiding judge for that day's session. However, all team members are actively engaged in discussions during the staffing, and the team displays excellent communication. Staffing typically begins by discussing any new participants (if any) for admission to the program, followed by updates on participants scheduled to appear in court. Staffing notes are thorough and comprehensive, covering all other relevant topics such as history of sanctions/incentives, drug test results, and participant fees owed.
- Participants are required to stay for the entire reentry court session, although exceptions can be made for participants on occasion (those who need to return to work or have been excused for pre-approved reasons).
- Court sessions were observed with each of the judges presiding. Court began at 1:30 p.m. and ended at approximately 2:30 p.m., with an average of 12 participants in attendance each time. This resulted in an average of 5 minutes per participant in front of the judge. Team members noted that court sessions typically last 1-2 hours.
- Both reentry court judges are assigned to the program indefinitely. Both judges have cases and dockets outside of the reentry court. In between the time spent in staffing and court, the judges receive communication from team members about participants and other administrative matters.
- The magistrate judge has not received any formal drug court training since being assigned the program (other than on-the-job training). The Article III judge has received

Participant quotes:

"They both give advice in different situations, but its good. They always give insight into our situations."

"Just having a conversation with the judge is so different for me now. It's weird to have a conversation with them and be on those kinds of terms with them. They are the ones that usually sent me away."

"We are here for a reason, and they want to help us more than they want to hurt us. I think they are both of them are equal in my experience."

"They both offer the same thing I think."

some training on the drug court model through conferences, and also presided over a mental health court in a different county previously. Both judges have had opportunities to observe other drug court programs in operation as well.

- The judge stands at a podium placed in front of the jury box where participants are seated during the session. When the court session begins, the judge recognizes participants who are on the “A-team” by naming them individually and having them sit in the front row of the jury box while the courtroom applauds. After acknowledging the “A-team,” the judge directs the rest of the participants to the back rows of the jury box. Each participant then stands up in the jury box when their name is called and speaks with the judge directly.

Participant quote:

“Standing up and talking in court like that is a little intimidating. You get used to it, but I still get nervous.”

- Observations with the magistrate judge presiding revealed that he was supportive, encouraging, and positive with all participants. Overall he was relatable and it is clear he is invested in the program and the success of its participants. The judge asked many questions that were specific to each participant and it was evident that he had an understanding of their situation. He encouraged several participants who were doing well to share what they thought was working for them, taking full advantage of the courtroom as theatre dynamic. He remained respectful but authoritative throughout the session as he addressed some participants about the program’s expectations and requirements. The judge also followed recommendations provided by team members during staffing.

- Observations with the Article III judge presiding revealed that he was open, direct and enthusiastic during the session. He was particularly enthusiastic about those who were on the “A-team” and noted that the others who were not on the “A-team” had improvements to make. He was compassionate and genuine when addressing participants, noting that he and the team were worried about certain individuals and their current focus. The judge is an active listener and is polite with all participants. The judge also takes the opportunity to have participants doing well explain the “why and how” of feeling better, knowing it’s important for others in the courtroom to hear these kinds of perspectives. He also provides participants the opportunity to ask for help or talk about things going on in their lives. He was authoritative throughout, but remained respectful. He is clear and direct with participants who are not doing well. He will state how the team perceives their progress and explains that lying to him is the one thing he will not tolerate. The judge also followed recommendations provided by team members during staffing.

Participant quotes:

“He seems a little stern, but it’s just a personality thing.”

“He’s caring...the way he said things felt like he was genuinely concerned.”

- Other team members speak up when necessary to clarify issues such as phase dates, treatment schedules or next appointments. However, all team members are actively engaged during court. The U.S. attorney and probation office hand out incentives to those phasing up, the federal defender hands out candy bars for those with clean date milestones, and the federal defender’s legal assistant confirms next court dates and phase dates.

- Multiple team members (including the judges) will engage in discussions with participants after the court session to confirm appointments, offer encouragement, or just to continue conversations that occurred in court.

Commendations

- **The judges have presided over the program for more than 2 years.** Experience and longevity are correlated with more positive participant outcomes and significantly higher cost savings, particularly 2 years and longer (Carey et al., 2012). The PRC program benefits from having two judges who are committed long term.
- **Both judges work collaboratively and maintain consistency in their responses to participants.** Although the PRC has a unique arrangement with two judges that alternately preside, because both judges regularly attend staffing and court together, they are able to maintain consistency and perform well together as a team. This was confirmed by multiple team members and participants, as well as observed during site visits.
- **The judge requires participants to stay through the entire court hearing as a learning experience for participants.** Because drug court hearings are a forum for educating all participants and impacting their behavior, it is important that the court requires most participants (an exception can be made for some participants) to stay for the entire hearing both to observe consequences (both good and bad) and to learn how those who are doing well are able to succeed and make positive, healthy choices and changes in their lives.
- **Judges spent greater than 3 minutes with each participant.** During observations, both judges averaged around 4-5 minutes when addressing each participant. An average of 3 minutes per participant is related to graduation rates 15 percentage points higher and recidivism rates that are 50% lower than drug courts that spend less than 3 minutes per participant (Carey et al., 2011). This should be taken into consideration if more participants are assigned to the program and caseloads increase. The caseload may be able to be split between the two judges at some point, allowing for more time for each participant to interact and form a relationship with their assigned judge.

Participant quotes:

“Seems like a nice guy. I always felt like I was getting hosed before when I talked with judges. It’s very different now. It’s kind of enjoyable.”

“He’s fair. Actually maybe even a little too lenient.”

“You better be straightforward with him or you’re in trouble...his pet peeve is dishonesty.”

Recommendations

- **Whenever possible, the judges and team should participate in regular trainings and conference opportunities on the drug court model and related topics.** Although the Article III judge has attended some training, we recommend that both judges and the team regularly attend (at least once per year) some formal drug court trainings when time and funding permits, so they can obtain the latest information on best practices. There are also informal (and free) methods of training that can be engaged in more immediately. The National Drug Court Resource Center has training materials available at <http://www.ndcrc.org/content/training-technical-assistance>, including publications and

free Webinars. Research has shown that drug courts that have formal training for all team members have higher graduation rates and lower recidivism (Carey et al., 2008, 2011). The judge sets an important precedent for the entire team by setting ongoing education as a top priority.

KEY COMPONENT #8: MONITORING AND EVALUATION MEASURE THE ACHIEVEMENT OF PROGRAM GOALS AND GAUGE EFFECTIVENESS.

This component encourages drug court programs to monitor their progress toward their goals and evaluate the effectiveness of their practices. The purpose is to establish program accountability to funding agencies and policymakers as well as to themselves and their participants. Further, regular monitoring and evaluation provides programs with the feedback needed to make adjustments in program practices that will increase effectiveness. Finally, programs that collect data and are able to document success can use that information to gain additional funding and community support. Monitoring and evaluation require the collection of thorough and accurate records. Drug courts may record important information electronically, in paper files or both. Ideally, drug courts will partner with an independent evaluator to help assess their progress. Lastly, it is important to determine how receptive programs are to modifying their procedures in response to feedback.

National Research

Carey et al. (2008) and Carey et al. (2011) found that programs with evaluation processes in place had better outcomes. Four types of evaluation processes were found to save the program money with a positive effect on outcome costs: 1) maintaining electronic records that are critical to participant case management and to an evaluation, 2) the use of program statistics by the program to make modifications in drug court operations, 3) the use of program evaluation results to make modification to drug court operations, and 4) the participation of the drug court in more than one evaluation by an independent evaluator. Courts that have modified their programs based on evaluation findings have experienced twice the cost savings and a significant reduction in recidivism compared to courts that do no modifications (Carey et al., 2012). The same is true of programs that make modifications based on self-review of program statistics (Carey et al., 2012).

District of Oregon Portland Reentry Court Process

- The PRC collects data both electronically and manually for participant tracking. The data collected by PRC includes some limited information from the treatment providers. There is no central database specifically for reentry court that stores all relevant participant information. Treatment providers, probation and the court all have separate databases that are utilized.
- The PRC probation officer uses the database PACTS (Probation and Pretrial Services Automated Case Tracking System) to document some reentry court participant information. This database is operated by the federal probation office, and includes all offenders on supervision (not just reentry court). Only the probation officer and their administrative staff utilize this database, which tracks information such as visits with probationers, employment, and general case notes. Although a sufficient amount of information is entered, staff reported that the ability to retrieve this information from the system on reentry court participants is limited.
- The PRC keeps track of key information on all reentry court participants (drug testing, program outcomes, sanctions, etc.) in an Excel spreadsheet that is maintained by a federal

probation office administrative assistant. A report created from this spreadsheet and sent out to team members each month contains information on all currently active PRC participants. The monthly reports display static information (such as their PCRA score or PACTS ID) as well as updates on the number of drug tests since the last report and date of last positive test.

- Prior to this evaluation, the PRC has had one outside evaluator conduct a process and outcome evaluation on the program. This was completed by the U.S. District Court for the District of Oregon and the University of Oregon in 2010.

Commendations

- **The PRC collects electronic data.** The program is commended for performing data collection in their existing federal probation office database (PACTS) and in Excel. The program is also commended for using this information to send a monthly report to team members. The reentry court team should continue to accumulate and analyze data about the reentry court participants and use it for program reviews and planning, to be sure that it is moving toward its goals and informing the team about the types of participants who are most and least successful in the program. Program data can be included for review at policy committee meetings and used to assess the program's functioning and any areas that may benefit from adjustment.
- **The PRC has completed a previous evaluation and is participating in the current evaluation.** The PRC is commended for its interest in participating in research and evaluation, and its willingness to work on continuous program improvement. Courts that have participated in evaluation and made program modifications based on evaluation feedback have had twice the cost savings compared to courts that have not adjusted their program based on evaluation feedback (Carey et al., 2012).

Recommendations

- **Confirm where important data are being kept and explore options of using a database specifically for drug/reentry courts.** Programs that use their data for program improvement have greater reductions in recidivism and greater cost savings (Carey et al., 2012). The team should continue to collect electronic data and establish a process for using it in program reviews and planning. As requested during the follow-up meeting with the PRC team, a list of data elements important for participant case management, program self-monitoring and evaluation is included in Appendix B. This list is presented as a worksheet with a blank section where the team can note where each data element is currently being kept. For the purposes of future outcome evaluation, the team may want to assign someone to fill out this worksheet so that future evaluation would have a starting place for where to collect the key data elements. The PRC may also consider the feasibility of obtaining a database that is specific to drug/reentry courts, in particular an online system that all team members can access and enter information into and that allows the program to retrieve information on participants with more efficiency.
- **Conduct an outcome study.** Program leadership should invest in an outcome evaluation to determine program effectiveness in light of continuing program maturation and the application of program improvements. Implementing a full outcome evaluation can also help determine which components of the program are contributing to participant success and which may be barriers to success. The outcome evaluation should include a compari-

son of the program with the “business as usual” option (i.e., probation), including information on recidivism and a cost-benefit comparison. The outcome evaluation can also be used to demonstrate the PRC’s effectiveness to stakeholders and establish buy-in from the community. Having numbers based specifically on the PRC may also help the program obtain funding as well. The team is aware of this need, and is considering options available to them to complete this recommendation.

- **Share evaluation and assessment results.** The PRC team members are encouraged to discuss the overall findings, both to enjoy the recognition of its accomplishments and to identify areas of potential program adjustment and improvement. Plan a time for the policy committee to discuss the results of this evaluation and make a plan for how to use the information. Appendix A contains a brief set of guidelines for how to review program feedback and next steps in making changes to the program. In addition, the assessment and evaluation results can be very beneficial to the program if it is looking to apply for grants to fund additional positions, etc., or for local funders/agencies to help them access resources. These results can document needs as well as show how well the program has done in some areas.

KEY COMPONENT #9: CONTINUING INTERDISCIPLINARY EDUCATION PROMOTES EFFECTIVE DRUG COURT PLANNING, IMPLEMENTATION, AND OPERATIONS.

This component encourages ongoing professional development and training of drug court staff. Team members need to be updated on new procedures and maintain a high level of professional and technical knowledge. Drug courts must decide who receives this training and how often. This can be a challenge during implementation as well as for courts with a long track record. Drug courts are encouraged to continue organizational learning and share lessons learned with new hires.

National Research

Carey et al. (2008) and Carey et al. (2012) found that drug court programs requiring all new hires to complete formal training or orientation, and requiring *all* drug court team members to attend regular trainings were associated with higher graduation rates and greater cost savings due to lower recidivism.

District of Oregon Portland Reentry Court Process

- The probation officer and federal defender have received training and education specifically on the drug court model through the National Association of Drug Court Professionals (NADCP).
- Some team members have also received training specifically related to the target population of the court and the use of rewards/sanctions.
- Reentry court staff members occasionally bring new information on drug court practices, including drug addiction and treatment, to staffing meetings.
- The U.S. attorney, both treatment representatives (who recently joined the program), and the magistrate judge have not received any formal drug court training or training on the use of sanctions and rewards (outside of on-the-job training). However, almost all team members have observed other programs in operation.

- There is currently no system in place for new reentry court staff members to obtain formal training on the drug court model before or soon after starting work.

Commendation

- **Some team members have received formal training** and the majority of team members have observed other programs in operation. The more team members that have been trained on the drug court model, addiction, incentives and sanctions and who have an understanding of the specific population in your program, the more informed they will be in making decisions about appropriate responses to participant behavior.

Recommendations

- **Ensure that all drug court team members receive initial training before or soon after becoming part of the PRC team as well as ongoing training.** Because of the lack of formal, drug court specific, education for some team members (especially newer members), we recommend that the PRC team explore ways to obtain training for any team member who has not had this education as well as refreshers for those who have. These trainings should include education on the drug court model, incentives and sanctions, the program's specific target population, collaboration and drug court roles. NPC's recent research findings showed that drug courts who obtained regular training for their team members had better participant outcomes, including decreased recidivism, greater program completion, and greater cost savings (Carey et al., 2008, 2012).

This training can help to ensure strong program implementation, as fully trained and engaged team members are more likely to be focused on following the model and program integrity. Research on the use of evidence-based and promising practices in the criminal justice field has consistently shown that in order to operate effective programs as intended, practitioners must receive the necessary resources to make the program work, receive ongoing training and technical assistance, and be committed to the quality assurance process (Barnoski, 2004; Lowenkamp, Holsinger, & Latessa, 2005). Andrews and Bonta (2010) maintain that correctional and court programs must concentrate on effectively building and *maintaining* the skill set of the employees that work with offenders.

The National Drug Court Institute (NDCI) will often provide training or assistance at little or no cost for those programs that show the need (see <http://www.ndci.org>). There are also free training materials and Webinars available on the NDCI Web site and on the Web site for the National Drug Court Resource Center (www.ndcrc.org). One low-cost option is to have team members take turns performing the duty of searching for recent drug court research or attend a Webinar and then spend 10 minutes at team meetings reviewing the main findings and how they can be used to supplement the program.

KEY COMPONENT #10: FORGING PARTNERSHIPS AMONG DRUG COURTS, PUBLIC AGENCIES, AND COMMUNITY-BASED ORGANIZATIONS GENERATES LOCAL SUPPORT AND ENHANCES DRUG COURT PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS.

This component encourages drug courts to develop partnerships with other criminal justice service, nonprofit and commercial agencies. For these collaborations to be true "partnerships," regular meetings and collaborations with the partners should occur. If successful, the drug court will benefit from the expertise that resides in all of the partner agencies and participants will enjoy greater access to a variety of services. Drug courts must still determine what partners are

available and decide with whom to partner and how formal to make these partnerships. Other important factors to weigh include who will be considered as part of the main drug court team, who will provide input primarily through policymaking, and what types of services will be available to participants through these partnerships.

National Research

Responses to American University's National Drug Court Survey (Cooper, 2000) show that most drug courts are working closely with community groups to provide support services for their drug court participants. Examples of community resources with which drug courts are connected include self-help groups such as AA and NA, medical providers, local education systems, employment services, faith communities, and Chambers of Commerce.

In addition, Carey et al. (2005) and Carey et al. (2011) found that 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.

District of Oregon Portland Reentry Court Process

- The PRC does not specifically have an advisory board, but its policy committee meets regularly outside of staffing when needed to discuss program issues.
- The PRC has been primarily funded through the federal probation office since program inception. Services are available to any individual on federal probation, so funds are not specifically set aside for the reentry court. The team reported a very small amount of additional funding exists through an attorney admissions fund that is paid into by attorneys. This has been used mostly for incentives and graduations. There is also a limited amount of Second Chance Act⁵ funding that can be utilized if services are specific to employment.
- The reentry court has developed and maintained relationships with organizations that can provide services for participants in the community and refers participants to those services when appropriate. Some of these services include employment assistance/job training, food, clothing, healthcare, transportation, housing assistance, and educational services.
- There is a federal probation officer (not assigned to the team) who works with the offender workforce development Program. This program specializes in job skills that can provide participants with job leads and employment skills training. Participants may have to be placed on a waiting list prior to receiving these services, and typically receive these services for approximately three months on average.
- Team members noted during interviews that the limited number of community partnerships the PRC has established may contribute to a lack of resources in housing (specifically the time it takes to obtain transitional housing), employment, and transportation, which results in barriers to participant progress.

Commendations

- **The program has creatively and effectively addressed many participant needs.** The program is commended for thoughtfully coming up with solutions to program barriers

⁵ Signed into law on April 9, 2008, the Second Chance Act (P.L. 110-199) was designed to improve outcomes for people returning to communities from prisons and jails.

faced by participants. The participants provided examples during the focus groups such as bus passes, job readiness training and medical services. This responsiveness helps the participants be more likely to succeed and helps them develop a trust in the program that it really is on their side and working in their best interest. The team should continue discussing possible community connections and resources, and ideas for generating outside support to enhance the program and to be responsive to changes in the environment and participant needs.

Recommendations

- **Continue to invite community members and staff from other agencies to PRC graduations.** Graduation ceremonies provide powerful testimony to the effectiveness of drug courts. Inviting potential community partners to graduations is one low-cost strategy for strengthening outreach efforts and allows them to witness positive program impacts. It is important to educate those not familiar with drug courts in how the drug court model works and its benefits.
- **Conduct a strategic planning session on drug court funding, or as an alternative, place strategic planning issues on the agenda of one or more drug court policy meetings.** In either setting there should be a discussion concerning program needs and ideas for generating additional resources. The team should identify mechanisms and potential sources of funding, such as grants, community partnerships, and enhanced federal funding to support the program. The team should also discuss who will be responsible for which steps toward achieving these goals. The NADCP Web site (www.nadcp.org) should also be reviewed periodically, as it includes information on funding opportunities as they come available.

APPENDICES/ ADDITIONAL RESOURCES

The appendices at the end of this document contain resources to assist the program in making any changes based on the feedback and recommendation in this report. Appendix A provides a brief “how-to” guide for beginning the process of changing program structure and policies. Appendix B provides a summary of data elements that the PRC may already be collecting, and a list of data elements that programs should collect for case management, self-monitoring and evaluation. The PRC might want to assign someone to fill out this worksheet to verify where (in what existing database) each of these data elements is being collected (or if any or not being collected). Other important and useful resources for drug courts are available at the National Drug Court Resource Center’s Web site: <http://www.ndcrc.org>.

Finally, Appendix C contains a letter from the United States Attorney for the District of Oregon with her review and feedback on the evaluation of the Portland and Eugene Federal Reentry Courts.

REFERENCES

- Andrews, D., & Bonta, J. (2010). *The Psychology of Criminal Conduct* (5th Ed.). New Providence, NJ: LexisNexis.
- Barnoski, R. (2004). *Outcome Evaluation of Washington State's Research-Based Programs for Juveniles*. Olympia, WA: Washington State Institute for Public Policy.
- 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., 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 USDOJ Bureau of Justice Assistance in May 2005.
- Carey, S. M., Mackin, J. R., & Finigan, M. W. (2012). What Works? The 10 Key Components of Drug Courts: Research Based Best Practices. *Drug Court Review*, VIII(1), 6-42.
- 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. (2011). *California Drug Court Cost 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/execsum.pdf>
- 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.
- Government Accounting Office (GAO) (2005). "Adult Drug Courts: Evidence indicates recidivism reductions and mixed results for other outcomes." February 2005 Report. Available at <http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d05219.pdf>
- Kralstein, D. (2010, June). *The impact on drug use and other psychosocial outcomes: Results from NIJ's Multisite Adult Drug Court Evaluation*. Presentation at the 16th Annual Training Conference of the National Association of Drug Court Professionals. Boston, MA.
- Longshore, D. L., Turner, S., Wenzel, S. L., Morral, A. R., Harrell, A., McBride, D., Deschenes, E., & Iguchi, M. Y. (2001). Drug courts: A conceptual framework. *Journal of Drug Issues*, 31(1), Winter 2001, 7-26.

- Lowenkamp, C. T., Holsinger, A. M., & Latessa, E. J. (2005). Are drug courts effective: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Community Corrections*, Fall, 5-10, 28.
- 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. (2008, October). *The Verdict is In*. Presented at the New England Association of Drug Court Professionals annual conference, Boston, MA.
- Marlowe, D. B. (2012). Alternative Tracks in Adult Drug Courts: Matching Your Program to the Needs of Your Clients. National Drug Court Institute. Volume VII, No. 2.
http://www.ndcrc.org/sites/default/files/alt_tracks_3-14-12.pdf
- 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.
- National Association of Drug Court Professionals Drug Court Standards Committee (1997). *Defining drug courts: The key components*. U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Drug Court Programs Office.
- National Drug Court Institute (2011). *The Drug Court Judicial Benchbook*.
- SAMHSA/CSAT Treatment Improvement Protocols (1994). TIP 8: Intensive outpatient treatment for alcohol and other drug abuse. Retrieved October 23, 2006, from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/bv.fcgi?rid=hstat5.section.28752>

**APPENDIX A: GUIDE FOR USE OF NPC ASSESSMENT
AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE REPORTS**

Brief Guide for Use of NPC Evaluation and Technical Assistance Reports

The 10 Key Component assessment results can be used for many purposes, including 1) improvement of program structure and practices for better participant outcomes (the primary purpose), 2) grant applications to demonstrate program needs or illustrate the program's capabilities, and 3) requesting resources from boards of county commissioners or other local groups.

When you receive the results:

- Distribute copies of the report** to all members of your team, advisory group, and other key individuals involved with your program.
- Set up a meeting** with your team and policy committee to discuss the report's findings and recommendations. Ask all members of the group to **read the report** prior to the meeting and **bring ideas and questions**. Identify who will **facilitate** the meeting (bring in a person from outside the core group if all group members would like to be actively involved in the discussion).
- During the meeting(s), **review each recommendation**, discuss any questions that arise from the group, and **summarize the discussion, any decisions, and next steps**. You can use the format below or develop your own:

Format for reviewing recommendations:

Recommendation: Copy the recommendations from the electronic version of report and provide to the group.

Responsible individual, group, or agency: Identify who is the focus of the recommendation, and who has the authority to make related changes.

Response to recommendation: Describe the status of action related to the recommendation (some changes or decisions may already have been made). Indicate the following:

- 1. This recommendation will be accepted. (see next steps below)
- 2. Part of this recommendation can be accepted (see next steps below and indicate here which parts are not feasible or desirable, and why)
- 3. This recommendation cannot be accepted. Describe barriers to making related changes (at a future time point, these barriers may no longer exist) or reason why the recommendation is not desirable or would have other negative impacts on the program overall.

Next steps: Identify which tasks have been assigned, to whom, and by what date they will be accomplished or progress reviewed. Assign tasks only to a **person who is present**. If the appropriate person is not present or not yet identified (because the task falls to an agency or to the community, for example), identify who from the group will take on the task of identifying and contacting the appropriate person.

- Person: (Name)
- Task: (make sure tasks are specific, measurable, and attainable)

- **Deadline or review date:** (e.g., June 10th) The dates for some tasks should be soon (next month, next 6-months, etc.); others (for longer-term goals for example) may be further in the future.
 - **Who will review:** (e.g., advisory board will review progress at their next meeting)
-
- **Contact NPC Research** after your meeting(s) to discuss any questions that the team has raised and not answered internally, or if you have requests for other resources or information.
 - **Contact NPC Research** if you would like to hold an additional conference call with or presentation to any key groups related to the study findings.
 - **Request technical assistance or training as needed** from NADCP/NDCI or other appropriate groups.
 - **Add task deadlines to the agendas of policy meetings**, to ensure they will be reviewed, or select a date for a follow-up review (in 3 or 6 months, for example), to discuss progress and challenges, and to establish new next steps, task lists, and review dates.

**APPENDIX B: LIST OF DATA ELEMENTS FOR
PROGRAM SELF-MONITORING AND EVALUATION**

District of Oregon Portland Reentry Court Data Elements Worksheet

Variable/Data element	PACTS (Probation and Pretrial Services Automated Case Tracking System)	Excel Spreadsheet (Probation Office)	Federal Court (Data-base/Excel Spreadsheets)	Treatment Provider (Data-base/Excel Sheets)	Other
DEMOGRAPHICS & ID (collect from all possible sources)					
Name					
SSN, state ID, FBI ID, DL#, DC case number, state Tx number, KDOC#					
Birth Date					
Gender					
Race/Ethnicity					
CLIENT INFORMATION					
Mental health or A&D diagnoses					
Employment status at drug court entry					
Employment status at drug court exit					
Highest grade of school completed at time of drug court entry					
Number and ages of children					
Housing status at entry					

Variable/Data element	PACTS (Probation and Pretrial Services Automated Case Tracking System)	Excel Spreadsheet (Probation Office)	Federal Court (Data-base/Excel Spreadsheets)	Treatment Provider (Data-base/Excel Sheets)	Other
Housing status at exit					
Income at entry (if self-supporting)					
Income at exit (if self-supporting)					
Prior treatment (when, what kind, how many episodes)					
Drug of choice (primary and secondary)					
Other demographics					
DRUG COURT SPECIFIC DATA					
Drug court entry date					
Drug court exit date					
Drug court status (e.g., active, completed)					
Drug court status on exit (e.g., graduated, revoked, terminated, dropped out)					
If participation in drug court is revoked or terminated, reason					
Criminal justice status on exit (e.g., on probation, charge expunged, etc.)					

Variable/Data element	PACTS (Probation and Pretrial Services Automated Case Tracking System)	Excel Spreadsheet (Probation Office)	Federal Court (Database/Excel Spreadsheets)	Treatment Provider (Database/Excel Sheets)	Other
Probation start and end dates for drug court case					
Date of drug court eligible arrest					
Charge for drug court arrest					
Court case number for case leading to drug court participation					
Date of referral to drug court program and referral source					
Dates of entry into each phase					
Dates of UAs (whether participant showed on UA date)					
Dates of positive UAs					
Dates of other drug tests					
Dates of other positive drug tests					
Agency providing test results					

Variable/Data element	PACTS (Probation and Pretrial Services Automated Case Tracking System)	Excel Spreadsheet (Probation Office)	Federal Court (Data-base/Excel Spreadsheets)	Treatment Provider (Data-base/Excel Sheets)	Other
Dates of drug court appearances and whether participant showed					
Risk/Need Score(s)					
Noncompliant events (date and type)					
Sanctions related to noncompliant events (dates, types, and duration)					
Rewards/incentives (date, type, amount)					
Detention/jail time as a sanction (dates, # of days)					

Variable/Data element	PACTS (Probation and Pretrial Services Automated Case Tracking System)	Excel Spreadsheet (Probation Office)	Federal Court (Database/Excel Spreadsheets)	Treatment Provider (Database/Excel Sheets)	Other
<p>Dates of services received with types/modalities of service received (see examples below)</p> <p>[Note: If dates not available, should collect the types/modalities of services received and dates started and ended or the # of times the individual received a particular type of session.]</p>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Group A&D sessions 					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Individual A&D sessions 					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Residential (dates entered and discharged) 					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mental health services 					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Parenting classes 					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Family therapy 					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Employment services 					
<p>Agency providing services for each service</p>					

Variable/Data element	PACTS (Probation and Pretrial Services Automated Case Tracking System)	Excel Spreadsheet (Probation Office)	Federal Court (Database/Excel Spreadsheets)	Treatment Provider (Database/Excel Sheets)	Other
Aftercare services (dates and types)					
Dates of re-arrests/re-referrals during program participation					
Charge(s)/allegation(s) associated with re-arrests/re-referrals during program participation					
Outcome(s) of re-arrests/re-referrals (conviction, dismissed, etc.) during program participation					
Other probation violations during program participation					
BASIC RECIDIVISM DATA We typically don't expect drug court programs to have these (particularly not for a comparison group), but we always leave these in our data list in case this data is available on participants.					

Variable/Data element	PACTS (Probation and Pretrial Services Automated Case Tracking System)	Excel Spreadsheet (Probation Office)	Federal Court (Database/Excel Spreadsheets)	Treatment Provider (Database/Excel Sheets)	Other
Arrest dates					
Filing dates					
Charges associated with arrest/filing					
Conviction dates					
Disposition					
ADDITIONAL RE-CIDIVISM DATA (Generally used in NPC cost studies)					
Probation start and end dates					
Jail start and end dates					
Prison start and end dates					
OTHER OUTCOME DATA We typically don't expect drug court programs to have these, but we always leave these in our data list in case this data is available.					
Dates of ER visits					

Variable/Data element	PACTS (Probation and Pretrial Services Automated Case Tracking System)	Excel Spreadsheet (Probation Office)	Federal Court (Database/Excel Spreadsheets)	Treatment Provider (Database/Excel Sheets)	Other
Dates of hospitalizations					
Dates and amount of welfare/food stamps					
Dates and amount of taxes paid					
Dates of foster care entry and exit for children of DC participants					

**APPENDIX C: LETTER FROM UNITED STATES
DISTRICT ATTORNEY – DISTRICT OF OREGON**



U.S. Department of Justice

S. Amanda Marshall

United States Attorney

District of Oregon

1000 SW Third Avenue, Ste. 600 (503) 727-1000
Portland, OR 97204-2902 Fax: (503) 727-1117

May 2, 2013

Shannon Carey
NPC Research
5100 SW Macadam Ave.
Suite 575
Portland, OR 97239

Dear Ms. Carey:

I have reviewed the NPC Research reports regarding both the Eugene and Portland Reentry Courts, and I concur with all of the findings and recommendations. Overall, it was good to see that there is a lot we are doing right, and also plenty we can work on to ensure our continued efforts are evidence based.

I am particularly supportive of the recommendations to tighten up drug test procedures; develop and publish guidelines for sanctions and incentives; utilize program phases to track progress; limit public group discussion to ensure such discussion is constructive and respectful of privacy and confidentiality; objectively review outcomes; and establish metrics to gauge program success.

Finally, I want to thank you and your team for the thorough, well-researched, thought provoking report. I am certain it will assist team members in their quest to make our reentry court programs even better. Our office continues to support reentry and is fully committed to finding ways to improve the program. Please do not hesitate to call me if I can be of assistance in this process.

Sincerely,

S. AMANDA MARSHALL
United States Attorney

cc: Judge Hernandez
Judge Aiken
Judge Papak
Steve Wax
Will Blasher