

Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Juvenile Drug Court Programs: 2000 – Present
PART ONE:

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	Focus of Study	Population Studied	Comparison Group
1	March 31, 2004	<i>Three-Year Annual Report: Bibb Co. (Georgia) Juvenile Drug Court Program</i>	Program description; description of participants; recidivism for 53 graduates and 43 youth terminated	96 youth who left program (53 graduated; 43 terminated) plus 45 current participants	n/a
2	February 2004	<i>Evaluation of the Kalamazoo County Juvenile Drug Treatment Court Program: October 1, 2002 – September 30, 2003: Year 6. By David J. Hartmann, Ph.D. and Paul Gregory, M.A., Western Michigan University</i>	Reviewed 51 participants in Year 6 of program, making comparisons, where applicable, with participants during previous 5 years of program operation.	51 participants entering program in Year 6, comparing them where applicable with prior program participants.	Control group established during Year one continued to grow during each year.
3	March 2003	<i>Summary Report of Virginia's Drug Court Programs. Office of the Supreme Court of Virginia and Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services. Author Not Provided</i>	Individuals in the Virginia drug court program between November 1995 and December 2002 were analyzed.	217 Virginians admitted to the felony drug court program	Control group matched by age, race, gender, educational level, and offense history
4	May 5, 2002	<i>From Whether to How Drug Courts Work: Retrospective Evaluation of Drug Courts in Clark County (Las Vegas) and Multnomah County (Portland), [Oregon]. John S. Goldkamp; Michael D. White; Jennifer B. Robinson.</i>	Study focuses primarily on evaluating adult drug courts in Portland, Oregon and Las Vegas, Nevada but provides summary review of Clark Co. Juvenile Drug Court.	Studies all 145 juveniles entering the Clark Co., Nevada juvenile drug court in 1999	N/A
5	June 10, 2001	<i>A Preliminary Outcome Evaluation of North Dakota's Juvenile Drug Court: Recidivism Analysis. Kevin M. Thompson, Dept. of Sociology. North Dakota State University. [two drug courts: E. Central Jud District and NE Central Jud District]</i>	Outcome evaluation of participants in juvenile drug courts in E. Central Jud District and NE Central Jud District	32 Participants for at least two months in juvenile drug courts in E. Central Jud District and NE Central Jud District for the period May 2000 – May 2001	Juveniles referred to court from 1995 - 1997
6	2000	<i>Beckham County Juvenile Drug Court: Phase II Analysis and Evaluation. David Wright, Bob Clymer, Bob.</i>	Beckham County Juvenile Drug Court graduates were monitored at 6,12, and 18 months after graduation.	Beckham County Juvenile Drug Court graduates were monitored at 6, 12, and 18 months after graduation.	Beckham County's Graduated Sanctions Program graduates were monitored at 6, 12, and 18 months after graduation.
7	February 1999	<i>Evaluation of the Orange County Juvenile Substance Abuse Treatment Court Program</i> Applegate, Brandon. Reuter, David. McCarthy, Bernard. Santana, Shannon.	Youths processed by the DC Program with a follow-up evaluation of 180 days	100 juveniles were admitted to the drug court program between August 20, 1997 and October 31, 1998.	N/A
8	September 18, 2003	<i>Evaluation of Maine's Statewide Juvenile Drug Treatment Court Program. Fourth Year Outcome Evaluation Report. Donald F. Anspach, Andrew S. Ferguson, Laura L. Phillips. College of Arts and Sciences. University of Southern Maine</i>	246 youth admitted to Maine's Juvenile Drug Treatment Court studied;	6 juvenile drug courts in Maine (York, Cumberland, Androscoggin, Kennebec, Penobscott and Sagadahoc Cos.)	Matched comparison group

Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluations of Juvenile Drug Court Programs: 2000 - present. Compiled by the BJA Drug Court Clearinghouse Project. School of Public Affairs. American University. Updated. April 4, 2008.

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

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	Focus of Study	Population Studied	Comparison Group
9	March 1998	<i>Evaluation of the Juvenile Drug Court Diversion Program [New Castle County, Delaware]</i> Miller, Marsha. Scocas, Evelyn. O'Connell, John. N/A	Juveniles admitted into the diversion program in Delaware were monitored during program treatment.	144 juveniles were admitted into the Diversion Program in Summer 1997	90 juveniles that had been arrested for misdemeanor drug possession in New Castle County during the first half of 1995. Equivalent criminal histories were accounted for.
10	December 2004	<i>Evaluation of Virginia's Drug Treatment Court Programs (Phase I). Office of the Executive Secretary, Supreme Court of Virginia</i>	Process and outcome study of Virginia's adult and juvenile drug courts	371 youth admitted to Virginia juvenile drug courts	n/a
11	August 12, 2002	<i>The Impact of North Dakota's Juvenile Drug Court on School Achievement. Kevin M. Thompson. Department of Sociology. North Dakota State University. Fargo, ND 58105</i>	Reviews educational progress and achievement of juveniles enrolled in North Dakota's juvenile drug court; focuses on academic performance, attendance, qualitative remarks by teachers and parents re changes in school attitudes and behaviors	Studies 72 juveniles admitted to the 2 juvenile drug courts in N.D. (Fargo and Grand Forks) as of the time of the study; studies achievement of 40 juveniles who had been enrolled at least 2 quarters in school at time of study	n/a (compares school performance pre and during drug court enrollment)
12	November 2004	<i>An Adult Recidivism Outcome Evaluation of North Dakota's Juvenile Drug Court. Kevin M. Thompson. Department of Criminal Justice and Political Science. North Dakota State University</i>	Analysis recidivism of juvenile drug court participants four years following participation when most were adults	133 of the original juvenile drug court participants in North Dakota's juvenile drug courts implemented in May 2000	
13	July 2002	<i>Outcome Evaluation of Ohio's Drug Court Efforts. Final Report. By Edward J. Latessa, Ph.D.; Deborah Koetzle Shaffer; Christopher Lowenkamp. Center for Criminal Justice Research. University of Cincinnati</i>	Study of adult and juvenile drug courts in Ohio to examine their effectiveness; primary focus is on effects of frequent court contacts and community based treatment on recidivism rates	Common Pleas: Sampled 788 drug court participants and 429 comparison group members from Hamilton, Butler, Erie, and Richland Counties Municipal Court: 556 drug court participants and 228 comparison group from Cuyahoga Co., Miami County and City of Akron; Juvenile Court: studied 310 participants and 134 comparison group members from Belmont, Summit and Montgomery Counties	Matched offenders eligible for drug court program re demographic characteristics and presence of substance abuse problem

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

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	Focus of Study	Population Studied	Comparison Group
14	March 2005	<i>Analysis of Oklahoma Drug Courts: Fiscal Years 2002-2004.</i> Oklahoma Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services participants	Analyzed data from 25 adult drug and DUI courts operating in 30 counties in Oklahoma, involving participants who were active July 1, 2001 – June 30, 2004, totaling 2,307 participants; also reviewed data on 161 juvenile participants in 8 juvenile drug courts	161 juvenile participants in 8 drug courts participating during July 1 2001 – June 30, 2004 period	n/a
15	March 2005	<i>Evaluation of the Kalamazoo County Juvenile Drug Treatment Court Program: October 1, 2003 – September 30, 2004 (Year 7)</i> David J. Hartmann, Ph.D. and Kirsten E. DeVall, M.A., Kercher Center for Social Research. Western Michigan University	Compiled demographic info, retention, recidivism rates and progress of participants through drug court program	All participants who were active or entered in Year 7 and all participants in Years 1-7 combined	Juveniles who entered the criminal just system and were qualified for the juvenile drug court program (138 juveniles) for years 1-7)
16	March 2004	State of California Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs. <i>Comprehensive Drug Court Implementation Act of 1999: Interim Report to the Legislature.</i> Kathryn P. Jett, Director	Study mandated by Comprehensive Drug Court Implementation Act (CDCI) of 1999 describing interim programmatic progress achieved	Data collected from January 2001 – June 2003 for “new participants”, participants who completed (“completers”), and those who were terminated (total of 1,041 juveniles admitted to programs; 358 completed	n/a
17	February 2006	<i>Maryland Drug Treatment Courts: Interim Report of the Effectiveness of Juvenile Drug Courts.</i> NPC Research. Portland, Oregon	Interim report on the effectiveness of Maryland’s juvenile drug court	153 participant sample of juveniles placed in Maryland juvenile drug courts between 2001 – 2004 and released prior to December 15, 2004 [excluded juveniles aged 17 or older because potential recidivism would be reflected in adult system rather than juvenile]; 62% males/38% females; 71% white; 28% African American; average participant studied was 15 years old, had two adjudicated charges prior to being placed in juvenile drug court	n/a: compared history of participants one year prior to entering juvenile drug court in terms of adjudicated criminal offenses
18	December 2004	<i>Drug Courts in the State of Wyoming: A Process and Outcome Evaluation. Report to the Wyoming Department of Health, Substance Abuse Division.</i> Laurel Parker West, Ph.D., Tiffany Comer Cook., Wyoming Survey and Analysis Center. University of Wyoming	Study commissioned by the Wyoming Department of Health Substance Abuse Division to show “how the drug court movement is taking shape in Wyoming and to what effect”; studied state’s 9 adult, 6 juvenile and 2 tribal drug courts		N/A

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

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	Focus of Study	Population Studied	Comparison Group
19	February 2006	<i>Christchurch Youth Drug Court Pilot: One year follow-up study.</i> Wendy Searle and Philip Spier	Reoffending by 30 young people who participated in Youth Drug Court Pilot project during its first 12 months of operation	30	Two groups from youth who had convictions in 2002/3.
20	March 2006	<i>Muscogee County Juvenile Drug Court Program Evaluation: October 1, 2001 – August 31, 2005.</i> Robert F. Carlson, Ph.D., Program Evaluator	Primarily a process evaluation but some outcome info (primarily recidivism) provided	140 participants who were active, terminated or graduated from October 1, 2001 – January 31, 2004.	N/A
21	2007	<i>2005/2006 Tennessee Drug Court Annual Report. Office of Criminal Justice Programs. Dept. of Finance and Administration.</i>	Compilation of information submitted by 37 of existing 45 drug courts in the state to annual report of drug court activity and performance according to stated performance measures to be evaluated.	n/a	n/a
22	2007	<i>Wyoming Drug Court Performance Measures Project. National Center for State Courts.</i>	Collected demographic and performance measures data for Wyoming drug courts: retention; sobriety; in program recidivism and units of service for period January 1, 2005-June 30, 2005.	Drug court participants during January 1 – June 30, 2005	n/a
23	2006	<i>Measuring Recidivism in a Juvenile Drug Court: Systematic Outcome Study of a Juvenile drug Court Using Historical Information.</i> Wayne J. Pitts, Ph.D. Dept. of Criminology and Criminal Justice, Univ of Memphis. Pub in the Southwest Journal of Criminal Justice. Volume 3, No. 1.2006	Tracks recidivism and other outcomes for juvenile drug court participants based on both new referrals to juvenile probation as well as new arrests as adults	62 juveniles who exited the program during the period January 1, 2001 and December 31, 2002.	61 Drug court eligible offenders arrested at same time as drug court participants but weren't referred to drug court. Matched group based on sex, race/ethnicity, age, type of referring offense, substance abuse history, geographical location and drug court eligibility criteria
24	August 2006	<i>An Outcome Evaluation of Juvenile Drug Court Using the Child and Adolescent Functional Assessment Scale.</i> Kevin M. Thompson. N. Dakota State University.	To determine effectiveness of treatment for juvenile drug court participants; assess treatment progress differences between juvenile drug court participants and other substance abusing juveniles, particularly in light of weekly sessions before the judge to promote compliance	49 juvenile drug court graduates; 47 terminated;	94 in comparison group – juveniles who had undergone substance abuse treatment in the last three years at four different sites (some hadn't entered drug court because lived in area not served; others had a violent conduct history; all had similar problems

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

PART TWO:

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results			Other Results	System Impact Cost/Benefit
			Re-Arrests/drug use	Convictions	Time Followed		
1	March 31, 2004	Reviewed program information regarding participant demographics, drug use history, recidivism, and other info.	<u>53 graduates:</u> 14 (26%) rearrested, half (7) for drug related offenses 43 terminated: 24 rearrested (56%), 9 for drug-related offenses;	1 graduate (1.8%) convicted of a drug related offense; 5 (11.6%) of those terminated were convicted of a drug related offense	n/a	Cost savings of \$ 28,200.00 for pretrial detention costs that would have been incurred until arraignment hearing. (\$ 200 for 2 days x 141 participants)	
2	February 2004	Analyzed characteristics and performance of 52 youth who entered drug court in Year 6 of its operation, making comparisons, where applicable, with participants of prior years		For participants who had been out of the program for at least one year, there was a decrease in the total number of adjudicated crimes between the pre-program year (180), the in-program period (reduced to 69 – 62%), and the post-program year (reduced to 54-70%)	n/a	Recidivism for participants following one year similar to recidivism of probationer control group – both declined significantly; considered to reflect greater likelihood of success predicted for control group	
3	March 2003	N/A	-12.5% DC -55.6% Control Recidivism is defined as re-arrest.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Recidivism rates for the individual drug courts are shown.
4	May 5, 2002	-tracked rearrests of juveniles during 12 months following their enrollment	2/3 of youth rearrested for new offense within 12 months of program enrollment	N/A	12 months following enrollment		

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

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results			Other Results	System Impact Cost/Benefit
			Re-Arrests/drug use	Convictions	Time Followed		
5	June 10, 2001	Tracked recidivism for 32 participants enrolled in two juvenile drug courts for at least two months for a one year period	16% of juv. Drug court parties recidivated within one year compared with 57% of comparison group		12 months following enrollment (for participants with a minimum of 2 months participation)	Also found that recidivism rate of juv drug court participants was 19% lower than recidivism rate of juveniles referred for first time alcohol violation (2,016 during 1995-97 period), although juv drug court participants had average of 3+ prior referrals, and significantly lower than recidivism rates for 112 juveniles for first offense drug charges; no significant differences for program completers vs. noncompleters though only 11 graduates at the time of the study.	Separate report addresses impact of program participation on school achievement (August 12, 2002), which noted: (1) average GPA increased from 1.78 to 2.08 in two quarters of participation; class periods missed reduced from 73 to 53; and many qualitative improvements, including one student elected to student council; one achieved perfect grade point average; another increased very low ACT score to 82 nd percentile; and a few considering or going to college
6	2000	N/A	6 months -33% DC -33% Comp. 12 months -44% DC -33% Comp. 18 months -55% DC -55% Comp. - Recidivism was measured as re-arrest.	N/A	6 months, 12 months, and 18 months	N/A	N/A
7	February 1999	Individuals were compared within the program using different variables in order to draw conclusions.	180 days -15% overall -11% graduates -21% non-graduates Recidivism defined as re-arrest.	N/A	180 days	- Weakness in case processing- slow and understaffed. - 82% of graduates had “improved rate of functioning”	N/A

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

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results			Other Results	System Impact Cost/Benefit
			Re-Arrests/drug use	Convictions	Time Followed		
8	November 3, 2003	Traced 246 youth admitted to Maine's juvenile Drug Court and compared to matched comparison group, resulting in study of 105 drug court participants; 30 graduates; and 105 comparison groups	Fewer Juvenile drug court participants arrested than control group and graduates least likely to re-offend; juvenile drug court participants less likely than control group to be rearrested for alcohol or drug related offenses, or for felonies or violent crime			Rate of in-program positive drug tests for juvenile drug court participants was lower (24%) than rate of positive drug tests for other youth in Maine's cjs system (35%) Participants who are more frequently tested have lower rates of positive drug tests	Cost of juvenile drug court is \$23.83/day ;, cost for 64 participants was "\$ 853,379 compared with 760,161 for traditional adjudication (93,218 more for the juvenile drug court BUT if increased to 90 clients, would be 44,877 less for the drug court (1,207,579) than traditional process (1,252,456)
9	March 1998	- Initial non-compliance did not result in termination from the program. - Non-compliance during the program was analyzed only.	During Treatment -21% DTC -30% Comp. - Recidivism is defined as a new arrest.	N/A	During treatment, 6,9, and 12 months after treatment	Marijuana was the drug of choice.	N/A

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

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results			Other Results	System Impact Cost/Benefit
			Re-Arrests/drug use	Convictions	Time Followed		
10	December 2004	Review of drug court info and post program rearrest info	<p>Average statewide recidivism rates of juvenile drug court graduates is 12.6% (felonies) and 12.6% (Misdemeanors).</p> <p>Average statewide recidivism rates of juvenile nongraudates (those who withdrew or were expelled from the programs) is 26.9% (felony) and 11.9% (misdemeanor).</p>	n/a	n/a	Significantly lower recidivism for juvenile drug court participants if they complete the treatment program and graduate	n/a

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

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results			Other Results	System Impact Cost/Benefit
			Re-Arrests/drug use	Convictions	Time Followed		
11	August 12, 2002	Compiled two sets of school records: quantitative data on school grades and attendance; qualitative data including comments from teachers and parents re school progress	n/a	n/a	n/a	<p>88% of juvenile drug court participants were enrolled in school at time of admission to drug court: 63% in mainstream school; 30% in alternative school; one was home schooled and several were working on their GED;</p> <p>-average GP! Among participants in 2 quarters preceding drug court was 1.78; in 2 quarters following drug court participation, average GPA increased to 2.08;</p> <p>-attendance records showed decreases in absenteeism (juveniles missed 73 class periods in the 90 days prior to drug court; compared with 53 missed class periods in 90 days following drug court;</p> <p>- teachers assessments were more positive;</p> <p>- one juvenile was elected to student council; one achieved perfect grade point average; another scored in 82nd percentile on the ACT following a very poor score prior to drug court;</p> <p>-several have gone to or are considering college.</p>	n/a

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

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results			Other Results	System Impact Cost/Benefit
			Re-Arrests/drug use	Convictions	Time Followed		
12	November 2004	Tracked recidivism of juvenile drug court participants (graduates and failures) and comparison group four years following drug court participation; used three sources: (1) ND State Court Data Warehouse; (2) Fargo Police tracking system; and ND AS4000 computer.	<u>East Central:</u> 60% (12) of 20 graduates in East Central program charged with adult crime (Class A or higher;52% (13) of 25 terminated participants charged with adult misdemeanor, compared with 44% (19) of comparison group; <u>North East:</u> 21% (5) grds arrested for misd; 17% ; 52% (11) of terminated arrested for misd;_	<u>East Central:</u> 40% (8) graduates and 36% (9) terminated convicted of Class A misdeem or higher; 10% (2) graduates and 12% (3) terminated convicted of felony, compared with 7% comparison group: <u>North East:</u> 17% (4) grads convicted of misd; 33% *7) terminated convicted of misd.; 4 % (1) graduate convicted of felony and 5% (1) terminated convicted of felony compared with 7% (3) comparison group		Current comparison group may skew results because juvenile drug court participants may have more severe needs; better comparison may be with pre-program cjs involvement of participants vs. cjs involvement post program	n/a
13	July 2002	Quasi-experimental matched comparison group design to estimate impact of drug courts on future criminal involvement; evaluated 3 distinct groups of participants: those in Common Pleas Court; Municipal Court; and Juvenile Drug Courts	56% of juvenile drug court participants rearrested vs. 75% of comparison group; predictors of rearrest were gender, prior record and whether the youth participated in the drug court; males, offenders with prior arrests and those not in drug court significantly more likely to be rearrested (62% vs. 78%)			Graduation: 34% of juvenile drug courts graduated	

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

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results			Other Results	System Impact Cost/Benefit
			Re-Arrests/drug use	Convictions	Time Followed		
14	March 2005	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	38 (23.6%) graduated; 23 (14.3%) terminated; 96 (59.6%) active and 4 (2.5%) unknown status	n/a
15	March 2005			Preprogram: 62% drug court participants had committed 125 crimes; postprogram: 25 participants committed 47 crimes; Postprogram: drug court participants committed .77 crimes vs. .83 for control group	One year after leaving program	Retention rate was 51.6% for all seven years combined (compared with 52.6% for Years 1-6); For both year 7 and years 1-7 combined, the number of violations committed by participants while in the program and the number of resulting sanctions decreased with each phase of the program.	
16	March 2004	Review of data compiled by programs				<p>1,041 new juvenile participants admitted; 358 completed;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 90% tested negative -94% of juvenile females who gave birth gave birth to drug free babies (58); -6% (4) gave birth to drug exposed babies -341 juveniles became employed -58 either enrolled or completed parenting classes -189 re-enrolled in school or vocational training -825 reported increasing their school attendance -451 reported increasing their grade point average -57 earned a GED -58 completed vocational or other education program -141 graduated from high school -57 enrolled in post secondary education the siblings of 251 participants reported they were positively affected by participant's participation -juveniles completed 5,333 community service hours 	-358 juvenile drug court completers avoided 83,802 days in custody or institutions during study period; 77% of days avoided (64,521) were in Juvenile Hall; 20% (16,556 days) in group homes, and 3% (2,725 days) in California Youth Authority

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

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results			Other Results	System Impact Cost/Benefit
			Re-Arrests/drug use	Convictions	Time Followed		
17	February 2006	Review of data available in statewide data system for juvenile drug court participants		(1) 153 juveniles responsible for 317 adjudicated charges during year prior to drug court entry but only 70 adjudicated charges in year following drug court entry = reduction of 247 (77%) adjudicate offenders; (2) 75% red. in criminal offenses for “chronic offenders		20% of 153 participant sample were “chronic” offenders (3 or more adjudicated offenses within 12 month period); had 75 -participation in juvenile drug court resulting in reduction in crime been for those who have highest risk of reoffending	Cost per day for all costs (court, public defender, DA, etc.) estimated at \$ 48.96 (Harford County) x 285.5 days (average length of stay) = average cost pre participant is \$ 13,901.00 – compared with \$ 43,593.25 cost for detaining individual per “period of residency” (192.1 days @ \$ 226.93) for nonsecure residential services
18	October 2004	<i>Drug Courts in the State of Wyoming: A Process and Outcome Evaluation. Report to the Wyoming Department of Health, Substance Abuse Division.</i> Laurel Parker West, Ph.D., Tiffany Comer Cook., Wyoming Survey and Analysis Center. University of Wyoming	recidivism rates for juveniles ranged between 4%-39%; recidivism rate for adults ranged from 49% [but not clear whether all programs measure graduates and participants or only graduates]	-	n/a	-Wyoming’s drug courts are implementing effective programs that are producing positive results for participants, their communities and the state as a whole -Adult drug court clients, juvenile clients, parents and local drug court coordinators believe the drug court model is working well for them <u>Program characteristics:</u> -as of January 2004, 110 juvenile drug court participants -age: juveniles: 16 yrs average - gender: male: , 69% juveniles; -race/ethnicity: 74% Caucasian (all) – drug court demographics similar to state’s except that drug court participants are 16% native American vs. 2% of state population - Household Income: 80% less than \$ 30,000yr. (household); 50% less than \$ 10,000 - marijuana was most common drug for juveniles; meth was third most common drug for both adults and juveniles	Drug courts are less costly alternative to traditional incarceration; average cost per day for drug court client is \$ 18.59-25.63; average cost for incarceration for adult is \$ 85.99 and \$ 149.52 for juvenile

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

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results			Other Results	System Impact Cost/Benefit
			Re-Arrests/drug use	Convictions	Time Followed		
19	February 2006	<i>Reviewed records of 30 participants in pilot drug court and compared them with two groups of similarly situated youth convicted during 2002-2003.</i>	[Before entering YDC, the 30 participants had average of 15 (median of 11) prior convictions, almost all entailed a property offense and over half had a prior violent offense, and less than a quarter had a prior drug offense. All but one (97%) had committed a prior offense of at least moderate seriousness prior to the drug court;] -80% of participants accumulated further offenses and 20% accumulated at least 10 offenses; - 60% committed another offense within 6 months of leaving YDC and 70% reoffended within one year. The average number of offenses for each participant within 12 months of leaving YDC was 6.2, and median was 2.0 - half committed a property offense	-	12 months following termination	-YDC sample slightly less likely to commit violent offense and slightly more likely to commit property, drug or traffic offense but differences not statistically significant. - rate of reoffending and seriousness of offending by YDC participants reduced significantly after existing the drug court compared with levels prior to entry - noted a number of good practices, including (1) continuity of judge; need for closer monitoring of participants re compliance with court orders; need for services that involve families/partners and friends to they can learn skills and encourage youth to keep using them; need to involve youth in range of positive, socially normal activities to replace alcohol and drug	

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

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results			Other Results	System Impact Cost/Benefit
			Re-Arrests/drug use	Convictions	Time Followed		
19			*participants who successfully completed YDC had lower reoffending rates after program than noncompleters	-			

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

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results			Other Results	System Impact Cost/Benefit
			Re-Arrests/drug use	Convictions	Time Followed		
20	March 2006	<i>Reviewed records of 334 participants who had been active (101), terminated (124) or graduated (109) from October 1, 2001-January 31, 2004 for patterns of delinquency prior to admission to drug court, during court participations , and up to 6 months following termination (if participant was in drug court for less than six month, period for prior criminal history limited to equal number of months in drug court)</i>	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> --Misdemeanors most prevalent charge - Prior to Drug court: misdemeanors most prevalent conviction (39%)- - During Drug Court: misdemeanors most prevalent (50%); and - Following Drug Court (57%) - Drug Charges (Misd and fel) accounted for 23% prior offenses, 15% of offenses during participation, and none of the charges following completion. - Marked reduction in recidivism for active participants and graduates - 94% decrease in convictions for active participants --93% decrease in convictions for completers -of the 32 participants terminated, 19 re-offended after leaving - 6% of graduates reoffended - only 6% of graduates received additional charges after graduation and only one was a drug related offense 	6 months following termination	<p>Empirical evidence that drug court participation led to substantial reengagement in education al process:</p> <p>(1) of 129 graduates, 40% (52) were enrolled and attending classes at time of admission; 20 weren't attending school; 57 were in alternative school</p> <p>(2) at graduation , 80% were enrolled in regular classes and 17% were working or obtained GED; only 3% of participants in alternative school.</p>	

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

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results			Other Results	System Impact Cost/Benefit
			Re-Arrests/drug use	Convictions	Time Followed		
21	2007	Compilation of information submitted by 37 of existing 45 drug courts in the state to annual report of drug court activity and performance according to stated performance measures to be evaluated.	-Four juv . drug courts in Tenn reported overall 30% one-year post graduation recidivism and 3% 2-year post graduation recidivism		1 year and 2 years following graduation		
22	2007	Compiled data from existing adult (and juvenile—reported separately) programs	-Rearrests: 51.4% (terminated); graduates: 27.9%		Jan. 1 – June 20, 2005	Drug test: 3.8% of graduates had positive results; 15.9% of terminated/withdrawals -status: graduates: 45%; active: 30%; terminated: 15%; absconded: 10% -gender: 53% male; 47% female -age at admission: 15.5years -average days between admission and exit from program: 389 -Caucasian: 62%; Native American: 35 % -grades: 9-11 th grade: 76% no prior substance abuse treatment: 73% no more than 2 prior arrests in prior year: 63% -charge: drug possession (88%) -primary drug: alcohol: 96%; marijuana: 94%; meth: 23%	

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

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results			Other Results	System Impact Cost/Benefit
			Re-Arrests/drug use	Convictions	Time Followed		
23	2006	Reviewed data provided by NM Children, Youth and Families Department for juveniles whose probation ended during the study period; reviewed closed files of juveniles handled by the San Juan Co. Juvenile Probation Office; compiled recidivism data for drug court and comparison group youth for minimum of 16 months following program exit	Drug court participants had lower percent of new arrests for both juvenile and adult offenses regardless of whether they graduated		16 months minimum	Educational Status at time of intake: - 90% of drug court participants enrolled in school vs 50% of comparison group residential status -most drug court participants living at home with one or both parents at time of intake vs, large percentage of comparison group not living with a parent	

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

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results			Other Results	System Impact Cost/Benefit
			Re-Arrests/drug use	Convictions	Time Followed		
24	August 2006	Licensed addiction counselors completed Child and Adolescent Functional Assessment scale on each juvenile to identify emotional, behavioral or substance us disorders: seven subscales used: school performance; home functioning; delinquency; behavior toward others; moods/emotions; substance use; and family/social support				<p>All three groups (graduates, comparison or terminated) made substantial progress during first 90 days of treatment; following 90 days,</p> <p>Drug court graduates continue to make substantial treatment gains;</p> <p>Comparison groups made modest gains and</p> <p>Terminated participants either stalled or regressed—may need continued structure after 90 days; may also be dealing with new issues once they have stopped using drugs</p> <p>Being dually diagnosed had only weak impact on treatment outcome</p> <p>Youth with little family support and/or widespread family conflict made little treatment progress – may need family services and more intensive treatment; Additional academic support/resources important after 90 days in treatment Juvenile drug court is clearly effective for those who complete the program</p>	