

Michigan Drug Treatment Courts

Annual Report and Evaluation Summary



Project Years

October 1, 2005 – September 30, 2006

October 1, 2006 – September 30, 2007

Provided by the
Michigan Supreme Court
State Court Administrative Office

Executive Summary

Seventy-nine drug treatment court programs operate in Michigan to reduce substance abuse and criminal activity through a combination of therapeutic services and judicial supervision. Programs admit nonviolent offenders from circuit and district courts, drunk driving offenders, juvenile offenders, parents with cases in the family division of circuit court, and defendants in tribal court. During fiscal years 2006 and 2007, more than 4,765 people were admitted to drug courts, more than 6,956 cases were active in drug court, and more than 2,624 individuals completed a drug court program.

The Michigan Supreme Court's State Court Administrative Office (SCAO) administers state and federal grant programs that fund drug courts throughout the state. In 2007, SCAO awarded \$1,797,000 in state funds to 52 drug courts and \$1,788,000 in federal funds to 11 drug courts. The federal dollars, from the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program, are used collaboratively by SCAO, the Department of Corrections, and the Office of Drug Control Policy to divert prison-bound nonviolent offenders.

Graduates of Michigan's adult circuit and adult district drug courts are unlikely to be charged with new offenses in the first 12 months after graduation. Of the individuals who successfully completed an adult circuit drug court program, only 11 percent were charged with committing a new crime in the first 365 days after graduation. Of the individuals who successfully completed an adult district drug court program, only 10.6 percent were charged with committing a new crime in the first 365 days after graduation.

Graduates of Michigan's driving while intoxicated (DWI) courts are very unlikely to be charged with either a drunk driving charge or any criminal offense in the subsequent one-year period. Of the individuals who successfully completed a DWI court program, only 2.6 percent were charged with committing a new drunk driving offense and only 6.5 percent were charged with committing either a new drunk driving offense or a criminal offense within one year of graduation.

These postgraduation recidivism rates were calculated for those who successfully completed drug court prior to July 1, 2007. Additional measures of success, including retention in the program, completion of the program, improvement in employment and education, and postadmission rearrest rates, are provided in this report and generally pertain to participants active in fiscal years 2006 and 2007.

This report summarizes drug court activity for the two fiscal years that occurred between October 1, 2005, and September 30, 2007. Grant information and full evaluation reports are available on-line at <http://courts.michigan.gov/scao/services/tcs/spec.htm>. To request information by phone, contact SCAO's Specialty Courts Program at 517-373-7351.



Table of Contents

Overview of Drug Courts in Michigan5
Caseload Statistics8
Measures of Success13
 Retention13
 Completion.....13
 Improvement in Employment and Education14
 Postadmission Rearrest15
 Barry County Adult Drug Court15
 Kalamazoo County Adult Drug Court16
 Ottawa County DWI Court16
 Bay County DWI Court16
 City of Clarkston DWI Court.....16
 Postgraduation Recharge17
Appendix A: Descriptions of Drug Court Types18



List of Tables

Table 1: Types of Drug Courts	5
Table 2: Michigan Drug Courts	6
Table 3: New Admissions and Active Cases	8
Table 4: Most Serious Charge.....	8
Table 5: Drugs Used	9
Table 6: Gender.....	10
Table 7: Ethnicity.....	10
Table 8: Age at Screening.....	11
Table 9: Education at Admission.....	11
Table 10: Employment at Admission	12
Table 11: Retention.....	13
Table 12: Completion	14
Table 13: Improvement in Employment or Education	14
Table 14: Postadmission Rearrest.....	15
Table 15: Postgraduation Recharge	17



Overview of Drug Courts in Michigan

Individuals who are addicted to alcohol or drugs are often involved in criminal proceedings. Historically, courts punished drug offenders without addressing their underlying addictions; consequently, offenders frequently cycled in and out of the criminal justice system. Beginning in the late 1980s, drug courts offered an effective solution to alcohol- and drug-related crime by addressing the underlying cause and treating addiction as a complex disease.

A drug court handles cases involving substance-abusing offenders and provides comprehensive services and supervision. Drug courts hold offenders accountable for their behavior through intensive judicial supervision, immediate and graduated incentives and sanctions, and frequent drug testing. Drug courts rely on numerous professionals, including judges, prosecutors, defense counsel, substance abuse treatment specialists, probation officers, law enforcement personnel, correctional personnel, educational and vocational experts, and community leaders.

As of February 2008, there were 81 drug treatment courts in Michigan; 79 in operation and two in the planning stage. Seventeen drug courts admit nonviolent offenders from circuit courts and twelve admit nonviolent offenders from district court. Twenty-four additional circuit and district drug courts, called Driving While Intoxicated (DWI) courts, specialize in drunk driving offenders. Family dependency drug courts receive cases from the family division of circuit court; eight of these are in operation, and one is in the planning stage. In addition, fifteen juvenile drug courts are in operation, and one is in the planning stage. There are also at least three tribal drug courts in Michigan. See Appendix A for descriptions of each type of drug court.

Table 1
Types of Drug Courts
As of February 2008

Type of Drug Court	Operational Drug Courts	Drug Courts in Development	Total
Adult Circuit	17	0	17
Adult District	12	0	12
Driving While Intoxicated (DWI)	24	0	24
Family Dependency	8	1	9
Juvenile	15	1	16
Tribal	3	0	3
Total	79	2	81

Michigan has been a leader in the drug court movement. In June 1992, the first woman's drug treatment court in the nation was established in Kalamazoo County for the 9th Circuit Court. The program was a success, and other courts sought to establish their own drug court programs. The drug courts in operation as of February 2008 are listed by county on the next two pages.



Michigan Drug Treatment Courts
2008 Annual Report

Table 2
Michigan Drug Courts
As of February 2008

County	Court	Type of Drug Court
Alcona	23 rd Circuit Court	Adult
Barry	Barry County Trial Court	Adult
Barry	Barry County Trial Court	Juvenile
Bay	18 th Circuit Court	Family Dependency
Bay	74 th District Court	DWI
Berrien	Berrien County Trial Court	Adult
Calhoun	37 th Circuit Court	Adult
Cass	43 rd Circuit Court	Family Dependency
Charlevoix	33 rd Circuit Court	Juvenile
Charlevoix	90 th District Court	DWI
Chippewa	Gwaiak Miicon Drug Court	Tribal
Dickinson	95B District Court	Adult
Eaton	56 th Circuit Court	Adult
Eaton	56 th Circuit Court	Family Dependency
Eaton	56 th Circuit Court	Juvenile
Eaton	56 th District Court	DWI
Emmet	57 th Circuit Court	Juvenile
Emmet	Odawa Youth to Healing Wellness Program	Tribal
Genesee	67 th District Court	DWI
Genesee	68 th District Court	Adult
Genesee	7 th Circuit Court	Adult
Genesee	7 th Circuit Court	Family Dependency
Grand Traverse	13 th Circuit Court	Family Dependency
Grand Traverse	13 th Circuit Court	Juvenile
Grand Traverse	86 th District Court	DWI
Grand Traverse	Grand Traverse Band Tribal Court	Tribal
Hillsdale	1 st Circuit Court	Juvenile
Ingham	30 th Circuit Court	Family Dependency
Ingham	54A District Court	DWI
Ingham	55 th District Court	DWI
Ionia	64A District Court	DWI
Iron	Iron County Trial Court	Adult
Isabella	Isabella County Trial Court	Adult
Isabella	Isabella County Trial Court	Juvenile
Jackson	4 th Circuit Court	Adult
Jackson	4 th Circuit Court	Family Dependency
Kalamazoo	8 th District Court	DWI
Kalamazoo	9 th Circuit Court	Adult - Men
Kalamazoo	9 th Circuit Court	Adult - Women
Kalamazoo	9 th Circuit Court	Family Dependency
Kalamazoo	9 th Circuit Court	Juvenile
Kent	61 st District Court	Adult
Livingston	44 th Circuit Court	Adult
Livingston	44 th Circuit Court	Juvenile
Livingston	53 rd District Court	DWI



Michigan Drug Treatment Courts
2008 Annual Report

Table 2, continued
2008 Michigan Drug Courts
As of February 2008

County	Court	Type of Drug Court
Mackinac	92 nd District Court	DWI
Macomb	16 th Circuit Court	Adult
Macomb	16 th Circuit Court	Juvenile
Macomb	37 th District Court	Adult
Manistee	19 th Circuit Court	Juvenile
Marquette	96 th District Court	Adult
Monroe	38 th Circuit Court	Juvenile
Muskegon	60 th District Court	DWI
Oakland	43 rd District Court	DWI
Oakland	44 th District Court	Adult
Oakland	46 th District Court	DWI
Oakland	47 th District Court	DWI
Oakland	51 st District Court	DWI
Oakland	52 nd District Court – Division 1	DWI
Oakland	52 nd District Court – Division 2	DWI
Oakland	52 nd District Court – Division 3	DWI
Oakland	52 nd District Court – Division 4	Adult
Oakland	6 th Circuit Court	Adult
Oakland	6 th Circuit Court	Juvenile
Otsego	46 th Circuit Court	Adult
Ottawa	20 th Circuit Court	Adult
Ottawa	20 th Circuit Court	Juvenile
Ottawa	58 th District Court	DWI
Saginaw	10 th Circuit Court	Family Dependency
Washtenaw	15 th District Court	DWI
Washtenaw	22 nd Circuit Court	Juvenile
Wayne	16 th District Court	DWI
Wayne	19 th District Court	Adult
Wayne	23 rd District Court	Adult
Wayne	28 th District Court	Adult
Wayne	33 rd District Court	DWI
Wayne	34 th District Court	DWI
Wayne	35 th District Court	Adult
Wayne	36 th District Court	Adult
Wayne	3 rd Circuit Court	Adult
Wayne	3 rd Circuit Court	Juvenile



Michigan Drug Treatment Courts
2008 Annual Report

Caseload Statistics

Between October 1, 2005, and September 30, 2007, Michigan drug courts screened and admitted more than 4,765 individuals. During these two years, drug courts handled a total of 6,956 cases. Of the new admissions, more than 1,900 (40 percent) were drunk drivers, more than 1,300 (29 percent) were adults in circuit court, 905 (19 percent) were adults in district court, and 503 (11 percent) were juveniles. An additional 89 individuals with civil petitions in the family division of circuit court were admitted to a family dependency drug court.

Table 3
New Admissions and Active Cases

Type of Drug Court	New Admissions		Active Cases	
	#	%	#	%
Adult Circuit	1,364	29%	1,975	28%
Adult District	905	19%	1,358	20%
DWI	1,904	40%	2,866	41%
Family Dependency	89	2%	111	2%
Juvenile	503	11%	646	9%
Total	4,765	100%	6,956	100%

This table includes new admissions and active cases during fiscal years 2006 and 2007 from 71 drug courts.

Michigan drug courts provide services to persons charged with a variety of offenses, (excluding violent offenses), and persons involved in family division civil petitions. Of the participants with active cases during fiscal years 2006 and 2007, 36 percent were charged with one or more felony, 61 percent were charged with one or more misdemeanor, and 2 percent involved civil petitions or status offenses.

Table 4
Most Serious Charge

Type of Drug Court	Felony		Misdemeanor		Civil Petition		Status/ Other	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Adult Circuit	1,955	99%	17	1%	0	0%	1	0%
Adult District	105	8%	1,253	92%	0	0%	0	0%
DWI	269	9%	2,583	91%	0	0%	1	0%
Family Dependency	0	0%	0	0%	107	99%	1	1%
Juvenile	174	29%	377	63%	18	3%	31	5%
Total	2,503	36%	4,230	61%	125	2%	34	0%

This table includes active cases during fiscal years 2006 and 2007 from 71 drug courts.

Almost 100 percent of the offenders admitted to an adult circuit drug court were charged with at least one felony.



Michigan Drug Treatment Courts
2008 Annual Report

By contrast, the most serious offense charged to 92 percent of offenders admitted to adult district drug courts was a misdemeanor. Participants in the family dependency drug court arise from civil petitions filed in the family division, which typically involve allegations of child abuse or neglect. The majority (91 percent) of the offenders admitted to DWI courts were charged with a misdemeanor. Juveniles in drug court were charged with a variety of offenses, ranging from felonies (29 percent), to misdemeanor (63 percent) and status offenses (5 percent).

The primary drug used by participants in an adult circuit drug court includes alcohol (27 percent), cocaine/crack (25 percent), marijuana (16 percent), and heroin (13 percent). Multiple drugs (9 percent), opiates (4 percent), and methamphetamines/amphetamines (4 percent) were also relatively common.

Table 5
Drugs Used

Type of Drug Court	Alcohol %	Marijuana %	Cocaine/ Crack %	Heroin %
Adult Circuit	27%	16%	25%	13%
Adult District	53%	19%	18%	7%
DWI	84%	7%	5%	1%
Family Dependency	16%	23%	48%	3%
Juvenile	15%	82%	0%	0%
Total	55%	19%	13%	5%

Type of Drug Court	Multiple Drug %	Opiate %	Methamphetamine Amphetamine %	Other %
Adult Circuit	9%	4%	4%	2%
Adult District	2%	2%	0%	1%
DWI	2%	0%	0%	0%
Family Dependency	2%	3%	5%	2%
Juvenile	1%	0%	0%	1%
Total	4%	2%	1%	1%

This table includes active cases during fiscal years 2006 and 2007 from 71 drug courts. Barbituates, benzodiazepine, club drugs, hallucinogens, inhalants, sedatives, and hypnotics are included as other drugs.

More than half (53 percent) of the participants in adult district drug courts chose alcohol as their primary drug. Marijuana was the drug of choice for 19 percent of participants and cocaine/crack was the drug of choice for 18 percent of participants. An additional seven percent chose heroin as their primary drug of choice.

The majority (84 percent) of participants in the DWI drug courts chose alcohol as their primary drug of choice. Seven percent chose marijuana and five percent chose cocaine/crack.

Cocaine and crack cocaine were the most common drug of choice for almost half (48 percent) of the participants in the family dependency drug courts. Marijuana (23 percent) and



Michigan Drug Treatment Courts

2008 Annual Report

alcohol (16 percent) were also relatively common for participants in the family dependency drug courts. Methamphetamine or amphetamine was the drug of choice for five percent of the participants in the family dependency drug courts.

The majority (82 percent) of juveniles in the juvenile drug courts reported marijuana as their primary drug. An additional 15 percent indicated alcohol was their primary substance. Very few juveniles choose any drug other than alcohol or marijuana as their primary drug of choice.

Table 6
Gender

Type of Drug Court	Females		Males		Total #
	#	%	#	%	
Adult Circuit	533	27%	1,442	73%	1,975
Adult District	427	31%	1,931	69%	1,358
DWI	680	24%	2,186	76%	2,866
Family Dependency	98	88%	13	12%	111
Juvenile	148	23%	498	77%	646
Total	1,886	27%	5,070	73%	6,956

This table includes active cases during fiscal years 2006 and 2007 from 71 drug courts.

Overall, males were almost three times more likely than females to be admitted to a drug court. However, the majority (88 percent) of participants in family dependency drug courts were female. More than three-quarters of the participants in the DWI courts, which handled almost 3,000 cases, were male.

Seventy-six percent of participants in all drug courts were white. Eighty percent of the participants in DWI courts were white. By comparison, 66 percent of juveniles in juvenile drug court were white.

Table 7
Ethnicity

Type of Drug Court	Non-White		White		Total #
	#	%	#	%	
Adult Circuit	547	28%	1,428	72%	1,975
Adult District	333	25%	1,025	76%	1,358
DWI	561	20%	2,305	80%	2,866
Family Dependency	36	32%	75	68%	111
Juvenile	223	35%	423	66%	646
Total	1,700	24%	5,256	76%	6,956

This table includes active cases during fiscal years 2006 and 2007 from 71 drug courts.



Michigan Drug Treatment Courts

2008 Annual Report

A substantial portion (28 percent) of drug court participants were between the ages of 22 and 30 when screened for admission. An additional 23 percent of participants were between 31 and 40 years old at screening. The majority of juveniles screened and admitted to juvenile drug courts were 15 or 16 years old.

Table 8
Age at Screening

Type of Drug Court	16 or Younger	17-18	19-21	22-30	31-40	41-50	51 or Older
Adult Circuit	0%	3%	10%	31%	29%	20%	6%
Adult District	0%	6%	14%	31%	23%	19%	6%
DWI	0%	5%	12%	31%	23%	20%	9%
Family Dependency	0%	0%	8%	42%	37%	12%	1%
Juvenile	93%	7%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Total	9%	5%	11%	28%	23%	18%	7%

This table includes active cases during fiscal years 2006 and 2007 from 71 drug courts.

Offenders admitted to DWI courts had a higher level of education than offenders admitted to other types of drug courts; 40 percent of participants had an education level above completion of high school. Additionally, more than half (58 percent) of the offenders admitted to DWI courts were employed full-time. By comparison, 49 percent of offenders admitted to a family dependency court had an education level below high school completion, and 68 percent were unemployed. Sixty-two percent of the juveniles admitted to juvenile drug court were in 9th or 10th grade at screening.

Table 9
Education at Admission

Type of Drug Court	Less Than 12 th Grade %	HS Diploma or GED %	More Than HS %	Total %
Adult Circuit	32%	49%	19%	100%
Adult District	31%	47%	22%	100%
DWI	22%	38%	40%	100%
Family Dependency	49%	32%	20%	100%
Juvenile	Less Than 9 th Grade 31%	9 th and 10 th Grades 62%	11 th and 12 th Grades 8%	Total 100%

This table includes active cases during fiscal years 2006 and 2007 from 71 drug courts.



Michigan Drug Treatment Courts
2008 Annual Report

Table 10
Employment at Admission

Type of Drug Court	Unemployed %	Employed Part Time %	Employed Full Time %	Not in Labor Force %	Total %
Adult Circuit	55%	11%	28%	6%	100%
Adult District	36%	16%	41%	6%	100%
DWI	21%	15%	58%	5%	100%
Family Dependency	68%	14%	9%	9%	100%
Juvenile	20%	8%	0%	72%	100%

This table includes active cases during fiscal years 2006 and 2007 from 71 drug courts.



Measures of Success

Several factors can be used to evaluate the success of drug courts, including retention in the program, completion of the program, improvement in employment or education, postgraduation recidivism rates, and postadmission recidivism rates.

Retention

National studies indicate that participants who stay in treatment longer and complete treatment are more likely to have positive outcomes and are less likely to be rearrested for a drug-related crime. Twelve months after admission, 72.8 percent of the participants in drug courts were either still in the program, or had successfully completed the program.

Table 11
Retention

Type of Drug Court	Percent Retained in Program
Adult Circuit	69.2%
Adult District	70.3%
DWI	78.5%
Family Dependency	50.5%
Juvenile	68.7%

This table includes a subset of cases that were active during fiscal years 2006 and 2007. It includes all successful cases, all transferred cases, cases discharged unsuccessfully or by voluntary withdrawal within 12 months, and any case active for at least 12 months.

The retention rates differed for each court type. DWI court achieved the highest retention rates at 78.5 percent. Adult district drug court retained 70.3 percent of its participants for at least 12 months. Adult circuit drug courts (69.2 percent) and juvenile drug courts (68.7 percent) also achieved high retention rates. The family dependency drug courts retained just over half of their participants (50.5 percent) for at least 12 months.

Completion

More than 50 percent of all individuals discharged from Michigan drug courts, totaling 2,624 individuals, successfully completed a drug court treatment program in fiscal years 2006 and 2007. More than 60 percent of individuals discharged from DWI courts completed the program. More than half of the individuals discharged from adult district drug courts and juvenile drug courts completed the program. Forty-five percent of individuals discharged from adult circuit drug courts and 41.7 percent of individuals discharged from family dependency drug courts successfully completed the program. These rates are within the range of completion rates reported by the U.S. Government Accountability Office for adult drug courts throughout the



Michigan Drug Treatment Courts

2008 Annual Report

nation.¹ In that report, the national range of completion rates for the adult drug courts ranged from 27 percent to 66 percent.

Table 12
Completion

Type of Drug Court	Successfully Completed	
	#	%
Adult Circuit	627	45.1%
Adult District	510	50.3%
DWI	1,183	60.6%
Family Dependency	40	41.7%
Juvenile	264	52.4%
Total	2,624	52.9%

This table includes successful and unsuccessful discharges from 71 drug courts.

Improvement in Employment and Education

Despite high employment rates in Michigan, many participants were able to improve their employment status by the time they were discharged or successfully graduated from drug court. More than half (53 percent) of graduates from adult circuit drug courts and more than half (53 percent) of the graduates of the family dependency drug courts reported improved employment. For juveniles, 87 percent reported an improvement in their educational level, suggesting that they were able to stay in school and continue to the next grade.

Table 13
Improvement in Employment or Education

Type of Drug Court	Employment		Education	
	All Discharges	Successful Discharges	All Discharges	Successful Discharges
	%	%	%	%
Adult Circuit	31%	53%	9%	15%
Adult District	25%	40%	13%	18%
DWI	33%	44%	13%	17%
Family Dependency	25%	53%	12%	28%
Juvenile	23%	41%	61%	87%

This table includes discharges from 71 drug courts.

¹ United States Government Accountability Office, Report to Congressional Committees. (February, 2005) *Adult Drug Courts: Evidence Indicates Recidivism Reductions and Mixed Results for Other Outcomes*. This report is available on-line at www.gao.gov/new.items/d05219.pdf.



Michigan Drug Treatment Courts

2008 Annual Report

Postadmission Rearrest

Five drug courts were involved in in-depth evaluations which included comparison groups. Postadmission rearrest rates for participants in five of Michigan's drug courts who did not complete the program were better than rearrest rates for nonparticipants. Graduates of these drug courts were even less likely to be arrested, which demonstrates that positive outcomes are achieved even for those who do not complete the program. In the 24 months following admission, recidivism rates were better for participants in two adult drug courts (Barry County and Kalamazoo County) and three DWI drug courts (Ottawa County, Bay County, and the City of Clarkston) than nonparticipants.

Table 14
Postadmission Rearrest

Drug Court	Nonparticipants	Drug Court Participants	Drug Court Graduates
Barry County Adult Drug Court	50%	26%	4%
Kalamazoo County Adult Drug Court	52%	38%	14%
Ottawa County DWI Court	24%	8%	NA
Bay County DWI Court	31%	16%	NA
City of Clarkston DWI Court	14%	5%	NA

Participants were followed for 24 months after admission to the drug court to determine if they were arrested for any offense. Nonparticipants include offenders who were eligible for admission to a drug court, but did not participate for some reason except those who declined to participate. Rates were calculated by NPC Research of Portland, Oregon.

Barry County Adult Drug Court

The Barry County Adult Drug Court (BCADC) is one of eleven courts in Michigan that targets the priority population of high-risk prison-bound offenders. It was subject to an outcome evaluation that concluded that BCADC "was successful in decreasing drug abuse, reducing participant recidivism, and producing cost savings for the taxpayer."² BCADC's recidivism rates were particularly positive.

Offenders admitted to BCADC were less likely to be arrested after admission than offenders who were eligible for the program but did not participate. Within 24 months after admission, 26 percent of the BCADC participants were arrested for a new offense. By comparison, 50 percent of the offenders who were eligible for the program but did not participate were arrested. Regardless of whether an offender graduates from BCADC, their admission to the program resulted in fewer subsequent arrests.

Arrest rates for graduates of BCADC were even lower. In the 24 months after admission only four percent of the graduates were arrested for a new offense. This is a more positive outcome than the outcome for nonparticipants (50 percent).

² Marchand, G., Waller, M., & Cary, S. M. (2006, September) *Barry County Adult Drug Court Outcome and Cost Evaluation*. Portland, Oregon. NPC Research. The full evaluation report is available on-line at http://www.nperesearch.com/projects_0039.php.



Michigan Drug Treatment Courts

2008 Annual Report

Kalamazoo County Adult Drug Court

The Kalamazoo County Adult Drug Court (KCADC), which provided the nation's first female-specific drug court, continues to offer gender-specific treatment. It was also subject to an outcome evaluation that concluded that KCADC "was successful in decreasing participant drug abuse, reducing participant recidivism, and producing cost savings for the taxpayer."³ KCADC's recidivism rates also were positive.

Offenders admitted to KCADC were less likely to be arrested after admission than offenders who were eligible for the program but did not participate. In the 24 months after admission, 38 percent of the KCADC participants were arrested for a new offense. By comparison, 52 percent of the offenders who were eligible for the program but did not participate were arrested. Regardless of whether an offender graduates from KCADC, his or her admission to the program resulted in fewer arrests.

Arrest rates for KCADC graduates were even lower. In the 24 months after admission, 14 percent of the graduates were arrested. This is lower than the rearrest rate of nonparticipants (52 percent) and the national rearrest rate for drug court discharges (17 percent).

Ottawa County DWI Court

Offenders admitted to Ottawa County's DWI Court were less likely to be arrested after admission than traditional probationers. In the 24 months after admission, 7.7 percent of the participants were arrested for a new offense, while 24.2 percent of probationers were arrested. DWI Court participants also were less likely to be arrested for a new drunk driving offense. Probationers were 19 times more likely than the DWI Court participants to be arrested for a new drunk driving charge.

Bay County DWI Court

Offenders admitted to Bay County's DWI Court were less likely to be arrested after admission than traditional probationers. In the 24 months after admission, 15.5 percent of participants were arrested for a new offense, while 30.6 percent of the probationers were arrested. DWI Court participants were also less likely to be arrested for a new drunk driving offense. Probationers were five times more likely than the DWI Court participants to be arrested for a new drunk driving charge.

City of Clarkston DWI Court

Offenders admitted to the City of Clarkston's DWI Court were less likely to be arrested after admission than traditional probationers. In the 24 months after admission, 4.5 percent of participants were arrested for a new offense, while 13.7 percent of the probationers were arrested. DWI Court participants were also less likely to be arrested for a new drunk driving

³ Marchand, G., Waller, M., & Cary, S. M. (2006, September) *Kalamazoo County Adult Drug Treatment Court Outcome and Cost Evaluation*. Portland, Oregon. NPC Research. The full evaluation report is available on-line at http://www.nperesearch.com/projects_0039.php.



Michigan Drug Treatment Courts

2008 Annual Report

offense. Probationers were five times more likely than the DWI Court participants to be arrested for a new drunk driving charge.

Postgraduation Recharge

An examination of adult circuit, adult district, and DWI drug courts revealed that drug court graduates are unlikely to be charged with committing a new criminal offense in the first 12 months after graduation.

Adult Circuit and Adult District Drug Courts

Graduates of Michigan's adult circuit and adult district drug courts are unlikely to be charged with new offenses in the first 12 months after graduation. Of the individuals who successfully completed an adult circuit drug court program, only 11 percent were charged with committing a new crime in the first 365 days after graduation. Of the individuals who successfully completed an adult district drug court program, only 10.6 percent were charged with committing a new crime in the first 365 days after graduation.

DWI Courts

Graduates of Michigan's driving while intoxicated (DWI) courts are very unlikely to be charged with either a drunk driving charge or any criminal offense in the year following graduation. Of the individuals who successfully completed a DWI court, only 2.6 percent were charged with committing a new drunk driving offense and only 6.5 percent were charged with committing either a new drunk driving offense or a criminal offense within one year of graduation.

Table 15
Postgraduation Recharge

Drug Court	Drug Court Graduates	Graduates Recharged	Recidivism Rate
Adult Circuit Drug Courts	526	58	11.0%
Adult District Drug Courts	330	35	10.6%
DWI Courts			
Drunk Driving Charges	831	22	2.6%
Drunk Driving and Criminal Charges	831	54	6.5%

Participants were monitored for 12 months after graduation from drug court to determine if they were charged for new criminal offenses, or in the case of DWI courts, for new drunk driving offenses. The column of drug court graduates includes those who successfully completed a drug court program prior to July 1, 2007. The column of graduates recharged includes those who successfully completed a drug court program prior to July 1, 2007, and were charged with a new offense in the first 365 days after graduation.



Michigan Drug Treatment Courts

2008 Annual Report

Appendix A

Descriptions of Drug Court Types

Adult Circuit and Adult District Drug Courts

The adult drug court model is the oldest and most frequently implemented drug court model. It is characterized by a specially-designed court docket focusing on nonviolent drug-related felony and misdemeanor cases. The judge is more actively involved in supervising drug court offenders during regularly scheduled review hearings that involve most of the drug court treatment team members. The primary purposes are to reduce recidivism and substance abuse and increase the likelihood of successful rehabilitation through early, continuous, and intense judicially supervised treatment, mandatory periodic drug testing, community supervision, and use of appropriate sanctions and other rehabilitation services.

Driving While Intoxicated (DWI) Courts

A Driving While Intoxicated (DWI) court has a docket dedicated to changing the behavior of offenders charged with driving while intoxicated. The goal of these courts is to protect public safety by addressing the defendant's substance abuse. As with other drug court models, the DWI court involves all criminal justice stakeholders (e.g., prosecutors, defense attorneys, probation, and law enforcement) with substance abuse treatment professionals, to encourage sober behaviors that will prevent DWI recidivism.

Family Dependency Drug Courts

The enactment of the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997 gave added impetus to the establishment of family drug courts by calling for states to initiate termination of parental rights proceedings for children who have been in foster care for 15 of the previous 22 months. This short time frame for dealing with issues of this magnitude makes it all the more urgent for court systems to develop mechanisms to ensure judicial supervision, coordination, and accountability of the services provided to juveniles and families in crisis. Because many more individuals and entities need to be involved in these types of cases, development of family drug courts is proving to be a more complex task than the development of adult drug courts.

Family dependency drug court dockets consist of selected abuse, neglect, and dependency cases where parental substance abuse is a primary factor. Judges, attorneys, child protection services workers, and treatment personnel unite with the goal of providing safe, nurturing, and permanent homes for children, while simultaneously providing parents the necessary support and services to become drug-free and alcohol-free. Family drug courts help parents regain control of their lives and promote long-term stabilized recovery to enhance the possibility of family reunification within the mandatory legal time frames.

Juvenile Drug Courts

A juvenile drug court is a docket within a juvenile court to which selected delinquency cases, and in some instances status offenders, are referred for handling by a designated judge.



Michigan Drug Treatment Courts

2008 Annual Report

The youths referred to this docket are identified as having problems with alcohol and/or other drugs. The juvenile drug court judge maintains close oversight of each case through regular status hearings with the parties involved. The judge both leads and works as a member of a team that is comprised of representatives representing treatment programs, juvenile justice, social and mental health services, school and vocational training programs, law enforcement, probation, prosecution, and the defense. The team meets frequently over the course of a year or more, determining how best to address the substance abuse and related problems of the youth and his or her family.

Healing-to-Wellness Tribal Courts

The tribal advisory board describes its drug courts as Healing-to-Wellness courts. These courts operate within the tribal justice system to address alcohol- and drug-related offenses. The programs use the core principles of drug treatment court and also incorporate customs and traditions of the native community.

