APPENDIX B: PRACTICES PERFORMED IN 90% OR MORE OF THE PROGRAMS IN THIS ANALYSIS
PRACTICES REPORTED BEING PERFORMED THE SAME WAY BY AT LEAST
90 PERCENT OF THE COURTS

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

Key Component #1

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

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

Key Component #2:

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

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

Key Component #3

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

- Allowed participants with felony charges
- Allowed participants with co-occurring disorders
- Had written eligibility requirements
- Reported that they performed a full assessment to determine level of care
**Key Component #4**

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

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

**Key Component #5**

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

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

**Key Component #6**

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

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

**Key Component #7**

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

- The Judge attends staffing meetings
- The judge speaks directly to participants during court sessions.
- The program reports that the judge provides consistent follow-through on warnings to participants.
Key Component #8
None

Key Component #9: What Are the Drug Courts in California Doing?
None

Key Component #10
In this study, over 90% of the drug courts reported that:

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