



National Drug Court
Resource Center

Painting the Current Picture

A National Report on Treatment
Courts in the United States

*Juvenile Drug Treatment
Courts Brief*

Kristen DeVall, Ph.D.
Christina Lanier, Ph.D.
Lindsay J. Baker, M.A.

2022







National Drug Court
Resource Center

Painting the Current Picture

A National Report on Treatment
Courts in the United States

*Juvenile Drug Treatment
Courts Brief*

Kristen DeVall, Ph.D.¹
Christina Lanier, Ph.D.¹
Lindsay J. Baker

¹The first two authors are listed alphabetically and both authors contributed equally to the preparation of this monograph.

2022

Painting the Current Picture: A National Report on Treatment Courts in the United States, Juvenile Drug Treatment Courts Brief

This project was supported by Grant No. 2019-DC-BX-K002 awarded by the Bureau of Justice Assistance. The Bureau of Justice Assistance is a component of the Department of Justice's Office of Justice Programs, which also includes the Bureau of Justice Statistics, the National Institute of Justice, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, the Office for Victims of Crime, and the SMART Office. Points of views or opinions in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the National Drug Court Resource Center.

Kristen DeVall, Ph.D., *Co-Director*
Christina Lanier, Ph.D., *Co-Director*
National Drug Court Resource Center
University of North Carolina Wilmington
680 S. College Road
Wilmington, NC 28403-5978
(910) 962-2440
ndcrc.org

Cover design by Ben Yerby

Publication design by Ben Yerby

Prepared by the National Drug Court Resource Center

Suggested citation:

DeVall, K., Lanier, C., & Baker, L. (2023). *Painting the Current Picture: A National Report on Treatment Courts in the United States*. National Drug Court Resource Center.

Drug courts perform their duties without manifestation, by word or conduct, of bias or prejudice, including, but not limited to, bias or prejudice based upon race, religion, gender, national origin, disability, age, sexual orientation, language, or socioeconomic status.

Copyright © 2022 National Drug Court Resource Center

Acknowledgements

The National Drug Court Resource Center (NDCRC) would like to extend gratitude and thanks to everyone involved in this important project. We sincerely appreciate the efforts of the individuals and organizations within the states/territories that completed the survey. This information serves as the basis for the publication and is critical to our understanding of treatment courts.

NDCRC appreciates the Bureau of Justice Assistance at the U.S. Department of Justice whose support made this project and publication possible.

The authors sincerely thank Paul Gregory, Ph.D., David J. Hartmann, Ph.D., Doug B. Marlowe, J.D., Ph.D., and David Wright, Ph.D. for serving as peer reviewers and offering insights and suggestions. Additional thanks go to Savannah Bryson for assisting with data collection, Ben Yerby, M.A., for designing the report, as well as the NDCRC staff and the University of North Carolina Wilmington for their support of this effort.

About the Authors

Kristen E. DeVall, Ph.D., received her Ph.D. in sociology from Western Michigan University in 2008. At present she is the co-director of the National Drug Court Resource Center & a professor of sociology and criminology at the University of North Carolina Wilmington. She has conducted evaluations of numerous treatment court programs and other criminal justice initiatives since 2004. Several statewide evaluations have involved the collection and analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data, as well as the merging of large datasets. Dr. DeVall has also garnered over \$14 million in grant funding from SAMHSA, BJA, OJJDP, as well as state and local entities to support various treatment courts & other criminal justice programs. In addition, she worked as a case manager for a community corrections program for seven years. Providing direct services to individuals involved with the criminal justice system allowed her to see firsthand how the system operates and identify opportunities for system-level and policy change. Overall, her work seeks to bridge the gap between academia and practitioners, as well as influence the development of evidence-based policies and practices.

Christina Lanier, Ph.D., is the co-director of the National Drug Court Resource Center and a professor of sociology and criminology at the University of North Carolina Wilmington. She received her Ph.D. in sociology from the University of Delaware in 2006. She has extensive experience in the area of program evaluation and has conducted several evaluations of treatment courts, as well as other criminal justice programs such as the Swift and Sure Sanctions Probation Program (SSSPP) in Michigan and the North Carolina Treatment Alternatives for Safe Communities (TASC). Additionally, Dr. Lanier has secured over \$10 million in federal (OJJDP, BJA, and SAMHSA), state, and local agencies. Her research has been published in *Substance Use and Misuse*, *The Prison Journal*, *Violence Against Women*, *Homicide Studies*, *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, and *The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*. Dr. Lanier's focus is on linking the work of researchers with practitioners to develop policy and implement social change.

Lindsay Baker, M.A., earned a M.A. in Criminology from the University of North Carolina Wilmington in 2022. During her time as a student, Lindsay garnered experience in the areas of restorative justice and reentry which ultimately sparked her interest in treatment court work. Lindsay served as a graduate fellow with the NDCRC and is now employed there as a Social Science Researcher. In this role, Lindsay assists with the collection, analysis, and dissemination of treatment court data to multiple audiences. As part of the NDCRC's team, Lindsay seeks to highlight the importance of therapeutic jurisprudence and treatment in the justice system.

Contents

Acknowledgements	vii
About the Authors	vii
Introduction	1
What are Treatment Courts?	2
Therapeutic Jurisprudence	3
Treatment Court Terminology	3
Table 1: Treatment Court Terminology Adopted by States/Territories	4
Figure 1: Milestones in the Development of Treatment Courts	5
Survey Methodology	8
Response Rates	9
Table 2: Response Rates by Question and Court Type	10
Statewide Management Information Systems	11
Table 3: Variables Tracked by States/Territories with MIS	12
Growth of Treatment Courts	13
Figure 2: Number of Treatment Courts in the United States from 1989 to 2019	14
Table 4: Growth of Treatment Courts in the United States from 2009 to 2019	15
Figure 3: Number of Treatment Courts in the U.S. and Territories	16
Table 5: Treatment Courts by Type and State/Territory	18
Table 6: Reasons for Program Closure 2018–2019	20
Table 7: Treatment Court Programs in Planning as of December 31, 2019	21
Treatment Court Appropriations	22
Table 8: Treatment Court Appropriations (in millions) FY2014–2019	22
Figure 4: Federal Appropriations (in millions) for Treatment Courts FY2014–2019	23
BJA, SAMHSA, & OJJDP Treatment Court Grant Awards	24
Table 9: Treatment Court Federal Grant Award Funding by Agency FY2014–2019	24
Figure 5: Treatment Court Federal Grant Award Funding by Agency FY2014–2019	25
Treatment Court Participants (2019)	26

All Treatment Court Participants (Adult & Juvenile).....	26
Table 10: All Treatment Court Participants.....	27
Adult Treatment Court Participants.....	28
Table 11: All Adult Treatment Court Participants.....	29
Juvenile Treatment Court Participants.....	30
Table 12: All Juvenile Treatment Court Participants.....	31
Juvenile Drug Treatment Courts (JDTCs)	33
History & Structure.....	33
Court Objectives and Guidelines.....	34
Effectiveness of JDTCs.....	35
Enhancing Practitioner Knowledge and Capacity.....	36
Figure 6: Number of Juvenile Drug Treatment Courts in the U.S. and Territories.....	38
JDTC Analysis	40
Table 13: Total Number of JDTC Participants by Gender and Disposition Status.....	40
Table 14: Total Number of JDTC Participants by Race, Ethnicity, and Disposition Status.....	41
Figure 7: Top Drugs of Use within JDTC Programs.....	42
Figure 8: Eligible Offense Classifications among 152 JDTCs.....	43
Figure 9: Dispositional Models among 157 JDTCs.....	43
Figure 10: Reported Gaps in Services among JDTCs.....	44
Other Treatment Courts	46
State Legislation and Appropriations	47
Issues to Consider	48
Treatment Court Data: Availability & Quality.....	48
Equity & Inclusion: Racial & Ethnic Disparities in Treatment Courts.....	49
Table 15: Comparison of Adult Treatment Court Participants with Other Criminal Justice Populations by Race/Ethnicity (%).....	51
Table 16: Comparison of Juvenile Treatment Court Participants with Other Criminal Justice Populations by Race/Ethnicity (%).....	52
The Rise in Stimulant Use: The Role of Treatment Courts in Addressing this Issue.....	53
Table 17: Select Substance Use & Treatment Access Indicators from 2019 NSDUH (SAMHSA) (%).....	54

Table 18: % of States/Territories Reporting Specific Drugs of Use by Treatment Court Participants by Court Type	56
---	----

References	58
-------------------	----

Appendices	74
-------------------	----

Appendix A: Dispositional Models Utilized in Treatment Courts	74
---	----

Introduction

The 2019 issue of the *Painting the Current Picture: A National Report on Treatment Courts in the United States* (hereafter referred to as *PCP*) represents the sixth time an in-depth analysis of treatment court programs across the United States has been conducted. The current version was conducted by the National Drug Court Resource Center (NDCRC), located at the University of North Carolina Wilmington (UNCW). All previous iterations of this survey (2004, 2005, 2008, 2011, 2016) were conducted by the National Association of Drug Court Professionals (NADCP). The monograph has continued the long-standing tradition of providing a detailed snapshot of the treatment court field within the United States. Especially noteworthy is that these data provide the authors with the ability to monitor trends and to highlight similarities and differences in the findings obtained over time. The monograph also provides a synopsis of the most recent scholarly literature on treatment courts. Summaries of the extant literature for each treatment court type include a brief overview of the history and structure, best practice standards, guiding principles, effectiveness and cost-benefit findings, and directions for enhancing practitioner knowledge and capacity.

New to the 2019 *PCP* monograph is the organization of information by treatment court type. While aggregate data regarding all treatment court programs is provided, several interesting trends are revealed when examining data by program type and age group served. Similar to the 2014 *PCP*, there are important lessons for the field to consider and on which action should be taken. These lessons include:

First, the type and quality of data being gathered regarding treatment courts varies greatly across states/territories. Data availability and quality have great implications for the type of research questions that can be answered about treatment courts, the ability to monitor data trends over time, and the ability to obtain an accurate picture of what is happening in the field.

Second, racial/ethnic disparities in both enrollment in and graduation from treatment courts continues to be an issue within the treatment court field. This finding was highlighted in the 2014 *PCP* monograph. In 2019, the National Association of Drug Court Professionals and National Center for State Courts published the *Equity & Inclusion: Equivalent Access Assessment & Toolkit*, with support from the Office of National Drug Control Policy (ONDCP). In the same year, American University, with BJA funding, launched the *Racial & Ethnic Disparities (RED) Assessment Tool*. Both of these tools are designed to assist jurisdictions with identifying and addressing disparities.

Third, for the past 10–15 years much attention and resources have been paid to the opioid epidemic and how treatment courts are well-positioned to address the needs of high-risk/high-need individuals with an opioid use disorder. However, what has received less attention is the fact that in some regions/jurisdictions, stimulant use has been and continues to be the prevalent drug of use among individuals. A small body of research has demonstrated that treatment courts are effective in addressing the needs of this population of individuals as well (Farrell et al. 2019; Jones et al. 2019; Lanier & DeVall, 2017).

These issues represent opportunities for the field to continue the legacy of using data to make informed decisions in order to advance the mission of treatment courts. These issues are not insurmountable. With a commitment to excellence in mind and the necessary resources, improvements can be made. Strategies are currently being implemented to address these areas in need of enhancement.

What are Treatment Courts?

The legacy of treatment courts began in 1989 in Miami-Dade County (FL). At the time, the United States was embroiled in the “war on drugs” and large percentages of individuals being processed through criminal justice systems across the country had similar characteristics: 1) a substance use disorder that contributed to criminal behavior; 2) a history of cycling through the criminal justice system one or more times previously; and 3) had been charged with non-violent crimes. A small but determined group of criminal justice practitioners came together and openly expressed dissatisfaction with the traditional criminal justice system that was ineffective at reducing recidivism. They argued that the strategies being utilized neither focused on nor addressed the underlying criminogenic needs of justice-involved individuals. To this end, they sought to design a strategy for more effectively intervening in the lives of these individuals so as to stop the revolving door cycle in/out of the criminal justice system in which so many individuals were entangled. Out of these efforts the drug court model was born. Figure 1 presents a timeline of milestones within the treatment court field between 1989 and 2019. This information was adapted from Marlowe et al. (2016).

The adult drug court model is one criminal justice initiative that quickly obtained bi-partisan support in part because it helped courts better assess and manage system-wide court backlogs. Based upon the positive results, additional resources were made available, and programs began expanding to jurisdictions across the U.S.

In an effort to provide guidance regarding what the drug court model entailed, NADCP, the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) and the Drug Court Programs Office (DCPO) co-authored *Defining Drug Courts: The Key Components* in 1997. In addition, the Drug Court Programs Office (DCPO), established in 1995, and merged with BJA in 2003, supported a recidivism study, along with the National Institute of Justice (NIJ), and began to assess the impact of treatment courts (Roman et al., 2003). The authors found that drug court graduates had a recidivism rate (measured as an arrest resulting from a criminal charge) of only 16.4% one-year after program completion and a rate of only 27.5% two years after completion. Again, in 2011, the NIJ/DOJ funded the *Multisite Adult Drug Court Evaluation* (NIJ, 2012). This study was a 5-year longitudinal process, impact, and cost evaluation of 23 drug courts and six comparison courts in eight states. The results of this evaluation led to the development of the *Research 2 Practice* initiative, a BJA/NIJ sponsored endeavor, which identified seven evidence-based components for a successful drug court program (BJA & NIJ, 2012).

Since 1989, the drug court model has served as the foundation for the development of other treatment court programs designed to serve specific target populations that have underlying substance use disorders which have contributed to their involvement in the criminal justice, juvenile justice, or child welfare systems. Over the past 30 years, several terms have been coined and adopted by states/territories to distinguish drug court programs from other initiatives. An overview of these specific terms is provided in the next section. For the purposes of this report, we use the term “treatment courts” to refer to all programs collectively. However, when speaking of a specific court type (e.g., adult drug court, veterans treatment court, juvenile drug treatment court, etc.), we use the generally accepted term to refer to the specific treatment court type so as to make clear the distinction to the audience. Before turning to terminology, a discussion of the theoretical foundation for the drug court model is warranted.

Therapeutic Jurisprudence

While the drug court model was developed without an explicit theoretical foundation, the various model components and implied philosophical orientation have strong sociological and legal theoretical roots. Roscoe Pound (1912) coined the term “sociological jurisprudence” and argued that “the law must look to the relationship between itself and the social effects it creates” (p. 446). Decades later, David Wexler & Bruce Winick argued that scholars needed to examine “the extent to which substantive rules, legal procedures, and the roles of lawyers and judges produce therapeutic or anti-therapeutic consequences for individuals involved in the legal process” (Hora et al., 1999, p. 442). Thus, the term “therapeutic jurisprudence” was born. While first applied to the study of mental health law, therapeutic jurisprudence has been applied to myriad types of law and for the purposes of this discussion, criminal law. According to Hora et al. (1999) and Winick & Wexler (2015) the drug court model represents the *translation* of therapeutic jurisprudence into practice. More specifically,

Through the introduction of drug treatment principles on addicted criminal defendants [sic], and now juveniles and participants in family court, [drug treatment courts] DTCs unknowingly apply the concepts of therapeutic jurisprudence every day in hundreds of courtrooms across America. Once DTCs realize this, they can use therapeutic jurisprudence principles to enhance existing procedures, to make a greater impact on the lives of drug-addicted and alcoholic criminal defendants, and to increase the safety of communities across America (Hora et al., 1999, p. 447).

It has been argued that therapeutic jurisprudence seeks to incorporate a “‘rights’ perspective – focusing on justice, rights, and equality issues with the ‘ethic of care’ perspective – focusing on care, interdependence, and response to need” (Rottman & Casey, 1999, p. 13). Similarly, by way of structure (e.g., 10 Key Components and Adult Drug Court Best Practice Standards), the drug court model seeks to balance due process rights with providing access to culturally-appropriate, evidence-based treatment and recovery support services that are known to be effective with a criminal justice-involved population.

Treatment Court Terminology


As can be seen in Table 1, a variety of terms have been adopted by states/territories across the United States when referring to treatment court programs. The most often used terms include: problem-solving courts (20.4%), specialty courts (20.4%), treatment courts (18.5%), and drug courts (16.7%). When examining by area of focus, 42.7% of states/territories have adopted an alternative orientation (i.e., collaborative courts, problem-solving courts, and specialty courts). Just over one-third (25.2%) of states/territories have adopted terminology that is treatment focused (e.g., treatment courts, drug treatment courts, recovery courts, etc.) Roughly one-fifth (20.5%) have retained the original term of drug courts (also included are drug/alternative courts and drug intervention courts). Finally, one state (1.9%) adopted terminology that appears to be focused on accountability/compliance.

As the treatment court model continues to be expanded and enhanced, it is important to keep in mind that states/territories will vary in what terminology they adopt to describe treatment court programs. However, in order to ensure that the concept of treatment courts is not coopted, practitioners, scholars, funders, and legislators must be aware of the diversity in terms used to reference a specific program model designed to address the needs of high-risk/high-need individuals with substance use and/or mental health disorders that have contributed to their involvement in the criminal justice system, child welfare system, or juvenile justice system.

Table 1: Treatment Court Terminology Adopted by States/Territories

Term	# of States/Territories	% of States/Territories
Accountability/Compliance		
Accountability Courts	1	1.9
		1.9
Drug		
Drug Courts	9	16.7
Drug/Alternative Courts	1	1.9
Drug Intervention Courts	1	1.9
		20.5
Treatment		
Drug Treatment Courts	4	7.4
Drug/Treatment Courts	2	3.7
Treatment Courts	10	18.5
Therapeutic Courts	1	1.9
Recovery Courts	2	3.7
		35.2
Other		
Collaborative Courts	1	1.9
Problem-solving Courts	11	20.4
Specialty Courts	11	20.4
		42.7
Total	54	

Figure 1: Milestones in the Development of Treatment Courts^a



^aAdapted from Marlowe et al. (2016) with additions from 2015–2019.

Figure 1 (Cont.): Milestones in the Development of Treatment Courts

● **2000**

- First Juvenile and Family Drug Court Training Conference held in Phoenix, Arizona
- American Bar Association releases Proposed Standard 2.77 – Procedures in Drug Treatment Courts
- Conference of Chief Justices/Conference of State Court Administrators (CCJ/COSCA) passes resolution in support of problem-solving courts

● **2001**

- NADCP and National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges release *16 Strategies for Juvenile Drug Courts*
- First juvenile mental health court opens in Santa Clara County, California

● **2002**

- First campus drug court opens at Colorado State University
- DCP0 merges into BJA

● **2003**

- DCP0 Drug Court Discretionary Grant Program merges into Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA)

- The National Institute of Justice (NIJ) reports drug court recidivism rates are as low as 16.4% nationwide one year after graduation

● **2004**

- NADCP holds 10th Annual Drug Court Training Conference
- CCJ/COSCA reaffirms support for problem-solving courts by passing a second joint resolution
- First VTC was established in Anchorage, Alaska in 2004 providing an avenue for veterans charged with a crime to receive treatment from the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA)

● **2005**

- 23% of adult drug courts accept impaired driving population, a 165% increase from 2004
- 33 U.S. states report an increase in drug court clients whose primary drug of choice is methamphetamine

● **2006**

- U.S. incarcerated population reaches 2.2 million

- National study finds that parents in family dependency treatment courts were significantly more likely to be reunified with their children than were comparison group parents
- 7.2 million people in the U.S. are under criminal justice supervision

● **2007**

- National Center for DWI Courts (NCDC) founded

● **2008**

- BJA funds one of the first treatment courts specifically developed for veterans in Buffalo, New York, by the Honorable Judge Robert Russell

● **2010**

- National Drug Court Resource Center opens
- Justice for Vets founded
- Organization of American States (OAS) adopts the Hemispheric Drug Strategy, which encourages member states to develop drug courts
- NADCP Board of Directors issues unanimous resolution directing drug courts to assess and rectify racial and ethnic disparities

2011

- NIJ Multisite Adult Drug Court Evaluation finds that drug courts reduce crime and substance abuse and improve family functioning and employment

2012

- AllRise Ride Across America
- Global Centre for Drug Courts founded
- Campbell Collaboration concludes that drug courts reduce crime and effects last at least 3 years
- U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee holds hearing on drug courts

2013

- DOJ receives a separate appropriation for veterans treatment courts
- Volume I of *Best Practice Standards* published
- Doing Justice Summit is convened
- First veterans court conventions are held
- AllRise Ride Across America

2014

- 25th anniversary of drug courts
- 20th anniversary of NADCP

- NADCP awarded special consultative status to the United Nations as an NGO
- Over 3,000 operational treatment courts within the United States
- Tribal Law and Policy Institute (TLPI) publishes the *Tribal Healing to Wellness Courts: The Key Components* funded by BJA

2015

- Volume II of *Best Practice Standards* published
- Federal appropriation for drug courts hits new record: \$110 million
- CCJ/COSCA endorses the NADCP *Best Practice Standards* and calls for further expansion and funding for problem-solving courts

2016

- Federal appropriations for treatment courts is \$130 million

2017

- NADCP Justice for Vets publishes the *10 Key Components of Veterans Treatment Courts*
- BJA funds the first opioid intervention court in Buffalo, New York
- Federal appropriations for treatment courts are \$134 million

2018

- NADCP *Best Practice Standards* vols. I & II (revised) published
- Spanish translations of *Best Practice Standards* vols. I & II published
- Federal appropriations for treatment courts are \$166 million

2019

- 30th anniversary of treatment courts
- 25th anniversary of NADCP
- *Family Treatment Court Best Practice Standards* published
- NADCP and National Center for State Courts (NCSC) published the *Equity & Inclusion: Equivalent Access Assessment & Toolkit* funded by Office of National Drug Control Policy (ONDCP)
- American University (AU) launches the *Racial & Ethnic Disparities (RED) Assessment Tool* funded by BJA
- Federal appropriations for treatment courts is \$230 million
- Over 3,800 operational treatment courts within the United States

Survey Methodology

The 2019 *Painting the Current Picture: A National Report on Treatment Courts in the United States* survey was disseminated to state/territory treatment court coordinators on July 30, 2020, using Qualtrics, a web-based survey platform. Respondents were asked to complete the survey instrument by September 30, 2020. However, due to myriad challenges brought on by the COVID-19 pandemic, data collection did not conclude until February 28, 2021. This provided respondents with seven full months to complete the electronic survey. Prior to beginning this survey project, the *PCP* survey instrument was submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for approval. In addition, the University of North Carolina Wilmington (UNCW) Institutional Review Board reviewed the project protocol and survey instrument to ensure compliance with human subjects' protection. Approval was granted by both external entities.

The *PCP* survey was distributed to the designated state/territory coordinator(s) in all 50 states, the District of Columbia, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, and Puerto Rico. For states/territories with a statewide management information system, the state/territory coordinator (or designee) was asked to answer the questions for the entire state/territory. However, in states/territories where these data were not available (e.g., where there was no statewide management information system), the state/territory coordinator was asked to send the survey instrument to local treatment court administrators/coordinators to complete. National Drug Court Resource Center (NDCRC) staff then aggregated all data received from these local personnel to create a state/territory profile/summary. Respondents were asked to provide data for 2019 (January 1, 2019 – December 31, 2019).

Prior to the disseminating the *PCP* survey, the NDCRC embarked on several outreach efforts to educate the field on the purpose of this survey, benefits, project timeline, and address questions/concerns.

- Co-Directors Drs. Kristen DeVall & Christina Lanier called individual state/territory coordinators to discuss the NDCRC in general and *PCP* survey between February – July 2020.
- The National Drug Court Resource Center (NDCRC), National Association of Drug Court Professionals (NADCP), Center for Court Innovation (CCI), & Children & Family Futures (CFF) co-hosted a web-based Q&A event on July 15, 2020 to discuss upcoming survey projects (the *PCP* was discussed during this event).
- NDCRC emailed an informational letter regarding the survey and associated data collection form in mid-July 2020 notifying respondents of the survey launch date (July 30, 2020) and instructions about the participant data needed to answer some of the survey questions.

On July 30, 2020, respondents received an email that included the survey link, data collection form, and a PDF copy of the survey. Follow-up emails were sent every two weeks to coordinators who had not yet completed the survey. During this same time, the NDCRC co-directors hosted “office hours” so respondents could ask questions and get “real time” answers to questions regarding the survey. After completing the survey, NDCRC staff reviewed the data for accuracy and contacted respondents (as needed) to address inaccuracies and/or complete missing fields.

The survey asked about various treatment court types for both adults and juveniles. The survey was organized into three blocks, which are described below.

Block 1: Management Information System

Block 1 asked respondents whether their state/territory has a management information system (MIS) used to gather and track data regarding treatment court participants. If yes, respondents were asked if this data collection was mandatory or voluntary. Moreover, respondents were asked to specify which data elements are included in the state/territory's MIS.

Block 2: Treatment Court Program Structure & 2019 Participants

Block 2 was organized by treatment court type. First, respondents were asked to report the number of treatment court programs by type that were in operation (during 2019), in planning (to become operational within the next 12 months), and the number of programs that closed between 2018-2019. Respondents indicating that one or more treatment court programs closed within their state/territory were asked to report the reason(s) for the closure. Second, respondents were asked a series of questions regarding the operational treatment court programs in their state/territory. These questions were organized into two groups:

Group 1 included questions regarding participants in each state/territory's treatment court programs during 2019 – the number of individuals enrolled (between January 1 – December 31, 2019), the number of graduates, the number of individuals terminated, and the number of individuals still enrolled in the program on 12/31/19. Additionally, respondents were asked to parcel out the total number of participants, graduates, terminations, and those still enrolled by gender and race/ethnicity.¹

Group 2 included questions regarding the structure of each state/territory's operational treatment court programs – the offense levels permitted in each court type, the dispositional model, the top three drugs of use reported by program participants, and the specific gaps in community resources that address participants' needs.

Block 3: Legislation & Training Needs

Block 3 asked respondents to report on whether their state/territory had authorizing and appropriation legislation for treatment courts. If so, the specific bill numbers were requested. Respondents were also asked whether their state/territory had a training conference for treatment court practitioners, as well as specific topics for future training/technical assistance.

Response Rates

Respondents from 52 of 54 states/territories responded to the *PCP* survey. New Jersey and Wisconsin did not respond to the *PCP* survey. However, of the 52 responding state/territory coordinators, five only provided the number of operational treatment courts (by type) but did not answer any additional survey questions. Therefore, the overall response rate for the 2019 *PCP* is 87.0%. The response rates for individual survey items are provided in Table 2. It should be noted that jurisdictions do not collect data in the same way and the reliability of data collection varies greatly across states/territories. Some items were not applicable to all jurisdictions and/or treatment court types. Therefore, only valid jurisdictions were included in the denominator when calculating response rates and percentages.

¹ It is important to note that some states/territories treated race and ethnicity as two variables while other states/territories combined these two terms into one variable. Consequently, the ability to analyze ethnicity data varied.

Table 2: Response Rates by Question and Court Type (%)

	All	ADC	DWI	FTC	VTC	MHC	JDTC	JMHC
# of states/territories responding to survey	52	52	36	38	44	39	39	14
# of courts represented	3,609	1,696	257	335	480	490	305	46
Statewide or territory-wide management information system (MIS)	100.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total number of treatment courts in operation by court type	100.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Participant data by gender (total, disposition status, still enrolled) ^a	—	73.1-82.7	63.9-72.2	77.8-78.9	61.4-65.9	64.1-71.8	59.0-71.8	57.1-71.4
Participant data by race/ethnicity (total, disposition status, still enrolled) ^a	—	63.5-76.9	63.9-72.2	75.0-80.6	52.3-61.4	56.4-71.8	56.4-71.8	50.0-64.3
Eligible offense classifications	—	76.9	80.6	—	68.2	71.8	71.8	71.4
Dispositional models	—	76.9	77.8	—	70.4	71.8	69.2	71.4
Top drugs of use	—	67.4	86.1	86.8	78.0	79.5	76.9	71.4
Gaps in services	—	76.9	72.2	68.4	65.9	66.7	66.7	57.1
Legislation authorizing treatment courts	90.4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Legislation providing appropriations for treatment courts	88.5	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Host training conference for team members	90.4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Training/technical assistance needs	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

^aParticipant data (the total number, by disposition status, and still enrolled) were not provided by all states/territories responding to the survey. Therefore, the range in percentage of states/territories providing these data is presented.

Statewide Management Information Systems

Respondents were asked if their state/territory currently has a statewide management information system (MIS) for collecting data from treatment courts. Less than two-thirds (59.6%) of states/territories (n=31) reported having a statewide MIS, while 40.4% (n=21) do not have a system. Among those with a MIS, 93.5% (n=29) report that entering treatment court data is mandatory. Also, provided in Table 3 is a summary of the variables that are collected by those states/territories with a MIS. The most frequent variables recorded were demographic characteristics such as participant's age at entry and the race/ethnicity of the participant, which were collected by 90.3% of these states/territories. Over 80% of states/territories with a MIS collected education and employment status at program entry, while 77.4% obtained this information at program exit. Housing status at entry and exit was only collected by about two-thirds of these states/territories (67.7% and 64.5%, respectively). Among the pre-program variables such as risk and need level, previous offenses, and drug of use, 87.1% reported tracking participant reported drug of use. Participant's risk and need level was collected by 77.4% and previous felonies and misdemeanors were recorded by 67.7% of these states/territories. Programmatic measures such as exit date, number of days in the program, and disposition status were each collected by 83.9% of states/territories, whereas program entry date was collected by 87.1%.

Measures examining program services varied greatly in reporting frequency. For example, 74.2% of management information systems collected data on the type of treatment received but only 58.1% tracked the type of treatment that was recommended for participants and the number of treatment sessions received. Even fewer states/territories (48.4%) collected data on the utilization of recovery support services. Looking at the frequency of collecting information regarding drug and alcohol testing, 83.9% of states/territories tracked the number of tests submitted by participants and the results of the tests. About three-quarters of states/territories collected data regarding incentives and sanctions. The number of court review sessions was tracked by 80.6% of states/territories with a MIS.

“ Less than two-thirds (59.6%) of responding states/territories reported having a statewide management information system (MIS) for tracking treatment court program and participant data.

Table 3: Variables Tracked by States/Territories with MIS (n=31)

Variables	% collected
<i>Demographic characteristics</i>	
Age @ program entry	90.3
Race and/or ethnicity	90.3
Education @ program entry	83.9
Education @ program exit	77.4
Employment @ program entry	83.9
Employment @ program exit	77.4
# of minor children/dependents	71.0
Marital status	77.4
Housing status @ program entry	67.7
Housing status @ program exit	64.5
<i>Pre-program variables</i>	
Risk & need level	77.4
# of previous felonies	67.7
# of previous misdemeanors	67.7
Drug(s) of use/choice	87.1
<i>Program Information</i>	
Program entry date	87.1
Program exit date	83.9
# of days in program	83.9
Program disposition	83.9
<i>Program services</i>	
Treatment level of care (recommended)	58.1
Type of treatment received	74.2
# of treatment sessions received	58.1
# of recovery support services received	48.4
# of drug/alcohol screens completed	83.9
Results of drug/alcohol screens	83.9
# of incentives received	77.4
# of sanctions received	74.2
# of court review sessions attended	80.6

Growth of Treatment Courts

Figure 2 presents the growth of treatment courts over the past thirty years (1989–2019). As can be seen, there has been an exponential increase in the number of programs during this time. It should be noted that data were not available for 2015–2018. In 2016 and 2019, there were transitions in the entities managing the NDCRC. To strengthen the quality of the data being collected, a set of new survey tools were developed that involved obtaining the Office of Budget and Management (OMB) approval. In addition, there were delays caused by the COVID-19 pandemic.

As of December 31, 2019, 3,856² treatment courts (see Figure 3) were operational within the United States (90.8% of these programs serviced adults and 9.2% serviced juveniles). This represents a 12% increase in the number of operational programs over the previous five years. However, this increase was largely among adult programs (17%), as compared to juvenile where there was a 22% decrease in the total number of programs. See Table 5 on page 18 for the number of programs by type and state.

Of these 3,856 programs, adult drug courts continue to be the most prevalent model, comprising close to half (44.0%; n=1,696) of all treatment courts. Other prevalent models included: adult mental health courts (12.7%; n=490), veterans treatment courts (12.4%; n=480), family treatment courts (8.7%; n=335), juvenile drug courts (7.9%; n=305), and DUI/DWI courts (6.7% n=257). The remaining treatment court models together represented 7.6% of all treatment courts.

“ In 2019, 3,856 treatment courts were operational within the United States.

As presented in Table 4, program growth from 2014–2019 was the greatest among reentry treatment courts (235%), veterans treatment courts (80%), and adult mental health courts (25%). Additionally, the number of juvenile mental health courts increased by 24% while adult drug courts and family treatment courts both increased by 10%. Only three categories of treatment courts observed a decrease in the number of programs between 2014–2019, which included: adult co-occurring disorders court (-66%), juvenile drug courts (-27%), and DUI/DWI courts (-2%).


While previous versions of *PCP* included information regarding “problem-solving courts” more generally, this monograph focuses exclusively on treatment court programs operating within states/territories. To this end, programs were selected for inclusion if they met the following criteria:

1. Serve individuals (adults and juveniles) with substance use disorders, mental health disorders, or co-occurring disorders; and
2. Model includes the following elements: judicial leadership, multidisciplinary team, drug testing, court hearings, clinical treatment, and community supervision/ monitoring.

Federal drug treatment court programs were excluded from this study. Given the specific focus of the current study, readers should be cautioned against comparing the total number of problem-solving court programs (reported in 2014) with the total number of treatment court programs reported in this study. In addition, two states (i.e., New Jersey and Wisconsin) did not provide data for this study despite having operational treatment courts during the study timeframe.

² This total includes the following adult treatment courts: drug courts, DUI/DWI courts, family treatment courts, veteran treatment courts, mental health courts, COD courts, opioid courts, reentry courts, tribal healing to wellness courts (2020), and other courts. The following juvenile courts are included in the total: drug treatment courts, mental health courts, and COD courts.

Figure 2: Number of Treatment Courts in the United States from 1989 to 2019



While the total number of treatment court programs increased by 12% from 2014 to 2019, this increase was largely observed in adult programs, which reported a 17% increase. Over this same time period, there was a 22% decrease in juvenile programs.

Table 4: Growth of Treatment Courts in the United States from 2009 to 2019


# of Programs (as of December 31)					
Treatment Court Program	2009	2014	2019 ^a	Difference from 12/31/2014	% Change
Adult					
Adult Drug	1,317	1,540	1,696	156	10%
Adult Hybrid Drug/DUI ^b	354	407	351	-56	-14%
Co-occurring Disorders	NR	62	21	-41	-66%
DUI/DWI	172	262	257	-5	-2%
Family Treatment	322	305	335	30	10%
Mental Health	288	392	490	98	25%
Opioid Intervention	NR	NR	24	—	—
Other state/tribal	0	0	1	1	—
Re-entry Drug	29	26	87	61	235%
Tribal Healing to Wellness	89	138	109 ^c	-29	-21%
Veterans Treatment	19	266	480	214	80%
Adult sub-total	2,236	2,991	3,500	509	17%
Juvenile					
Juvenile Co-occurring Disorders	NR	NR	5	—	—
Juvenile Drug	476	420	305	-115	-27%
Juvenile Mental Health	NR	37	46	9	24%
Juvenile sub-total	476	457	356	-101	-22%
Adult & Juvenile Total	2,712	3,448	3,856	408	12%

^aWisconsin and New Jersey did not provide court counts and thus are excluded from the table.


^bHybrid drug/DUI courts are a subset of ADCs and not count separately in the total line tallies.

^cTHWC totals are as of December 31, 2020.

Figure 3: Number of Treatment Courts in the U.S. and Territories (2019)



U.S.A.



* Wisconsin only includes THWC.
No data available for New Jersey.

Table 5: Treatment Courts by Type and State/Territory (2019)

State	Adult								Juvenile						
	Drug	DUI/DWI	Hybrid Drug/ DUI ^a	Co-occurring Disorder	Family	Mental Health	Opioid Intervention	Re-entry	Tribal Healing to Wellness ^c	Veterans	Other	Drug	Co-occurring Disorder	Mental Health	State/Territory Total
Alabama	55	1	26		13	11			1	28		11		1	121
Alaska	5	1	5		2	3			7	1	1				20
Arizona	12	3	3		2	4	1		10	4		6		1	43
Arkansas	49	14			2	2				16		16			99
California	86	14			38	50		18	11	48		27		11	303
Colorado	30	15	1		11	7			1	7		3		2	76
Connecticut	1														1
Delaware	5	2				3		1		3				3	17
District of Columbia	1					1									2
Florida	56	4			13	31	1			31		20		1	157
Georgia	51	24	6		21	35				19		8		5	163
Guam	1	1			1			1		1		1			6
Hawaii	6				1	1				4		4			16
Idaho	35	6	3		2	11			3	6		4		2	69
Illinois	69	4	3			29				20					122
Indiana	44		2		12	8		12		27		1			104
Iowa	10	3	3		12	4			1	1		6			37
Kansas	11					4			1	1		2			19
Kentucky	71					1				7					79
Louisiana	32	8	32	3	7	1		9	2	4		10		1	77
Maine	6			1	3				1	2					13
Maryland	24	3	2		5	7		2		7		2			50
Massachusetts	32			1	1	8				6					48
Michigan	75	31	75		8	31			6	27		12		6	196
Minnesota	38	14	17		3	4			3	8		1			71

Mississippi	25		1		3				1								11						40
Missouri	80	23	32		15						15						4						137
Montana	14	6		2	5				9		4						2						42
Nebraska	20	1			4			2	2		2						2						33
Nevada	26	8		3	4	6	2	2	2		5						4						62
New Hampshire	10		10			11					6												27
New Jersey																							NR ^b
New Mexico	32	10	9		4	5			14		1						7						73
New York	96	4	96		22	30	20		1		35						7						215
North Carolina	29	7			8	7			1		4						3						59
North Dakota	7		7						4								6						17
N. Mariana Islands	1																						1
Ohio	113	6		3	34	34		10			26						19	5	6				256
Oklahoma	50	2	2	5	4	22			4		3						7						97
Oregon	30	2	2		7	15		1	2		5						5						67
Pennsylvania	56	14	10	1	5	22					25						5		1				129
Puerto Rico	10																						10
Rhode Island	1				1						1						1						4
South Carolina	31					10					5						13						59
South Dakota	10	4	3			2			2		3												21
Tennessee	46	3			2	8					10						6						75
Texas	65	6		1	14	20		29	1		32						24		2				194
Utah	27	2			16	13					2						5		4				69
Vermont	3	1				1																	5
Virginia	38	2			7	13					7						7						74
Washington	28	7		1	18	15			12		9						11						101
West Virginia	29				5						1						18						53
Wisconsin									6														6 ^d
Wyoming	14	1	1						1		1						4						21
Total	1,696	257	351	21	335	490	24	87	109	480	1	305	5	46	1	305	5	46	1	305	5	46	3,856

^aHybrid drug/DUI courts are a subset of ADCs and not count separately in the total line tallies. ^bNR = Not reported.

^cTHWC totals are as of December 31, 2020. ^dTotals for the THWCs were available, but not provided for the other treatment court types.

Survey respondents reported that 41 treatment court programs closed between 2018-2019. It should be noted that there may be more than one reason why programs closed. Only twenty respondents answered this question and reasons are presented in Table 6. Half of the respondents indicated that program closure was the result of insufficient referrals and 20.0% provided an “other reason.” One example was that a jurisdiction created tracks within a program for a specific sub-population(s) as opposed to operating a stand-alone program. An additional 15.0% of respondents indicated that insufficient funding was the reason for program closure.

As jurisdictions diversify the type of treatment courts to meet the needs of residents, the number of participants served by each program may be less than in the past. For example, a jurisdiction with a hybrid drug/DUI/DWI program may elect to implement a standalone DUI/DWI program and a standalone ADC. This change would impact enrollments in the ADC as DUI/DWI participants are funneled into the new program. However, prior to this type of change, it is imperative that jurisdictions examine their programmatic data to determine if there is a need for this type of change and whether the resources are available to sustain multiple programs over time.

Table 6: Reasons for Program Closure 2018–2019

Reasons for Closure	#	% of respondents
Insufficient services	2	10.0
Insufficient referrals	10	50.0
Funding	3	15.0
Loss of judicial will/interest	2	10.0
Loss of political will/interest	2	10.0
Change in offense classification	2	10.0
Other reason	4	20.0

In terms of projected treatment court program expansion, respondents reported that 81 programs were in the planning stage as of December 31, 2019. An overview of the type of treatment court programs being planned is presented in Table 7. The majority (92.6%) of treatment court programs being planned will serve adults which will continue to contribute to growth in new treatment courts since 2014. Almost one-third (32.1%) of these programs are adult drug courts, almost one-fourth (23.5%) are adult mental health courts, and less than one-fifth are family treatment courts (18.5%) and veterans treatment courts (18.5%). Among programs that will serve juveniles, 4.9% will be juvenile drug treatment courts and 2.5% will be juvenile mental health court programs.

Table 7: Treatment Court Programs in Planning as of December 31, 2019

	# of Programs in Planning	% of Programs in Planning
Adult		
Adult Drug	26	32.1%
Co-occurring Disorders	—	—
DUI/DWI	—	—
Family Treatment	15	18.5%
Mental Health	19	23.5%
Opioid Intervention	—	—
Other state/tribal (hybrid)	—	—
Re-entry Drug	—	—
Veterans Treatment	15	18.5%
Adult sub-total	75	92.6%
Juvenile		
Juvenile Co-occurring Disorders	—	—
Juvenile Drug	4	4.9%
Juvenile Mental Health	2	2.5%
Juvenile sub-total	6	7.4%
Adult & Juvenile Total	81	


Treatment Court Appropriations

Federal appropriations for treatment courts have been earmarked within the budgets for the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) and the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) (Sacco, 2018; U.S. General Services Administration, n.d.; SAMHSA, n.d.). Funding has grown over the years, but it is notable that federal appropriations increased by 72% between 2014 and 2019 (Table 8 and Figure 4). More specifically, DOJ appropriations increased by 108% and SAMHSA appropriations increased by 33%. During this five-year period, appropriations for veterans treatment courts increased by 450% and adult drug courts by 90%. This increase in federal funding over time is notable and a testament to the important work treatment courts do to address the needs of individuals with a substance use, mental health, or co-occurring disorder involved in the criminal justice, juvenile justice, or child welfare systems. In addition to these funding streams, starting in FY2017, Congress began appropriating funds under the Comprehensive Opioid, Stimulant, and other Substance Abuse Program (COSSAP), which also supports family treatment courts; law enforcement-led diversion and deflection programs with referral to treatment; and prosecution and court-based diversion programs serving individuals identified as lower risk and need.

Table 8: Treatment Court Appropriations (in millions) FY2014–2019

	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	Change between 2014–2019
US Department of Justice (DOJ)							
BJA Drug Court Discretionary Grant Program	\$ 40.50	\$ 41.00	\$ 42.00	\$ 43.00	\$ 75.00	\$ 77.00	90%
BJA Veterans Treatment Courts	\$ 4.00	\$ 5.00	\$ 6.00	\$ 7.00	\$ 20.00	\$ 22.00	450%
OJJDP Juvenile and Family Treatment Courts	\$ 13.00	\$ 13.00	\$ 13.00	\$ 13.00	\$ 19.40	\$ 20.40	57%
DOJ sub-total	\$ 57.50	\$ 59.00	\$ 61.00	\$ 63.00	\$ 114.40	\$ 119.40	108%
Substance Abuse & Mental Health Administration (SAMHSA)							
SAMHSA sub-total	\$ 52.75	\$ 50.00	\$ 60.00	\$ 58.00	\$ 70.00	\$ 70.00	33%
Total appropriations (in millions)	\$ 110.25	\$ 109.00	\$ 121.00	\$ 121.00	\$ 184.40	\$ 189.40	72%

Figure 4: Federal Appropriations (in millions) for Treatment Courts FY2014–2019



“

In 2019, federal appropriations for treatment courts reached an all-time high of \$189.4 million. This represents a 72% increase in funding as compared to 2014.

BJA, SAMHSA, & OJJDP Treatment Court Grant Awards

Given the increase in federal appropriations for treatment courts between 2014 and 2019, it is not surprising that the amount of funding awarded to states/territories and local programs through a competitive grant process has also increased during this time. In 2014, roughly \$33.6 million was awarded to support treatment court efforts in states/territories (see Table 9 and Figure 5). This amount soared to \$99.5 million in 2018, but decreased by 23.6% in 2019 when \$76 million was awarded. Between 2014–2019, federal grant awards to support treatment courts increased by 126%.


Table 9: Treatment Court Federal Grant Award Funding by Agency FY2014–2019^a

	Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA)	Substance Abuse & Mental Health Administration (SAMHSA)	Office of Juvenile Justice & Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP)	FY Grant Award Total (in millions)	Change between 2014–2019
2014	\$ 16,559,669	\$ 11,335,710	\$ 5,714,795	\$ 33,610,174	
2015	\$ 13,031,137	\$ 15,118,192	\$ 7,746,618	\$ 35,895,947	
2016	\$ 21,577,221	\$ 16,389,235	\$ 12,657,246	\$ 50,623,702	
2017	\$ 22,248,664	\$ 25,953,715	\$ 4,100,000	\$ 52,302,379	
2018	\$ 47,412,254	\$ 37,154,712	\$ 14,943,192	\$ 99,510,158	
2019	\$ 44,114,442	\$ 21,932,055	\$ 10,002,530	\$ 76,049,027	+126%
Agency Total	\$ 184,537,594	\$ 141,236,021	\$ 63,558,257	\$ 347,991,387	

^aData were provided by BJA, SAMHSA, and OJJDP.

“ Federal funding awarded to states, territories, and programs for treatment courts increased 126% from 2014 to 2019. ”

Figure 5: Treatment Court Federal Grant Award Funding by Agency FY2014–2019



Treatment Court Participants (2019)

The *PCP* survey was designed to capture the number and characteristics of operational programs, as well as the number and characteristics of individuals served by these programs. These data provide a snapshot of the treatment court field in 2019. As noted previously, a key feature of the current study is the presentation of the results in three sections. First, is a summary of all participants (adult and juvenile) served by treatment courts. Next, data is presented separately for all adult and juvenile treatment court participants. Lastly, programmatic and participant data are provided by treatment court type.

All Treatment Court Participants (Adult & Juvenile)

A total of 140,402 adult and juvenile individuals were enrolled in the 3,856³ operational treatment court programs in 2019 that responded to the survey (see Table 10). A total of 61,927 participants had a disposition (either successful or unsuccessful) and 71,368 individuals were still enrolled in the programs as of December 31, 2019. Among participants with a disposition, 59.7% graduated. Of interest to scholars, practitioners, and other treatment court stakeholders is the demographic profile of these participants. Unfortunately, not all states/territories provided demographic data regarding participants. What follows is a summary of the demographic characteristics of treatment court participants in terms of gender and race/ethnicity based on available data.

In terms of gender, the majority (66.7%) of treatment court participants in 2019 were identified as male, one-third (33.3%) were identified as female, and less than one percent (0.04%) were identified as non-binary.⁴ The graduation rate among males was 62.1%, whereas the graduation rate among females was 58.5% and 46.7% among non-binary participants.

In terms of race, the majority of treatment court participants were identified as White/Caucasian (71.4%), followed by Black/African American (19.3%), Other race (5.5%), American Indian/Alaskan Native (2.4%), and Asian/Pacific Islander (1.5%). A total of 13,732 participants were identified as Hispanic/Latinx (ethnicity).⁵ Graduation rates across the various racial/ethnic groups ranged from 57.3% (Black/African American) to 66.4% (Asian/Pacific Islander).

3 109 THWCs are included in this total. However, data regarding participants are not included in this monograph.

4 It is important to note that recognition of non-binary as a category for gender is not often utilized. Thus, it is highly likely that programs have not yet adopted this category and thus have underestimated the totals for non-binary participants (see Fausto-Sterling, A. (2012). *Sex/Gender: Biology in a social world*. New York, NY: Routledge.).

5 It is important to note that some states/territories treated race and ethnicity as two variables while other states/territories combined these two terms into one variable. Consequently, the ability to analyze ethnicity data varied.

Table 10: All Treatment Court Participants (2019)

	Total Active	Total Successful	Total Unsuccessful	Graduation Rate	Total Still Enrolled as of 12/31/19
All Participants	140,402	36,993	24,934	59.7%	71,368
Total Participants:	136,497	30,197	19,428		59,510
Gender					
Female	33.3% (45,526)	33.0% (9,959)	36.4% (7,069)	58.5%	33.4% (19,883)
Male	66.7% (90,971)	67.0% (20,238)	63.6% (12,359)	62.1%	66.6% (39,627)
Non-binary	0.04% (52)	0.05% (14)	0.08% (16)	46.7%	0.03% (18)
Total Participants:	119,039	25,151	16,407	60.5%	48,830
Race					
American Indian/Alaskan Native	2.4% (2,826)	2.3% (589)	2.5% (411)	58.9%	3.3% (1,598)
Asian/Pacific Islander	1.5% (1,741)	1.5% (378)	1.2% (191)	66.4%	1.4% (664)
Black/African American	19.3% (23,010)	16.3% (4,090)	18.6% (3,044)	57.3%	20.0% (9,776)
White/Caucasian	71.4% (84,950)	72.5% (18,242)	69.5% (11,397)	61.5%	70.1% (34,216)
Other	5.5% (6,512)	7.4% (1,852)	8.3% (1,364)	57.6%	5.3% (2,576)
Ethnicity					
Hispanic/Latinx	13,732	2,891	1,895	60.4%	5,653

“ In 2019, at least 140,402 individuals were served by treatment court programs. Of those individuals with a disposition, 59.7% graduated.

Adult Treatment Court Participants

A total of 136,771 individuals were enrolled in the 3,500⁶ adult treatment court programs that were operational during 2019 (see Table 11). A total of 59,911 individuals had a disposition (either successful or unsuccessful) and 69,934 were still enrolled in a treatment court program as of December 31, 2019. Among participants with a disposition, 59.7% graduated. Of interest to scholars, practitioners, and other treatment court stakeholders is the demographic profile of these participants. Unfortunately, not all states/territories provided demographic data regarding participants. What follows is a summary of the demographic characteristics of treatment court participants in terms of gender and race/ethnicity based on available data.

In terms of gender, the majority (66.5%) of adult treatment court participants in 2019 were identified as male, one-third (33.4%) were identified as female, and less than one percent (0.04%) were identified as non-binary.⁷ The graduation rate⁸ among males was 62.2%, whereas the graduation rate among females was 58.4% and 46.7% among non-binary participants.

In terms of race/ethnicity, the majority of treatment court participants were identified as White/Caucasian (71.6%), followed by Black/African American (19.1%), Other race (5.5%), American Indian/Alaskan Native (2.3%), and Asian/Pacific Islander (1.4%). A total of 12,917 participants were identified as Hispanic/Latinx.⁹ Graduation rates across the various racial/ethnic groups ranged from 57.3% (Black/African American) to 65.2% (Asian/Pacific Islander).

6 109 THWCs are included in this total. However, data regarding participants are not included in this monograph.

7 It is important to note that recognition of non-binary as a category for gender is not often utilized. Thus, it is highly likely that programs have not yet adopted this category and thus have underestimated the totals for non-binary participants (see Fausto-Sterling, A. (2012). *Sex/Gender: Biology in a social world*. New York, NY: Routledge.)

8 The graduation rate for each group was calculated as follows: # of successful participants within the group/# of successful participants + # of unsuccessful participants within the group.

9 It is important to note that some states/territories treated race and ethnicity as two variables while other states/territories combined these two terms into one variable. Consequently, the ability to analyze ethnicity data varied.

Table 11: All Adult Treatment Court Participants (2019)

	Total Active	Total Successful	Total Unsuccessful	Graduation Rate	Total Still Enrolled as of 12/31/19
All Participants	136,771	35,742	24,169	59.7%	69,934
Total Participants:	132,886	29,304	18,838		58,369
Gender					
Female	33.4% (44,439)	33.0% (9,663)	36.5% (6,885)	58.4%	33.5% (19,564)
Male	66.5% (88,396)	67.0% (19,627)	63.5% (11,953)	62.2%	66.5% (38,788)
Non-binary	0.04% (51)	0.05% (14)	0.08% (16)	46.7%	0.03% (17)
Total Participants:	116,140	24,448	15,951		47,959
Race					
American Indian/Alaskan Native	2.3% (2,711)	2.3% (569)	2.4% (388)	59.5%	3.2% (1,555)
Asian/Pacific Islander	1.4% (1,639)	1.4% (341)	1.1% (182)	65.2%	1.3% (619)
Black/African American	19.1% (22,240)	16.0% (3,904)	18.2% (2,911)	57.3%	19.9% (9,521)
White/Caucasian	71.6% (83,187)	72.9% (17,818)	69.8% (11,138)	61.5%	70.3% (33,735)
Other	5.5% (6,363)	7.4% (1,816)	8.4% (1,332)	57.7%	5.3% (2,529)
Ethnicity					
Hispanic/Latinx	12,917	2,738	1,786	60.5%	5,416



In 2019, at least 136,771 adults were enrolled in treatment court programs. Of those adult participants with a disposition, 59.7% graduated.

Juvenile Treatment Court Participants

A total of 3,631 youth were enrolled in the 356 juvenile treatment court programs that were operational during 2019 (see Table 12). A total of 2,016 individuals had a disposition (either successful or unsuccessful) and 1,434 were still enrolled in a juvenile treatment court program as of December 31, 2019. Among youth with a disposition, 62.1% graduated. Of interest to scholars, practitioners, and other treatment court stakeholders is the demographic profile of these participants. Unfortunately, not all states/territories provided demographic data regarding participants. What follows is a summary of the demographic characteristics of youth enrolled in juvenile treatment courts in terms of gender and race/ethnicity based on available data.

In terms of gender, the majority (70.3%) of juvenile treatment court participants in 2019 were identified as male and slightly less than one-third (29.7%) were identified as female. Due to small cell frequencies in the non-binary category, these data were suppressed and thus are not reported¹⁰. The graduation rate among males was 60.1%, whereas the graduation rate among females was slightly higher at 61.7%.

In terms of race/ethnicity, slightly less than two-thirds (60.8%) of juvenile treatment court participants were identified as White/Caucasian, followed by Black/African American, (26.6%), Other race (5.1%), American Indian/Alaskan Native (4.0%), and Asian/Pacific Islander (3.5%). A total of 815 participants were identified as Hispanic/Latinx.¹¹ Graduation rates across the various racial/ethnic groups ranged from 46.5% (American Indian/Alaskan Native) to 80.4% (Asian/Pacific Islander).

¹⁰ It is important to note that recognition of non-binary as a category for gender is not often utilized. Thus, it is highly likely that programs have not yet adopted this category and thus have underestimated the totals for non-binary participants. (see Fausto-Sterling, A. (2012). *Sex/Gender: Biology in a social world*. New York, NY: Routledge.)

¹¹ It is important to note that some states/territories treated race and ethnicity as two variables while other states/territories combined these two terms into one variable. Consequently, the ability to analyze ethnicity data varied.

Table 12: All Juvenile Treatment Court Participants (2019)

	Total Active	Total Successful	Total Unsuccessful	Graduation Rate	Total Still Enrolled as of 12/31/19
All Participants	3,631	1,251	765	62.1%	1,434
Total Participants:					
Gender	3,662	907	590		1,158
Female	29.7% (1,087)	32.6% (296)	31.2% (184)	61.7%	27.4% (319)
Male	70.3% (2,575)	67.4% (611)	68.1% (406)	60.1%	72.5% (839)
Non-binary	—	—	—	—	—
Total Participants:					
Race	2,899	703	456		871
American Indian/Alaskan Native	4.0% (115)	2.8% (20)	5.0% (23)	46.5%	4.9% (43)
Asian/Pacific Islander	3.5% (102)	5.3% (37)	2.0% (9)	80.4%	5.2% (45)
Black/African American	26.6% (770)	26.5% (186)	29.2% (133)	58.3%	29.3% (255)
White/Caucasian	60.8% (1,763)	60.3% (424)	56.8% (259)	62.1%	55.2% (481)
Other	5.1% (149)	5.1% (36)	7.0% (32)	52.9%	5.4% (47)
Ethnicity					
Hispanic/Latinx	815	153	109	58.4%	237

‘—’ indicates data not reported due to small cell frequencies

“

In 2019, at least 3,631 juveniles were enrolled in treatment court programs. Of those juvenile participants with a disposition, 62.1% graduated.

Juvenile Drug Treatment Courts (JDTCs)

Juvenile drug treatment courts (JDTC) serve youth charged with a delinquency offense that is deemed to be influenced by substance use. Youth participants are provided clinical treatment, case management, and must submit to frequent random drug/alcohol testing. Similar to other treatment court types, participants appear before a judge regularly to assess their progress as well as their families' engagement in the program. JDTCs are encouraged to engage with the families of participants (e.g., immediate family members and other individuals important to the youth) to help facilitate program success. Another distinguishing feature of JDTCs is that the team may include coordination with educational systems via a school liaison who reports on participants' progress in school. These courts are focused on helping youth develop positive lifestyles and improve their level of functioning so they may become crime-free and substance-free adults (Cooper, 2001).

History & Structure

Following the development of adult treatment courts and in response to increasing rates of juvenile substance use, the first two juvenile drug treatment courts (JDTC) were established in Wilmington, Delaware and Visalia, California in 1995 (Belenko et al., 2022; Shaw & Robinson, 1998). JDTCs were an important development for practitioners and policymakers who recognized the inability of traditional juvenile court processes to handle minors with complex substance-related issues (Sullivan et al., 2016). While juvenile substance use is now on the decline, it remains a pressing issue in the United States as about 3.7% of adolescents (approximately 916,000 youths) aged 12 to 17 had a substance use disorder (SUD) between 2017 and 2018 (SAMHSA, 2019).

Juvenile substance use is linked to poor school performance, family issues, and criminal recidivism, highlighting the need for early intervention (Belisle & Thompson, 2020). In 2019, there were 305 juvenile drug treatment courts across the United States working to help children and teens with a wide spectrum of substance related challenges (NDCRC, 2021). In order to qualify for a juvenile drug treatment court, the youth must be referred by a juvenile court judge, fall into the court's acceptable age range, have an identified substance use disorder, and at a high-risk for criminal recidivism. Youth not meeting these eligibility criteria should be diverted from court processes to limit their interactions with the juvenile justice system.

With an emphasis on therapeutic jurisprudence and community safety, JDTCs take a more rehabilitative, problem-solving approach to youth with substance use disorders as compared to traditional juvenile courts. JDTCs thus reflect many of the same goals and values associated with adult treatment courts and follow a similar program structure. For example, like their adult counterparts, JDTC participants adhere to frequent judicial hearings and work directly with program staff to develop appropriate treatment plans that address their unique needs (Tanner-Smith et al., 2016). JDTCs also rely on sanctions and incentives to encourage behaviors associated with program compliance such as abstinence from drugs and alcohol.

Several aspects of the juvenile drug treatment court model differ from the adult treatment court model because the youth population is so unique. For example, JDTCs recognize that most juveniles use illicit substances for different reasons than adults and thus require unique treatment approaches. Second, juveniles are still in the process of developing cognitive, emotional, and social skills. For this reason, it is important for JDTC staff to actively engage with family/guardians and peers of juvenile participants, members of the community, and school personnel to expand the treatment court's services to a "more comprehensive continuum of care" (NDCI, 2003, p. 8). Involving family/caregivers and other stakeholders in treatment processes can empower these individuals in meaningful ways (Taylor, 2016). This "collaborative planning" approach is just one of the *16 Strategies for Juvenile Drug Courts* as described by the National Drug Court Institute (2003). JDTCs also utilize developmentally appropriate services for participants and should ensure court policies, training, and procedures are culturally responsive.

Court Objectives and Guidelines

The following section outlines the seven primary objectives of juvenile drug treatment courts from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) (2016). This section also includes brief summaries of each objective's corresponding guideline statements which are meant to assist treatment court professionals in meeting the specific JDTC objectives.

Objective #1: Focus the JDTC philosophy and practice on effectively addressing substance use and criminogenic needs to decrease future offenders and substance use and to increase positive outcomes.

In order to adequately meet the first objective, JDTCs require a team of stakeholders who understand and are committed to the philosophy of the court. Collaborative community partners should be part of this team, as well as representatives from local school systems who can help juvenile participants overcome barriers related to education. Likewise, each team member should have a clearly defined role in the JDTC and access to regular, high-quality training sessions that cover topics such as the nature of substance use disorders/recovery and effective implementation of evidence-based practices in treatment. Finally, JDTCs should continuously engage parents or guardians in treatment court processes. Fully engaging all parents or guardians will likely require the use of licensed interpreters, particularly when engaging those who speak limited English. For this reason, JDTCs are encouraged to provide translations of all documents for non-English speaking participants and their guardians.

Objective #2: Ensure equitable treatment for all youth by adhering to eligibility criteria. There are three eligibility criteria for JDTC participation. Youth participants should be 14 years or older, have a substance use disorder, and have a moderate to high risk of reoffending. Participants should be appropriately screened for substance use disorders and for their risk of reoffending through the use of screening assessments and validated instruments. Youth without substance use disorders and who are not at a high risk for reoffending should not be enrolled in JDTC processes. Finally, JDTCs should be accepting of youth of all genders, racial and ethnic groups, and youth who identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer or questioning, intersex, and/or gender nonconforming (LGBTQI-GNC).

Objective #3: Provide a JDTC process that engages the full team and follows procedures fairly. To meet the third objective, JDTCs must make a continuous effort to work with parents and guardians to encourage their active participation. The judge also plays an important role in helping courts meet this objective. Judges should interact with all participants in a fair and nonjudgmental way, and should maintain consistency when applying incentives and sanctions. Finally, members of the court team should meet weekly to review participant progress and discuss treatment plans.

Objective #4: Conduct comprehensive needs assessments that inform individualized case management. Needs assessments should include the following information for each participant: drug and alcohol use, criminogenic needs, mental health needs, history of abuse and/or trauma, well-being needs and strengths, parental drug use, parental mental health considerations, and parenting skills. It is important that case managers consider this information when developing individualized treatment plans.

Objective #5: Implement contingency management, case management, and community supervision strategies effectively. In order to sustain an effective juvenile treatment court program, it is important for team members to apply incentives and sanctions fairly and consistently to participants. However, the use of graduated sanctions should not exceed the use of incentives, and detention as a sanction should be used infrequently and for short periods of time only if the youth poses a danger to themselves or others. Overall, the JDTC team should primarily focus on addressing the unique, individualized needs of participants as opposed to detecting and penalizing violations of program requirements.

Objective #6: Refer participants to evidence-based substance use treatment, to other services, and for prosocial connections. JDTC programs should have access to and use treatment modalities linked to improved outcomes for youth with substance use disorders, such as assertive continuing care, behavioral therapy, cognitive behavioral therapy, family therapy, motivational enhancement therapy, and multiservice

packages that combine two or more treatment modalities. Further, participants should practice prosocial skills in the context of work, education, relationships, and their community, among other domains.

Objective #7: Monitor and track program completion and termination. Court personnel should strive for equal outcomes for all participants regardless of gender, race, ethnicity, or sexual orientation. These include outcomes related to retention, duration of program involvement, and treatment progress. Youth participants should only be removed from the program as a last resort. Lastly, each JDTC should collect data on family-related factors (like home functioning, communication), recidivism during the program, program completion and termination, education and employment, and involvement in other prosocial activities.

Effectiveness of JDTCs

In terms of the overall effectiveness of JDTCs, recent meta-analyses of JDTC research indicate mixed results. For example, in their large-scale meta-analysis of 34 JDTC evaluations, Mitchell et al. (2012) discovered that JDTCs are sometimes effective at reducing general recidivism but seem to have no statistically significant effect on drug recidivism or drug use. Even the most rigorous evaluations reviewed by Mitchell et al. (2012) only reported small court-related effects on general recidivism. Overall, JDTC participation is “equivalent to a reduction in recidivism from 50% to approximately 43.5%” which is more than 40% smaller than the effect of adult treatment court or DUI/DWI court participation (2012, p. 69).

In contradiction to Mitchell et al. (2012), Gummelt and Sullivan (2016) found that JDTC youth had significantly lower recidivism scores than their matched counterparts on probation. It is hypothesized that these trends are a result of the “intense and highly supervised program components” that characterize JDTCs. In order to fully understand the extent to which JDTCs reduce recidivism and drug use, additional knowledge is needed on the impact of factors such as participant levels of risk/need and program intensity.

Much of what is known regarding JDTCs tends to focus on outcomes such as program completion rates and factors predictive of success. For example, in their study of completion outcomes from a rural juvenile drug treatment court, Konecky et al. (2016) found that youth with a prior criminal history and antisocial attitudes were more likely to fail the program than others. Lower scores on a substance use scale were also associated with program failure. These results suggest that youth who have severe criminal histories, are defiant of authority, and/or reject help from others may need additional intervention while in JDTC programs to ensure their success. Likewise, while it may seem counter-intuitive, juveniles who engage in substance use to a lesser extent may experience “fewer negative consequences” associated with substance use, ultimately reducing their incentive to complete treatment (Konecky et al., 2016, p. 82; Sullivan et al., 2016). It is likely that participants with less severe levels of substance use require different incentives throughout the treatment process or should be considered for other interventions.

Another area of interest is the relationship between the type of treatment intervention provided and program outcomes such as reductions in substance use. Taylor (2016) evaluated whether adherence to a general responsivity approach in the development of treatment interventions decreased substance-use severity among JDTC participants. Based on the risk-needs-responsivity model, general responsivity approaches base interventions on broad, theoretical models (e.g., cognitive behavioral models) as compared to specific responsivity which develops interventions based on the individual’s needs (Taylor, 2016). Contrary to the hypothesis, as levels of adherence to general responsivity techniques increased, substance-use severity scores also increased among participants. Thus, it is possible that the general responsivity principle may not work well within JDTCs despite its extensive use in the field. Instead, specific responsivity interventions, or interventions that center around family engagement, may be more suitable for juvenile participants. This was apparent in a separate study evaluating the impact of parental and youth involvement in Risk Reduction Therapy for Adolescents (RRTA), a family-based substance use disorder treatment (Mauro et al., 2017). Parents and youth assigned to the RRTA group were more engaged in treatment than their counterparts in the treatment as usual (TAU) group where parental involvement was infrequent. Likewise, youth assigned to the RRTA group experienced greater reductions in substance use during the 6-month follow-up period. These findings are consistent with previous studies citing a relationship between youth engagement in

therapy and substance use reductions (Tetzlaff et al., 2005; Dakof et al., 2015). While results were only marginally significant due to a small sample size, Mauro et al. (2017) recommend that courts provide effective interventions that engage youth and their families to improve treatment outcomes, particularly those related to substance use reductions.


Although family-based interventions seem promising, more research is needed to understand what treatment interventions are the most appropriate for JDTC participants. This is especially true for substance-involved youth with important mental health considerations, as JDTC youth with co-occurring substance use and mental health disorders are more likely to have worse criminal justice outcomes than youth who are only substance-involved (Manchak et al., 2016). More specifically, Manchak et al. (2016) found that youth with co-occurring disorders were 40% less likely to successfully complete drug treatment court than substance-involved youth, and 70% more likely to receive a conviction while in drug treatment court. It may be the case that the current structure of most JDTCs does not appropriately address the needs of juveniles with co-occurring disorders, as mental health disorders often create obstacles when it comes to complying with the rules and regulations of the court. It is recommended that JDTCs “work to determine more effective management strategies for this population” by not only appropriately identifying which participants have mental health disorders, but by evaluating and monitoring the way the court addresses their needs (Manchak et al., 2016, p. 260). Likewise, court personnel should remain aware of their own perceptions of youth with co-occurring disorders and continue making decisions based on mental health assessments as opposed to their own perceptions of risk.

Enhancing Practitioner Knowledge and Capacity


Despite the growth in knowledge regarding JDTCs in recent years, additional research is needed to clarify discrepancies present within the literature and contribute to the overall evidence base. One area in need of future exploration relates to co-occurring disorders among JDTC participants. In addition to substance use disorders, many juveniles suffer from mental health disorders such as anxiety and/or depression that sometimes stem from traumatic life experiences. Additional research can build an understanding of the impact of co-occurring disorders on children and teens entering juvenile drug treatment court programs, as well as how JDTCs address the mental health needs of these young participants (Konecky et al., 2016; Manchak et al., 2016). There is also a need to increase knowledge regarding the impact of different treatment interventions, such as those that are family-based, on outcomes of interest (e.g., program retention, graduation, and post-program recidivism). Mauro et al. (2017) found that family-based treatments that engage JDTC participants and their parents/guardians resulted in higher rates of success as compared to individuals in the treatment-as-usual group. Replicating studies such as this with larger, more diverse samples will provide additional support for this approach. Likewise, from Taylor (2016), more research is needed on the compatibility between general responsivity treatment approaches and the JDTC model, with further investigation into the usefulness of specific responsivity approaches.

Other areas of inquiry include identifying factors that predict program completion given that the findings to date are mixed. Konecky et al. (2016) encourage more exploration into the benefits of motivational interviewing to understand other factors associated with program success and program failure. JDTC researchers also stress the need for longitudinal studies following JDTC participants into adulthood to understand the long-term impact of program participation on substance use and recidivism (Dakof et al., 2015; Gummelt & Sullivan, 2016). Finally, as is the case with treatment court research in general, most of the current JDTC literature lacks methodological rigor (Mitchell et al., 2016). Treatment court researchers should employ the use of more rigorous research designs to ensure that findings are generalizable to the larger population. More specifically, the use of larger samples and extended follow-up periods will yield more robust information regarding the effectiveness of JDTCs (Belisle & Thompson, 2020).

Figure 6: Number of Juvenile Drug Treatment Courts in the U.S. and Territories (2019)



JDTC



*No data available for Wisconsin and New Jersey

JDTC Analysis

A total of 39 states/territories provided data on 305 operational juvenile drug treatment courts (JDTCs) in 2019. Table 13 provides an overview of the total number of JDTC participants, as well as the distribution by gender and disposition status. Data regarding the total number of JDTC participants in 2019 was provided by 71.8% of respondents.¹² A total of 3,108 participants were active in JDTCs in 2019 with an average of 10.4 participants per JDTC program. The disposition status of JDTC participants was reported by 71.8% of respondents. In 2019, 1,048 JDTC participants successfully completed the program, whereas 688 were unsuccessful. Thus, the graduation rate among these participants was 60.4%.¹³ Twenty-seven states/territories (69.2%) provided the total number of participants who were active at the end of 2019.

Table 13 also reports the total number of participants, disposition status, and gender. The total number of active participants by gender was reported by 71.8% of respondents. Based on these data, 27.4% of participants were female and 72.6% were male.¹⁴ Among the 61.5% of respondents providing disposition information by gender, the successful category was 29.3% female and 70.7% male. The graduation rate among these participants was 58.3% for females and 58.0% for males. Lastly, 59.0% of respondents provided the total number of participants still enrolled at the end of the year.

Table 13: Total Number of JDTC Participants by Gender and Disposition Status (2019)

	Total Active	Total Successful	Total Unsuccessful	Graduation Rate	Total Still Enrolled as of 12/31/19
All JDTC (n=27-28)^a	3,108	1,048	688	60.4%	1,211
Total Participants: Gender (n=23-28)^a	3,104	719	519	58.1%	981
Female	27.4% (852)	29.3% (211)	29.1% (151)	58.3%	24.9% (244)
Male	72.6% (2,252)	70.7% (508)	70.9% (368)	58.0%	75.0% (736)
Non-Binary	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.1% (1)

^a'n' represents the range of the # of states/territories responding to the question

Table 14 provides the total number of JDTC participants by race, ethnicity, and disposition status. Looking first at the total active participants in 2019, which was provided by 71.8% of respondents, the analyses revealed that 61.4% of participants were identified as White/Caucasian and 25.1% were identified as Black/African American. About 4.0% of participants were identified as either American Indian/Alaskan Native or Asian/

¹² Given that several surveys were incomplete, the total number of valid responses for each category of questions is provided, as well as the response rate. The response rate is calculated by dividing the total number of states/territories providing a response by the total number of states/territories reporting at least one JDTC.

¹³ The graduation rate for each group was calculated as follows: # of successful participants within the group/(# of successful participants + # of unsuccessful participants within the group).

¹⁴ It is important to note that recognition of non-binary as a category for gender is not often utilized. Thus, it is highly likely that programs have not yet adopted this category and have underestimated the totals for non-binary participants (see Fausto-Sterling, A. (2012). *Sex/Gender: Biology in a social world*. New York, NY: Routledge.).

“ Over 3,000 participants were served by JDTCs in 2019. Among those with a disposition, 60.4% graduated.

Pacific Islander and 4.9% were identified as Other race. Disposition status by race/ethnicity was reported by 59.0% of respondents. Among successful participants, 62.7% were White/Caucasian, 23.4% were Black/African American, 6.4% were Asian/Pacific Islander, 4.4% were Other race, and 3.2% were American Indian/Alaskan Native. White/Caucasian participants made up 57.2% of unsuccessful participants, while Black/African Americans represented 28.1%. Participants identified as Other race constituted 6.7% of this category and American Indian/Alaskan Native were 5.7%. Asian/Pacific Islanders made up 2.2% of unsuccessful participants. The resulting graduation rates among these participants revealed that Asian/Pacific Islanders had the highest rate at 80.0%. This was followed by White/Caucasian participants at 60.6%, Black/African American participants at 53.9%, Other race participants at 48.1%, and American Indian/Alaskan Native at 43.9%. Among those participants identified as Hispanic/Latinx, analyses revealed a graduation rate of 55.9%.¹⁵ The total number of participants enrolled at the end of 2019 by race/ethnicity was reported by 56.4% of respondents.

Table 14: Total Number of JDTC Participants by Race, Ethnicity, and Disposition Status (2019)


	Total Active	Total Successful	Total Unsuccessful	Graduation Rate	Total Still Enrolled as of 12/31/19
Total Participants: Race (n=22-28)^a	2,489	565	402	58.4%	715
American Indian/Alaskan Native	4.5% (113)	3.2% (18)	5.7% (23)	43.9%	6.0% (43)
Asian/Pacific Islander	4.1% (101)	6.4% (36)	2.2% (9)	80.0%	6.2% (44)
Black/African American	25.1% (625)	23.4% (132)	28.1% (113)	53.9%	26.2% (187)
White/Caucasian	61.4% (1,529)	62.7% (354)	57.2% (230)	60.6%	56.2% (402)
Other	4.9% (121)	4.4% (25)	6.7% (27)	48.1%	5.5% (39)
Ethnicity (n=22-28)^a					
Hispanic/Latinx	711	124	98	55.9%	218

^an' represents the range of the # of states/territories responding to the question

15 It is important to note that some states/territories treated race and ethnicity as two variables while other states/territories combined these two terms into one variable. Consequently, the ability to analyze ethnicity data varied.

Respondents were asked to provide the top three drugs of use among JDTC participants in 2019 (see Figure 7). Among the 30 states/territories (76.9% of eligible respondents) for whom data was available, 93.3% reported marijuana, 80.0% reported alcohol, and 56.7% reported methamphetamine. If we examine these drugs by drug classifications, over 70% of states/territories reported at least one stimulant (e.g., cocaine/crack, methamphetamine, and prescription stimulants) and 33.4% reported opioids/heroin as a top three drug of use among JDTC participants.


Figure 7: Top Drugs of Use within JDTC Programs (2019) (n=30)



“ Among JDTC participants, the top three reported drugs of use were marijuana (93.3%), alcohol (80.0%), and methamphetamine (56.7%).


Figure 8 provides the offense classifications among 152 JDTCs in 28 states/territories (71.8% of eligible respondents). Over two-thirds of JDTCs accepted both felony and misdemeanor offenses. Felony offenses alone were accepted by 13.8% of JDTCs and only misdemeanors were allowed among 18.4%.

Figure 8: Eligible Offense Classifications among 152 JDTCs (2019) (n=28)



Data regarding the dispositional model used in JDTCs was provided for 157 JDTCs across 27 states/territories (69.2% of eligible respondents) and is presented in Figure 9. Four models were provided: pre-plea diversion, post-plea diversion, post-sentence, and a hybrid model (i.e., utilizing more than one of the models).¹⁶ One-third of JDTCs reported using a post-sentence model in their courts, while a hybrid approach was utilized by 23.6%. Post-plea diversion was employed within 28.0% of JDTCs and 15.3% used pre-plea diversion.

Figure 9: Dispositional Models among 157 JDTCs (2019) (n=27)




Two-thirds (66.7%) of eligible state/territory respondents provided data regarding the reported gaps in services among JDTCs (see Figure 10). Among recovery support services, almost two-thirds of states/territories indicated that there was a gap in transportation services and 57.7% identified the area of

16 See Appendix A on page 74 for definitions of dispositional models.

education/training. A need for improvement in the area of peer support was reported by 53.8% of states/territories. Within the area of clinical treatment services, half of states/territories recognized a gap in the areas of residential treatment and mental health treatment. Similarly, under the category of other services, the need for gender- and culturally-specific programming was reported by half of the states/territories.

Funding from the Office of Juvenile Justice & Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) can be used to address identified gaps in services within JDTC program operations, treatment services, as well as recovery support services.

Figure 10: Reported Gaps in Services among JDTCs (2019) (n=26)



Other Treatment Courts

In addition to the courts highlighted in the report, respondents were asked to report the number of other types of treatment courts.¹⁷ The courts included: adult co-occurring disorder courts (COD), opioid intervention courts (OIC), reentry courts, and juvenile co-occurring disorder courts (JCOD).

Looking first at adult COD courts, a total of 10 states/territories reporting having 21 courts. A COD court operates similarly to adult drug courts but specifically serves individuals diagnosed with both a substance use disorder and a severe and persistent mental health disorder. These courts treat both issues simultaneously through intensive clinical treatment and supervision (Marlowe et al., 2016). Opioid intervention courts were reported by four states/territories with 24 total courts operating across the country. These courts are similar to adult drug courts; however, they serve individuals at high-risk for opioid overdose at the pretrial phase. These courts focus on providing a rapid response and screening in order to connect participants to clinical treatment as quickly as possible (Center for Court Innovation, 2019). Among 11 states/territories there were 87 operational reentry courts. While reentry courts reflect many of the characteristics of adult drug courts, these courts “...provide a coordinated and comprehensive response to the *multiple needs and collateral consequences* that formerly incarcerated individuals may face upon their release” (Ayoub & Rempel, 2021, p. 73). In some cases, reentry court participants may not need to demonstrate a substance use disorder. Moreover, services within these courts may begin prior to release from incarceration.

One state reported five JCOD courts, which serve youth diagnosed with both a substance use disorder and a serious mental health disorder. These courts operate similar to adult COD courts but include elements of juvenile treatment courts such as parental/guardian involvement in programming and partnerships with schools.

¹⁷ See Table 5 on page 18 for a list of these other treatment courts by state.

State Legislation and Appropriations

Among the 47 states/territories from whom data were provided, 76.6% indicated that their state/territory currently has legislation authorizing the development and implementation of treatment courts. The legislation varied across states/territories with some states/territories authorizing treatment courts in general and others having legislation for specific treatment court types. The status of appropriation, or funding, legislation was reported by 46 of the states/territories (88.5% of respondents). Among these respondents, just over half (52.2%) reported that their state/territory had this type of legislation. Additionally, 22 states/territories reported having both authorizing legislation and appropriation legislation.

“

46.8% of states/territories reported having both authorizing and appropriating legislation for treatment courts.

Issues to Consider

Results from the 2019 *Painting the Current Picture: A National Report on Treatment Courts in the United States* revealed three areas to be addressed, which include data collection and management needs, treatment court equity and inclusion, and enhanced focus on stimulants as drugs of use and concern. What follows is a detailed discussion of the issue, relevance for treatment court stakeholders, and suggestions for improvement.

Treatment Court Data: Availability & Quality

Pursuant to *Adult Drug Court Best Practice Standards* Standard #10, Monitoring & Evaluation, “The Drug Court routinely monitors its adherence to best practice standards and employs scientifically valid and reliable procedures to evaluate its effectiveness” (NADCP, 2018b). Moreover, the best practice standards and essential elements for other treatment court types (i.e., DUI/DWI, family treatment courts, veterans treatment courts, juvenile drug treatment courts, and adult mental health courts) also include provisions for monitoring and evaluation. However, the first step toward fully realizing this best practice standard (BPS) is for programs to systematically collect the demographic and programmatic data necessary to examine whether programs are operating with fidelity to the model and producing the intended outcomes. While the focus for BPS #10 is on the external evaluation of programs, the same data needed for evaluation can also be used by program staff and administrators to “...monitor their everyday operations, report essential performance information, identify areas of success, and bring to light problem areas or ways to improve” (Rempel, 2010, p. 2). Additionally, these data can be used to make decisions regarding resource allocation and identifying programmatic needs which can be used to justify grant funding applications.

Regardless of the data collection strategy developed/implemented, the *quality* of data being collected is of utmost importance. It is critical that all team members responsible for data collection have been trained on *how* to gather this information and that a systematic process has been implemented to ensure consistency across individuals and over time. This is especially important given that the treatment court model involves data from multiple sources (e.g., treatment, probation, recovery support service providers, etc.). To this end, clearly defining which team members are responsible for data collection is imperative to ensuring the data are consistent and reliable. For example, if drug/alcohol testing results are to be entered into the data collection system every Friday, it is imperative that team members responsible for entering these data follow this protocol. One strategy for ensuring consistent and timely data entry is to conduct routine audits of the data system. Moreover, this process will allow for the correction of data errors and entering any missing data. The quality of data collected directly impacts the ability of programs to make data-informed decisions, as well as the ability of external evaluators to conduct process and outcome evaluations.

At present only 59.6% of states/territories have a statewide management information system which stores demographic and programmatic information regarding treatment court participants. Therefore, more than one-third of states/territories do not have a statewide data collection strategy and storage system in place. Within these jurisdictions, local programs are responsible for determining which data to collect and how best to store this information. This has resulted in measures being defined differently and/or not being

Less than two-thirds (59.6%) of responding states/territories reported having a statewide management information system (MIS) for tracking treatment court program and participant data.

collected. For example, participant race and ethnicity measures were not defined consistently across all states/territories. Some jurisdictions defined race and ethnicity separately (as two variables), whereas others combined the terms into one variable. This resulted in an inability to fully examine variations in treatment court access and graduation for all racial/ethnic groups. According to the Center for Court Innovation (2013), “The creation of a *statewide* data tracking system will enable states [and territories] to engage in rigorous research and evaluation efforts—either state-led or in collaboration with external evaluators” (p. 5). In summary, the treatment court field would benefit greatly from two significant improvements within this area:

1. 100% of states/territories implement a statewide management information system used to track treatment court participant data.
2. The establishment of standardized definitions for all key measures used to examine treatment court program processes and outcomes.

One effort underway to address this issue is the *Strengthening the Foundation* initiative, an advisory panel of national experts, funded by BJA. The panel has been charged with guiding the development of a new conceptual framework for the evaluation of treatment courts. Their objectives are to develop universal performance indicators to support treatment court evaluations, assess the capacity of states/territories to collect data, and identify gaps and recommendations for building capacity.

BJA State-Based Training and Technical Assistance Program provides technical assistance to states in building data capacity and BJA encourages states to request funding through its treatment court program to support data collection.

Equity & Inclusion: Racial & Ethnic Disparities in Treatment Courts

An area that continues to draw attention within treatment courts is equity and inclusion. As noted in the *Adult Drug Court Best Practice Standards Vol. 1* (2018a), “[D]rug courts have an affirmative legal and ethical obligation to provide equal access to their services and equivalent treatment for all individuals (p. 12).” In other words, courts should not discriminate based on race, ethnicity, gender, religion, sexual orientation, disability, etc. Many treatment courts have indeed made concerted efforts to address the inequities identified within their courts. Most recently, some treatment courts have begun utilizing American University’s *Racial and Ethnic Disparities (RED) Program Assessment Tool* and/or NADCP/NCSC’s *Equity and Inclusion: Equivalent Access Assessment Toolkit*, to assist in identifying areas of inequity. Specific uses of the Toolkit information include: developing program marketing plans, analyzing treatment court access process, developing time task plans. In addition, several states are working to incorporate this toolkit within an existing statewide database system. Moreover, discussions are underway regarding the creation of a juvenile equity and inclusion toolkit. While progress has been made, the issue of equal access to, retention in, and graduation from treatment courts is still one to be addressed.

Research suggests that there may be a discrepancy in the experience of participants based on their race/ethnicity. Findings from several studies have revealed differences in admission rates, as well as graduation rates by race/ethnicity (Dannerbeck et al., 2006; DeVall & Lanier, 2012; Gallagher, 2013; Ho et al., 2018; McKean & Warren-Gordon, 2011; Nicosia et al., 2013; Sechrest & Shicor, 2001; Shannon et al., 2018; Sheeran & Heideman, 2021). In their study of diversion outcomes among a male sample, Nicosia et al. (2013) found that Black and Hispanic males were significantly less likely to receive diversion to drug treatment court as compared to similarly situated White males. Relatedly, Sheeran and Heideman’s (2001) examination of admittance rates in a Milwaukee drug treatment court revealed that non-Hispanic Blacks were 44% less likely to be admitted to the court even after controlling for other measures. Interestingly, the authors also examined the reasons reported for participants being rejected by race/ethnicity. Non-Hispanic Black

individuals were more likely to be deemed ineligible for reasons such as prior criminal record or the nature of the current charge. As noted by Sheeran and Heidman (2001) “...exclusionary criteria may be limiting the reach of the program and...could be modified to reduce the disproportionate impact of certain eligibility and requirements” (p. 12). However, while these studies did find significant variations in who is accepted into treatment court, it is important to note that others have found that to not be the case (e.g., Ho et al., 2018).

Research examining graduation rates has also identified differences in outcomes based on race/ethnicity. DeVall and Lanier’s (2012) study of a mid-Western treatment court found that non-White participants had a graduation rate of 22.3%, which was significantly lower than that of White participants at 40.7%. Black participants had 40% lower odds of graduating as compared to White participants in Ho et al.’s (2018) study of 142 treatment courts. Studies have found that even after controlling for factors such as prior criminal history, drug(s) of use, etc. Black participants are significantly less likely to successfully complete treatment court (Gallagher, 2013; Sheeran & Heidman, 2021).

Research investigating racial/ethnic disparities in juvenile treatment courts have had results similar to that of adult treatment courts. Studies have found that White/Caucasian individuals are represented at a much higher percentage than other racial/ethnic groups (Barnes et al., 2009; Stein et al., 2013; Stein et al., 2015; Sullivan et al., 2016; Tanner-Smith et al., 2016). For example, Stein et al.’s (2015) meta-analytic review of 31 JDTC studies revealed that White/Caucasian participants constituted, on average, 61.3% of the courts’ populations. Similarly, Tanner-Smith et al.’s (2016) meta-analysis of 46 studies found that the average percentage of White/Caucasians across studies was 67.0%. Disparities in graduation rates across racial/ethnic groups have also been found. Applegate and Santana (2000) found that Black/African American youth were 2.7 times less likely to graduate as compared to youth that were not Black/African American. White/Caucasian participants were more likely to graduate as compared to minority participants in Stein et al.’s (2013) review of 41 JDTC studies. It is important to note, however, that some research has revealed no effect of race/ethnicity on JDTC admission and/or graduation (Barnes et al., 2009; Mackin et al., 2010).

Given the identified issues related to race/ethnicity, presented below is an overview of the percentage of individuals represented in treatment courts by race/ethnicity and other criminal justice populations. While statistical comparisons are not made, an examination of the proportion of representation can provide a picture of the overall distribution by race/ethnicity.

Table 15 provides comparisons of ADC participants with other criminal justice populations by race and ethnicity. Based on the data reported, individuals identified as Caucasian/ White constituted 71.6% of all adult treatment court participants in 2019, while making up 69.8% of all individuals arrested for a drug offense and only 54.0% of probationers. In contrast, individuals identified as Black/African American made up only 19.1% of all adult treatment court participants but accounted for 27.4% of drug offense arrestees and 30.0% of probationers. Additionally, Black/African Americans constituted 33.6% of persons in jail. Thus, depending on the comparison population, Black/African Americans are under-represented in adult treatments courts by 9.0% to almost 15.0%. These data suggest an over-representation of White/Caucasian participants and an under-representation of Black/African American participants. Similar trends are found when examining those individuals who were identified as Hispanic/Latinx, however, these data should be interpreted with caution given the inconsistency of collection of participants’ ethnicities.

“ While 30.0% of adult probationers were Black/African American, only 19.1% of adult treatment court participants identified as such.

Table 15: Comparison of Adult Treatment Court Participants with Other Criminal Justice Populations by Race/Ethnicity (%)

Comparison Population	Caucasian/ White ^a	Black/ African American ^a	American Indian/ Alaskan Native ^a	Asian/ Pacific Islander ^a	Hispanic/ Latinx
<i>Adult Treatment Courts</i>	71.6	19.1	2.3	1.4	10.0
<i>US Population (2019)^b</i>	60.0	12.4	0.7	5.8	18.4
<i>Arrestees^c</i>					
Any offense	67.5	27.9	2.8	1.6	19.8
Drug offense	69.8	27.4	1.4	1.5	21.9
<i>Probationers^d</i>	54.0	30.0	1.0	1.0	13.0
<i>Parolees^d</i>	45.0	38.0	1.0	1.0	15.0
<i>Persons in Jail^e</i>	49.4	33.6	1.4	1.0	14.6
<i>Persons in Prison (sentenced)^f</i>	30.6	32.8	—	—	23.2

^aDoes not include individuals of Hispanic or Latinx ethnicity. ^bUS Census Bureau, 2019 American Community Survey (Ruggles et al., 2021).

^cUniform Crime Report, 2019 (US DOJ, FBI). ^d*Probation and Parole in the United States, 2019* (Oudekerk & Kaebler, 2021).

^e*Jail Inmates in 2019*, (Zeng & Minton, 2021). ^f*Prisoners in 2019*, (Carson, 2020)

When examining adult graduation rates by race and ethnicity, there appears to be a high rate of variability across groups and court types. Among all adult treatment courts, the reported graduation rate for participants identified as White/Caucasian was 61.3%, whereas the rate for those identified as Black/African American was 57.3%. Looking more closely at the court specific graduation rates, a similar trend is observed. For example, the graduation rate among ADC participants identifying as White/Caucasian was 58.8%, while the graduate rate for Black/African American was 54.8%. Within FTCs, there is even a greater difference with White/Caucasian participants reported graduation rate at 51.9% and Black/African Americans at 33.3%. The overall graduation rate among MHCs providing data on race/ethnicity was 54.7%, while Black/African American participants had a rate of 48.0% and Hispanic/Latinx participants had a rate of 44.1%. Overall, the graduation rate, regardless of court type, was much lower for Black/African American and Hispanic/Latinx participants.

“

Regardless of adult treatment court type, the graduation rate for Black/African American and Hispanic/Latinx participants was much lower than Caucasian/White participants in 2019.

Looking at race and ethnicity among juvenile treatment court participants, findings reveal both over- and under-representation of youth of color when compared to other criminal justice populations. For example, participants identified as Black/African American made up 26.6% of juvenile treatment court participants in 2019 but only 21.4% of drug offense arrestees. However, this same group constituted 33.5% of juvenile on probation. White/Caucasian participants were both under-represented when compared to drug offense arrestees and over-represented when compared to the juvenile probation population. Participants identified as American Indian/Alaskan Native or Asian/Pacific Islander were over-represented in juvenile treatment courts compared to all other criminal justice populations.

“ While 33.5% of juvenile probationers in 2019 were Black/African American, only 26.6% of juvenile treatment court participants identified as such.

Table 16: Comparison of Juvenile Treatment Court Participants with Other Criminal Justice Populations by Race/Ethnicity (%)

Comparison Population	Caucasian/ White ^a	Black/ African American ^a	American Indian/ Alaskan Native ^a	Asian/ Pacific Islander ^a	Hispanic/ Latinx
<i>Juvenile Treatment Courts</i>	60.8	26.6	4.0	3.5	28.1
<i>US Population (2019)^b</i>	49.9	13.7	0.8	5.6	25.4
<i>Arrestees^c</i>					
Any offense	62.5	33.9	2.2	1.4	23.6
Drug Offense	74.8	21.4	2.2	1.6	30.1
<i>Probationers^d</i>	44.4	33.5	1.7	1.2	19.2
<i>Confined/Placement^e</i>	33.3	40.6	2.0	1.0	2.6

^aRacial categories do not include individuals of Hispanic or Latinx ethnicity. ^bKids Count Data Center, <https://datacenter.kidscount.org>.

^cUniform Crime Report, 2019 (US DOJ, FBI). ^dSickmund et al. (2021) <https://www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/ezajcs/>.

^eSickmund et al. (2021) <https://www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/ezacjrp/>.

The trends in graduation rates among juvenile treatment courts by race and ethnicity show outcomes both similar and divergent from adult treatment courts. Juvenile drug treatment court participants identified as White/Caucasian had a graduation rate of 60.6% but Black/African Americans' graduation rate was only 53.9%. Conversely, among juvenile mental health court participants, Black/African Americans had a higher graduation rate (73.0%) than their White/Caucasian counterparts (70.7%).

While some progress has been made in increasing equity and inclusion in treatment courts, these data suggest that there is still work to be done. Treatment court programs should closely examine their participant data to identify if disparities exist within their program jurisdictions. If there is evidence of

disparities, programs should develop a plan to ensure that all persons regardless of race/ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, religion, disability, etc. are able to access and have the opportunity to successfully complete the program. One area that should be examined based on the research presented is eligibility and exclusion criteria. Do the current criteria automatically exclude certain groups? These “...criteria may be limiting the reach of the program...” (Sheeran & Heideman, 2021). As noted by Marlowe (2013), programs should also review their screening and assessment tools to ensure the tools are neither culturally nor racially biased. Moreover, researchers argue that the integration of culturally competent treatment and interventions are crucial to ensuring all participants are successful (Gallagher, 2013; McKean & Warren-Gordon 2011; Sheeran & Heideman, 2021). This was evident in Ho et al.’s (2018) examination of the relationship between treatment court practices and racial disparities in graduation. The results revealed that “...the provision of family/domestic counseling...” as a practice significantly decreased the racial gap in graduation. The authors argue that “...the focus on family/domestic counseling on the family and others who are most important to Black participants may be particularly effective” (2018, p. 28).

The JDTC graduation rate for Black/African Americans as 53.9%, while the rate was 60.6% for Caucasian/Whites in 2019.

BJA requires applicants to include a plan for collecting and examining access and retention data to ensure disparities do not exist for race, color, religion, national origin, sexual orientation, gender, gender identity, or disability in admission protocols or elsewhere in treatment court programs. Programs are encouraged to use American University’s *Racial and Ethnic Disparities (RED) Program Assessment Tool* and/or NADCP/NDCl’s *Equity and Inclusion: Equivalent Access Assessment Toolkit* to identify areas of inequity and use the data to develop a plan for addressing disparities.

The Rise in Stimulant Use: The Role of Treatment Courts in Addressing this Issue

For the past several years, the opioid epidemic has dominated the proverbial landscape from media coverage, discourse regarding substance use disorders, to the enactment of state and federal policies focused on reducing substance use among adults and youth. An unprecedented number of resources have been devoted to addressing this trend. The devastating toll this epidemic has had on individuals, families, and communities cannot be overstated. However, another epidemic of sorts has co-existed, but received much less attention overall, involving stimulants (e.g., methamphetamine, cocaine/crack cocaine, and prescription stimulants).

According to SAMHSA (2020) nearly 2 million people (ages 12+) had used methamphetamine in the past year, and 1 million met the DSM-V criteria for a methamphetamine use disorder (a significant increase). Additionally, the National Institute on Drug Abuse (2019, p. 5) reported that “Nationwide, overdose deaths from the category of drugs that includes methamphetamine increased by 7.5 times between 2007 and 2017, about 15 percent of all drug overdose deaths involved the methamphetamine category in 2017, and 50 percent of those deaths also involved an opioid.” Interestingly, Artigiani et al. (2018) reported that methamphetamine use and overdose death figures vary significantly by region in the United States. More specifically, the Midwest and West regions of the U.S. had the highest rates. Jones et al. (2019) found similar significant regional differences when examining methamphetamine use among individuals using heroin

entering treatment. Odds of treatment admissions reporting methamphetamine use were more than 47 times higher in the West and almost 8 times higher in the Midwest (as compared to the Northeast).

When examining rates of substance use by racial category, notable differences are revealed. SAMHSA's Center for Behavioral Health Statistics and Quality (2021) examined the 2019 National Survey of Drug Use and Health data. Table 17 summarizes these findings and reveals that American Indian/Alaskan Native and individuals identifying as two or more races, consistently report the highest past year use of various substances as compared to other groups. Additionally, these same two groups (i.e., American Indian/Alaskan Native and individuals identifying as two or more races) have the highest percentages of individuals with illicit drug, alcohol use, and substance use disorders in the past year. These findings correspond with the findings of Meinhofer et al.'s (2020) study of Adoption and Foster Care Analysis and Reporting System (AFCARS) from 2008-2017. The results revealed that home removals due to parental drug use increased in the general population and across all racial/ethnic groups during this time. However, the increase was most pronounced among Native American/Alaskan Native children.

Table 17: Select Substance Use & Treatment Access Indicators from 2019 NSDUH^a (SAMHSA) (%)

...in the past year among individuals 12 and older	White	Black/ African American	American Indian/ Alaskan Native	Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander	Two or more races
Methamphetamine use	0.7	0.2	2.4	1.1	1.1
Misuse of prescription pain relievers	4.2	3.6	5.2	4.3	5.8
Fentanyl product misuse	0.1	—	—	—	0.2
Illicit drug use disorder	2.9	3.4	4.8	3.0	5.0
Alcohol use disorder	5.8	4.8	8.3	4.9	6.6
Substance use disorder	7.8	7.1	11.2	6.8	9.9

^aNational Survey on Drug Use and Health (NSDUH)

In response to this trend, researchers have begun more closely examining rates of stimulant use within the U.S. and worldwide. Farrell et al. (2019) found that cocaine and amphetamines are widely used worldwide, available supplies of these substances are increasing, and the use of these substances creates serious challenges for public health officials. High-income North American countries had the highest prevalence rates for both cocaine dependence and amphetamine dependence. Jones et al. (2019) examined rates of methamphetamine use among individuals seeking substance use disorder treatment for heroin between 2008-2017. Alarming, they found that “Methamphetamine use among heroin treatment admissions in the United States increased from one in 50 primary heroin treatment admissions to one in 8 admissions in 2017” (p. 347).

“ NIDA reports an increase in overdose deaths involving individuals using both opioids and methamphetamine.

The 2019 *PCP* study included an examination of the most often reported substances used by treatment court participants by court type (per *PCP* survey respondents). Of interest was whether there were differences in the types of substances and the prevalence of stimulant use among participants by court type. Table 18 provides a summary of these data. What is noteworthy is the high percentage of respondents across several court types reporting the use of stimulants among treatment court participants. More specifically, 100% of FTC respondents, 93.5% of ADC respondents, and 83.3% of MHC respondents indicated participants were using stimulants. Within these court types, stimulants were reported by the highest percentage of respondents as compared with other substances (e.g., heroin/opioids). In VTCs, stimulants were reported by 81.5% of respondents, which was the second highest percentage behind alcohol. This trend of high stimulant use is observed among adult treatment court programs, but not within juvenile programs. Stimulants were the third highest substance of use reported by *PCP* respondents behind marijuana and alcohol within juvenile drug courts and juvenile mental health courts.

Table 18: % of States/Territories Reporting Specific Drugs of Use by Treatment Court Participants by Court Type (2019)

Treatment Court Type	Alcohol	Cocaine/ Crack Cocaine	Heroin/ opioids	Marijuana	Metham- phetamine	Total Stimulants ^a
Adult						
Adult Drug Court (n=52)	63.0	19.6	80.4	58.7	67.4	93.5
DUI/DWI Court (n=36)	100.0	9.7	75.1	77.4	41.9	58.1
Family Treatment Court (n=38)	54.5	12.1	81.8	57.6	75.8	100.0
Mental Health Court (n=39)	80.6	12.9	54.8	71.0	61.3	83.3
Veterans Treatment Court (n=44)	91.2	20.6	38.2	73.5	55.9	81.5
Juvenile						
Juvenile Drug Court (n=39)	80.0	6.7	33.4	93.3	56.7	70.1
Juvenile Mental Health Court (n=14)	70.0	10.0	10.0 (heroin only)	90.0	30.0	50.0

^a“Total Stimulants” category includes: cocaine/crack cocaine, methamphetamine, and prescription stimulants (not presented in table).

“ In 2019, “total stimulants” ranked as the highest or one of the highest reported substances of use among participants across all court types for both adults and juveniles.

Conversations and action steps designed to address substance use within the U.S. must consider what works with addressing opioid use disorders, stimulant use disorders, and poly drug use. Farrell et al. (2019) note that “The current standard of care for stimulant dependence is primarily psychosocial interventions combined with case management. However, the majority of evidence does not support their effectiveness when compared to treatment-as-usual” (p. 1658). Also noteworthy is that there are no medications for addiction treatment (MAT) currently available to treat stimulant use, manage withdrawal, or prevent returns to use. However, MAT has been found to effectively treat individuals with opioid and alcohol use disorders.

In addressing the needs of individuals with stimulant use disorders, programming that involves the following elements is most effective: evidence-based clinical treatment (i.e., Matrix Model, Motivational Interviewing, cognitive behavioral therapy), contingency management, and community reinforcement. Research has found that treatment court programs incorporating these elements, operating with fidelity to the model, and in accordance with identified best practice standards, achieve the best outcomes (Farrell et al., 2019; Jones et al., 2019; SAMHSA, 2020). The few studies conducted to date that explicitly examined treatment court programs’ effectiveness with participants using methamphetamine revealed positive results (Huddleston, 2005; Lanier & DeVall, 2017; Marinelli-Casey et al., 2008; SAMHSA, 2016).

In summary, it would behoove treatment court team members to engage in dialogue around how their programs are addressing the needs of individuals. Given the national data presented above, treatment courts should examine drug of use trends by race/ethnicity and gender. Specific attention should be paid to what treatment modalities are available to participants who may be using (or have used) both opioids and stimulants. It is imperative that programs provide participants with access to clinical treatment and recovery support services that are known to be effective in meeting the needs of the jurisdiction’s target population. In addition, additional research on the effectiveness of treatment court programs with individuals reporting stimulant, opioid, and poly drug use disorders is needed.

References

- Ahlin, E. M., Zador, P. L., Rauch, W. J., Howard, J. M., & Duncan, G. D. (2011). First-time DWI offenders are at risk of recidivating regardless of sanctions imposed. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 39(2), 137-142. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2011.01.001>
- Almquist, L., & Dodd, E. (2009). *Mental health courts: A guide to research-informed policy and practice*. Council of State Governments Justice Center. http://www.consensusproject.org/jc_publications/mental-health-courts-a-guide-to-research-informed-policy-and-practice/Mental_Health_Court_Research_Guide.pdf
- American University. (2019). *Racial and ethnic disparities program assessment tool*. <https://redtool.org/resources.php>.
- Applegate, B. K., & Santana, S. (2000). Intervening with youthful substance abusers: A preliminary analysis of a juvenile drug court. *Justice System Journal*, 21(3), 281-300. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23277556.2000.10871290>
- Artigiani E.H., McCandlish, D., & Wish, E.D. (2018). *Methamphetamine: A regional drug crisis*. National Drug Early Warning System. <https://cesar.umd.edu/sites/cesar.umd.edu/files/pubs/ndews-scs-methamphetamine-report-september-2018-final.pdf>
- Aseltine, E. D. & Antunes, M. J. L. (2021). Tribal healing to wellness courts. In E.M. Ahlin & A. S. Douds (Eds.), *Taking problem-solving courts to scale: Diverse applications of the specialty court model* (pp. 195-210). Lexington Books.
- Atkin-Plunk, C. A., Armstrong, G. S., & Dalbir, N. (2021). Veteran treatment court clients' perceptions of procedural justice and recidivism. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 32(5), 501-522. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0887403420920334>
- Ayoub, L. H., & Rempel, M. (2021). Reentry courts. In E.M. Ahlin & A.S. Douds (Eds.). *Taking problem-solving courts to scale: Diverse applications of the specialty court model* (pp.73-89). Lexington Books.
- Bahr, S. J., Masters, A. L., & Taylor, B. M. (2012). What works in substance abuse treatment programs for offenders? *The Prison Journal*, 92(2), 155-174. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0032885512438836>
- Baldwin, J. M. (2015). Investigating the programmatic attack: A national survey of veterans treatment courts. *Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology*, 105(3), 705-752. <https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/jclc/vol105/iss3/4>
- Baldwin, J. M. (2017). Whom do they serve? A national examination of veterans treatment Court participants and their challenges. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 28(6), 515-554. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0887403415606184>
- Barnes, J. C., Ventura Miller, H., & Miller, J. M. (2009). Identifying leading characteristics associated with juvenile drug court admission and success: A research note. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 7(4), 350-360. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1541204009334630>
- Behnken, M. P., Arredondo, D. E., & Packman, W. L. (2009). Reduction in recidivism in a juvenile mental health court: a pre- and post-treatment outcome study. *Juvenile and Family Court Journal*, 60(3), 23-44. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1755-6988.2009.01030.x>
- Behnken, M. P., Bort, A., & Borbon, M. (2017). Race and gender recidivism differences among juvenile mental health court graduates. *Juvenile and Family Court Journal*, 68(2), 19-31. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jfcj.12092>

- Belenko S, Dennis M, Hiller M, Mackin J, Cain C, Weiland D, Estrada B, Kagan R. The Impact of Juvenile Drug Treatment Courts on Substance Use, Mental Health, and Recidivism: Results from a Multisite Experimental Evaluation. *J Behavioral Health Services Research*. 2022 Oct;49(4):436-455. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11414-022-09805-4>
- Belisle, L., & Thompson, K. (2020). Sustained outcomes? An exploratory study of juvenile drug courts and long-term recidivism. *Juvenile and Family Court Journal*, 71(1), 63–83. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jfcj.12161>
- Bonfine, N., Ritter, C., & Munetz, M. R. (2016). Exploring the relationship between criminogenic risk assessment and mental health court program completion. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 45, 9–16. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijlp.2016.02.002>
- Bouffard, J. A., & Richardson, K. A. (2007). The effectiveness of drug court programming for specific kinds of offenders: methamphetamine and DWI offenders versus other drug-involved offenders. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 18(3), 274–293. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0887403406298621>
- Bouffard, J. A., Richardson, K. A., & Franklin, T. (2010). Drug courts for DWI offenders? The effectiveness of two hybrid drug courts on DWI offenders. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 38(1), 25–33. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0887403406298621>
- Breckenridge, J. F., Winfree, L. T., Maupin, J. R., & Clason, D. L. (2000). Drunk drivers, DWI “drug court” treatment, and recidivism: Who fails? *Justice Research and Policy*, 2(1), 87–105. <https://doi.org/10.3818/JRP.2.1.2000.87>
- Breitenbucher, P., Bermejo, R., Killian, C.M., Young, N.K., Duong, L. & DeCerchio, K. (2018). Exploring racial and ethnic disproportionalities and disparities in family treatment courts: Findings from the regional partnership grant program. *Journal for Advancing Justice*, 1, 35–63. <https://advancejustice.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/AJ-Journal.pdf>
- Bronson, J., & Berzofsky, M. (2017). *Indicators of mental health problems reported by prisoners and jail inmates, 2011–2012*. Bureau of Justice Statistics, U.S. Department of Justice. <https://bjs.ojp.gov/content/pub/pdf/imhprpji1112.pdf>
- Brook, J., Akin, B.A., Lloyd, M.H., & Yan, Y. (2015). Family drug court, targeted parent training and family reunification: Did this enhanced service strategy make a difference? *Juvenile and Family Court Journal*, 66(2), 35–52. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/jfcj.12028>
- Brook, J., Akin, B.A., Lloyd, M.H., Johnson-Motoyama, M., & Yan, Y. (2016). Family drug treatment courts as comprehensive service models: Cost considerations. *Juvenile and Family Court Journal*, 67(3), 23–43. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jfcj.12060>
- Bruns, E. J., Pullmann, M. D., Weathers, E. S., Wirschem, M. L., & Murphy, J. K. (2012). Effects of a multidisciplinary family treatment drug court on child and family outcomes: Results of a quasi-experimental study. *Child Maltreatment*, 17(3), 218–230. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077559512454216>
- Burwell, S., McSwain, R. G., Frazier, F., & Greenway, K. (2014). *Trends in Indian health: 2014 edition*. Department of Health and Human Services. https://www.ihs.gov/sites/dps/themes/responsive2017/display_objects/documents/Trends2014Book508.pdf
- Bullinger, L. R., & Ward, B. C. (2021). What about the children? How opioid use affects child well-being. *Contemporary Economic Policy*, 39(4), 737–759. <https://doi.org/10.1111/coep.12523>
- Carey, M., & Luo, F. (2020). Intended and unintended benefits of specialty courts: Results from a Texas DWI court. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 59, 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10509674.2020.1745979>

- Callahan, L., Coccozza, J., Steadman, H. J., & Tillman, S. (2012). A national survey of U.S. juvenile mental health courts. *Psychiatric Services*, 63(2), 130–134. <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ps.201100113>
- Callahan, L., Steadman, H. J., Tillman, S., & Vesselinov, R. (2013). A multi-site study of the use of sanctions and incentives in mental health courts. *Law and human behavior*, 37(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0093989>
- Carson, E. A. (2020). *Prisoners in 2019*. Bureau of Justice Statistics. <https://bjs.ojp.gov/content/pub/pdf/p19.pdf>
- Cavanaugh, M. R., & Franklin, T. W. (2012). Do DWI courts work? An empirical evaluation of a Texas DWI court. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 51(4), 257–274. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10509674.2011.641074>
- Center for Behavioral Health Statistics and Quality. (2021). *Racial/ethnic differences in substance use, substance use disorders, and substance use treatment utilization among people aged 12 or older (2015–2019)*. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. <https://www.samhsa.gov/data/>
- Center for Children and Family Futures & the National Association of Drug Court Professionals (2019). *Family Treatment Court Best Practice Standards*. https://www.nadcp.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/Family-Treatment-Court-Best-Practice-Standards_Final2.pdf
- Center for Court Innovation (2013). *Developing a statewide drug court data tracking system: The why, what, and how of it*. <https://www.courtinnovation.org/sites/default/files/documents/drugcourtdatasystem.pdf>
- Center for Court Innovation. (2019). *The 10 essential elements of opioid intervention courts*. https://www.courtinnovation.org/sites/default/files/media/documents/2019-07/report_the10essentialelements_07092019.pdf
- Center for Families, Children, & the Courts. (2020). *Juvenile collaborative court models: Juvenile mental health court*. Judicial Council of California. https://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/JCJC_Models_Juvenile_mental_health_court.pdf
- Chartier, K., & Caetano, R. (2010). Ethnicity and health disparities in alcohol research. *Alcohol Research & Health*, 33(1–2), 152–160. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3887493/>
- Cheesman, F. L., & Kunkel, T. L. (2012). *Virginia adult drug treatment court impact study*. National Center for State Courts. <https://ncsc.contentdm.oclc.org/digital/collection/spcts/id/244>
- Children’s Bureau, Administration on Children, Youth and Families, Administration For Children And Families, & U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2019). *Adoption and Foster Care Analysis and Reporting System (AFCARS), foster care file 2017* [Data set]. National Data Archive on Child Abuse and Neglect. <https://doi.org/10.34681/7424-0J56>
- Child Welfare Information Gateway (2019a). *Plans of safe care for infants with prenatal substance exposure and their families*. <https://www.childwelfare.gov/pubPDFs/safecare.pdf>
- Child Information Gateway (2019b). *Parental substance use as child abuse*. <https://www.childwelfare.gov/pubPDFs/parentalsubstanceuse.pdf>
- Cooper, C. S. (2001). *Juvenile drug court programs*. US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, and the Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grants Program. <https://www.ojp.gov/pdffiles1/ojjdp/184744.pdf>

- Clark, S., McGuire, J., & Blue-Howells, J. (2010). Development of veterans treatment courts: Local and legislative initiatives. *Drug Court Review*, 7(1), 171-208. https://ndcrc.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/DCRVOLUME7-5_Development_of_Veterans_Treatment_Courts_Local_and_Legislative_Initiatives.pdf
- Crumpton, D., Carey, S., Mackin, J., Finigan, M., Pukstas, K., Weller, J., Linhares, R., & Brekhus, J. (2006). *Harford County juvenile drug court performance evaluation: Program process, outcome and cost analyses*. Portland, OR: NPC Research. https://npcresearch.com/wp-content/uploads/H CJDC_Process_Outcome-Cost-FINAL-report_110906-with-cover1.pdf
- Cunningham, J. K., Solomon, T. A., & Muramoto, M. L. (2016). Alcohol use among Native Americans compared to whites: Examining the veracity of the 'Native American elevated alcohol consumption' belief. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, 160, 65-75. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2015.12.015>
- Dakof, G. A., Henderson, C. E., Rowe, C. L., Boustani, M., Greenbaum, P. E., Wang, W., Hawes, S., Linares, C., & Liddle, H. A. (2015). A randomized clinical trial of family therapy in juvenile drug court. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 29(2), 232-241. <https://doi.org/10.1037/fam0000053>
- Dannerbeck, A., Harris, G., Sundet, P., & Lloyd, K. (2006) Understanding and responding to racial differences in drug court outcomes. *Journal of Ethnicity in Substance Abuse*, 5(2), 1-22. https://doi.org/10.1300/J233v05n02_01
- Davis, K. M., Peterson-Badali, M., Weagant, B., & Skilling, T. A. (2015). A process evaluation of Toronto's first youth mental health court. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 57(2), 159-188. <https://doi.org/10.3138/CJCCJ.2014.E10>
- Derrick, R.M., Callahan, L., Vesselinov, R., Krauel, R.W., Litzenberger, J.A., & Camp, L. R. (2018). Serving those who served: Outcomes from the San Diego Veterans Treatment Court Review Calendar (SDVTRC) pilot program. *Psychological Injury and Law*, 11, 171-183. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12207-017-9308-4>
- DeVall, K.E., Gregory, P.D., & Hartmann, D.J. (2012). The potential of social science theory for the evaluation and improvement of drug courts: Do we need a theory of drug court effectiveness? *Journal of Drug Issues*, 42(4), 320-336. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022042612461767>
- DeVall, K. E., & Lanier, C. L. (2012). Successful completion: An examination of factors influencing drug court completion for white and non-white male participants. *Substance Use & Misuse*, 47(10), 1106-1116. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3109/10826084.2012.680171>
- Development Services Group, Inc. (2016). *Family drug courts literature review*. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. https://www.ojjdp.gov/mpg/litreviews/Family_Drug_Courts.pdf
- Douds, A. S., Ahlin, E. M., Howard, D., & Stigerwalt, S. (2017). Varieties of veterans' courts: A statewide assessment of veterans' treatment court components. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 28(8), 740-769. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0887403415620633>
- Eckberg, D. A., & Jones, D. S. (2015). "I'll just do my time": The role of motivation in the rejection of the DWI court model. *The Qualitative Report*, 20(1), 130-147. <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR20/1/eckberg7.pdf>
- Fahey, J., Wahwassuck, K., Leof, A., & Smith, J. (2018). *Joint jurisdiction courts: A manual for developing tribal, local, state & federal justice collaborations*. 2nd Ed. Portland, OR: Project T.E.A.M., Center for Evidence-based Policy, Oregon Health & Science University.
- Farrell, M. Martin, N.K., Stockings, E., Borquez, A., Cepeda, J.A., Degenhardt, L. Ali, R., Tran, L. Rehm, J., Torrens, M., Shoptaw, S. & McKetin, R. (2019). Responding to global stimulant use: Challenges and opportunities. *The Lancet*, 394(10209), 1652-1667. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(19\)32230-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(19)32230-5)

- Fausto-Sterling, A. (2012). *Sex/Gender: Biology in a social world*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Flies-Away, J. T., Gardner, J., & Garrow, C. (2014). *Overview of tribal healing to wellness courts*. Tribal Law and Policy Institute. <http://www.wellnesscourts.org/files/THWC%20overview%20Final%20-%20Sept%20%202014.pdf>
- Flies-Away, J. T., & Garrow, C. E. (2013). Healing to wellness courts: Therapeutic jurisprudence + Indian tribes and human rights accountability. *Michigan State Law Review*, 2013(2), 403–450. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17613/6xtp-we57>
- Flies-Away, J. T., Garrow, C.E., & Sekaquaptewa, P. (2014). *Tribal healing to wellness courts: The key components (2nd ed.)*. Tribal Law and Policy Institute. <https://wellnesscourts.org/files/Tribal%20Healing%20to%20Wellness%20Courts%20The%20Key%20Components.pdf>
- Freeman-Wilson, K. & Huddleston, C.W. (1999). *DWI/Drug courts: Defining a national strategy*. National Drug Court Institute. https://www.ndci.org/sites/default/files/ndci/Mono1.DWI_.pdf
- Fulkerson, A., Keena, L., & Longman, A. (2016). In or out: The drug court dilemma. *Criminology, Criminal Justice, Law & Society*, 17(2), 34–45. <https://ccjls.scholasticahq.com/article/852-in-or-out-the-drug-court-dilemma>
- Gallagher, J. R. (2013) Drug court graduation rates: Implications for policy advocacy and future research. *Alcoholism Treatment Quarterly*, 31(2), 241–253. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07347324.2013.772019>
- Gardner, P. (2011). An overview of juvenile mental health courts. *ABA Child Law Practice*, 30(7), 101–105. https://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/administrative/child_law/clp/artcollections/juvjust/juvmhcourts.authcheckdam.pdf
- Ghertner, R., Waters, A., Radel, L., & Crouse, G. (2018). The role of substance use in child welfare caseloads. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 90, 83–93. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2018.05.015>
- Goldberg, Z. E., Chin, N. P., Alio, A., Williams, G., & Morse, D. S. (2019). A qualitative analysis of family dynamics and motivation in sessions with 15 women in drug treatment court. *Substance Abuse: Research and Treatment*, 13, 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1178221818818846>
- Goldkamp, J. S., White, M.D., & Robinson, J. B. (2002). An honest chance: Perspectives on drug courts. *Federal Sentencing Reporter*, 14(6), 369–372. <https://doi.org/10.1525/fsr.2002.14.6.369>
- Goodale, G., Callahan, L., & Steadman, H. J. (2013). Law & psychiatry: what can we say about mental health courts today? *Psychiatric services (Washington, D.C.)*, 64(4), 298–300. <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ps.201300049>
- Gottlieb, K., Deck, C., Duclos, C., Koester, S., & Tompkins, J. E. (2005). *Process and outcome evaluations in four tribal wellness courts*. U.S. Department of Justice. <https://www.ojp.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/231167.pdf>
- Gummelt, G., & Sullivan, M. (2016). Evaluating the effectiveness of a juvenile drug court: Comparisons to traditional probation. *Juvenile and Family Court Journal*, 67(4), 55–68. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jfcj.12081>
- Han, W., Matejkowski, J., & Lee, S. (2020). Racial variation in mental health court experiences and the associations of these experiences with recidivism. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 47(4), 808–828. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854820921886>
- Han, W., & Redlich, A. D. (2016). The impact of community treatment on recidivism among mental health court participants. *Psychiatric Services*, 67(4), 384–390. <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ps.201500006>

- Han, W. & Redlich, A. D. (2018) Racial/ethnic disparities in community behavioral health service usage: A comparison of mental health court and traditional court defendants. *Criminal Justice & Behavior*, 45(2), 173–194. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0093854817739045>
- Harris, B., Keator, K., Vincent-Roller, N., & Keefer, B. (2017). Engage, involve, empower: Family engagement in juvenile treatment courts. *National Center for Mental Health and Juvenile Justice*. <https://www.ncjfcj.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/Engage-Involve-Empower-Family-Engagement-in-Juvenile-Drug-Treatment-Courts.pdf>
- Hartley, R. D., & Baldwin, J. M. (2019). Waging war on recidivism among justice-involved veterans: An impact evaluation of a large urban veterans treatment court. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 30(1), 52–78. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0887403416650490>
- Heretick, D., & Russell, J. (2013). The impact of juvenile mental health court on recidivism among youth. *Journal of Juvenile Justice*, 3(1), 1–14. <https://www.ojp.gov/pdffiles/244254.pdf>
- Herzog, J. R. R., Ferdik, F. V., Scott, D. L., Denney, A. S., & Conklin, S. I. (2019). Participant perceptions of veterans treatment courts: A qualitative assessment and systems model. *Journal of Veterans Studies*, 4(2), 78–93. <http://dx.doi.org/10.21061/jvs.v4i2.108>
- Hiday, V.A., Ray, B. & Wales, H. (2016). Longer-term impacts of mental health courts: Recidivism two years after exit. *Psychiatric Services*, 67(4), 78– 383. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10979-006-9061-9>
- Ho, T., Carey, S. M., & Malsch, A. M. (2018). Racial and gender disparities in treatment courts: Do they exist and is there anything we can do to change them? *Journal for Advancing Justice*, 1(1), 5–34. <https://advancejustice.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/AJ-Journal.pdf>
- Holbrook, J., & Anderson, S. (2011). Veterans courts: Early outcomes and key indicators for success. *Widener Law School Legal Studies Research Paper Series no. 11-25*. <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1912655>
- Honegger, L. N. (2015). Does the evidence support the case for mental health courts? A review of the literature. *Law & Human Behavior*, 39(5), 478–488. <https://doi.org/10.1037/lhb0000141>
- Honegger, L. N., & Honegger, K. S. (2019). Criminogenic factors associated with noncompliance and rearrest of mental health court participants. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 46(9), 1276–1294. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854819862010>
- Hora, P. G., Schma, W. G., & Rosenthal, K. (1999). Therapeutic jurisprudence and the drug treatment court movement; Justice system's response to drug abuse and crime in America. *Notre Dame Law Review*, 74(2), 439–537. <https://scholarship.law.nd.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1629&context=ndlr>
- Huddleston, C. W. (2005). *Drug courts: An effective strategy for communities facing methamphetamine*. National Drug Court Institute. <https://www.ojp.gov/pdffiles1/bja/209549.pdf>
- Huddleston, C.W., Freeman-Wilson, K., & Boone, D.L. (2004). *Painting the current picture: A national report card on drug courts and other problem-solving court programs in the United States* (Vol. 1, no. 1). National Drug Court Institute and Bureau of Justice Assistance. <http://www.ndci.org/sites/default/files/nadcp/PCPI.1.2004.pdf>
- Huddleston, C.W., Freeman-Wilson, K., Marlowe, D.B., & Roussell, A. (2005). *Painting the current picture: A national report card on drug courts and other problem-solving court programs in the United States* (Vol. 1, No. 2). National Drug Court Institute and Bureau of Justice Assistance. <http://www.ndci.org/sites/default/files/ndci/PCPI.2.2005.pdf>

- Huddleston, C.W., Marlowe, D.B., & Casebolt, R. (2008). *Painting the current picture: A national report card on drug courts and other problem-solving court programs in the United States* (Vol. 2, no. 1). Alexandria, VA: National Drug Court Institute and Bureau of Justice Assistance. [http://www.ndci.org/sites/default/files/ndci/PCPII1_web\[1\].pdf](http://www.ndci.org/sites/default/files/ndci/PCPII1_web[1].pdf).
- Huddleston, W., & Marlowe, D.B. (2011). *Painting the current picture: A national report on drug courts and other problem-solving court programs in the United States*. National Drug Court Institute. <https://www.ndci.org/sites/default/files/nadcp/PCP%20Report%20FINAL.PDF>
- Hunter, M. J. B. (1999). Tribal court opinions: Justice and legitimacy. *Kansas Journal of Law and Public Policy*, 8(2), 142-146.
- Jalain, C. I., & Grossi, E. L. (2020). Take a load off Fanny: Peer mentors in veterans treatment courts. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 31(8), 1165-1192. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0887403419880289>
- James, D. J., & Glaze, E. (2006). *Mental health problems of prison and jail inmates*. U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics. <http://bjs.ojp.usdoj.gov/content/pub/pdf/mhppji.pdf>
- Janku, A. D., & Yan, J. (2009). Exploring patterns of court-ordered mental health services for juvenile offenders: is there evidence of systemic bias? *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 36(4), 402-419. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854808330799>
- Jewell, J. D., Rose, P., Bush, R., & Bartz, K. (2017). The long term effectiveness of drug treatment court on reducing recidivism and predictors of voluntary withdrawal. *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction*, 15(1), 28-39. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11469-016-9652-8>
- Johnson, R. S., Stolar, A. G., McGuire, J. F., Clark, S., Coonan, L. A., Hausknecht, P., & Graham, D. P. (2016). US veterans' court programs: An inventory and analysis of national survey data. *Community Mental Health Journal*, 52(2), 180-186. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10597-015-9972-3>
- Johnson, R. S., Stolar, A. G., McGuire, J. F., Mittakanti, K., Clark, S., Coonan, L. A., & Graham, D. P. (2017). Predictors of incarceration of veterans participating in U.S. veterans' courts. *Psychiatric Services*, 68(2), 144-150. <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ps.201500266>
- Johnson, R. S., Stolar, A. G., Wu, E., Coonan, L. A., & Graham, D. P. (2015). An analysis of successful outcomes and associated contributing factors in veterans' court. *Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic*, 79(2), 166-173. <https://doi.org/10.1521/bumc.2015.79.2.166>
- Jones, C. G. A., & Kemp, R. I. (2014). The strength of the participant-judge relationship predicts better drug court outcomes. *Psychiatry, Psychology and Law*, 21(2), 165-175. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13218719.2013.798392>
- Jones, C. M., Underwood, N., & Compton, W. M. (2019). Increases in methamphetamine use among heroin treatment admissions in the United States, 2008-17. *Addiction*, 115(2), 347-353. <https://doi.org/10.1111/add.14812>
- Justice for Vets. (2017) *Ten Key Components of Veterans Treatment Courts*. <https://justiceforvets.org/resource/ten-key-components-of-veterans-treatment-courts/>
- Knudsen, K. J., & Wingenfeld, S. (2016). A specialized treatment court for veterans with trauma exposure: Implications for the field. *Community Mental Health Journal; New York*, 52(2), 127-135. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10597-015-9845-9>
- Konecky, B., Cellucci, T., & Mochrie, K. (2016). Predictors of program failure in a juvenile drug court program. *Addictive Behaviors*, 59, 80- 83. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2016.03.025>

- Krull, H., Farmer, C. M., Rennane, S., Goldstein, E., Armour, P., & Ruder, T. (2021). *Trends in Department of Defense Disability Evaluation System ratings and awards for posttraumatic stress disorder and traumatic brain injury, 2002-2017*. RAND Corporation. https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR3174.html
- Landess, J., & Holoyda, B. (2017). Mental health courts and forensic assertive community treatment teams as correctional diversion programs. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, 35(5-6), 501-511. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bsl.2307>
- Lanier, C., & DeVall, K. E. (2017). How'd you do it? Applying structural ritualization theory to drug treatment courts. *Journal of Drug Issues*, 47(2), 289-308. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022042616687119>
- Latimer, J., Morton-Bourgon, K., & Chrétien, J. (2006). *A meta-analytic examination of drug treatment courts: Do they reduce recidivism?* Department of Justice Canada. <http://herzog-evans.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/A-meta-analytic-examination-of-DTC-Latimer-et-al.pdf>
- Lennon, C. (2020). The growth and need for veterans treatment courts. *Touro Law Review*, 35(4), 1171-1194. <https://digitalcommons.tourolaw.edu/lawreview/vol35/iss4/5>
- Lipari, R. N. (2019). *Key substance use and mental health indicators in the United States: Results from the 2018 National Survey on Drug Use and Health*. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA). <https://www.samhsa.gov/data/sites/default/files/cbhsq-reports/NSDUHNationalFindingsReport2018/NSDUHNationalFindingsReport2018.pdf>
- Liang, B., Knottnerus, J. D., & Long, M. A. (2016a). A theoretical model of drug/DUI courts: An application of structural ritualization theory. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 41(1), 31-46. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s12103-015-9331-5>
- Liang, B., Knottnerus, J. D., & Long, M. A., (2016b). What do clients achieve in drug/DUI court? Examining intended and unintended outcomes. *Justice System Journal*, 37(3), 272-289. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0098261X.2016.1151841>
- Lloyd, M.H. (2015). Family drug courts: Conceptual frameworks, empirical evidence, and implications for social work. *Families in Society the Journal of Contemporary Social Services*, 96, 49-57. <https://doi.org/10.1606/1044-3894.2015.96.7>
- Lloyd Sieger, M.H., Cohen, J.B., & Nano, X. (2021). Family-centered practice in adult treatment courts: What can we learn from the Family Treatment Court Best Practice Standards? *Juvenile and Family Court Journal*, 71(1), 95-118. <http://doi.org/10.1111/jfcj.12194>
- Loong, D., Barnsley, J. Dewa, C.S., Aubry, T. (2021). Individual factors associated with recidivism among mental health court program clients. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 74, 101651. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijlp.2020.101651>
- Lowder, E.M., Desmarais, S.L., & Baucom, D.J. (2016). Recidivism following mental health court exit: Between and within-group comparisons. *Law & Human Behavior Law and Human Behavior*, 40(2), 118-127. <https://doi.org/10.1037/lhb0000168>
- Lurigio, A., & Snowden, J. (2009). Putting therapeutic jurisprudence into practice: The growth, operations, and effectiveness of mental health court. *Justice System Journal*, 30, 196 - 218. https://www.ncsc.org/__data/assets/pdf_file/0025/18637/putting-therapeutic-jurisprudence-into-practice.pdf
- MacDonald, J. M., Morral, A. R., Raymond, B., & Eibner, C. (2007). The efficacy of the Rio Hondo DUI Court: A 2-year field experiment. *Evaluation Review*, 31(1), 4-23. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0193841X06287189>

- MacKain, S.J. & Mueser, K.T. (2009). Training in illness self-management for people with mental illness in the criminal justice system. *American Journal of Psychiatric Rehabilitation*, 12(1), 31-56. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15487760802615590>
- MacKenzie, D. L. (2006). *What works in corrections: reducing the criminal activities of offenders and delinquents*. Cambridge University Press.
- Mackin, J. R., Lucas, L. M., Lambarth, C. H., Herrera, T. A., Waller, M. S., Carey, S., & Finigan, M. W. (2010). *Baltimore County juvenile drug court outcome and cost evaluation*. Portland, OR: NPC Research. <https://mdcourts.gov/sites/default/files/import/opsc/dtc/pdfs/evaluationsreports/baltimorecountyjuveniledcoutcome-costreport.pdf>
- Manchak, S. M., Sullivan, C. C., Schweitzer, M., & Sullivan, C. J. (2016). The influence of co-occurring mental health and substance use problems on the effectiveness of juvenile drug courts. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 27(3), 247-264. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0887403414564464>
- Marinelli-Casey, P., Gonzales, R., Hillhouse, M., Ang, A., Zweben, J., Cohen, J., Hora, P.F., & Rawson, R.A. (2008). Drug court treatment for methamphetamine dependence: Treatment response and posttreatment outcomes. *Journal of Substance Abuse*, 34(2), 242-248. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsat.2007.04.005>
- McCoy, M. L. (1993). When cultures clash: The future of tribal courts. *Human Rights*, 20(3), 22-25. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/i27879765>
- Marlowe, D. B. (2013). Achieving Racial and Ethnic Fairness in Drug Courts. *Court Review: The Journal of the American Judges Association*, 49, 40-47. <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/ajacourtreview/436>
- Marlowe, D.B., Hardin, C.D., & Fox, C.L. (2016). *Painting the current picture: A national report on drug courts and other problem-solving court programs in the United States*. National Drug Court Institute. <https://www.ndci.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/Painting-the-Current-Picture-2016.pdf>
- Matejkowski, J., Han, W. & Conrad, A. (2020). Voluntariness of treatment, mental health service utilization, and quality of life among mental health court participants. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 26(2), 185-197. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/law0000227>
- Mauro, P. M., McCart, M. R., Sheidow, A. J., Naeger, S. E., & Letourneau, E. J. (2017). Parent and youth engagement in court-mandated substance use disorder treatment. *Journal of Child & Adolescent Substance Abuse*, 26(4), 324-331. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1067828X.2017.1305935>
- McCall, J. D., & Pomerance, B. (2019). Veterans treatment courts. In J. Tsai & E. R. Seamone (Eds.), *Intersections between mental health and law among veterans* (pp. 89-110). Springer International Publishing.
- McCall, J. D., Tsai, J., & Gordon, A. J. (2018). Veterans treatment court research: Participant characteristics, outcomes, and gaps in the literature. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 57(6), 384-401. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10509674.2018.1510864>
- McKean, J., & Warren-Gordon, K. (2011) Racial differences in graduation rates from adult drug treatment courts. *Journal of Ethnicity in Criminal Justice*, 9(1), 41-55. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15377938.2011.535469>
- Meinhofer, A., Onuoha, E., Anglero-Diaz, Y., & Keyes, K.M. (2020). Parental drug use and racial and ethnic disproportionality in the U.S. foster care system. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 118, 1-4. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2020.105336>
- Messer, S., Patten, R., & Candela, K. (2016). Drug courts and the facilitation of turning points: an expansion of life course theory. *Contemporary Drug Problems*, 43(1), 6-24. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0091450916632545>

- Messina, N., Calhoun, S., & Warda, U. (2012). Gender-responsive drug court treatment: A randomized controlled trial. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 39(12), 1539-1558. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854812453913>
- Minton, T. (2020). *Jails in Indian Country, 2017-2018* (pp. 1-36). Bureau of Justice Statistics. <https://bjs.ojp.gov/content/pub/pdf/jic1718.pdf>
- Mitchell, O., Wilson, D. B., Eggers, A., & MacKenzie, D. L. (2012). Assessing the effectiveness of drug courts on recidivism: A meta-analytic review of traditional and non-traditional drug courts. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 40(1), 60-71. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2011.11.009>
- Montgomery, L. M., & N. Olson, J. (2018). Veterans treatment court impact on veteran mental health and life satisfaction. *Journal of Psychology and Behavioral Science*, 6(1), 1-4. <https://doi.org/10.15640/jpbs.v6n1a1>
- Moore, K. A., Barongi, M. M., & Rigg, K. K. (2017). The experiences of young adult offenders who completed a drug court treatment program. *Qualitative Health Research*, 27(5), 750-758. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732316645782>
- Moore, K. A., Harrison, M., Young, M. S., & Ochshorn, E. (2008). A cognitive therapy treatment program for repeat DUI offenders. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 36(6), 539-545. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2008.09.004>
- Morris, M. C., Marco, M., Bailey, B., Ruiz, E., Im, W., & Goodin, B. (2019). Opioid prescription rates and risk for substantiated child abuse and neglect: A Bayesian spatiotemporal analysis. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, 205, 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2019.107623>
- Morse, D. S., Cerulli, C., Bedell, P., Wilson, J. L., Thomas, K., Mittal, M., Lamberti, J.S., Williams, G., Silverstein, J., Mukherjee, A., Walck, D., & Chin, N. (2014). Meeting health and psychological needs of women in drug treatment court. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, 46(2), 150-157. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsat.2013.08.017>
- Narag, R. E., Maxwell, S. R., & Lee, B. (2013). A phenomenological approach to assessing a DWI program. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 57(2), 229-250. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X11431685>
- National Association of Drug Court Professionals. (1997). *Defining drug courts: The key components*. <https://www.ojp.gov/pdffiles1/bja/205621.pdf>
- National Association of Drug Court Professionals. (2010). *Resolution of the board of directors on the equivalent treatment of racial and ethnic minority participants in drug courts*. <https://www.dwicourts.org/wp-content/uploads/NADCP%20Board%20Resolution%20-%20The%20Equivalent%20Treatment%20of%20Racial%20and%20Ethnic%20Minority%20Participants%20in%20Drug%20Courts%2006-01-10.pdf>
- National Association of Drug Court Professionals. (2018a). *Adult Drug Court Best Practice Standards Volume I*. <https://www.nadcp.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/Adult-Drug-Court-Best-Practice-Standards-Volume-I-Text-Revision-December-2018-1.pdf>
- National Association of Drug Court Professionals. (2018b). *Adult Drug Court Best Practice Standards Volume II*. <https://www.nadcp.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/Adult-Drug-Court-Best-Practice-Standards-Volume-2-Text-Revision-December-2018-1.pdf>
- National Association of Drug Court Professionals. (2019). *Equity & inclusion: Equivalent access assessment & toolkit*. National Drug Court Institute. <https://www.ndci.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/Equity-and-Inclusion-Toolkit.pdf>

- National Center for DWI Courts. (2006). *The ten guiding principles of DWI courts*. https://www.dwicourts.org/wp-content/uploads/Guiding_Principles_of_DWI_Court_0.pdf
- National Council on Disability. (2009). *Invisible wounds: Serving service members and veterans with PTSD and TBI*. <https://ncd.gov/publications/2009/march042009>
- National Drug Court Institute (NDCI). (2003). *Juvenile drug courts: Strategies in practice*. https://ndcrc.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/Juvenile_Drug_Courts_Strategies_in_Practice.pdf
- National Drug Court Resource Center. (2021). *Treatment courts across the United States (2020)*. https://ndcrc.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/2020_NDCRC_TreatmentCourt_Count_Table_v8.pdf
- National Highway Transportation Safety Administration. (2020). *Overview of motor vehicle crashes in 2019*. <https://crashstats.nhtsa.dot.gov/Api/Public/Publication/813060>
- Nelson, S. E., Belkin, K., LaPlante, D. A., Bosworth, L., & Shaffer, H. J. (2015). A prospective study of psychiatric comorbidity and recidivism among repeat DUI offenders. *Archives of Scientific Psychology*, 3(1), 8-17. <https://doi.org/10.1037/arc0000009>
- Nicosia, N., MacDonald, J. M., & Arkes, J. (2013). Disparities in criminal court referrals to drug treatment and prison for minority men. *American Journal of Public Health*, 103(6), e77-e84. <https://dx.doi.org/10.2105%2FAJPH.2013.301222>
- Office of Justice Programs. (2007). *Restorative justice on-line notebook*. <https://www.ojp.gov/pdffiles1/nij/242196.pdf>
- Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. (2016). *Juvenile drug treatment court guidelines*. <https://ojjdp.ojp.gov/sites/g/files/xyckuh176/files/pubs/250368.pdf>
- Oudekerk, S. & Kaebler, D. (2021). *Probation and parole in the United States, 2019*. Bureau of Justice Statistics. <https://bjs.ojp.gov/sites/g/files/xyckuh236/files/media/document/ppus19.pdf>
- Patten, R., Messer, S., & Candela, K. (2014). "I don't see myself as prison material": Motivations for entering a rural drug court. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 59(11), 1188-1202. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X14532321>
- Pound, R. (1912) The scope and purpose of sociological jurisprudence. *Harvard Law Review*, 489, 512-13.
- Poythress, N. G., Petrila, J., McGaha, A., & Boothroyd, R. (2002). Perceived coercion and procedural justice in the Broward mental health court. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 25(5), 517-533. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0160-2527\(01\)00110-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0160-2527(01)00110-8)
- Quast, T. (2018). State-level variation in the relationship between child removals and opioid prescriptions. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 86, 306-313. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2018.10.001>
- Quast, T., Bright, M. A., & Delcher, C. (2019). The relationship between foster care entries and high-dose opioid prescribing in California. *Addictive Behaviors*, 93, 52-58. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2019.01.015>
- Quast, T., Storch, E. A., & Yampolskaya, S. (2018). Opioid prescription rates and child removals: Evidence from Florida. *Health Affairs*, 37(1), 134-139. <https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.2017.1023>
- Ramirez, A. M., Andretta, J. R., Barnes, M. E., & Woodland, M. H. (2015). Recidivism and psychiatric symptom outcomes in a juvenile mental health court. *Juvenile and Family Court Journal*, 66(1), 31-46. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jfcj.12025>

- Ray, B., Kubiak, S.P., Comartin, E.B. & Tillander, E. (2015). Mental health court outcomes by offense type at admission. *Administrative Policy Mental Health*, 42(3), 323–331. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10488-014-0572-2>
- Redlich, A. D., Steadman, H. J., Monahan, J., Pamela, C. R., & Petrila, J. (2006). Patterns of practice in mental health courts: A national survey. *Law and Human Behavior*, 30(3), 347–362. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10979-006-9036-x>
- Reedt, L., Hunt, K. S., James, P. L., Reimer, M. K., & Maass, K. T. (2017). *Recidivism among federal drug trafficking offenders*. United States Sentencing Commission: Washington, DC. https://www.ussc.gov/sites/default/files/pdf/research-and-publications/research-publications/2017/20170221_Recidivism-Drugs.pdf
- Rempel, M. (2010). *Action research: Using information to improve your drug court*. Center for Court Innovation. <https://www.courtinnovation.org/sites/default/files/Action%20Research.pdf>
- Richland, J., & Deer, S. (2015). *Introduction to tribal legal studies (3rd ed.)*. Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.
- Ronan, S. M., Collins, P. A., & Rosky, J. W. (2009). The effectiveness of Idaho DUI and misdemeanor/DUI courts: Outcome evaluation. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 48(2), 154–166. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10509670802641030>
- Rottman, D., & Casey, P. (1999). Therapeutic jurisprudence and the emergence of problem solving courts. *PsycEXTRA Dataset*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/E564202006-002>.
- Ruggles, S., Flood, S., Foster, S., Goeken, R., Pacas, J., Schouweiler, M., & Sobek, M. (2021) *IPUMS USA* (Version 11.0) [Data set]. IPUMS. <https://doi.org/10.18128/D010.V11.0>
- Ruiz, B. S., Stevens, S. J., Fuhrman, J., Bogart, J. G., & Korchmaros, J. D. (2009). A juvenile drug court model in southern Arizona: Substance abuse, delinquency, and sexual risk outcomes by gender and race/ethnicity. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 48(5), 416–438. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10509670902979637>
- Russell, H. R. T. (2015). Veteran Treatment Courts. *Touro Law Review*, 31(3), 385–401. <https://digitalcommons.tourolaw.edu/lawreview/vol31/iss3/8>
- Sacco, L.N. (2018). *Federal support for drug courts: In brief*. Congressional Research Service. <https://sgp.fas.org/crs/misc/R44467.pdf>
- Sarteschi, C.M., Vaughn, M.G., & Kim, K. (2011). Assessing the effectiveness of mental health courts: A quantitative review. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 39(1), 12–20. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2010.11.003>
- Saum, C. A., Hiller, M. L., & Nolan, B. A. (2013). Predictors of completion of a driving under the influence (DUI) court for repeat offenders. *Criminal Justice Review*, 38(2), 207–225. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0734016813476514>
- Seck, M. M., Tsagaris, G. S., & Rowe, R. (2017). Mental health courts and adult offenders with developmental disabilities and co-occurring diagnoses. *Best Practices in Mental Health: An International Journal*, 13(2), 30–40. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2017-45092-004>
- Shaffer, D. K. (2011). Looking inside the black box of drug courts: A meta-analytic review. *Justice Quarterly*, 28(3), 493–521. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.75.5.795>

- Shannon, L. M., Birdwhistell, S., Hulbig, S. K., Jones, A. J., Newell, J., & Payne, C. (2017). Examining implementation and preliminary performance indicators of veterans treatment courts: The Kentucky experience. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 63, 54–66. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2017.03.003>
- Shannon, L. M., Jones, A. J., Nash, S., Newell, J., & Payne, C. M. (2018). Examining racial disparities in program completion and post-program recidivism rates: Comparing Caucasian and non-Caucasian treatment court participants. *Journal for Advancing Justice*, 1, 63–88. <https://advancejustice.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/AJ-Journal.pdf>
- Shaw, M., & Robinson, K. (1998). Summary and analysis of the first juvenile drug court evaluations: The Santa Clara County drug treatment court and the Delaware juvenile drug court diversion program. *National Drug Court Institute Review*, 1(1), 73–85.
- Sheeran, A. M., & Heideman, A. J. (2021). The effects of race and ethnicity on admission, graduation, and recidivism in the Milwaukee County adult drug treatment court. *Social Sciences*, 10(7), 261–278. <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci10070261>
- Sickmund, M., Sladky, A., and Kang, W. (2021). *Easy access to juvenile court statistics: 1985–2019*. [Data set]. <https://www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/ezajcs/>
- Sickmund M. Sladky T.J. Puzzanchera C. and Kang W. (2021) *Easy access to the census of juveniles in residential placement*. [Data set]. <https://www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/ezacjrp/>
- Sickmund, H. N., & Snyder, M. (2006). *Juvenile offenders and victims: 2006 national report*. U.S. Department of Justice. <https://www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/nr2006/downloads/NR2006.pdf>
- Skeem, J.L., Montoya, M.A. & Manchak, S.M. (2018). Comparing costs of traditional and specialty probation for people with serious mental illness. *Psychiatric Services*, 69(8), 896–902. <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ps.201700498>
- Slattery, M., Dugger, M. T., Lamb, T. A., & Williams, L. (2013). Catch, treat, and release: Veteran treatment courts address the challenges of returning home. *Substance Use & Misuse*, 48(10), 922–932. <https://doi.org/10.3109/10826084.2013.797468>
- Sloan, F. A., Gifford, E. J., Eldred, L. M., & McCutchan, S. A. (2016). Does the probability of DWI arrest fall following participation in DWI and hybrid drug treatment court programs? *Accident; Analysis and Prevention*, 97, 197–205. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aap.2016.08.029>
- Smith, J. W. (2012). The Anchorage, Alaska veterans court and recidivism: July 6, 2004–December 31, 2010. *Alaska Law Review*, 29, 93–111. <https://scholarship.law.duke.edu/alr/vol29/iss1/4>
- Snedker, K. A., Beach, L. R., & Corcoran, K. E. (2017). Beyond the “revolving door?": Incentives and criminal recidivism in a mental health court. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 44(9), 1141–1162. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0093854817708395>
- Stein, D. M., Deberard, S., & Homan, K. (2013). Predicting success and failure in juvenile drug treatment court: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of substance abuse treatment*, 44(2), 159–168. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsat.2012.07.002>
- Stein, D. M., Homan, K. J., & DeBerard, S. (2015). The effectiveness of juvenile treatment drug courts: A meta-analytic review of literature. *Journal of Child & Adolescent Substance Abuse*, 24(2), 80–93. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1067828X.2013.764371>
- Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. (2016). *Children affected by methamphetamine program: Implementation progress and performance measurement report*. https://ncsacw.samhsa.gov/files/CAM_Final_Report_508.pdf

- Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. (2019). *Key substance use and mental health indicators in the United States: Results from the 2018 National Survey on Drug Use and Health*. Rockville, MD: Center for Behavioral Health Statistics and Quality, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. <https://www.samhsa.gov/data/>
- Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. (2019). *Results from the 2018 National Survey on Drug Use and Health: Detailed tables*. Center for Behavioral Health Statistics and Quality, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. <https://www.samhsa.gov/data/>
- Substance Abuse & Mental Health Services Administration. (n.d.) *SAMHSA budget archives*. <https://www.samhsa.gov/about-us/budget/archive>
- Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (2020). *Treatment of stimulant use disorders*. https://store.samhsa.gov/sites/default/files/SAMHSA_Digital_Download/PEP20-06-01-001_508.pdf
- Sullivan, C. J., Blair, L., Latessa, E., & Sullivan, C. C. (2016). Juvenile drug courts and recidivism: Results from a multisite outcome study. *Justice Quarterly*, 33(2), 291–318. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07418825.2014.908937>
- Tanner-Smith, E. E., Lipsey, M. W., & Wilson, D. B. (2016). Juvenile drug court effects on recidivism and drug use: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 12(4), 477–513. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11292-016-9274-y>
- Taylor, L. R. (2016). General responsivity adherence in juvenile drug treatment court: Examining the impact on substance-use outcome. *Journal of Drug Issues*, 46(1), 24–40. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022042615610618>
- Tetzlaff, B. T., Kahn, J. H., Godley, S. H., Godley, M. D., Diamond, G. S., & Funk, R. R. (2005). Working alliance, treatment satisfaction, and patterns of posttreatment use among adolescent substance users. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*, 19(2), 199–207. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0893-164X.19.2.199>
- Thompson, M., Osher, F., & Tomasini-Joshi, D. (2007). *Improving responses to people with mental illness: The essential elements of a mental health court*. Council of State Governments Justice Center. <https://csgjusticecenter.org/publications/improving-responses-to-people-with-mental-illnesses-the-essential-elements-of-a-mental-health-court/>
- Timko, C., Flatley, B., Tjemsland, A., McGuire, J., Clark, S., Blue-Howells, J., Blonigen, D., Rosenthal, J., & Finlay, A. (2018). A longitudinal examination of veterans treatment courts' characteristics and eligibility criteria. *Justice Research and Policy*, 17(2), 123–136. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6051754/>
- Tsai, J., Finlay, A., Flatley, B., Kaspro, W. J., & Clark, S. (2018). A national study of veterans treatment court participants: Who benefits and who recidivates. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research; New York*, 45(2), 236–244. <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ps.201600233>
- Tsai, J., Flatley, B., Kaspro, W. J., Clark, S., & Finlay, A. (2016). Diversion of Veterans With Criminal Justice Involvement to Treatment Courts: Participant Characteristics and Outcomes. *Psychiatric Services*, 68(4), 375–383. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5776060/>
- Underwood, L. A., & Washington, A. (2016). Mental illness and juvenile offenders. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 13(2), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph13020228>
- U.S. Department of Justice. *BJA FY 2023 Veterans Treatment Court Discretionary Grant Program*. Washington, D.C.

- U.S. Department of Justice. (2019). *2019 Crime in the United States: Arrests for Drug Abuse Violations*. [Data table]. <https://ucr.fbi.gov/crime-in-the-u.s/2019/crime-in-the-u.s.-2019/tables/arrest-table.xls>
- U.S. Department of Justice. (2020). *Crime in the United States, 2019*. <https://ucr.fbi.gov/crime-in-the-u.s/2019/crime-in-the-u.s.-2019/home>.
- U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, Office of Mental Health and Suicide Prevention. (2020). *2020 National Veteran Suicide Prevention Annual Report*. https://www.mentalhealth.va.gov/docs/datasheets/2020/2020_National_Veteran_Suicide_Prevention_Annual_Report_508.pdf
- U.S. General Services Administration. (n.d.) *Enacted federal budgets*. <https://www.gsa.gov/reference/reports/budget-performance/enacted-federal-budgets>.
- van Wormer, J., & Hsieh, M. L. (2016). Healing families: Outcomes from a family drug treatment court. *Juvenile & Family Court Journal*, 67(2), 49–65. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jfcj.12057>
- Veteran Treatment Court Coordination Act of 2019, Public Law No. 116–153, 134 Stat. 688 (2020). <https://www.congress.gov/116/plaws/publ153/PLAW-116publ153.pdf>
- Vicenti, C. (1995). The reemergence of tribal society and traditional justice systems. *Journal of the American Judicature Society*, 75(3), 134–141. <https://turtletalk.files.wordpress.com/2010/08/the-reemergence-of-tribal-society-and-traditional-justice-systems-by-carey-vicenti.pdf>
- Webster, M. K. (2015). Alternative courts and drug treatment: Finding a rehabilitative solution for addicts in a retributive system. *Fordham Law Review*, 84, 855–903. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2685361>
- Weinrath, M., Gorkoff, K., Watts, J., Smee, C., Allard, Z., Bellan, M., Lumsden, S., & Cattini, M. (2019). A quantitative study of a drug treatment court in a western Canadian city: Post-sentencing and reoffence outcomes. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 61(4), 45–68. <https://doi.org/10.3138/cjccj.2018-0035>
- Wilkinson, A. (2015). A framework for understanding tribal courts and the application of fundamental law: Through the voices of scholars in the field of tribal justice. *Tribal Law Journal*, 15, 67–95. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2654340
- Winfrey, L. T., & Giever, D. M. (2000). On classifying driving-while-intoxicated offenders: The experiences of a citywide DWI drug court. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 28(1), 13–21. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0047-2352\(99\)00028-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0047-2352(99)00028-8)
- Winick, B. J., & Wexler, D. B. (2015) Drug treatment court: Therapeutic jurisprudence applied. *Touro Law Review*, (18)3, 479–486. <https://digitalcommons.tourolaw.edu/lawreview/vol18/iss3/6>
- Wittouck, C., Dekkers, A., De Ruyver, B., Vanderplasschen, W., & Vander Laenen, F. (2013). The impact of drug treatment courts on recovery: a systematic review. *The Scientific World Journal*, 2013, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2013/493679>
- Wolff, N., Fabrikant, N., & Belenko, S. (2011). Mental health courts and their selection processes: Modeling variation for consistency. *Law and Human Behavior*, 35(5), 402–412. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1007%2Fs10979-010-9250-4>
- Yu, J. (2000). Punishment and alcohol problems: Recidivism among drinking-driving offenders. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 28, 261–270. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0047-2352\(00\)00047-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0047-2352(00)00047-7)
- Zeng, Z. & Minton, T.D. (2021). *Jail inmates in 2019*. Bureau of Justice Statistics. <https://bjs.ojp.gov/content/pub/pdf/ji19.pdf>

- Zhang, S., Huang, H., Wu, Q., Li, Y., & Liu, M. (2019). The impacts of family treatment drug court on child welfare core outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 88, 1-44. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2018.10.014>
- Zil, C. E., Waller, M. S., Johnson, A. J., Harrison, P. M., & Carey, S. M. (2014). *Cass County/Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe Wellness Court process, outcome, and cost evaluation report*. NPC Research. <https://npcresearch.com/wp-content/uploads/Cass-County-Wellness-Court-Process-Outcome-and-Cost-Evaluation-FINAL-FOR-OTS.pdf>
- Zuni, C. (1998). Strengthening what remains. *Kansas Journal of Law and Public Policy*, 7(1), 17-30. <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2798395> Appendices

Appendices

Appendix A: Dispositional Models Utilized in Treatment Courts

The information below is extracted from the 2016 publication of *Painting the Current Picture* (Marlowe et al, 2016).

Pre-plea or deferred prosecution model: Participants enter the program as a condition of pretrial supervision or pursuant to a pretrial diversion agreement, with the understanding that the arrest charge(s) will be dismissed upon successful completion of treatment. Because no guilty plea is entered, the case resumes processing through the criminal justice system in the event of unsuccessful termination.

Post-plea diversion or deferred sentencing: The participant is required to plead guilty or no contest to the charge(s) or stipulate to (acknowledge the truth of) the facts in the criminal complaint. The plea or stipulation is then held in abeyance and is vacated or withdrawn if the participant completes the program successfully. These models are better suited for high-risk/high-need individuals.

Post-sentencing or term of probation: Individuals may be sentenced to treatment court after conviction as a condition of probation or other community-based sentence. These programs may also be ordered for individuals previously sentenced to probation who are subsequently charged with a new drug-related offense or technical violation. In post-sentencing drug courts, the record of the conviction stands, but participants avoid incarceration or reduce their probation obligations if they succeed in treatment. Post-sentencing programs are not voluntary, and participants are not entitled to withdraw their consent to participate.

Hybrid (post-plea diversion and post-sentencing): Participants may enter these types of programs as post-plea diversion or post-sentencing. Few, if any, drug courts merged pre-plea cases with higher risk post-plea or post-sentencing cases.





ndcrc.org



(910) 962-2440
ndcrc@uncw.edu



National Drug Court Resource Center
University of North Carolina Wilmington
680 S. College Road
Wilmington, North Carolina 28403-5978

