



www.npcresearch.com

Clackamas County Juvenile Drug Court Process Evaluation Final Report



Submitted by

NPC Research, Inc.

Shannon M. Carey, Ph.D.

Judy Weller, B.S.

Becky Roth, B.S.

July 2003

Executive Summary

In November 2001, the Clackamas County Juvenile Drug Court (CCJDC) began operations. An implementation grant from the DCPO in September 2001 provided funds for evaluation, and NPC Research was subsequently hired to perform a process and outcome study of the Drug Court. This report contains the process evaluation for the CCJDC performed by NPC Research. The Ten Key Components of Drug Courts (developed by the NADCP in 1997) were used as a framework for the evaluation, and this Court was evaluated on its ability to demonstrate these key components. The chief results are as follows:

Ten Key Components of Drug Courts

Component 1. Drug courts integrate alcohol and other drug treatment services with justice system case processing.

An integrated Drug Court Team, with communication as its central feature, is the CCJDC's biggest strength and possibly the greatest reason why this Drug Court is operating effectively and efficiently. The Team communicates regularly in a variety of ways, and seeks out new ideas for ways to keep this Court running smoothly and for ways to improve Court practices. Each member of the Team appears to be invested in making the Drug Court work for its participants.

Component 2. Using a non-adversarial approach, prosecution and defense counsel promote public safety while protecting participants' due process rights.

Both the Prosecution and Defense Counsel believe that the mission of each has not been compromised by Drug Court. One change in both their roles is the non-adversarial team effort that goes into decision-making for each client. Their roles, however, remain essentially the same: the Public Defender's role is still to advocate for the participants, and the District Attorney's role is still to ensure that public safety is protected.

Component 3. Eligible participants are identified early and promptly placed in the drug court program.

The time from referral to entry in the Drug Court is approximately two weeks. This is a reasonably prompt time period for a youth to begin receiving services. In addition, the youth and his or her family receive significant contact from the Court throughout that two week period in the form of assessments and discussions with the Drug Court staff about the Drug Court Program and about the willingness of the family to commit to the program.

Component 4. Drug courts provide a continuum of alcohol, drug, and other related treatment and rehabilitation services.

The Drug Court Program has four phases and Aftercare, each of which targets a different stage in the youth's treatment. Diverse specialized treatment services are available to the extent that funding will allow. Each participant attends individual counseling, group counseling, and family counseling. In addition, participants are given frequent UAs to monitor drug use, are involved in

activities giving them life skills such as jobs and education, and have the opportunity to participate in community services and other activities.

Component 5. Abstinence is monitored by frequent alcohol and other drug testing.

Based on results from the American University National Drug Court Survey (Cooper, 2000), the number of urinalyses (UAs) given in this Court is comparable to the large majority of drug courts nationally. However, not all UA collections are fully viewed, and participants and staff believe that the youths often have an idea of the timing of their next drug test. The Drug Court Team has also utilized other forms of drug testing, such as a saliva swab and a drug detection patch. An adulterant test strip is also used when youths are suspected of tampering with the sample. The Team is currently discussing the option of using a Breathalyzer to detect alcohol use.

Component 6. A coordinated strategy governs drug court responses to participants' compliance.

Sanctions and rewards for this Court are comparable to what most other drug courts are doing nationally (Cooper, 2000). This Drug Court works together as a team to determine sanctions and rewards with the Judge's approval. Sanctions and rewards are often individualized and are chosen to suit the youth's specific situation. The Drug Court does not have written guidelines for sanctions and rewards. However, the Team has agreed upon some graduated standard sanctions that generally start with community service and end with termination. The Team works hard to make sure responses to participants' compliance are consistent, while trying to be creative with rewards and sanctions to meet a particular need.

Component 7. Ongoing judicial interaction with each drug court participant is essential.

In the CCJDC Program, parents and participants are required to be in Court on a consistent basis, where they have regular contact with the Judge. The frequency of court appearances for each participant is comparable to the majority of drug courts nationwide (Cooper, 2000). The Judge is involved in all decision-making regarding each participant. She goes to great lengths to get to know and help all participants and their family members. Because of the Judge's consistency and care for each participant, she is well trusted and inspires participants to make her proud of them.

Component 8. Monitoring and evaluation measure the achievement of program goals and gauge their effectiveness.

Evaluation and monitoring are a high priority for this Drug Court Program. This Court has participated extensively in the pilot of the Oregon Drug Court Management System, a statewide drug court database that is still being refined, and has ensured that evaluator feedback was included in this process. NPC was invited to observe Court sessions, Team meetings and quarterly retreats. The Team has proved itself to be committed to an accurate evaluation and has done so through a high degree of organization and integration of the Team members. In addition, this Court demonstrates a high degree of self-monitoring. They openly discuss issues as they arise and focus on ways to adjust the program to address these issues.

Component 9. Continuing interdisciplinary education promotes effective drug court planning, implementation, and operations.

Education on Drug Court planning, implementation and operation is a high priority for this Drug Court. The Drug Court Team members have attended drug court trainings and do so on a regular basis. In addition, the Drug Court Coordinator, Case Manager, Treatment Provider, and Judge all attend local trainings whenever they are available and observe other drug courts in order to learn new ideas and bring them back for discussion with the Team.

Component 10. Forging partnerships among drug courts, public agencies, and community-based organizations generates local support and enhances drug court effectiveness.

The CCJDC has developed partnerships with several community agencies and organizations, including Mental Health, the Oregon Youth Authority, C-TEC (an educational/employment agency), and the local Chamber of Commerce. The Coordinator spends a great deal of time forging relationships locally and statewide. She is involved with various committees and attends Drug Court-related meetings frequently. The Coordinator also solicits local resources for incentives and donations.

The CCJDC is continually working towards creating relationships with community members.

Recommendations

The CCJDC is unusual in the quality of its process and operations. There was very little in the way of changes or improvements for the evaluator to recommend. This is mainly due to the self-monitoring and self-correction regularly performed by the Juvenile Drug Court Team. Following are the few recommendations resulting from this evaluation:

Observe all UAs: Although observing all UAs would necessitate spending a greater amount of time and resources, the value of observed UAs in the participants' recovery may be worth the time and money spent.

Consider other methods for assigning UA collection times: Because some participants and staff believe that participants can often predict when they will need to report for a UA, the Drug Court may want to consider different methods for assigning their UA collection times. One way is to assign participants numbers or colors that come up randomly.

Consider community service as just a requirement, rather than a sanction: Although the CCJDC uses community service as both a sanction and a requirement, it is possible that community service might serve better as just a requirement, instead of a sanction so that participants will not associate service to their community as a punishment. Other courts have made a certain number of hours of community service a requirement for graduation and have allowed the participant to choose a type of community service they would enjoy.

Provide a written list of sanctions: As some participants expressed the belief that the Drug Court Team is sometimes inequitable in their assignment of sanctions, it may be useful to give participants a written list of possible sanctions for various common offenses and include a

explanation saying that the sanctions listed are just possibilities, not the rule, and that sanctions are assigned on an individual basis.

Conclusion

Overall, the CCJDC demonstrates the Ten Key Components of Drug Court in an exemplary fashion. The Drug Court Program is well organized due, in large part, to a well-organized Drug Court Coordinator. The Court's greatest strength is its highly integrated Drug Court Team.

The one key component that was demonstrated satisfactorily, but not in an exemplary fashion, was the UA process. The Drug Court Team needs to determine a way to consistently view the UA collections and to truly randomize the UA collection times. An additional issue for this Drug Court, as it is for Drug Courts nationally, is a lack of funding. The CCJDC would like to provide further services to their participants, as well as accept offenders that require more time and attention, but has not been able to do so at this point. The Drug Court Team, and particularly the Coordinator, is working on obtaining funding. This Court is also examining ways to become self-supporting.

In addition to the exceptional quality of the CCJDC Team, strengths of this Drug Court include the commitment to continuing education of the Team members, the high priority the Team places on evaluation and self-monitoring, and the strong leadership of the Judge combined with the Judge's ability to demonstrate her care and honest concern for the Drug Court participants and their families.

Table of Contents

- Executive Summary.....i
- Introduction..... 1
- Methods..... 2
 - Site Visits 2
 - Key Informant Interviews 2
 - Focus groups 3
 - Document review 3
 - Administrative data analysis 3
- Results..... 4
 - Clackamas County Juvenile Drug Court Process Description..... 4
 - Participant Focus Group Results..... 18
 - 10 Key Components Results 23
- Summary/Conclusion 34

Introduction

Clackamas County is part of the metropolitan, tri-county area surrounding the city of Portland, Oregon. It continues to be one of the fastest growing counties in Oregon. The Clackamas County Circuit Court is the second busiest court in the state and it has supported a growing caseload in recent years. The Clackamas County Sheriff estimates that 70% of all those arrested in the county are abusing alcohol and/or drugs at the time of the arrest. During a three-year period in the mid-1990s, the sheriff reported a 38% increase in drug-related cases. According to Clackamas County Juvenile Department statistics, 80% of all youths on their caseloads are active substance abusers. These statistics led the county to begin planning a juvenile drug court. In January 2001, the Drug Court Program Office awarded Clackamas County a drug court planning grant.

In November 2001, the Clackamas County Juvenile Drug Court (CCJDC) began operations. Although the funds to hire an evaluator were not available when the drug court was first being implemented, the county had drug court planning staff attend drug court sessions in other counties and attend workshops on drug court evaluation in order to prepare for future studies. Arrangements were also made to collect client data in a drug court database, the Oregon Drug Court Case Management System (ODCMS), which is used in several counties in Oregon. In September 2001, Clackamas County received a drug court implementation grant from the DCPO. This grant provided funds for evaluation, and NPC Research was hired to perform a process and outcome study of the Clackamas County Juvenile Drug Court.

This report contains the process evaluation for the CCJDC performed by NPC Research. The Ten Key Components of Drug Courts (developed by the NADCP in 1997) were used as a framework for the evaluation, and this court was evaluated on its ability to demonstrate these key components. The first section of this report is a description of the methods used to perform this process evaluation. This section describes the protocols used to obtain the information on drug court process, including site visits, key stakeholder interviews, focus groups, document reviews and an examination of the Drug Court database. The results portion of this report consists of three sections. The first results section contains a detailed process description of the CCJDC, the second section contains the results of the focus groups conducted with the Drug Court participants and their families, and the third section contains a list of the Ten Key Components of Drug Courts with a discussion for each component on whether this court demonstrated that component and how well. A summary of the results with overall conclusions can be found at the end of this report.

Methods

Information was acquired for the process evaluation from several sources, including observations of court sessions and team meetings during site visits, key informant interviews, focus groups and the Drug Court database. This information was then used to answer specific evaluation questions related to the Ten Key Components of Drug Courts. The methods used to gather this information from each source are described below. Once this information was gathered, a detailed process description was written and sent to the Drug Court for feedback and corrections. The Drug Court process was then evaluated, using the Ten Key Components of Drug Courts as a framework to determine whether, and how well, these key components were being demonstrated by the Drug Court Program.

Site Visits

NPC evaluation staff traveled monthly to the Drug Court to observe court sessions and Drug Court Team meetings. In addition, evaluation staff attended the Drug Court Team's quarterly retreats. These observations gave the evaluation team first-hand knowledge of the structure, procedures, and routines of the Drug Court as well as allowing an observer's view of team interactions to help evaluate the cohesiveness and integration of the team members.

Key Informant Interviews

Key informant interviews were a critical component of the process study. NPC staff interviewed 13 individuals involved in the Juvenile Drug Court, including the Drug Court Coordinator, Drug Court Judge, District Attorney, Public Defender, Treatment Providers, Probation and law enforcement representatives, as well as other individuals who were involved in the Drug Court. NPC Research, under a grant from the Administrative Office of the Courts of the State of California, designed a Drug Court Typology Interview Guide to provide a consistent method for collecting structure and process information from drug courts. This guide was modified to fit the purposes of this evaluation, including adding questions related to how the CCJDC operated in terms of the Ten Key Components of Drug Courts (NADCP, 1997). (More information on the Ten Key Components is included in the evaluation results, below.) The information gathered through this guide helped the evaluation team focus on important and unique characteristics of the Clackamas County Drug Court.

The topics for this Typology Interview Guide were chosen from three main sources: the evaluation team's extensive experience with drug courts, the American University Drug Court Survey, and a paper by Longshore, et al. (2001), describing a conceptual framework for drug courts. The typology interview covers a large number of areas -- including specific drug court characteristics, structure, processes, and organization -- that contribute to an understanding of the overall drug court typology. The topics in the Typology Interview Guide include eligibility guidelines, drug court program process (e.g., phases, treatment providers, urinalyses, fee structure, rewards/sanctions), graduation, aftercare, termination, non-drug court process, the drug court team and roles, and drug court demographics and other statistics.

Key people involved with the Drug Court were asked many of the questions in the Typology Guide during site visits and through multiple follow-up phone calls. This served three purposes:

1. It allowed us to spread the interview questions out over time, minimizing the length of the

interview at any one point in time,². It provided us with an opportunity to connect with key players throughout the duration of the project, maximizing our opportunities to obtain information, and 3. It allowed us to keep track of any changes that occurred in the drug court process from the beginning of the project to the end.

Focus groups

NPC Research conducted two focus groups at the Clackamas County Juvenile Drug Court. One focus group was with Juvenile Drug Court participants and the other focus group was with the parents/guardians of Drug Court participants (both current participants and participants who had graduated or been terminated). These focus groups gave the participants and parents/guardians an opportunity to express their perceptions and share their experiences of the Drug Court process with the evaluation team. Feedback from Drug Court participants was also relevant to addressing Key Component #2: whether drug court participants felt that their due process rights have been protected.

Document review

The evaluation team reviewed documentation from the Drug Court Program that would further the team's understanding of Drug Court history, operations, and practices. These documents included staff job descriptions, program grant proposals, and meeting minutes.

Administrative data analysis

The Oregon Drug Court Management System (ODCMS) was developed by the Oregon Judicial Department, State Justice Institute. The database was still in the pilot stages during this evaluation, with the most recent version of the database being implemented less than one month ago. This most recent version is thought to be the final version, but it is still being tested. The database allows drug courts to record information on client demographics, drug court hearings, drug testing, treatment providers, substance abuse, criminal history, case notes, outcomes, and follow-up information. While this database will be used primarily for the outcome evaluation, it also provided valuable information for the process evaluation, including information on how the database was being used by this court (as different processes at different drug courts lead to drug court staff using the database to suit their unique needs). This database provided the evaluation team with information on the types of clients served by the drug court, the frequency of drug court hearings and the types of treatment, monitoring, and sanctioning processes.

Results

The following results include a detailed process description of the Drug Court's current operations, a description and discussion of the focus group results, and an evaluation of the drug court process in terms of the Ten Key Components. Points of interest, issues, or successes experienced by the Drug Court are highlighted within the text as either "comments" or "observations." "Comments" contain information gathered directly from interviews with Drug Court staff or from participants, while "observations" contain information from evaluator observations of drug court processes.

Clackamas County Juvenile Drug Court Process Description

Implementation

The Clackamas County Juvenile Drug Court was implemented in November 2001. It was funded by a grant written by the Juvenile Department from the Drug Courts Program Office. Doug Poppen (Director of the Juvenile Department), Ellen Crawford (Juvenile Department Supervisor), and Michael Luna (original Drug Court Coordinator) were instrumental in its implementation. Judge Darling agreed to try Juvenile Drug Court and was a force behind getting key people to meet and agree to collaborate on the program.

Capacity and Enrollment

The total number of participants, as stated in the grant, was estimated as 140, including family members. Forty-three youths were to be served by the program over the two-year period. By the end of April 2003, 35 youths (30 males and 5 females) had entered the Juvenile Drug Court. The vast majority of participants were white (33 out of the 35); one was Hispanic, and one African-American. The primary drugs of choice were marijuana and methamphetamine. The ages of the participants at entry ranged from 14 to 18 years (although 18 year olds are no longer eligible for the program), with the majority being ages 16 and 17.

Referrals have been fairly steady at three to five per month. By April 1, 2003, unsuccessful terminations included six youths who went to juvenile correctional facilities, one who went to a residential treatment program, and two who opted out.

Eligibility

The target population for the Clackamas County Juvenile Drug Court is 14-17 year old males and females who are arrested for criminal offenses, excluding violent (person felony) crimes. Although the original grant called for youths to be eligible up to age 18, this was changed because 18 year olds are not eligible for many of the services available to those under 18.

To begin the referral process, the Juvenile Court Counselor determines that the youth may be appropriate for Drug Court; they then request that the case be pre-screened by the Case Manager. To be admitted to Drug Court, the youth needs to meet the American Society of Addiction

Medicine (ASAM) criteria for Level 2 treatment, be identified as a moderate or high risk for substance abuse on the Oregon Juvenile Risk Assessment tool, have an overall risk assessment score that is moderate to high, and demonstrate a commitment to participate in the program and motivation to eliminate their drug use. When the program started, it was a requirement that participants have previous drug and alcohol treatment. That requirement has since been dropped as it was determined that youths coming in with previous D&A treatment did not appear significantly different from youths who had not participated in treatment. Youths with significant mental health issues are no longer accepted into the program as it was determined that the program was unable to meet their treatment needs.

Observation: The CCJDC staff is very concerned about “turning away” these youths. Their inability to accept them is mainly due to lack of funding (and therefore a lack of staff time) rather than a lack of interest. This Drug Court is extremely proactive in addressing their issues and has already submitted a grant proposal to fund enhancements that will allow them to accept youths with more serious problems, as well as to provide more of the services that they have found to be beneficial to the families.

Juveniles are referred to Drug Court through the Juvenile Department, their attorney, or by the Judge. When a Juvenile Court Counselor determines that a youth may be appropriate for Drug Court, they request that the case be pre-screened by the Case Manager to determine whether the youth meets the eligibility requirements. If the Case Manager determines that the youth meets the eligibility criteria, a referral packet is completed and a screening is scheduled with the Treatment Provider. During this screening the Treatment Provider assesses whether the youth is appropriate for the program from a clinical perspective. If Drug Court is not appropriate for a particular youth/family (e.g., if the family has significant mental health issues that would interfere with successful completion of the program or the family is not willing to commit to the expectations of the program), the Treatment Provider will recommend to the Case Manager that the family not be accepted, although that is a rare occurrence. The youth must have one adult family member (parent, foster parent, etc.) willing to participate in the program alongside them. If the Treatment Provider deems the youth appropriate, then the case is staffed before the entire Drug Court Team. If the youth is accepted into the program, the family is then asked to observe one court session, to make sure they understand the process before committing. Prior to entering the program the youth and family also attend an orientation with the Case Manager. Orientation is an opportunity for the family to receive additional information about the program and to have their questions answered. The family usually begins Drug Court the following week. Once the youth has entered Drug Court a full mental health assessment is completed.

Youths entering the program are required to make an admission to either a new charge or a probation violation. Youths are not required to have a drug-related charge to enter the program. The length of time between arrest and entry into the program varies. The length of time from referral to entry usually takes two weeks. There is no waiting list.

Incentives to Participate and Complete the Drug Court Program

If the youth comes into Drug Court on an existing charge, then that charge is dismissed upon successful completion of Drug Court. If the youth comes into Drug Court on a probation

violation, the probation violation is dismissed upon successful completion of Drug Court, but the initial charge is not dismissed.

The incentive for most youths entering the program is getting their charge expunged from their record. The team believes that the incentive changes as the participants get further along in the program. Their motivation changes, and they want to be successful because they have put so much hard work into Drug Court. For the parents, the incentive is hope for a drug free child and better relationships among family members.

Drug Court Goals

The Clackamas County Juvenile Drug Court Team agreed that their Drug Court has three main goals:

- 1) Reduce recidivism
- 2) Reduce drug and alcohol use
- 3) Increase family functioning

These goals are to be attained through changing client perceptions of drug use and changing family systems.

Additional goals, related to the above goals, include:

- Help kids and families learn a sober lifestyle and teach participants how to make healthy choices
- Provide the youth with a place to make changes in their lives while living within their community as opposed to placement in a residential facility
- Help parents take back control
- Teach families tools to deal with issues
- Support parents
- Help participating families view the Court differently
- Have Judge and Juvenile Department as partners
- Reduce the number of kids going into an institution
- Provide comprehensive outpatient treatment
- Give a level of service not otherwise provided
- Offer a support system
- Give the kids a positive link to the community

Drug Court Program Phase Description

There are four phases plus Aftercare in the Clackamas County Juvenile Drug Court program. The program is a minimum of one year, with each phase consisting of specified treatment objectives, and therapeutic and rehabilitative activities. In general, Phases 1 and 2 are more educational while Phases 3 and 4 are more about processing in regard to homes, relationships, and sobriety.

During Phase I, youths and parents/guardians attend Court once a week and are asked to complete one of the three required family sessions. The participants are also expected to attend therapeutic groups (group treatment) twice a week, attend the Drug Court Support Group once a week and meet with the Case Manager on a weekly basis. Individual counseling is set up as necessary. The parent(s)/guardian(s) are asked to attend the Parent Support Group on a weekly basis while the participant is in Phase 1. During all phases of the program participants are required to be involved in school (high school, GED, college), maintain employment, or participate in volunteer work (e.g., community service), whichever is applicable. The participant must have 30 consecutive days clean before entering Phase 2.

In Phase 2, the youths and family begin attending Court every two weeks instead of weekly. Although the Case Manager contacts are decreased to every two weeks, the youths continue to participate in therapeutic groups twice a week. In this phase, the participants are no longer required to attend the Drug Court Support Group, although they are required to attend one community support group. A community support group can include: an AA/NA/MA meeting, a church youth group, the Drug Court Support Group, or other group approved by the Case Manager. AA/NA/MA group meetings were a previous requirement but other options have since been added, as it was determined that the meetings were not youth oriented, and therefore were not beneficial for most Juvenile Drug Court participants. In the past, youths were asked to turn in verification slips for the support group that they had attended. Participants are currently required to complete a writing assignment describing the support group they attended, and they are expected to turn them in at each court appearance. Phase 2 participants must have 45 consecutive days clean to move to Phase 3.

Observation: The change in requirements for AA/NA meetings described above is an example of this Drug Court's ability to do self-evaluation. The team is quick to notice a practice that is not working well, discuss the issue as a group to determine what the purpose of the practice was and how they can accomplish that purpose differently, and then institute any needed adjustments to the process. This is discussed further in the section on Ten Key Components of Drug Courts.

Once the youth enters Phase 3, unless otherwise sanctioned, Court is attended every three weeks, and contact with the Case Manager occurs every three weeks. During this phase the therapeutic groups are decreased to once a week. Support group attendance is not a requirement in this phase. Upon entering Phase 3, each youth must have selected a community activity to participate in for two hours a week. The activity may include, but is not limited to, organized athletics, school sponsored clubs, classes, volunteer work, auditing a class, an activity with another Drug Court participant that is supervised by a parent, or structured family activities that are approved by the Case Manager in advance. The youths are required to complete a written assignment each week describing their community activity. This assignment is turned in weekly during the therapeutic group. Within the first 30 days of Phase 3 the youth selects someone to serve as his/her Mentor during Phase 4. Youth must have 60 consecutive days clean to advance to Phase 4.

In Phase 4, the youth and family attend Court every four weeks. Contact with the Case Manager occurs once a month, and there is one required therapeutic group a week. The participants are

required to meet with their Mentor once a week for a minimum of 30 minutes and continue in their chosen community activity for two hours a week. Before entering Aftercare the participants are required to design an Aftercare plan that applies to their particular needs. The youth must have 90 consecutive clean days to complete Phase 4.

The Drug Court Team considers the final three months of the program Aftercare, although the participants do not graduate before completing the Aftercare portion of the program. The purpose of the Aftercare Phase is to release youths and families from dependence on the program and give youths and families an opportunity to practice what they have learned in the first four phases of treatment. The Aftercare Phase consists of a joint plan that includes expectations from the Drug Court Team and aspects important to participants and families to assist the participants in living a clean and sober lifestyle. In addition to the basic expectations of the Drug Court (one Court appearance a month and a minimum of three UAs over the 90 day period), the Aftercare plan incorporates the aspects of the program and the community which the youth found most beneficial. An Aftercare Planning Meeting is scheduled a couple of weeks before the youth's anticipated transition to Aftercare. The participants and parents are asked to be present and encouraged to bring along any significant support people such as Mentors, other family members, neighbors, teachers or anyone else that may play an important role in the participant's Aftercare. The meeting is an opportunity for the youths to present their Aftercare plan to the Treatment Team, and a chance for the Team to provide feedback regarding the plan and answer any questions. Once the Treatment Team approves of the Aftercare plan it is submitted to the Judge for final approval. The Drug Court Team is available for support during Aftercare, but it is up to the family to follow their plan. Once in the Aftercare phase, the youth and family have one meeting with the Judge and Coordinator to review their experience and to provide feedback about the program. The youth must have 90 consecutive days clean to complete the Aftercare Phase.

Requirements to Change Phase

In addition to attending the meetings and following the other requirements described above, there are specific requirements that participants must meet before moving from one phase of the program to the next. An individualized treatment plan is created, and certain goals must be met. Phase advancement also requires the approval of the team. In order to change phases, a youth must be clean for the following number of consecutive days:

- Phase 1: 30 days
- Phase 2: 45 days
- Phase 3: 60 days
- Phase 4: 90 days
- Aftercare: 90 days

Before participants advance to the next phase, they must give a presentation in Court. Prior to Court, these presentations are given during one of the therapeutic groups so that the participant can receive feedback from the Treatment Provider and from other group members. For each phase advancement there are different questions which make up their presentations (e.g., why the participant is there, what problems s/he has had, what are his/her strengths).

Treatment

The CCJDC uses a single treatment provider model. Clackamas County Mental Health is the only treatment provider for the CCJDC. The treatment approach varies to best meet the needs of the client. Most treatment approaches are based on holistic, systemic, strengths-based, motivational, cognitive behavior and family-centered theories.

Treatment services include:

- Group treatment
- Individual treatment
- Family therapy sessions
- Full mental health assessment or psychiatric assessment, when needed
- Referrals to other services are provided as needed

Drug Court Sessions

Drug Court takes place once a week, on Tuesday, and lasts for approximately an hour and a half. All parent(s)/guardian(s) and youths are required to stay for the entire session. Approximately 15 parents and 12 youths attend each session. Drug Court staff members who attend Court include the Judge, Drug Court Coordinator, Case Manager, Treatment Provider, Family Therapist, Prosecutor, Defense Counsel, Mental Health or Juvenile Department Supervisor, a Deputy from the Sheriff's Department and the Recreational Group Facilitator. Frequency of attendance for participants depends on their phase requirements: once a week for Phase 1, once every two weeks for Phase 2, once every three weeks for Phase 3, and once every four weeks for Phase 4 and during Aftercare. These requirements may change according to the youth's progress and what the Judge mandates. For example, if a youth is having a difficult time in the program, the Judge may increase the frequency of hearings.

The Drug Court Team

Judge. The Judge has about 10% of her time dedicated to Drug Court. She presides over the Court, determines sanctions and rewards while taking into account recommendations from the team, builds relationships with the youths and their families, participates in the staffing, and helps determine treatment recommendations. She also helps the Coordinator with community outreach, helps to solve problems, and serves as a role model to youths and parents.

The Judge's specific goals for the program include improving family functioning, reducing drug use, reducing the youths' future involvement in the criminal justice system, and changing the youths' attitude toward drug use, family, and school.

Comment: The Judge was also named, by both Team members and participants, as a special Judge, one who is energetic, creative, fun, genuinely committed to the youths she works with, compassionate, firm, and "the one who makes Drug Court what it is."

Drug Court Coordinator. The Drug Court coordinator spends 100% of her time on Drug Court activities and has an extensive and very specific set of tasks. The Coordinator attends weekly process meetings, prepares the agenda and does program planning. She serves as a resource for team members; fills in for them at Court hearings or groups, and helps with getting them needed resources. She is part of the Treatment Team and is involved in case management decisions. In Court she enters data into the Oregon Drug Court Management System (ODCMS). (This database is discussed further later in this process description). In addition, part of the Clackamas County Drug Court Coordinator's role is to look to the future for sustainability. Doing so requires researching federal and state funding opportunities. The Coordinator also solicits local resources for incentives and donations. She represents the Court in the community and is involved in numerous activities (e.g., state leadership, and the ODCMS pilot).

A more detailed description of the duties performed by the Coordinator for this Drug Court are provided in the following job description:

1. Monitor implementation grant; review time task plans, program objectives and budget details to ensure grant compliance; comply with reporting requirements and timely submission of reports; maintain contact with Grants Manager; participate in reporting and coordinating with State and Federal authorities.
2. Develop, maintain and modify Drug Court policy/procedures manual. (The policy/procedure manual is used by the Drug Court Team to determine admission criteria, incentives, sanctions, team member roles, and completion/termination guidelines). Monitor program goals and objectives to ensure compliance with mission statement and continue to review goals and objectives along with Drug Court Team to identify and implement revisions.
3. Monitor the Drug Court database and software and ensure grant compliance. Coordinate, monitor and participate in data input. Coordinate with internal data technician to see that Drug Court data needs are being met; coordinate at the State level for consistency in data collection among other Juvenile Drug Courts.
4. Oversee the initiation and final process and outcome evaluation. Collaborate with the evaluator to see that appropriate measures and data are reported that reflect the primary issues of the Drug Court.
5. Secure long-term funding sources for Drug Court sustainability; attend applicable workshops for sustainability; network with federal Grant Manager, National Drug Court Institute, Adult Drug Court Coordinator, and any other applicable resources.
6. Ensure adequate communication among various agencies involved with the Drug Court Program; visit and gather information from agencies that provide services to Drug Court participants, and share information with Drug Court Team for quality assurance.
7. Develop and maintain community resources needed to implement and enhance Drug Court goals and objectives; increase community awareness of the Drug Court Program and develop community partnerships to enhance the program.

8. Additional duties, as directed, may include: facilitation of support groups; assistance with Drug Court proceedings; individual contact and advocacy with Drug Court youths and families.

The Coordinator's activities support the goals of the Drug Court in that the Drug Court needs to have supportive services in place. The Coordinator promotes Drug Court within the community and thus gains resources (including financial resources), involvement from the community, and educational resources. The Coordinator provides leadership needed to streamline the efforts of all agencies involved and gathers data needed to evaluate the success of the program, keeping up to date with the ODCMS database so the data is ready to use at any time.

Observation: The CCJDC Coordinator appears to be extremely well organized and committed to fostering an environment of teamwork. Her attention to small details supports the teamwork environment. For example, for the first graduation ceremony, the Coordinator created a task list with blanks so the Team Members could sign up for each task. This allowed the Team to see the work that needed to be done, to know what other Team members were doing, and to be sure that all tasks were covered. She has been known to bring calculators for each member of the Drug Court Team for their use when meeting on budget issues. The Coordinator also created a wallet-sized laminated contact list for the Drug Court participants so they know how to reach any of the Drug Court Team when they need to explain absences or they need help. This allows participants no excuses for not keeping in touch with the team members.

Law Enforcement. A Deputy from the Sheriff's Department began attending all Drug Court sessions after a situation occurred that was a potential safety risk. The Deputy also transports youths sanctioned to detention and provides some security services. He is stationed at the Juvenile Department.

Probation. The Juvenile Court Counselor serves as the Case Manager and plays a large role in the CCJDC. She performs case management on a weekly basis, including UA collection and helping the Coordinator identify needs and gaps (e.g., transportation). The Case Manager creates the weekly reports on participants as well as the Youth Handbook. She attends Court and logs hearings, case numbers, and other similar information for the ODCMS. She is responsible for supervision and tracking of the youth as well as coordination with schools and community service organizations.

The Juvenile Department's goals for Probation are the same as the Drug Court's goals: to reduce recidivism, reduce use, and increase family functioning. The Case Manager's activities try to fulfill these goals by ensuring that participants are abiding by the order of the Court.

Public Defender. The Public Defender makes an initial consultation, attends all staffing meetings, and helps make Drug Court Team recommendations. Once clients are in Court, the Public Defender has little personal contact with them, although he is available for consultation. He attends Tuesday meetings, monthly meetings, and the quarterly meetings. His role is to advocate for the participants and to answer questions for the youths and the rest of the Drug Court Team.

The Public Defender's goal is to see that the youth's position is presented to the Drug Court Team. For Drug Court, the Public Defender will know that he has reached this goal by the kind and number of youths who get into Drug Court, and if participants get as many services as are available while in the program.

District Attorney. The DA is responsible for making decisions about whether or not a youth is eligible for Drug Court based on their current charge. She attends Drug Court Team meetings and Court sessions and recommends sanctions. She also researches various legal issues for the Team, such as developing a list of non-eligible crimes and meeting with other people with legal expertise to verify legal information pertinent to Drug Court. The DA has four and a half to five hours per week dedicated to Drug Court.

Treatment Provider. There are two main therapists for this Drug Court:

The Juvenile Treatment Therapist runs all therapeutic groups and individual sessions. He also performs UA collection and occasionally runs family sessions. One hundred percent of his time is dedicated to Drug Court.

By using a holistic approach, the Juvenile Treatment Therapist's goal is to improve overall functioning of the youth and the family, and prevent drug and alcohol use. His activities relate to the goals of the Court in that he works to see that the crimes are fewer and further between, to get the youth to internalize more, and to see that the family and relationship skills are improving. He offers the participants education and communication skills, and he builds rapport with them.

The Family Therapist provides family therapy, including the program's three required family sessions. Additional family sessions are optional after the third family session, although the Judge has mandated additional sessions in the past. The Family Therapist facilitates a weekly parent support group, works on program development, and assists the team in formulating dispositions for youths. He works part-time with Drug Court.

The role of the Family Therapist is to decrease family chaos by helping family members improve their communication and by helping parents increase their structure within the home. Therapeutic goals seek to empower parents while building the youth's self-esteem.

Other Service Providers. There are three other agencies that provide services for the Juvenile Drug Court participants and their families:

The Recreational Group Facilitator is a skills group facilitator from the Juvenile Department who addresses issues such as anger management and accountability. He also helps the Treatment Provider with the therapeutic group after Court. Although he is not a core member of the Drug Court Team, he does attend the Tuesday staffing meetings, sits in on Drug Court sessions, co-facilitates one therapeutic group, and provides positive team building activities. The Recreational Group Facilitator has a more active role during the summer, providing activities such as team building and games with cognitive skill building woven into them. He works five to six hours a week on Drug Court activities.

The Transition Advisor, from the Clackamas Technical Education Consortium (CTEC), provides educational and other resources (e.g., help with resume writing, finding temporary jobs, job search) and helps youths find work or schooling. She attends the Drug Court staffing meetings in order to provide information about alternative programs in school and about programs that are available in the community. CTEC also provides some funding for supportive services (bus, clothing, fees, books, etc.) as the youths in Drug Court are required to be in school, working, or participating in volunteer work.

The Oregon Youth Authority Liaison provides services when out-of-home placement is needed. OYA gains temporary custody of a youth, which allows the Juvenile Department to keep them in the Drug Court program. The OYA Liaison has about five hours a week for Drug Court.

OYA's main goal is to support both the Juvenile Department and Drug Court in accomplishing their goals. The OYA Liaison's goal for Drug Court is to help the participants to understand their problems. He feels that the youths may need to be out of the home to do this. Another goal is to see the youths successfully complete foster care and be reunited with their families.

Observation: The above Team members exemplify the connections this Drug Court has in the community. These Team members also exemplify the range of services available to the participants of this Drug Court. This is discussed further in the section on Key Components.

Team Meetings

The Clackamas County Juvenile Drug Court Team meets to review cases every Tuesday for two hours prior to Drug Court. On the second Tuesday of the month, the team meets for an additional hour to discuss program development. Quarterly retreats also occur to discuss program development and agency coordination. The Juvenile Department Supervisor and Mental Health Supervisor attend meetings on alternate weeks.

Communication with Court

Team members communicate with the Court through Drug Court Team meetings and email. The Judge receives formal paperwork (a chart with an update for all ongoing cases) from the Team before each Court session. The information that is shared includes attendance at required treatment sessions and other required meetings, UA status, treatment group topics, and parent reports. Any drug and alcohol use is shared with the Team, as well as anything about participants' behaviors that are relevant to their progress in Drug Court. A confidentiality agreement is signed when the youth joins Drug Court advising them that information will be shared between the agencies that make up the Drug Court Team. Youths are kept informed about disclosures and informed when the Treatment Provider intends to disclose personal information and the intent of such disclosures.

Comment: If personal issues are shared by the Treatment Provider with the Team, they are targeted toward the effort of better treatment planning and Team response to behaviors. All efforts are made to motivate the youths to share the information themselves.

In addition, when the Team does a screening for a potential new participant, the team receives a packet of information about the youth/family several days before the screening occurs. When a youth is accepted into Drug Court, the Judge receives booking sheets, including a picture of the youth.

Urinalysis (UA)

The Drug Court attempts to collect UAs on a random basis. The Drug Court Case Manager keeps a monthly calendar with the UA collection from each youth randomly dispersed by day. On the weekend, the youths call in on a UA phone line through Juvenile Reception Center. Youths whose names are on the recording must come in to the department for their UA at the designated time.

During the week, the youths find out if they are scheduled for a UA through the Case Manager or the Team member that is facilitating group. UAs are given two to three times a week during Phase 1 and 2, but may be increased if use is suspected or tapered off if the youth is doing well. There is usually only one UA per weekend, but an additional UA may be added if deemed appropriate. During Phases 3 and 4, there are one to two UAs each week. Three UAs are required during Aftercare, although the youth and family can determine if they want more. Parents have access to UA supplies if they choose to test their child in the home. Although all UA collections should be observed, approximately 50% actually are observed by Drug Court staff due to lack of available staff members of the appropriate gender.

When participants come in for a UA they are required to empty their pockets and are checked to reduce the possibility of tampering with their UA. The sample is sent to an outside company for testing and the results are faxed back within three days.

Comment: Although the Court believes in the importance of random UAs, some Drug Court staff believe that participants often have some idea of when their next drug test will be coming up. In addition, the UA collection is often not observed due to lack of availability of staff of the appropriate gender.

Observation: Additional funds, such as those that may be provided by the enhancement grant, might help provide staff time to deal with these issues.

In addition to UA tests, the Drug Court Program uses saliva swabs and a drug detection patch. These tests are utilized more as a screening tool if it is suspected that the youth is using. The Drug Court Team has access to the Juvenile Department Breathalyzer but is considering getting its own Breathalyzer in order to more effectively test for alcohol use, as it is quickly eliminated from the body and therefore difficult to detect through urinalysis.

Rewards

Rewards are given to Clackamas County Drug Court participants for individual progress, consistent compliance with Drug Court requirements, and for reduction in use. During the

Tuesday meeting, Team members suggest giving rewards for those participants they feel are doing well and deserve recognition. Material rewards were given more frequently when Drug Court first started, but when the Team realized rewards did not need to be material to hold value, they began giving more personal recognition along with smaller material rewards.

Among the variety of rewards that may be given are a decrease in the number of groups that the participant must attend, an increase in freedoms and privileges (such as being allowed to report in less often or decreasing the number of group sessions required), praise, and a promotion to the next phase. The Judge gives a toy frog, the "Leap Ahead Award," to Phase 1 participants after a few weeks of doing well. The frog can be taken away and returned during Phase 1, but the frog becomes the participant's to keep upon entering Phase 2. The Judge also gives certificates and coins as rewards.

The Team has included two incentive-based drawings into the program. The first is the bi-weekly "Group Grab" drawing. The participants are eligible for this drawing based on their participation, behavior, and effort in therapeutic groups. For each group that a youth actively participates in, they earn one ticket toward the "Group Grab." The youth whose name is drawn gets to choose from a number of incentives including candy, small gift certificates, and other small items. The second incentive-based drawing is the "Most Improved Kid of the Week" award. Each week the Judge puts one name in the drawing for the youth who has demonstrated the most improvement. This drawing is held once a month, and the incentive is usually a gift certificate. The Judge also recognizes parents for their improvement and effort.

Sanctions

The Drug Court Team uses a variety of sanctions. In the early phases, the Team determines which sanctions to impose, but in the later phases the Judge looks for more parental responses to the youth's actions. The goal is for the family to gain back control and begin to hold their child accountable through appropriate responses. Sanctions are individualized and are chosen to suit the youth's specific situation.

Comment: The team is always looking for innovative sanctions. The Court works to be both fair *and* effective, by recognizing circumstances and utilizing creativity in determining the most appropriate sanction for each participant.

There have been on-going conversations about whether there should be common sanctions, progressive sanctions, and/or individually-based sanctions for different kids. Currently, the Team has decided on standard sanctions for certain behaviors, such as positive UAs. Other behaviors that are sanctioned include: not showing up for an appointment, problems at home, a new charge, and school problems. The standard sanctions are graduated and often start with community service and end with termination. For example, the first positive UA earns four hours of community service, then eight hours, then one night in detention, two to three days in detention, and then one week in detention. Participants have also been ordered to pay a fee for missing individual treatment appointments. If a youth continues to struggle in the program, they may be taken out of the home and placed in foster care for approximately 30-90 days.

The Case Manager (Probation) initiates the sanction process during the Tuesday team meeting. The Case Manager provides the Team with an overview of the youth's progress since the last Court appearance. If the youth has any violations, the Team discusses the issue and gives the Judge input on the recommended sanction.

Unsuccessful Termination

Unsuccessful termination from the program results from serious non-compliance or a continued lack of progress in the program. Any combination of the following factors occurring over an extended period of time could lead to a termination: new serious crimes, serious or violent behavior, continued drug use, not attending groups or Court, running away for a week or more, chronic failure to cooperate with treatment or home rules, and if foster care and/or inpatient treatment have been tried without success. Termination is based on the youth's individual circumstances and needs, as well as on what prior resources have been tried. Six youths were terminated prior to April 2003.

Most youths who were terminated were committed to MacLaren (a juvenile correctional facility). As a result of recent budget cuts, the Team has begun to utilize inpatient treatment and residential treatment programs after termination, as there is minimal space available in the juvenile correctional facilities.

Observation: As the above paragraph demonstrates, termination from this Drug Court program does not necessarily mean termination from treatment. The Drug Court Team, when deciding upon termination, makes this decision with the intention of doing what is best for the participant and his or her family.

Graduation

The first graduation for the Clackamas County Juvenile Drug Court took place in February 2003, with six graduates. In addition to completing each phase of the program, other specific graduation requirements are stated in the Clackamas County Drug Court Policy and Procedure Manual as follows:

“To be eligible for graduation the youth must:

- Successfully follow the Aftercare plan
- Test negative and maintain abstinence from drugs during all of the Aftercare Phase (90 days);
- Have approval from Drug Court Team;
- Be sufficiently involved in or have completed an academic/vocational training program and, if appropriate, obtain consistent employment;
- Demonstrate an understanding of personal problems of drug abuse, criminal behavior and relapse prevention;
- Verbally present in Drug Court a request for graduation."

Requirements for each youth vary according to his or her individualized treatment plan. However, the requirements stated above are mandatory for all participants.

The first graduation took place at the Clackamas County Courthouse. The Juvenile Drug Court Judge spoke, welcoming the graduates, families and friends. The Judge for the Clackamas County Adult Drug Court (CCADC) presided over the ceremony. The Clackamas County Sheriff, a Clackamas County Commissioner, and an Oregon State Senator all attended and spoke at the graduation. The graduates were recognized, two at a time, by the Treatment Provider and Case Manager. The parents were recognized by the Judge and the Family Therapist. A reception with refreshments was held after the ceremony.

Data Collection by the Drug Court Program

The Oregon Drug Court Management System (ODCMS). The ODCMS is a new Drug Court Data Management System that is still in the developmental stages. Clackamas County was part of the ODCMS database trial that included evaluator input as to which data to collect, as well as which data were of key importance and which were unnecessary. There are seven Oregon Courts using this software, experimentally, while it is being developed. At this point, only the Drug Court Coordinator is entering data for the Juvenile Drug Court because the software is yet to be user-friendly. Training will be provided for the Team when the software is ready for them to start entering data. The most recent and complete version of this database software was provided to the program in April of 2003.

On a weekly basis, the Coordinator enters UA results, case management progress, Court attendance, sanctions, and demographic information such as address and ethnicity. The Case Manager currently uses a spreadsheet to track the youth's progress between Court appearances and enters case notes in the Juvenile Judicial Information System (JJIS). There is also a mental health database that the Coordinator can indirectly access through the therapists.

Comment/Observation: The state is currently addressing issues involved with the new HIPAA regulations. At the state level, drug courts are struggling with keeping medical health records accessible, as the new HIPAA regulations suggest that drug courts cannot have access to those records. This is a problem for both efficient drug court operations and for evaluation. In order to understand participant progress (or lack of progress) and to determine appropriate responses (e.g., rewards and sanctions) to participant successes or failures, the judge and the other drug court team members must have access to information on participant progress in treatment, as well as any extenuating life circumstances. In addition, for evaluators to determine if drug courts are providing the appropriate type and amount of services, as well as to determine successful outcomes, it is essential that HIPAA-regulated data be available for legitimate evaluation purposes.

Observation: Data collection and evaluation are clearly a priority at this Drug Court. They have been involved in the creation of the ODCMS database from the beginning and made sure that an evaluator was involved in its design and in working out the "bugs." They have pilot tested several versions at their Court and given feedback on the usability and practicality of the software.

Drug Court Funding

In a time of massive budget cuts in the State and counties of Oregon, there is currently no solid funding for the Drug Court program. However, there are enough funds to keep the Court running while the Coordinator organizes efforts to apply for new grants (such as the enhancement grant proposal sent out in May). Despite the lack of resources the climate remains positive. The Oregon Association of Drug Court Professionals is also becoming more active in assisting Drug Courts with finding funding opportunities.

Observation 1: This Drug Court's Team members have demonstrated their true commitment to the program in recent meetings on how to adjust the process in response to the cut in resources. Each Team member made suggestions for how to provide what they felt were the most important services to keep in order for participants to succeed, without regard for the security of their own employment.

Observation 2: The CCJDC has been examining the possibility of becoming self-supporting. Part of this process would include having participants pay for their treatment and UAs.

Recommendation: One possibility for participants who do not have much money is for the Drug Court to find employers in the community who are willing to have Drug Court participants perform various jobs for an hourly wage, which they would then use to pay their Drug Court fees.

Participant Focus Group Results

As described in the methodology, two focus groups were conducted at this Drug Court, one for the juvenile participants and one for their parents or guardians. The main topics for questions asked at both focus groups included what the focus group participants liked about the Drug Court program, what they disliked, what parts of the program they felt supported their success and what parts made it more difficult to succeed, whether they felt their due process rights were protected and finally, any suggestions they had for improving the CCJDC program. The youth focus group results are presented first and then are followed by the parent/guardian results.

Youth Focus Group

Six youths were available for the youth focus group, one female and five males. Two had been in the program for one year, two had been in the program for about six months, and two had been in the program one month or less. Although graduates were invited, none were able to attend. Most of the small number of participants who had been terminated were in correctional facilities and therefore were unavailable for the focus group.

What they liked:

- All the participants very much liked the Juvenile Treatment Therapist. They felt that it was safe to talk to him, that he really listened and understood what they were saying, and that he helped them think through their issues and make better choices.
- The youths appreciated that the program helped them to get off drugs, gave them the opportunity to have their conviction removed from their records, and gave them “a second chance.”
- The participants liked the ‘Group Grab’ and the ‘Drug Court Kid of the Month’ (especially when they have the opportunity to win Blazer tickets).

What they disliked:

- The participants disliked going to Court and going up before the Judge. They agreed that when the Judge was happy with them it was okay, but when the Judge was unhappy they “hated the whole experience.”
- Family therapy was unanimously disliked. They agreed that the main feature they disliked was talking about issues in front of their parents.
- The NA/AA meeting requirement had just been changed a few days before the date of the focus group, so there were still complaints about those meetings (and also relief that they were no longer required).
- The amount of time it takes to participate in the program was also difficult for the participants. They felt that the group and Court session requirements sometimes got them in trouble with their employers or made it difficult for them to take the classes they wanted at school.

Observation: Although the above comments from the Drug Court participants are concerning what they disliked about the program, much of what they disliked was also included in what they felt helped them to succeed. This issue is further discussed later in this section.

Comment/Observation: Some youth said that Drug Court staff would sometimes call employers to help smooth the way for participants to meet the program requirements without causing issues in the workplace. The practice of having Drug Court staff talk with employers can be extremely helpful in supporting Drug Court participants’ ability to meet program time requirements. In addition, these conversations can lead to further support and linkages with the community. Some employers will even keep positions available specifically for Drug Court participants.

What worked:

(What they felt was most helpful for their success in the program):

- The UAs helped participants remember to be honest and helped them to avoid using (since they would be caught).

- The participants felt that the Drug Court Team was really trying to help. As one participant said, “If you mess up, it’s not the end of the world.” This encouraged participants to feel that they had a chance to succeed.
- The Court hearings before the Judge made participants “want to do better.” The hearings serve as a reminder about what could happen to them, both positively and negatively.
- The group therapy and other meetings with the Juvenile Therapist were unanimously voted as one of the most helpful parts of the program. As one youth said, “I finally saw why I had to stop using.”
- The participants agreed that although they disliked family therapy, it helped them communicate more with their parents. “I have a much better relationship with my father now. We talk.”

What Didn’t Work:

(What they felt was least helpful (or was a barrier) to their success):

- Participants believe that the community service was not effective as a sanction. “We might risk smoking if we’re only going to get community service.”
- The requirement of 45 days clean during Phase II, which participants know is supposed to last 60 days, caused participants to feel that they were expected to use for the first two weeks.

Comment/Observation: The Drug Court Team knows about the issue of 45 days clean versus the expected duration of 60 days. They have decided to keep the requirement and the duration as is because it provides them with information about where the participants are in their progress toward ending their drug use.

- Some participants felt their job was a barrier to their ability to complete the program. Many felt that going to school or working made it much more difficult to fulfill the Drug Court requirements.
- Transportation to and from the Drug Court activities was also a barrier.

Were their due process rights protected?

- All participants felt that their rights were protected and that, in fact, they got a “better deal” than those who didn’t get to participate in Drug Court.
 - “The program is a blessing.”
 - “They give you a fair hearing.”
 - “We signed something that said we understood our rights and that we would do what they said.”
 - “They give you chances you wouldn’t get somewhere else.”

Other information and quotes of interest:

- All the focus group participants felt that the Drug Court staff treated them well. They felt that members of the Team wanted them to succeed and would do all they could to help them succeed.

- Some Drug Court participants felt that the Court “was sexist.” “Girls don’t get nearly the same treatment. One girl messed up a lot and only got four hours of community service.”
- The focus group participants agreed that sanctions were not the same for everyone. They understood that “it has to be individual [and] people have to be treated differently” but that “sometimes they (the Team) are way off.”
- The participants all agreed that the Drug Court was getting “stricter” (quicker to give sanctions and harder sanctions). Some felt that it was getting too strict. Others felt that it was better to be strict because people were going back to “doing their own thing” and the Court needed to be strict to get them to stop.
- “I was on a road to nowhere. The program helped me.”
- “The kids that have failed were bound to run anyway. They messed up too much. They didn’t care. The Team tried everything for those people. They just didn’t like the program and made excuses for their use.”

Observation: The kids had no suggestions on ways to improve the program. Each time one of them would suggest something, either another participant or the individual who suggested it would decide that it really was necessary for the program practices to remain as they were.

Parent/Guardian Focus Group

Fourteen parents attended the focus group, three with a youth who had been terminated, five with a youth who had graduated, and six with a youth in different phases of the program.

What they liked:

- Parents liked having the back-up of the Court structure. This was particularly true for single parents.
- The family involvement in the Drug Court process was well-liked. Parents felt included and said that the Court gave them resources and tools for parenting skills to help them work appropriately with their kids. They felt that someone in the system cared. They particularly enjoyed the parent talks with the Judge.
- The parents liked that the program held the kids accountable.
- The parent support groups and the one-on-one parent counseling were both listed in what the parents liked about the program.

What they disliked:

- The main parent complaint was the limited program resources. They felt that the services provided were great, but that there weren’t enough of them. For example, the JEMP (a 24-hour monitoring device) is used for kids who are under house arrest, but there “weren’t enough JEMPs to go around.”
- Some parents felt that they were given information at the orientation too quickly and that there was too much of it, but other parents disagreed. However, all the parents agreed that the Drug Court program asks for feedback regularly and that the Drug Court Team really listens to their suggestions.

Observation: The parents appeared to have a difficult time finding anything negative to say about the program. Although the first few answers to the question were about what they disliked, the focus group discussion quickly turned to how well the Drug Court Team dealt with problems and then on to more positive comments on the program. The parents of the youths who had been terminated believed that the termination was just what their child needed and were still very positive about the program.

What Worked:

(What was most helpful for success in the program):

- o Parents felt that the multidisciplinary approach was very helpful. They knew who to talk to about a specific type of problem.
- o The phases helped with parenting skills. The parents learned from seeing the freedoms their children were getting back from following the structure and discipline of the Court.
- o Parents felt that having the Court hold their kids accountable, and teaching the parents how to hold their kids accountable was key to helping their kids succeed.
- o The sanctions that are tailored to fit the specific kid were important to the parents.
- o The parents believed that the kids did self-policing of each other and that this helped the kids stick to the rules.
- o Parents thought the family therapy helped them learn how to talk with their kids and how and when to hold their kids accountable.

What Didn't Work:

(What they felt was least helpful (or was a barrier) to participant success):

- o One parent felt that the location of the Court made it difficult to participate. No other parent agreed.
- o Parents felt that the AA/NA groups were unhelpful and inappropriate for their kids.
- o Similar to the youths' comments, parents believed that the community service was not effective as a sanction.

Comment/Observation: Parents agreed that community service should not be used as a sanction, but instead should be a requirement, to teach the kids about giving back to their communities. Other drug courts have implemented this idea successfully. They allow their participants to choose any type of community service (with the judge's consent), and they must perform a certain number of hours to be promoted to the next phase. Some courts have community service as a graduation requirement.

Observation: As with the question on parent dislikes, the parents had a difficult time finding anything that they found was a real barrier that would prevent their child from succeeding.

Suggestions to improve the program:

- o Some parents thought it would be helpful to have a written explanation of terms used in the Drug Court process and about the principle behind the coordination of services. They

felt this would improve the orientation process. (One person said they do have a handout and it cleared up any questions that she had.)

- o One parent said, "I think it would be cool if there was a video about the program that the parents could check out about orientation."

Other information and quotes of interest:

- o Parents were concerned about the 60 days required, of which only 45 days have to be clean, to complete Phase II.

Observation: It appears that the 45 days clean out of 60 is an issue for both the kids and the parents. It might be helpful for parents to have the program strategy explained to them.

- o "I can't remember an instance where fairness was not in the forefront of this program. The Judge emanates fairness and the rest of the Team members are really balanced people."
- o "It helped *mature me as a father*. I wanted to be my kid's friend, but that doesn't work. I needed to be a grownup. I know the program helped my son. It held him accountable."
- o "We applaud the Team. They are figuring it out and it's impressive. They have a good reflection of character, they are willing listeners, everything is from the heart, and they are humble. They are cohesive, and there are no turf battles. They support one another on the Team and back each other."
- o "I felt like we were their only case."

10 Key Components Results

This section lists the Ten Key Components of Drug Courts as described by the National Association of Drug Court Professionals (NADCP, 1997). Also listed are the research questions developed for this evaluation, which were designed to determine whether and how well each key component is demonstrated by this Drug Court. Each question is followed by a discussion of the practices of this Drug Court in relation to the key component of interest. Some questions require a comparison to other drug courts. In these cases, results from the National Drug Court Survey performed by Carolyn Cooper at American University (2000) are used as a benchmark.

Component 1. Drug courts integrate alcohol and other drug treatment services with justice system case processing.

Research Question: Has an integrated drug court team emerged?

This is the CCJDC's biggest strength and, in the opinion of the evaluator, is the largest reason why this drug court is operating effectively and efficiently. Communication between the Team members is central in how this Team has become so highly integrated. As described above in the section on Drug Court process, the Team members communicate every day through email, as well as attend the weekly Team meetings, the monthly meetings on program development. and

the quarterly retreats. The emails give each member of the Team up-to-date information on what is happening with participants during the week as well as upcoming events and any tasks assigned to the various Team members. The weekly Team meetings are focused on the progress of participants attending Court that week, and allow the Team members to have input and make decisions on the Team response to each participant's problems or successes. The quarterly retreat is generally a time to discuss drug court policies and make decisions on changing practices that are not working or on implementing new practices they believe will help enhance the program (i.e., increase participant success). The Team works together to come to a consensus on Drug Court policies as well as other routine decisions, such as sanctions and rewards for each participant. Although the Team does not always agree on what the best decision may be, they are always willing to discuss different ideas and sometimes will agree to disagree, while supporting whatever direction was chosen in the end.

Keeping the Team members involved in decision-making fosters a strong sense of teamwork and helps each member feel that they are a valued member of the Team. In addition, this frequent communication and input from the Team members allows the Court to act swiftly when problems arise. The Team is open to new ideas and, in fact, seeks out new ideas for ways to keep this Court running smoothly and ways to improve Court practices. Each member of the Team appears to be invested in making this Drug Court work for its participants, without being invested in having his or her own personal ideas implemented in the process.

Component 2. Using a non-adversarial approach, prosecution and defense counsel promote public safety while protecting participants' due process rights.

Research Question: Are the Public Defender's Office and the District Attorney's Office satisfied that the mission of each has not been compromised by Drug Court?

Both the prosecution and defense counsel believe that the mission of each has not been compromised by Drug Court, although both agree that their roles have changed.

Both attorneys for the CCJDC believe that one of the main differences in their roles is the Team effort (non-adversarial) that goes into decision-making for each client. This Team approach has required the attorneys to give up some of the independence they have in traditional court processing, but their roles (i.e., purposes) are still essentially the same. The Public Defender's role is still to advocate for the participants, and the District Attorney's role is still to ensure that public safety is protected. But now they do this as a team.

Regarding defendants' rights, the Public Defender believes that a youth on probation has fewer rights than one who is not on probation. A youth in the beginning of Drug Court is under more intense supervision and their rights are imposed upon more. But later in the program, a youth who is doing well will have less supervision and more freedom. Another way to look at it is that a youth in Drug Court has more rights than a youth in residential treatment. The youth does not lose a lot of legal rights except up front when the results of his or her case are delayed, meaning it does not get resolved until they pass or fail Drug Court.

Component 3. Eligible participants are identified early and promptly placed in the drug court program.

Research Questions: Are the eligibility requirements being implemented successfully? Is the original target population being served?

Cases are referred to the Drug Court from Court Counselors, the Judge or the youth's attorney. This process appears to be working fairly well, as youths are being referred to the program at a steady pace of three to five per month. However, the Drug Court Team has recently attempted to make this process more efficient by creating a new referral sheet which asks for information the Team needs on eligibility, including the youth's court status, prior services, and the family situation. This has been implemented very recently and the Team is still waiting to see the results.

The eligibility process for entry into the CCJDC includes several steps, starting with a review of the youth's criminal history and followed by several different assessments on drug and alcohol addiction status, mental health, and suitability of the youth offender's family for Drug Court. The latter is mainly determined by whether the family is willing to commit to the Drug Court process and whether there are any significant mental health issues in the youth's family.

The original target population was males and females ages 15-18, who were arrested for criminal offenses and were assessed as having substance abuse as a moderate or high risk factor as identified in the risk screening tool, and were ready to participate in a program to eliminate their drug abuse.

The eligibility requirements have changed slightly during the time of implementation as the Drug Court Team determined that the program was not suitable for some youths. The CCJDC originally accepted 18 year olds, but juvenile services were not available for "adults" of 18 years or older. Also, youths with more severe mental health issues were accepted when the program was first implemented, but these youths were found to be extremely resource intensive, using a disproportionate amount of Team time and attention, so those with significant mental health issues are no longer allowed in the program in favor of the Court having their resources available for a greater number of participants.

The Drug Court Team follows the eligibility requirements closely. However, the Team, on rare occasions, will make exceptions when there is a youth that is judged to be a low safety risk and whom the Team feels would benefit from the Drug Court Program. For example, a family in which both mother and son had significant mental health issues was accepted into the Drug Court Program recently because the family advocated strongly for themselves and had a keen desire to take part in the program.

The total number of participants estimated in the original grant proposal was 140 individuals, including both youths and their families. The goal for the Court was to accept 25 youths in the first year and then to double that number in the second year. The current goal of the Court is to be serving at least 43 youths by the end of the second year. The CCJDC is currently

approximately half way through its second year and is serving 35 youths. It appears the Court is going to reach its goal.

Finally, the time from referral to entry in the Drug Court is approximately two weeks. This is a reasonably prompt time period for a youth to begin receiving services. In addition, the youth and his or her family receive significant contact from the Court throughout that two week period in the form of assessments and discussions with the Drug Court staff about the Drug Court Program and about the willingness of the family to commit to this program.

Component 4. Drug courts provide a continuum of alcohol, drug, and other related treatment and rehabilitation services.

Research Question: Are diverse specialized treatment services available?

Diverse specialized treatment services are available to the extent that funding will allow. Each participant attends individual counseling, group counseling, and family counseling (less often). In addition, participants are given frequent UAs to monitor drug use, are involved in activities giving them life skills such as jobs and education, and have the opportunity to participate in community services and other activities.

In therapy sessions, the participants are educated on various issues concerning drug and alcohol abuse, its effects, and ways to abstain. The youths are also given the opportunity to process their use and reasons why they may be abusing drugs or alcohol.

The Team works together to decide what kind of services would be most helpful to the individual participant. All participants have guidelines they must follow to progress in the program. At the same time, the Team works to give each participant individual treatment. The Team has included representatives from an educational/workforce agency and the Oregon Youth Authority for added input and availability of resources to better serve the participants.

The Drug Court Program has four phases and Aftercare. Each phase targets a different stage in the youth's treatment. The Clackamas County Drug Court Policy and Procedure Manual lists the requirements for each phase and the main focus for each phase.

The Team has been discussing adding gender specific services. The Juvenile Treatment Therapist is male, so females may have a harder time discussing their issues with a person not of the same gender. However, there are currently very few females in the Drug Court Program, and those who have been asked about their treatment have expressed satisfaction with the current Therapist. Moreover, gender specific services are available through referral, if those services appear necessary.

Component 5. Abstinence is monitored by frequent alcohol and other drug testing.

Research Question: Compared to other drug courts, does this court test frequently?

Based on results from the American University National Drug Court Survey (Cooper, 2000), the number of urinalyses (UAs) given in this Court is comparable to the large majority of drug courts nationally: two to three UAs a week in the first two phases, and one to two UAs a week in the third and fourth phases. Participants are required to give UAs more frequently in the beginning of the program, and they gradually taper off toward the end of the program. However, participants who are suspected of using drugs or alcohol are sanctioned with more frequent UAs.

The Case Manager makes up a monthly calendar and randomly disperses names on different days. On the youth's day, he/she comes in to the Juvenile Department for a UA. The Case Manager has the participant empty his/her pockets and checks the youth for anything that might be used to tamper with the sample. An adulterant test strip is also used when a youth is suspected of tampering with the sample. Not all UAs are observed due to lack of available staff members of the appropriate gender.

Observation: The number of unobserved UAs is a concern for the Drug Court Team, and should be. Drug tests are a powerful tool in the recovery process. Focus groups and interviews with participants at many drug courts have consistently resulted in participants naming drug testing as one of the main practices that worked to help them stop using. If the participants know they will not be observed, it is much easier to "fool the system." Some members of the youth focus group at this Drug Court admitted that they had done so at some time.

Recommendation: One solution might be to have the males always go to the male Juvenile Treatment Therapist and the females always go to the female Case Manager. This would be a significant time commitment for the Therapist, but the value of observed UAs in the participants' recovery may be worth the time spent. Another option, if Juvenile Department Staff already collect UAs for youths on probation, may be that those staff could also observe Drug Court UAs. However, this last option may not be workable as there is some concern from Juvenile Department Staff that the Drug Court participants already use a disproportionate amount of resources.

Comment: Some staff and participants mentioned that youths were sometimes able to tell when their turns for UAs were coming up. This implies that UAs are not truly random. Again, this allows participants to work around the system.

Recommendation: The Drug Court may want to consider some other methods for assigning their UA collection times. One option used by many drug courts is to assign each participant a color (some participants would be assigned the same color) and pick one or more colors each day. Those participants assigned the colors chosen that day would need to come in for a UA. The colors could be chosen in a manner that insured that each color was chosen at least the number of times the participants were required to come in each week. Colors could also be chosen so that more or fewer UAs might occur each week, so the participant won't know

how many times they may need to come in. Some participants might have to give UA samples two days in a row, then other times have them three days apart. Finally, the Drug Court may want to purchase a message machine (which can be fairly inexpensive) and have the participants call in during a specified time period (e.g., a two hour span first thing in the morning, so a phone line would only be used during that time period) to find out if their color has come up. Alternatively (or additionally), the color can be posted at the Drug Court for participants to see when they come in.

The Drug Court Team has also utilized other forms of drug testing, such as a saliva swab or a drug detection patch. The saliva swab has not been used often and is more of a screening tool if someone on the Team suspects the participant has used alcohol. The swab is useful because it gives results right away. The drug detection patch has also been used rarely. It is worn for a week and is particularly helpful in detecting drugs that leave the body such as cocaine. Also, it can help a participant with refusal skills and accountability. The downfall is that it doesn't detect alcohol, and it is expensive (about three times the cost of a UA), and the results take a week to get back from the lab. These non-UA methods of drug detection are useful, but impractical (e.g., too expensive) to use on a regular basis.

The Team is currently discussing the option of using a Breathalyzer. Since alcohol is one of the major concerns for the youths in this Drug Court, it is important to have a test that will detect use reliably. Alcohol leaves the body quickly. If alcohol is drunk the evening before and a UA doesn't occur until the next afternoon, the UA most likely will not pick it up. The Breathalyzer could be taken on home visits in the evening and on the weekend.

Observations: This Drug Court is still exploring options for the most effective manner of drug detection for its participants. This is one of the only areas within the Ten Key Components in which this Court is not exemplary. It would be expedient for the Drug Court Team to focus some more of their efforts in this area. It does appear that they are already working on this issue.

Component 6. A coordinated strategy governs drug court responses to participants' compliance.

Research Questions: Does this court work together as a team to determine sanctions and rewards? Are there standard or specific sanctions and rewards for particular behaviors? Is there a written policy on how sanctions and rewards work? How does this Drug Court's sanctions and rewards compare to what other drug courts are doing nationally?

This Drug Court works together as a team to determine sanctions and rewards (with the Judge's approval). Each participant's progress is discussed in Drug Court Team meetings, and rewards or sanctions are determined with each Team member's input. In the early phases, the Team determines which sanctions to impose, but in the later phases the Judge looks for more parental responses to the youth's actions. The goal is for the family to gain back control and begin to hold their child accountable through appropriate responses. Sanctions are individualized and are chosen to suit the youth's specific situation, therefore the Drug Court does not have written guidelines for sanctions and rewards.

However, the Team has agreed upon some standard sanctions. The standard sanctions are graduated and often start with community service and end with termination. For example, the first positive UA earns four hours of community service, then eight hours, then one night in detention, two to three days in detention, and then one week in detention.

Some common sanctions used by the CCJDC include detention, community service, electronic monitoring, house arrest, increasing court sessions, increasing the number of UAs and fines. These sanctions are used for non-compliant behaviors such as dirty UAs or missing required court or treatment sessions. Along with these sanctions, the Team chooses individualized sanctions that are meaningful for a particular participant; for example, the Team has found that taking some youths' Nintendo away can be quite effective.

Comment/Observation: Some parents are concerned that the use of community service as a sanction is not effective (as the youths do not find this sanction particularly onerous), and teaches the youths to associate service to the community with punishment.

Recommendation: Although community service is used by the CCJDC as both a requirement and a sanction, it is possible that it might serve better as just a requirement, instead of a sanction. Other courts have made a certain number of hours of community service a requirement for graduation and have allowed the participant to choose a type of community service they would enjoy, such as helping to build houses for low-income families, handing out food at a kitchen for homeless individuals, participating in Meals-on-Wheels, or helping an adult lead church youth groups for younger children.

Comment: Some Team members feel it would be useful to have standard sanctions for common non-compliance issues in written form, while others prefer to determine sanctions on a case-by-case basis. Additionally, some youths feel that some participants are treated differently (unfairly) from others for the same offense, although the parents feel that the sanctions are generally appropriate for a particular youth.

Recommendation: It may be useful to give participants a written list of possible sanctions for various common offenses and include a written explanation saying that the sanctions listed are just possibilities and are not the rule. Sanctions are determined by the Team and are tailored to fit each individual and the circumstances, so different youths may receive different sanctions for the same offense.

Nationally, the most common process is that the judge makes the final decision regarding sanctions or rewards - based on input from the team. All drug courts surveyed said they had established guidelines for their sanction and rewards policies, and over half (64%) said their guidelines were written. Following are the most common responses for non-compliance.

- *Sanctions for new arrests.* If it was a drug possession offense or other non-violent non-drug related offense, most courts allowed the participant to continue but prosecuted the new crime separately from drug court. A large percentage terminated participants for new arrests. The majority of courts said the sanction for a new arrest depended on the charge and the

circumstances. If the new arrest was for drug trafficking or violence, almost all courts terminated the participant from the drug court program.

- o *Sanctions for relapse or non-compliance.* Most courts increased the frequency or intensity (e.g., moved participant from outpatient to inpatient) of treatment, increased the frequency of UAs, and increased the frequency of court hearings. Also, over half the courts used one to three days of jail as a sanction for relapse; a large percentage used four to seven days of jail.

The CCJDC court has not had much experience with re-arrests. At this point, the Team has worked to keep a participant in the program if there it is not a great safety risk or other issues that would keep a participant from continuing.

In comparison to courts nationally, this Court's standard sanctions appear to be quite similar. For example, this Drug Court increases the frequency of UAs when there is a positive UA and if there is suspected use, uses jail (detention) as a sanction on a graduated basis, and will increase treatment as needed.

The most common rewards for good participant progress in drug courts nationally were praise from judge at court hearings, promotion to next phase, reduced frequency of court hearings, praise from other drug court participants, special tokens or gifts, and decreased frequency of UAs. A small percentage of courts allowed people to graduate early, and a small percentage had parties, gift certificates or reduced the drug court program fee.

Rewards for this Court are comparable to what most other drug courts are doing. Participants are rewarded for progress with praise from the Judge, promotion to the next phase, reduction in frequency of court hearings and UAs, increased freedoms and privileges, and tokens or gifts (e.g., the frog for the Leap Ahead award, and the Grab Bag). There are no fees for this program, so reduced drug court fees are not used as a reward.

The Team works hard to make sure responses to participants' compliance are consistent while trying to be creative with rewards and sanctions to meet a particular need.

Component 7. Ongoing judicial interaction with each drug court participant is essential.

Research Questions: Compared to other drug courts, does this court's participants have frequent contact with the judge? What is the nature of this contact?

Nationally, the American University Drug Court Survey reported that most drug court programs require weekly contact with the Judge in Phase I, contact every two weeks in Phase II, and monthly contact in Phase III. So the amount of contact decreases for each advancement in Phase. Although most drug courts followed the above model, a good percentage had less court contact (e.g., every two weeks in Phase I, monthly in Phase II and III.)

In the CCJDC Program, parents and participants are required to be in Court on a consistent basis. Therefore, they have regular contact with the Judge and the accountability of having to see the

Judge. The participants go to Court once a week in Phase 1, once every two weeks in Phase 2, once every three weeks in Phase 3, and once every four weeks in Phase 4. These requirements can change according to the youth's progress and what the Judge mandates. For example, if a youth is having a difficult time in the program, the Judge may increase the frequency of hearings.

The Judge is involved in all decision-making regarding each participant. She attends the staffing meeting before each Court session and relies heavily on the professional input of Team members before making decisions that are to be brought up for the participant in Court.

Comment: The Judge is very much a team player and sincerely desires the best possible treatment, sanction, reward, acknowledgement, verbal warning, etc., for each youth in the Drug Court Program.

The participants in the CCJDC have a very positive relationship with the Judge. The Judge goes to great length to get to know and help each person, including the participants' family members. Team members have said that the Judge works to build personal relationships with the participants, is consistent in Court, well trusted, a good role model, and "a mother hen."

Observation: The Judge in Court will ask participants, "Is there anything we can do to help?" This is a proactive way of encouraging the youths to think about how the Court can help them with issues they are having that may get in the way of their recovery, rather than how they can avoid telling the Court about their problems or offenses. In addition, because of the Judge's consistency and her demonstration of care for each participant, she is well trusted. Participants have been heard to say that they want to please her; that they are scared of her because she is the Judge, but they also want her to be proud of them. This gives the participants additional incentive to comply with the program.

In addition, the Judge also works to build relationships with the participants' families. She makes personal calls to them to see how things are going or to offer help. She holds a session after Court to talk to the parents/guardians about how things are going both in the home and as related to Court. The Judge has also been known to show up at a participant's house as a kind of reinforcement on a particularly important issue; for example, showing up early in the morning to make sure a participant gets up, if that is the issue he or she is struggling with.

Observation: The above example demonstrates the Judge's understanding of the power of the Judge's position of authority as well as the personal commitment of the Judge to do what each participant needs to progress.

Component 8. Monitoring and evaluation measure the achievement of program goals and gauge their effectiveness.

Research Question: Is evaluation and monitoring integral to the program?

Evaluation and monitoring are a high priority for this Drug Court Program. This Court has participated extensively in the pilot of the ODCMS and has ensured that evaluator feedback was included in this process. At one of their recent quarterly retreats, the Team task was to develop a

list of what practices were most important to the Drug Court to continue in the face of budget cuts. Evaluation was on the final list. NPC was asked to observe Court sessions, Team meetings, and quarterly retreats as often as possible. When NPC sent a process description draft to the Drug Court for feedback on the accuracy of this description, there were immediate responses from the Drug Court Team, which were then followed by a Team decision to go over the draft together and then send a document with the combined feedback and changes to the evaluator. This last demonstrates not only commitment of the Team to an accurate evaluation, but also the high degree of organization and integration of the Team members at this Court.

In addition, this Court demonstrates a high degree of self-monitoring. They openly discuss issues as they arise and focus on ways to adjust the program to address these issues. This is exemplified by the change in requirements for AA/NA meetings (described above) when it was determined that the meetings were inappropriate for most participants, and in the Drug Court's change in eligibility requirements with regard to significant mental health issues. Although this decision was not one they were pleased to make, as they want to help as many youths as possible, they were able to recognize the fact that they did not have the resources to support this type of client.

Component 9. Continuing interdisciplinary education promotes effective drug court planning, implementation, and operations.

Research Question: Is this program continuing to advance its training and knowledge?

Education on Drug Court planning, implementation and operation is a high priority for this Drug Court. The Drug Court Team members have attended Drug Court trainings and do so on a regular basis. They recently attended an NADCP training, and included NPC staff in that training. In addition, the Drug Court Coordinator, Case Manager, Treatment Provider, and Judge all attend local trainings whenever they are available and observe other drug courts to learn new ideas. New information is brought back and discussed regularly with the Team.

Because the Drug Court Team has found family involvement in the Court to be extremely beneficial both to the program process and to the participants, the entire Team recently had a training on how families could be better involved in the Drug Court process. Although the Team did not agree with everything the trainer recommended, they listened carefully and discussed openly how they felt about these new ideas and worked on ways to put the ones they agreed would be beneficial into effect.

Comment: Team members reported that one effect of the training was that they felt reinforcement and encouragement for the way they are currently running the program. They learned new ideas for how to make the Drug Court more effective, but they also learned that their team was of exceptional quality.

Component 10. Forging partnerships among drug courts, public agencies, and community-based organizations generates local support and enhances drug court effectiveness.

Research Question: Compared to other drug courts, has this court developed effective partnerships across the community?

Responses to Carolyn Cooper's National Survey showed that most drug courts are working closely with community groups to provide support services for their drug court participants. Examples of community members that drug courts are connected with include: AA/NA groups, medical providers, local education systems, employment services, faith communities, and chambers of commerce.

The CCJDC has developed partnerships with several community agencies and organizations, including Mental Health, the Oregon Youth Authority, C-TEC (an educational/employment agency), and the local Chamber of Commerce. Recently, the Drug Court Team hosted the Clackamas Chamber of Commerce weekly meeting. Chamber members were invited to the Judge's courtroom for socializing and snacks. It is customary for the host of that week's meeting to give a short speech or presentation about their business. The meeting was an opportunity to tell community members, businesses, and leaders about the Drug Court. The success of the meeting was noticeable. The Team felt a great deal of support from all who attended. Various chamber members brought up ways they could help through volunteering and offering donations such as golf lessons or other things for the participants to use. This is an example of how the Team strives to forge relationships in the community.

The Coordinator spends a great deal of time forging relationships locally and statewide. She is involved with various committees and attends Drug Court-related meetings frequently. The Coordinator also solicits local resources for incentives and donations.

Observation/Comment: There is an issue in the relationship between the Drug Court and some of the Juvenile Department staff. The Juvenile Department heads are invested in the CCJDC but other Court counselors appear to have some resentment toward Drug Court because of its ability to tap into so many more resources than regular Juvenile Court. The head of the Juvenile Department has tried to keep communication open about this issue and will continue to do so.

This is not uncommon for Drug Courts as there are many people who work with youth in the criminal justice system who would like to do more than traditional court processing will allow. Drug Courts are in a unique position with a mission that specifically includes gaining as many beneficial services as possible for their participants, as well as having a certain amount of independence due to funding sources (such as grant money) that are outside state and county funds that may be mandated for use in certain ways.

The CCJDC is continually working towards creating relationships with community members. This is particularly important in times of decreased funding as community members can provide donations of time and materials to maintain program operations. In addition, the CCJDC is currently exploring options for becoming self-supporting and is engaging in discussion with an

organization that can help them with this process. Becoming self-supporting would entail Drug Court Program fees for participants and help from local community members.

Summary/Conclusion

Overall, the CCJDC demonstrates the Ten Key Components of Drug Court in an exemplary fashion. The Drug Court Program is well organized due, in a large part, to a well-organized Drug Court Coordinator. The Court's greatest strength is its highly integrated Drug Court Team. The degree of integration of the Team is brought about by three main factors: 1. A Drug Court Coordinator who is organized and committed to making this program of the highest quality and who attends to small details that allow the Team to work efficiently as a group (such as creating task lists so Team members can sign up and be sure all necessary work is being accomplished), 2. A Judge who provides focus to the Team while strongly encouraging input from all Team members, and 3. Team members who invest their time and energy into doing what is best for the Program participants without clinging to their own personal agendas.

The one key component that was demonstrated satisfactorily, but not in an exemplary fashion, was the UA process. It was recommended by the evaluators that the Team focus some attention on enhancing this process so that it is more random and so that all UAs are observed by Program Staff. Some suggestions were given on how the Drug Court might accomplish this.

An additional issue for this Drug Court, as it is for Drug Courts nationally, is a lack of funding. The CCJDC would like to provide further services to their participants, as well as accept offenders that require more time and attention, but they have not been able to do so at this point. The Drug Court Team, and particularly the Coordinator, is working on obtaining funding including a recently completed grant proposal to the Bureau of Justice Assistance. This Court is also examining the option of becoming self-supporting.

In addition to the exceptional quality of the CCJDC Team, strengths of this Drug Court include the strong commitment to continuing education of the Team members, the high priority the Team places on evaluation and self-monitoring, and the strong leadership of the Judge combined with the Judge's ability to demonstrate her care and honest concern for the Drug Court participants and their families.