

**APPENDIX B: PRACTICES PERFORMED IN 90% OR MORE OF  
THE PROGRAMS IN THIS ANALYSIS**

**PRACTICES REPORTED BEING PERFORMED THE SAME WAY BY AT LEAST  
90 PERCENT OF THE COURTS**

This includes all courts that have data for that practice, not just courts that have data on recidivism and costs

***Key Component #1***

Of the adult drug courts that participated in this study, at least 90%:

- Included a prosecuting attorney, a defense attorney, a treatment provider and a judge as members of the drug court team
- Always had the judge and treatment provider attend staffing (participant progress) meetings
- Did NOT have all team members attend staffings (i.e., Over 90% of the courts reported that the judge, prosecutor, defense attorney, coordinator, probation and law enforcement did NOT always attend staffing together)
- Always had a judge at court sessions
- Received verbal reports from the treatment provider on participant progress during team meetings and court sessions
- Received written reports from the treatment provider on participant progress
- Received reports from the treatment provider that included participant attitude toward and engagement in treatment, treatment completion status, missed treatment sessions, and progress towards goals

***Key Component #2:***

Of the adult drug courts that participated in this study, over 90%:

- Included a prosecutor on the drug court team
- Included a defense attorney on the drug court team
- Accepted offenders with drug possession charges into the program
- Accepted offenders with felony charges into the program

***Key Component #3***

Of the adult drug courts that participated in this study, over 90%:

- Allowed participants with felony charges
- Allowed participants with co-occurring disorders
- Had written eligibility requirements
- Reported that they performed a full assessment to determine level of care

#### *Key Component #4*

Of the adult drug courts that participated in this study, over 90%:

- Had probation perform case management and home visits
- Had treatment perform case management
- Provided outpatient individual and group treatment sessions
- Required self-help groups (such a NA/AA)
- Had a minimum program length of less than 2 years
- Had between one and four phases
- Required relapse prevention as a part of their curriculum

#### *Key Component #5*

Of the adult drug courts that participated in this study over 90%:

- Reported that they performed random drug testing
- Performed drug testing for cause (such as the participant appears under the influence)
- Used urine drug testing (“urinalyses” or “UAs”)

#### *Key Component #6*

Of the adult drug courts that participated in this study over 90%:

- Used intangible rewards such as applause and praise from the judge in court
- Used jail as a sanction
- Used writing essays and community service as sanctions
- Had increased drug testing, increased outpatient treatment sessions, residential treatment and return to an earlier phase as potential responses to participant non-compliance
- Reported that participants know which behaviors lead to sanctions and rewards
- Had a minimum number of days that participants must be drug-free in order to graduate
- Terminated probation early as an incentive to graduate from drug court
- Provided participants with a certificate or other tangible memento upon graduation

#### *Key Component #7*

Of the adult drug courts that participated in this study in over 90%:

- The Judge attends staffing meetings
- The judge speaks directly to participants during court sessions.
- The program reports that the judge provides consistent follow-through on warnings to participants.

*Key Component #8*

None

*Key Component #9: What Are the Drug Courts in California Doing?*

None

*Key Component #10*

In this study, over 90% of the drug courts reported that:

- Probation is a member of the drug court team
- The program had a partnership with an agency that provided education (e.g., GED) services
- Participants were regularly referred to services available in the community