

HEADNOTES INDEX

The Headnote Index provides access to an article's major points or concepts using a cumulative indexing system. Each headnote can be located by volume, issue, and headnote (e.g., VIII1[1] is the first headnote in this issue).

BALLOT INITIATIVES

- IV2[13] State Ballot Initiatives Threatened Drug Court
- IV2[14] Specific Initiatives Addressed

CAMPUS DRUG COURTS

- IV1[1] Crime & Campus Drug Courts
- IV1[2] "Hard Core" Drinkers on Campus
- IV1[3] Increase in Serious Student Offenses at CSU
- IV1[4] Drug Court at CSU
- IV1[5] CSU Campus Drug Court Pilot
- IV1[6] Process & Design
- IV1[7] Campus Drug Court Team (CDCT)
- IV1[8] Campus Departments Involved
- IV1[9] Evaluation
- IV1[10] Future

COERCION

- III1[1] Coercion Necessary
- III1[2] Drug Courts Successful
- III1[3] National Results
- III1[4] Drug Court Retention
- III1[5] Social Contracting
- III1[6] Contingency Management
- III1[7] Participant Motivation
- III1[8] Drug Courts Provide Lesson

COMMUNITY REINTEGRATION & DRUG COURTS

- III2[1] Importance of Reintegration
- III2[2] What is Reintegration?
- III2[3] The Court's Role
- III2[4] The Court's Authority
- III2[5] Courts & Communities
- III2[6] Risks Involved
- III2[7] Judicial Ethics
- III2[8] Courts & Treatment

COST ASSESSMENTS

- II2[9] Evaluating Multnomah County STOP Program

- II2[10] Costs in Calculating Taxpayer Savings
- II2[11] Multnomah County Justice System Savings
- II2[12] Cost Savings to the Oregon Citizen
- II2[13] Estimated Savings of Expanding Program

COUNTYWIDE APPROACHES

- III1[9] Countywide Standards
- III1[10] County Comparisons
- III1[11] Program Comparisons
- III1[12] Stakeholder Cooperation
- III1[13] LA's MIS
- III1[14] Orange County's MIS
- III1[15] Countywide MIS
- III1[16] Countywide Success

CREATININE-NORMALIZED

CANNABINOID RESULTS

- IV1[19] Non-Normalized Method for Detecting Drug Use
- IV1[20] Considerations in Creatinine-Normalized Cannabinoid Drug Tests
- IV1[21] Creatinine-Normalized Calculations
- IV1[22] Interpreting Creatinine-Normalized Ratios
- V1[5] Framing the Question
- V1[6] Variables
- V1[7] Research Review
- V1[8] Perpetuating the 30-Plus Day Assumption
- V1[9] Establishing the Cannabinoid Detection Window
- V1[10] Client Detoxification
- V1[11] Abstinence Baseline
- V1[12] Cannabinoid Testing Following Positive Results
- V1[13] Court Expectations & Client Boundaries

DEFENSE ATTORNEYS

- VIII1[11] Responsibilities
- VIII1[12] Decision to Enter Drug Court
- VIII1[13] Representation on a Drug Court Team
- VIII1[14] Serving Dual Roles

DRUG COURT CRITICAL REVIEW

- II2[1] Consistent Findings
- II2[2] Client Characteristics
- II2[3] Drug Use
- II2[4] Retention & Graduation Rates
- II2[5] Recidivism Rates
- II2[6] Postprogram Recidivism
- II2[7] Cost Savings
- II2[8] Improving Drug Court Evaluation
- VIII1[1] Best Practices in Drug Court
- VIII1[2] Characteristics of Effective Drug Courts
- VIII1[3] Characteristics of Cost-Effective Drug Courts
- VIII1[4] Adult Drug Court Ranking
- VIII1[5] Practices & Criminal Behavior
- VIII1[6] Practices & Substance Use Outcomes
- VIII1[7] High-Performance Drug Courts

DRUG COURT SYSTEM

- II[23] Limited Enrolment, Limited Impact
- II[24] Serious & Disinterested Offenders Passed over
- II[25] Probation & Communities
- II[26] Drug Courts Offer More Effective Supervision
- II[27] Offender Inclusiveness & Communities Needs
- II[28] Denver

EVALUATION

- II[1] Consistent Findings
- II[2] Retention Rates
- II[3] Population Demographics
- II[4] Supervision
- II[5] Cost Saving
- II[6] Drug Usage
- II[7] Recidivism During Program
- II[8] Recidivism
- II[9] Design Weakness

EXPUNGEMENT

- V1[1] Benefits
- V1[2] Methods
- V1[3] Results
- V1[4] Discussion

FAMILY DRUG TREATMENT COURTS (FDTC)

- III1[17] Development
- III1[18] Jackson County
- III1[19] Criminal/Civil Cases
- III1[20] Immediate Involvement
- III1[21] Appropriate Treatment
- III1[22] Sanctions & Incentives
- III1[23] Effectiveness
- III1[24] Challenges
- VII [9] Best Practices
- VII[10] Necessary Partners & Roles
- VII[11] Defining the Mission
- VII[12] Court Calendaring Practices
- VII[13] Phase Structure & Management of Client Behavior
- VII[14] Structure
- VII[15] Case Management
- VII[16] Questions to Be Answered

HIV

- VIII1[15] Risk Behaviors in Drug Court
- VIII1[16] Risk Factors in Drug Court
- VIII1[17] Geographic Risk

IMPACT EVALUATIONS

- IV2[9] Methodologically Sound Impact Evaluations
- IV2[10] Comparison Group
- IV2[11] Data Collection & Analysis
- IV2[12] Evaluator Involvement Critical

JAIL-BASED TREATMENT

- II1[19] Jail-Based Treatment Gap
- II1[20] Jail-Based Treatment & Drug Courts
- II1[21] A “Working Model”
- II1[22] Communication With Drug Courts
- II1[23] Jail Staff Support
- II1[24] Program Space
- II1[25] Staff Assignment
- II1[26] Follow-Up & Re-Entry Courts

JUDGE

- II[10] Role

II[11]	Role Codified
II[12]	“Judge Effect”
II[13]	Self-Assessment
II[14]	Countertransference
II[15]	Participant Attitude
II[16]	Participant Psychology
II[17]	Court Environment & Process
II[18]	Shaping the Court Environment

JUDGE AS KEY COMPONENT

IV2[1]	Role
IV2[2]	Research Design
IV2[3]	Study Measures
IV2[4]	Study Sites
IV2[5]	Original Study Findings
IV2[6]	Study Replication: Misdemeanor Population
IV2[7]	Study Replication: Felony Population
IV2[8]	Judge is Key

JUVENILE DRUG COURTS

II[19]	Santa Clara: Cost Savings,
II[20]	Santa Clara: Retention
II[21]	Wilmington: Recidivism
II[22]	Wilmington: Postprogram Recidivism
VIII[1]	Effects
VIII[2]	Interventions
VIII[3]	Suggestions for Practice
VIII[4]	Policy Implications
VIII[1]	Juvenile Treatment Courts
VIII[2]	Training Needs
VIII[3]	Response to Training Teams

MULTISYSTEMIC THERAPY (MST)

III2[25]	Treating Adolescent Substance Use Effectively
III2[26]	NIDA’s Thirteen Principles
III2[27]	What is MST?
III2[28]	Evaluating the Effectiveness of MST
III2[29]	MST & the Thirteen Principles
III2[30]	MST & Juvenile Drug Court
III2[31]	Evaluating MST in Juvenile Drug Court

NIATx IMPROVEMENT MODEL

VIII1[8]	Applying NIATx to Drug Courts
----------	-------------------------------

VIII1[9]	Improving Participant Flow
VIII1[10]	Achieving Best Practices

PARTICIPANTS’ SATISFACTION

IV1[11]	Other Studies
IV1[12]	CDAS/NIDA Drug Court Participant Study
IV1[13]	CDAS Study Format
IV1[14]	Basic Client Information
IV1[15]	Motivation for Drug Court
IV1[16]	Clients’ Thoughts on Treatment
IV1[17]	Clients’ Opinions on the Court
IV1[18]	Conclusions on Client Perceptions

PERCEPTIONS OF DRUG COURT

III1[15]	Evaluating the FTDO Program in Maricopa
III1[16]	12-Month/36-Month Outcomes
III1[17]	Difficulty of Compliance
III1[18]	Helpfulness, Strengths, & Weaknesses

PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT

V2[5]	What Is Performance Measurement?
V2[6]	Measuring Drug Court Performance
V2[7]	Conclusion

PROCESS EVALUATION

V2[8]	What Are Process Evaluations?
V2[9]	Who Should Conduct Evaluations?
V2[10]	What Are the Critical Elements?
V2[11]	What Data Are Needed?
V2[12]	Methodological Rigorousness
V2[13]	Experimental Design & Comparison Groups

RECIDIVISM

V2[14]	What We Know Now
V2[15]	Recidivism Defined
V2[16]	Choosing Drug Court Participants for Analysis
V2[17]	Appropriate Comparison Groups
V2[18]	Ensuring Drug Court & Comparison Samples Are Comparable

RESEARCH

- II1[27] Recidivism & the Utah Juvenile Court
- II1[28] Delaware Drug Court Evaluation
- II1[29] Florida's First Judicial Circuit Drug Court Evaluation
- II1[30] Monterey County First-Year Evaluation
- II1[31] Riverside County Evaluation
- II2[21] Monterey County First-Year Evaluation
- II2[22] Butler County CDAT Evaluation
- II2[23] King County Evaluation
- II2[24] Suffolk County
- II2[25] Volusia County Process & Output Evaluation
- II2[26] Jefferson County Impact Evaluation
- II2[27] Madison County Final Evaluation
- II2[28] Santa Barbara County Year Three
- III1[25] Cleveland
- III1[26] Allen County
- III1[27] Delaware Juvenile Diversion Program
- III1[28] Orange County
- III1[29] Creek County
- III1[30] Project Exodus (Maine)
- III1[31] Denver
- III2[32] Dallas County DIVERT Court
- III2[33] Maine's Statewide Adult Drug Court Program
- III2[34] Maine's Statewide Juvenile Drug Court Program
- IV1[23] Dallas County DIVERT Court
- IV1[24] North Carolina
- IV2[15] New York State Evaluation
- IV2[16] Saint Louis Cost-Benefit Analysis
- VI1[14] Four Drug Court Site Evaluation
- VI1[15] Alaska's Therapeutic Court Evaluation
- VI1[16] Maine's Adult Drug Court Program
- VII1[5] Findings from Ohio

- VIII1[1] Youth in Juvenile Drug Courts Compared with Outpatient Treatment
- VIII1[1] Team Meetings & Status Hearings in Juvenile Drug Court

RESEARCH AGENDA

- V2[1] Past the First Generation of Research
- V2[2] National Research Advisory Committee
- V2[3] National Research Agenda
- V2[4] Conclusion

RETENTION

- II1[8] Early Predictors
- II1[9] Treatment Outcomes
- II1[10] Graduate/Nongraduate Similarities
- II1[11] Predictors of Program Completion
- II1[12] Arrest During Follow-Up
- II1[13] Predictors of Rearrest
- II1[14] Using Predictors

SANCTIONS

- II1[1] Increased Performance
- II1[2] Sanctions Need Not Be Painful
- II1[3] In the Eyes of the Behavior
- II1[4] Regularity of Sanctions
- II1[5] Clarification of Expected Behaviors
- II1[6] Effective Punishment
- II1[7] Research Potential
- VII1[1] Behavior Modification
- VII1[2] Methods
- VII1[3] Results in Sanctioning
- VII1[4] Discussions

THERAPEUTIC APPROACH

- III2[9] Common Factors in Treatment
- III2[10] Client Factors
- III2[11] Therapeutic Relationship Factors
- III2[12] Importance of Perceived Empathy
- III2[13] Client Acceptance
- III2[14] Role of Warmth/Self-Expression
- III2[15] Hope & Expectancy
- III2[16] Conveying Hope

- III2[17] Hope is Future-Focused
- III2[18] Empowering the Client
- III2[19] Model & Technique
- III2[20] The Strengths Approach
- III2[21] Strength-Based Implications for Practice 1
- III2[22] Strength-Based Implications for Practice 2
- III2[23] Strength-Based Implications for Practice 3
- III2[24] Strength-Based Implications for Practice 4

TREATMENT, PARTICIPANTS

- II2[14] Successful Treatment Programs

- II2[15] Therapeutic Setting
- II2[16] Treatment Completion
- II2[17] Cognitive Behavioral Tx: What Works
- II2[18] Effective Treatment Components
- II2[19] Treatment Matching
- II2[20] Sanctions & Incentives

VETERANS TREATMENT COURTS

- VIII1[1] Development
- VIII1[1] Local & Legislative Initiatives