

Warren Drug Court Program Process Evaluation

July 22, 1999

Warren Drug Court Program Process Evaluation

Prepared by

TK Logan, Katie Williams and Carl Leukefeld

**Center on Drug and Alcohol Research
University of Kentucky
643 Maxwellton Court
Lexington, KY 40506-0350**

606-257-8248

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	6
Program Description and Background	9
Program Goals	10
Recruitment and Screening	13
Capacity	14
Treatment Programming	15
Treatment Modalities Used	19
Relapse Patterns	23
Client Monitoring	23
Aftercare	24
Information Capabilities and Reporting	25
Funding	25
Evaluation	26
Major Problems Encountered	26
Program Strengths	26
Potential Program Changes	26
Advice to Other Drug Courts	27
Staff Characteristics	28
Community Agencies	30
Client Characteristics	32
Graduates and Dropouts	34
Case Studies	36
Perceptions	
Judge	38
Staff	41
Client	44
Treatment	58
Defense	51
Jail	53
Probation and Parole	54
Police	56
Prosecution	57
Conclusions	58

Index of Tables

Table 1—Key Components	10
Table 2—Program Goals and Measures	11
Table 3—Client Goals	13
Table 4—Treatment Modalities	19
Table 5—Summary of Client Contact with Program Components	22
Table 6—Graduations	24
Table 7—Staff Roles	28
Table 8—Tasks by Staff Position	28
Table 9—Advisory Board Members	29
Table 10—Community Linkages	30
Table 11—Clients Ever Admitted to the Drug Court Program by Year	32
Table 12—Client Characteristics for Fiscal Year 1998	32
Table 13—Summary of Program Exits	34
Table 14—First Cohort of Drug Court Clients	35
Table 15—Client Perceptions about the Importance of Program Components	45
Table 16—Participating Treatment Facilities	48
Table 17—Process Evaluation Methodology	62

Index of Appendices

Appendix A—Methodology

Appendix B—Newspaper Articles

Appendix C—Drug Court Brochures

Appendix D—ASI Client Examples

Appendix E—Client Calendar Examples

Appendix F—Monthly Report Examples

Appendix G—Quarterly Report Examples

Appendix H—Program Manuals

Executive Summary

The purpose of this report is to provide the results of a process evaluation of the Warren Drug Court. This comprehensive process evaluation included a six hour interview with the treatment coordinator of the Drug Court program, one-to-two-hour interviews with the two Judges involved in the Warren Drug Court program, surveys of eight randomly selected active clients, two Drug Court staff members, four community treatment providers, three defense attorneys, one prosecuting attorney, two representatives from the Probation and Parole office, two representatives from the Warren County Jail, and two Bowling Green Police Department representatives. In all, 23 different individuals representing 10 different agency perspectives provided information about the Warren Drug Court program for this report.

The data for this report is for the period from April 9, 1997 to December 31, 1998.

The Warren Drug Court program was established in 1997 and the first client entered the Warren Drug Court program on April 9, 1997. The mission of Kentucky's Drug Courts is to create a criminal justice environment that stops illicit drug use and related criminal activity and promotes recovery. In the program model developed in Warren County, defendants are accepted into the program by probation referrals made by the sentencing Judge.

The average time spent in the program before graduation is one to two years. Graduations occur quarterly each year in the Warren Drug Court program. As of April 9, 1999, 46 people have graduated from the Warren Drug Court program.

Program Goal Achievement. The Warren Drug Court program has six primary overall goals: promote abstinence; decrease recidivism; increase community safety; increase life skills; increase community awareness; and expand and maintain resource base. Highlights of goal achievement for the Warren Drug Court include only .8% of the 2,178 urine screens were positive and only .03% of participants were rearrested in the last quarter. Before entering the Drug Court program, 69% of participants were employed full-time and 6% were employed part-time; after entering the Drug Court program, 97% of participants were working full-time. Further, five articles have appeared in the local newspaper specifically referring to the Warren Drug Court. In addition, Drug Court staff and Judges have spoken at various community and civic groups, at the Kentucky School of Alcohol and Other Drug Studies, and at a Drug Court training session about the Drug Court program. And, the Drug Court program is currently working with approximately 16 different state and community based organizations.

Drug Court Judge and Staff. Currently there are two Drug Court Judges in the Warren Drug Court program. Judge Minton was involved with the planning of the Warren Drug Court program, but Judge Lewis took the first group of Drug Court clients. Judge Minton has worked with the program for nearly 18 months. The Drug Court program has four staff members with experience in substance abuse ranging from 1-½ years to 11 years. The average time of staff experience specifically with the Warren Drug Court program is one year.

Drug Court Clients. Current clients are 73% white and 26% African-American. Also, clients are an average age of 26 with ages ranging from 18-52 years old. Approximately 22% of the clients have children. Before entering Drug Court, 69% were employed full-time and 6%

were employed part-time; after entering the Drug Court program, 97% were working full-time. The average years of drug use for clients was 8 ½ years and approximately 50% of clients had been in prior treatment before entering the Drug Court program. Participants had an average of 5 prior charges and had spent an average of 6 months in jail/prison in their lifetime. Out of the first group of Drug Court clients, 42% graduated and 56% exited the program before graduation.

Additional Services. Services that respondents would like to see the Drug Court program offer included: (1) More defined and organized aftercare services; (2) An additional component for working with families of drug addicts could be useful for clients; (3) Expanding the Drug Court program to work with juveniles and alcoholics; and, (4) Expanding the staff in order to expand the client base.

Strengths. Each participant was asked about their perceived strengths of the program as well as the things that they believed needed to change. The following are some of the strengths mentioned by respondents: (1) Court monitoring, (2) Drug Screening, (3) Immediate sanctions, (4) Program requirement of either employment or enrollment in an educational program, (5) Good employee base, (6) Organization, (7) Good tracking of jailed clients, (8) More intensive drug education and treatment, (9) Staff support, (10) Introduction to 12-step programs, (11) Employment opportunities, and (12) Greater self-esteem.

Suggested Improvements. The following are improvements suggested by the respondents: (1) Educate the public and law enforcement agencies about the Drug Court program, (2) More help for clients instead of putting people in jail for non-crime type of things like missing a urine test, (3) Clients pay fees for the Drug Court program, (4) More orientation of clients as to what the clients are to expect in treatment, (5) Publish lists of current and past clients and distribute to the prosecutor and law enforcement agencies, (6) Be able to access Seven Counties treatment program in Jefferson County, (7) More community involvement, and (8) Uniform sanctions for all clients to be used by both Judges.

A major issue listed by several respondents was the need to establish a clearly defined protocol for the Drug Court program, such as Drug Court eligibility requirements and exclusions. Many respondents indicated that drug traffickers were not intended to be a part of the program, but that some traffickers had been accepted into the program.

Advice to new Drug Court Programs. Respondents were also asked what advice they would give to new Drug Court programs. Their responses included: (1) “Work with the Drug Court,” (2) Follow up on prior clients and monitor the adherence rate to guidelines for the Drug Court program, (3) Only give clients a certain number of times to have a positive drug screen, (4) Consider work and family progress, (5) Clarify the referral process and coordinate appointment services for clients, (6) Be prepared for changes in the judicial role, and (7) Do not be afraid to take some chances with more hardcore criminals; do not limit the clients because of a desired success rate.

Concluding Comments. The following were concluding responses by various respondents. Although these are concluding comments, they also are excellent summaries of what respondents think about the Drug Court program. Probation and Parole Officers stated that

they felt “the Warren Drug Court program is meeting the need of some of our most severe addicts,” and “Drug Court is a great idea if people have the will to use it as designed.” One staff member stated, “It’s a good program, and changes lives.” Responses from clients included “I like being clean, but the things we have to put up with is crazy,” “The Drug Court program helps a lot of people and we appreciate the concern you had for us, but changing rules all the time and talking smart is just acting power hungry to me, and “Like the set-up and glad that you kept me out of trouble. Thank you.” The prosecutor stated, “We have a well-trained staff in our local Drug Court. They are efficient, professional, and go the extra mile to ensure the success of the participants. Because of their hard work, I feel our Drug Court will be successful.”

Summary. In summary, the Warren Drug Court program was established approximately two years ago. This program is based on the *Key Components* and has three program phases, which take an average client approximately 18 months to complete. As of December 1998, there were 68 active clients, over 97% of the clients are maintaining full-time employment compared to approximately 69% who had full-time employment before entering the program. In addition, as of April 19, 1999, the program had 46 graduates.

The most compelling aspects of the Drug Court program are the immediate sanctions that clients are given when the program rules are violated. This aspect serves both as a motivator as well as promoting consequences for behavior. Another compelling aspect of the Drug Court program is the judicial involvement. This aspect of the program is particularly important for several reasons. One reason is that it shows the clients that someone cares about them on a regular basis. A second reason is that the Judge separates the punishment process from the support that the Drug Court staff give the clients. A third reason is that the Judges in the Warren Drug Court believe they are part of a treatment team and this treatment team approach changes the clients lives. Judges also believe this program is truly an opportunity to do something meaningful for both the clients and the community.

In conclusion, this program has had some difficult problems that they seem to have successfully overcome and some problems they are committed to working on consistently until they are overcome. All of the respondents indicated this program is making a real difference in the lives of the clients. Staff are committed and the Judges provide an overwhelmingly supportive environment for this program and the clients they serve. In addition to overcoming the difficulties during implementation and being committed to the clients, this program is committed to working with the community, fits well into the local community, and has been successful in meeting the program goals. The program also follows the principles from the *Key Components* closely on both a daily basis and has future ideas and plans that will make the program even better in a number of ways.

Program Description and Background

The motto for the Kentucky Drug Courts is “A chance... a change.” Kentucky’s Drug Courts are aligned with more than 200 Drug Courts across the United States. During Fiscal Year 1998, Warren County had 1,778 drug arrests.¹ In response to the rising costs of incarceration and increased drug related arrests, a Drug Court based on the Administrative Office of the Courts model was established in Warren County in 1997.

Warren County “is located in the Pennyryle and Western Coal Field regions of the state.”² According to the 1990 census, Warren County is 53% urban.³ The estimated population for Warren County in 1998 was 87,323.⁴

The first client began the Warren Drug Court program on April 9, 1997. Clients meet with Drug Court staff and treatment groups at the Drug Court office at 414 East 10th Street, Bowling Green, Kentucky 42101 or at the old courthouse across the street from the Drug Court office. The Drug Court program hours are from 8:00 a.m. to 6:30 p.m. Monday through Thursday and 8:00 a.m. to 4 p.m. on Fridays. Drug Court staff rotate their on-call availability and clients can reach a member of the Drug Court staff at any time. The Warren Drug Court currently serves anyone arrested or indicted in Warren County who meet other eligibility requirements. However, the program has expanded to a point where residence in Warren County may become a requirement for program eligibility.

Two Judges are involved with the Warren Drug Court. Judge Minton was involved with the planning of the Warren Drug Court, and Judge Lewis oversaw the first group of clients. Judge Minton has worked with the active program for nearly 18 months. Judge Minton has been to several meetings concerning the Drug Court program in Lexington. One seminar involved alternative sentencing programs and how they relate to the Drug Court program. The other conference was specifically geared toward the Drug Court program. Law enforcement personnel, lawyers, and Judges from around the State and the nation attended the seminar. Judge Lewis listed his experience as a prosecutor and as a Judge as training for the Warren Drug Court program.

The Warren Drug Court program is grounded in the Key Components described in the 1997 publication *Defining Drug Courts: The Key Components*⁵. The overall mission of Drug Courts is to stop the abuse of alcohol and other drugs and related criminal activity. In exchange for successful completion of the treatment program, the court may dismiss the original charge, reduce or set aside a sentence, offer some lesser penalty, or offer a combination of these. Drug Courts transform the roles of both criminal and justice practitioners and Alcohol and Other Drug treatment providers. The Judge is the central figure in a team effort that focuses on sobriety and accountability as primary goals. To ensure the primary goals are met, the Drug Court Standards

¹ Count of Drug and Non-Drug Offense Charges by County for Fiscal Year 1998. Research and Statistics Department of the Administrative Office of the Courts.

² <http://www.uky.edu/KentuckyAtlas/21227.html>

³ <http://www.lrc.state.ky.us/other/econ/counties/WARREN/censoc.txt>

⁴ http://www.census.gov/population/estimates/county/co-98-1/98C1_21.txt

⁵ *Defining Drug Courts: The Key Components* (January, 1997). U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Drug Courts Programs Office.

Committee developed some key components for all Drug Court programs. The key components as described in the 1997 *Defining Drug Courts: The Key Components*, are:

Table 1. Key Components

1. Drug Courts integrate alcohol and other drug treatment services within the justice system case processing.
2. Using a non-adversarial approach, prosecution and defense counsel promote public safety while protecting participants' due process rights.
3. Eligible participants are identified early and promptly placed in the Drug Court program.
4. Drug Courts provide access to a continuum of alcohol, drug, and other related treatment and rehabilitation services.
5. Abstinence is monitored by frequent alcohol and other drug testing.
6. A coordinated strategy governs Drug Court responses to participants' compliance.
7. Ongoing Judicial interaction with each Drug Court participant is essential.
8. Monitoring and evaluation measure the achievement of program goals and gage effectiveness.
9. Continuing interdisciplinary education promotes effective Drug Court planning, implementation, and operations.
10. Forging partnerships among Drug Courts, public agencies, and community-based organizations generates local support and enhances Drug Court effectiveness.

The Warren Drug Court program is modeled on the Fayette Drug Court program. However, there are some differences. Warren Drug Court serves a more rural population than the Fayette Drug Court program. The Warren Drug Court only serves probation track clients and these clients are placed back on probation for a short period of time after graduation from the Drug Court program. The Warren Drug Court program provides 12 weeks of aftercare for Drug Court clients. Fayette Drug Court clients were 67% African-American during Fiscal Year 1998 and Warren Drug Court clients were 73% white during Fiscal Year 1998.

Program Goals

In addition to the Key Components, the Administrative Office of the Courts has set a number of goals for the Warren Drug Court program. The following are the goals or benchmarks for goal achievement:

Table 2. Program Goals and Measures

Program Goals	Measures for Goal Achievement
1. Promote abstinence	Drug free babies; clean drug screens, number of meetings attended (AA/NA, treatment groups, education, case specialist meetings)
2. Decrease recidivism	# Re-arrests while in program and after graduation (tracked with Courtnet, a daily jail list, and arraignments are monitored daily as well)
3. Community safety	Lower community drug arrests; lower property crime
4. Increase life skills	Court approved housing; court approved employment; education level of clients; gaining/keeping custody of children
5. Community awareness	# Media contacts; national recognition; additional funding; requests to speak; more referrals
6. Expand and maintain resource base	Expanding and maintaining the number of agencies the Drug Court program can refer clients to or who work with the Drug Court program

Program Goal Achievement. Indicators for each of the program goals described in Table 2 are listed below.

1. Promote Abstinence

Data from the fourth quarter report for the second year, October 1-December 31, 1998, indicate that:

- 2,178 urine screens were conducted and 42 patches applied and only .8% were positive.
- 203 individual counseling/treatment sessions were held.
- 102 group sessions were conducted.
- 25 family sessions were conducted.
- 25 Drug Court sessions were held with the two Judges involved in the program.
- 608 participant appearances were made at the Drug Court sessions.

2. Decrease Recidivism

Data from the fourth quarter report for the second year, October 1-December 31, 1998, indicate that:

- 12 participants were promoted from Phase I to Phase II.
- 17 participants were promoted from Phase II to Phase III.
- 15 participants graduated from the program.
- Only 3 of the active participants were re-arrested, two of which were misdemeanors.

3. Community Safety

Community safety is a long-term goal of the program and has not yet been measured. However, it should be noted that for the period of time that clients are in the Drug Court program (approximately one to two years), clients are closely supervised. During this supervision period

there are very few new arrests, few dirty drug screens, the majority of the clients are employed full-time, the majority of clients are paying child support or caring for their children, and the majority are paying any other debts they may have incurred. This close supervision contributes in a substantial way to the community safety.

4. Increase Life Skills

Data from the fourth quarter report for the second year, October 1-December 31, 1988, indicate that:

- 2 participants continued to attend either GED classes or high school.
- 3 participants continued to attend vocational school.
- 3 participants were enrolled in or attending college classes.
- 82 participants obtained/maintained employment.
- In Fiscal Year 1998, before entering the Drug Court program 69% of participants were employed full-time and 6% were employed part-time; after entering the Drug Court program, 97% were working full-time.

5. Community Awareness

- 5 articles in the local newspaper specifically referring to the Warren Drug Court have been published since Drug Court began (see Appendix B).
- Drug Court staff and Judges have also spoken at various community and civic groups, at the Kentucky School of Alcohol and Other Drug Studies, and at a Drug Court training about the Drug Court program.

6. Expanding and Maintaining Resource Base

Services and coordination with other community organizations in the fourth quarter of the second year (October 1-December 31, 1998) included:

- The Barren River District Health Department (AIDS education, Sexually Transmitted Disease testing, Pregnancy testing)
- The Barren River Area Safe Space
- Community Action Adult education
- Salvation Army Halfway Back House
- Chrysalis House
- Schwartz Center
- LifeSkills Industries
- Narcotics Anonymous
- Alcoholics Anonymous
- LifeSkills, Inc. (Depression counseling and medication)
- Department of Employment Services
- Quality Temporaries
- L.E.A.P. (Let's Eliminate A Problem)

- Housing Authority
- Western Kentucky University
- Dynamic Analytic Solutions (Contract for urine testing services)

Warren Drug Court Goals. Goals developed by the Warren Drug Court treatment coordinator include more individualization of treatment programming for each client and a GED requirement for more clients. A third goal of the treatment coordinator is to see that the new Strengthening Families program is successful.

Client Goals. The following overall client program goals are printed in the client handbook.

Table 3. Client Goals

1.	To learn to be drug free.
2.	To learn better ways of coping with life.
3.	To adjust to a drug-free lifestyle.
4.	To develop a non-criminal pattern of living.
5.	To enhance employment skills through vocational training and educational pursuits.
6.	To attend NA/AA and other support groups.
7.	To increase social skills.
8.	To enhance self-esteem and self-motivation.
9.	To learn the warning signs of relapse and develop a relapse prevention plan.

Recruitment and Screening

Drug Court clients are all referred to the program by one of the two Judges. Clients typically learn about the Drug Court program through several means: (1) Judges, (2) Defense council, and/or (3) Word of mouth.

Currently, the Warren Drug Court only admits clients through a probation track. A client is eligible after the treatment coordinator has completed the Addiction Severity Index (ASI) and a set list of questions developed by the treatment coordinator to assess the client’s level of chemical dependency (See Appendix D for ASI examples and the treatment provider’s list of questions) The criteria for program eligibility include (1) Non-violent history, (2) Current charges must be drug related, and (3) Judge’s consent.

A case may be assigned to Drug Court in lieu of State-supervised probation from Circuit Court. Additionally, for defendants who have violated conditions of traditional probation, Drug Court may be incorporated as an alternative to revocation. After examining the facts of the case and speaking with the defendant and attorney, the sentencing Judge may decide the defendant’s criminal charges may have stemmed from substance abuse and they are referred for further assessment. An order of referral for assessment by Drug Court is then issued and based on the evaluation; the sentencing Judge may allow the defendant to complete the program in lieu of traditional probation. Eligibility assessment takes place within 48 hours of receiving a referral

from the Judge. Participants have usually entered a guilty plea at this time. Eligibility assessment is conducted either at the jail or in the Drug Court office.

When it has been determined that defendant has no prior violent criminal history, a meeting is scheduled to explain the program, sign the Agreement of Participation, obtain preliminary information, conduct an ASI, and schedule a drug test. Based on the information obtained, a notice of eligibility is forwarded to the referring Judge who makes the final determination of whether a defendant will be given the option of participating in Drug Court. If the defendant is interested in participating, the case is transferred to Drug Court after sentencing. Some cases are transferred to the Drug Court program before sentencing.

When a probation case is accepted into the Drug Court program, a Drug Court case specialist is assigned to him or her. The Division of Probation and Parole is notified and the Drug Court staff maintains all supervision. The Case Specialist and the client develop a payment plan if the client is required to make restitution, if the client owes child support, or if the client has incurred court costs. Standard supervision fees required by Probation and Parole are not applicable. Upon successful completion of Drug Court probation cases, the Drug Court may conditionally discharge participants from the remainder of the probation sentence.

Changes in Recruitment and Screening. Since the Warren Drug Court program began, changes have been made to the screening process. Potential clients must have fewer than two felonies and the program has eliminated all violent offenders with the exception of those who have committed fourth degree misdemeanor assaults. This requirement meets the federal grant prohibition against the acceptance of violent offenders.⁶

Capacity

Clients enter the program separately whenever the next space becomes available. However, Judicial discretion may direct the candidacy or non-candidacy of certain individuals. The maximum number of clients in the Drug Court program is between 75 and 100. However, there has not, to date, been a waiting list for the Warren Drug Court.

Timing. It can take anywhere from one day to three months from initial eligibility to entrance into the program. Some clients are required to serve some time incarcerated for prior charges before they can enter the program. Within the space of one week, a client is tested for drugs, assessed for eligibility, the results of this assessment are given to the Judge for the final decision, the client appears in his or her first Drug Court session, and an Individualized Program Plan is developed. A client has first contact with a treatment provider within a week after eligibility assessment and development of the IPP. Usually everything is completed within one week.

⁶ The definition of a violent offender is a person who fits either of the following criteria: (a) is charges with or convicted of an offense, during the course of which (i) the person carried, possessed, or used a firearm or other dangerous weapon; (ii) there occurred the use of force against the person of another; or (iii) there occurred the death of, or serious bodily injury to, any person; without regard to whether proof of any of the elements described herein is required to convict, or (b) has been previously convicted of a felony crime of violence involving the use of attempted use of force against a person with intent to cause death or serious bodily harm.

Treatment Programming

Potential clients must undergo an assessment to establish drug dependency and a history of drug use. The Warren Drug Court treatment coordinator administers the Addiction Severity Index (ASI). The ASI⁷ is a multidimensional instrument used to diagnose, evaluate, and assess change in a client's drug abuse patterns. It identifies personal and family background, current status, and problems in six domains including medical status, employment/support status, drug/alcohol use, legal status, family/social relationships, and psychiatric status. The ASI is a computerized assessment tool based upon the concept that successful treatment of drug offenders must address problems which may have contributed to their drug dependency. It takes approximately forty-five minutes to administer. The treatment coordinator also administers an additional set of questions to assess program eligibility. This set of questions is based on the DSM-IV criteria for drug abuse and dependency. The ASI and the second set of questions are used for assessment of risk and needs, as well as for program assessment. These instruments help to determine mental health of the client and abuse and child safety.

Orientation. Orientation sessions are conducted for groups and individual sessions are provided on an individual basis if more specific explanation is needed.

Program Documentation. Each client receives a participant handbook. This handbook describes the program, the expected goals for each client, cost and payments, participant rules, program requirements, individual, group and family counseling, chemical dependency education, support groups, incarceration, employment, the vocational/job training component, vocational rehabilitation, random drug screens, discharge, graduation, and program hours. In addition, each participant signs an Agreement of Participation, which describes program expectations, and they receive an assignment sheet which lists meeting times, journal topics, and other homework assignments.

Individual Program Plans (IPP). An initial step at Drug Court entry is the development of individualized program plans (IPPs) for each client. The plans outline specific responsibilities and goals with timetables. The plans may include group, family, and individual counseling; frequent and random drug testing; educational and vocational training; and health and community activities. As the client moves through the program and the IPPs are updated at each new phase, the client has more input into the development of his or her own plan. IPPs can also be updated with a crisis in the client's life. Defining psychosocial factors—family life, relationships, level of addiction, and court involvement—help determine how an IPP will be developed. Also included in each client's IPP are the ASI results, any child support and any other court costs owed, any client involvement with the Department of Social Services, and any personal counselors that the client already sees.

IPPs are reviewed and modified as the client moves to a higher phase, or when a client is demoted to an earlier phase. Drug Court staff, the case manager, the Judge, the client's probation officer and the client can all work at updating and evaluating the client's IPP. IPPs

⁷ NIDA (1995). "Assessing Client Need Using the ASI: A Handbook for Program Administrators." U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, National Institutes of Health. NIH Publication No. 95-3619.

vary between clients, but not as much as the treatment coordinator would like. IPPs also differ by gender and by race. The Warren Drug Court tries to separate the clients into treatment groups based on their gender and there is a young African-American male group.

Phase I takes a minimum of one month to complete. There is no maximum time set on any of the phases, but most clients take approximately six weeks to complete the first phase. During this phase, clients are required to provide three random drug screens per week, to attend five AA/NA meetings per week, to attend one group session per week, to attend any individual or family sessions as needed, to attend one Drug Court session per week, to pay any child support, to maintain Court-approved stable housing, to maintain Court-approved employment, training, and/or education referrals, and to write daily journal assignments. During each phase, clients can choose the AA/NA meetings that they will attend, but there is one mandatory meeting on Tuesday evenings.

Phase II takes a minimum of eight months to complete. Most clients complete the second phase in the minimum amount of time. During this phase, clients are required to provide two random drug screens per week, to attend four mandatory AA/NA meetings per week, to attend one group session per week, to attend any individual or family sessions as needed, to attend one Drug Court session every other week, to pay any child support, to maintain Court-approved stable housing, to maintain Court-approved employment, training, and/or education referrals, to write daily journal assignments, to read a book every two weeks and turn in a report to the Judge, to do at least one good deed every week and include a report of these good deeds with the journal assignments, and to obtain or maintain an approved NA sponsor and maintain regular contact.

Phase III takes a minimum of three months to complete. Most clients complete Phase III within five months. To complete this final phase, a client is required to provide one urine drug screen per week, to attend four AA/NA meetings per week, to attend one group counseling session, to attend any individual or family sessions, to write daily journal assignments, to read a book and turn in a report to the Judge, to write a journal entry about at least one good deed, to attend one Drug Court session per month, to pay any child support, to maintain Court-approved stable housing, to maintain Court-approved employment, training, and/or education referrals, and to maintain a full-time NA sponsor and have regular contact with this sponsor.

Drug Court Sessions. The Drug Court program is in a single jurisdiction and participants are seen on a Drug Court calendar. Between thirteen and thirty-five clients appear at a Drug Court session at any given time. This variation in numbers of clients seen at one time stems from the fact that one Judge generally sees fewer clients in his sessions than does the other Drug Court Judge. Sessions are held weekly and each client is assigned to a specific Judge. Clients stay with that assignment throughout the program. Drug Court staff provide case notes for each client before each court session. The Drug Court Judge reviews the participant files and participants are held accountable for successes or failures. Staff and Judges meet before each session to discuss any issues with or successes of clients. Although the Judge reviews written reports from Drug Court staff, clients report directly to the Drug Court Judge in Court, explaining successes and failures. It is during the Drug Court sessions that the Drug Court Judge rewards successes and sanctions clients for non-compliance.

Warren Process Evaluation

In general, Drug Court sessions last one hour and participants are required to stay the entire hour. Each client goes before the Judge in the following order: those appearing for progress reports are first, those to be admitted into the program are second, and those in custody for an act of non-compliance are last. Participants are seen on a regular basis at Drug Court sessions with required attendance decreasing as a client moves through the phases. However, clients can be seen on an intermittent basis if immediate sanctioning is needed.

Program Rules. Participants have specific rules they are required to follow while participating in the Drug Court program. These rules include:

1. Appropriate clothing is expected at all times. Sunglasses are not allowed to be worn inside the Drug Court Center or Court unless approved. Clothing bearing drug or alcohol-related themes, or promoting or advertising alcohol or drug use is not allowed. No gang colors or clothing can be worn.
2. Attendance at all scheduled group, individual, and family counseling sessions, educational sessions and Court sessions is mandatory, unless prior approval is obtained. The client must arrive on time and not leave until the meeting is over. If the client is late, they are not allowed to attend the session and may be considered absent.
3. The following actions are not tolerated by clients while they are in the Drug Court program: violence or threats of any kind; use and/or possession of drugs and/or alcohol; belligerent behavior; possession of any type of weapon; inappropriate sexual behavior or harassment.
4. No loitering of family and/or friends is allowed on the premises. If they provide transportation for the client, they are expected to drop them off and pick them up at the end of the session.
5. Clients are not allowed to carry beepers or cellular phones to Court or group sessions.
6. All participants must notify staff of any arrest or court obligations.
7. The program must comply with KRS 620.030 regarding the reporting of cases of abuse or neglect of minors. The program must also comply with KRS 209.030 regarding the reporting of cases of abuse and neglect of adults. Federal law and regulations do not protect any information about suspected child abuse or neglect from being reported under state law to appropriate state or local authorities.
8. Clients are expected to maintain appropriate behavior at all times during Drug Court sessions and while in the courthouse. Clients must address the Judge with respect. Unless prior approval is given, clients are expected to remain for the entire proceeding, refrain from talking while seated, and show support and encouragement to fellow participants by applause, but only during appropriate times.

9. Use of prescription medications is monitored and verified by a physician and must be approved.

In addition, although all sessions and responsibilities to participate in the Drug Court program may require transportation and child care, the Drug Court program provides neither service.

Employment. Drug Court clients are required to obtain and maintain full-time employment throughout the program. Exceptions are full-time students, or those who have been determined by a physician to be physically or mentally incapable of full-time employment. Participants are permitted to change jobs while in the program; however, staff must be notified prior to the change. If a client loses a job while in the program, they are given a time frame to locate other appropriate employment. Drug Court staff may assist clients by referring them to Vocational Rehabilitation or various temporary agencies, such as Ahead Staffing, Ready Staffing, and Quality Temporary. Drug Court staff also help clients by keeping a file of job listings from the local newspaper. If a client is unemployed, they are required to complete 20 hours of community service per week. If a client continues to be non-compliant with the employment requirement, the Judge may incarcerate the client for a short period of time. Program staff routinely verifies employment either through phone contact with the employer or copies of paycheck stubs. On-site visits may also be conducted. In the event of incarceration, the client's direct supervisor will confirm all work release schedules.

Education. Clients with less than a high school degree or GED and those who are unemployed or underemployed are expected to work on developing their educational skills. The Drug Court staff often help by: assessing current skills; aptitude and interest testing; development of a personal action plan; life skills seminars; adult education referrals; job and interview counseling; and, job search skills. Also, a representative from the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation is available to program participants. Vocational Rehabilitation offers services including career counseling, training placement, job placement, and various educational opportunities.

Housing. Clients are required to reside in or find Court-approved housing. Often clients have been living with other substance abusers. This environment can hamper sobriety efforts and is often particularly difficult for Drug Court clients to remain in their previous using context. Drug Court clients are encouraged to reduce contact with old friends, places, and habits. This may include a change in relationships and home environment. An assessment of how critical it may be for the client to leave their current housing is incorporated into the Individual Program Plan. Case specialists conduct housing verification by either contacting the landlord/landlady or by site visits. Drug Court staff refer clients to the Bowling Green Housing Authority and to Community Action for help in finding appropriate housing. Often clients are referred to recovery homes.

Treatment Modalities Used

The Warren Drug Court provides the majority of treatment services for clients. As indicated in the Table below, there are a number of different treatment and program modalities that are integrated and used in the Drug Court program. In addition, many of the treatment and program modalities described below are used as needed on an individualized basis. There is rarely a waiting period for Drug Court clients because most treatment is done in-house and provided by Drug Court staff.

Table 4. Treatment Modalities

<i>TREATMENT COMPONENT</i>	<i>RATING*</i>	<i>DURATION</i>	<i>SESSIONS</i>	<i>WHERE PROVIDED?</i>	<i>SHOULD BE ADDED OR DROPPED</i>	<i>COMMENT</i>
Substance Abuse Treatment Components						
Detox	5	3-7 Days	1	Hospital or treatment center		
Methadone maintenance	1	Indefinite	Unknown	Clinic	Dropped	
Medical treatment (prescription drugs, etc.)	4	Indefinite	N/A	Various medical providers		
Individualized treatment plans	5	Ongoing	Changes with phases	Drug Court		
Staged recovery process model or “treatment matching” model	4	14-18 months	Multiple	Drug Court		
Relapse prevention model	4	12 weeks	12	Drug Court		
Substance abuse education	5	Ongoing	Multiple	Drug Court		
AA/NA type 12-step model	5	Ongoing	Multiple	AA/NA groups		
Self-help therapy using a manual or diary	2	Ongoing	14-18 Months	Individual client	Dropped	Some are ok
Acupuncture/acupressure	N/A					
Hypnosis	N/A					
Management of Services						
Case management (emphasis on procuring and monitoring service from various agencies to insure delivery of treatment to the clients in the program)	4	14-18 Months	Multiple	Drug Court		
Casework (extends beyond case management and includes active integration of the care provided, counseling from a social work perspective, and involvement with the client’s family)	4	14-18 Months	Multiple	Drug Court		
Advocacy for obtaining services/benefits for the client	2	Varies by client	Varies	Drug Court		

*1=Not at all critical; 2=Not critical; 3=Not sure; 4=Critical; 5=Extremely critical

Warren Process Evaluation

<i>TREATMENT COMPONENT</i>	<i>RATING*</i>	<i>DURATION</i>	<i>SESSIONS</i>	<i>WHERE PROVIDED?</i>	<i>SHOULD BE ADDED OR DROPPED</i>	<i>COMMENT</i>
Mental Health Services						
Individual Counseling	5	14-18 months	Multiple	Drug Court & Community Mental Health		
Scheduled group therapy or group counseling	5	14-18 months	Multiple/ weekly	Drug Court		
Family therapy	4	14-18 months	Varies	Drug Court		
Art or recreation programs as therapy	N/A					
Housing Services						
Housing Assistance	4	Varies				
Halfway House	5	12 months		4 local halfway houses		
Education						
Education (academic or remedial focus)	4	Varies	Varies	Bowling Green Adult Ed.		
Vocational skills training	4	Varies	Varies	Bowling Green Voc Tech		
Readiness for vocation	4	3-6 months	Multiple	Voc Rehab & Lifeskills Industries		
Employment						
Work release	N/A					
Employment counseling	4	Varies	Varies	Drug Court & Voc Rehab		
Other Training						
Social skills development training	2	14-18 months	Multiple	Drug Court	Dropped	
Problem solving skills training	4	14-18 months	Multiple	Drug Court		May have value for some clients
Life skills training	2	14-18 months	Multiple	Drug Court		May have value for some clients
Parenting classes	N/A					
Cognitive behavioral (e.g., teach self-reinforcement)	4	14-18 months	Multiple	Drug Court & Lifeskills		
Training in anger management or aggression management	4	Varies	Varies	Lifeskills		
Stress management	4	Varies	Varies	Drug Court & Lifeskills		
Biofeedback training	N/A					
Relaxation methods	4	Varies	Varies	Drug Court & Lifeskills		
Transcendental meditation	N/A					

*1=Not at all critical; 2=Not critical; 3=Not sure; 4=Critical; 5=Extremely critical

Warren Process Evaluation

TREATMENT COMPONENT	RATING*	DURATION	SESSIONS	WHERE PROVIDED?	SHOULD BE ADDED OR DROPPED	COMMENT
Thinking errors approach	4	14-18 months	Varies	Drug Court		
Moral or ethical training	N/A					
Other Components						
Mentoring or big brother	4	14-18 months	Multiple	Phase III clients & AA/NA sponsors		
Book reports	2	12 months	Multiple	Drug Court	Dropped	
Good deed reports	2	8-12 months	Multiple	Drug Court	Dropped	
Journaling	4	8 months	Multiple	Individual client		
Contingency contracting (combines both rewards & punishments for specific named behaviors)	4	14-18 months	2 or 3 times	Drug Court		
Token economy	N/A					
Health						
Referrals to health care organizations (medical, dental)	4	Varies	Varies	Health Department; Various providers		
Physical exercise	4	Varies	Varies	Individual client		
HIV testing referral	4	Varies	Varies			
TB testing referral	4	Varies	Varies	Health Department		

*1=Not at all critical; 2=Not critical; 3=Not sure; 4=Critical; 5=Extremely critical

Other Program Components. In addition to each of the treatment components there are several components of the Drug Court program that make the program unique: community service, assignment sheets, journals, good deeds, and book reports. Also, mentoring is beginning to be used.

Community service is used in the sanctioning process. The number of hours assigned as sanctions can vary. The smallest amount of community service assigned to date has been four hours. Community service is available to the participant through a variety of agencies including Habitat for Humanity, YMCA, Boys Club, and YWCA.

Clients are required to complete **assignment sheets**. New sheets are given to clients once a week in Phase I, once every two weeks in Phase II, and once every month in Phase III. The assignments include attendance at AA/NA meetings, attendance at Drug Court sessions, attendance at group sessions and daily journals. **Journals** are turned in to the Judge at each Drug Court session. The purpose of the journals is to help the client process their own ideas and thoughts and to help them coordinate the reality of their situation with their thoughts. The journals also help the clients understand how to complete the steps of the program. Included in some of the journal assignments are descriptions of **good deeds** that the clients do each week.

Good deeds can include grocery shopping for others, giving rides to AA/NA meetings, cleaning for others, etc. The point of good deeds is to focus on helping others and being less self-centered. **Book reports** are another part of a client’s assignment sheet. The main purpose of book report assignments is to get the client culturally involved through reading. Recovery-oriented or spiritually oriented reading materials of the client’s choice are accepted for book reports. These books especially help the client to understand what the program is all about.

Mentoring is not a required component of the Drug Court program. However, some clients do mentor others. In Phase III a client is sometimes asked by Drug Court personnel to show a client in Phase I how the program works. Sometimes a client from Phase III will take the initiative and mentor a new client before being assigned one by the Drug Court staff, but the staff has the right to veto this mentor relationship if they disapprove. Some clients who have graduated from the program and who are a part of the after care component of the program have mentored clients still in the program. Mentoring is done on an informal basis.

Another unique program component will be the Strengthening Families Program. This program will be implemented during the next year. The Strengthening Families Program is a three-year program that targets 9-14 year old children of Drug Court clients. The purpose of the Strengthening Families Program is to prevent or delay substance abuse among the children of Drug Court clients and to teach parenting skills to Drug Court clients.

Client Contact. Clients have contact with a variety of program components on a regular basis during the Drug Court program. In addition, the contact they have with various program components changes as they move through the program phases. A summary of client contact by program component is presented in the following table.

Table 5. Summary of Client Contact with Program Components.

	PHASE I		PHASE II		PHASE III	
	# Times	Per	# Times	Per	# Times	Per
AA/NA	5	Week	4	Week	4	Week
Substance abuse individual counseling	1	Week	1	2 Weeks 1 Month	1	Month
Substance abuse group counseling	1	Week	1	Week	1	Week
Other individual counseling	Varies		Varies		Varies	
Other group counseling	Varies		Varies		Varies	
Family Counseling	As Needed		As Needed		As Needed	
Job Counselor	As Needed		As Needed		As Needed	
Drug Court staff	4	Week	2	Week	2	Week
Drug Court Judge	1	Week	1	Week	1	Week
Probation officer	Varies		Varies		Varies	
Drug testing	3	Week	2	Week	1	Week
Defense council	Varies		Varies		Varies	
Department of Social Services	Varies		Varies		Varies	
Friends of the Family (child support)	1	Week	1	Week	1	Week

As the table indicates, the client contact for each of the different program components varies by phase and, to some extent, is based on individual need. In general, clients have contact with Drug Court staff four times per week in Phase I, two times per week in Phase II, and two times per week in Phase III. Clients also generally have contact with substance abuse treatment counseling twice a week in Phase I, between one and two times in Phase II, and between one and two times in Phase III.

Relapse Patterns

As they go through the program, clients become less likely to relapse. Seeing old friends and visiting old places is the most common cause of relapse. The second most common cause of relapse is a failure in a client's intimate relationships. Other causes of relapse include: movement to another phase, crisis in the family, major life events, release from the program, treatment discharge, pending graduation, lack of meeting attendance, and not paying attention in meetings. Some clients never relapse while others will relapse a number of times.

Client Monitoring

Clients are monitored by the Drug Court Judge and on an individual basis by their Drug Court case specialist through urine drug testing and individual and group sessions.

Urine drug testing. Clients are monitored in several ways. One of the most important ways clients are monitored in the Drug Court program is through drug testing. Drug testing is done frequently and randomly. When client is sentenced to Drug Court, they are given their first urine drug screen. The Drug Court office has facilities where the clients can provide urine samples. The Warren Drug Court uses Dynamic Analytic Solutions to analyze urine samples. Clients are required to call a phone number daily to find out if they are required to provide a urine sample.

Urine screens are used to test for alcohol, marijuana, cocaine, opiates, phencyclidine (PCP), amphetamines, benzodiazepines, methaqualone, propoxyphene, and barbiturates. Sometimes a patch is used to test clients. The patch tests for marijuana, cocaine, opiates, phencyclidine (PCP), and amphetamines. There is one other test that can be run to determine whether or not the client has been using LSD, but the test is very expensive and is seldom used. Drug screens are conducted randomly—at least 3 times per week in Phase I; 2 times per week in Phase II; and 1 time per week in phase III. The average cost of a drug screen during the past fiscal year was \$13 for one panel.

Sanctions and Rewards. There is no system of graduated sanctions; all cases are handled individually. Sanctions and rewards reflect the client's history in Drug Court and recommendations from the Drug Court staff.

Dirty urine screens and recommendations from the Drug Court staff prompt sanctions. Other reasons for sanctions include: missing groups, missing individual appointments, missing any other appointments, failure to complete assignments, failure to maintain employment, and failure to maintain housing. The possible range of sanctions has extended from four hours of

community service to six weeks in jail. While clients are in jail, they are allowed to continue to come to treatment groups and to work. Sanctions also include: extra assignments, residential treatment, increased treatment, increased court appearances, increased AA/NA meetings, increased urine tests, and phase demotion.

Rewards are often given for the opposite reason for why sanctions are given. Clean urine screens and full program participation prompt rewards. The primary reward is promotion to a new phase. Time spent in the program leads to this reward and the program is more lenient with clients in the higher phases. Rewards include applause and recognition of progress by the Judge, Drug Court staff, and other Drug Court clients.

Graduation. The minimum time requirement for graduation is 12 months. In addition, clients must successfully go through all three Phases, have maintained clean drug screens for at least five to six months, have maintained court approved housing for one year, and have maintained court approved employment for at least nine months. Graduations are held quarterly. All participants are required to attend each graduation. Drug Court staff, Advisory Board members, Drug Court Judges, family members and friends of the clients are all invited to attend Drug Court graduations. Graduates are presented with plaques and t-shirts. A keynote speaker gives a speech and graduates are invited to speak.

Since the Warren Drug Court’s inception, three graduations have taken place. The following table lists the numbers of graduates.

Table 6. Graduations

Graduation Date	Males		Females		Total
	Black	White	Black	White	
September 18, 1998	1	2	0	5	8
December 8, 1998	8	4	0	3	15
April 1, 1999	4	10	2	7	23
Totals	13	16	2	15	46

Program Removal. Participants are removed from the program for a variety of reasons. Failure to participate in the program, failure to appear in court, new non-drug charges filed, and new drug charges filed, as well as not maintaining court approved housing and employment are all reasons for dismissal from the program. The Drug Court Judge has the final decision about whether to retain a client in the program or to remove a client from the program. When a client is terminated from the program, they are placed back on probation.

Aftercare

Currently, clients have to undergo three to four months of aftercare. This post-release component is formally structured and monitored by the Drug Court staff. Clients are put back on probation for a period of three to four months after they graduate from the Drug Court program and are monitored by the Office of Probation and Parole. They also are monitored by urine drug screens for a period of time. Group therapy and relapse prevention are both parts of the aftercare component. Also included is an integration component with the aim of reducing separation anxiety. Alumni groups are planned for the future and mentoring by graduates is in future plans.

Drug Court does not mandate that clients fulfill any special requirements other than the stipulations that the Probation Office imposes during the Aftercare period.

Information Capabilities and Reporting

Regular reports about Drug Court clients are made. For example, case notes are made on a regular basis using assignment sheets and other information. Drug Court Judges are the primary recipients of client reports. Nearly all of the client reports given to Judges are made orally before the Drug Court session begins. Public defenders and anyone involved in a specific client's case can have access to reports about specific Drug Court clients. However, no confidential information about Drug Court clients is given to people other than the Drug Court Judge, treatment providers and the clients' families. No information is given without the client's consent.

Participants' progress reports are made in narrative and score card format. Included in these reports are the following data: urinalysis results, record of treatment attendance, appearance for urinalysis, appearance for court hearings, notes on participants compliance with court ordered conditions, counselor notes, treatment provider notes, criminal history, and personal history. Negative urine drug screens are especially noted.

Aggregate status reports are produced on a monthly and quarterly basis. Monthly aggregate reports include number of candidates referred, assessed drug screens, number of candidates eligible, and number of clients transferred. Also reported are the number of participants moving to each phases, number of court sessions, number of participants identified as using based on urine screens, number of individual sessions, number of group sessions, number of family/support sessions, number of employment and housing verifications, amount paid toward court obligations, number of sanctions, number of participants re-arrested for new charges, number of terminations, and total number of active participants in the proceeding month. (see Appendix G for examples of a monthly report) Quarterly reports summarize monthly statistics and the progress toward program goals and measures outlined in the Program Goals section of this report. (see Appendix H for examples of quarterly reports)

Reports about the Drug Court program in general are made available to Judges and the Administrative Office of the Courts Drug Court Manager and Drug Court Field Coordinator. The program is able to generate reports on the termination and transfer of participants. Aggregate status reports about clients are made twice yearly. No budgetary reports are made at the Warren Drug Court because the financial matters are handled in Lexington. An automated data collection database is in place but is soon to be replaced by a newer and better model. Staff will also soon have access to e-mail.

Funding

The Warren Drug Court is funded by a federal Byrne grant and State appropriations grants. Drug Court clients do not pay fees to be in the program. Resources are shared throughout the Drug Courts in the State of Kentucky. Costs are saved by the purchase of a set of treatment videotapes that circulate between the programs. It should be noted that since staff does

most of the Drug Court treatment and other programming, the cost of treatment services is absorbed into the overall cost of the Drug Court program; therefore, less is spent on treatment.

Evaluation

Currently used to assess the effectiveness of the Drug Court program are the following: number of relapses per client, percentage of clean urinalysis, frequency of new arrests, improved coordination of justice system and social services, better use of Judicial time, regaining custody, reduction in probation violation caseloads, recidivism, cost, retention in program/treatment, time in custody, participant progress in education development, employment status, stable living conditions, reunified families, and the birth of drug free babies. Currently, an outcome evaluation is not planned. If an outcome evaluation is to be conducted, the treatment coordinator hopes that it will be done by an outside organization.

Major Problems Encountered

The Warren Drug Court went through a major staff change within the first year of its existence when several staff members resigned. The Commonwealth's Attorney withdrew the support of the prosecutor's office for the Drug Court to protest some of the admissions to the program. New staff were hired to fill the places of those who resigned. Ongoing talks between the Judges and the Commonwealth's Attorney are being held to re-establish a working relationship between the Commonwealth's Attorney and the Drug Court program.

Program Strengths

Some of the most useful components of the Drug Court program include the treatment aspect of the program as well as the sanctions available. The ability to have the justice system involved in the treatment of substance abusers is a positive aspect of the Drug Court program.

Potential Program Changes

A Strengthening Families Program is going to be put into place during the next year. The Strengthening Families Program is a three-year program that targets 9-14 year old children of Drug Court clients. The purpose of the Strengthening Families Program is to prevent or delay substance abuse among the children of Drug Court clients and to teach parenting skills to Drug Court clients. The goals of the program are to (1) Delay initiation of alcohol, tobacco, and marijuana use for those children who have not begun use; (2) Reduce use of alcohol, tobacco, and marijuana use for those children who have begun use; (3) Reinforce negative attitudes toward substance use; and, (4) Reduce significant family risk factors. Also, a Management of Information Systems (MIS) upgrade is planned. More community involvement and an alumni association are also goals of the Drug Court program in Warren County. Also, a renewed relationship with the Commonwealth Attorney's Office is desired.

Advice to Other Drug Courts

Advice imparted by the Warren Drug Court treatment coordinator includes developing a strong collaboration between the criminal justice component and the treatment aspect of the program. It is important that all parties involved with the Drug Court program understand the purpose of the Drug Court program and that their roles in the Drug Court program are clearly defined.

Staff Characteristics

The Drug Court program currently has 4 staff members, 2 females and 2 males. Three of the staff are African-American and one is white. Ages of the staff range from 29 to 47 with the average age of 39. Experience of the staff range from 1 ½ years to 11 years in the substance abuse field, with one staff member having one and a half years of experience, one with four years, one with eight years and the final staff member has eleven years of experience in the field. One staff member has been with the Drug Court program for 10 months and another has been with the program for 18 months with the average amount of time spent with this program being one year. Three of the staff are recovering substance abusers.

The normal, full time workload is 37.5 hours per week. The following Table represents staff roles that contribute to the Warren Drug Court program.

Table 7. Staff Roles

<i>STAFF FUNCTION OR POSITION</i>	<i>HOURS PER WEEK</i>	<i># STAFF WITH THAT JOB & WORKLOAD</i>	<i>E=EMPLOYEE C=CONTRACT V=VOLUNTEER O=OTHER</i>	<i>PART DRUG COURT FUNDED</i>	<i>S=SECURITY T=TREATMENT A=ADMINISTRATION O=OTHER</i>
Treatment coordinator	37.5	1	E	100%	T, A
Case specialist	37.5	2	E	100%	T
Case specialist	20	1	E	100%	T

The following table presents agency tasks by staff position in more detail.

Table 8. Tasks by Staff Position

	<i>POSITION WITH PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY</i>	<i>% OF TIME ON TASK</i>	<i>COMMENT</i>
Agency coordination	All Staff		
Information management	Treatment Coordinator & Case Specialists	1%	
Case management	Case Specialists	60%	
Assessing Success	Treatment Coordinator	1%	16 hours/year
Treatment	Treatment Coordinator—Groups Case Specialists—Individual	30% 10%	
Program Reviews	All Staff		
Recommending Modifications	All Staff		
Paperwork	All Staff	20%	

Staff members spend between 1 ½ to 3 hours with each client each week during Phase I, between 1 and 2 hours each week with each client in Phase II, and between 1 and 2 hours with each client each week in Phase III. Staff is shared among other Drug Courts when needed. To date, case specialists have not gone to other Drug Court programs to help. Administrative staff from the Lexington office has assisted the Warren Drug Court through the staff change. Since the inception of the Drug Court program, only two staff members have left their positions. Both of these staff members resigned.

Staff Training. The Administrative Office of the Courts personnel policies manual and a Drug Court manual are used to assist in staff training. The treatment coordinator and case

specialists work with new staff members to train them through instruction, review of materials, and shadowing.

Interns. No interns have worked with the Warren Drug Court program. Students at Western Kentucky University in the Departments of Psychology, Social Work, and Counseling are eligible to do an internship with the Drug Court; however, to date, none have applied.

Volunteers. There are currently no volunteers at the Warren Drug Court program. Volunteers could be utilized to help with administrative work such as filing and answering phones.

Judges. Currently there are two Drug Court Judges in the Warren Drug Court program. Judge Minton was involved with the planning of the Warren Drug Court, but Judge Lewis took the first group of clients. Judge Minton has worked with the program for nearly 18 months. Judge Minton has been to several seminars concerning the Drug Court program in Lexington. One seminar involved alternative sentencing programs and how they relate to the Drug Court program. The other conference was specifically geared toward the Drug Court program. Law enforcement personnel, lawyers, and Judges from around the State and nation attended the seminar. Judge Lewis listed his experience as a prosecutor and as a Judge as training for the Warren Drug Court program.

Board of Advisors. The Drug Court program has a Board of Advisors with eight members. The Board of Advisors can advise staff about the availability of resources within the community, provide assistance with community acceptance, provide for networking to expand the continuum of care and resources. Committee members may assist with specific needs such as the review of possibilities for drug testing and sanctions. The Drug Court committee consists of local court officials, community resource providers, and key community leaders to provide input to shape a program to meet local needs. This board meets as needed. Members of the Board are:

Table 9. Advisory Board Members

Members	Organization
Reverend Steve Ayers	Hillvue Heights Church
Mike Caudill	Warren County Attorney
David Douglas	Lifeskills Industries
Rochella Ferguson	Ahead Staffing
Mark Kreisler	Lifeskills, Inc.
Dr. Harper Wright	Retired—Addictionologist
Richard Bridges	Partnership for a Drug Free Community
Thomas M. Loving	Warren County Drug Task Force

Community Agencies

Community organizations are involved with the Drug Court program in a variety of ways. For example, the South Central Kentucky Minority Economic Development Council conducts entrepreneurship training for the cultural awareness group. Local churches and the Salvation Army help the Drug Court through support with resources. This community involvement helps to foster the view of the Drug Court as a positive entity in the community. The following Table lists community organizations that provide services to the Drug Court program.

Table 10. Community Linkages

AGENCY	SERVICE
Local AA	12-Step meetings
Local NA	12-Step meetings
Comprehensive Care	Mental Health services
Local literacy program (through public library)	Literacy
Adult Education program	GED training/testing
Ameri-Corp	
Health Department	Medical/Educational
Chamber of Commerce	Public Relations/Support
Lifeskills	Contract services for individual & group therapy
Park Place	Mental Health, Psychiatrists, Input treatment
Boys Club	Community service
HANDS	Community service
Salvation Army	Community service
Wendy's	Employment
Taco Bell	Employment
H & W Plastic	Employment
Various Roofing & Siding Contractors	Employment
Vocational Rehabilitation	Employment
Employment Services	Employment
Vocational Tech	Employment
Hillvue Heights Community Church	Rooms for group sessions
State Street Baptist Church	Mentoring sessions
11 th Street Baptist Church	Mentoring sessions
Champions Against Drugs	Substance Abuse/Violence prevention for youth
Pregnancy Support Center	Assist pregnant females
Barren River Area District Developmental Spouse Abuse Center	Domestic violence
Housing Authority	Housing
Friends of the Court	Child support

An increase in community involvement is desired. Involvement with the Rotary Club is hoped for, as is a better relationship with the Fraternal Order of Police. The Warren Drug Court staff is working on developing a better relationship with the Bowling Green Police Department

and probation officers. Several case specialists are on the boards of organizations such as the Family Court and a halfway house. Drug Court staff and Judges have spoken about the program at various civic meetings, Kentucky School of Alcohol and Other Drug Studies, and Drug Court trainings.

Client Characteristics

As of December 31, 1998, the following number of clients have been admitted to the Warren Drug Court program:

Table 11. Clients Ever Admitted to the Drug Court Program by Year

	<i>TOTAL NUMBER OF ADMISSIONS</i>		<i>TOTAL</i>	<i>MONTHS ON WHICH IS BASED</i>
	Males	Females		
Fiscal Year 1997	22*	16*	38*	7/96-6/97
Fiscal Year 1998	61	31	92	7/97-6/98
Fiscal Year 1999	22	12	34	7/98-12/98

*Estimated

The following table represents client characteristics in Fiscal Year 1998. The number of clients enrolled in the program changed over the course of the year. The information in this table reflects the change in clients and the totals are not always equal.

Table 12. Characteristics for Fiscal Year 1998

<i>CHARACTERISTICS</i>	Males	Females	Total/Average
Ethnic Background			
White	29	21	50
Black	14	4	18
Age Groups			
Youngest	18	18	18
Oldest	52	50	51
Average Age	26	26	26
Medical Status			
Pregnant (anytime in the program)	0	2	2
HIV Positive	0	0	0
Active AIDS	0	0	0
Hepatitis C	0	1	1
Participation in Other Programs			
Work release	0	0	0
Vocational training	4	2	6
GED	12	7	19
AA/NA	43	25	68
Pre-program Employment			
Full-time employed (35+ hours)	29	18	47
Part-time employed	3	1	4
Seasonally employed	1	3	4
Illicit employed	1	3	4
Unemployed	1	3	4
In prison or other controlled environment	2	3	5

CHARACTERISTICS	Males	Females	Total/Average
Current Employment Status			
Full-time employed	56	10	66
Part-time employed	1	1	2
Currently in Education program	11	4	15
Currently in Trade school	1	0	1
Marital Status			
Married (Legal or common law)	24	9	33
Single (Never married)	34	21	55
Divorced/separated	2	1	3
Widowed	0	0	0
Education			
Less than High School education	18	11	29
HS graduate or GED	40	20	60
Education beyond High School	6	6	12
Vocational or Trade School	2	1	3
Past Living Status			
With spouse and/or children	27	18	45
Alone	20	8	28
With parents and/or other relatives	13	5	18
In residential substance abuse treatment	0	0	0
Children			
Total # of active clients who have children	7	8	15
# Active clients currently without custody	7	6	13
# Gained custody since entering the program	2	2	4
# Gained custody after graduating from the program	2	2	4
Drug History			
Average # years used drugs	8.4	8.8	8.6
Treatment History			
% Ever had treatment	70%	48%	52%
Residential Treatment	11	5	16
Outpatient	8	6	14
AA/NA	24	12	36
Criminal Justice History			
Average # prior charges			5*
Average # months ever spent incarcerated			6*

*Estimated values

As the table indicates, clients in Fiscal Year 1998 were 73% white and 26% African-American. Also, clients were an average age of 26 with ages ranging from 18-52 years old. Approximately 22% of the clients had children. Before entering the Drug Court, 69% were

employed full-time and 6% were employed part-time; after entering the Drug Court program, 97% were working full-time.

Drug Court clients had used drugs an average of 8 ½ years and approximately 50% of the clients had been in treatment prior to entering the Drug Court program. Participants had an average of five prior charges and had spent an average of six months in jail/prison in their lifetime.

It is common for current clients to have had a history of the following kinds of charges: theft/property offenses, prescription drug fraud, check/credit card forgeries, drug possession, drug sales/trafficking, prostitution, parole/probation violations, fourth degree assault, domestic violence charges, and contempt of court charges. The primary drugs of choice or primary drug problems for clients were alcohol and cocaine.

Drug Court clients have a variety of special needs. Childcare, help for the physically challenged or disabled, and help for the deaf and mute. The Drug Court tries to help clients in any way possible with childcare. Many of the clients with physical handicaps are referred to rehabilitation programs.

Graduates and Dropouts

Twenty-nine clients have graduated from the program, seventy exited due to failure or misconduct, and seven have exited for other administrative reasons. The following table describes the program exits by gender for the duration of the program as of April 12, 1999.

Table 13. Summary of Program Exits

	<i>MALES N=107</i>	<i>FEMALES N=61</i>	<i>TOTAL N=168</i>
Number of graduates	18	11	29 (17%)
Number exited due to failure or misconduct	47	23	70 (42%)
Number who voluntarily exited before completion	0	0	0
Number who absconded	0	0	0
Number of other administrative exits	4	3	7 (4%)
Number still in program	38	24	62 (37%)

The Warren Drug Court program takes a minimum of 12 months to complete with an average of 18 months. For the first group of Drug Court clients, 42% graduated and 53% exited the program due to failure or misconduct. The following table describes the first group of Drug Court clients:

Table 14. First Cohort of Drug Court Clients

<i>Number admitted more than 18 months ago</i>	<i>MALES N=22</i>	<i>FEMALES N=16</i>	<i>TOTAL N=38</i>
Number of graduates	9	7	16 (42%)
Number exited for failure or misconduct	12	8	20 (53%)
Number of administrative exits	0	1	1 (3%)
Number still in program	1	0	1 (3%)

Case Studies

This section presents two client case studies. One of the clients succeeded to graduation and the other terminated from the Drug Court program. Names have been omitted to protect client confidentiality.

Case I. A 19-year-old African-American male charged with Trafficking a Controlled Substance (cocaine) 1st degree, 1st offense was referred to the Warren Drug Court. This was the client's first and only involvement with the legal system. An ASI was administered and the client was found to have a moderate problem with alcohol and a considerable problem with drugs. He was deemed appropriate for the Drug Court program.

Within three weeks of his entrance to the program, the client was sanctioned with 30 days in jail for a positive drug screen for marijuana. He was then referred to and entered a treatment facility for inpatient substance abuse treatment where he stayed for 28 days and successfully completed their program. The client was then referred to a local recovery home for housing and to LifeSkills Industries for vocational rehabilitation and training. However, the client had great difficulty in abiding by rules and regulations of both the recovery home and LifeSkills Industries. Therefore, he was sanctioned repeatedly for missing work and failing to abide by the rules and regulations of the recovery home and the Drug Court. Within five months of entering the Drug Court program, this client was terminated.

Case II. After receiving charges of Trafficking in Marijuana, over 5 pounds, this 30-year-old white male client was referred to the Warren Drug Court. He has a prior history of possession of marijuana. At the initial evaluation, the client admitted to daily marijuana use for the past 15 years. Other psychosocial areas were found to be stable. The client had full-time employment, no history of abuse, no medical problems, and a mild history of depression that appeared to be related to marijuana dependence. All criteria indicated that this client was eligible for admission in the Drug Court program.

After official mandate in the Drug Court by Judge Thomas Lewis, the client was ordered to complete a 71-day jail sentence that was part of his plea bargain, but had not yet been served. The client was given work release and the Warren County Jailer was ordered by the court to allow the client access and time to attend all Drug Court functions.

The client was informed of all rules and program criteria, including sanctions if any violations occurred. Through the course of treatment in Drug Court this client remained drug free, attended all Drug Court functions, was active in NA, and adhered to all conditions of the Drug Court. Due to the lack of violations, the client was able to move through the Drug Court process in the minimum amount of time required in each phase. He graduated on December 8, 1998 after only 14 months as a participant in the Warren Drug Court.

Probably the most striking change this client made, besides remaining drug free, was the reunification of a paternal relationship with his daughter. The client had been divorced for approximately three years when he entered Drug Court. From this marriage he had a four-year-old daughter with whom he had not been involved since the divorce, though he regularly paid his

Warren Process Evaluation

child support. The client was able to develop a relationship that benefited both his recovery and his daughter's sense of stability. His ex-wife reported that due to the client's involvement, their daughter reversed a tendency toward acting out and withdrawing emotionally from family and social affiliations.

Perceptions

Judge Perceptions

Two Judges work with the Warren Drug Court program. Judge Minton was involved with the planning of the Warren Drug Court, but Judge Lewis took the first group of clients. Judge Minton has worked with the program for nearly 18 months. Only one of the two Judges had worked with a program such as the Drug Court in the past. As a prosecutor in the 1970's, he would send people to Alcoholics Anonymous to get treatment. Both Judges indicated that they wished to stay with the Warren Drug Court program for an indefinite period of time.

There is no required training for Judges involved with the Drug Court program. However, the Judges involved with the Warren Drug Court have attended several seminars and other conferences to learn more about the Drug Court program. Judge Minton has been to several seminars concerning the Drug Court program in Lexington. One seminar involved alternative sentencing programs and how they relate to the Drug Court program. The other conference was specifically geared toward the Drug Court program. Law enforcement personnel, lawyers, and Judges from around the State and the nation attended the seminar. Judge Lewis listed his years as a prosecuting attorney and as a Judge as training for the Warren Drug Court program.

The great time commitment necessary is one of the ways that the Drug Court has impacted the judicial system. The Judges give up one lunch hour per week every week of the year in order to preside over the Drug Court sessions. One of the Judges has only missed two sessions of court between the start of the program in April of 1997 to December 1998. Judges also give time before the Drug Court sessions in order to review client files with the Drug Court staff. Both Judges indicated that the traditional role of a Judge is changing with the Drug Court program. In this program, the Judge becomes a part of the treatment team, whereas the normal role of a Judge is to be an impartial decision-maker. One Judge indicated that the program brings more awareness of the drug culture and the social problems that accompany this culture to the Judges.

The Judges indicated that the Warren Drug Court has impacted the community, as well. The program is beneficial to the community because it is helping a small segment of the population. Unfortunately, a larger group cannot be aided because the resources do not exist in the Warren County area. The Judges believe that the police have seen the benefits of giving aid to clients rather than simply punishing them.

The Judges agreed that more than half of the clients in the Drug Court program had been in some other treatment program (with the exclusion of AA and NA) prior to entrance into the Warren Drug Court program. The Judges agreed that the role of the Judge is the important difference between the Drug Court and other treatment programs. The Judge has the ability to impose realistic and harsh sanctions upon a client—jail time—whereas other treatment programs do not have such severe punishments available.

Judges believe that clients find out about the Drug Court program mostly through word of mouth—on the street, and/or from other inmates while in jail. Some find out through their defense attorneys, but there is little official publicity about the program.

Judges agree that clients enter the program mainly to escape jail time. Only a few enter the program because they are primarily interested in getting help for their drug problems. Judges also believe that the Drug Court program rules are clear to clients. There are written materials for the clients about the rules of the program, but the explanations by the staff are crucial to client comprehension. As clients go through the phases, their understanding of the rules becomes clearer. Judges believe that clients choose to remain in the program primarily because, at some point, they realize the program is helping them and they are able to avoid jail time.

The Judges agree that the program takes about the right amount of time overall to complete and that testing for drugs is done with the right frequency in each of the phases. However, one of the Judges noted that each client is different and has different needs; therefore, the timeframe is not perfect for each individual client (there are some that should be tested more frequently and there are some who require more time in the program).

The Judges agree that the Warren Drug Court would not function if it provided drug testing and court hearing but no treatment or if the clients did not appear before any Judge. They also agree that the needs of the individual clients determine whether or not they would be able to handle appearing before the Judge more or less often. Overall, the number of sessions seems to be appropriate. Both Judges concurred that clients could appear before different Judges with little impact upon their progress as long as the Judges communicated frequently.

The Judges believe that clients understand the sanctioning process fairly well. They also agree that there must be a clear understanding that severe consequences immediately follow client failure. Rewards are important as a motivation factor. The recognition of good work from someone in authority is often something that clients have never experienced. This positive recognition helps to foster self-esteem in clients.

The Judges stated that some of the most difficult aspects of the program for clients include (1) The Drug Court interfering in the lives of clients who are in relationships with other substance abusers, (2) Abstaining from drugs and alcohol, and (3) Sharing their innermost thoughts with others.

Peer pressure is the main situation that would trigger a client's relapse. Any time a client's routine is interrupted relapse can be triggered. In order to be successful in the program, a client must develop a good self-image.

There are a number of important differences between clients who complete the program and those who do not. The substance to which they are addicted plays a role—legal drugs are easier to obtain, therefore, it is more difficult for clients addicted to prescription drugs to abstain from drug use and complete the program. The more intelligence and social skills the clients have, the more likely they are to complete the program.

There are several services that the Judges would like to see implemented as a part of the Drug Court program. More defined and organized aftercare services are seen as something that would be a very important component of the program. A component for working with families of addicts is being added to the program for a part of the Drug Court population. One Judge would like to expand the program to work with juveniles and alcoholics who have no other drug dependency. The other Judge believes that an expanded staff is a necessity.

Both Judges agreed that the program is still relatively new and is evolving; therefore the process of change is ongoing. One Judge would like to see clients have to pay fees to the program. He felt that people believe that they get what they pay for and the program would be more meaningful if a monetary value were attached to it. The money could then be used to hire more staff and expand the services available to clients.

As noted by administration and staff, there have been a number of problems since the start of the program. Resources for treatment are limited in Warren County and this will be an ongoing concern. At the program's inception, the Warren Drug Court did not have a facility available in which to do drug testing. This has been rectified. There were some major problems with the first group of staff for the Drug Court. New staff were hired to replace the first group.

In order to evaluate the success of the program, a study of recidivism among graduates and former clients would be necessary. One Judge recommended an examination of the recidivism rates of those clients who did not graduate, because even though they failed, they may have gained something valuable from the program.

The Judges see the Warren Drug Court as a viable, more cost-effective, alternative to incarceration.

The strengths of the Warren Drug Court program listed by the Judges include: (1) Access to community resources, (2) Sanctions from Judges, and (3) Self-esteem of the clients.

Advice that the Judges would give to other Drug Court programs included: (1) Be prepared for changes in the judicial role, and (2) Do not be afraid to take some chances with more hardcore criminals—do not limit the clients because of a desired success rate. “If you don't take chances, they'll never change.”

Staff Perceptions

The Warren Drug Court program has four staff members. Staff stated that they believe that thirty percent of Drug Court clients have been in drug/alcohol treatment prior to entering the Drug Court program.

Staff believe that clients find out about the Drug Court program through their attorneys, the Judges, Drug Court staff, friends, and while in jail. Staff listed the reasons for clients to enter the program as being to avoid going to prison and to get help with their chemical dependency. The reasons that staff believe that clients remain in the program are a desire to obtain and maintain a better way of life and the security of others watching over them.

Staff members believe that the following components of the Drug Court program are extremely important: drug treatment, individual treatment/program plans, drug testing, drug education, and sanctions for non-compliance. Also important are reviews of progress, court sessions, the employment requirement, the mentoring component of the program, the community service component of the program, individual counseling, family counseling, health referrals, the housing requirement, and physical health. Staff members did not believe that the book report assignments were important and one staff member believed that the journal assignments were also unimportant. One additional service staff would like to see the Drug Court program offer is affordable housing assistance to clients.

Staff representatives believe that the Drug Court program takes just the right amount of time to complete and that just enough drug testing is done in each of the phases. Also, staff believe the Drug Court program rules are extremely clear to clients and that clients understand the sanctioning process very well.

Staff members spend between one and a half to three hours with each client each week during Phase I, between one and two hours each week with each client in Phase II, and between one and two hours with each client each week in Phase III. Depending on the amount of time spent with clients, staff members either believe it is adequate or not enough.

Staff listed the most critical components of the Drug Court program as being the introduction to 12-step programs, individual and group counseling, substance abuse education, random drug testing, weekly court sessions, and immediate sanctions for non-compliance.

Staff believe that the most important things a client has to do to be successful in completing the Drug Court program include abstaining from all mood- and mind-altering drugs, becoming involved in a recovery or 12-step program, and attending and participating in all required Drug Court group sessions, individual counseling sessions, and court sessions.

The most important differences between clients who complete the program and clients who do not complete the program, according to Drug Court staff, are that “clients who complete [the program] come to accept that drugs/alcohol have always been and will always continue to cause them life problems. [Clients] also understand that recovery is ongoing and that it entails

more than remaining chemical-free” and that clients who complete the Drug Court program “have a desire to obtain a drug free life.”

Some of the most important rewards used with the Drug Court participants include phasing up, public and private praise, and eventual graduation. The use of rewards is prompted by compliance with the rules and regulations and growing in the recovery process.

Clients have reported to Drug Court staff that they following situations trigger relapse: “Being around old playgrounds and playmates,” being around friends and family members who are still using drugs, and financial stresses.

Staff members believe that the Drug Court program has helped clients with the following areas: substance abuse, employment, living conditions, court procedures, education, mental health, and spiritual development. However, some concern was expressed about Drug Court’s ability to help with client relationships.

Staff members believe that aftercare services would be very important for Drug Court clients. They also believe that clients would be involved with aftercare services. Staff think that clients would be most likely to be involved with these aftercare activities: AA/NA meetings, using a 12-step sponsor, group meetings, drug testing, and mentoring.

Aspects of the Drug Court program that staff members believe have been particularly difficult for clients include becoming adjusted to an extremely disciplined routine and learning to follow strict guidelines.

Staff members indicated that they were very satisfied with their current jobs. They also often work hours other than normal (8am-4:30pm, M-F) hours. This work outside of normal office hours depends on client needs. “If a client needs me after hours, I am available. I often attend meetings with clients and their social workers or teachers concerning their kids.”

Staff members spend fifty percent of their time in in-person contact with clients. The rest of their time is divided in the following ways: 10 percent in phone contact with clients, 10 percent in travel to see clients for other program-related work, 10 percent in direct contact with other program staff (staff meetings, court sessions, etc.), 5 percent in collaborative work with other community services (planning, arranging services, public relations, recruiting, etc.), 5 percent in administrative duties such as paperwork, and 10 percent in other activities such as staff training and professional readings.

Staff members believe that criminal justice sanctions greatly induce clients to conform to the program rules. Other methods that induce clients to follow the rules include verbal reprimands, loss of privileges, peer pressure, and the revision of their treatment plans. Family pressure, to some extent, also induces clients to conform to program rules.

Representatives believe that the following things need to be changed about the Drug Court program: (1) Uniform sanctions for all clients should be used by all Judges, (2) Less

modeling of Drug Courts and more community specific Drug Courts, (3) More community involvement with the Drug Court, and (4) Program needs to be based on client needs.

Staff believe that the most helpful aspects of the Drug Court program include (1) Staff availability to clients, (2) Introduction to 12-step programs, (3) Staff support, (4) Sanctions for non-compliance, and (5) Substance abuse education.

Staff members have been given the following feedback concerning the Drug Court program: “It’s a good program and changes lives.”

Client Perceptions

Ten surveys were sent to randomly selected clients. Eight surveys were completed and returned. Seventy-five percent of the respondents were male and twenty-five percent were female, with an average age of 25 years old (ranging from 20 to 39). Fifty percent of the respondents were white, and fifty percent were African-American. Survey participants had been in the Drug Court program an average of 8 months (ranged from 3-18 months), and 50% were in Phase I, 37% were in Phase II, and 13% were in Phase III.

When participants were asked what the main substance was that led to their problem, marijuana and non-crack cocaine were listed most frequently. Other substances listed included Dilaudid and crack cocaine. One woman listed that she also forged prescriptions. Another participant indicated that his involvement with the program stemmed from “not checking in with [his] probation officer.” Fifty percent of the respondents indicated they had a heavy substance abuse problem. One client indicated that his use of the substance was moderate, and another indicated that his substance abuse was light.

Fifty percent of the clients had been to AA/NA groups before entering the Drug Court program. Nearly 63 percent of the clients surveyed had not attended any other treatment prior to entering the Drug Court program.

Clients believed the Drug Court program’s rules were clear. Sixty-three percent of the respondents felt that the program rules change frequently. Seventy-five percent of the respondents felt that the Drug Court program was clearly explained to them when they entered the program.

Clients listed the most important reason that they entered the Drug Court program as being the opportunity to get treatment for their drug problems. Other reasons included the chance not to go to jail and the chance to live a normal life. Two clients indicated that they entered the Drug Court program because the Judge ordered them there. Another client stated that he entered the program “because I was set up and that is the only way they say I could get out of it.”

Eighty-seven percent of clients felt that the Drug Court has met any special needs that they might have. The same percentage of clients indicated that there are not any services that they would like to be involved with or that they are currently not receiving. They also indicated that the program takes just the right amount of time to complete and that they are satisfied with the program.

Sixty-three percent of clients indicated that just the right amount of testing for drugs was done in Phase I. Twenty-five percent of the respondents believed that the testing was done too often. During Phase II, fifty percent of clients believed that just the right amount of testing for drugs was done. Fifty percent of the clients were not sure if the right amount of drug testing was done in Phase III.

Clients rated the importance of specific program components, which ranged from drug treatment as the highest to the fee payment requirement as the lowest as indicated in Table 15 below:

Table 15. Client Perceptions about the Importance of Program Components

PROGRAM COMPONENT	MEAN*
Drug Treatment	4.6
Individual treatment/program plans	4.2
Review of progress	4.2
Rewards for compliance	4.4
Drug testing	4.1
Drug education	4.1
Employment requirement	3.7
Individual counseling	3.7
Equal treatment for clients	3.7
Court sessions	3.6
Physical health	3.6
Mentoring component	3.5
Health referrals	3.5
Sanctions for noncompliance	3.5
Physical exercise requirement	3.4
Journal assignments	3.4
Community service component	3.4
Good deed requirement	3.2
Family counseling	3.1
Book report assignments	3.0
Fee payment requirement	2.2

1=Extremely Unimportant; 2=Unimportant, 3=Not Sure; 4=Important; 5=Extremely Important

Clients indicated the following reasons were important for remaining in the program included the educational opportunities (13%), the chance to avoid jail (25%), and the opportunity to get and stay clean (50%).

Clients indicated that they believe the Drug Court Judges and staff:

- Cared about them
- Know what they are talking about
- Make good referrals
- Are responsive to meetings their needs
- Are helpful with their individual treatment plans

Clients also indicated that they believed that the Drug Court staff always had time for them. They felt that the Judges are responsive to their needs, are fair about sanctions, and rewards and are fair in the evaluation of the client’s progress. However, clients felt that Drug Court staff were not always fair in their evaluation of the client’s progress. Clients believed that

the group sessions cover topics that are interesting, that they usually learn a lot in the group sessions, that there is equal time for members in group sessions, and that they always have the chance to be heard in the group sessions. Clients did not believe that there were neither too many people at group sessions nor too many group sessions.

Clients indicated that they understand the sanctioning process. They also thought that the rewards most important to Drug Court participants to help them complete the program included Judge praise and promotion to the next phase. Other important rewards included peer praise, a reduction in the frequency of court hearings, the reduction in the frequency of urinalysis, a reduction in fees, certificates, mementos, and “just letting me know I’m doing good.” Important sanctions include unhappiness of the Judge and jail time. Clients listed an increase in fees as being unimportant as a sanction.

Clients described their relationships with their AA/NA mentors as being very good. Other good relationships reported by clients included those with the Judges, the Drug Court case specialist, other Drug Court clients, counselors, the Drug Court Rehab Counselor or treatment coordinator, and their Drug Court mentor. Some clients indicated that they had a bad relationship with the defense counsel and their families. Clients also indicated that their relationship with the prosecutor was very poor.

Clients believed that the Drug Court program has helped them very much with their substance use and their relationships. The program has also helped clients with court procedures, their mental health, their physical health, their spiritual development, their self-esteem, and caring about others. However, clients felt that the program had not been helpful in terms of employment and education.

Sixty-three percent of the respondents indicated that they were aware of aftercare services provided by the Drug Court program. Clients felt that aftercare services would be somewhat important for them and they also indicated that they would be somewhat involved with aftercare services.

Clients indicated that they would like to be involved with the aftercare component of the Drug Court program. Among the ways they would like to be involved included (1) Helping other addicts recover from drug use, (2) Helping with personal problems, (3) Learning how to talk to people, (4) 12-step work, (5) Sharing with other members, (6) NA meetings, and (7) Service work.

The most difficult aspects of the program for clients included (1) “Getting around without my own car,” (2) “Living conditions,” (3) “Curfew,” (4) “Work schedule with Drug Court,” (5) “Making meetings six times a week,” (6) “Court every Wednesday,” and (7) Maintaining sobriety.

The best things about the program that clients mentioned included the following:

- Employment--“Helping me find a job.”
- Drug Court personnel--“Judge,” “Counselors,” “Sponsor,” “Have a true desire to teach others how to be drug free,” “Concerned about participants family members,” “Believing in me,” and “Will take that extra mile (hours) to make sure program works as smoothly as possible.”
- Program Aspects—“Explanation,” “Group session,” “NA meeting,” “Journals,” “Culture group,” and “Guidance.”
- Staying clean—“Helping you stay clean,” and “Meet people who are not using.”
- Second chance--“Staying out of jail.”
- Self esteem—“More self-esteem.”

Changes clients indicated they would like for the Drug Court program included the themes of program duration, equality among participants, the program requirements, the changing of rules, and miscellaneous comments. The comments are as follows:

- Program Duration—“Too many meetings to attend,” “Time it takes to complete it,” “Going to court all the time,” and “Time of some meetings.”
- Equality—“Not equal with all participants in phasing up,” “Some people get many more chances than others,” “Clients not sharing at meetings,” and “Closer watch on some clients as to what time they get to meetings. There are a few people who come in to meetings fifteen minutes before the meeting is over and get their papers signed.”
- Program Requirements—“All the homework,” “Rules,” “Drug Screens,” and “The way I am forced to talk when I am not ready.”
- Changing Rules—“Rules change a lot.”
- Other—“Talk to us more,” “Some of the punishments,” “Need a family counseling group,” “They need more funds,” “They can be a little too mean and they won’t understand you. They want it their way or no way,” “Quit being so hard on young black men,” “Hounding of clients,” and “More help instead of putting people in jail for non-crime type of things like missing a [urine drug] test.”

Final comments from clients also included “I like being clean, but the things we have to put up with is crazy,” “The Drug Court program helps a lot of people and we appreciate the concern you had for us, but changing rules all the time and talking smart is just acting power hungry to me,” and “Like the set-up and glad that you kept me out of trouble. Thank you.”

Treatment Perceptions

Four treatment facilities were surveyed about their responses to the Warren Drug Court program.

Table 17. Participating Treatment Facilities

Treatment Facility	# Of DC Clients Currently Served
Communicare, Incorporated	5
Independence House	0
Park Place Recovery Center	6
Volta	Unknown

Volta does not work specifically with Drug Court. Some residents have stated that they have been referred to Volta for treatment, but there is no special coordination with the Drug Court program. Independence House serves the State of Kentucky and has received clients from other Drug Court programs. Only one client from the Warren Drug Court has received treatment at Independence House in the past.

One of the treatment facilities began working with the Warren Drug Court program in 1998. One organization began serving the Drug Court program in 1997 and a third organization had been serving Drug Court programs in the state for five years. One organization did not specially recognize Drug Court program clients and therefore did not know how many clients were served by their facility or when they began to work with the Drug Court program. At the time of the survey, nine clients were receiving treatment services at one of the responding locations. In 1996, one organization served 8 Drug Court clients from the various programs throughout the state, and in 1997, this same organization served 9 clients. In 1998, a total of 26 clients were served by one or more of the agencies surveyed.

None of the treatment facilities had staff specifically devoted to the Drug Court program clients. The treatment representatives also indicated that the Drug Court program has not had any impact on orientation and/or training programs. However, one organization noted that the Drug Court program has changed the facilities’ perception of criminal thinking. One organization has changed its admission policies through contact with the Drug Court program. One organization noted that they have added residential and intensive outpatient admissions to their services.

The treatment facilities coordinate their services with the Drug Court staff and clients in a number of ways. They inform the Drug Court staff about clients on their compliance and non-compliance. They take referrals and explain policies and procedures of admission. They also add treatment modalities based on individual needs.

Treatment facilities use different instruments to assess Drug Court clients at intake. Seventy-five percent use the MAST (Michigan Alcoholism Screen Test) and one organization uses an interview with an admissions counselor. These instruments are used for risk assessment, needs assessment, and DSM-IV diagnosis.

On average, Drug Court clients wait until there is another bed available before they enter the treatment program. One facility has an average of a week's wait before clients enter the program.

Seventy-five percent of treatment facilities explain program requirements to Drug Court clients during a phone screening. Treatment facilities also explain their program requirements to Drug Court clients in writing, in person and through Drug Court staff.

Some of the special needs and special populations of the Drug Court clients include pregnant women, women with dependent children and DUI clients. Group counseling, one-on-one sessions, AA/NA meetings, and giving these clients priority address these needs. Transportation is provided by some of the treatment facilities for women, for the disabled, and for clients with special medical needs. All of the treatment facilities require clients to arrange childcare services on their own.

Treatment components used by the treatment facilities include detoxification, methadone maintenance, medical treatment, individual treatment plans, staged recovery process model, relapse prevention model, substance abuse education, AA/NA groups, case management (emphasis on procuring and monitoring service from various agencies to insure delivery of treatment to the clients in the program), advocacy for obtaining services/benefits for the client, individual counseling, scheduled group therapy or group counseling, family therapy, social skills development training, problem solving skills training, life skills training, parenting classes, cognitive behavioral component, training in anger management or aggression management, stress management, relaxation methods, thinking errors approach, moral or ethical training, health care, referrals to health care organizations, HIV testing referrals, TB testing referrals, service for cultural/ethnic groups, service for special populations such as a specific women's program, and other behavior modification approaches.

Services provided for Drug Court clients include screenings, assessments, treatment modalities based on their needs, individual, group, and family counseling, and references to long-term transitional living, adult learning, and Vocational Rehabilitation.

All of the treatment facilities offer aftercare services to Drug Court clients. Fifty percent offer outpatient follow-up, either through individual or group sessions. One facility offers weekly sessions to clients.

Treatment facilities indicated that an average of 42 percent of the Drug Court clients that they have treatment have had problems with depression. Approximately 25 percent have been bipolar, 25 percent have had an anxiety disorder, 13 percent have had some form of psychosis, and 25 percent have had antisocial personality disorder. Another 25 percent have had a dual diagnosis.

Only one agency is authorized to prescribe medications to Drug Court clients. Only one facility has the ability to provide specialized treatment services to Drug Court clients who have mental health needs. One facility noted that they have developed special affiliations with mental health agencies that provide specialized treatment services to those Drug Court clients with

mental health disorders. The listed agencies included an outpatient clinic, the local hospital psychiatric treatment unit, and a state mental health hospital.

Treatment facilities listed alcohol as one of the main substances of abuse for the Drug Court clients. Other substances listed included crack cocaine and marijuana. Seventy-five percent of the treatment facilities do drug testing independently of the Drug Court program. Fifty percent test for drugs on a random or as needed basis. One facility has a testing facility on-site and also contracts with an independent laboratory to do drug testing.

Seventy-five percent of the fees for Drug Court clients are paid for by the Drug Court clients or by the Drug Court program. Other methods of payment include through the Department of Mental Health and through insurance.

Seventy-five percent of the treatment facilities make regular reports about the Drug Court clients. Reports are made in compliance with the Drug Court referral, when a client is admitted to or discharged from the treatment facility, when there is a change in the treatment modality, and in terms of progress or non-compliance of the client. Reports are made to the Drug Court office. Volta only provides information at the authorization of the client.

The treatment respondents indicated that they have incurred no additional costs as a result of the Drug Court program.

Significant benefits the agencies have received as a result of the Drug Court program included: (1) Referrals, (2) Additional community resources, (3) Case management resource for the shared clients, (4) Leverage to keep clients in treatment, (5) Abides by our rules and policies.

Strengths of the Drug Court program were listed as: (1) Court monitoring, (2) Drug screening, (3) Hold clients accountable for their behavior which helps them integrate back into society, and (4) Referrals.

None of the treatment facilities surveyed listed any difficulties or problems that they have had with the Drug Court program.

Some things that the Drug Court program could do to improve included: (1) More orientation of clients as to what the clients are to expect in treatment, and (2) Better communication.

Some advice that treatment facilities would give to the Drug Court program is to clarify the referral process and to coordinate appointment services for clients.

Defense Perceptions

Three private attorneys recommended by the treatment coordinator for their knowledge of the Drug Court program filled out surveys. None of the attorneys has any staff specifically devoted to the Drug Court program, but they are involved with the program because they have clients who are eligible for the program.

One attorney noted that the Drug Court program has had an impact on attorney/staff orientation and/or training programs. Attorneys and staff are familiarized with the Drug Court on how to educate clients about requirements. One noted that the Drug Court impacts office policies and procedures because the Drug Court offers a different alternative to clients.

Defense attorneys gave the following reasons for clients to enter the program: to keep out of jail/prison, and to help themselves with their drug problems. Defense attorneys saw the reasons that a client remains in the program as the same. “As a client moves through the program, their progress becomes more important. If they are clean, they don’t worry about going to prison so much.”

Defense attorneys listed the following components of the program as being important: drug treatment, individualized treatment/program plans, continuous review of client progress, court sessions, drug testing, employment requirement, individual counseling, family counseling, health referrals, drug education, sanctions for non-compliance, rewards for compliance, and the housing requirement. Opinions differed over if the following components were important: journal assignments, mentoring, and the physical health requirement. Defense attorneys believed that the fee payment requirement and the community service component were less important.

The Drug Court program has been found to impact the criminal justice system in a variety of ways. Defense attorneys believed that the Drug Court has encouraged greater coordination with other justice agencies, has promoted new relationships with the justice system and other agencies in the community, has encouraged greater coordination with community groups, and has provided a more effective response to substance abusers. “Drug Court has served as a valuable tool to be used in seeking to resolve cases that arise primarily because of a client’s alcohol/drug use.” However, defense attorneys did not believe that the Drug Court has permitted more attorneys to be available for other cases or has provided law enforcement with an additional tool to enforce a no tolerance policy.

It was noted that savings in time and effort were made as a result of the Drug Court program. It is “easier to enter a plea bargain.” No additional costs resulted from the Drug Court program.

Defense attorneys believed that effective measures of the success of the Warren Drug Court would include: (1) Rates of recidivism, (2) Ability of clients to stay clean, (3) Client cooperation with Drug Court, and (4) Long-term success of clients. “The most important evaluator of any Drug Court program is the rate of recovery by participants and their ability to conform their conduct to the requirements of law both during and after Drug Court participation.”

Warren Process Evaluation

Some problems mentioned by defense attorneys included a seeming loss of client contact. However, this loss of contact is seen as a likely necessity. There are also some disagreements between prosecutors and the Judges. “We don’t have a full, complete commitment to the Drug Court program by our Commonwealth Attorney, Drug Task Force, or the Police. Without such a commitment, the effectiveness of Drug Court’s can be limited.”

The benefits of the Drug Court program, as listed by the defense attorneys, include: (1) Alternative dispositions, (2) Recovery of clients, (3) Some realization of benefits of recovery, (4) Clients get help for dependency, (5) Clients stay out of jail, and (6) Clients get a job.

The strengths of the Drug Court program are: (1) Close supervision, (2) Clients get help for dependency, (3) Requirement of AA/NA, (4) Clients get jobs, (5) Clients stay out of jail, and (6) Positive encouragement.

Improvements that could be made include: (1) Less restriction in Phase I based on prior record (trafficking should not be a bar), (2) Insure that all the people involved are committed, (3) Take steps to educate the public about Drug Courts and their savings benefits, and (4) Establish clearly defined protocols, such as Drug Court eligibility requirements and exclusions.

Advice from defense respondents to other defense attorneys included: “Work with the Drug Court program.”

“The Drug Court program can work, but it requires everyone’s cooperative efforts. In my experience, prosecutors and others involved in law enforcement are reluctant to lend their support to Drug Court programs since they don’t want to be perceived as being light on crime. The public also seems to have difficulty accepting Drug Courts, as there is a ‘lock ‘em up and throw away the key’ mentality. The cost and other savings that can be derived from Drug Court participation must be fully explained to both the public and the prosecuting attorney.”

Jail Perceptions

Representatives of the Warren County Jail filled out surveys concerning the Warren Drug Court. There are no jail staff solely dedicated to the Drug Court, nor any known intention of dedicating officers to the Drug Court. An officer listed a reason as “there is no funding available through Fiscal Court” for creating a new position to handle Drug Court work.

The Warren Drug Court has not had any impact on officer or staff orientation or training programs. It has also not affected the jail’s relationship with community groups. However, jail officers have changed their policies and procedures to accommodate the Drug Court’s needs. “Jail staff must now keep a record of individuals lodged by the Drug Court for purposes of drug testing and special court sessions.” This new duty has increased the workload for the officers and staff.

Jail representatives did not believe that: (1) Drug Court has permitted officers to be available for other cases, (2) Drug Court has provided a more effective response to arrests of substance abusers, (3) Drug Court will increase education and awareness of officers about substance abuse and its impact on clients, (4) Drug Court has resulted in more jail space for pre-trial or sentenced defendants, or that (5) Drug Court has reduced the number of substance dependant detainees.

Responses were inconsistent in that on one hand comments indicated that the Drug Court program does provide law enforcement with an additional tool to enforce a no tolerance policy. However, other comments indicated that the Drug Court program does not provide law enforcement with an additional tool to enforce a no tolerance policy.

Jail representatives felt that the Warren Drug Court has not provided savings in a number of areas. The officers disagreed with the following statements: (1) Less time has been spent in court appearances, (2) There have been savings in jail overtime, (3) There have been savings in jury costs, and (4) There has been a reduced number of re-arrests. The jail has not realized any savings as a result of the Drug Court program. However, the jail has also not incurred any additional costs as a result of the program.

Three strengths of the Warren Drug Court listed were: (1) Good employee base, (2) Seemingly organized, and (3) Good tracking of jailed clients.

Jail representatives stated that an important condition in evaluating the effectiveness of the Drug Court would be tracking the recidivism rate of clients.

Officers felt that the Warren Drug Court could improve would be by eliminating drug dealers as clients. “It is just a matter of constant wonderment to myself how, after having read of Drug Court’s structure and purpose, that significant drug traffickers are put in the Drug Court program.”

Probation and Parole Perceptions

The probation and parole office does not have any staff who work exclusively with the Drug Court program in Warren County. However, the office provides drug screening and referrals to treatment for their regular clients.

The representatives from the Office of Probation and Parole believed that the Drug Court program has made an impact on arrest and jail policies and procedures. The probation and parole officers “do not have to make a motion to revoke [parole] if violations occur.” Therefore, the paperwork for the officers has decreased. It was also stated that the Drug Court program has affected the probation and parole office’s relationship with community groups. The representative noted that fewer people are in jail and fewer people go to treatment groups. However, the representatives did not believe that the Drug Court program had any impact on probation and parole staff orientation or training programs.

Probation and parole representatives agree that the Warren Drug Court (1) Has encouraged greater coordination with other justice agencies, (2) Has promoted new relationships with the justice system and other agencies in the community, (3) Has permitted officers to be available for other cases, (4) Has provided a more effective response to arrests of substance abusers, (5) Provides law enforcement with an additional tool to enforce a no tolerance policy, (6) Will increase education and awareness of officers about substance abuse and its impact on clients, (7) Has resulted in more jail space for pre-trial defendants, and (8) Has resulted in more space for sentenced defendants.

Probation and parole representatives indicate that the Drug Court program has provided savings in a number of areas including: (1) Less time spent in court appearances, (2) Savings in police and corrections overtime, (3) Savings in jury costs, and (4) Savings in probation and parole contacts. Overall, the Office of Probation and Parole has not incurred any additional costs as a result of the Drug Court program and the office has realized savings in fewer contacts and people.

There are some other ways the Drug Court has impacted the probation and parole office. Officers do not have to set up treatment for the clients and therefore have more time for other probation and parole clients. The representatives expect to see clients exit the program with fewer problems and they expect that the graduates will be less likely to re-offend. However, the probation and parole officers have “spent more time on reports for second, third, and fourth felony convictions when one or two should have been final.”

The problems the probation and parole office has had as a result of the Drug Court program have included trying to figure out jail time when a client has been in and out of jail over a period of one year. In order to solve this problem, close work with the jail has been necessary. It was noted that a few drug traffickers have been placed in the Drug Court program.

Benefits of the Drug Court program listed were: (1) Clients receive a more intensive treatment program, (2) The program frees up some probation and parole officer time which, in turn, helps the officers to give more attention to other clients, and (3) There is less paperwork for

officers. Strengths that were mentioned by probation and parole representatives included: (1) More intensive drug education and treatment, (2) Faster response to violations and, (3) Graduates will be less likely to re-offend.

There are a number of things that the Warren Drug Court could do to improve: (1) Be able to access the Seven Counties Treatment program in Jefferson County, (2) Provide probation and parole officers with education and training on the Drug Court program, and (3) Provide the clients' treatment program when being placed back on active supervision. One of the judges involved with the program has let drug traffickers into the program that the Office of Probation and Parole opposed. The representatives from the office therefore indicated that not accepting any drug traffickers as one of the areas of needed improvement. A desire for consistency and the avoidance of politics was noted by the representatives.

Advice that the probation and parole representatives would give to their counterparts in other jurisdictions beginning Drug Courts included: (1) Only give clients a certain number of times to have a positive drug screen, (2) "Consider work and family progress," and (3) "Try to allow the subject to go to prison prior to getting bad enough to receive a new felony conviction." Probation and parole representatives indicated that providing any support necessary for a Drug Court program is very important.

Components that probation and parole representatives thought important for evaluation of the Drug Court program were: (1) Number of graduates that recidivate, (2) Number of clients who stay off drugs, and (3) Number of clients who are off probation and parole.

Comments made about the Warren Drug Court included the following: I feel "the Warren County Drug Court program is meeting the need of some of our most severe addicts," and "Drug Court is a great idea if people have the will to use it as designed."

Police Perceptions

Representatives of the Bowling Green Police Department completed surveys about the Warren Drug Court program. Currently, no officer is solely dedicated to Drug Court duties, but there is an effort to create a Drug Court liaison officer.

The representatives from the Police Department indicated that the Warren Drug Court has had no impact on officer or staff orientation or training, on arrest policies and procedures and on the relationship between the police department and community groups. There is a community-policing program but this program and the Drug Court are not coordinated in any way.

The Drug Court has prompted new relationships with the justice system and other agencies in the community. It has also permitted officers to be available for other cases. The program has helped save time for police by reducing the amount of time spent in court appearances. However, police representatives do not believe that the Drug Court program has provided a more effective response to arrests of substance abusers or that the Drug Court provides law enforcement with an additional tool to enforce a no tolerance policy. Police representatives do not believe that the Drug Court program has reduced the number of re-arrests.

Strengths of the Drug Court program listed were (1) The awareness of the rehabilitation program; and, (2) An increased contact with the local judicial system.

Police representatives indicated that the Drug Court program could improve by providing a list of participants to police agencies and by making presentations on the Drug Court program to local law enforcement agencies. Another way in which the Drug Court program could improve would be through more strict compliance with client conditions.

Advice that the police would give to police agencies in other jurisdictions beginning Drug Court programs would be to follow up on prior clients and to monitor the adherence to guidelines for the Drug Court program. Police believe that an examination of the recidivism rate among participants would be important in an evaluation of the effectiveness of the Drug Court program.

Prosecution Perceptions

Only one of the two surveys sent to prosecutors was returned. The Commonwealth Attorney's office participated in the Drug Court program for one year but recently decided against further participation with the program because the Judges accepted clients into the program, such as drug traffickers, which the Commonwealth Attorney felt should not be in the program.

The prosecution representative indicated that the Drug Court program has not had any effect on attorney or staff orientation or training programs or on the Commonwealth Attorney's relationship with community groups. However, the Drug Court has impacted some policies of the Commonwealth Attorney's office in that the prosecutor would "recommend probation if the defendant [would] agree to participate in Drug Court."

The prosecutor believes that the Drug Court program (1) Has encouraged greater coordination with other justice agencies, (2) Has promoted new relationships with the justice system and other agencies in the community, (3) Has encouraged greater communication with community groups, (4) Has provided a more effective response to substance abusers, (5) Has increased education and awareness of attorneys about substance abuse and its impact on clients, (6) Has promoted more efficient use of office resources, and (7) Has reduced the number of substance dependant detainees. However, the Commonwealth Attorney did not believe that the Drug Court has permitted more attorneys to be available for other cases or that the Drug Court has provided law enforcement with an additional tool to enforce a no tolerance policy.

The prosecution representative noted that time has been saved in terms of case preparation and that jury costs have been reduced as a result of the Warren Drug Court. The representative noted no increase in costs as a result of the program, but no savings were realized, either.

A benefit of the Drug Court program is the closer monitoring of the Drug Court participants. Several strengths of the program were listed: (1) More productive probationers, (2) Immediate sanctions for violators, (3) Greater incentive for clients to succeed, and (4) The program requirement of either employment or enrollment in school for all participants.

In order to improve, the prosecution representative recommended that the Drug Court publish lists of all the clients in the program and all the clients who have been terminated. These lists should then be given to the office of the prosecutor and the police. The representative believed that an evaluation of the Drug Court program should include a study of the recidivism rate of graduates.

The representative of the prosecution stated "We have a well-trained staff in our local Drug Court. They are efficient, professional, and go the extra mile to ensure the success of the participants. Because of their hard work, I feel our Drug Court will be successful."

Conclusions

In summary, the Warren Drug Court program was established approximately two years ago. This program is based on the *Key Components* and has three program phases, which take an average client approximately 18 months to complete. As of December 1998, the program had 68 active clients, over 97% of the clients were maintaining full-time employment compared to approximately 69% who had full-time employment before entering the program. In addition, as of April 19, 1999, the program has had 46 graduates. Drug Court staff and Judges have spoken at various community and civic groups, at the Kentucky School of Alcohol and Other Drug Studies, and at a Drug Court training session about the Drug Court program. The Warren Drug Court program coordinates with approximately 16 state and community based agencies.

The most compelling aspects of the Drug Court program are the immediate sanctions that clients are given when the program rules are violated. This aspect serves both as a motivator as well as promoting consequences for behavior. Another compelling aspect of the Drug Court program is the judicial involvement. This aspect of the program is particularly important for several reasons. One reason is that it shows the clients that someone cares about them on a regular basis. A second reason is that the Judge separates the punishment process from the support that the Drug Court staff give the clients. A third reason is that the Judges in the Warren Drug Court believe they are part of a treatment team and this treatment team approach changes the clients lives. Judges also believe this program is truly an opportunity to do something meaningful for both the clients and the community.

At least half of the clients who enter the Drug Court program had been in treatment before entering the Drug Court program. The main reasons cited for why clients enter the Drug Court program was to avoid jail time, although a small percentage also enter to get help for their substance abuse problem. Clients remain in the program for similar reasons, but others added their reasons included the educational opportunities offered by the Warren Drug Court program.

Additional services the Drug Court program could offer that were mentioned across respondents included:

- More defined and organized aftercare services
- An additional component for working with families of addicts
- Expanding the Drug Court to work with juveniles and alcoholics
- Expanding the staff to work with more clients

The following were some of the strengths of the program listed by respondents:

- Court monitoring
- Drug screening
- Immediate sanctions
- Program requirement of either employment or enrollment in an educational program
- Good employee base
- Organization
- Good tracking of jailed clients

- More intensive drug education and treatment
- Staff support
- Introduction to 12-step programs
- Employment opportunities
- Greater self-esteem

The following are some of the suggested areas for improvement for the current program:

- Educate the public and law enforcement agencies about the Drug Court program
- More help for clients instead of putting people in jail for non-crime type of things like missing a urine test
- Clients pay fees for the Drug Court program
- More orientation of clients as to what the clients are to expect in treatment
- Publish lists of current and past clients as to what the clients are to expect in treatment
- Be able to access Seven Counties treatment program in Jefferson County
- More community involvement
- Uniform sanctions for all clients to be used by both Judges

A major issue listed by several respondents was the need to establish a clearly defined protocol for the Drug Court program, such as Drug Court eligibility requirements and exclusions. Many respondents indicated that drug traffickers were not intended to be a part of the program, but that some traffickers had been accepted into the program.

Some problems with the Warren Drug Court program implementation included limited treatment resources, a lack of facilities for drug testing, and problems with the Drug Court staff. A facility for drug testing has been found and the first set of staff members resigned and has been replaced. However, the limited treatment resources in Warren County will continue to be an issue for the Warren Drug Court program.

The advice suggested for new Drug Court programs was:

- “Work with the Drug Court”
- Follow up on prior clients and monitor the adherence rate to guidelines for the Drug Court program
- Only give clients a certain number of times to have a positive drug screen
- Consider work and family progress
- Clarify the referral process and coordinate appointment services for clients
- Be prepared for changes in the judicial role
- Do not be afraid to take some chances with more hardcore criminals; do not limit the clients because of a desired success rate.

The following comments are excellent summaries of what respondents think of the Drug Court program.

Probation and Parole Officers stated that they felt “the Warren Drug Court program is meeting the need of some of our most severe addicts,” and “Drug Court is a great idea if people have the will to use it as designed.”

One staff member stated, “It’s a good program, and changes lives.”

Responses from clients included “I like being clean, but the things we have to put up with is crazy,” “The Drug Court program helps a lot of people and we appreciate the concern you had for us, but changing rules all the time and talking smart is just acting power hungry to me,” and “Like the set-up and glad that you kept me out of trouble. Thank you.”

The prosecutor stated, “ We have a well-trained staff in our local Drug Court. They are efficient, professional, and go the extra mile to ensure the success of the participants. Because of their hard work, I feel our Drug Court will be successful.”

In conclusion, this program has had some difficult problems that they seem to have successfully overcome and some problems they are committed to working on consistently until they are overcome. All of the respondents indicated this program is making a real difference in the lives of the clients. Staff are committed and the Judges provide an overwhelmingly supportive environment for this program and the clients they serve. In addition to overcoming the difficulties during implementation and being committed to the clients, this program is committed to working with the community, fits well into the local community, and has been successful in meeting the program goals. The program also follows the principles from the *Key Components* closely on both a daily basis and has future ideas and plans that will make the program even better in a number of ways.

Process Evaluation Methodology

In evaluating the effectiveness of programs like the Drug Court program, researchers have often relied on only the program outcomes such as termination and graduation rates and/or re-arrests to determine effectiveness. However, programs such as Drug Court are essentially long-term behavior modification programs that cannot be fully understood by looking solely at the final program outcomes. To better understand how and why a program like Drug Court is effective, an analysis of how the program was conceptualized, implemented, and revised is needed. A process evaluation, in contrast to an examination of program outcome only, can provide a clearer and more comprehensive picture of how Drug Court impacts those involved in the Drug Court process (e.g., prosecutors, Judges, staff, and clients).

Specifically, a process evaluation provides information about program aspects that lead to desirable or undesirable outcomes. Because changes to the original program design may affect the program outcomes, a process evaluation can be an important tool in helping prosecutors, Judges, staff, defendants, and defense council to better understand and improve the Drug Court process. In addition, a process evaluation may help to reveal strategies that are most effective for achieving desirable outcomes and may expose those areas that are less effective. A process evaluation may also help explain the reasons why some defendants successfully complete the program and why other defendants terminate from the program before they graduate. Finally, a process evaluation may help facilitate replication of the Warren Drug Court program in outer areas of Kentucky.

The Warren Drug Court program process evaluation used structured interviews for each of the different agency perspectives and a specific methodological protocol. The methodology protocol and interview procedures were used in a number of process evaluations across the state of Kentucky including the Fayette Drug Court program. This allows for comparisons of similarities and differences across the specific Drug Court program sites if desired.

The limitations for this process evaluation report include generalizability across time and programs. This report is specifically for the period between April 9, 1997 and December 31, 1998. Changes that occur after this point in time are not reflected in this report. In addition, the representatives surveyed for this report may or may not reflect all attitudes toward the Warren Drug Court program. Regardless, the report is critical for documenting the program or the planning process through the stated time period.

The process evaluation for the Warren Drug Court program included semi-structured interviews with and surveys of active Drug Court clients, Drug Court staff and treatment coordinator, Drug Court Judges, defense council, prosecutors, probation and parole representatives, jail personnel, police department representatives, and treatment program representatives. The specific breakdown of interviews is as follows:

Table 15. Process Evaluation Methodology

Respondent	Number interviewed/returned	Response Rates
Active Clients	8	80%
Treatment coordinator	1	100%
Drug Court staff	2	67%
Drug Court Judges	2	100%
Defense Council	3	100%
Prosecutors	1	50%
Probation & Parole	2	100%
Jail	2	100%
Police Department	2	100%
Treatment Programs	4	100%
Total	27	89%

The treatment coordinator interview lasted about six hours and the Judge interviews lasted between one and two hours. All of the other surveys were self-administered. Clients were chosen randomly by the treatment coordinator and the treatment coordinator provided names and contact number of other representatives with working knowledge of the Warren Drug Court program. Information was collected from December 1998 to April 1999. The treatment coordinator interviewed left his position in January thus affecting some of the data collected. Feedback from each of the respondents is reported in separate sections.