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**Graduation Rates**
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- Graduation Rates:
  - ALL: 59%
  - African American: 39%
  - Hispanic or Latino: 32%
  - Women: 39%

**Best Practice Standards**

- Duty to avoid disparate access, services, and impacts regardless of intent
- Affirmative obligation to know whether disparities exist (annual monitoring)
- Take corrective actions unless doing so would demonstrably threaten public safety or program effectiveness
- Evaluate success of the corrective actions and adjust, as necessary, until disparities are eliminated (annual monitoring)

www.AllRise.org
Pre-Entry Attrition

Effects are cumulative and subtractive:

- Pre-trial release vs. detention
- Public defender philosophy and private counsel knowledge (6th Amendment applies)
- Plea offer from prosecution
- Plea acceptance by defendant
- Screening tools (?)
- Eligibility criteria
- Suitability determinations

Can be influenced but not controlled by the drug court

Directly within control of the drug court

Impact of Pretrial Detention

- Approximately two thirds of jail inmates are (presumed innocent) pretrial detainees
- Approximately 70% are charged with nonviolent, non-weapon-related crimes
- Approximately 80% cannot pay $2,500 bail/bond
- Compared to matched released defendants:
  - More likely to plead guilty or be convicted
  - More likely to receive a jail or prison sentence
  - Receive longer incarceration or probation sentences
  - Have lower employment and educational attainments
  - Earn lower salaries
  - Are less likely to own a home
  - Experience greater family conflict and dysfunction
Key Moments in NADCP History
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Racial Disparities Reduced but not Eliminated

BJS (2012); COSCA (2013); NJ-AOC (2018); VanNostrand & Lowenkamp, 2013
The Access Process

Triggering Event
- Case not examined

Paper Eligibility
- Case deemed ineligible

Refer for Screening
- Individual screened out

Clinical Assessment
- Clinical needs don’t match with program

Admission Decision
- Decision made for non-admission.

Someone believes Individual is unsuitable
Key Moments in NADCP History
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**Reasons for Non-Admission**

"Paper-Eligible Candidates"

- African American males (n=385)
- Caucasian males (n=492)

- Prosecutor Decision
- Defendant Refusal
- Insufficient Evidence
- Judge Override
- Case Dismissed
- Medical or Mental Health

Janku (2016)

---

**Exclusionary Charges**

- U.S. Census
- All Arrests
- Violent Arrests
- Property Arrests
- Drug Arrests

Uniform Crime Reports (FBI, 2017)
Recidivism Rates

Re-Arrest Rate: 2005 - 2014 (9-year follow-up)

Excludes sex offenders
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**Recidivism Rates**

Re-Arrest Rate: 2005 - 2014 (9-year follow-up)

- **ALL PRISONERS**
  - Violent Index Offense: 39%
  - Property Index Offense: 43%
  - Drug Index Offense: 40%
  - Any Offense: 84%

- **Violent Offense**
  - Violent Index Offense: 88%
  - Property Index Offense: 84%
  - Drug Index Offense: 85%

*Excludes sex offenders*

*BJS: Alper & Durose (2018)*

**Arrested for Different Offense**

Re-Arrest Rate: 2005 - 2014 (9-year follow-up)

- **ALL PRISONERS**
  - Violent Index Offense: 77%
  - Property Index Offense: 83%
  - Drug Index Offense: 77%

- **Different Offense**
  - Violent Index Offense: 75%
  - Property Index Offense: 83%

*BJS: Alper & Durose (2018)*
Marketing & Outreach

Social Marketing Surveys
- What is the word on the street about drug court?
- Why did you decide to (not to) participate?
- Why did other people you know decide to (not to) participate?
- When did you first hear about drug court?
- Who first told you about drug court?
- What was their attitude about it?
- What might make it more appealing?

Turn-offs
- Already served a portion of their sentence or held pretrial for more than a month
- Heard drug court was a trap for the unsuspecting
- Heard about drug court from someone they didn’t trust (e.g., prosecutor)
- Heard about it from defense counsel late in the case
- Orientation focused on rules and lists of obligations
- Alienating or disrespectful style during orientation
- Emphasis on intrinsic vs. concrete benefits
- Labeling or stigma
WHICH AD REFLECTS SOCIAL MARKETING?

 Participant Views (N=70)

- Favorable views of frequent drug testing and contacts with the judge (100%)
- Negative views of treatment providers (70%)
  - Pressure to accept label of addiction
  - Ultimatums to comply with treatment
  - Judgmental responses
- Negative views of treatment quality (66%)
  - Exclusively group-based interventions
  - Unaddressed mental health needs (trauma, depression)
  - Prefer natural recovery supports (e.g., church) over 12-Step groups
- Unaddressed employment & educational needs (64%)

Gallagher, 2013; Gallagher & Nordberg, 2016; Gallagher et al., 2016; Gallagher & Wahler, in press; Dannerbeck-Janku et al., in press
Outcome Variation

N = 21,008 participants in 142 Treatment Courts

Diagram: Bar chart showing outcome variation by race in treatment courts. The chart indicates that most courts (61%) had equivalent outcomes by race, while some had better outcomes for African Americans.

Ho et al., in press

Best Practices

- Community members on Steering Committee
- Arrest for drug possession does not lead to termination from the program (police presence)
- Program routinely offers family counseling
- All team members, including treatment and defense counsel, attend staffings and hearings
- Program regularly reviews data on services and outcomes and makes modifications as needed
- Program census is less than 125 participants
- 90 days of sobriety is required for graduation

Ho et al., in press
Other Best Practices

- Staff and organizational readiness for change; managerial & supervisor supportiveness
- Treatment programs located in community
- Emphasize vocational & educational services
- Provide cognitive behavioral therapy (CBT)
- Focus on drugs of choice in affected community
- Prepare participants for peer support groups
- Administer gender-specific groups
- Staff personally involved in community
- Linkages and resources in community
- Professionally trained mentors

Culturally Proficient Treatment

Successful Graduation Rates

- African American: 41.5% (n = 65)
- Caucasian w/ GED: 21.9% (n = 114)
- Caucasian w/o GED: 7.1% (n = 56)

*Replicated: Beckerman & Fontana 2001; Marlowe et al., 2018*

Vito & Tewksbury (1998)
H.E.A.T.

- Culturally tailored, strength-based, trauma informed
- African American males 18 to 29 years of age
- Not presumed to be drug or alcohol dependent
- 80 sessions over 9 months:
  1. Self – prevalent myths, stereotypes and misconceptions of African American manhood
  2. Family – unrecognized and unacknowledged trauma
  3. Community – neighborhood challenges and threats
  4. Spirituality – natural and preferred recovery communities
  5. Mentoring and employment

Study 1: Feasibility

- Avg. 10 previous convictions
- Avg. 22 months of incarceration
- 90% of charges included drug trafficking
- Wide range of substances used
- 81% avg. session attendance rate
- Avg. of 65 sessions attended (SD=10 sessions)
- Avg. length of stay = 264 days
- 90% completed HEAT
- 71% on track to complete drug court
- Ratings of treatment satisfaction, counseling rapport, and peer support > 75th percentile
Study 2: Effect Size

- Reentry drug court
- Condition of parole
- Administrative discharge from parole
- Contemporary comparison group
- Matched comparison group

Effect Size: Cramer’s $V > 0.30$ (moderate)

$p < .05$
Conclusions

• Racial, ethnic and gender disparities permeate treatment courts
• Pretrial detention and bond contribute to disparities without protecting public safety
• Exclusionary charges (especially violence) contribute to disparities without protecting public safety
• Suitability determinations (especially by the prosecution) contribute to disparities
• Drug courts make poor efforts to sell their product
• Reflecting participants’ community-of-origin improves outcomes and reduces disparities

Conclusions (cont.)

• Following best practices improves outcomes and reduces disparities
• Culturally proficient interventions improve outcomes and reduce disparities
• There is no evidence that standardized and validated risk and need assessment tools exacerbate disparities, and substantial evidence they likely reduce disparities
• Ignoring these findings is a violation of the Adult Drug Court Best Practice Standards