

## 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., IX1[1] is the first headnote in this 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 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 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 & 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

III[20]	Jail-Based Treatment & Drug Courts
III[21]	A “Working Model”
III[22]	Communication With Drug Courts
III[23]	Jail Staff Support
III[24]	Program Space
III[25]	Staff Assignment
III[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
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
- VII1[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

- 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