



2025

Monitoring Sentencing Reform Report
Supplement

April 2025

Ohio Criminal Sentencing Commission

Chief Justice Sharon L. Kennedy, *Chair*

Judge Nick Selvaggio, *Champaign County Common Pleas Court, Vice Chair*

Director Amy Ast, *Ohio Department of Youth Services*

Brooke M. Burns, *Office of the Ohio Public Defender, Youth Defense Department*

Director Annette Chambers-Smith, *Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction*

Chief Charles Chandler, *Westerville Division of Police*

Judge Robert DeLamatre, *Erie County Common Pleas Court, Juvenile Division*

Judge Julia L. Dorrian, *Ohio 10th District Court of Appeals*

Lieutenant Kyle Erdeljac, *Columbus Division of Police*

Judge Timothy France, *Coshocton Municipal Court*

Sheriff John Hinton, *Morrow County Sheriff's Office*

Gwen Howe-Gebers, *Henry County Prosecuting Attorney, Juvenile*

Representative Latyna Humphrey, *Ohio House of Representatives*

Senator Catherine Ingram, *Ohio Senate*

Judge Kristen Johnson, *Hancock County Common Pleas Court, Probate and Juvenile Divisions*

Colonel Charles A. Jones, *Superintendent, Ohio State Highway Patrol*

Robert Krapenc, *Columbus Defense Attorney*

Timothy Lanzendorfer, *Attorney at Law, Ohio State Bar Association*

Teri LaJeunesse, *Victim Witness Division Director, Greene County Prosecutor's Office*

Senator Nathan Manning, *Ohio Senate*

Charles T. "Chip" McConville, *Knox County Prosecuting Attorney*

Judge Stephen McIntosh, *Franklin County Common Pleas Court*

Elizabeth Miller, *State Public Defender, Office of the Ohio Public Defender*

Judge Jennifer Muench-McElfresh, *Butler County Common Pleas Court*

Darren Shulman, *City Attorney, City of Upper Arlington*

Judge Helen Wallace, *Montgomery County Common Pleas Court, Juvenile Division*

Representative Josh Williams, *Ohio House of Representatives*

Commissioner Donnie Willis, *Jackson County Commissioner*

Judge Tyrone Yates, *Hamilton County Municipal Court*

Staff

Melissa A. Knopp, Esq., *Executive Director*

Michael Crofford, M.Ed., LPC, *Research Specialist*

William J. Davies, Esq., *Criminal Justice Counsel*

Angela Kay Garvey, *Coordinator*

Emily S. Haynes, Esq., M.L.S., *Criminal Justice Counsel*

Todd Ives (Lead Author), MPA, *Research Specialist*

Alex T. Jones, Esq., *Criminal Justice Counsel*

Acknowledgements

This supplemental report is the culmination of the hard work and dedication of the staff of the Ohio Criminal Sentencing Commission. The Commission would also like to thank interns Ben Prochaska, The Ohio State University Class of 2025, and Alishba Hussain, The Ohio State University Class of 2027, for their contributions to this report.

The Commission also would like to extend its gratitude to the following organizations for their assistance in providing information, expertise, or for otherwise contributing to this report:

Ohio Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services

Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction

Ohio Office of Criminal Justice Services

Supreme Court of Ohio Office of Court Services

Executive Summary

Overview

The Ohio Criminal Sentencing Commission (Commission) is statutorily required to produce a biennial Monitoring Report as prescribed by R.C. 181.25(A)(2)(a)-(c). The 2023 edition of the report, published in June 2024, was the first Monitoring Report since 2011. That edition of the report was the first to fully address all provisions of the Commission's R.C. 181.25(A)(2) responsibilities and set a framework for future reports. At the November 21, 2024, Commission meeting, the 2025 edition of the Monitoring Report was approved for publication on January 1, 2025. In addition, the Commission approved work on a supplemental report to the Monitoring Report to highlight the role of Ohio's certified specialized dockets and the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction's (ODRC) Targeted Community Alternatives to Prison (TCAP) program. This supplemental report is intended to showcase the effects

of these programs on individuals who are not sentenced to prison, as laid out in the R.C. 181.25(A)(2)(a)(i) provision of the Commission's Monitoring Report guidelines.

This supplemental report has been made possible by data provided by the Supreme Court of Ohio Specialized Dockets Section and the ODRC Bureau of Community Sanctions. As with previous Monitoring Reports, this report does not offer an evaluation of the efficacy of these programs or a cost-benefit analysis. It is intended to generate a baseline understanding of the nature of these programs and how they currently operate. This report is divided into two main sections – first an overview of the TCAP program and second, an analysis of Ohio's certified specialized dockets. The addition of these sections in the supplemental report will be included in future versions of the Monitoring Report.

Findings

Targeted Community Alternatives to Prison

The Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction's TCAP program provided over \$53,000,000 to 63 counties in the 2024-2025 state fiscal year. The number of felony four (F4) and felony five (F5) commitments in the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction's population decreased from 2018 to 2024, as did its total population. As a percentage of new commitments, F5s committed to ODRC decreased from 20% in 2018 to 14% in 2024. Targeted F5 offenders committed among the fiscal year (FY) 2024/2025 TCAP counties represented just over 19% of all admissions within those counties as a group in FY 2017, compared to just 7.6% in calendar year (CY) 2024. The percentage of new F4 commitments to ODRC decreased from 21% in 2021 to 18% in 2024. Because of the recency of including F4 offenders in the TCAP grant as a result of H.B. 110 (134th General Assembly), there is likely a lag in results of this program change.

Ohio's Certified Specialized Dockets

For the first time, programmatic data on Ohio's certified specialized dockets has been analyzed for publication in a report to Ohio's policymakers. Currently, there are 255 certified specialized dockets serving more than 6,100 individuals across the state. There are 13 types of certified specialized dockets, including dockets providing treatment services to families, juveniles, those suffering from substance abuse and/or mental health illnesses, veterans, and victims of human trafficking. Depending on the type of docket, an individual could spend 10 months to more than two years in a program. On average between 57-60% of those entering a certified specialized docket successfully graduate the program, and only 11-13% are charged with a new offense while in the program. The dockets receive funding from a variety of sources, and more than 70% of the participants in the programs receive Medicaid to cover treatment services.

Table of Contents

Targeted Community Alternatives to Prison (TCAP).....	1
Ohio's Certified Specialized Dockets.....	7
Appendix A: TCAP Funding by County.....	24
Appendix B: Additional Certified Specialized Dockets Data Tables.....	26

Targeted Community Alternatives to Prison (TCAP)

History and Overview

The Targeted Community Alternatives to Prison (TCAP) program is a grant funding opportunity provided by the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Corrections (ODRC). Its goal is to divert low level, non-violent offenders from state prisons in favor of treatment and other community-based alternatives in an effort to reduce prison population and costs and to rehabilitate offenders locally.¹ In 2017 the 132nd General Assembly passed H.B. 49 which created the TCAP program. Beginning July 1st, 2018, those sentenced to fifth-degree felonies in the designated counties with a prison term of 12 months or less could not be sent to prison and instead must serve their sentence locally with several exceptions including: if the offense was an offense of violence, sex offense, trafficking offense, or some other mandatory prison term, if the offender had a prior conviction for a sex offense or violent felony offense, or if the sentence was to be served concurrently to a prison eligible felony offense.

H.B. 49 mandated participation among the ten most populous counties at the time (Franklin, Cuyahoga, Hamilton, Summit, Montgomery, Lucas, Butler, Stark, Lorain, and Mahoning Counties) but allowed for other counties to voluntarily join.² In 2019, the 133rd General Assembly passed H.B. 166, which eliminated the mandatory participation of the targeted counties and consequently made TCAP participation voluntary for all counties.³ In 2023, the 134th General Assembly passed H.B. 110, which expanded TCAP to include fourth-degree felonies with the same exclusions as with the fifth-degree felonies. This allowed counties to voluntarily participate in the program and receive TCAP funding for either the F5 level or both the F4 and F5 level.⁴

Participating counties are able to use the funds on a variety of community correction purposes including, but not limited to, personnel costs, probation services, program expenses, equipment, electronic monitoring services (EM), contracts for residential or outpatient treatment services, residential services including local jail incarceration, etc. TCAP funding is not permitted to be used on capital projects.⁵ In order to apply for funding, counties must submit a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to the ODRC which then distributes the funding to participating counties.

1 *Targeting Community Alternatives to Prison by Helping Ohio Communities Manage Low-Level, Non-Violent Offenders*. Retrieved from <http://www.ccao.org/wp-content/uploads/TCAP%20Fact%20Sheet.pdf>

2 Ohio Legislative Services Commission: [hb49-drc-comparison-document-as-enrolled-132nd-general-assembly.pdf](#)


3 Ohio Legislative Services Commission: [hb166-drc-comparison-document-as-enrolled-133rd-general-assembly.pdf](#)

4 Ohio Legislative Services Commission: [hb110-drc-comparison-document-as-enrolled-134th-general-assembly.pdf](#)

5 *Targeting Community Alternatives to Prison by Helping Ohio Communities Manage Low-Level, Non-Violent Offenders*. Retrieved from <http://www.ccao.org/wp-content/uploads/TCAP%20Fact%20Sheet.pdf>

Figure 1 displays participating counties at both the F5 and combined F4 and F5 levels for the 2024-2025 fiscal year. Table 1 displays the number of participating counties at each level and the total funding amounts for each level and overall.⁶ A table of TCAP funding by county is included in Appendix A.

Figure 1. Counties Accepting TCAP Funds FY2024-2025



Source: Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction, Bureau of Community Sanctions

Table 1. Number of Counties Participating in TCAP and Funding Amounts

Level of TCAP Funds Accepted	Number of Participating Counties	Funding Amount
None	25	—
F5	37	\$25,877,680.00
F4/F5	26	\$27,829,123.00
Total TCAP Funding FY24-25	63	\$53,706,803.00


Source: Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction, Bureau of Community Sanctions

⁶ Provided data is for the FY24-25 grant cycle starting on 07/01/23 and ending on 06/30/25.

One of the initial concerns with the TCAP program is that it would shift the incarcerated population from prisons to the county jails. Jail population statistics over the course of the TCAP show a major decrease in jail incarceration in 2020, corresponding to COVID-19, and a plateauing of individuals incarcerated in jails from 2021 through 2023, below the levels from 2018-2019. Figures 2 through 7 display population trends encompassing the timeframe in which TCAP was active.


Figure 2 displays a historic look at ODCR's custody population over the last three decades. It shows total population by the number of annual commitments from the courts. This is compared to Figure 3, illustrating the incarceration rate nationwide in all state prisons.

Figure 2. ODCR FY Custody Population Count and New Court Commitments, 1996 - 2024



Source: Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction, Bureau of Research and Evaluation


Figure 3. Incarcerated Rates in State Prisons Nationwide, 2000-2022



Source: U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics, Prisoners in 2022 – Statistical Tables


Figure 4 and Figure 5 show the trends in ODRC’s F4 and F5 commitments over the last seven years. Figure 4 displays the total number of new commitments for F4s and F5s, while Figure 5 shows new commitments of F4s and F5s as a percentage of all new commitments.

Figure 4. ODRC Total Number of F4 and F5 New Commitments, FY18-FY24



Source: Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction, Annual Reports (2018-2024)


Figure 5. ODRC Percentage of F4 and F5 New Commitments, FY18-FY24



Source: Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction, Annual Reports (2018-2024)

Figure 6 shows a pre- and post- TCAP comparison of the program from 2017 to 2024, isolating the counties participating in the grant compared to those counties not participating.

Figure 6. F4/F5 TCAP Offenses⁷ as a Percentage of Total Commitments in FY 2017 and CY 2024, by TCAP Funding Recipient Status⁸




Source: Provided by ODRC Bureau of Research and Evaluation

7 F4/F5 TCAP offenses represent commitments where the most serious offense is a non-violent, non-mandatory time, non-2907/2925.03 offense. Offenders with a TCAP offense may have been committed under exclusionary criminal history criteria not available in administrative data

8 TCAP counties are defined on the basis of funding recipient status in the FY 24/25 grant period. Not all TCAP counties have both an F4 and F5 MOU, and not all currently participating counties were necessarily grant recipients in prior funding cycles.

Finally, Figure 7 gives a snapshot of the average daily jail inmate count in Ohio, from 2018 to 2023.

Figure 7. Average Daily Jail Inmate Count, 2018-2023 (Number of Jails in Parentheses)



Source: Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction, Bureau of Adult Detention

The introduction of TCAP has corresponded with a decrease in new commitments for that population, indicating that these policy changes are achieving their goals. The prison population was most dramatically impacted following the COVID-19 pandemic and remains below pre-pandemic levels, a trend that has been experienced in state prisons nationwide. Corresponding with the rollout of TCAP, the number of F5 commitments to prison began decreasing in 2019. Total new commitments of F5 offenders decreased from over 3,600 in 2018 to just below 2,000 in 2024, accelerated by COVID-related impacts on court processing and thus new prison commitments. Similarly, F4 commitments dropped from 3,600 in 2018 to around 2,600 in 2024. As a percentage of all commitments, F5s decreased from around 20% in 2018 to 14% in 2024. H.B. 110 (134th General Assembly) expanded TCAP to include fourth-degree felonies. Accordingly, the percentage of F4 commitments dropped from 21% in 2021 to 18% in 2024.

Figure 6 shows how the magnitude of these drops varied by whether a county participated in the FY 24/25 TCAP grant program by isolating the subset of non-violent/non-R.C. 2907 offenses targeted under TCAP. Targeted F5 offenders committed among the FY 24/25 TCAP counties represented just over 19% of all admissions within those counties as a group in FY 2017 (the most recent pre-TCAP statutory environment), compared to just 7.6% in CY 2024. In contrast, the change among non-TCAP counties was less than two percentage points (26.4% to 24.5%). The contrast is less pronounced among targeted F4 offenders, with a decline of just under two percentage points among the TCAP counties (9.3% to 7.5%) while virtually unchanged (10.9% to 10.8%) among the counties not participating in the F4 program.

Due to the recency of changes in sentencing F4 offenders and the inclusion of F4s into TCAP, the impact is likely to develop in future years. Although the impact of COVID-19 on jail populations cannot be isolated, the trends have not shown an increase in jail incarceration over the last three years.

Ohio's Certified Specialized Dockets

History and Overview

The specialized docket model is based on providing a therapeutically oriented judicial approach to providing court supervision and appropriate supervision to offenders. The framework for specialized dockets was first developed in 1989 in Miami - Dade County, Florida, the site of the nation's first drug court. The premise of treatment programs is to develop community collaborations for a complete systems approach to handling cases with the highest rates of recidivism. The model promotes wrap-around treatment services, intensive court monitoring, and immediate sanctions based on compliance with court supervision and treatment orders.⁹ Note that while the Ohio General Assembly has the authority to create courts, the local courts and the Supreme Court of Ohio maintains the sole authority to create dockets and certify specialized dockets.¹⁰ This report solely concerns certified specialized dockets.

In 2001, Chief Justice Thomas J. Moyer created the Specialized Dockets Section in the administrative offices of the Supreme Court of Ohio.¹¹ To institutionalize the specialized docket program, Chief Justice Moyer created the Advisory Committee on Specialized Dockets in 2009 with the stated purpose:

To provide ongoing advice to the Court and its staff regarding the promotion of statewide rules and uniform standards concerning specialized dockets in Ohio courts; the development and delivery of specialized docket services to Ohio courts, including training programs for judges and court personnel; and the consideration of any other issues the advisory committee deems necessary to assist the Court and its staff regarding specialized dockets in Ohio courts.¹²

In 2012, the Supreme Court of Ohio, as a result of this Committee, created minimum standards for certified specialized docket operations and a certification process to enforce these standards. The Advisory Committee on Specialized Dockets was elevated to the Commission on Specialized Dockets with the responsibility of overseeing the specialized docket certification process.¹³

9 The Supreme Court of Ohio Specialized Dockets Section. 2008. *A Handbook for Developing a Mental Health Court Docket*.

10 See R.C. 1901.186 and R.C. 1901.041 for drug court and drug recovery program creation.

11 Knopp, Melissa A. (2023) "Breaking the Cycle: Ohio Reentry Courts," *Ohio Northern University Law Review*: Vol. 41: Iss. 3, Article 9. Available at: https://digitalcommons.onu.edu/onu_law_review/vol41/iss3/9

12 Ibid.

13 The Supreme Court of Ohio, Rules of Superintendence, SUP. R. 36.02-36.28, available at <https://www.supremecourt.ohio.gov/docs/LegalResources/Rules/superintendence/Superintendence.pdf#Rule36.02>

Rule 36.20 of the Rules of Superintendence for the Courts of Ohio establishes the procedure for certification of a specialized docket as follows:

The judge of a court of common pleas, municipal court, or county court or division of the court operating or establishing a particular session of court that offers a therapeutically oriented judicial approach to providing court supervision and appropriate treatment to individuals may receive certification of the session from the Supreme Court by doing both of the following:

- (1) Complying with and adopting a local rule or issuing an administrative order implementing the “Specialized Docket Standards,” as set forth in Appendix I to this rule;
- (2) Successfully completing the certification application process pursuant to Sup. R. 36.21 through 36.26.

Pursuant to Superintendence Rules 36.20 through 36.28, effective January 1, 2013, all specialized dockets operating in Ohio must be certified by the Supreme Court of Ohio. The data presented in this section is provided by the Specialized Dockets Section, unless otherwise noted.

As of 2024, there are 255 certified specialized dockets operating in Ohio tied to substance use or mental health. Table 2 displays the total number of certified specialized dockets in Ohio by type, along with their updated naming convention.¹⁴

Table 2. Number of Certified Specialized Dockets by Docket Type

Previous Docket Title	New Docket Title	Number of Dockets
Drug	Adult Substance Use	106
Drug - Domestic Violence	Substance Use - Domestic Violence	5
Drug - Human Trafficking	Substance Use - Human Trafficking Victims	6
Drug - Reentry	Substance Use - Reentry	10
Drug - Veterans Treatment	Substance Use - Veterans Treatment	29
Family Dependency Treatment	Substance Use - Family Dependency Treatment	31
Juvenile Drug	Juvenile Substance Use	11
Juvenile Drug - Human Trafficking	Juvenile Substance Use - Human Trafficking Victims	1
Juvenile Mental Health	Juvenile Mental Health	4
Juvenile Treatment	Juvenile Treatment	6
Mental Health	Mental Health	36
Operating Vehicle under the Influence (OVI)	Operating Vehicle under the Influence (OVI)	7
Substance Abuse Mental Illness (SAMI)	Substance Use Mental Illness (SUMI)	3
Grand Total		255

14 As of the publication of this report, the Supreme Court of Ohio Specialized Dockets Section is updating the naming convention of the specialized docket types. Table 2 displays the old title of the dockets compared to the new titles, for reference. The new titles are used throughout this report, but refer to the same docket types as listed in the previous docket title column.

Table 3 displays the total number of certified specialized dockets by court jurisdiction.

Table 3. Number of Certified Specialized Dockets by Court Jurisdiction


Court Jurisdiction	Number of Specialized Dockets
County Court	12
Common Pleas: Domestic, Juvenile	10
Common Pleas: General	64
Common Pleas: General, Domestic	37
Common Pleas: General, Domestic, Probate	1
Common Pleas: General, Domestic, Probate, Juvenile	3
Common Pleas: General, Probate	1
Common Pleas: Juvenile	14
Common Pleas: Probate	1
Common Pleas: Probate, Juvenile	26
Common Pleas: Probate, Juvenile, Domestic	2
Municipal	84
Grand Total	255

As shown in Table 2, the thirteen certified specialized docket types are designed to address specific populations. Note that specific eligibility criteria may vary by program. The Specialized Dockets Section offers training and assistance to dockets based on Ohio’s certification standards and national best practices.¹⁵ Guidance exists for each of the certified specialized docket types, but the dockets themselves determine eligibility in adherence to certification standards.

15 See <https://www.supremecourt.ohio.gov/courts/services-to-courts/specialized-docket-section/national-best-practices-resources/>

Figure 8 provides a map of the total number of certified specialized dockets in each county in Ohio. Currently, 68 counties (77%) in Ohio have at least one certified specialized docket.

Figure 8. Total Number of Certified Specialized Dockets by County, 2024¹⁶



¹⁶ The grey shaded counties with no numbers do not contain a certified specialized docket.

Methodology

In 2019, the Supreme Court of Ohio, pursuant to Sup. R. 37, began collecting data among the certified specialized dockets.¹⁷ This supplemental report relies on a data extract, pulled on December 9, 2024, provided to the Commission for analysis. Analysis primarily centers on years of 2019-2023 to show the most complete picture of full program reporting. Because at the time of the data extraction not all dockets reported full 2024 program data, this year is excluded from the trend analyses. This analysis does not study the efficacy or Ohio's certified specialized dockets, but instead provides a descriptive, programmatic overview of the operation of these programs.¹⁸ For a comprehensive study on the impact of certified specialized dockets, a standard definition of docket type and target populations would be required. Data collected should also match the stated goals of performing an impact evaluation of the dockets.

Certified specialized dockets report data monthly on all individuals in their docket.¹⁹ Commission staff analyzed the data extract to present key data at an aggregated level on Ohio's certified specialized dockets. As only certified specialized dockets are required to report data, this report does not present analysis on any programs that are not certified. The analysis provides policymakers and stakeholders with a descriptive overview of the various certified specialized dockets and presents no individually identifiable information.²⁰ Appendix B of this report shows more detailed tables by docket type for the graphics presented below.

17 See <https://www.supremecourt.ohio.gov/docs/LegalResources/Rules/superintendence/Superintendence.pdf#Rule37>

18 For an impact study of Ohio drug courts see Shaffer, D. K., Listwan, S. J., Latessa, E. J., & Lowenkamp, C. T. (2008). Examining the Differential Impact of Drug Court Services by Court Type: Findings From Ohio. *Drug Court Review*, 6(1), 33–66.

19 For reporting instructions and definitions of each data point, see <https://www.supremecourt.ohio.gov/docs/JCS/specDockets/events/dataCollectionWebinar/dataCollectionInstruct.pdf>

20 For more information on certified docket data reporting, see <https://www.supremecourt.ohio.gov/courts/services-to-courts/specialized-docket-section/>

Analysis of Ohio's Certified Specialized Dockets

As of December 9, 2024, there are over 6,000 individuals participating in a certified specialized docket. Table 4 shows a snapshot of all current participants, by docket type.

Table 4. Current Certified Specialized Docket Participants by Docket Type

Docket Type	Number of Participants	Percent
Adult Substance Use	3,274	53.3%
Substance Use - Domestic Violence	188	3.1%
Substance Use - Human Trafficking Victims	267	4.4%
Substance Use - Reentry	254	4.1%
Substance Use - Veterans Treatment	593	9.7%
Substance Use - Family Dependency Treatment	380	6.2%
Juvenile Substance Use	83	1.4%
Juvenile Substance Use - Human Trafficking Victims	11	.2%
Juvenile Mental Health	33	.5%
Juvenile Treatment	28	.5%
Mental Health	851	13.9%
Operating Vehicle under the Influence (OVI)	100	1.6%
Substance Use Mental Illness (SUMI)	75	1.2%
Grand Total	6137	

The majority of individuals in certified specialized dockets participate in a substance use docket of some kind, which drives most of the trends shown in this report, and mental health dockets represent nearly 15% of all participants. Adult dockets also make up the largest slice of participants, at just below 92% of all participants. Juvenile and family dockets represent 8.7% of all participants in the data.

It is also important to note the length of time spent in these programs. Table 5 displays the average length of time in each program in months. This length of time in program is defined from the date an individual entered the program to the date they exited the program. The program participation time is shown across each type of exit, successful, unsuccessful, or neutral. The average time in program is derived from all exits from certified specialized dockets from 2019 to 2024, of which there were 15,982 exits.

Table 5. Time in Docket by Exit Type, from all Exits 2019-2024²¹

Docket Type	Successful Exit (Mos)	Neutral Exit (Mos)	Unsuccessful Exit (Mos)	All Exits Average (Mos)
Adult Substance Use	18.6	11.5	13.3	16.1
Substance Use - Domestic Violence	11.0	8.8	10.1	10.7
Substance Use - Human Trafficking Victims	25.6	20.9	18.6	22.0
Substance Use - Reentry	14.6	13.6	12.1	13.5
Substance Use - Veterans Treatment	17.7	15.3	16.9	17.4
Substance Use - Family Dependency Treatment	15.6	11.1	9.4	12.7
Juvenile Substance Use	12.2	12.7	14.7	13.1
Juvenile Substance Use - Human Trafficking Victims	9.9	6.5	8.3	9.1
Juvenile Mental Health	17.9	13.7	16.3	17.0
Juvenile Treatment	12.2	11.8	11.7	11.9
Mental Health	17.5	11.0	12.6	15.3
Operating Vehicle under the Influence (OVI)	16.5	11.2	10.2	14.7
Substance Use Mental Illness (SUMI)	25.5	9.8	13.9	18.7

On average, those who successfully exited a docket spent more time in the program than those who had a neutral or unsuccessful exit. Depending on the docket, the average participant who exited a docket successfully could spend anywhere from ten months to over two years in a program.

²¹ Note that it is possible for individuals to exit a docket due to the docket ending. These individuals have been excluded from analysis.

The remainder of the report shows trends in certified specialized dockets from 2019 to 2023. To provide context to these numbers, Figure 9 shows the number of dockets reporting data, per calendar year. Overall, the number of certified specialized dockets has remained steady after a slight increase in 2021.

Figure 9. Number of Certified Specialized Dockets Reporting Data, 2019-2023





Figure 10 displays the total number of program referrals and acceptances by year from 2019 through 2023 for all certified specialized dockets. This gives an idea of how many individuals are accepted into a docket out of the total number referred. Note that an individual may be referred to a docket in a calendar year and accepted in the next calendar year.


Figure 10. Referrals and Acceptances to Certified Specialized Dockets, by Year



Again, similar trends emerge where program referrals and acceptances decrease in 2020. While referrals begin to rebound in 2021, the number of acceptances remains static around 3,200 for the last four years.


Figure 11 shows the acceptance rate, as a percentage, from 2019 to 2023. This represents the percentage of individuals who had a determination of acceptance into a docket in a calendar year and were ultimately accepted into a docket. The (n=) by the year indicates the total number of people who had an acceptance determination in each year.

Figure 11. Docket Acceptance Rate, by Year




Pre-COVID-19 trends cannot be established with the data available. Since 2020, however, on average 64-66% of individuals are accepted into a docket. Figure 12 explores the reasons why an individual does not enter a docket.

Figure 12. Reason for Non-Acceptance into Docket (in percentages), by Year



For data reporting, dockets can record one of three reasons for why an individual is not ultimately accepted into the docket. It can be determined that an individual does not meet the program criteria, an individual could opt-out of a docket, and an individual might not complete the referral process for a variety of reasons. The trends for not being accepted into a docket remain static, with those not meeting the participation criteria as the most common reason. Note that individuals may opt out of a docket for many reasons. The intensive treatment process of certified specialized dockets and length of time required may deter individuals from enrolling in a program. One study of federal drug courts from the Government Accountability Office found that individuals might not enroll in a program “because of the day-to-day time commitment or overall length of the program. Adult drug court programs last from 12 to 36 months, and require frequent drug testing, regular court appearances, intensive treatment, and more intensive oversight from probation officers. For instance, individuals may perceive conditions placed on program participants as severe.”²² Figure 13 shows the same data on docket non-acceptances in raw numbers.

Figure 13. Reason for Non-Acceptance into Docket (in raw totals), by Year



22 United States Government Accountability Office. (2023). Factors Related to Eligibility and Acceptance of Offers to Participate in DOJ Funded Adult Drug Courts. Available at <https://www.gao.gov/assets/gao-23-105272.pdf>

The data also shows how individuals are referred to a docket. The case status at referral is divided into different reporting types for adult versus juvenile and family dockets. For adults, cases can be referred pre-conviction, post-conviction, or through a diversion program such as intervention in lieu of conviction or prosecutorial diversion. Figure 14 shows how cases are referred to adult dockets. Figure 15 displays the same data in raw totals.

Figure 14. Case Status at Referral in Adult Dockets (by percentage), by Year





Figure 15. Case Status at Referral in Adult Dockets (by raw total), by Year



For juvenile and family dockets, individuals are referred either pre-adjudication or post-adjudication. Figure 16 shows how individuals in these dockets are referred. Figure 17 displays the same data as raw totals rather than percentages.

Figure 16. Case Status at Referral in Juvenile and Family Dockets (by percentage), by Year





Figure 17. Case Status at Referral in Juvenile and Family Dockets (by raw total), by Year



The next set of figures looks at program exit data. Individuals in a certified specialized docket can exit in one of four ways: (1) successfully, (2) unsuccessfully, (3) neutrally, or (4) because the docket ended. While a docket can end while an individual is still participating, this is relatively rare. Figure 18 shows total docket exits by year, including all types of exits. Note that because data collection began in the middle of 2019, there is not full reporting on all exits for 2019. Therefore, analysis for exits is included for years 2020-2023.

Figure 18. Total Docket Exits, by Year





Figure 19 shows percentages of each exit type by year. Note that for this figure, exits due to a docket ending are excluded from analysis as this does not represent individuals who have the possibility of completing the program. The (n=) indicates the total number of exits by year.

Figure 19. Type of Program Exit (by percentage), by Year




The majority of certified specialized docket participants exit the program successfully, with 2023 representing the most successful year in which nearly 60% of the participants graduated the program. Table 6 shows the same data in raw numbers.

Table 6. Type of Program Exit (by raw total), by Year

Year	Successful Exit	Unsuccessful Exit	Neutral Exit	Total Exits
2019	1,074	741	189	2,004
2020	1,943	1,171	245	3,359
2021	1,720	1,046	235	3,001
2022	1,623	987	258	2,868
2023	1,590	847	232	2,669

Data is also collected on individuals who were charged with a new offense while participating in a certified specialized docket. This only applies to new charges that occurred while the participant was in the docket only, not violations. Also, if the participant is charged with an offense while in the docket, but for an action that occurred before docket participation, this is not counted as a new offense. Figure 20 is a combination graph which shows the percentage and total number of all participants who exited a program and were charged with a new criminal offense, by year. This is evaluated for each cohort of participants who exited a certified specialized docket in each given year. The (n=) indicates the total number of program exits for each year. For example, of all individuals who exited a docket in 2020, 11.4% were charged with a new offense.

Figure 20. Percentage and Total of Program Exits Charged with a New Offense while Participating in the Docket



Overall, the percentage of exiting docket participants who picked up a new charge in the program remains low, between 11-13% for the last four years. To reiterate, this is not a measure of program violations or other in-program sanctions.

The final set of figures shows how individuals in specialized dockets are funded. To start, the Ohio Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services provides funding for all types of specialized dockets programs. The line item for specialized dockets funding increased from \$5 million in fiscal year 2020 to \$10 million in fiscal year 2021, where it remains today. This increased the number of specialized dockets funded from 138 in fiscal year 2020 to 225 currently.²³ The average funding award for each program is \$45,428. The allowable use of funding includes staff, services, medication, recovery supports, and more.²⁴


23 Figures provided by Christopher Nicastro, Chief of the Bureau of Criminal Justice at the Ohio Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services. Note that funding goes to additional programs outside of the certified specialized dockets. For more information see: <https://mha.ohio.gov/community-partners/criminal-justice/court-resources/specialized-dockets>

24 The full list of allowable funding categories can be found here: <https://dam.assets.ohio.gov/image/upload/mha.ohio.gov/CommunityPartners/criminal-justice/CourtResources/Specialized-Dockets-Allowable-Expenses.pdf>

Specialized dockets also received funding grants through the Ohio Office of Criminal Justice Services. From fiscal year 2018 through 2025, over \$1,400,000 has been provided to specialized dockets through Justice Assistance Grants (JAG). In addition to the JAG, in 2024, over \$1,300,00 in grants were awarded through the Byrne State Crisis Intervention Program (SCIP) to specialized dockets.²⁵

Finally, data provided by the Supreme Court of Ohio Specialized Dockets Section records the source of funding for certified specialized dockets among participants to be used for medical care, behavioral health treatment, and other services or requirements of the docket (for example drug testing, group fees, etc.). Figure 21 shows the number and percentage of participants for each year that received funding through Medicaid or Managed Care. Note that an individual might have more than one source of health insurance. Also note, that this is among exiting participants, as the final source of health insurance is marked upon program exit.

Figure 21. Percentage and Number of Individuals on Medicaid, by Year



This supplemental report marks the first time comprehensive data on certified specialized dockets has been analyzed for publication. It is designed to provide policymakers and Commission stakeholders with an overview of how certified specialized dockets operate in Ohio. Ideally, this analysis contributes to a baseline understanding of the programs designed to divert individuals from incarceration. Further, this report can guide further insight and thought into how this data can be used for future evaluation and analysis on the operation of these programs. The Commission will continue to monitor the subject of this supplemental report along with its other statutory duties in future iterations of its biennial Monitoring Report.

²⁵ For more information on grants administered through the Ohio Office of Justice Statistics, see: <https://ocjs.ohio.gov/grants-funding-monitoring>

Appendix A: TCAP Funding by County

TCAP Funding by Ohio County - Felony 5 Only	
Ohio County	TCAP Funding
Ashtabula	\$ 468,973.00
Brown	\$ 293,391.00
Butler	\$ 2,476,698.00
Clinton	\$ 317,606.00
Coshocton	\$ 169,480.00
Cuyahoga	\$ 4,500,000.00
Darke	\$ 178,251.00
Erie	\$ 552,715.00
Fairfield	\$ 723,952.00
Franklin	\$ 4,500,000.00
Gallia	\$ 218,659.00
Geauga	\$ 284,023.00
Greene	\$ 873,739.00
Guernsey	\$ 202,458.00
Hancock	\$ 322,294.00
Henry	\$ 150,000.00
Highland	\$ 290,926.00
Holmes	\$ 150,000.00
Huron	\$ 294,852.00
Jefferson	\$ 228,840.00
Logan	\$ 235,439.00
Mahoning	\$ 1,171,446.00
Medina	\$ 824,332.00
Paulding	\$ 154,063.00
Perry	\$ 150,000.00
Pike	\$ 150,000.00
Preble	\$ 207,481.00
Putnam	\$ 150,000.00
Ross	\$ 615,690.00
Stark	\$ 1,961,002.00
Trumbull	\$ 1,227,333.00
Van Wert	\$ 156,626.00
Vinton	\$ 150,000.00
Washington	\$ 254,880.00
Wayne	\$ 453,761.00
Williams	\$ 184,047.00
Wood	\$ 634,723.00
Total	\$ 25,877,680.00

TCAP Funding by Ohio County - Felony 4 and 5

Ohio County	TCAP Amount
Allen	\$ 655,361.00
Athens	\$ 386,987.00
Belmont	\$ 610,332.00
Defiance	\$ 233,000.00
Fayette	\$ 834,955.00
Hamilton	\$ 6,172,800.00
Harrison	\$ 190,800.00
Hocking	\$ 265,227.00
Knox	\$ 362,562.00
Lawrence	\$ 921,711.00
Licking	\$ 1,525,560.00
Lorain	\$ 1,701,580.00
Lucas	\$ 2,244,164.00
Meigs	\$ 150,000.00
Monroe	\$ 231,600.00
Montgomery	\$ 3,952,495.00
Morgan	\$ 170,400.00
Morrow	\$ 272,400.00
Noble	\$ 190,800.00
Ottawa	\$ 292,800.00
Pickaway	\$ 740,057.00
Sandusky	\$ 485,494.00
Seneca	\$ 392,488.00
Summit	\$ 3,970,263.00
Tuscarawas	\$ 544,388.00
Union	\$ 330,899.00
Total	\$ 27,829,123.00

Appendix B: Additional Certified Specialized Dockets Data Tables

Table B1. Dockets Reporting Data in Each Year

Docket Type	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Adult Substance Use	98	100	105	104	103
Substance Use - Domestic Violence	5	5	5	7	6
Substance Use - Human Trafficking Victims	5	6	6	6	6
Substance Use - Reentry	11	9	9	10	9
Substance Use - Veterans Treatment	23	23	28	29	27
Substance Use - Family Dependency Treatment	28	31	35	33	32
Juvenile Substance Use	15	15	12	13	12
Juvenile Substance Use - Human Trafficking Victims	0	1	1	2	2
Juvenile Mental Health	5	4	4	4	3
Juvenile Treatment	5	5	6	6	7
Mental Health	35	35	36	38	39
Operating Vehicle under the Influence (OVI)	6	6	6	6	5
Substance Use Mental Illness (SUMI)	2	2	2	3	4
Total	238	242	255	261	255

Table B2. Docket Acceptances, by Year

Docket Type	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Adult Substance Use	2,322	1,638	1,731	1,665	1,735
Substance Use - Domestic Violence	123	125	71	118	112
Substance Use - Human Trafficking Victims	116	62	80	92	97
Substance Use - Reentry	242	155	132	124	148
Substance Use - Veterans Treatment	274	208	268	261	246
Substance Use - Family Dependency Treatment	350	312	288	263	268
Juvenile Substance Use	149	100	87	85	74
Juvenile Substance Use - Human Trafficking Victims	10	7	5	6	8
Juvenile Mental Health	41	35	26	17	11
Juvenile Treatment	29	33	36	44	33
Mental Health	516	365	378	413	388
Operating Vehicle under the Influence (OVI)	59	49	49	52	47
Substance Use Mental Illness (SUMI)	34	29	56	40	43
Total	4,265	3,118	3,207	3,180	3,210

Table B3. Docket Referrals, by Year

Docket Type	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Adult Substance Use	3,110	2,411	2,683	2,771	27,40
Substance Use - Domestic Violence	231	208	146	197	193
Substance Use - Human Trafficking Victims	144	87	111	106	135
Substance Use - Reentry	370	356	263	243	248
Substance Use - Veterans Treatment	397	281	422	397	389
Substance Use - Family Dependency Treatment	526	542	544	494	472
Juvenile Substance Use	172	129	109	108	99
Juvenile Substance Use - Human Trafficking Victims	6	7	5	8	9
Juvenile Mental Health	50	44	28	24	11
Juvenile Treatment Mental Health	33	33	45	49	42
Operating Vehicle under the Influence (OVI)	79	70	95	71	78
Substance Use Mental Illness (SUMI)	63	60	93	90	117
Total	5,954	4,864	5,282	5,314	5,260

Table B4. Docket Acceptance Rate, by Year

Docket Type	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Adult Substance Use	79.9%	69.7%	70.7%	66.3%	66.2%
Substance Use - Domestic Violence	61.8%	64.1%	63.4%	68.2%	62.9%
Substance Use - Human Trafficking Victims	85.9%	78.5%	78.4%	90.2%	85.1%
Substance Use - Reentry	67.0%	42.7%	52.4%	50.6%	58.7%
Substance Use - Veterans Treatment	76.5%	70.5%	69.1%	64.8%	65.3%
Substance Use - Family Dependency Treatment	73.1%	59.8%	61.4%	60.3%	60.0%
Juvenile Substance Use	89.2%	80.0%	76.3%	85.9%	80.4%
Juvenile Substance Use - Human Trafficking Victims	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Juvenile Mental Health	80.4%	79.5%	83.9%	77.3%	100.0%
Juvenile Treatment Mental Health	85.3%	100.0%	90.0%	93.6%	94.3%
Operating Vehicle under the Influence (OVI)	76.6%	63.6%	58.3%	73.2%	67.1%
Substance Use Mental Illness (SUMI)	55.7%	50.0%	61.5%	44.9%	36.1%
Total	76.7%	64.9%	66.3%	64.2%	64.1%

Table B5. Total Program Exits, by Year

Docket Type	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Adult Substance Use	993	1895	1729	1553	1558
Substance Use - Domestic Violence	43	81	94	75	101
Substance Use - Human Trafficking Victims	56	73	70	71	64
Substance Use - Reentry	167	152	144	142	118
Substance Use - Veterans Treatment	128	207	195	211	220
Substance Use - Family Dependency Treatment	184	317	288	249	269
Juvenile Substance Use	108	126	96	80	75
Juvenile Substance Use - Human Trafficking Victims	13	7	6	6	5
Juvenile Mental Health	38	31	24	18	10
Juvenile Treatment Mental Health	11	28	36	41	41
Mental Health	240	360	355	351	285
Operating Vehicle under the Influence (OVI)	39	49	35	45	41
Substance Use Mental Illness (SUMI)	14	49	30	42	36
Total	2,034	3,375	3,102	2,884	2,823

Table B6. Percentage of Successful Exits, by Year

Docket Type	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Adult Substance Use	51.7%	55.6%	56.8%	56.1%	58.1%
Substance Use - Domestic Violence	65.1%	65.4%	73.4%	77.3%	79.2%
Substance Use - Human Trafficking Victims	44.6%	43.8%	50.0%	43.7%	42.2%
Substance Use - Reentry	45.5%	66.2%	52.8%	53.5%	61.9%
Substance Use - Veterans Treatment	71.9%	76.3%	76.9%	74.9%	73.1%
Substance Use - Family Dependency Treatment	47.3%	53.3%	46.9%	49.0%	50.4%
Juvenile Substance Use	58.3%	56.7%	61.7%	59.5%	58.9%
Juvenile Substance Use - Human Trafficking Victims	38.5%	57.1%	33.3%	50.0%	100.0%
Juvenile Mental Health	56.0%	71.0%	66.7%	61.1%	90.0%
Juvenile Treatment Mental Health	45.5%	39.3%	36.1%	46.3%	39.0%
Mental Health	58.3%	61.1%	57.5%	54.7%	63.6%
Operating Vehicle under the Influence (OVI)	81.3%	65.3%	68.6%	73.3%	75.6%
Substance Use Mental Illness (SUMI)	21.4%	53.1%	40.0%	23.8%	30.6%
Total	53.6%	57.8%	57.3%	56.6%	59.6%

