

## **SHANNON M. CAREY, Ph.D.**

---

NPC Research  
975 SE Sandy Blvd., Ste. 220  
Portland, OR 97214  
(503) 243-2436 x 104; fax: (503) 243-2454  
carey@npcresearch.com

---

### **EDUCATION**

- Ph.D., 2000**      Portland State University, Portland, Oregon  
Majors: Systems Science and Psychology  
Dissertation entitled: Allopathic and Alternative Medicine: What Influences Patients' Choice of Health Care Practitioner?
- M.S., 1996**      Portland State University, Portland, Oregon  
Major: Health Psychology
- B.S., 1990**      Portland State University, Portland, Oregon  
Majors: Biology and Psychology

### **WORK EXPERIENCE**

#### **NPC Research, Portland Oregon**

- January 2015 – Present: Co-President, Director of Development**
- June 2009 – January 2015: Executive Vice President/Senior Research Associate**
- April 2004 – June 2009: Senior Research Associate**
- June 2000 – April 2004: Research Associate**
- April 1999 – June 2000: Research Coordinator**
- August 1998 – April 1999 Research Assistant**

*Statewide Evaluation of Pennsylvania's Treatment Courts (2017-2019) – Principal Investigator.* NPC and Pennsylvania's Administrative Office of the Courts is collaborating on a BJA funded study of the process, outcomes and costs of adult and veterans treatment courts. In addition, PA added funds to perform a similar evaluation in the state's mental health and DUI courts. This study includes an examination of treatment court recidivism and health outcomes compared to a matched comparison group and a detailed cost analysis of each type of treatment court.

*Statewide Evaluation of Colorado's Drug Court (2016-2021) – Principal Investigator.* Colorado's Administrative Office of the Courts requested a statewide outcome and cost evaluation of Colorado's adult drug courts and DWI courts. This evaluation also encompasses process evaluations, data support and other evaluation tasks for a variety of individual drug courts and for county criminal justice and juvenile justice agencies.

*NIJ's Evaluation of Second Chance Act Adult Reentry Courts (NESCAARC) (2011-2017)* – Principal Investigator. NPC Research, RTI International, and the Center for Court Innovation (CCI) are collaborating on NIJ's evaluation of specialized reentry court models across 8 sites funded by Second Chance Act through the Bureau of Justice Assistance. The evaluation plan includes a process evaluation, impact evaluation, and cost-benefit analysis. This multi-site, multi-component, evaluation will address the following goals:

- Goal 1: Describe the SCA reentry courts through a comprehensive *process evaluation*:
- Goal 2: Determine the effectiveness of the SCA reentry courts at reducing recidivism and improving individual outcomes through a rigorous *impact evaluation*:
- Goal 3: Conduct a cost-benefit analysis:
- Goal 4: Contribute to the development of a true "reentry court model":

*Minnesota Statewide DWI Court Evaluation (2012-2014)* – Principal Investigator. NPC Research was contracted by the Minnesota Office of Traffic Safety to perform process and outcome evaluation of all of Minnesota's operating DWI courts and includes cost analysis in 7 of these DWI court sites. This evaluation involves nine DWI courts in both urban and rural areas of the state.

*Oregon Measure 57 Drug Court Evaluation (2011-2014)* – Principal Investigator. Oregon's Measure 57 (M57) provides the opportunity for treatment to prison bound substance abusing offenders in lieu of incarceration. The Oregon Criminal Justice Commission received a Second Chance Act grant to fund several drug court programs specifically tailored for the M57 population. This grant also provided funds for evaluation. Working collaboratively with the Oregon Criminal Justice Commission, NPC is performing a multi-method approach to answer a variety of evaluation questions about these M57 programs including topics such as service delivery, adherence to the 10 Key Components of drug courts, commitment and participation of the drug court team members and the cost of the M57 drug court program (DC) as well as the cost of business as usual (BAU) for similar cases as well as participant experience in the program and their views of its effectiveness. NPC will be performing a full process evaluation as well as a cost analysis of the programs and local BAU. In addition, NPC will be performing in-depth participant and control group interviews at two time points, baseline (at the time of random assignment) and 6 months after baseline.

*Ohio Specialized Docket Family Dependency Court Evaluation (2009-2015)* – Principal Investigator. In late 2009, NPC Research was contracted by the Ohio Supreme Court Specialized Docket Section to conduct a statewide evaluation of Ohio's Family Drug Treatment Courts. NPC conducted an online assessment of all 20 family drug treatment court sites. The results of this assessment were used to select seven (7) FDTCs for more in-depth process evaluations, and four (4) of these seven sites will then be selected to receive outcome evaluations and will add valuable information to the still sparse literature on FDTCs.

*What Works?: An Examination of Drug Court Practices within the 10 Key Components and Program Outcomes in 101 Drug Courts (2009-2012)* – Principal Investigator. This project was funded by the National Association of Drug Court Professionals through a grant from the Bureau of Justice Assistance. The purpose of this project was to compare drug court program practices and outcomes (including graduation rates, criminal justice recidivism and cost-benefits) across over 100 drug court programs to determine which program practices are related to the most positive outcomes.

*10 Key Components of Drug Court Technical Assistance to SAMHSA Adult Drug Court Grantees (2010)* Co-Principal Investigator. This project involves technical assistance to 22 Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA)-funded adult drug courts. Through a subcontract from JBS International, NPC is conducting technical assistance

with a focus on practices that fall within the 10 Key Components of Drug Courts. NPC synthesizes the findings from online assessments, interviews, and observations; develops a set of recommendations; and convenes a video conference with the drug court team, NPC staff, and at least one nationally recognized drug court expert to discuss the findings and recommendations. In addition, NPC provides each site, JBS, and SAMHSA with a written report containing the assessment information and detailed recommendations.

*Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) Oregon Drug Courts Cost Evaluation (2008-2010)* – Principal Investigator. NPC Research, in partnership with Oregon’s Criminal Justice Commission and the Oregon Judicial Department, is performing a detailed statewide cost evaluation that includes analyses of agency-specific cost-benefits and the cost-benefits of specific drug court practices, as well as providing the first direct comparison of the relative usefulness of two differing cost-benefit methodologies, the Washington State Institute for Public Policy approach (WSIPP), and NPC Research’s Transactional Institutional Analysis (TICA) approach.

*Oregon Byrne Drug Court Evaluation (2008-2009)* – Principal Investigator. The State of Oregon Criminal Justice Service has contracted with NPC Research to conduct the third year of the Byrne/CJC Methamphetamine Drug Court Grant Evaluation. The purpose of this evaluation is to examine characteristics and outcomes of successful Byrne-funded adult, juvenile, and family drug court programs in Oregon and to understand how Oregon Drug Courts implement the 10 Key Components. Two of the Family Drug Court sites received full process, impact and cost evaluations. In these programs the evaluation will focus on child welfare, treatment, program, and criminal justice outcome, and potential societal cost savings.

*A Cost Evaluation of an Adult and Juvenile Drug Court in Michigan (2007-2009)* – Principal Investigator. The Michigan State Court Administrative Office contracted with NPC Research to perform outcome and cost analyses of the juvenile and adult drug courts in Oakland County. The drug court participants will be examined in terms of outcomes such as reductions in drug use and graduation rate. The impacts of the program on recidivism (e.g., re-arrests, time on probation and time in jail) will be assessed by comparing the drug court participants with a comparison group of offenders who were eligible for the program but did not attend using statewide and local criminal justice, substance abuse treatment, and probation data.

*A Cost Benefit Evaluation of California Drug Courts, Phase III: Development, Testing and Launch of a Web-Based Cost Tool for Statewide Drug Court Costs (2005-2010)* – Project Director. (See Phases I and II, below, for more detail on this study). The Administrative Office of the Courts (Judicial Council of the State of California) has contracted with NPC Research to conduct a long-term statewide cost analysis of drug courts. This study performed in 3 phases. Phase III is currently nearly complete with the final report draft at the AOC. The purpose of this phase was to develop and test a web-based drug court cost self-evaluation tool (DC-CSET) and then use the tool statewide to determine statewide costs. Programs will continue to use the tool to report to the CA AOC after project completion.

*Performance and Cost Evaluation of the Rutland County (Vermont) Adult Drug Court (2008)* – Principal Investigator. The Vermont Supreme Court Office of the Court contracted with NPC Research to conduct an outcome evaluation and cost-benefit evaluation of the Rutland County Drug Court program. The drug court participants were examined in terms of outcomes such as reductions in drug use and graduation rate. The impacts of the program on recidivism (e.g., re-arrests, time on probation and time in jail) were assessed using statewide and local criminal justice, substance abuse treatment, and probation data by comparing the drug court participants with a comparison group of offenders who were eligible for the program but did not attend.

*Methamphetamine Users in Missouri Drug Courts: Program Elements Associated with Success (2007-2008)* Principal Investigator. Research Question: What participant characteristics, drug court program elements, or combination thereof, are particularly important in predicting graduation rates for drug court participants whose drug of choice is methamphetamine? This statewide study

of Missouri's drug courts uses a mixed-methods design involving: (1) analyzing existing drug court information housed in Missouri's statewide drug court database and (2) collecting detailed program-related information using a Web-based survey methodology. The Web-based methods include two surveys, one for the drug court coordinator and court staff, the other for treatment providers. This will be one of the first studies that collects in-depth information on drug court treatment practices and relates these practices to participant outcomes.

*Michigan DUI Courts Outcome Evaluation (2007-2008)* – Principal Investigator. In 2004, the Michigan State Courts Administrative Office (SCAO) proposed to conduct an outcome evaluation of DUI courts in Michigan. The evaluation was designed as a longitudinal study that included tracking and collecting data on DUI court participants for a minimum of one year following either program completion or termination from DUI Court and a comparison group of offenders who were eligible for DUI court in the year prior to DUI court implementation. Data was collected by SCAO staff from 2005 through 2007. In 2007, SCAO contracted with NPC Research to perform the data analysis and report writing for three of the DUI courts that participated in this study, Ottawa and Bay County and Clarkston DUI courts.

*Development of a Web-Based Drug Court Cost Tool in Michigan. (2007-2008)* – Principal Investigator. In 2007, the Michigan State Courts Administrative Office (SCAO) determined a need for developing systems and infrastructures that can provide ALL drug courts with cost effective tools for purposes of managing, measuring and evaluating each program's performance, outcomes, and cost-benefits. NPC Research was hired to develop a web-based cost tool that drug courts in Michigan can use to determine their own costs and benefits and that the state can use to determine the costs and benefits of drug courts statewide.

*A Process, Outcome and Cost Analysis of the Effect of State Mandated Treatment on Drug Court Programs (2005-2007)* – Principal Investigator. In November 2000, California voters approved Proposition 36, the Substance Abuse and Crime Prevention Act (SACPA). The primary goal of SACPA is to provide an alternative to incarceration for low-level, non-violent drug possession offenders (Prop36.org, 2004). At the time SACPA was implemented, California had also already broadly implemented the drug court model, (over 120 in operation). NPC Research recently completed a cost-benefit evaluation of the drug courts in California before the implementation of SACPA. Results showed that the criminal justice system saved money on offenders who participated in drug court due to reduced recidivism after program entry. In March 2005 the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) awarded a grant to NPC Research to conduct a process, outcome and cost study of SACPA and drug courts after the implementation of SACPA.

*Performance and Cost Evaluations of Drug Courts Statewide in Maryland (2004-2009)* – Co-Director. In 2003, NPC Research performed cost evaluations in two drug courts in Baltimore City and Anne Arundel. The results were used by the AOC to obtain more funding for Maryland drug courts from the legislature. In 2004, the Maryland Administrative Office of the Courts contracted with NPC Research to perform Process, Outcome and Cost Evaluations in an additional five (5) adult drug courts and nine (9) juvenile drug courts in the state of Maryland. In 2006, the AOC once again used these results to obtain more funding. NPC Research was contracted to perform evaluations and provide technical assistance for problem solving courts statewide.

*A Cost Evaluation of Five Adult Drug Courts in Indiana and Process Evaluation of Three Juvenile Drug Courts (2005-2006)* – Principal Investigator. The Indiana Judicial Center (IJC) has contracted with NPC Research to conduct complete performance and cost-benefit analyses of five adult Indiana drug court programs and process evaluations in three juvenile drug court programs. The purpose of this study is to answer the following policy questions: 1. Who is served by the Indiana drug court programs and how? 2. What is the success rate of these drug court programs? 3. What is the effect of the program on participant outcomes? 4. What are some promising practices of Indiana drug courts? 5. What are the costs and savings to the criminal justice system, and thereby to society? The final report will provide information to the

IJC and the individual courts including the components of adult and juvenile drug courts that reflect promising practices, recommendations for enhancing drug court program processes, the costs and benefits related to adult drug courts, the impact of adult drug court programs.

*A Cost Evaluation of Two Adult Drug Courts in Michigan (2005-2006)* – Principal Investigator. The Michigan Administrative Office of the Courts has contracted with NPC Research to perform process, outcome and cost analyses of the adult drug courts in Barry County and Kalamazoo County.

*Oregon Healthy Teens Survey (2003–2009)* – Principal Investigator. NPC Research has collected drug use and risk and protective factor data from sixth, eighth, and eleventh grade public school students in Oregon for over 10 years. Alcohol, tobacco, and other drug (ATOD) use among public school students continues to be a major concern in Oregon as it is across the nation. Substance use among school-aged children affects scholastic performance and willingness to remain in school—and sets a pattern that can follow an individual throughout his or her life. Knowledge about the risk and protective factors that exist for young people in our schools and communities is essential to our efforts to prevent substance abuse. The most recent survey was administered to 8th and 11th graders in Oregon statewide in the spring of 2004. The analyzed data are used to form prevention programs and policies. It is hoped that these results will enable policy makers to target prevention efforts to reverse the trends of increasing student drug use in Oregon and in the nation.

*An Assessment of Dependency Case Flow in Clackamas County - Response to the Children's Justice Act (2004)* – Principal Investigator. This project is intended to assist Clackamas County in improving the efficiency of court processing of child abuse and neglect cases, specifically by identifying bottlenecks or roadblocks, working closely with all key stakeholders to create strategies for improving the system, and providing technical assistance to facilitate implementation of the first set of improvements. At the conclusion of this project, it is hoped that system partners will have selected strategies to improve communication, coordination, and collaboration between agencies, and ultimately, to increase the efficiency of dependency case processing. This system change could serve as a model for other counties in Oregon to improve the statewide efficiency and effectiveness of the system response to child abuse and neglect.

*A Process, Impact and Cost Evaluation of the Clackamas County Juvenile Drug Court Enhancement (2003-2005)* – Principal Investigator. The Clackamas County Juvenile Drug Court (CCJDC) received an enhancement grant from the Bureau of Justice Assistance to improve the services the drug court provides to the families of participating juveniles. NPC Research will update the process and impact evaluations performed in a previous evaluation to examine the changes due to the enhancements and will also perform a cost evaluation of the enhancements and the attendant outcomes.

*A Cost Benefit Evaluation of California Drug Courts, Phase II: Testing the Methodology, Cost Studies in 6 Drug Courts (2002-2004)* – Project Director. (See Phase I, below, for more detail on this study). Funded by the USDOJ Bureau of Justice Assistance. The Administrative Office of the Courts (Judicial Council of the State of California) has contracted with NPC Research to conduct a long-term statewide cost analysis of drug courts. This study is being performed in 3 phases. Phase II is currently in progress. The purpose of this phase is to test the methodology developed in Phase I in 6 additional drug courts and to create a drug court self-evaluation tool that can be used by drug courts to perform their own cost evaluations.

*Process and Impact Evaluations of Four Drug Courts in Oregon (2002-2004)* – Principal Investigator. Four drug courts in three Oregon counties received funds from the USDOJ Bureau of Justice Assistance in 2001. A process and outcome study is included as a requirement for receiving these funds. Clackamas, Malheur, and Marion Counties each chose NPC Research to perform these evaluations. All four drug courts were implemented within the last two years and have incorporated new and innovative practices into their drug court processes.

*A Detailed Cost Analysis in a Mature Drug Court Setting: (2000-2003)* – Project Director. Funded by the National Institute of Justice. NPC Research conducted an intensive cost analysis at a single mature drug court. NPC has tracked court and criminal justice resource utilization and unit costs for a small intensive study group composed of a sample of those in the drug court program and a sample of those eligible but receiving standard court processing. Drug court participants and a comparison group of non-participants are timed in court sessions, treatment sessions and other interactions with the criminal justice and treatment systems to get a more exact look at the resources being used in running these programs. The final report on this study is available on the NPC website and will be published by NIJ in 2004.

*A Cost Benefit Evaluation of California Drug Courts, Phase I: Building the Methodology (2000-2002)* – Project Director. Few drug court evaluations in California have been based upon economic or cost-benefit analysis. Policymakers, aware of this, have been reluctant to permanently fund these programs. This type of cost benefit analysis in California is necessary if policymakers are to make informed decisions about the efficacy—and thus continued funding—of these programs. The Administrative Office of the Courts (Judicial Council of the State of California) with funding from DCPO, contracted with NPC Research to conduct a long-term statewide cost analysis of drug courts. This study is being performed in 3 phases. Phase I is a detailed cost case study in 3 drug courts. Duties include evaluation planning and implementation; staff supervision; report writing; and quantitative, qualitative, and archival data collection and analysis.

*Process and Impact Evaluation of the Substance Abuse and Crime Prevention Act in Santa Clara County in California (2001-2002)* – Project Director. California's Proposition 36, the Substance Abuse and Crime Prevention Act (SACPA) was passed by the voters in 2001 and mandates drug treatment and supervision in lieu of incarceration for nonviolent drug offenders. The Santa Clara County Executive Office contracted with NPC Research to perform an evaluation of the implementation of SACPA in Santa Clara County. This evaluation consisted of the development of a logic model and performance measures to evaluate the successful implementation of SACPA. NPC also evaluated the process and short-term impact of SACPA in Santa Clara County.

*Drug Courts and Medicaid Managed Behavioral Health Care: (2000-2002)* – Lead Evaluator. This longitudinal outcomes research study will describe substance abuse treatment services for drug court participants and comparison group offenders in Oregon (which has one of the country's oldest drug court programs). This project will examine cohorts of offenders prior to and after Medicaid managed care (the Oregon Health Plan) had been implemented. Drug court participants will be compared with similar offenders who were eligible for but did not participate in drug court. Duties include evaluation planning and implementation; staff supervision; report writing; and quantitative, qualitative, and archival data collection/analysis.

*Oregon Public School Drug Use Survey for the Office of Alcohol and Drug Abuse Programs: (1998-2000)* – Project Manager. Duties include, supervising the annual administration of statewide youth risk and protection factor survey, survey development, data analysis and report writing. This survey is administered longitudinally to sixth, eighth, and eleventh graders. Analyzed data is used to form prevention programs and policies.

*Risk Screening and Assessment Project (2000-2001)* – Research Manager for the Oregon Juvenile Department Directors' Association in developing and implementing a statewide set of instruments for use with juvenile offenders and youths at risk of juvenile justice involvement. The project includes a risk (to offend or re-offend) screen/assessment, a needs identification tool, supplementary resource materials, and trainings on use of the tools. The risk screen is required for use by programs funded by Oregon Juvenile Crime Prevention dollars. Duties include measure development and pilot testing, user manual and supplemental materials development, presentations to policymakers, and user trainings.

*Douglas County Drug Court (1999)* – Research Coordinator for a process evaluation of the Douglas County Drug Court (adults). Duties included coordinating data collection, conducting key stakeholder interviews and a focus group of drug court graduates, and report writing.

*Caring Communities (1999)*. Caring Communities are a collaborative effort in Portland to integrate the work of schools, local government and nonprofit social service agencies. Their goals are to build a stronger sense of community, promote healthy children and families, encourage neighborhood involvement in designing services and determining budget priorities, and enhance community strengths. Responsibilities included key stakeholder interviews and logic model development.

*CSAP/NIDA Juvenile Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention Diffusion Evaluation and Integrated Data Systems Project (1998-1999)* – Senior Research Assistant for 5-year project evaluating prevention activities in six communities in Oregon. Responsibilities include supervision of data collection, data analysis, report writing and presentation of results.

**9/97-6/99**                    **Portland State University, Portland, Oregon**

**Instructor, Psychology Department**

Instructor for Psychology as a Natural Science and Psychology as a Social Science. Duties include all those necessary for teaching a class: designing class format, preparing and giving lectures, writing exams, grading exams and papers. Also, advising undergraduates in a Psychology major.

**6/97-8/98**                    **Multnomah County Health Department. Portland, Oregon**

Research Assistant, Assisted in the evaluation of various Multnomah County health programs such as NOAH and Linkage, which combine primary care with mental health and substance abuse care. Duties included the design of surveys for program participants, data collection, chart audits, database development, and statistical analysis.

**9/93-8/97**                    **Portland State University, Portland, Oregon**

**Teaching Assistant, Psychology Department**, Assisted in Counseling Psychology, Social Psychology, Developmental Psychology, Adolescent Developmental Psychology, and Experimental Methods. Duties included instructing undergraduates in preparation of term papers, writing study guides and exam questions, grading papers and exams, and occasional lecturing.

**8/95-9/96**                    **Portland State University, Portland, Oregon**

**Research Assistant, Office of Institutional Research and Planning**, Participated in the full cycle of mail survey research for an ongoing study of student retention at PSU. Helped redesign survey items, supervised the printing and mailing as well as the scanning of completed surveys. Ran data analyses and wrote the reports circulated by OIRP and sent to the University president. This work also served as my predoctoral research internship.

**6/94-12/94**                    **Portland State University, Portland, Oregon**

**Research Assistant, Regional Research Institute**, Assisted Children's Services Division on a study examining the effect of a new CSD program to reduce child abuse in Oregon. Duties included: Assisting in the design of study questionnaires and auditing child abuse reports in CSD branches throughout Oregon.

8/90-8/93

**Oregon Health Sciences University, Portland, Oregon  
Specialty Laboratory Technician, Pediatric Metabolic Lab**, Performed clinical diagnostic tests for Tay-Sachs carriers and patients with mucopolysaccharride disorders, and monitored carnitine levels in children. Also performed tests on the amino acid analyzer. Entered data and produced and edited reports of patient results on UNIX and Macintosh computers.

## TECHNICAL REPORTS AND PUBLICATIONS

**Note:** the majority of the following reports and publications can be found on the NPC Research Web site: [www.npcresearch.com](http://www.npcresearch.com).

- Carey, S. M., & Ho, T. (2017). U.S. District Court District of Oregon: Portland Reentry Court Outcome Evaluation Report. Submitted to U.S. Probation U.S. District Court District of Oregon, December 2018.
- Ho, T., Carey, S. M., & Malsch, A. M. (2018). Racial and Gender Disparities in Treatment Courts: Do They Exist and Is There Anything We Can Do to Change Them? *The Journal for Advancing Justice*(1), 5-34.
- Carey, S. M., Rempel, M., Lindquist, C., Cissner, A., Hassoun Ayoub, L., Kralstein, D., & Malsch, A. M. (2017). Reentry Court Research: An Overview of Findings from the National Institute of Justice's Evaluation of Second Chance Act Adult Reentry Courts. *National Institute of Justice May 2017*, <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/251496.pdf>
- Lindquist, C., Ayoub, L. H., & Carey, S. M. (2017). Lessons learned about reentry court program implementation and sustainability (from year 3 of The National Institute of Justice's Evaluation of Second Chance Act Adult Reentry Courts). Portland, OR; NPC Research. *National Institute of Justice May 2017*, <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/251495.pdf>
- Kissick, K., Rodi, M. C., & Carey, S. M. (2017). Chittenden County Treatment Court Process, Outcome and Cost Evaluation. *Submitted to Vermont Administrative Office of the Courts, March 2017*.
- Ho, T., Carey, S. M., & Mackin, J. R. (2016). Arkansas Treatment Courts Best Practices Assessment Statewide Summary. *Submitted to Arkansas, Administrative Office of the Courts, May 2016*
- Kissick, K., Carey, S. M., & Mackin, J. R. (2016). New Mexico Problem-Solving Courts Best Practices Assessment Statewide Summary. *Submitted to New Mexico, Administrative Office of the Courts, April 2016*.
- Kissick, K., Waller, M. S., Johnson, A. J., & Carey, S. M. (2015). Clark County Family Treatment Court: Striding Towards Excellent Parents (STEP): Process, Outcome and Cost Evaluation. *Submitted to the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Administration (SAMHSA), October 2015*.
- Kissick, K., Waller, M. S., Johnson, A. J., & Carey, S. M. (2015). Doña Ana County Magistrate DWI Drug Court, Las Cruces, NM: Process, Outcome, and Cost Evaluation Report. *Submitted to New Mexico, Administrative Office of the Courts, April 2015*.
- Kissick, K., Waller, M. S., Johnson, A. J., & Carey, S. M. (2015). Santa Fe County Magistrate DWI Drug Court, Santa Fe, NM: Process, Outcome, and Cost Evaluation Report. *Submitted to New Mexico, Administrative Office of the Courts, April 2015*.
- Kissick, K., Waller, M. S., Johnson, A. J., & Carey, S. M. (2015). Valencia County Magistrate DWI Drug Court, Belen, NM: Process, Outcome, and Cost Evaluation Report. *Submitted to New Mexico, Administrative Office of the Courts, April 2015*.



- Carey, S. M., Herrera Allen, T., Einspruch, E. L., Mackin, J. R., & Marlowe, D. (2015). Using Behavioral Triage in Court-Supervised Treatment of DUI Offenders. *Alcoholism Treatment Quarterly*, 33:1, 44-63
- Lindquist, C., Hassoun Ayoub, L., Dawes, D., Harrison, P. M., Malsch, A. M., Hardison Walters, J., Rempel, M., & Carey, S. M. (2014, September). The National Institute of Justice's Evaluation of Second Chance Act Adult Reentry Courts: Staff and client perspectives on reentry courts from year 2. Portland, OR; NPC Research.  
<https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/248187.pdf>
- Carey, S. M., Zil, C. E., Waller, M. S., Harrison, P. M., & Johnson, A. J. (2014). Minnesota DWI Courts: A Summary of Evaluation Findings in Nine DWI Court Programs. *Submitted to the Minnesota Department of Public Safety, July 2014.*
- Zil, C. E., Waller, M. S., Harrison, P. M., Johnson, A. J., & Carey, S. M. (2014). South St. Louis County DWI Court, St. Louis County, MN: Process, Outcome, and Cost Evaluation. *Submitted to the Minnesota Department of Public Safety, July 2014.*
- Zil, C. E., Johnson, A. J., Harrison, P. M., & Carey, S. M. (2014). Roseau County DWI Court, Roseau County, MN: Process and Outcome Evaluation Report. *Submitted to the Minnesota Department of Public Safety, July 2014.*
- Harrison, P. M., Waller, M. S., Johnson, A. J., Zil, C. E., & Carey, S. M. (2014). Ramsey County DWI Court, Ramsey County, MN: Process, Outcome, and Cost Evaluation. *Submitted to the Minnesota Department of Public Safety, July 2014.*
- Harrison, P. M., Waller, M. S., Zil, C. E., Johnson, A. J., & Carey, S. M. (2014). Otter Tail County DWI Court, Fergus Falls, MN: Process, Outcome, and Cost Evaluation Report. *Submitted to the Minnesota Department of Public Safety, July 2014.*
- Harrison, P. M., Johnson, A. J., Zil, C. E., & Carey, S. M. (2014). Borderland Substance Abuse Court, Lake of the Woods County, MN: Process and Outcome Evaluation Report. *Submitted to the Minnesota Department of Public Safety, July 2014.*
- Harrison, P. M., Zil, C. E., Waller, M. S., Johnson, A. J., & Carey, S. M. (2014). Fourth Judicial District Adult DWI Court, Hennepin County, MN: Process, Outcome, and Cost Evaluation Report. *Submitted to the Minnesota Department of Public Safety, July 2014.*
- Harrison, P. M., Zil, C. E., Waller, M. S., Johnson, A. J., & Carey, S. M. (2014). Crow Wing County DWI Court, Crow Wing County, MN: Process, Outcome, and Cost Evaluation Report. *Submitted to the Minnesota Department of Public Safety, July 2014.*
- Zil, C. E., Waller, M. S., Johnson, A. J., Harrison, P. M., & Carey, S. M. (2014). Cass County/Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe Wellness Court Walker, MN: Process, Outcome, and Cost Evaluation Report. *Submitted to the Minnesota Department of Public Safety, July 2014.*
- Zil, C. E., Waller, M. S., Harrison, P. M., Johnson, A. J., & Carey, S. M. (2014). Beltrami County DWI Court, Beltrami County, MN: Process, Outcome, and Cost Evaluation Report. *Submitted to the Minnesota Department of Public Safety, July 2014.*
- Carey, S. M., van Wormer, J., & Mackin, J. R. (2014). Maintaining Fidelity to the Juvenile Drug Court Model: Let's Not Throw the Baby Out with the Bath Water. *Drug Court Review*, IX(1), 74-98.
- Lindquist, C., Hardison Walters, J., Rempel, M., & Carey, S. M. (2013, February). The National Institute of Justice's Evaluation of Second Chance Act Adult Reentry Courts: Program characteristics and preliminary themes from year 1. Research Triangle Park, NC: RTI International, Center for Court Innovation, and NPC Research.  
<https://www.nij.gov/topics/corrections/reentry/pages/evaluation-second-chance.aspx>

- Carey, S. M., Herrera Allen, T., Perkins, T., & Waller, M. S. (2013). A Detailed Cost Evaluation of a Juvenile Drug Court that Follows the Juvenile Drug Court Model (16 Strategies). *Juvenile and Family Court Journal* 64 (4), 1–20.
- Johnson, A. J., Zil, C. E., & Carey, S. M. (2013). Borderlands DWI Court Process Evaluation, Lake of the Woods County, Minnesota. *Submitted to the Minnesota Office of Traffic Safety*, April 2013.
- Waller, M. S., Johnson, A. J., & Carey, S. M. (2013). Fourth Judicial District Adult DWI Court Process Evaluation, Hennepin County, Minnesota. *Submitted to the Minnesota Office of Traffic Safety*, February 2013.
- Johnson, A. J., & Carey, S. M. (2013). U.S. District Court, District of Oregon, Portland Reentry Court Process Evaluation Report (2013). *Submitted to the U.S. District Court District of Oregon*, April 2013.
- Carey, S. M., Einspruch, E. L., Sanders, M. B., & Waller, M.S. (2013). Noble County Adult Drug Court Outcome and Cost Evaluation Final Report. Submitted to Noble County Adult Drug Court, Albion Indiana, October 2013.
- Kissick, K., Waller, M.S., & Carey, S.M. Bexar County Felony Drug Court: Process, Outcome, and Cost Evaluation Final Report (2013). Submitted to Bexar County Felony Drug Court San Antonio, Texas, September 2013.
- Carey, S.M., Sanders, M.B., & Malsch, A.M. (2012). Colorado Adult Drug Courts And DUI Courts: Statewide Process Assessment And Outcome Evaluation. *Submitted to Colorado Judicial Department, Office of the State Court Administrator*.
- Carey, S. M., Mackin, J. R., & Finigan, M. W. (2012). What Works? The 10 Key Components of Drug Courts: Research Based Best Practices. *Drug Court Review*, VIII(1), 6-42.
- Carey, S.M. & Waller, M.S. (2011). *Oregon Drug Courts: Statewide Costs and Promising Practices*. Submitted to the Oregon Criminal Justice Commission and the U.S.D.O.J. Bureau of Justice Assistance, March 2011.
- Perkins, Aborn & Carey (2011). *Ohio Specialized Docket Courts Evaluation: Franklin County Family Drug Court Process Evaluation*. Submitted to The Supreme Court of Ohio, Specialized Dockets Section.
- Carey, S. M., Waller, M. S., & Weller, J. M. (2010). *California Drug Court Cost Study: Phase III: Statewide Costs and Promising Practices, final report*. Submitted to the California Administrative Office of the Courts, April 2010.
- Carey, S. M., Sanders, M. B., Waller, M. S., Burrus, S. W. M., & Aborn, J. A. (2010) *Marion County Fostering Attachment Treatment Court Process, Outcome and Cost Evaluation (Family Drug Court)*. Submitted to the Oregon Criminal Justice Commission and the Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance.
- Carey, S. M., Sanders, M. B., Waller, M. S., Burrus, S. W. M., & Aborn, J. A. (2010) *Jackson County Community Family Court Process, Outcome and Cost Evaluation – Final Report*. Submitted to the Oregon Criminal Justice Commission and the Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance.
- Bigelow, D. A., Finigan, M. W., Carey, S. M., & McFarland, B. H. (2010). Medicaid Managed Care and Drug Court Outcomes. In: B. H. McFarland, D. McCarty, & A. E. Kavas (Eds.), *Medicaid and Treatment for People with Substance Abuse Problems*. Hauppauge NY: Nova Science Publishers, Inc.  
[https://www.novapublishers.com/catalog/product\\_info.php?products\\_id=13973](https://www.novapublishers.com/catalog/product_info.php?products_id=13973)

10 Key Component Technical Assistance Reports: NPC Research provided JBS International and the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) individual reports describing the assessment, local process, and recommendations for technical assistance and program improvement for 22 grantees. In addition, NPC Research has contracted with individual courts and states to provide assessment and 10 Key Component technical reports on their drug court programs. For an example report, please contact Dr. Carey.

Mackin, J. R., Carey, S. M., Finigan, M. W., Lucas, L. M., Lambarth, C. H., Waller, M. S., Herrera Allen, T., Weller, J. M., & Linhares, B. (2009). *Maryland Problem-Solving Courts Evaluation, Phase III: Integration of Results from Process, Outcome, and Cost Studies Conducted 2007-2009*. A report to the Maryland Judiciary, Office of Problem-Solving Courts. NPC Research: Portland, OR.

Carey, S. M., Lucas, L. M., Waller, M., Furrer, C. J., Kissick, K., & Finigan, M. W. (2009). *Michigan Drug Courts: Oakland County Adult Treatment Court Cost Evaluation*, Final Report. Submitted to the Michigan Supreme Court, State Courts Administrative Office, March 2009.

Carey, S. M., Lucas, L. M., Waller, M. S., Furrer, C. J., Kissick, K., & Finigan, M. W. (2009). *Michigan Drug Courts: Oakland County Family Focused Juvenile Treatment Court Cost Evaluation*, Final Report. Submitted to the Michigan Supreme Court, State Courts Administrative Office, March 2009.

Carey, S. M., Lucas, L. M., Waller, M. S., Lamberth, C., Linhares, R., Weller, J., & Finigan, M. W. (2009). *Vermont Drug Courts: Rutland County Adult Drug Court Cost Evaluation*, Final Report. Submitted to the Vermont Judiciary, January 2009.

Weller, J. M., Mackin, J. R., Carey, S. M., & Finigan, M. W. (2009). *Umatilla County Drug Court Process Evaluation*. A report to the Umatilla County Community Corrections. NPC Research: Portland, OR.

Carey, S. M., & Waller, M. S. (2008). *California Drug Courts: Costs and Benefits PHASE III: DC-CSET Statewide Launch Superior Court of Sacramento County Sacramento Drug Court Site-Specific Report*. A report to the California Administrative Office of the Courts.

Carey, S. M., & Perkins, T. (2008). *Methamphetamine Users in Missouri Drug Courts: Program Elements Associated with Success*, Final Report. Submitted to the Missouri Office of the State Court Administrator, November 2008.

Carey, S. M., Fuller, B., & Kissick, K. (2008). *Michigan DUI Courts Outcome Evaluation*, Final Report. Submitted to the Michigan Supreme Court, State Courts Administrative Office.

Carey, S. M., Fuller, B., & Kissick, K. (2008). *Michigan DUI Courts Outcome Evaluation, Bay County DUI Court*, Final Report. Submitted to the Michigan Supreme Court, State Courts Administrative Office.

Carey, S. M., Fuller, B., & Kissick, K. (2008). *Michigan DUI Courts Outcome Evaluation, Ottawa County DUI Court*, Final Report. Submitted to the Michigan Supreme Court, State Courts Administrative Office.

Carey, S. M., Fuller, B., & Kissick, K. (2008). *Michigan DUI Courts Outcome Evaluation, Clarkston DUI Court*, Final Report. Submitted to the Michigan Supreme Court, State Courts Administrative Office.

Carey, S. M., Finigan, M. W., & Pukstas, K. (2008). *Exploring the Key Components of Drug Courts: A Comparative Study of 18 Adult Drug Courts on Practices, Outcomes and Costs*. Submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.

- Carey, S. M., Pukstas, K., Waller, M. S., & Finigan, M. W. (2008). *Drug Courts and State Mandated Drug Treatment Programs: Outcomes, Costs and Consequences*. Technical Report Submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.
- Finigan, M. W., Carey, S. M., & Cox, A. A. (2008). *The Impact of Mature Drug Court Over 10 Years of Operation: Recidivism and Costs*. Submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.  
[http://www.npcresearch.com/Files/10yr\\_STOP\\_Court\\_Analysis\\_Final\\_Report.pdf](http://www.npcresearch.com/Files/10yr_STOP_Court_Analysis_Final_Report.pdf)
- Carey, S. M., & Waller, M. S. (2007). *Guam Adult Drug Court Outcome Evaluation* Final Report. Submitted to the Guam Judicial Council.  
[http://www.npcresearch.com/Files/Guam\\_Adult\\_Drug\\_Court\\_Outcome\\_Evaluation\\_Final%20\\_Report\\_0307.pdf](http://www.npcresearch.com/Files/Guam_Adult_Drug_Court_Outcome_Evaluation_Final%20_Report_0307.pdf)
- Wiest, K., Carey, S. M., Martin, S., Waller, M. S., Cox, A. A., Linhares, W., Crumpton, D., & Finigan, M. W. (2007). *Indiana Drug Courts: Marion County Drug Treatment Court Diversion Program: Process, Outcome and Cost Evaluations*, Final Report. Submitted to the Indiana Judicial Council, April 2007.
- Wiest, K., Carey, S. M., Martin, S., Waller, M. S., Cox, A. A., Linhares, W., Crumpton, C. D., & Finigan, M. (2007). *Indiana Drug Courts: Monroe County Drug Treatment Court: Process, Outcome and Cost Evaluations*, Final Report. Submitted to the Indiana Judicial Center, April 2007.
- Wiest, K., Carey, S. M., Martin, S., Waller, M. S., Cox, A. A., Linhares, W., Crumpton, C. D., & Finigan, M. (2007). *Indiana Drug Courts: St. Joseph County Drug Court Program: Process, Outcome and Cost Evaluations*, Final Report. Submitted to the Indiana Judicial Center, April 2007.
- Wiest, K., Carey, S. M., Martin, S., Waller, M. S., Cox, A. A., Linhares, W., Crumpton, D., & Finigan, M. (2007). *Indiana Drug Courts: Vanderburgh County Day Reporting Drug Court: Process, Outcome and Cost Evaluations*, Final Report. Submitted to the Indiana Judicial Center, April 2007.
- Wiest, K., Carey, S. M., Martin, S., Waller, M. S., Cox, A. A., Linhares, W., Crumpton, D. and Finigan, M. (2007). *Indiana Drug Courts: Vigo County Drug Court: Process, Outcome and Cost Evaluations*, Final Report. Submitted to the Indiana Judicial Council, April 2007.
- Linhares, R., Carey, S. M., Martin, S., Wiest, K., & Finigan, M. W. (2007). *Indiana Drug Courts: Howard County Juvenile Drug Court: Program Process Evaluation*, Final Report. Submitted to the Indiana Judicial Council, April 2007.
- Linhares, R., Carey, S. M., Martin, S., Wiest, K., & Finigan, M. W. (2007). *Indiana Drug Courts: Tippecanoe County Juvenile Drug Court: Program Process Evaluation*, Final Report. Submitted to the Indiana Judicial Council, April 2007.
- Linhares, R., Carey, S. M., Martin, S., Wiest, K., & Finigan, M. W. (2007). *Indiana Drug Courts: Vanderburgh County Juvenile Drug Court: Program Process Evaluation*, Final Report. Submitted to the Indiana Judicial Council, April 2007.
- Carey, S. M., Finigan, M. W., Crumpton, C. D., & Waller, M. S. (2006). *California Drug Courts: Outcomes, Costs and Promising Practices: An Overview of Phase II in a Statewide Study*. *Journal of Psychoactive Drugs*. SARC supplement 3.
- Marchand, G., Waller, M. S., & Carey, S. M. (2006). *Kalamazoo County (MI) Men's and Women's Drug Courts Cost Evaluation* Final Report. Submitted to the Michigan Administrative Office of the Courts. (Full text can be found at [www.npcresearch.com](http://www.npcresearch.com) in September 2006).

- Marchand, G., Waller, M. S., & Carey, S. M. (2006). *Barry County (MI) Adult Drug Court Cost Evaluation Final Report* Submitted to the Michigan Administrative Office of the Courts. (Full text can be found at [www.npcresearch.com](http://www.npcresearch.com) in September 2006).
- NPC Research (2006). *Maryland Drug Treatment Courts: Interim Report of the Effectiveness of Juvenile Drug Courts*. Submitted to the Drug Treatment Court Commission of Maryland, Annapolis MD. Full text can be found at [www.npcresearch.com](http://www.npcresearch.com).
- Carey, S. M., Marchand, G. & Waller, M. S. (2006). *Clackamas County Juvenile Drug Court Enhancement Cost Evaluation*, Final Report. Submitted to OJDDP. Full text of report can be found at [www.npcresearch.com](http://www.npcresearch.com).
- Carey, S. M., & Waller, M. S. (2005). *Guam Adult Drug Court Process Evaluation* Final Report. Submitted to the Guam Adult Drug Court and the Bureau of Justice Assistance. Report can be found at [www.npcresearch.com](http://www.npcresearch.com).
- Carey, S. M., Waller, M. S., & Marchand, G. (2005). *Malheur County Adult Drug Court 'S.A.F.E. Court' Cost Evaluation*, Final Report. Submitted to Malheur County Circuit Court, S.A.F.E. Court.
- Carey, S. M., Finigan, M. W., Waller, M. S., Lucas, L. M., & Crumpton, D. (2005). *California Drug Courts: A Methodology for Determining Costs and Avoided Costs, Phase II: Testing the Methodology*, Final Report. Submitted to the California Administrative Office of the Courts. Revision submitted to the Bureau of Justice Assistance, April 2005.
- Carey, S. M., & Marchand, G. (2005). *Malheur County Adult Drug Court 'S.A.F.E. Court' Outcome Evaluation*, Final Report. Submitted to the Bureau of Justice Assistance, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice.
- Crumpton, D., Carey, S. M., & Finigan, M. W. (Oct. 2004). *Enhancing Cost Analysis of Drug Courts: The Transactional and Institutional Cost Analysis Approach*. NPC Research: Portland, OR
- Carey, S. M., & Finigan, M. W. (2004). A Detailed Cost Analysis in a Mature Drug Court Setting: A Cost-Benefit Evaluation of the Multnomah County Drug Court. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*. 20(3) 292–338.
- Byrne, F., Schauffler, R., Lightman, L., Finigan, M., & Carey, S. (2004). California Drug Courts: A methodology for determining costs and avoided costs. *Journal of Psychoactive Drugs*. SARC supplement 2, 147–156.
- Carey, S. M. (2004b). *Clackamas County Adult Drug Court Outcome Evaluation*, Final Report. Submitted to the Bureau of Justice Assistance, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice.
- Carey, S. M. (2004a). *Clackamas County Juvenile Drug Court Outcome Evaluation*, Final Report. Submitted to the Bureau of Justice Assistance, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice.
- Carey, S. M., Weller, J. M., & Heiser, C. (2003b). *Malheur County Adult Drug Court 'S.A.F.E. Court' Process Evaluation*, Final Report. Submitted to the Bureau of Justice Assistance, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice.
- Carey, S. M., Weller, J. M., & Roth, B. (2003b). *Marion County Adult Drug Court Process Evaluation*, Final Report. Submitted to the Bureau of Justice Assistance, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice.
- Carey, S. M., Weller, J. M., & Heiser, C. (2003a). *Clackamas County Adult Drug Court Process Evaluation*, Final Report. Submitted to the Bureau of Justice Assistance, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice.

- Carey, S. M., Weller, J. M. & Roth, B. (2003a). *Clackamas County Juvenile Drug Court Process Evaluation*, Final Report. Submitted to the Bureau of Justice Assistance, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice
- Carey, S. M., & Finigan, M. W. (2003). *A Detailed Cost Analysis in a Mature Drug Court Setting: A Cost-Benefit Evaluation of the Multnomah County Drug Court*. National Institute of Justice.
- Finigan, M. W., & Carey, S. M. (2003). *Analysis of 26 Process and Impact Evaluations of Drug Courts: Lessons Learned*. National Institute of Justice.
- Carey, S. M., Finigan, M. W., Weller, J. M., Schnacker, L., & Crumpton, C. D. (2003). *An Independent Evaluation of SACPA/Proposition 36 in Santa Clara County*, Final Report. Process and impact evaluation submitted to the Santa Clara County Executive Office.
- Finigan, M. W., Barron, N., & Carey, S. M. (2003). Chapter 10: Effectively Assessing and Preparing Inmates for Community Substance Abuse Treatment: The Portland Target Cities Project In-Jail Intervention. Stephens, R.C., Scott, C.K., & Muck, R.D. (Eds.) *Clinical Assessment and Substance Abuse Treatment: The Target Cities Experience*. (pp. 165–178). State University of New York Press.
- Carey, S. M., Finigan, M. W., Crumpton, C. D., & Worcel, S. D. (2002). *California Drug Courts: A Methodology for Determining Costs and Avoided Costs, Phase I: Building the Methodology, San Diego East County Drug Court*, Site-Specific Report.
- Carey, S. M., Finigan, M. W., Crumpton, C. D., & Worcel, S. D. (2002). *California Drug Courts: A Methodology for Determining Costs and Avoided Costs, Phase I: Building the Methodology, Los Angeles County Central Drug Court*, Site-Specific Report.
- Carey, S. M., Finigan, M. W., Crumpton, C. D., & Worcel, S. D. (2002). *California Drug Courts: A Methodology for Determining Costs and Avoided Costs, Phase I: Building the Methodology, Butte County Drug Court*, Site-Specific Report.
- Carey, S. M., Finigan, M. W., Crumpton, C. D., & Worcel, S. D. (2002). *California Drug Courts: A Methodology for Determining Costs and Avoided Costs, Phase I: Building the Methodology*, Final Report.
- Carey, S. M. (2001). *Oregon Statewide School Drug Use Survey* – One-hundred and eighty reports submitted to each participating school.
- Carey, S. M. (2001). *Jackson County School Drug Use Survey Report*
- Carey, S. M. (2001). *Safe and Drug Free Schools Survey – School Building Reports*. One-hundred and eighty reports submitted to each participating school.
- Carey, S. M., McEmrys, A., Lucas, L. M., & Finigan, M. W. (2001). *Jackson County School Drug Use Survey Report*.
- Carey, S. M., Lucas, L. M., & Finigan, M. W. (2000). *Statewide School Survey School Building Reports*. Reports given to 482 schools in the state of Oregon.
- Weller, J. M., Carey, S. M., & Finigan, M. W. (2000). *Safe and Drug Free Schools Survey Reports*. Given to nine school districts in the state of Oregon.
- Carey, S. M., Myers, G., & Finigan, M. W. (2000) *California Drug Courts Statewide Cost Evaluation Research Design*. Submitted to the California Administrative Office of the Court Collaborative Justice Committee.
- Carey, S. M., Myers, G., & Finigan, M. W. (2000) *California Drug Courts Statewide Cost Evaluation Phase I Research Design*. Submitted to the California Administrative Office of the Court Collaborative Justice Committee.

- Carey, S. M., Myers, G., & Finigan, M. W. (2000) *California Drug Courts Statewide Cost Evaluation Phase II Action Plan*. Submitted to the California Administrative Office of the Court Collaborative Justice Committee.
- Carey, S. M., Cole, R. T. M., Finigan, M. W., Lucas, L. M., & Mackin, J. R. (1999). *Douglas County Drug Court Process Evaluation*. A report to the Douglas County, Oregon, Trial Court Administrator's Office.
- Finigan, M. W., Carey, S. M., & Lucas, L. M. (1998). *The 1998 Oregon Public School Drug Use Survey, Key Findings Report*. A report to the Oregon Office of Alcohol & Drug Abuse Programs.

## SELECTED TRAININGS AND PRESENTATIONS

- Breitenbucher, P., & Carey, S. M. (2017, July). **Moving Forward - Research Findings, Reflections, and a Roadmap for the Family Drug Court Movement**. Presented at the NADCP annual conference in National Harbor, Washington DC.
- Carey, S. M., & van Wormer, J. (2017, July). **What's Behind the Curtain? New Research in Juvenile Drug Court Best Practices**. Presented at the NADCP annual conference in National Harbor, Washington DC.
- Ho, T., & Carey, S. M. (2017, July). **Assessing Diversity, Disparity, and Best Practices: Results of a 2017 Review of Over 150 Adult Drug Courts and DUI Courts**. Presented at the NADCP annual conference in National Harbor, Washington DC.
- Carey, S. M., & Floerke, S. (2017, July). **How to Implement Research Based Best Practices in Your DWI Court**. Presented at the NADCP annual conference in National Harbor, Washington DC.
- Carey, S. M. (2017, July). **Do the Adult Best Practices Standards Apply to Other Treatment Court Types? What Fits, What Might Fit, What Doesn't Fit**. Presented at the NADCP annual conference in National Harbor, Washington, DC.
- Carey, S. M., Davis, P., Goss, S., Carpenter, C., & Caron, A. (2017, July). **Delivering Incentives, Sanctions, and Therapeutic Adjustments in the Courtroom: What Every Judge Needs to Know**. Presented at the NADCP annual conference in National Harbor, Washington, DC.
- Carey, S. M., & Harberts, H. (2017, May). **Delivering Incentives, Sanctions, and Therapeutic Adjustments in the Courtroom: What Every Judge Needs to Know**. Presented at the Colorado Collaborative Justice Conference, Denver, CO.
- Carey, S.M. & Johnson, A. J. (2017, May). **How to Conduct a Peer Review in CO**. Presented at the Colorado Collaborative Justice Conference, Denver, CO.
- Carey, S. M., & Johnson, A. J. (2016, May). **How to Conduct a Peer Review in CO**. Presented at the Colorado Collaborative Justice Conference, Westminster, CO.
- Carey, S. M. (2016, May). **The importance of Identifying Risks and Needs: Target Population and Implementing Tracks in Your Drug Court**. Presented at the Colorado Collaborative Justice Conference in Westminster, CO.
- Carey, S. M. (2015, November). **Incentives and Sanctions: Practical Application of the Science of Behavior Change**. Presented at the New Mexico Association of Drug Court Professional Conference, Albuquerque, NM.

Carey, S. M. (2015, November). **Target Population and Implementing Tracks: The importance of Identifying Risk and Need.** Presented at the New Mexico Association of Drug Court Professional Conference, Albuquerque, NM.

Carey, S. M., Floerke, S., & Vlavianos, R. (2015, July). **DWI court research and best practices: What's the latest evidence?** Presented at the National Association of Drug Court Professionals Annual Conference, Washington, DC.

Carey, S. M., & Zil, C. E (2015, July). **Data, Evaluation and Outcomes: What You Should Collect and Why.** Presented at the National Association of Drug Court Professionals Annual Conference, Washington, DC.

Breitenbucher, P, & Carey, S. M. (2015, May). **Family Drug Courts. Parents are Adults Too.** Presented at the National Association of Drug Court Professionals Annual Conference, Washington, DC.

Carey, S. M., & Rice, B. (2015, May). **What is it and why should we want it? Colorado's Problem Solving Court Peer Review Process.** Presented at the Colorado Collaborative Justice Conference, Denver, CO.

Carey, S. M. (2015, April). **Therapeutic Responses to Behavior.** Presented at the California Collaborative Justice Conference, Sacramento, CA.

Carey, S. M. (2013, May). **Incentives and Sanctions: Practical Application of the Science of Behavior Change.** Presented at the Colorado Best Practices Conference, Denver, CO.

Carey, S. M., Rice, B., & Jaegar, N. (2013, June). **Data, Evaluation and Fidelity to the Model: Best Practices.** Presented at the National Association of Drug Court Professionals Annual Training Conference, Washington, DC

Carey, S. M., & Mackin, J. R. (2013, June). **Top 10 drug court best practices and more! What works? New findings from the latest research.** Presented at the National Association of Drug Court Professionals Annual Training Conference, Washington, DC

Carey, S. M. (2011, November). **Evaluation: What Every Drug Court Needs to Know.** Presented at the Ohio Specialized Docket Courts Annual Conference.

Carey, S. M.(2011, October). **What Works: Best Practices in Adult Drug Courts. New Findings from the Latest Research.** Presented at Utah State Drug Court Training Conference, Park City, UT.

Carey, S. M. (2011, July). **Family Drug Treatment Courts: Costs and Consequences—A Tale of Two FDC's.** Presented at NADCP Annual Training Conference, Washington, DC.

Carey, S. M., Mackin, J. R., & Finigan, M. W. (2011, July). **What Works: Best Practices in Adult Drug Courts. New Findings from the Latest Research.** Presented at NADCP Annual Training Conference, Washington, DC.

Carey, S. M., & Mackin, J. R. (2011, July). **Juvenile Drug Courts: Show Me the Money!** Presented at NADCP Annual Training Conference, Washington, DC.

Carey, S. M. (2010, 2011). Multiple presentations on drug court best practices based on NPC's research as well as presentations on evaluation at state drug court conferences as well as National Drug Court Institute (NDCI) sponsored trainings for drug courts and at National Center for DWI Courts (NCDC) sponsored trainings. Also facilitation with drug court teams at these training conferences and of the experienced practitioner workshop on evaluation at the NADCP annual conference.



Carey, S. M. (2009). *How to do cost-benefit analysis in your adult drug court: Introducing the new DCCMIS addition!* Presented at the annual Michigan Association of Drug Court Professionals Conference, Lansing, MI. February, 2009.

Carey, S. M. (2009). *Some Answers to our Burning Questions: Drug Court Practices Related to Lower Recidivism and Lower Costs.* Presented at the annual Michigan Association of Drug Court Professionals Conference, Lansing, MI. February, 2009.

Carey, S. M. (2009). *Adult Drug Courts: Some Answers to our Burning Questions.* Presented at the annual Oregon Association of Drug Court Professionals Symposium, Salem, OR. September, 2009.

Carey, S. M. (2009). *Juvenile Drug Courts: Some Answers to our Burning Questions.* Presented at the annual Oregon Association of Drug Court Professionals Symposium, Salem, OR. September, 2009.

Carey, S. M. (2009). *Oregon Byrne Evaluation Year 3.* Presented at the annual Oregon Association of Drug Court Professionals Symposium, Salem, OR. September, 2008.

Carey, S. M., & Mackin, J. R. (2009, June). **Best Practices in Adult Drug Courts: Reduce Recidivism and Costs.** Presented at the National Association of Drug Court Professionals Annual Training Conference, Anaheim, CA.

Carey, S. M. (2009, June). **California Drug Court Statewide Cost Study: Preliminary Findings in 25 Sites.** Presented at the National Association of Drug Court Professionals Annual Training Conference, Anaheim, CA.

Barton, G., & Burrus, S. W. M. (2009, June). **A Tale of Two Family Drug Courts: Show Me the Money!** Presented at the National Association of Drug Court Professionals Annual Training Conference, Anaheim, CA.

Barton, G., Byrne, F., Carey, S. M., D'Amato, S., Gennette, K., Hudson, M. K., & Mackin, J. R. (2009, June). **Getting the Most out of Your Evaluation.** Presented at the National Association of Drug Court Professionals Annual Training Conference, Anaheim, CA.

Mackin, J. R., & Carey, S. M. **Getting the Most out of Your Evaluation** (2009, June). Presented at the SAMHSA/CSAT grantee meeting, Anaheim, CA.

Carey, S. M., & Binion, J. (2009, February). **How to Do Cost-Benefit Analysis in Your Adult Drug Court: Introducing the DCCAT, the New DCCMIS Addition!** Presented at the Michigan Association of Drug Court Professionals Annual Conference, Lansing, MI.

Carey, S. M. (2009, February). **Drug Courts: Some Answers to Our Burning Questions: How Drug Court Practices Impact Recidivism and Costs.** Presented at the Michigan Association of Drug Court Professionals Annual Conference, Lansing, MI.

Carey, S. M. and Waller, M. (2007-2009). **How to Use the California Drug Court Cost Self-Evaluation Tool in Your Drug Court.** Multiple trainings at multiple regional sites in California. Multiple trainings with individual court through conference calls and web conference.

Carey, S. M., & Finigan, M. W. (2008, October). **Implementation of the Ten Key Components: Variations in Practice Across 18 Drug Courts.** Presented at New England Association of Drug Court Professionals Annual Conference, Boston, MA.

Carey, S. M., & Finigan, M. W. (2008, October). **Juvenile Drug Courts: Some Answers to our Burning Questions: How Drug Court Practices Impact Recidivism and Costs.** Presented at New England Association of Drug Court Professionals Annual Conference, Boston, MA.

Carey, S. M., & Finigan, M. W. (2008, October). **Adult Drug Courts: Some Answers to our Burning Questions: How Drug Court Practices Impact Recidivism and Costs.** Presented at New England Association of Drug Court Professionals Annual Conference, Boston, MA.

Burrus, S. W. M., Carey, S. M., Finigan, M. W. (2008, October). **Are Family Treatment Drug Courts Effective? Results from two studies and six sites.** Presented at New England Association of Drug Court Professionals Annual Conference, Boston, MA.

Carey, S. M. (2008, October). **Handout: Examples of Drug Court Rewards, Sanctions and other Responses.** Distributed at New England Association of Drug Court Professionals Annual Conference, Boston, MA.

Carey, S. M., Finigan, M. W., & Mackin, J. R. (May 29, 2008). **How Drug Court Practices Impact Recidivism and Costs.** Powerpoint presented at the annual meeting of the National Association of Drug Court Professionals, St. Louis, MO.

Burrus, S. W. M., Carey, S. M., Mackin, J. R., & Finigan, M. W. (2008, May). **Family Drug Treatment Courts and Juvenile Drug Courts: Outcomes, Costs and Promising Practices.** Powerpoint presented at the annual meeting of the National Association of Drug Court Professionals, St. Louis, MO.

Carey, S. M., & Perkins, T. (April 24, 2008). **Methamphetamine and the latest research on promising practices for drug courts.** Powerpoint presented at the annual meeting of the Missouri Association of Drug Court Professionals, Osage Beach, MO.

Carey, S. M., Finigan, M. W., & Mackin, J. R. (May 29, 2008). *How Drug Court Practices Impact Recidivism and Costs.* Presented at the annual meeting of the National Association of Drug Court Professionals, St. Louis, MO.

Finigan, M. W., Burrus, S. W. M., Carey, S. M., & Mackin, J. R. (2008, May). *Family Drug Treatment Courts and Juvenile Drug Courts: Outcomes, Costs and Promising Practices.* Presented at the annual meeting of the National Association of Drug Court Professionals, St. Louis, MO.

Carey, S. M., & Perkins, T. (April 24, 2008). *Methamphetamine and the latest research on promising practices for drug courts.* Presented at the annual meeting of the Missouri Association of Drug Court Professionals, Osage Beach, MO.

Carey, S. M. (2007). "A Tale of Three Drug Court Cost Studies." National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice, Annual Conference July 2007.

Carey, S. M. (Chair), Marchand, G., Pukstas, K., & Wiest, K. (2006, November). Implementing a Standardized, Process, Outcome and Cost-Benefit Methodology in Multiple States: Challenges and Successes in Evaluating Drug Treatment Court Programs." American Society of Criminology.

Carey, S. M. (Chair), Marchand, G., Pukstas, K., & Wiest, K. (2006). Implementing a Standardized, Process, Outcome and Cost-Benefit Methodology in Multiple States: Challenges and Successes in Evaluating Drug Treatment Court Programs." American Evaluation Association, November 2006.

Carey, S. M., & Finigan, M. W. (2006). "California Drug Courts: Outcomes, Costs and Promising Practices." National Association of Drug Court Professionals, June 2006.

Carey, S. M. (2006). "Clackamas County Juvenile Drug Court Cost Evaluation." National Association of Drug Court Professionals, June 2006.

- Carey, S. M. (2005). "California Drug Courts: Outcomes, Costs and Promising Practices." Substance Abuse Research Conference (SARC), September 2005.
- Carey, S. M. (2005). "California Statewide Drug Court Cost Study – Results on nine adult drug court sites and updates on the development Drug Court Cost Self-Evaluation Tool (DC-CSET). California Administrative Office of the Courts Collaborative Justice Advisory Committee Meeting, September 2005.
- Carey, S. M. (2005). "Portrait of Drug Courts and Offenders in Today's Environment: The Effect of State Mandated Treatment for Drug Offenders on Drug Court Programs." USDOJ - National Institute of Justice Research and Evaluation Conference, July 2005.
- Carey, S. M. (2004). "Evaluation of Drug Court Costs and Benefits in Oregon, California and Maryland." The National Association of Drug Court Professional 2004 Conference.
- Carey, S. M. (2004). Panel Chair and presenter. "The Multnomah County Drug Court Cost Evaluation: A Detailed Cost Analysis in a Mature Drug Court Setting." The Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences 2004 Conference.
- Carey, S. M. (2003). "The Multnomah County Drug Court Cost Evaluation: A Detailed Cost Analysis in a Mature Drug Court Setting." The National Association of Drug Court Professional 2003 Conference.
- Carey, S. M., & Finigan, M. W. (2003). "The Multnomah County Drug Court Cost Evaluation: A Detailed Cost Analysis in a Mature Drug Court Setting." Trial Court Research and Improvement Consortium, March 2003.
- Carey, S. M. (2002). "California Drug Court Cost Evaluation Phase I Results" at the National Association of Drug Court Professionals Conference.
- Carey, S. M. (2002). "SACPA/Prop36 Evaluation" and "California Drug Court Cost Evaluation Phase I Results" at the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences Conference.
- Carey, S. M. (2001). "California Drug Court Cost Evaluation Phase I Preliminary Results" at the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences Conference.
- Carey, S. M. (2001). "California Drug Court Cost Evaluation Phase I Description and Progress" at 2001 National Association of Drug Court Professionals.
- Carey, S. M. (2001). Presentation of "California Drug Court Cost Evaluation Phase I Description and Progress" at 2001 California Drug Court Symposium.