

#### **PART ONE**

| # | Publication<br>Date | Bibliographic Information  | Focus of Study  | Population Studied  | Comparison Group      |
|---|---------------------|--|---|---|-----------------------|
| 1 | December 30, 2005   | Process and Outcome Evaluations of<br>Four Tribal Wellness Courts. Final<br>Draft. Karen Gottlieb et al.   | Process and outcome evaluation of first<br>four tribal wellness courts funded under<br>US DOJ Tribal Drug Court Initiative. | Blackfeet Alternative court (Browning, Montana): operated between January 1998  – September 2000: adult court with 40 active participants; 18 (45%) graduated   | N/A                   |
|   |                     |  |   | Fort Peck Community Wellness Courts: (Poplar, Montana): February 1998 – September 2003; 54 juvenile participants; 15 (30%) graduated Hualapai Wellness Court: (Peach Springs, Arizona): March 1999 – October 2003: 64 adults (83% graduated) and 36 juveniles (64% graduated  Poarch Band of Creek Indians: began in July 1998 and still operating: as of April 2004, admitted 28 participants; 15 (54%) graduated and 5 still in program |                       |
| 2 | December 30, 2005   | Poarch Band of Creek Indians. Executive Summary. Final Draft. Karen Gottlieb et al.                        | See Publication No. 1   | See Publication No. 1   | See Publication No. 1 |
| 3 | December 30, 2005   | Hualapai Executive Summary. Final<br>Draft. Karen Gottlieb et al.  | See Publication No. 1   | See Publication No. 1   | See Publication No. 1 |
| 4 | December 30, 2005   | Hualapai Wellness Court Evaluation<br>Final Draft Karen Gottlieb et al.                                    | See Publication No. 1   | See Publication No. 1   | See Publication No. 1 |
| 5 | December 30, 2005   | Blackfeet Alternative Court<br>Evaluation: (1) Executive Summary<br>and (2) Evaluation Report- Final Draft | See Publication No. 1   | See Publication No. 1   | See Publication No. 1 |

| # | Publication<br>Date  | Bibliographic Information  | Focus of Study        | Population Studied    | Comparison Group      |
|---|----------------------|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 6 | December 30, 2005    | Fort Peck Tribes Community Wellness<br>Court Evaluation. (1) Executive<br>Summary; and (2) Evaluation Report.<br>Final Draft.        | See Publication No. 1 | See Publication No. 1 | See Publication No. 1 |
| 7 | December 10,<br>2004 | Lessons Learned from the First Four Tribal Wellness Courts with Recommendations for the Future. Karen Gottlieb and Christine Duclos. | See Publication No. 1 | See Publication No. 1 | See Publication No. 1 |

#### **PART TWO**

| # | Publication       | Methodology   |  | Recidivism Results |               |
|---|-------------------|---|--|--------------------|---------------|
|   | Date              |   | Re-Arrests   | Convictions        | Time Followed |
| 1 | December 30, 2005 | Mixed-method design using qualitative perspectives to provide context for quantitative results; semi-structured open ended interviews with stakeholders (family members, community members, participants, etc.) to tell story of implementing and outcome of wellness courts; study team was anthropologist and attorney and four team members specializing in public health, anthropology and state and tribal law; interview comments categories according to 10key components of "Tribal Healing to Wellness Courts" | Post program arrests for alcohol or drug related offenses ranged from 45-59% in the three adult courts and over 90% in the two juvenile courts; Graduates as likely as nongradutes to have post program alcohol and drug arrest - men as likely as women to have post program alcohol or drug arrest - adult graduates took longer to reoffend than nongraduates - adult participants had fewer post-program alcohol and drug arrests than preprogram arrests for same length of time; and majority of adult post-program arrests were for public intoxication or disorderly conduct wellness court model has more impact on adults than juveniles: [adults in all four sites wanted to change because of their children]  HUALAPAI: Adult: recidivism for persons who exited program was 54%; 3 year recidivism rate was 59% for alcohol or drug offense and 77% for all post program arrests including crimes against persons; JUVENILE: 75% of juvenile participants had post program arrest; not difference between those who graduated and those who didn't  Fort Peck: 45 of the 50 participants (90%) arrested on criminal charge after leaving the program; most frequent charge was disorderly conduct; no significant relationship between completion status and whether participant was arrested after leaving program (14 of the 15 graduates and 31 of the 35 |                    |               |

| # | Publication  | Methodology           | Recidivism Results                          |                       |                       |
|---|--------------|-----------------------|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|
|   | Date         |                       | Re-Arrests                                  | Convictions           | Time Followed         |
|   |              |                       | terminated participants had post program    |                       |                       |
|   |              |                       | arrest                                      |                       |                       |
|   |              |                       | <b>BLACKFEET</b> : 21 of the 40             |                       |                       |
|   |              |                       | participants (52.5%) had at least one post  |                       |                       |
|   |              |                       | program arrest; 19 of the 40 participants   |                       |                       |
|   |              |                       | (47.5%) had no post program arrests; no     |                       |                       |
|   |              |                       | significant relationship between program    |                       |                       |
|   |              |                       | completion status and recidivism            |                       |                       |
|   |              |                       | <b>POARCH CREEK</b> : 6 of 19 (32%)         |                       |                       |
|   |              |                       | participants who exited program exiting     |                       | Three years following |
|   |              |                       | Program had at least one post program       |                       | participation         |
|   |              |                       | drug or alcohol related arrest; conversely, |                       |                       |
|   |              |                       | 68% had no arrests; no correlation          |                       |                       |
|   |              |                       | between program status and rear rest        |                       |                       |
| 2 | December 30, | See Publication No. 1 | See Publication No. 1                       | See Publication No. 1 | See Publication No. 1 |
|   | 2005         |                       |   |                       |                       |
|   |              |                       |   |                       |                       |
| 3 | December 30, | See Publication No. 1 | See Publication No. 1                       | See Publication No. 1 | See Publication No. 1 |
| 3 | 2005         | See Fublication No. 1 | See Publication No. 1                       | See Fuolication No. 1 | See Fublication No. 1 |
|   | 2003         |                       |   |                       |                       |
| 4 | D 1 20       | G D III di N I        |   |                       | G D III C N I         |
| 4 | December 30, | See Publication No. 1 | See Publication No. 1                       | See Publication No. 1 | See Publication No. 1 |
|   | 2005         |                       |   |                       |                       |
|   |              |                       |   |                       |                       |
| 5 | December 30, | See Publication No. 1 | See Publication No. 1                       | See Publication No. 1 | See Publication No. 1 |
|   | 2005         |                       |   |                       |                       |
|   |              |                       |   |                       |                       |
| 6 | December 30, | See Publication No. 1 | See Publication No. 1                       | See Publication No. 1 | See Publication No. 1 |
|   | 2005         |                       |   |                       |                       |
|   |              |                       |   |                       |                       |
| 7 | December 10, | See Publication No. 1 | majority of post-program arrests are for    | N/A                   | N/A                   |
| , | 2004         |                       | misdemeanor alcohol-related offenses        |                       |                       |
|   | 200.         |                       | (public intoxication; open container;       |                       |                       |
|   |              |                       | Driving under the influence; minor in       |                       |                       |
|   |              |                       | possession, liquor violation- results       |                       |                       |
|   |              |                       | indicate substance abuse slowed down        |                       |                       |
|   |              |                       |   |                       |                       |
|   | 1            | 1                     | 1   | II.                   | 1                     |

#### **PART THREE**

| # | Publication<br>Date | Bibliographic<br>Information   | System Impact/Cost Savings | Other Findings   |
|---|---------------------|--|----------------------------|--|
|   | December 30, 2005   | Process and Outcome Evaluations of Four Tribal Wellness Courts. Final Draft. Karen Gottlieb et al. |                            | -All but one of the teams had great deal of member turnover that was detrimental to the program  - Participants surprised by time commitment required and many didn't understand program requirements; 9no public defender or advice of public defender0  - incarceration frequently used as sanction in 3 of the 4 courts – participants could serve more jail time as sanction than if served traditional sentence  -participants appreciated efforts of wellness court probation officers  -all four programs had complaints from participants re inconsistent application of sanctions and incentives  -all four programs would have benefited from computerized records  -purposes and goals of wellness courts not well known in communities at large  -only one of the program continued to operate after federal funding ended –3 not successful in institutionalization  -participants, family, team members and community members in all programs thought the programs were successful and underestimated rate of recidivism  - JUVENLE programs, however, had sense of hopelessness – need to offer juveniles more than treatment; needed education, job training and a focus on a positive future.  - need to integrate cultural tradition into treatment but not require participants to do activities perceived a religious because tribes are religiously diverse.  -HUALAPAI: many felt they had slowed down their use of alcohol, able to hold a job and take care of themselves: strengths were: home/school liaison involvement; treatment structured in participants' lives; incorporation of traditional healing practices; therapeutic sanctions for juveniles; first judge was catalyst for drug court; weaknesses related to failure to institutionalize (training, written policies on sanctions and incentive, termination criteria, etc.  FORT PECK: strengths: team work; compassion of team; weaknesses included lack of participation with school, tribal elders and tribal leaders; poor communication with mental health provider;  BLACKFEET: strengths: team work; compassion of team; weakn |
| 2 | December 30, 2005   | Poarch Band of Creek<br>Indians. Executive<br>Summary. Final Draft.<br>Karen Gottlieb et al.       | N/A                        | See Publication No. 1  |

| # | Publication<br>Date | Bibliographic<br>Information   | System Impact/Cost Savings | Other Findings  |
|---|---------------------|--|----------------------------|---|
| 3 | December 30, 2005   | Hualapai Executive<br>Summary. Final Draft.<br>Karen Gottlieb et al.   | N/A                        | See Publication No. 1   |
| 4 | December 30, 2005   | Hualapai Wellness Court Evaluation Final Draft Karen Gottlieb et al.   | N/A                        | See Publication No. 1   |
| 5 | December 30, 2005   | Blackfeet Alternative<br>Court Evaluation: (1)<br>Executive Summary and<br>(2) Evaluation Report-<br>Final Draft                     | N/A                        | See Publication No. 1   |
| 6 | December 30, 2005   | Fort Peck Tribes Community Wellness Court Evaluation. (1) Executive Summary; and (2) Evaluation Report. Final Draft.                 | N/A                        | See Publication No. 1   |
| 7 | December 10, 2004   | Lessons Learned from the First Four Tribal Wellness Courts with Recommendations for the Future. Karen Gottlieb and Christine Duclos. | N/A                        | Lesson # 1:  - Build the Wellness Court Team based on roles, not on specific individuals  - Develop a strong structure for the Wellness Court with written policies and procedures such as interagency agreements that survive membership changes  Lesson # 2:  - Assume the participants do not understand the Wellness Court rules and regulations  - Use an "informed consent" approach with participants by reviewing the manual and contract regularly to remind them of the rules and regulations  Lesson # 3:  - Be more exclusive than inclusive in participant selection  - Select participants who shoe a readiness for change or have different treatment strategies for those participants who are at different stages of readiness for behavioral change at the time of admission to maximize resources and success.  Lesson # 4:  - Be careful in asking participants to do activities that can be perceived a religious rather than cultural.  - Distinguish between integrating cultural tradition and integrating religious belief into the wellness court to avoid conflict with individual religious practices |

| # | Publication | Bibliographic | System Impact/Cost Savings | Other Findings  |
|---|-------------|---------------|----------------------------|---|
|   | Date        | Information   |                            |   |
|   |             |               |                            | Lesson # 5; - Monitor participants using team member probation officers during the hors when illegal acts are most likely to occur to provide the best supervision of the participants Do not rely on law enforcement for intensive monitoring  |
|   |             |               |                            | Lesson # 6: - Reward positive behaviors liberally to achieve compliance - Do not focus primarily on negative sanctions to achieve compliance  |
|   |             |               |                            | Lesson # 7: - Have a judge who knows how to be a team player to enhance the teamwork in Wellness Court decision making - Be selective in choosing a Wellness Court Judges   |
|   |             |               |                            | Lesson # 8: - Maximize the importance of the collection of evaluation data - Begin systemic and uniform automate data collection on Day One of the Wellness Court and construct an integrated database to enable both internal and external evaluations to be conducted                                     |
|   |             |               |                            | Lesson # 9: - Match staff members with appropriate trainings and educational conferences to avoid repetitive e training and to keep members up to date - Do not attend a training or conference without reviewing the agenda and deciding if it is the right choice   |
|   |             |               |                            | Lesson # 10: - Integrate the Wellness Court from the start with the community - Emphasize outreach with tribal council, law enforcement, training center, health and social services, and community college to both take advantage of tribal resources and increase ownership of the Wellness Court program |