

The Council of State Treatment Court Coordinators

An organization of statewide Treatment Court Coordinators who gather to:

Make recommendations to the CCJ/COSCA Behavioral Health Committee based on experience, expertise, and insights from working with treatment court teams and clients;

Share insights regarding the front-line execution and impact of policy;

Share best practices with each other and the community at large;

Provide both formal and informal support, tools, materials with one another;

Collaborate to deliver education and professional developments to membership;

Partner with complementary organizations and their shared goal of supporting the success of behavioral health courts.



Drug Trends

- a. As a field, we are seeing an ever-increasing variety and complexity of drugs and drug mixes.
- **b.** Testing significantly lags behind usage.
- c. Efforts must be made to better collaborate across state and federal agencies to fund and provide training, technical assistance, and interventions to address new variants and drug types.

d. We recommend focused technical assistance from our partners to address behavioral indicators as a result of drug use.

e. Funding priorities must align and increase to account for the changes in testing in order to respond appropriately to these trends.

Harm Reduction

- a. Harm reduction is a movement that is gathering speed and has significant implications for treatment courts.
- b. Interagency partners need to have a conversation at the state and national level to understand and define what harm reduction is and is not.
- c. There are critical distinctions between harm reduction in the general population and harm reduction within the court system. Specifically, we view justice involved clients as distinct from drug users within the general population.
- d. We strongly advocate for the continued prioritization of evidence-based practices within our courts and as a critical component to all significant initiatives.
- e. Harm reduction poses a significant risk to access and quality of care if such measures do not reflect evidence-based best practices for treatment courts.

Universal Screening

- a. State Treatment Court Coordinators strongly advocate that universal screening for the justice population needs to occur as early as possible to identify criminogenic risks and behavioral health needs.
- b. It is necessary for those justice involved individuals to be appropriately triaged and refer potential participants into appropriate tracks to match the intervention and effectively utilize resources to reduce recidivism.
- c. We can improve Tx engagement by meeting people where they are.

Emerging Issues and Mea

- d. We are committed to providing equitable access and equitable Tx to the justice population to reduce racial and ethnic disparities.
- e. We strongly urge state leaders to convene stakeholders to implement statewide screening processes and to support the funding and resources towards these efforts.

Fidelity and Certification

- a. State Coordinators concurred that states need to adopt Treatment Court Standards and implement fidelity measures to ensure courts are operating according to best practices.
- b. With standards and fidelity, we as a field would arm treatment courts with information to improve for the benefit of participants and our communities. Without these, we stand to increase harm for the very people these courts should help.
- c. Fidelity measures need to be transparent, gain buy-in from treatment court judges, and seek engagement with team members.