

ERRATUM

Erratum to Drug Court Review Volume VII, Issue I, 2010:

Article: *Mechanisms of Effectiveness in Juvenile Drug Court: Altering Risk Processes Associated with Delinquency and Substance Abuse*

Authors: Cindy M. Schaeffer, PhD, Scott W. Henggeler, PhD, Jason E. Chapman, PhD, Colleen A. Halliday-Boykins, PhD, Phillippe B. Cunningham, PhD, Jeff Randall, PhD, Steven B. Shapiro, MS

Conflict-of-interest statement: Scott W. Henggeler is a board member and stockholder of MST Services, which provides training in multi-systemic therapy for financial compensation.

The online version of the original article can be found at www.ndci.org/sites/default/files/ndci/DrugCourtReviewVolume7PDF.pdf

National Drug Court Institute

HEADNOTES INDEX

The Headnotes Index provides access to major points or concepts in articles from previous issues by using a cumulative indexing system. Each headnote can be located by volume, issue, and headnote (e.g., IX1[1] is the first headnote in issue 1 of volume IX (the previous issue).

BALLOT INITIATIVES

- IV2[13] State Ballot Initiatives
Threaten 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 Lessons

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 Courts
- 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 Enrollment, 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 &
Community Needs
- II[28] Denver

ETG/ETS TESTING

- IX1[1] Effect in Drug Courts
- IX1[2] Detecting Weekend
Alcohol Use

- IX1[3] Efficient EtG/EtS Testing

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 & Manage-
ment 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

- II1[10] Role
- II1[11] Role Codified
- II1[12] “Judge Effect”
- II1[13] Self-Assessment
- II1[14] Countertransference
- II1[15] Participant Attitude
- II1[16] Participant Psychology
- II1[17] Court Environment & Process
- II1[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

- II1[19] Santa Clara: Cost Savings
- II1[20] Santa Clara: Retention
- II1[21] Wilmington: Recidivism
- II1[22] Wilmington: Postprogram Recidivism
- VII1[1] Effects
- VII1[2] Interventions
- VII1[3] Suggestions for Practice
- VII1[4] Policy Implications
- VII1[1] Juvenile Treatment Courts
- VII1[2] Training Needs
- VII1[3] Response to Training Teams
- IX1[10] Inconsistent Outcomes

- IX1[11] Future of Juvenile Drug Courts

LOW RISK, LOW NEED TRACKS

- IX1[6] LR/LN Participants & Reduced Supervision & Services
- IX1[7] Alternative Tracks

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

NALTREXONE, EXTENDED RELEASE

- IX1[4] Effect in Drug Courts
- IX1[5] Cost Benefit

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

- II1[15] Evaluating the FTDO Program in Maricopa
- II1[16] 12-Month/36-Month Outcomes
- II1[17] Difficulty of Compliance

II1[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

V1[14] Four Drug Court Site Evaluation

V1[15] Alaska's Therapeutic Court Evaluation

V1[16] Maine's Adult Drug Court Program

VII1[5] Findings from Ohio

VII1[1] Youth in Juvenile Drug Courts Compared with Out-patient 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

- III1[10] Graduate/Nongraduate Similarities
- III1[11] Predictors of Program Completion
- III1[12] Arrest During Follow-up
- III1[13] Predictors of Rearrest
- III1[14] Using Predictors

SANCTIONS

- III1[1] Increased Performance
- III1[2] Sanctions Need Not Be Painful
- III1[3] In the Eyes of the Behavior
- III1[4] Regularity of Sanctions
- III1[5] Clarification of Expected Behaviors
- III1[6] Effective Punishment
- III1[7] Research Potential
- VII1[1] Behavior Modification
- VII1[2] Methods
- VII1[3] Results in Sanctioning
- VII1[4] Discussions

TEAM COMMUNICATION &

CONSENSUS

- IX1[12] Team Decision Making
- IX1[13] Improving Communication

TEAM SATISFACTION SCALE

- IX1[8] Measuring Team Satisfaction
- IX1[9] Factors Influencing Team Satisfaction

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

- VII1[1] Development
- VII1[1] Local & Legislative Initiatives