
INTRODUCTION

The Editorial Board is pleased to present the first issue of volume four of the *Drug Court Review* (Volume IV, 1). Volume IV takes a look at three important areas to the drug court field: the development and implementation of the nation's first campus drug court, drug court participants' satisfaction with treatment and the drug court experience, and the use of creatinine-normalized cannabinoid results to determine new marijuana use versus continuing drug excretion from previous exposure. Each of these areas represents a component of the future of the drug court movement, and each component has a role to play in furthering the institutionalization of drug courts throughout the United States.

These issues, and the information we are able to uncover about them, are important to the continued development and evolution of the drug court model.

In this issue:

- ◆ Cheryl L. Asmus, Ph.D., details the development and implementation of the nation's first campus drug court, established at Colorado State University. Dr. Asmus outlines the need for campus drug courts, program design, program personnel, involved campus departments and agencies, the evaluation process, and future directions.
- ◆ Christine A. Saum, Ph.D., Frank R. Scarpitti, Ph.D., Clifford A. Butzin, Ph.D., Victor W. Perez, M.A., Druretta Jennings, M.L.T., and Alison R. Gray, B.A., delve into drug court participants' perceptions of, and satisfaction with, the treatment and drug court experiences. The authors present data from 312 interviews with drug court clients conducted shortly after discharge from a Delaware drug treatment court.

Overall most drug court clients were satisfied with their treatment and courtroom experiences; however, statistically significant differences were detected between those who completed the drug court program and those who did not.

- ◆ Paul L. Cary, M.S., examines the use of creatinine-normalized cannabinoid results to differentiate between those participants who have engaged in new use of marijuana and those who have maintained abstinence yet evidence continuing drug excretion from previous exposure. Mr. Cary presents a list of fundamental considerations necessary for the proper use of creatinine-normalized cannabinoid results, reviews the calculations involved in this method, and also presents a non-normalized method for making these distinctions.
- ◆ Finally, this issue of the *Review* concludes with a “Research Update” on two recent drug court research evaluations, compiled from the executive summaries of those evaluations themselves.

THE DRUG COURT REVIEW

Published semi-annually, the *Review*'s goal is to keep the drug court practitioner abreast of important new developments in the drug court field. Drug courts demand a great deal of time and energy of the practitioner. There is little opportunity to read lengthy evaluations or keep up with important research in the field. Yet, our ability to marshal scientific and research information and "argue the facts" can be critical to a program's success and ultimate survival.

The *Review* builds a bridge between law, science and clinical communities, providing a common tool to all. A headnote and subject indexing system allows access to evaluation outcomes, scientific analysis and research on drug court related areas. Scientific jargon and legalese are interpreted for the practitioner into a common language.

Although the *Review*'s emphasis is on scholarship and scientific research, it also provides commentary from experts in the drug court and related fields on important issues to drug court practitioners.

THE NATIONAL DRUG COURT INSTITUTE

The *Drug Court Review* is a project of the National Drug Court Institute. NDCI was established under the auspices of the National Association of Drug Court Professionals and with the support of the Office of National Drug Control Policy, Executive Office of the President and the Bureau of Justice Assistance, U.S. Department of Justice.

The National Drug Court Institute's mission is to promote education, research and scholarship to the drug court field and other court-based intervention programs.

Historically, education and training in the drug court field have only been available at regional workshops and the annual national conference; analysis and scholarship were largely limited to anecdotes and personal accounts.

That situation has changed. Evaluations exist on dozens of drug court programs. Scholars and researchers have begun to apply the rigors of scientific review and analysis to the drug court model. The level of experience and expertise necessary to support an institute now exist.

Since its creation in December 1997, NDCI has launched a comprehensive practitioner training series for judges, prosecutors, public defenders, court coordinators, treatment providers, and community supervision officers; developed a research division responsible for developing a scientific research agenda and publication dissemination strategy for the field, as well as developing a series of evaluation workshops; and published a monograph series on relevant issues to drug court institutionalization and expansion.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank all those who have contributed to this issue of the *Drug Court Review*: to the Office of National Drug Control Policy, Executive Office of the President, and the Bureau of Justice Assistance, U.S. Department of Justice, for the leadership, support, and collaboration that those agencies have offered to the National Drug Court Institute; and to Dr. Cheryl L. Asmus, Dr. Christine A. Saum, Dr. Frank R. Scarpitti, Dr. Clifford A. Butzin, Victor W. Perez, Druretta Jennings, Alison R. Gray, Paul L. Cary, Dr. Thomas B. Fomby, Vasudha Rangaprasad, and Dr. Amy Craddock for their contributions as authors.

Judge Karen Freeman-Wilson (Ret.)
Executive Director
National Drug Court Institute
