

**WASHINGTON STATE'S DRUG COURTS FOR ADULT DEFENDANTS:
OUTCOME EVALUATION AND COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS**

Technical Appendices

ROBERT BARNOSKI, PH.D.

STEVE AOS

MARCH 2003

WASHINGTON STATE INSTITUTE FOR PUBLIC POLICY

110 Fifth Avenue Southeast, Suite 214

Post Office Box 40999

Olympia, Washington 98504-0999

Telephone: (360) 586-2677

FAX: (360) 586-2793

URL: <http://www.wsipp.wa.gov>

Document No. 03-03-1201A

CONTENTS

Appendix A: Drug Court Outcome Evaluations Reviewed for the Cost-Benefit Analysis.....	1
Appendix B: Eligibility Criteria.....	5
Appendix C: Regression Results.....	13
Appendix D: Cost Analyses	25

APPENDIX A: DRUG COURT OUTCOME EVALUATIONS REVIEWED FOR THE COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS

Studies Reviewed for Criminal Outcome Effects	Used in Meta-Analysis?	Research Design Information						Difference in the Proportion That Re-offend (negative ES = lower crime)			Difference in the Mean Number of Offenses of Those That Re-offend		
		Design Score	Researcher Role	N (Treat)	N (Comp)	Follow-up (yrs)	Crime Outcome	ES	AdjES	p	ES	AdjES	p
Notes to Information Listed: The "Design Score" is a measure of the overall level of confidence that can be placed in the findings based on how the evaluation was designed—a "5" is the highest score, "1" is the lowest. "Researcher Role" is whether the program was carried out by the developer (1) or whether it was a "real world" program (0). "N (Treat)" and "N (Comp)" are the numbers in the treatment and comparison groups. "Follow-up (yrs)" is the follow-up time in years. "Crime Outcome" is a code for the type of recidivism measure used in the study (see code definitions at end of table). "ES" is the mean difference effect size approximated from proportion data (dichotomous group recidivism rates) using the arcsine transformation and adjusted using the Hedges correction for small sample sizes as described in Lipsey and Wilson (2000); "AdjES" is the Institute-adjusted effect size; p is the significance level.													
Deschenes, Elizabeth Piper and Greenwood, Peter W., "Maricopa County's drug court: An innovative program for first-time drug offenders on probation." <i>Justice System Journal</i> 17, no. 1 (1994): 99-115. Updated summary reported in Belenko, Steven, <i>Research on drug courts: A critical review</i> (New York: The National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University, June 1998).	Yes	5	0	176	454	1.0	At	-0.02	-0.02	.81	0.04	0.04	.81
Turner, S., Greenwood, P., Fain, T., and Deschenes, E., "Perceptions of drug court: How offenders view ease of program completion, strengths and weaknesses, and the impact on their lives." <i>National Drug Court Institute Review</i> 2, no. 1 (1999). This is an update of the 12-month results reported in Deschenes, Elizabeth Piper and Greenwood, Peter W., "Maricopa County's drug court: An innovative program for first-time drug offenders on probation." <i>Justice System Journal</i> 17, no. 1 (1994): 99-115. This research reports the three-year outcomes of the Maricopa County (Arizona) First-Time Drug Offender Program, a post-adjudicatory drug court. The program is for first-time felony drug possession offenders with no more than one non-drug felony-related conviction.	Yes	5	0	143	363	3.0	At	-0.22	-0.22	.03	0.00	0.00	.98
Gottfredson, Denise C., Najaka, Stacy S., and Kearley, Brook, "A randomized study of the Baltimore city drug treatment court: Results from the three-year follow-up" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Society of Criminology, Chicago, November 2002). This is a randomized trial of the Baltimore Court (a different test than the matched group 1997 study) with 36-month outcomes.	Yes	5	0	139	96	3.0	At	-0.24	-0.24	.07	-0.22	-0.22	.13
Breckenridge, J. F., Winfree, Jr., L. T., Maupin, J. R., and Clason, D. L. "Drunk drivers, DWI 'drug court' treatment, and recidivism: Who fails?" <i>Justice Research and Policy</i> 2, no. 1 (2000): 87. This research reports on a drug court in Las Cruces, New Mexico, for alcoholic DWI offenders.	Yes	5	0	39	36	1.6	Ct	-0.17	-0.17	.45	-	-	-
Lind, B., Weatherburn, D., and Chen, S., <i>New South Wales drug court evaluation: Cost-effectiveness</i> (Sydney: NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research, 2002). <www.lawlink.nsw.gov.au/bocsar>. This research reports the results of an evaluation of the drug court in New South Wales, Australia. This is a randomized waiting-line design; although the control group was more male, no other pre-existing differences were measured. The results used here are the one-year outcomes.	Yes	5	0	308	160	1.0	Td	-0.10	-0.10	.30	-0.11	-0.11	.42
Truitt, L., Rhodes, W. M., Seeherman, A. M., Carrigan, K., and Finn, P., <i>Phase I: Case studies and impact evaluations of Escambia County, Florida and Jackson County, Missouri drug courts</i> (Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates, March 2000). Some results also reported in Belenko, Steven, <i>Research on drug courts: A critical review, 2001 update</i> (New York: The National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University, June 2001). This is the result for the Escambia County, Florida, drug court from the study's split population model, with the study's adjustments for program participation self selection.	Yes	4	0	483	252	2.0	Af	-0.66	-0.50	.00	-	-	-
Truitt, L., Rhodes, W. M., Seeherman, A. M., Carrigan, K., and Finn, P., <i>Phase I: Case studies and impact evaluations of Escambia County, Florida and Jackson County, Missouri drug courts</i> (Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates, March 2000). Some results also reported in Belenko, Steven, <i>Research on drug courts: A critical review, 2001 update</i> (New York: The National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University, June 2001). This is the result for the Jackson County, Missouri, drug court from the study's split population model, with the study's adjustments for program participation self-selection.	Yes	4	0	693	1416	2.0	Af	-0.30	-0.23	.00	-	-	-
Logan, T., Hoyt, W., and Leukefeld, C., <i>Kentucky drug court outcome evaluation: Behavior, costs, and avoided costs to society</i> (Lexington: Center on Drug and Alcohol Research, University of Kentucky, 2001). This research reports the results of an evaluation of drug courts in Kentucky. There were known pre-existing differences between the participant and comparison groups, with the comparison group having more criminal history. The authors conducted a Heckman analysis to control for self-selection, but the reported results were in the opposite direction of what would have been expected, given the differences in the raw recidivism data.	No	4	0	593	593	1.0	Ccf	-	-	-	-	-	-
Goldkamp, J. S. and Weiland, D., <i>Assessing the impact of Dade County's felony drug court</i> (Philadelphia: Crime and Justice Research Institute, 1993). This research reports the results of Miami's drug court. The finding reported here is for the drug court sample vs. the pre-drug court sample of drug cases (sample V); because there were differences reported in pre-existing differences between the two groups, the author's multivariate logit results were used to estimate the program effect shown here.	Yes	3	0	326	301	1.5	At	-0.12	-0.06	.15	-	-	-

Af = Arrests, felony; At = Arrests, total; Ccf = Criminal charges, felony; Cf = Convictions, felony; Chg = New criminal charges; Crc = Court referrals, criminal 1 offenses; Ct = Convictions, total; all studies with a less-than level "3" rating are listed as "LT3" and are not used in subsequent analyses.

Studies Reviewed for Criminal Outcome Effects	Used in Meta-Analysis?	Research Design Information						Difference in the Proportion That Re-offend (negative ES = lower crime)			Difference in the Mean Number of Offenses of Those That Re-offend		
		Design Score	Researcher Role	N (Treat)	N (Comp)	Follow-up (yrs)	Crime Outcome	ES	AdjES	p	ES	AdjES	p
Notes to Information Listed: The "Design Score" is a measure of the overall level of confidence that can be placed in the findings based on how the evaluation was designed—a "5" is the highest score, "1" is the lowest. "Researcher Role" is whether the program was carried out by the developer (1) or whether it was a "real world" program (0). "N (Treat)" and "N (Comp)" are the numbers in the treatment and comparison groups. "Follow-up (yrs)" is the follow-up time in years. "Crime Outcome" is a code for the type of recidivism measure used in the study (see code definitions at end of table). "ES" is the mean difference effect size approximated from proportion data (dichotomous group recidivism rates) using the arcsine transformation and adjusted using the Hedges correction for small sample sizes as described in Lipsey and Wilson (2000); "AdjES" is the Institute-adjusted effect size; p is the significance level.													
Bell, M. M., <i>King County drug court evaluation: Final report</i> (Seattle: M. M. Bell, Inc., 1998). The result reported here is for all who entered the diversion (pre-adjudication) King County drug court for adults charged with possession with no prior sex or violent adult convictions. The result compares drug court participants (completers and non-completers) with those who opted out. The groups were similar on some matching variables, but the drug court group was probably at higher risk, since they had a more extensive criminal history than the opt-outs.	Yes	3	0	154	180	1.0	Ccf	-0.18	-0.09	.11	-	-	-
<i>Evaluation: Spokane County drug court program</i> (Spokane, WA: Spokane County Drug Court, 1999). The result reported here is for all who entered the pre-trial diversion Spokane County drug court for arrests for possession or forged fraudulent prescriptions, excluding those with pending felony charges, gang involvement, and prior sex or violent convictions. The result compares drug court participants (completers and non-completers) with those who opted out. The groups were similar on some matching variables, but the drug court group was probably at higher risk since they had a more extensive criminal history than the opt-outs.	Yes	3	0	73	130	2.5	At	0.13	0.06	.38	-	-	-
Gottfredson, Denise C., Coblenz, Kris, and Harmon, Michele A., "A short-term outcome evaluation of the Baltimore City drug treatment court program." <i>Perspectives Winter</i> (1997): 33–38. Summary results also reported in Belenko, Steven, <i>Research on drug courts: A critical review</i> (New York: The National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University, June 1998). The results reported here are for the District, Circuit, and violation of parole cases and use the author's logistic regression results to adjust for pre-existing differences (the treatment group was at higher risk for re-offense than the matched comparison group).	Yes	3	0	145	529	0.5	At	-0.28	-0.14	.00	-	-	-
Harell, A., Cavanagh, S., and Roman, J., <i>Findings from the evaluation of the D.C. superior court drug intervention program</i> (Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute, December 1998). This research reports the results of the "treatment docket" of the D.C. experiment—for defendants with drug felonies. The result reported here is for the treatment participants vs. the standard docket, with the effect estimated from the author's logistic regression to control for pre-existing differences. Since this research tests graduated sanctions, not drug treatment participation, it is not included in the drug court summary.	No	3	0	140	311	1.0	At	-	-	-	-	-	-
Granfield, Robert, Eby, Cynthia, and Brewster, Thomas, "An examination of the Denver drug court: The impact of a treatment-oriented drug-offender system." <i>Law & Policy</i> 20, no. 2 (1998): 183–202. This research reports the results of the post-adjudication Denver drug court for offenders with a misdemeanor or felony drug charge. The result reported here combines the outcomes of the two pre-program comparison groups. The authors found the drug court and comparison groups to be "relatively equivalent" on sex, age, or previous criminal history.	Yes	3	0	100	200	1.0	At	0.05	0.03	.68	-	-	-
Finigan, M. W., <i>An outcome program evaluation of the Multnomah County S.T.O.P. drug diversion program</i> (Portland, OR: NPC Research Inc., 1998). This research reports the results of the Multnomah County (Oregon) drug court for offenders with a misdemeanor or felony drug charge. The result reported here for the treatment group combines program completers and dropouts. The comparison group was matched on sex, age, and previous criminal history, and no significant differences were found. The difference in proportions was estimated from the effect size for the difference in mean convictions rates.	No	3	0	300	150	2.0	Ct	-	-	-	-	-	-
Peters, Roger H. and Murrin, Mary R., "Effectiveness of treatment-based drug courts in reducing criminal recidivism." <i>Criminal Justice and Behavior</i> 27 (2000): 72–96. This research reports the results of a mixed diversion and post-adjudication drug court program in Escambia County, Florida, for drug and property offenders with a history of drug involvement and limited criminal justice involvement. The result shown here compares program completers and non-completers (combined) with a matched comparison group. The authors adjusted for a pre-existing difference (the treatment group had more prior arrests than the comparison group).	Yes	3	0	168	81	2.5	At	0.10	0.05	.46	0.09	0.04	.60
Peters, Roger H. and Murrin, Mary R., "Effectiveness of treatment-based drug courts in reducing criminal recidivism." <i>Criminal Justice and Behavior</i> 27 (2000): 72–96. This research reports the results of a diversion drug court program in Okaloosa County, Florida, for drug and property offenders with a history of drug involvement and limited criminal justice involvement. The result shown here compares program completers and non-completers (combined) with a matched comparison group. The authors adjusted for a pre-existing difference (the treatment group had more prior arrests than the comparison group).	Yes	3	0	58	31	2.5	At	-0.23	-0.12	.29	0.44	0.22	.16
Vito, Gennaro F. and Tewksbury, Richard A., "The impact of treatment: The Jefferson County (Kentucky) drug court program." <i>Federal Probation</i> 62, no. 2 (1998): 46–51. This research reports the results of a diversion drug court program in Kentucky for drug possession offenders with no history of violent offenses. The result shown here compares program completers and non-completers (combined) with a matched comparison group. The authors found that the two groups were comparable on most pre-existing factors, but the treatment group may have been at a slightly higher risk to re-offend.	Yes	3	0	216	74	1.0	Cf	-0.14	-0.07	.28	-	-	-

Af = Arrests, felony; At = Arrests, total; Ccf = Criminal charges, felony; Cf = Convictions, felony; Chg = New criminal charges; Crc = Court referrals, criminal 2 offenses; Ct = Convictions, total; all studies with a less-than level "3" rating are listed as "LT3" and are not used in subsequent analyses.

Studies Reviewed for Criminal Outcome Effects	Used in Meta-Analysis?	Research Design Information						Difference in the Proportion That Re-offend (negative ES = lower crime)			Difference in the Mean Number of Offenses of Those That Re-offend		
		Design Score	Researcher Role	N (Treat)	N (Comp)	Follow-up (yrs)	Crime Outcome	ES	AdjES	p	ES	AdjES	p
Notes to Information Listed: The "Design Score" is a measure of the overall level of confidence that can be placed in the findings based on how the evaluation was designed—a "5" is the highest score, "1" is the lowest. "Researcher Role" is whether the program was carried out by the developer (1) or whether it was a "real world" program (0). "N (Treat)" and "N (Comp)" are the numbers in the treatment and comparison groups. "Follow-up (yrs)" is the follow-up time in years. "Crime Outcome" is a code for the type of recidivism measure used in the study (see code definitions at end of table). "ES" is the mean difference effect size approximated from proportion data (dichotomous group recidivism rates) using the arcsine transformation and adjusted using the Hedges correction for small sample sizes as described in Lipsey and Wilson (2000); "AdjES" is the Institute-adjusted effect size; p is the significance level.													
Goldkamp, J. S., White, M. D., and Robinson, J. B., "Do drug courts work? Getting inside the drug court black box." <i>Journal of Drug Issues</i> 31, no. 1 (2001): 27–72. This research reports the results of the Clark County (Nevada) drug court. The results reported are from the authors' logistic regression analysis to control for pre-existing differences; the results compare the drug court group with the combined results for the comparison A and B groups for all cohorts.	Yes	3	0	499	510	0.0	At	-0.35	-0.18	.00	-	-	-
Goldkamp, J. S., White, M. D., and Robinson, J. B., "Do drug courts work? Getting inside the drug court black box." <i>Journal of Drug Issues</i> 31, no. 1 (2001): 27–72. This research reports the results of the Multnomah County (Portland) drug court. The results reported are from the authors' logistic regression analysis to control for pre-existing differences; the results compare the drug court group with the combined results for the comparison A and B groups for all cohorts.	Yes	3	0	691	401	1.0	At	0.09	0.04	.16	-	-	-
Harrell, A., Roman, J., and Sack, E., <i>Drug court services for female offenders, 1996–1999: Evaluation of the Brooklyn treatment court</i> (Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute, 2001). The results reported here are the two-year follow-up using the mean-adjusted recidivism rates from the study's logistic regression to control for pre-existing differences in the drug court and non-drug court samples.	Yes	3	0	283	114	2.0	At	-0.15	-0.08	.16	-0.31	-0.16	.11
Miethe, T. D., Lu, H., and Reese, E., "Reintegrative shaming and recidivism risks in drug court: Explanations for some unexpected findings." <i>Crime and Delinquency</i> 46, no. 4 (2000): 522–541. This research reports the results of the Las Vegas drug court evaluation. The authors used logistic regression models to account for pre-existing differences in the drug court and non-drug court samples.	Yes	3	0	301	301	1.0	Crc	0.23	0.12	.00	-	-	-
Belenko, S., Fagan, J. A., and Dumanovsky, T., "The effects of legal sanctions on recidivism in special drug courts." <i>The Justice System Journal</i> 17, no. 1 (1994): 53–81. This research was on New York City's fast track drug court where speed, rather than treatment, was the goal.	No	3	0	2742	3202	1.3	Af	-	-	-	-	-	-
Brewster, M. P., "An evaluation of the Chester County (PA) drug court program." <i>Journal of Drug Issues</i> 31, no. 1 (2001): 177–206. This research reports the results of a pre-post evaluation of the Chester County drug court in suburban southeastern Pennsylvania, for offenders charged with "non-mandatory" drug offenses. The comparison group was selected to be "similar offenders (from a year earlier) who would have been participants had the program been in existence when they were prosecuted." The author's proportional hazards regression model results are reported here. The study had a short average follow-up time for the treatment group.	Yes	3	0	194	51	0.6	At	-0.27	-0.13	.07	-	-	-
Bavon, A., "The effect of the Tarrant County drug court project on recidivism." <i>Evaluation and Program Planning</i> 24 (2001): 13–24. This research compared drug court program participants (graduates and dropouts) with drug court opt-outs (those eligible but did not participate). The author reports no significant pre-existing differences between the two groups (the numbers in Table 1, however, do indicate significant differences). Multivariate analysis was not performed.	Yes	3	0	157	107	1.0	At	-0.12	-0.06	.35	-	-	-
Spohn, C., Piper, R. K., Martin, T., and Frenzel, E. D., "Drug courts and recidivism: The results of an evaluation using two comparison groups and multiple indicators of recidivism." <i>Journal of Drug Issues</i> 31, no. 1 (2001): 149–176. This is the result for the Douglas County Nebraska drug court vs. the traditionally adjudicated group, using the study's logistic regression results to control for known pre-existing differences.	Yes	3	0	285	194	1.0	Af	-0.31	-0.16	.00	0.04	0.02	.82
Stageberg, P., Wilson, B., and Moore, R. G., <i>Final report on the Polk County adult drug court</i> (Iowa Department of Human Rights, Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning, 2001). The test reported here is for the total drug court group vs. the "pilot" group (those included as the target population prior to drug court development), using the study's reported risk adjustment factor to adjust for pre-existing differences in the two groups.	Yes	3	0	124	124	1.8	Cf	-0.38	-0.19	.00	-	-	-
<i>Salt Lake County drug court outcome evaluation</i> (Utah Substance Abuse and Anti-Violence Coordinating Council, September 2001). This evaluation used a matched comparison group of individuals, from a period before the operation of the drug court, who would have qualified for the drug court. There were no statistically significant differences between the groups with regard to age, sex, race, and arrest history.	Yes	3	0	199	150	1.5	At	-0.72	-0.36	.00	0.73	0.36	.00
Latessa, E. J., Shaffer, D. K., and Lowenkamp C., <i>Outcome evaluation of Ohio's drug court efforts: Final report</i> (Cincinnati: Center for Criminal Justice Research, Division of Criminal Justice, University of Cincinnati, July 2002). This result is for the municipal misdemeanor courts, using the report's logistic regression results.	Yes	3	0	556	228	2.1	At	-0.18	-0.09	.02	-	-	-
Latessa, E. J., Shaffer, D. K., and Lowenkamp C., <i>Outcome evaluation of Ohio's drug court efforts: Final report</i> (Cincinnati: Center for Criminal Justice Research, Division of Criminal Justice, University of Cincinnati, July 2002).. This result is for the felony courts, using the report's logistic regression results.	Yes	3	0	788	429	1.7	At	-0.40	-0.20	.00	-	-	-

Af = Arrests, felony; At = Arrests, total; Ccf = Criminal charges, felony; Cf = Convictions, felony; Chg = New criminal charges; Crc = Court referrals, criminal 3 offenses; Ct = Convictions, total; all studies with a less-than level "3" rating are listed as "LT3" and are not used in subsequent analyses.

Studies Reviewed for Criminal Outcome Effects	Used in Meta-Analysis?	Research Design Information						Difference in the Proportion That Re-offend (negative ES = lower crime)			Difference in the Mean Number of Offenses of Those That Re-offend		
		Design Score	Researcher Role	N (Treat)	N (Comp)	Follow-up (yrs)	Crime Outcome	ES	AdjES	p	ES	AdjES	p
Rempel, M., Fox, D., Farole, D., and Cissner, A., <i>The impact of three New York City drug courts on recidivism: Results for post-arrest and post-program recidivism</i> (paper presented at the American Society of Criminology annual meeting, Chicago, November 2002). This research reports the results of an evaluation of the Brooklyn drug court. The drug court participants were compared with a contemporaneous matched group (using propensity scoring matching) that did not receive the drug court program. There remained significant differences in pre-existing prior convictions, age, and race for the treatment and comparison group samples, with the comparison group being higher risk to re-offend.	Yes	3	0	429	307	4.0	Ct	-0.16	-0.08	.03	-	-	-
Rempel, M., Fox, D., Farole, D., and Cissner, A., <i>The impact of three New York City drug courts on recidivism: Results for post-arrest and post-program recidivism</i> (paper presented at the American Society of Criminology annual meeting, Chicago, November 2002). This research reports the results of an evaluation of the Bronx drug court. The drug court participants were compared with a prior-period matched group (using propensity scoring matching) that did not receive the drug court program. There were no significant differences in pre-existing variables for the treatment and comparison group samples.	Yes	3	0	141	372	3.0	Ct	-0.30	-0.15	.00	-	-	-
Rempel, M., Fox, D., Farole, D., and Cissner, A., <i>The impact of three New York City drug courts on recidivism: Results for post-arrest and post-program recidivism</i> (paper presented at the American Society of Criminology annual meeting, Chicago, November 2002). This research reports the results of an evaluation of the Queens drug court. The drug court participants were compared with a prior-period matched group (using propensity scoring matching) that did not receive the drug court program. There were no significant differences in pre-existing variables for the treatment and comparison group samples.	Yes	3	0	156	144	3.0	Ct	-0.53	-0.27	.00	-	-	-
Tjaden, C. D., Diana, A., Feldman, D., Dietrich, W., and Jackson, K., <i>Denver drug court: Second year report, outcome evaluation</i> (Vail, CO: Toucan Research and Computer Solutions, 2002). This research reports the results of an evaluation of the Denver drug court. The comparison group was selected from a nearby county without a drug court, based on selection criteria. Multivariate results are recorded, taken at three-year follow-up.	Yes	3	0	2320	880	3.0	Chg	-0.07	-0.04	.06	-	-	-
Bedrick, B., and Skolnick, J. H., "From 'treatment' to 'justice' in Oakland, California," in W. C. Terry, III (ed.) <i>The early drug courts: Case studies in judicial innovation</i> (Thousand Oaks: Sage, 1999) Chapter 3, pp. 43-76. This research reports the results of Oakland's FIRST diversion drug court for those charged with first-time drug possession with no felony convictions within the previous five years. The treatment sample included both completers and non-completers. The comparison sample consisted of offenders prior to the treatment drug court who entered the non-drug court diversion program; limited comparisons indicate similar age and racial makeup, but no comparative information was reported. The finding reported here was adjusted by the Institute for differences in at-risk time.	No	LT3	0	110	110	4.0	Af	-	-	-	-	-	-
Terry, III, W. C., "Broward County's dedicated drug treatment court: From postadjudication to diversion," in W. C. Terry, III (ed.) <i>The early drug courts: Case studies in judicial innovation</i> (Thousand Oaks: Sage, 1999) Chapter 4, pp. 77-107. This research reports the results of Broward County's drug court. The treatment group consists of program graduates only. The comparison group had significantly more females; any differences in prior criminal history were not reported. Logistic regression results are reported here.	No	LT3	0	221	69	1.0	Af	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kelly, W. R., "The Travis County drug diversion court: A preliminary outcome evaluation," (1996). Reported in summary of research on the Travis County, Texas, drug court in Belenko, Steven, <i>Research on drug courts: A critical review</i> (New York: The National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University, June 1998). Summary results also reported in GAO, <i>Drug courts: Overview of growth, characteristics, and results</i> (Washington, D.C.: United States General Accounting Office, July 1997). The evaluation included outcome information on the graduates.	No	LT3	0	22	27	0.0	At	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sechrest, D. K., Shichor, D., Artist, K., and Briceno, G., <i>The Riverside County drug court: Final research report for the Riverside County Probation Department Riverside County, California</i> (San Bernardino, CA: California State University, San Bernardino Criminal Justice Dept., 1998). This research reports the results of a study of the Riverside County, California, drug court. There were known pre-existing differences in the matched comparison group (the pre-program comparison groups had more criminal history). These differences were not controlled in the evaluation. The result reported here for the treatment group combines program graduates and removals, and adjusts for the different follow-up times used in the evaluation.	No	LT3	0	76	243	2.0	At	-	-	-	-	-	-
Deschenes, E. P., Imam, I., Foster, T. L., Diaz, L., Moreno, V., Patascil, L., and Ward, D., <i>Evaluation of Orange County drug courts</i> (Richmond, CA: The Center for Applied Local Research, 1999). This study used a non-equivalent comparison group design with a matched comparison group (based on gender, race/ethnicity, and age—not criminal history). There were significant pre-existing differences on criminal history between the drug court group (less risky) and the probation comparison group (more risky). No multivariate analysis to attempt to control for the pre-existing differences was reported.	No	LT3	0	236	234	2.0	At	-	-	-	-	-	-

Af = Arrests, felony; At = Arrests, total; Ccf = Criminal charges, felony; Cf = Convictions, felony; Chg = New criminal charges; Crc = Court referrals, criminal 4 offenses; Ct = Convictions, total; all studies with a less-than level "3" rating are listed as "LT3" and are not used in subsequent analyses.

APPENDIX B: ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

Appendix B reprinted from: G. B. Cox, L. Brown, C. Morgan, "NW HIDTA / DASA Washington State Drug Court Evaluation Project: Final Report" (Olympia, WA, July 13, 2001): Northwest High-Intensity Drug Trafficking Area and Washington Division of Alcohol and Substance Abuse, ADAI Technical Report Series 01-01.

King County Drug Court Eligibility Criteria

Legal Criteria

The Prosecutors Office is responsible for initial screening.

The first level criteria for drug court admission include:

- Arrest for possession of Schedule I or II drugs with no evidence of intent to sell
- Arrest for prescription drug offenses (including forged prescriptions) with no evidence of intent to sell
- Drug related property crimes may be considered

Other legal criteria include:

- No other pending felony charges
- No prior adult conviction for sex offenses
- No prior adult conviction for violent offenses

The King County Drug Court program has developed the flexibility to accept some individuals with a history of **misdemeanor** domestic violence. These decisions are made on a case-by-case basis at the discretion of the Drug Court Judge.

Clinical Criteria

The individual must be diagnosed as chemically dependent. While it is uncommon, treatment agencies can recommend against drug court entry, usually on the basis of a history of non-compliance with treatment. When this occurs, the Drug Court Judge in consultation with the Drug Court team makes the final decision about the defendant's participation in the program.

Kitsap County Drug Court Eligibility Criteria

Legal Criteria

The legal offenses eligible for drug court consideration include:

- Possession of controlled substances
- Prescription/legend drug offenses (including forged prescriptions)
- Drug-related property crimes (theft, forgery, etc.)
- Probation violations (if based on the defendant's substance abuse)

Offenses not eligible for drug court include:

- Prior or pending violent or sex offenses
- Delivery of controlled substances
- Manufacture of a drug, including marijuana and methamphetamine
- Possession of drugs with intent to deliver
- Firearms present at the time of arrest
- Prior or pending burglary offense (presumptive exclusion only – Prosecutor studies the facts of each case and may admit defendants with a prior burglary charge at his discretion)
- Any violence involved with the current offense.

The Prosecutor's Office is responsible for screening all potential Drug Court participants. As a part of this process, the Prosecutor may contact the local drug task force and/or the arresting agency to determine if the defendant is a "person of interest" for additional charges.

Clinical Criteria

The participant must be diagnosed with a chemical dependency or addiction. In addition, the participant must want to participate in treatment and there must be adequate services available to address the needs of the participant.

Pierce County Drug Court Eligibility Criteria

Legal Criteria

The prosecutor's office is responsible for screening defendants for potential Drug Court legal eligibility.

The offenses eligible for Drug Court consideration have evolved over time. Current eligible offenses include:

- Unlawful Possession of a Controlled Substance (UPCS) (except PCP)
- Prescription Forgery
- Malicious Mischief 2
- Possession of Stolen Property 2 (except guns)
- Theft 2 (except guns)
- Unlawful Issuance of Checks or Drafts
- Vehicle Prowl 1
- Taking a Motor Vehicle Without Permission
- Unlawful Manufacture of Marijuana (with certain restrictions)
- Eluding (attempting to elude) police (with certain restrictions)
- Unlawful Use of a Building for Drug Purposes (this offense was added in the spring of 1999)

In addition to the above, the following must also be true for a defendant to be eligible for Drug Court:

- There must not be a violent misdemeanor arising out of the same incident.
- Restitution at the time of entry into Drug Court shall not exceed \$1,500.
- Defendants cannot have been in possession of a firearm at the time of arrest unless they had a valid permit to carry the firearm at that time.
- There must be no evidence of drug dealing by the defendant, with an exception for those "middling" a drug deal in order to obtain drugs to support their habit.
- The defendant must have no prior adult or juvenile criminal history of violent or sex offenses.
- There must be no verifiable evidence of gang association or affiliation within one year of the arrest.
- The defendant must be a U.S. citizen.
- The defendant must relinquish all firearms and permits to carry firearms.
- The defendant must not have previously participated in the Drug Court Program.

Clinical Criteria

In addition to meeting legal eligibility requirements as defined above, potential Drug Court clients must be assessed by PCA to be drug or alcohol addicted or dependent and not mentally ill to the degree that such illness would render them not amenable to treatment.

Skagit County Drug Court Eligibility Criteria

Legal Criteria

The county prosecutor's office is responsible for determining legal eligibility criteria for Drug Court participation. Criteria are discussed among the Drug Court team but the prosecutor determines eligibility. The offenses eligible for Drug Court participation have evolved over time.

Eligible offenses include:

- Unlawful Possession of a Controlled Substance (UPCS) of less than one ounce
- Single count delivery cases or intent to deliver cases of less than one ounce and not involving co-defendants
- Prescription forgery
- Manufacturing of marijuana of less than ten plants
- Non-violent property crimes
- Not currently charged with or previously convicted of a violent crime, sexual offense or weapons charge as defined by statute (OJP Implementation Grant Proposal, April 9, 1998)

Since January 1999, the eligibility criteria have broadened on a case-by-case basis. Currently, those charged with distribution of drugs may also be eligible for Drug Court depending on the amount of drugs present and other circumstances surrounding the crime. In addition, delivery offenses may be eligible if the defendant benefited by obtaining drugs to support his or her habit as opposed to profiting financially from the delivery. Under no circumstances may a defendant be offered Drug Court participation if his or her drug charge involved the operation of a methamphetamine lab.

Defendants with misdemeanor assault charges may be allowed into Drug Court on a case-by-case basis, depending on circumstances and the approval of the arresting officer(s). Individuals arrested for crimes in which a weapon was used are strictly prohibited from Drug Court. However, those arrested for an eligible offense who were in possession of a weapon at the time of the crime may be considered for Drug Court as long as the weapon was not used in the crime. Likewise, those arrested for theft of a weapon in order to support a drug habit may be offered Drug Court participation if the prosecutor can obtain the consent of the victim(s) and arresting officer(s) and if there are no prior weapons offenses in the defendant's criminal history.

Clinical Criteria

In addition to meeting legal eligibility requirements as defined above, potential Drug Court clients must be assessed by the Skagit Recovery Center (SRC) to be drug or alcohol addicted or dependent and not mentally ill to the degree that such illness would render them unable to successfully participate in treatment.

Spokane County Drug Court Eligibility Criteria

Legal Criteria

An individual may qualify for the program if:

- Charged in Superior Court with Possession of Schedule I, II, or III Controlled Substances; or Forged Prescriptions; or Conspiracy to Possess Controlled Substances; or Conspiracy to Deliver Controlled Substances. Evidence of intent to sell will be presumed if the offender is in possession of more than a certain quantity of specific drugs.
- Arrested for Possession with Intent to Deliver, but charged in Superior Court with Possession of a Controlled Substance, if offender opts in prior to setting of a trial date and/or amending the charge. The prosecutor may opt the offender out, within 7 days, if quantities exceed the above amounts.
- Charged with Possession of a Controlled Substance with Intent to Deliver (small amount and detective agrees) will be considered on a case-by-case basis.
- Charged in Superior Court with Felony Theft, Possession of Stolen Property, Trafficking in Stolen Property (all in the first or second degree); Forgery; Unauthorized Issuance of a Bank Check; and Taking a Motor Vehicle without the Owner's Permission, and the offender petitions for admission into Drug Court prior to setting a trial date.

The following conditions must also be met:

- Documented history of heroin, methamphetamine, cocaine or other controlled substance addiction.
- A verified sworn statement from the offender documenting a causal connection between the addiction and the felony property offenses.
- The offender must execute a promissory note and a Confession of Judgment for the full amount of restitution payable to all victims. The total amount of restitution cannot exceed \$2,500.
- There must be a reasonable basis to believe the offender can successfully complete the Drug Court Program.
- The offender must petition the court for entry into the program prior to setting a trial date.
- Have no other pending felony charges at arrest.
- Have no prior adult or juvenile sex or violent offenses as defined by RCW 9.94A.030 (31) and (36), (1994).
- Case-by-case consideration of people charged with the gang unit.
- The Prosecutor may opt the offender out of Drug Court, within 14 days, if law enforcement requests exclusion for public safety reasons.
- Have no hold from another jurisdiction (Washington or another state).
- Prior program participation candidates considered on a case-by-case basis.
- Have demonstrable Spokane area residence (job, school, family).
- Willingness to participate in an intensive treatment, education, and closely monitored program.
- No felony charges for crimes against property or persons committed while an active participant in Drug Court.
- Participation in the Felony Drug Court program will not bar prosecution for any other current offenses. (Spokane County Prosecuting Attorney, 1999)

Thurston County Drug Court Eligibility Criteria

Legal Criteria

Two groups of offenders are considered legally eligible for Drug Court admission. The group with highest admission priority includes individuals who are charged solely with felony possession of a controlled or counterfeit controlled substance or forged prescription, whose offense did not involve the use of a firearm or other deadly weapon and who have no history of a serious violent offense (as defined in RCW 9.94A.030(31) and RCW 9.94A/030(38)) or an adult sex offense (as defined in RCW 9.94A.030(33)); or history of delivery or intent to deliver or manufacture of a controlled substance.

A second group includes individuals charged with any of the following offenses:

- Theft in the first or second degree
- Possession of stolen property in the first or second degree
- Forgery
- Unlawful issuance of bank checks
- Trafficking in stolen property in the second degree
- Taking a motor vehicle without owner's permission, who meet the following criteria in addition to those with no previous history of violent, sex, or delivery, intent to deliver or manufacture offenses

Other conditions that must be met include:

- No pending, non-eligible offenses that would result in a prison term if convicted.
- Able to pay restitution in full within the time frame of the Program.
- A significant drug abuse problem evidenced by treatment records, drug convictions, medical records, or other reliable evidence.
- A reasonable and rational nexus between the alleged offense and the drug abuse problem.

Individuals who meet the legal criteria must also agree to the following terms as a condition of entry into the Drug Court Program.

- Satisfactory completion of a clinical treatment evaluation by the treatment agency for the development of a treatment program.
- Compliance with all the rules and regulations of the treatment agency as well as the conditions and requirements ordered by the Court.
- Completion of the treatment program as ordered and to the satisfaction of the Court and the treatment agency.
- No use or possession of alcohol or controlled substances or association with any person using or possessing alcohol or control substance.
- Request, whenever possible, that any prescribed medication be non-narcotic and obtain treatment agency approval for any use of over the counter or prescribed medication.
- Submission to witnessed urinalysis tests as required by the Court or treatment agency.
- Keep the Court and treatment agency advised of address and place of employment.
- Appearance at all Court hearings.
- Obedience to all laws while participating in the program.
- Sign all releases necessary to facilitate treatment, including access to diagnostic and treatment information.

- Make regular payments toward the cost of treatment based on ability to pay as determined by the Court.
- Make monthly payments set by the Court to the Thurston County Office of Assigned Counsel if represented by the Office at any time while participating in the program.
- Pay full restitution to the victim, if it is owed, prior to graduation from Drug Court.
- Any statement made by the defendant related to the purpose of the program may not be used against the defendant in a subsequent criminal proceeding. (Unsolicited statements in open court or statements made in treatment about criminal activity other than the Drug Court crime are not protected communication.)
- Acknowledgement that the Court alone determines program completion and ability to graduate.
- Participant can withdraw from the program during the first two weeks following admission and return to regular processing as if the Drug Court contract had never been agreed to.
- Failure to abide by all terms of the contract or any new violation of the law will be subject to Court ordered sanctions including jail time and termination from the program.
- Agreement to waive the following:
 - ✓ Right to a speedy trial
 - ✓ Right to a jury trial
 - ✓ Right to call witnesses or to hear and question any witness
 - ✓ Right to testify
- If a defendant is terminated, the Court will determine guilt on the pending charge(s) solely on the existing evidence that constitutes the basis for prosecution of the pending charge(s).
- Waive the right to challenge the legality of the existing evidence and stipulation to the facts presented in the existing evidence.
- Upon graduation from the Drug Court program, the pending charge(s) will be dismissed and cannot be prosecuted in the future.

APPENDIX C: REGRESSION RESULTS

Table C-1
The Effect of Drug Courts on Recidivism
For Kitsap, Skagit, Spokane, and Thurston Counties

Alternative Modeling Approach	Comparison Group Sample Drawn From:	Regression Coefficient Table	Number of Observations	Estimates From Alternative Modeling Approaches				
				Regression Estimates	Total Recidivism (Felony and Misdemeanor)	Felony Recidivism	Felony Drug Recidivism	Violent Felony Recidivism
Standard Multivariate Regression	Same drug court counties, two years prior to drug court	Table C-5	313 drug court 1,985 comparison	Coefficient	-0.5743	-0.6018	-0.8146	-0.9553
				Odds Ratio	0.563	0.548	0.443	0.385
				P-value	0.0002	0.0005	0.0005	0.0481
	Non-drug court counties, same years as drug court counties	Table C-6	313 drug court 6,821 comparison	Coefficient	-0.2277	-0.2630	-0.4684	-0.5421
				Odds Ratio	0.796	0.769	0.626	0.582
				P-value	0.0946	0.0905	0.0288	0.2494
Propensity-to-Participate Matching	Same drug court counties, two years prior to drug court	Table C-7	224 drug court 224 comparison	Coefficient	-0.1719	-0.3257	-0.5965	-0.9900
				Odds Ratio	0.842	0.722	0.551	0.372
				P-value	0.3979	0.1411	0.0435	0.0636
	Non-drug court counties, same years as drug court counties	Table C-8	296 drug court 296 comparison	Coefficient	-0.4927	-0.4025	-0.7373	-0.8139
				Odds Ratio	0.611	0.669	0.478	0.443
				P-value	0.0093	0.0560	0.0117	0.1476
Risk Score Matching	Same drug court counties, two years prior to drug court	Table C-9	148 drug court 148 comparison	Coefficient	-0.6558	-0.4952	-0.7104	Insufficient violent recidivism to conduct this analysis
				Odds Ratio	0.519	0.609	0.491	
				P-value	0.0111	0.0875	0.0513	
	Non-drug court counties, same years as drug court counties	Table C-10	210 drug court 210 comparison	Coefficient	-0.2394	-0.1448	-0.3495	Insufficient violent recidivism to conduct this analysis
				Odds Ratio	0.787	0.865	0.705	
				P-value	0.2891	0.5793	0.2950	

Note:

- The Standard Multivariate Regression models are logistic regressions with the recidivism outcome as a function of drug court participation and other controls; no explicit attempt is made to control for self-selection.
- The Propensity-to-Participate Matching models first estimate a logistic regression with drug court participation as a function of right-hand side controls. Then the comparison group is chosen by matching propensity scores between actual drug court participants and those eligible for the drug court. A logistic regression then predicts recidivism as a function of drug court participation and the propensity scores.
- The Risk Score Matching models find exact matches for actual drug court participants based on a number of variables.

Table C-2
The Effect of Drug Courts on Recidivism
For Pierce County

Alternative Modeling Approach	Comparison Group Sample Drawn From:	Regression Coefficient Table	Number of Observations	Estimates From Alternative Modeling Approaches				
				Regression Estimates	Total Recidivism (Felony and Misdemeanor)	Felony Recidivism	Drug Felony Recidivism	Violent Felony Recidivism
Standard Multivariate Regression	Same drug court counties, two years prior to drug court	Table C-11	399 drug court 2,907 comparison	Coefficient	-0.5456	-0.4615	-0.2994	-1.2335
				Odds Ratio	0.579	0.630	0.741	0.291
				P-value	0.0006	0.0066	0.1024	0.0293
Propensity-to-Participate Matching		Table C-12	375 drug court 375 comparison	Coefficient	-0.3921	-0.2492	-0.0769	-0.8156
				Odds Ratio	0.676	0.779	0.926	0.442
				P-value	0.0131	0.1392	0.6738	0.0612
Risk Score Matching		Table C-13	121 drug court 121 comparison	Coefficient	-0.5196	-0.4328	-0.2082	Insufficient violent recidivism to conduct this analysis
				Odds Ratio	0.595	0.649	0.812	
				P-value	0.0630	0.1450	0.5314	

Note:

- The Standard Multivariate Regression models are logistic regressions with the recidivism outcome as a function of drug court participation and other controls; no explicit attempt is made to control for self-selection.
- The Propensity-to-Participate Matching models first estimate a logistic regression with drug court participation as a function of right-hand side controls. Then the comparison group is chosen by matching propensity scores between actual drug court participants and those eligible for the drug court. A logistic regression then predicts recidivism as a function of drug court participation and the propensity scores.
- The Risk Score Matching models find exact matches for actual drug court participants based on a number of variables.

Table C-3
The Effect of Drug Courts on Recidivism
For King County

Alternative Modeling Approach	Comparison Group Sample Drawn From:	Regression Coefficient Table	Number of Observations	Estimates From Alternative Modeling Approaches				
				Regression Estimates	Total Recidivism (Felony and Misdemeanor)	Felony Recidivism	Drug Felony Recidivism	Violent Felony Recidivism
Standard Multivariate Regression	Same drug court counties, two years prior to drug court	Table C-14	612 drug court 3,963 comparison	Coefficient	-0.2484	-0.1937	-0.0989	-0.1689
				Odds Ratio	0.780	0.824	0.906	0.845
				P-value	0.0493	0.1556	0.5066	0.6766
Propensity-to-Participate Matching		Table C-15	389 drug court 389 comparison	Coefficient	-0.3569	-0.2562	0.0425	-1.0368
				Odds Ratio	0.700	0.774	1.043	0.355
				P-value	0.0218	0.1178	0.8118	0.0114
Risk Score Matching		Table C-16	213 drug court 213 comparison	Coefficient	0.1363	0.0536	-0.0528	-0.6290
				Odds Ratio	1.146	1.055	0.949	0.533
				P-value	0.5405	0.8306	0.8446	0.2757

Note:

- The Standard Multivariate Regression models are logistic regressions with the recidivism outcome as a function of drug court participation and other controls; no explicit attempt is made to control for self-selection.
- The Propensity-to-Participate Matching models first estimate a logistic regression with drug court participation as a function of right-hand side controls. Then the comparison group is chosen by matching propensity scores between actual drug court participants and those eligible for the drug court. A logistic regression then predicts recidivism as a function of drug court participation and the propensity scores.
- The Risk Score Matching models find exact matches for actual drug court participants based on a number of variables.

Table C-4
Calculation of Summary Effect Sizes on
Felony Recidivism for the Drug Courts

Research Method	Sampling Frame	Kitsap, Skagit, Spokane, & Thurston Counties(1)	Pierce County(2)	King County(3)	Research Design Weight(4)
Standard Multivariate Regression Coefficients	Same drug court counties, two years prior to drug court	-0.6018	-0.4615	-0.1937	50%
	Non-drug court counties, same years as drug court counties	-0.2630	No comparable non-drug court counties		50%
Propensity-to Participate Matching Coefficients	Same drug court counties, two years prior to drug court	-0.3257	-0.2492	-0.2562	75%
	Non-drug court counties, same years as drug court counties	-0.4025	No comparable non-drug court counties		75%
Risk Score Matching Coefficients	Same drug court counties, two years prior to drug court	-0.4952	-0.4328	0.0536	75%
	Non-drug court counties, same years as drug court counties	-0.1448	No comparable non-drug court counties		75%
Average Coefficient, Adjusted for Research Design Weight (5)		-0.2431	-0.2474	-0.0828	
Odds Ratio		0.7842	0.7808	0.9205	
Long-term Recidivism Rate Without Drug Court (6)		38.8%	47.9%	52.3%	
Long-term Recidivism Rate With Drug Court		33.2%	41.8%	50.2%	
Percent Change		-14.4%	-12.8%	-4.0%	
Mean Difference Effect Size (7)		-0.1166	-0.1230	-0.0414	
Number of Drug Court Cases (8)		313	399	612	
Weighted Average Effect Size for Five Drug Courts		-0.1202		N/A	

(1) Appendix Table C-1.

(2) Appendix Table C-2.

(3) Appendix Table C-3.

(4) See footnote 9, main report

(5) The product of the coefficients times the research design weights for each method.

(6) The long-term felony recidivism rates were calculated by selecting all offenders in the counties listed who would have been eligible for drug court from 1991 to 1993 (based on the criteria discussed in the main report), and then calculating how many were subsequently reconvicted for a new offense in Washington during the following eight years.

(7) Mean difference effect size approximated with the arcsine transformation, see Lipsey and Wilson (2000), cited in main report, footnote 8.

(8) Appendix Tables C-1, C-2, and C-3.

Table C-5
Standard Multivariate Regression Modeling of Kitsap, Skagit, Spokane, and Thurston County Drug Court Cases
Versus Cases Filed in Same Counties Two Years Prior to the Start of Drug Court in Those Counties
 Number of Observations: Drug Court = 313 Comparison Group = 1,985 Total = 2,298

Parameter	Feloncy and Misdemeanor Recidivism			Feloncy Recidivism			Feloncy Drug Recidivism			Violent Feloncy Recidivism		
	Estimate	Error	Pr > ChiSq	Estimate	Error	Pr > ChiSq	Estimate	Error	Pr > ChiSq	Estimate	Error	Pr > ChiSq
Intercept	-0.7235	0.8051	0.3688	-1.598	0.8781	0.0688	-4.0138	1.0653	0.0002	-2.889	1.7469	0.0982
DrugCourtParticipant	-0.5743	0.1526	0.0002	-0.6018	0.1717	0.0005	-0.8146	0.2348	0.0005	-0.9553	0.4834	0.0481
Age	0.0701	0.0421	0.0963	0.0981	0.0477	0.0397	0.1439	0.057	0.0116	-0.0878	0.0971	0.3661
AgeSq	-0.00123	0.000625	0.0488	-0.00172	0.000718	0.0164	-0.00221	0.000853	0.0095	0.00076	0.0015	0.6127
Male	0.1067	0.1033	0.3016	0.0773	0.1116	0.4883	0.1262	0.1327	0.3413	0.684	0.2927	0.0194
White	-0.1824	0.352	0.6043	-0.3642	0.3526	0.3017	-0.1285	0.4355	0.768	1.1237	0.7329	0.1252
Black	-0.0669	0.391	0.8641	-0.3857	0.3963	0.3304	-0.2421	0.4938	0.6239	2.185	0.7721	0.0047
Asian	-0.5012	0.5471	0.3596	-0.5876	0.5648	0.2982	-0.3987	0.673	0.5536	1.8428	0.9647	0.0561
UnknownEthnic	-0.8738	0.4314	0.0428	-1.0156	0.4557	0.0258	-0.4325	0.5402	0.4233			
CurrentFelPropertyOffs	0.5175	0.2255	0.0217	0.6013	0.2383	0.0116	0.4396	0.3006	0.1436	-0.4446	0.6096	0.4658
CurrentFelOtherOffs	0.359	0.3056	0.2401	0.4514	0.3132	0.1495	0.6637	0.3324	0.0459	-0.0494	0.659	0.9403
CurrentMisdOffenses	-0.0858	0.1838	0.6408	-0.2319	0.2037	0.255	-0.5253	0.2583	0.042	-0.7166	0.5006	0.1523
CurrentClassBOffs	-0.7129	0.2359	0.0025	-0.4503	0.2539	0.0761	-0.2678	0.3092	0.3865	0.1989	0.5582	0.7216
CurrentClassCOffs	-0.6487	0.2152	0.0026	-0.6355	0.2305	0.0058	-0.3844	0.2712	0.1563	0.0486	0.4795	0.9193
JuvenileRecord	0.0859	0.1657	0.6044	0.0998	0.1723	0.5623	-0.0286	0.2077	0.8905	-0.1625	0.3417	0.6344
JuvenileMisdAdj	0.0999	0.0953	0.2946	-0.0103	0.0948	0.9134	-0.0388	0.1128	0.731	0.1553	0.1705	0.3625
JuvenileFelonyAdj	0.1501	0.0493	0.0023	0.129	0.0479	0.0071	0.1309	0.0557	0.0188	0.00996	0.0862	0.9079
DocCommitments	-0.183	0.0799	0.0219	-0.1463	0.0817	0.0734	-0.0152	0.0969	0.8756	-0.4593	0.2419	0.0576
PriorAdultFelPropertyAdj	0.1662	0.0589	0.0048	0.1736	0.0589	0.0032	-0.0642	0.0717	0.3704	0.0702	0.1269	0.5802
PriorAdultFelPersonAdj	-0.0401	0.1318	0.7609	-0.0827	0.1347	0.5389	-0.2771	0.1613	0.0858	0.261	0.2361	0.2689
PriorAdultFelDrugAdj	0.2484	0.0566	<.0001	0.269	0.0573	<.0001	0.2774	0.063	<.0001	-0.0698	0.1322	0.5976
PriorAdultMisdPersonAdj	0.2922	0.0532	<.0001	0.1572	0.0504	0.0018	0.1068	0.0568	0.0602	0.3082	0.0846	0.0003
PriorAdultMisdPropertyAdj	0.1466	0.0461	0.0015	0.0817	0.0464	0.0782	0.0155	0.0546	0.7764	-0.00849	0.1015	0.9333
PriorAdultMisdDrugAdj	0.1475	0.0745	0.0478	0.1323	0.0744	0.0753	0.2583	0.0818	0.0016	0.1106	0.1473	0.4529
Kitsap	-0.1493	0.1675	0.3728	-0.1787	0.184	0.3315	0.3826	0.244	0.1169	-0.0851	0.4256	0.8415
Skagit	-0.7378	0.2238	0.001	-0.8512	0.2553	0.0009	-0.3069	0.3356	0.3605	-0.6419	0.6156	0.2971
Thurston	-0.2633	0.1718	0.1254	-0.2185	0.1889	0.2474	0.4063	0.2523	0.1074	-0.1756	0.4516	0.6974
Area Under Receiver Operator Characteristic	0.694			0.684			0.681			0.739		
Recidivism Rate	43.4%			30.4%			18.3%			4.7%		

Table C-6
Standard Multivariate Regression Modeling of Kitsap, Skagit, Spokane, and Thurston County Drug Court Cases
Versus Cases Filed in Non-Drug Court Counties During 1998 and 1999

Number of Observations: Drug Court = 313 Comparison Group = 6,821 Total = 7,134

Parameter	Felony and Misdemeanor Recidivism			Felony Recidivism			Felony Drug Recidivism			Violent Felony Recidivism		
	Estimate	Error	Pr > ChiSq	Estimate	Error	Pr > ChiSq	Estimate	Error	Pr > ChiSq	Estimate	Error	Pr > ChiSq
Intercept	-2.5395	0.4533	<.0001	-3.5491	0.5347	<.0001	-4.4549	0.6844	<.0001	-3.7715	1.1287	0.0008
DrugCourtParticipant	-0.2277	0.1362	0.0946	-0.263	0.1553	0.0905	-0.4684	0.2143	0.0288	-0.5421	0.4707	0.2494
Age	0.0951	0.0233	<.0001	0.0851	0.0272	0.0018	0.0908	0.0333	0.0064	-0.0648	0.0657	0.3245
AgeSq	-0.00146	0.000341	<.0001	-0.00141	0.000402	0.0005	-0.00133	0.000488	0.0065	0.00036	0.001	0.7195
Male	-0.0642	0.0611	0.2938	-0.1726	0.0679	0.011	-0.1545	0.0827	0.0619	0.7411	0.2109	0.0004
White	0.3311	0.2012	0.0998	0.703	0.2617	0.0072	0.8855	0.3705	0.0169	0.71	0.2747	0.0098
Black	0.6169	0.2369	0.0092	0.8379	0.2946	0.0045	0.8213	0.4097	0.045	1.2513	0.3847	0.0011
Asian	-0.2979	0.3967	0.4527	-0.0487	0.5091	0.9238	-0.3567	0.811	0.66	1.2871	0.6591	0.0508
UnknownEthnic	-0.4053	0.2233	0.0695	0.1595	0.284	0.5743	0.6107	0.392	0.1193			
CurrentFelPropertyOffs	0.4774	0.1272	0.0002	0.4791	0.1352	0.0004	0.3329	0.1749	0.057	-0.00322	0.342	0.9925
CurrentFelOtherOffs	0.3862	0.1374	0.0049	0.3102	0.1501	0.0388	0.2253	0.1855	0.2245	0.5776	0.3081	0.0608
CurrentMisdoOffenses	0.2814	0.0885	0.0015	0.284	0.0971	0.0035	0.2344	0.1196	0.05	0.3533	0.217	0.1034
CurrentClassBOffs	-0.3396	0.1083	0.0017	-0.1902	0.1185	0.1085	-0.2635	0.1496	0.0782	-0.2119	0.2861	0.4588
CurrentClassCOffs	-0.3238	0.1113	0.0036	-0.1551	0.1222	0.2042	-0.1322	0.1547	0.3929	-0.1298	0.2959	0.661
JuvenileRecord	0.3818	0.098	<.0001	0.2916	0.1067	0.0063	0.3481	0.1315	0.0081	-0.0415	0.2381	0.8617
JuvenMisdoAdjs	0.1863	0.0583	0.0014	0.1343	0.0611	0.0279	0.0769	0.0773	0.3199	0.2597	0.122	0.0333
JuvenFelonyAdjs	0.00959	0.0297	0.7465	0.022	0.031	0.4785	-0.0455	0.0403	0.259	-0.0317	0.0638	0.6197
DocCommitments	-0.1917	0.0439	<.0001	-0.1788	0.0453	<.0001	-0.2343	0.063	0.0002	-0.0113	0.0967	0.9073
PriorAdultFelPropertyAdjs	0.2122	0.0356	<.0001	0.2753	0.0363	<.0001	0.1174	0.0451	0.0092	0.1274	0.0846	0.1323
PriorAdultFelPersonAdjs	0.2097	0.0752	0.0053	0.1938	0.0789	0.014	-0.0541	0.1052	0.6067	0.1708	0.1623	0.2925
PriorAdultFelDrugAdjs	0.1735	0.0346	<.0001	0.275	0.0367	<.0001	0.3154	0.0434	<.0001	0.0789	0.0904	0.3829
PriorAdultMisdoPersonAdjs	0.2663	0.0309	<.0001	0.1328	0.0314	<.0001	0.1483	0.037	<.0001	0.237	0.0616	0.0001
PriorAdultMisdoPropertyAdjs	0.1956	0.0268	<.0001	0.0638	0.0279	0.0221	0.00779	0.0346	0.8218	0.0121	0.0686	0.8599
PriorAdultMisdoDrugAdjs	0.1396	0.0388	0.0003	0.0894	0.0404	0.0269	0.1321	0.0471	0.0051	0.0433	0.0943	0.646
EastRural	-0.5121	0.094	<.0001	-0.2963	0.1073	0.0058	-0.3519	0.1295	0.0066	0.0406	0.2805	0.885
EastUrban	0.112	0.0923	0.2248	0.2227	0.1028	0.0303	0.0519	0.1231	0.6736	0.7504	0.2557	0.0033
WestRural	-0.0981	0.0856	0.2519	0.139	0.0953	0.1449	-0.0275	0.1135	0.8086	0.4475	0.2498	0.0733
WestMid	-0.2679	0.0895	0.0027	-0.0679	0.101	0.501	-0.2371	0.1231	0.0541	0.1824	0.2665	0.4936
Area Under Receiver Operator Characteristic	0.710			0.684			0.646			0.716		
Recidivism Rate	34.3%			22.3%			12.6%			2.9%		

Table C-7
Propensity-to-Participate Matching Model for Kitsap, Skagit, Spokane, and Thurston County Drug Court Cases
Versus Cases Filed in Same Counties Two Years Prior to the Start of Drug Court in Those Counties
 Number of Observations: Drug Court = 224 Comparison Group = 224 Total = 448

Parameter	Felony and Misdemeanor Recidivism			Felony Recidivism			Felony Drug Recidivism			Violent Felony Recidivism		
	Estimate	Error	Pr > ChiSq	Estimate	Error	Pr > ChiSq	Estimate	Error	Pr > ChiSq	Estimate	Error	Pr > ChiSq
Intercept	-2.1799	0.3352	<.0001	-2.1046	0.3095	<.0001	-3.1031	0.3789	<.0001	-3.1359	0.384	<.0001
DrugCourtParticipant	-0.1719	0.2033	0.3979	-0.3257	0.2213	0.1411	-0.5965	0.2955	0.0435	-0.99	0.5337	0.0636
PredictedRecid	0.048	0.00751	<.0001	0.0462	0.00996	<.0001	0.1011	0.022	<.0001	0.0985	0.0524	0.06
Area Under Receiver Operator Characteristic	0.696			0.647			0.693			0.652		
Recidivism Rate	41.3%			26.6%			13.4%			4.2%		

Table C-8
Propensity-to-Participate Matching Model for Kitsap, Skagit, Spokane, and Thurston County Drug Court Cases
Versus Cases Filed in Non-Drug Court Counties During 1998 and 1999
 Number of Observations: Drug Court = 296 Comparison Group = 296 Total = 592

Parameter	Felony and Misdemeanor Recidivism			Felony Recidivism			Felony Drug Recidivism			Violent Felony Recidivism		
	Estimate	Error	Pr > ChiSq	Estimate	Error	Pr > ChiSq	Estimate	Error	Pr > ChiSq	Estimate	Error	Pr > ChiSq
Intercept	-2.1769	0.247	<.0001	-2.2183	0.2395	<.0001	-3.1441	0.3177	<.0001	-3.8639	0.3983	<.0001
DrugCourtParticipant	-0.4927	0.1893	0.0093	-0.4025	0.2106	0.056	-0.7373	0.2923	0.0117	-0.8139	0.562	0.1476
PredictedRecid	0.0502	0.00645	<.0001	0.0465	0.00841	<.0001	0.0975	0.0199	<.0001	0.1639	0.0558	0.0033
Area Under Receiver Operator Characteristic	0.716			0.665			0.692			0.731		
Recidivism Rate	35.1%			21.8%			10.3%			2.5%		

Table C-9
Risk Score Matching Model for Kitsap, Skagit, Spokane, and Thurston County Drug Court Cases
Versus Cases Filed in Same Counties Two Years Prior to the Start of Drug Court in Those Counties
 Number of Observations: Drug Court = 148 Comparison Group = 148 Total = 296

Parameter	Felony and Misdemeanor Recidivism			Felony Recidivism			Felony Drug Recidivism		
	Estimate	Error	Pr > ChiSq	Estimate	Error	Pr > ChiSq	Estimate	Error	Pr > ChiSq
Intercept	-1.855	0.4703	<.0001	-2.1578	0.4474	<.0001	-2.9618	0.4675	<.0001
DrugCourtParticipant	-0.6558	0.2584	0.0111	-0.4952	0.2898	0.0875	-0.7104	0.3644	0.0513
PredictedRecid	0.0448	0.0121	0.0002	0.0515	0.0173	0.0029	0.1056	0.0288	0.0002
Area Under Receiver Operator Characteristic	0.681			0.674			0.716		
Recidivism Rate	35.5%			22.6%			13.9%		

Table C-10
Risk Score Matching Model for Kitsap, Skagit, Spokane, and Thurston County Drug Court Cases
Versus Cases Filed in Non-Drug Court Counties During 1998 and 1999
 Number of Observations: Drug Court = 210 Comparison Group = 210 Total = 420

Parameter	Felony and Misdemeanor Recidivism			Felony Recidivism			Felony Drug Recidivism		
	Estimate	Error	Pr > ChiSq	Estimate	Error	Pr > ChiSq	Estimate	Error	Pr > ChiSq
Intercept	-2.7358	0.3549	<.0001	-2.5611	0.3376	<.0001	-3.1603	0.3914	<.0001
DrugCourtParticipant	-0.2394	0.2258	0.2891	-0.1448	0.2612	0.5793	-0.3495	0.3337	0.295
PredictedRecid	0.0605	0.00958	<.0001	0.0483	0.0121	<.0001	0.0812	0.021	0.0001
Area Under Receiver Operator Characteristic	0.728			0.678			0.721		
Recidivism Rate	31.2%			17.9%			10.2%		

Table C-11
Standard Multivariate Regression Modeling of Pierce County Drug Court Cases
Versus Cases Filed in Pierce County Two Years Prior to the Start of Drug Court in Pierce County
 Number of Observations: Drug Court = 399 Comparison Group = 2,907 Total = 3,306

Parameter	Felony and Misdemeanor Recidivism			Felony Recidivism			Felony Drug Recidivism			Violent Felony Recidivism		
	Estimate	Error	Pr > ChiSq	Estimate	Error	Pr > ChiSq	Estimate	Error	Pr > ChiSq	Estimate	Error	Pr > ChiSq
Intercept	-0.6428	0.6921	0.3531	-1.2906	0.729	0.0767	-2.2452	0.7967	0.0048	-5.1259	1.5617	0.001
DrugCourtParticipant	-0.5456	0.1589	0.0006	-0.4615	0.1699	0.0066	-0.2994	0.1833	0.1024	-1.2335	0.5661	0.0293
Age	0.0433	0.0311	0.1645	0.0245	0.0331	0.4589	0.046	0.0365	0.2082	-0.0338	0.0823	0.6819
AgeSq	-0.00073	0.000456	0.1097	-0.00053	0.000486	0.2795	-0.00069	0.00054	0.1997	0.000055	0.00123	0.9641
Male	0.0895	0.0929	0.3353	0.1345	0.0986	0.1729	-0.1217	0.1065	0.2529	1.5453	0.3595	<.0001
White	-0.5763	0.3793	0.1286	-0.2107	0.397	0.5956	-0.1263	0.4253	0.7665	1.2202	0.4016	0.0024
Black	-0.2954	0.3857	0.4437	-0.0516	0.4032	0.8981	0.038	0.4321	0.9299	1.916	0.4024	<.0001
Asian	-0.7433	0.5259	0.1575	-0.3623	0.5601	0.5177	-0.4223	0.6468	0.5138	1.5451	0.8354	0.0644
UnknownEthnic	-1.3007	0.3932	0.0009	-0.6454	0.4116	0.1169	-0.2378	0.4412	0.5898			
CurrentFelPropertyOffs	0.1778	0.2292	0.438	0.1288	0.2317	0.5784	-0.00719	0.2554	0.9775	0.0193	0.5585	0.9724
CurrentFelOtherOffs	0.108	0.3127	0.7297	-0.166	0.3444	0.6298	-0.1317	0.384	0.7317	-0.9658	1.0531	0.3591
CurrentMisdOffenses	0.1904	0.127	0.1337	0.0924	0.1301	0.4778	0.0155	0.1414	0.9126	0.1036	0.3153	0.7425
CurrentClassBOffs	-0.3488	0.2499	0.1627	-0.2214	0.2581	0.3911	-0.0537	0.2774	0.8465	-0.4722	0.7143	0.5085
CurrentClassCOffs	-0.1472	0.2093	0.482	0.105	0.2149	0.6254	0.2279	0.2314	0.3246	0.3203	0.5262	0.5427
JuvenileRecord	0.2555	0.1702	0.1334	0.189	0.1737	0.2765	0.2495	0.1925	0.1949	0.5179	0.3373	0.1247
JuvenMisdAdjs	0.1063	0.1144	0.3526	0.0264	0.1096	0.8097	-0.129	0.1229	0.2939	0.071	0.1708	0.6775
JuvenFelonyAdjs	0.1797	0.0574	0.0017	0.1627	0.0529	0.0021	0.1	0.0569	0.079	0.11	0.0797	0.1676
DocCommitments	-0.0935	0.0684	0.1714	-0.0667	0.0674	0.3217	-0.0646	0.0756	0.3928	-0.2383	0.1605	0.1375
PriorAdultFelPropertyAdjs	0.2196	0.0549	<.0001	0.2102	0.0532	<.0001	0.0636	0.0581	0.2739	0.201	0.1126	0.0742
PriorAdultFelPersonAdjs	0.1638	0.1172	0.1624	0.1217	0.1177	0.301	0.0453	0.132	0.7314	0.3199	0.2218	0.1492
PriorAdultFelDrugAdjs	0.2072	0.0413	<.0001	0.218	0.0418	<.0001	0.2064	0.0447	<.0001	0.2946	0.0951	0.0019
PriorAdultMisdPersonAdjs	0.2268	0.0512	<.0001	0.0462	0.0496	0.3515	0.0137	0.054	0.8003	0.2655	0.0933	0.0044
PriorAdultMisdPropertyAdjs	0.307	0.0472	<.0001	0.2054	0.0426	<.0001	0.1263	0.045	0.005	0.049	0.0914	0.5914
PriorAdultMisdDrugAdjs	0.277	0.0838	0.0009	0.3346	0.0812	<.0001	0.3983	0.0837	<.0001	-0.1487	0.2003	0.4579
Area Under Receiver Operator Characteristic	0.712			0.670			0.624			0.784		
Recidivism Rate	41.1%			29.6%			20.9%			3.8%		

Table C-12
Propensity-To-Participate Matching Model for Pierce County Drug Court Cases
Versus Cases Filed in Pierce County Two Years Prior to the Start of Drug Court in Pierce County
 Number of Observations: Drug Court = 375 Comparison Group = 375 Total = 750

Parameter	Felony and Misdemeanor Recidivism			Felony Recidivism			Felony Drug Recidivism			Violent Felony Recidivism		
	Estimate	Error	Pr > ChiSq	Estimate	Error	Pr > ChiSq	Estimate	Error	Pr > ChiSq	Estimate	Error	Pr > ChiSq
Intercept	-2.0412	0.245	<.0001	-2.2305	0.2272	<.0001	-2.3416	0.2507	<.0001	-3.6961	0.3119	<.0001
DrugCourtParticipant	-0.3921	0.1581	0.0131	-0.2492	0.1685	0.1392	-0.0769	0.1827	0.6738	-0.8156	0.4357	0.0612
PredictedRecid	0.0498	0.00591	<.0001	0.0537	0.00727	<.0001	0.0572	0.0116	<.0001	0.1819	0.0401	<.0001
Area Under Receiver Operator Characteristic	0.704			0.686			0.642			0.754		
Recidivism Rate	43.2%			30.3%			21.6%			3.5%		

Table C-13
Risk Score Matching Model for Pierce County Drug Court Cases
Versus Cases Filed in Pierce County Two Years Prior to the Start of Drug Court in Pierce County
 Number of Observations: Drug Court = 121 Comparison Group = 121 Total = 242

Parameter	Felony and Misdemeanor Recidivism			Felony Recidivism			Felony Drug Recidivism		
	Estimate	Error	Pr > ChiSq	Estimate	Error	Pr > ChiSq	Estimate	Error	Pr > ChiSq
Intercept	-1.9712	0.5469	0.0003	-2.1247	0.5208	<.0001	-2.3084	0.5383	<.0001
DrugCourtParticipant	-0.5196	0.2794	0.063	-0.4328	0.297	0.145	-0.2082	0.3326	0.5314
PredictedRecid	0.0523	0.0144	0.0003	0.0618	0.0199	0.0019	0.0636	0.0278	0.0223
Area Under Receiver Operator Characteristic	0.670			0.646			0.652		
Recidivism Rate	39.7%			28.9%			20.2%		

Table C-14
Standard Multivariate Regression Modeling of King County Drug Court Cases
Versus Cases Filed in King County Two Years Prior to the Start of Drug Court in King County
 Number of Observations: Drug Court = 612 Comparison Group = 3,963 Total = 4,575

Parameter	Feloncy and Misdemeanor Recidivism			Feloncy Recidivism			Feloncy Drug Recidivism			Violent Feloncy Recidivism		
	Estimate	Error	Pr > ChiSq	Estimate	Error	Pr > ChiSq	Estimate	Error	Pr > ChiSq	Estimate	Error	Pr > ChiSq
Intercept	-2.031	0.6059	0.0008	-2.0523	0.649	0.0016	-2.3719	0.731	0.0012	-4.8904	1.4985	0.0011
DrugCourtParticipant	-0.2484	0.1263	0.0493	-0.1937	0.1364	0.1556	-0.0989	0.1489	0.5066	-0.1689	0.405	0.6766
Age	0.0308	0.0267	0.2492	0.00908	0.0288	0.7525	0.00084	0.031	0.9784	0.00746	0.0786	0.9245
AgeSq	-0.00067	0.00038	0.0812	-0.00038	0.00041	0.3517	-0.00019	0.000442	0.6752	-0.0007	0.00119	0.56
Male	0.1292	0.0822	0.1157	0.3531	0.0903	<.0001	0.3519	0.0997	0.0004	1.2052	0.2992	<.0001
White	0.4177	0.3166	0.187	0.1166	0.3361	0.7287	0.3062	0.3995	0.4434	-0.14	0.4202	0.739
Black	0.8656	0.3156	0.0061	0.631	0.3345	0.0592	0.8426	0.3975	0.034	0.9297	0.4062	0.0221
Asian	0.5287	0.4411	0.2306	-0.2751	0.5047	0.5858	-0.8081	0.7187	0.2608	0.1469	0.8715	0.8661
UnknownEthnic	0.2466	0.3476	0.4781	0.21	0.3672	0.5674	0.5528	0.4282	0.1966			
CurrentFelPropertyOffs	0.2365	0.3856	0.5397	0.342	0.4028	0.3959	0.2134	0.4822	0.6581	-0.4913	1.0932	0.6532
CurrentFelOtherOffs	-0.702	0.5948	0.2379	-0.1964	0.5962	0.7419	-1.1617	1.0482	0.2677	1.8763	0.8127	0.021
CurrentMisdOffenses	-0.2045	0.7494	0.7849	0.3082	0.7483	0.6805	0.2051	0.8246	0.8036	-11.318	412.7	0.9781
CurrentClassBOffs	0.0518	0.265	0.8449	0.0681	0.2817	0.809	-0.1059	0.3263	0.7456	0.3303	0.7498	0.6595
CurrentClassCOffs	0.1984	0.2473	0.4225	0.1512	0.263	0.5653	-0.0936	0.3088	0.7617	0.3545	0.6421	0.5808
JuvenileRecord	0.196	0.1461	0.1798	0.00852	0.1531	0.9556	-0.0963	0.1699	0.571	0.3786	0.2982	0.2042
JuvenMisdAdjs	0.0994	0.0812	0.2205	0.1289	0.0798	0.1065	0.0654	0.0873	0.4539	0.0992	0.1208	0.4112
JuvenFelonyAdjs	0.0681	0.0422	0.107	0.0802	0.0417	0.0545	-0.00297	0.0457	0.9482	0.1807	0.0621	0.0036
DocCommitments	-0.0965	0.0423	0.0226	0.00999	0.0418	0.8113	0.00319	0.0452	0.9437	-0.0563	0.1068	0.5979
PriorAdultFelPropertyAdjs	0.1845	0.0422	<.0001	0.1374	0.0419	0.001	-0.0126	0.0465	0.7868	0.0276	0.1009	0.7846
PriorAdultFelPersonAdjs	-0.0496	0.079	0.5301	-0.0877	0.0803	0.2745	-0.1028	0.0866	0.2348	-0.0514	0.1719	0.765
PriorAdultFelDrugAdjs	0.1465	0.0303	<.0001	0.1912	0.031	<.0001	0.2415	0.0328	<.0001	-0.0382	0.0752	0.6113
PriorAdultMisdPersonAdjs	0.2434	0.0351	<.0001	0.162	0.0339	<.0001	0.1824	0.0352	<.0001	0.1921	0.0733	0.0088
PriorAdultMisdPropertyAdjs	0.2674	0.0285	<.0001	0.1593	0.0276	<.0001	0.1077	0.0294	0.0002	-0.0419	0.0688	0.5422
PriorAdultMisdDrugAdjs	0.1107	0.095	0.2442	0.1193	0.0945	0.2069	0.111	0.1004	0.2689	-0.089	0.2413	0.7121
Area Under Receiver Operator Characteristic	0.704			0.683			0.667			0.754		
Recidivism Rate	40.3%			29.7%			22.0%			3.8%		

Table C-15
Propensity-To-Participate Matching Model for King County Drug Court Cases
Versus Cases Filed in King County Two Years Prior to the Start of Drug Court in King County
 Number of Observations: Drug Court = 389 Comparison Group = 389 Total = 778

Parameter	Felony and Misdemeanor Recidivism			Felony Recidivism			Felony Drug Recidivism			Violent Felony Recidivism		
	Estimate	Error	Pr > ChiSq	Estimate	Error	Pr > ChiSq	Estimate	Error	Pr > ChiSq	Estimate	Error	Pr > ChiSq
Intercept	-2.0723	0.2367	<.0001	-2.08	0.2153	<.0001	-2.3288	0.2531	<.0001	-3.255	0.2713	<.0001
DrugCourtParticipant	-0.3569	0.1555	0.0218	-0.2562	0.1638	0.1178	0.0425	0.1784	0.8118	-1.0368	0.4097	0.0114
PredictedRecid	0.0504	0.00562	<.0001	0.0491	0.00675	<.0001	0.0511	0.0111	<.0001	0.1368	0.0394	0.0005
Area Under Receiver Operator Characteristic	0.712			0.679			0.632			0.733		
Recidivism Rate	43.8%			31.1%			21.2%			4.0%		

Table C-16
Risk Score Matching Model for King County Drug Court Cases
Versus Cases Filed in King County Two Years Prior to the Start of Drug Court in King County
 Number of Observations: Drug Court = 213 Comparison Group = 213 Total = 426

Parameter	Felony and Misdemeanor Recidivism			Felony Recidivism			Felony Drug Recidivism			Violent Felony Recidivism		
	Estimate	Error	Pr > ChiSq	Estimate	Error	Pr > ChiSq	Estimate	Error	Pr > ChiSq	Estimate	Error	Pr > ChiSq
Intercept	-2.8059	0.3567	<.0001	-3.5345	0.3849	<.0001	-3.7964	0.4157	<.0001	-3.749	0.4382	<.0001
DrugCourtParticipant	0.1363	0.2227	0.5405	0.0536	0.2506	0.8306	-0.0528	0.2693	0.8446	-0.629	0.577	0.2757
PredictedRecid	0.0535	0.00785	<.0001	0.0845	0.0116	<.0001	0.1155	0.017	<.0001	0.1947	0.0682	0.0043
Area Under Receiver Operator Characteristic	0.732			0.771			0.759			0.777		
Recidivism Rate	34.0%			23.9%			19.0%			3.3%		

APPENDIX D: COST ANALYSES

Appendix Table D-1							
Cost Analysis of Six Washington State Courts for 2001: Inputs to the Cost Model							
	King	Kitsap	Pierce	Skagit	Spokane	Thurston	Total
Annual County Expenditures, 2001							
Superior Court and County Clerk (1)	\$56,157,614	\$9,657,430	\$20,895,037	\$3,146,012	\$6,392,626	\$4,746,981	\$100,995,700
Prosecutor and Public Defender (2)	\$25,254,747	\$3,065,881	\$16,852,005	\$1,537,705	\$11,920,989	\$4,369,877	\$63,001,204
Drug Court Expenditures (3)	\$748,000	\$192,500	\$929,000	\$315,000	\$242,294	\$300,000	\$2,726,794
Criminal Cases Filed, 2001 (4)	10,829	1,874	6,649	644	3,247	2,115	25,358
Drug Court Cases, 2001 (5)	320	53	252	29	52	61	767
Weekly Courtroom Hours by Function (6)							
Hours							
Civil and Juvenile Cases	1,351	145	455	87	390	219	2,646
Criminal (Non-Drug Court) Cases	644	89	330	14	147	81	1,305
Drug Court Cases	32	3	26	2	3	6	71
Percent Distribution of Hours							
Civil and Juvenile Cases	66.67%	61.16%	56.11%	84.99%	72.22%	71.57%	65.80%
Criminal (Non-Drug Court) Cases	31.78%	37.58%	40.74%	13.37%	27.22%	26.47%	32.44%
Adult Drug Court Cases	1.55%	1.26%	3.15%	1.64%	0.56%	1.96%	1.76%
Jail Cost per Day							
Jail Average Daily Population, 2001 (7)	3,020	265	1,264	216	617	403	5,785
Jail Expenditures, 2001 (8)	\$114,988,054	\$5,807,131	\$28,801,371	\$2,869,253	\$24,332,863	\$8,771,471	\$185,570,143
Annual Cost per Jail ADP	\$38,076	\$21,914	\$22,786	\$13,284	\$39,437	\$21,765	\$32,078
Cost per Day	\$104.32	\$60.04	\$62.43	\$36.39	\$108.05	\$59.63	\$87.88
Statewide Jail Cost per Day							
Jail Average Daily Population, 2001 (7)							9,976
Jail Expenditures, 2001 (8)							\$226,443,449
Annual Cost per Jail ADP							\$22,699
Cost per Day							\$62.19
Annual DOC Prison Cost per Inmate							
Annual Cost per DOC Prison Inmate (9)							\$24,685
Cost per Day							\$67.63
Community Supervision Cost per Day							
Annual Cost for an RMI-D Offender (10)							\$486
Cost per Day							\$1.33

Data Sources and Notes:

- (1) Washington State Auditor's Local Government Finance Reporting System (LGFRS), downloaded from the internet (<http://lgfrs.sao.wa.gov/lgfrs/>). Superior court costs include expenses for LGFRS account 512.2, less any reported interfund payments. The county clerk costs include expenses for LGFRS account 512.3, less any reported interfund payments.
- (2) Washington State Auditor's Local Government Finance Reporting System (LGFRS), downloaded from the internet (<http://lgfrs.sao.wa.gov/lgfrs/>). Prosecutor and public defender costs are included in LGFRS accounts 515.1 and 515.2, less any reported interfund payments. These costs do not include the civil portion of these offices.
- (3) Data are from a Washington State Institute for Public Policy (WSIPP) e-mail survey of the six drug courts.
- (4) Washington State Administrative Office of the Courts, downloaded from the internet (<http://www.courts.wa.gov/caseload/>). Table: The Superior Courts, Criminal Cases Filed by Type
- (5) Data are from a WSIPP analysis of individual court records from each drug court.
- (6) Data are from a WSIPP analysis of individual weekly court schedules obtained from each court. The following weekly schedules were included: King County (2/24/03 to 2/28/03); Kitsap County (2/24/03 to 2/28/03); Pierce County (2/24/03 to 2/28/03); Skagit County (2/18/03 to 2/28/03, prorated to one week, since the drug court meets every other week); Thurston County (2/24/03 to 2/28/03). The Spokane County data reflect the current court officer calendar, personal communication 3/06/03.
- (7) Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs, downloaded from the internet (<http://www.waspc.org/jails/counties.shtml>). The data for King County also include juvenile detention ADP (obtained from a WSIPP survey of juvenile detention facilities), since the King County expenses reported at footnote (8) include both adult and juvenile facilities.
- (8) Washington State Auditor's Local Government Finance Reporting System (LGFRS), downloaded from the internet (<http://lgfrs.sao.wa.gov/lgfrs/>). Jail costs include LGFRS account 523, less any reported probation expenses, account 523.3.
- (9) Washington State Office of Financial Management, Governor's 2003-2005 Budget Request. The figure shown is Washington State Department of Corrections actual institutional expense per inmate for fiscal year 2001, downloaded from the internet (<http://www.ofm.wa.gov/budget03/detail/310nl.htm>).
- (10) From personal communication with Washington State Department of Corrections staff.

Appendix Table D-2
Worksheet to Calculate Per-Participant Cost of Drug Court vs. Regular Criminal Court
(For Kitsap, Pierce, Skagit, Spokane, and Thurston Counties)

Court-Related Costs per Case	Drug Court	Regular Criminal Court	Non-Criminal Court	Total
Superior Court and County Clerk				
Percent of Courtroom Time on Each Function (1)	1.96%	33.12%	64.92%	100%
Total Superior Court and County Clerk Expenditures, 2001 (1)				\$44,838,086
Estimated Percent of Costs Not Related to Filing Volume (2)				22%
Annual Non-Drug Court Budget and Allocation to Function (3)	\$647,671	\$10,928,178	\$21,419,064	\$32,994,913
Annual Drug Court Expenditures (1)	\$1,978,794			\$1,978,794
Prosecutor and Public Defense (excluding civil functions)				
Percent of Courtroom Time on Each Function (4)	5.60%	94.40%		
Total Prosecutor and Defender Expenditures, 2001 (1)				\$37,746,457
Estimated Percent of Costs not Related to Filing Volume (5)				17%
Adult Felony Functions as Percent of Total Criminal Budget (6)				45%
Allocation of Felony Budget to Function	\$785,383	\$13,251,803		\$14,037,185
Total Court Costs per Filing				
Annual Filings (1)	447	14,082		
Court, Clerk, Prosecutor, Public Defender per Filing	\$3,206	\$1,717		
Drug Court Specific Costs per Filing	\$4,427	\$0		
Total Court-Related Cost per Filing	\$7,633	\$1,717		
Sanctions-Related Costs Per Case (7)				
	Drug Court Participants	Opt Outs		
Jail				
Statewide Cost per Day (1)				\$62.19
Average Jail Days (8)	57	90		
Jail Cost per Case	\$3,545	\$5,597		
Prison				
Statewide Cost per Day (1)				\$67.63
Percent Reduction for Good Time (9)				26.3%
Average Prison Days (10)	0.0	0.0		
Average Prison Days Served	0.0	0.0		
Prison Cost per Case	\$0	\$0		
Community Supervision				
Statewide Cost per Day (1)				\$1.33
Average Community Supervision Days (11)	37.0	16.0		
Community Supervision Cost per Case	\$49	\$21		
Total Sanctions-Related Costs per Case	\$3,594	\$5,618		
Total Cost per Case	\$11,227	\$7,335		
Drug Court Costs Less Regular Criminal Court Costs	\$3,891			

(1) See the inputs and their sources listed on Table D-1.

(2) The percent of costs not related to filing volumes was estimated with ordinary least squares regression, with the dependent variable (total court dollars) as a function of filings and filings-squared along with year dummies (2001 left out). The data were county level data from 1998 to 2001. The constant term was taken as an estimate of the non-filing related costs. The percentage was taken by dividing the value of the constant by average total court expenses for 2001.

(3) The total superior court and county clerk non-drug court budget is calculated by multiplying the total court and clerk budget by 1 minus the non-filing percentage and then subtracting the total drug court budget. This sum is then allocated to the court functions by the percentage distribution shown on this table.

(4) The percentage allocation is derived as the pro-rata share of the drug court and regular criminal court percentages shown on the first line of this table.

(5) The percent of costs not related to filing volumes was estimated with ordinary least squares regression, with the dependent variable (total legal dollars) as a function of criminal filings, criminal filings-squared, criminal filings cubed, along with year dummies (2001 left out). The data were county level data from 1998 to 2001. The constant term was taken as an estimate of the non-filing related costs. The percentage was taken by dividing the value of the constant by average total court expenses for 2001.

(6) The total prosecutor and public defense budget excludes the civil parts of the each budget, but it also includes juvenile and district court functions in addition to felony-only functions for criminal court. The percentage shown is an estimate of the felony-only resources as a percent of total criminal budgets. The estimate was derived from an analysis of budget data for Pierce County and Spokane County.

(7) These sanctions costs are not related to recidivism events but, rather, to disposition of the original charge. Recidivism related costs are estimated in the cost benefit analysis in this report.

(8) Average jail days represent an estimate for all drug court eligible offenders processed either through drug court or regular criminal court, not just those who actually go to jail. The figures shown are derived from a multivariate statistical analysis conducted for this evaluation.

(9) Personal communication with Washington State Caseload Forecast Council staff.

(10) We were unable in this evaluation to estimate reliably the number of prison days for the two groups associated with disposition of the current charge. Therefore, we've included the estimate at zero for both groups, producing no difference.

(11) Average community supervision days represent an estimate for all drug court eligible offenders processed either through drug court or regular criminal court, not just those actually placed on community supervision. The figures shown are derived from a multivariate statistical analysis conducted for this evaluation.

Appendix D-3, Cost-Benefit Summary from WSIPP Model (Aos et al. 2001)

WA Adult Drug Courts

Program Effectiveness (Crime Outcomes)		The expected effect of the program on...	...the Percent with Offenses or Re-Offenses		...the Avg. # of Offenses per Offender		Expected Number of Offenses per Person				
		Estimated effect size (from research findings)	-0.120		0.000						
Expected outcomes for thosewithout the program	45.8%	X	2.65	=			1.212		
		...with the program (from effect sizes)	39.8%	X	2.65	=			<u>1.055</u>		
		Expected change in the number of offenses							-0.157		
Adjustments		Adjustment 1: (felonies as % of total)							100.0%		
		Adjustment 2: (percent of expected future offending in the follow up period in footnote)							94.8%		
		Without the program, the adjusted expected number of offenses per person								1.279	
		With the program, the adjusted expected number of offenses per person								<u>1.113</u>	
		Expected change in the long-run number of offenses, after adjustments								-0.1660	
		Percentage change							-13.0%		
			Total	Murder	Sex Offenses	Rob- bery	Agg. Assault	Fel. Prop.	Drug	Misd.	
Taxpayer CJS Costs	Cost of One Future Offense	Present value cost of one offense		-\$440,875	-\$81,235	-\$78,523	-\$35,069	-\$17,003	-\$21,913	\$0	
		W/O Prog., offense distribution	100%	0.58%	0.58%	2.00%	5.79%	28.42%	62.64%	0.00%	
		Expected cost (PV) of one offense	-\$25,167	-\$2,542	-\$468	-\$1,569	-\$2,029	-\$4,832	-\$13,727	\$0	
		With Prog., offense distribution	100%	0.58%	0.58%	2.00%	5.79%	28.42%	62.64%	0.00%	
		Expected cost (PV) of one offense	-\$25,167	-\$2,542	-\$468	-\$1,569	-\$2,029	-\$4,832	-\$13,727	\$0	
	Adj. 4: (Overall adjustment to cost)	0.9									
	Program Benefits and Costs	Future CJS costs without program	-\$28,965								
		Future CJS costs with program	<u>-\$25,206</u>								
		Future CJS costs avoided (incurred)	\$3,759								
		Incremental Treatment Cost (savings)	\$3,891								
Sum- mary	NPV of the program	-\$132									
	Benefits per dollar of cost	\$0.97									
	Pct. reducton to break-even	-13.4%									
Victim Monetary Costs	One Victim- ization Per Offense	Estimated present value cost		-\$1,022,759	-\$6,085	-\$2,305	-\$1,412	-\$536	\$0	\$0	
		Distribution of one victimization	100.00%	0.58%	0.58%	2.00%	5.79%	28.42%	62.64%	0.00%	
		Expected cost, one victimization	-\$6,213	-\$5,897	-\$35	-\$46	-\$82	-\$152	\$0	\$0	
		Times prog. change in offenses	\$1,031								
		Cumulative program benefits	\$4,790								
		Cumulative NPV	\$899								
		Cumulative benefits/dollar of cost	\$1.23								
Vic. Quality of Life Costs	One Victim- ization	Estimated present value cost		-\$1,897,813	-\$80,645	-\$5,706	-\$7,666	-\$61	\$0	\$0	
		Expected cost, one victimization	-\$11,983	-\$10,943	-\$465	-\$114	-\$444	-\$17	\$0	\$0	
		Times prog. change in offenses	\$1,989								
		Cumulative program benefits	\$6,779								
		Cumulative NPV	\$2,888								
Cumulative benefits/dollar of cost	\$1.74										

S. Aos, P. Phipps, R. Barnoski, R. Lieb, *The Comparative Costs and Benefits of Programs to Reduce Crime Version 4.0* (Olympia: Washington State Institute for Public Policy, 2001).