

Summary of Impact/Outcome Findings Reported for Family Drug Court Programs: 2000 – Present

PART ONE

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	Focus of Study	Population Studied	Comparison Group
1	October 21, 2004	<i>FTDC Evaluation Status Update: FTDC Evaluation Coordination Meeting.</i> NPC Research and ABT Associates, Inc.	4 year longitudinal evaluation of FTDCs in four sites: San Diego, Reno, Santa Clara Co. and Suffolk Co., NY	Families whose cases started in 2002-2003; 1,092 individuals for administrative review; 296 individuals for interview samples	<u>Reno and Suffolk Cos:</u> Eligible parents in dependency cases in each county who are not referred to or who refuse entry to FTDC; <u>Santa Clara and San Diego Cos.:</u> (system-wide programs) matched demographic sample of parents involved in dependency cases in San Bernardino and Contra Costa Counties where no FTDC programs exist but whose demographic and child welfare caseload is comparable.
2	2004	<i>Treating Substance Abusing Parents: A Study of the Pima County Family Drug Court Approach</i> (no author attribution)	To examine effectiveness of the Pima County Court Assisted Treatment Services (CATS) program and its drug court intervention, by comparing summary statistics for volunteers to family drug court (33 parents/46 children) – all of whom lived in the same zip code area associated with a high percentage of drug involved child protective referrals; with treatment refusal group (42 parents/51 children) and treatment as usual group (45 parents/72 children) from a matched geographical area.	33 voluntary participants in Pima Family Drug Court	42 individuals who refused treatment and 45 individuals in a “treatment as usual group” from a matched geographic area
3	October 2000	<i>Evaluation of the Suffolk County Family Treatment Court (Suffolk County(Central Islip), New York. Child Welfare Training Program. School of Social Welfare. State University of New York (SUNY)</i>	Study of first two years of program (January 1, 1998 – December 31, 1999)	98 participants in first two years of program (91 groups of siblings (7 participants had spouses/partners in program) and 221 children under court supervision	N/A

Summary of Impact/Outcome Findings Reported for Family Drug Court Programs: 2000 – Present

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	Focus of Study	Population Studied	Comparison Group
4	March 2004	State of California Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs. <i>Comprehensive Drug Court Implementation Act of 1999: Interim Report to the Legislature.</i> Kathryn P. Jett, Director	Study mandated by Comprehensive Drug Court Implementation Act (CDCI) of 1999 describing interim programmatic progress achieved	Data collected from January 2001 – June 2003 for “new participants”, participants who completed (“completers”), and those who were terminated (total of more than 9,000, 7,790 of whom were adults; 3,563 completed program; 2,657 terminated)	n/a
5	June 2006	<i>Family Treatment Drug Court National Evaluation. Phase I.</i> NPC Research	Summarizes the (1) treatment and child welfare outcomes for parents in four FTDCs (San Diego, Cal; Santa Clara Co., Cal; Suffolk Co, NY, and Washoe Co. (Reno), Nev.; and (2) relationship between drug court procedures (time for program entry, etc.) and treatment factors (treatment completion, etc.) on case outcomes	50 drug court cases and 50 comparison cases in each site plus additional 50 SARMS cases in San Diego = total 451 cases	Similar comparison groups
6	March 2007	<i>Family Treatment Drug Court Evaluation.</i> NPC Research.[funded by DHHS SAMHSA]	National evaluation examining whether court, child welfare, and treatment outcomes differed for families served through FTDCs compared with families who receive traditional child welfare services; and how and for whom drug courts work best	Studied 802 FTDC participants in four FTDCs: San Diego Co, Cal;. Santa Clara Co., Cal;. Washoe Co., Nev, and Suffolk Co.,NY.	1,167 comparison cases in the four counties which didn't receive the FTDC services
7	August 2008	<i>Baltimore City Family Recovery Program (FRP) Independent Evaluation: Outcome and Cost Report.</i> Scott W. M. Burrus, Ph.D. ; Juliette R. Mackin, Ph.D. ; Jennifer A. Aborn, B.A. NPC Research-Portland, Oregon	independent study of the Baltimore City Family Recovery Program focusing on: 1. extent to which the FRP is meeting its stated goals and desired child welfare and treatment outcomes and; 2. cost analysis comparing the FRP to traditional case processing	Parents receiving FRP services between August 2005 and December 2006. Sample of 200 FRP cases. Data was collected on one parent per case (usually the mother).	Compared to families that did not receive these services. (200 comparison cases). The comparison group contained cases that entered the child welfare system with similar characteristics to the FRP group during 2004 to 2005; Time followed: For FRP cases-February 2008 through June 2008. For comparison group cases-2004 through 2005 prior to implementation of the FRP

Summary of Impact/Outcome Findings Reported for Family Drug Court Programs: 2000 – Present

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	Focus of Study	Population Studied	Comparison Group
8	2008	<i>Effects of Family Treatment Drug Courts on Substance Abuse and Child Welfare Outcomes.</i> NPC Research, Portland, OR. Sonia D. Worcel, Carrie J. Furrer, Beth L. Green, Scott W. M. Burrus, Michael W. Finnigan. <i>Child Abuse Review</i> Vol. 14: 427-443 (2008).	The paper examines whether court, child welfare and treatment outcomes differed for 301 families served through three FTDCs as compared to a matched sample of 1,220 families with substance abuse issues who received traditional child welfare services.	The FTDC treatment sample consisted of a total of 301 cases with mothers (an extremely small number of FTDC and comparison cases were father only cases and were excluded from the analysis sample) who entered the three study sites during the four year sampling period. Thus the total study sample consisted of 1,220 cases.	The final comparison sample consisted of 736 untreated eligible cases during the four-year sampling period at the FTDC sites and 183 matched cases from the same time period from the two comparison counties, for a total comparison sample of 919 cases.
9	February 2007	<i>How Effective are Family Treatment Drug Courts? Outcomes from a Four-site National Study (2007)</i> Beth L. Green, Carrie Furrer, Sonia Worcel, Scott Burrus, Michael W. Finigan. NPC Research, Portland, OR.	The current study examines key outcomes across four different FTDCs. Using a quasi-experimental design, we examine the effectiveness of the FTDC in improving treatment and child welfare outcomes for parents.	50 FTDC cases at each of the 4 sites 50 Tier I cases	50 comparison cases drawn from child welfare records
10	March 2008	<i>Hartford County Family Recovery Court (FRC)-Evaluation: Process, Outcome and Cost Report.</i> Scott Burrus, Sonia Worcel, Jennifer Aborn, NPC Research March (2008)	examined history, implementation and current status of the Hartford County, MD, Family Recovery Court	Family Recovery Court Cases (n=53)	Comparison group parents (n=26)
11	January 2011	<i>Montana Drug Courts: A Snapshot of Success and Hope.</i> Montana Supreme Court, Office of Court Administrator.	This report describes the accomplishments of Montana's Drug Courts and includes performance data for 30 months (May 2008-October 2010)	795 total Drug Court participants entered during the data collection period; 235 participants remain active.	NA
12	December 2007	<i>Evaluation of the Lewiston Family Treatment Drug Court: A Process and Intermediate Outcome Evaluation.</i> Hornby Zeller Associates.	The evaluation examines the core functional and operational components of the Lewiston Family Drug Court using performance benchmarks outlined in the <i>Key Components</i> .	The study focused on all participants of the Family Court up to November 30,2007	Three comparison groups: 1. Protective custody data from a court jurisdiction that does not have a family drug court program. 2. Parents with substance abuse problems who were processed through Lewiston District Court in the year prior to the date of implementation of the LCFDC. 3. Parents with substance abuse problems who were referred to the LCFDC but were not admitted.
13	March 2008	<i>Harford County Family Recovery Court (FRC) Evaluation: Process, Outcome and Cost Report.</i> NPC Research. Portland, Oregon.	The evaluation compared child welfare, treatment, and criminal justice outcomes and cost savings for parents that received FRC services.	Families receiving FRC services between 2004 and 2006	Families that did not receive services but were otherwise similar for 2004 to 2006

Summary of Impact/Outcome Findings Reported for Family Drug Court Programs: 2000 – Present

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	Focus of Study	Population Studied	Comparison Group
14	April 2005	<i>Children's Justice Act: An Examination of Time to Jurisdiction for Dependency Cases in Clackamas and Columbia Counties.</i> NPC Research. Portland, Oregon.	NPC was selected to help examine dependency cases that had jurisdiction established both sooner, as well as later than the 60-day statute. One of NPC's goals was to help identify common areas in those cases that take longer than 60 days to establish jurisdiction, and offer some suggestions for decreasing the time period between case filing and jurisdiction.	The Oregon State Judicial Department returned a list of 147 newly opened cases in Clackamas and 44 newly opened cases in Columbia during the time period studied. Case files selected for inclusion in the review had to be (1) first time petitions and (2) those cases that had not been dismissed.	N/A
15	June 2010	<i>Marion County Fostering Attachment Treatment Court Process, Outcome and Cost Evaluation Final Report.</i> NPC Research.	NPC Research was contracted by the Oregon State Police and the Criminal Justice Commission to conduct the third year evaluations of 11 drug courts funded by the Byrne Methamphetamine Reduction Grant Project. NPC conducted Drug Court Process Foundations evaluations of 11 Oregon adult and family drug court sites (examining the programs adherence to best practices within the 10 Key Components, with adjustments for the special family drug court population of parents with child welfare cases). In addition, as a part of this project, NPC performed full process, outcome and cost-benefit evaluations of two family drug court sites, the Marion and Jackson County Family Drug Court Programs.	NPC identified all participants who entered FATC from January 2006 (when the program was implemented) through July 2008. This time interval allows at least 12 months of follow-up for every participant post drug court start. For this time period, there were 39 drug court participants in the cohort (this includes 13 graduates according to what was reported to OTCMS). There were 35 drug court participants with two years of follow-up time.	The comparison group was identified from a list of petitions for shelter care obtained from the Marion County Juvenile Court. The parents with these petitions were eligible for the program but did not enter the FATC due to one of two reasons: because the program became full the first year and they were on a waiting list, or because their petitions occurred before the program was implemented. Individuals with appropriate criminal histories and who had an indication of a drug problem in the data provided from child welfare were selected from this list. The FATC and comparison groups were then matched in aggregate on age, gender, ethnicity, indication of prior drug use, number and age of children and criminal history, including all prior arrests and prior drug arrests specifically. The final match resulted in a comparison group of 49 individuals with no significant differences in the matching criteria from the FATC group with the exception of race/ethnicity.

Summary of Impact/Outcome Findings Reported for Family Drug Court Programs: 2000 – Present

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	Focus of Study	Population Studied	Comparison Group
16	June 2010	<i>Jackson County Community Family Court Process, Outcome, and Cost Evaluation Final Report.</i> NPC Research.	NPC Research was contracted by the Oregon State Police and the Criminal Justice Commission to conduct the third year evaluations of 11 drug courts funded by the Byrne Methamphetamine Reduction Grant Project. NPC conducted Drug Court Process Foundations evaluations of 11 Oregon adult and family drug court sites (examining the programs adherence to best practices within the 10 Key Components, with adjustments for the special family drug court population of parents with child welfare cases). In addition, as a part of this project, NPC performed full process, outcome and cost-benefit evaluations of two family drug court sites, the Marion and Jackson County Family Drug Court Programs.	NPC identified all participants who entered CFC from January 2002 through July 2008. This time interval was chosen to allow at least 12 months of follow-up for every participant post drug court start and included a sufficient sample size to examine up to 4 years of recidivism data. For this time period, there were 329 drug court participants who began the program, including 151 who graduated.	The comparison group was identified from a list of petitions for shelter care obtained from the Jackson County Family Court. The parents with these petitions were eligible for the program but did not enter the CFC due to one of two reasons: because the program became full the first year and they were on a waiting list, or because their petitions occurred before the program was implemented. Individuals with appropriate criminal histories and who had an indication of a drug problem in the data provided from child welfare were selected from this list. The CFC and comparison groups were then matched in aggregate on age, gender, ethnicity, indication of prior drug use, number and age of children and criminal history, including prior arrests and prior drug arrests. The final match resulted in a comparison group of 340 individuals with no significant differences in the matching criteria from the CFC group.