

Michigan Drug Treatment Courts

2008 Annual Report and Evaluation Summary



Project Years

October 1, 2006 – September 30, 2007

October 1, 2007 – September 30, 2008

Provided by the
Michigan Supreme Court
State Court Administrative Office

Table of Contents

Executive Summary 3
List of Tables 4
Overview of Drug Courts in Michigan 5
Descriptions of Drug Court Types 5
 Adult Circuit and Adult District Drug Treatment Courts 5
 Driving While Intoxicated (DWI) Treatment Courts..... 5
 Family Dependency Treatment Courts 6
 Juvenile Drug Treatment Courts 6
 Healing to Wellness Tribal Courts..... 6
Caseload Statistics 10
Performance Outcomes 14
 Retention 14
 Completion..... 15
 Improvement in Employment and Education 16
 Improved Access to Treatment and Increased Alcohol Use Monitoring..... 16
 Postgraduation Recharge 17



Executive Summary

Eighty-eight 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 2007 and 2008, more than 4,930 people were admitted to drug courts, more than 7,830 cases were active in drug court, and more than 2,391 completed a drug court program.

The Michigan Supreme Court's State Court Administrative Office (SCAO) administers state and federal grant programs to fund drug courts throughout the state. In 2008, SCAO awarded \$1,748,000 in state funds to 52 drug courts and \$1,725,000 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, only 11.1 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, only 11.7 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. Of the individuals who successfully completed a DWI court, only 1.3 percent were charged with committing a new drunk driving offense and only 6.8 percent were charged with committing either a new drunk driving offense or a criminal offense.

These postgraduation recidivism rates were calculated for those who successfully completed drug court prior to December 31, 2007. Additional measures of success, including retention, completion, improvement in employment and education, and postgraduation recharge rates, are provided in this report and generally pertain to participants active in fiscal years 2007 and 2008.

This report summarizes drug court activity for the two fiscal years that occurred between October 1, 2006, and September 30, 2008. 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.



List of Tables

Table 1: Types of Drug Courts7
Table 2: Michigan Drug Courts8
Table 3: New Admissions and Active Cases10
Table 4: Most Serious Charge.....10
Table 5: Drug of Choice11
Table 6: Gender.....12
Table 7: Ethnicity.....13
Table 8: Age at Screening.....13
Table 9: Education at Admission.....14
Table 10: Employment at Admission14
Table 11: Retention.....15
Table 12: Completion16
Table 13: Improvement in Employment and Education16
Table 14: Improved Access to Treatment.....17
Table 15: Increased Alcohol Use Monitoring.....17
Table 16: Postgraduation Recharge18



Overview of Drug Courts in Michigan

Also known as “problem-solving courts,” specialty courts have steadily gained acceptance as an alternative to imprisonment for nonviolent criminal offenders who abuse drugs or alcohol. Many repeat offenders have substance abuse disorders, causing them to cycle in and out of the justice system. To break this cycle, specialty courts employ “therapeutic jurisprudence,” which emphasizes treatment, rehabilitation, intensive supervision, judicial status hearings, frequent drug testing, and graduated incentives and sanctions. Core drug court team members consist of judges, probation officers, law enforcement personnel, prosecutors, defense counsel, and substance abuse treatment providers.

Spurred in part by the problem of jail overcrowding, many Michigan courts have turned to the problem-solving approach. 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. Recognizing that repeat criminal offenders often have alcohol and substance use or abuse disorders, many judges, prosecutors, and city attorneys have implemented drug treatment courts in their jurisdictions.

Descriptions of Drug Court Types

Although they share the same judicial model of therapeutic jurisprudence, drug treatment courts, family dependency treatment courts, juvenile drug treatment courts, and DWI treatment courts all have program-specific components designed to meet the specific needs of their target population.

Adult Circuit and Adult District Drug Treatment Courts

Eighteen circuit court and 16 district court adult drug treatment courts were operational, and one adult drug treatment court was in the planning phase, in 2008. 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 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 of a drug treatment court are to achieve a reduction in recidivism and substance abuse; to 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) Treatment Courts

There were 24 operational DWI treatment courts as of December 2008. DWI treatment courts, also known as “Sobriety” courts, target offenders who have been charged with driving while under the influence of drugs or alcohol. Each DWI treatment court contains key program components recommended by the Bureau of Justice Assistance in “The Ten Guiding Principles of DWI Courts.” This target population poses a high risk to the community because, in most



Michigan Drug Treatment Courts

2008 Annual Report

cases, their driving privileges have been revoked. Addressing transportation issues is a vital program component of this type of court.

Family Dependency Treatment Courts

As of December 2008, there were 11 operational family dependency treatment courts, and one additional family dependency treatment court was in the planning phase. The enactment of the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997 has given 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 makes it more important that court systems 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 with these 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 in the allegations of abuse or neglect. Judges, attorneys, child protection services workers, and treatment personnel unite with the goal of providing safe, nurturing homes for children, while simultaneously providing parents the necessary support and services to become drug-free and alcohol-free. Family drug courts aid parents in regaining 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 Treatment Courts

At the conclusion of 2008, there were 16 operational juvenile drug treatment 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. 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 from treatment, juvenile justice, social and mental health services, school and vocational training programs, law enforcement, probation, the prosecution, and the defense. Over the course of a year or more the team meets frequently, determining how best to address the substance abuse and related problems of the youth and the youth's family.

Healing to Wellness Tribal Courts

The tribal advisory board describes their drug courts as Healing-to-Wellness courts. These courts operate within the tribal justice system to address alcohol- and drug-related crime. The programs use the core principles of drug treatment court and also incorporate customs and traditions of the native community. There were three of these specialty courts in operation in Michigan during 2008.



Michigan Drug Treatment Courts
2008 Annual Report

Table 1
Types of Drug Courts
As of December 2008

Type of Drug Court	Operational Drug Courts	Drug Courts in Development	Total
Adult Circuit	18	0	18
Adult District	16	1	17
Driving While Intoxicated (DWI)	24	0	24
Family Dependency	11	1	12
Juvenile	16	0	16
Tribal	3	0	3
Total	88	2	90

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 December 2008 are listed by county on the next two pages.



Michigan Drug Treatment Courts
2008 Annual Report

Table 2
Michigan Drug Courts
As of December 2008

County	Court	Type of Drug Court
Alcona	23 rd Circuit Court	Adult
Alger	93 rd District 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
Benzie	19 th Circuit Court	Family Dependency
Benzie	19 th Circuit Court	Juvenile
Benzie	85 th District Court	Adult
Berrien	Berrien County Trial Court	Adult
Calhoun	37 th Circuit Court	Adult – Men
Calhoun	37 th Circuit Court	Adult – Women
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 Healing to Wellness Program	Tribal
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
Hillsdale	1 st Circuit Court	Family Dependency
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	41 st Circuit Court	Adult
Iron	95B District Court	Adult
Isabella	21 st Circuit Court	Adult
Isabella	21 st Circuit Court	Juvenile
Isabella	76 th District Court	Adult
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



Michigan Drug Treatment Courts
2008 Annual Report

Table 2
Michigan Drug Courts
As of December 2008

County	Court	Type of Drug Court
Kalamazoo	9 th Circuit Court	Juvenile
Kent	61 st District Court	Adult
Leelanau	Grand Traverse Band Tribal Court	Tribal
Livingston	44 th Circuit Court	Adult
Livingston	53 rd District Court	DWI
Luce	92 nd District Court	DWI
Macomb	16 th Circuit Court	Adult
Macomb	16 th Circuit Court	Juvenile
Macomb	37 th District Court	Adult
Macomb	39 th District Court	DWI
Macomb	41B District Court	Adult
Manistee	19 th Circuit Court	Juvenile
Marquette	96 th District Court	DWI
Monroe	38 th Circuit Court	Juvenile
Muskegon	60 th District Court	DWI
Oakland	6 th Circuit Court	Adult
Oakland	6 th Circuit Court	Juvenile
Oakland	43 rd District Court	DWI
Oakland	44 th District Court	Adult
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
Ogemaw	34 th Circuit Court	Family Dependency
Otsego	87 th District 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
Schoolcraft	93 rd District Court	Adult
Van Buren	36 th Circuit Court	Adult
Washtenaw	15 th District Court	DWI
Washtenaw	22 nd Circuit Court	Juvenile
Wayne	3 rd Circuit Court	Adult
Wayne	3 rd 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



Michigan Drug Treatment Courts
2008 Annual Report

Caseload Statistics

Between October 1, 2006, and September 30, 2008, Michigan drug courts screened and admitted more than 4,930 individuals. During these two years, drug courts handled a total of 7,846 cases. Of the new admissions, over 2,087 (42 percent) were drunk drivers, over 1,293 (26 percent) were adults in circuit court, 944 (19 percent) were adults in district court, and 487 (10 percent) were juveniles. An additional 119 (2 percent) were individuals with civil petitions in the family division of circuit court who 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	1,293	26	2,056	26
Adult District	944	19	1,627	21
DWI	2,087	42	3,285	42
Family Dependency	119	2	156	2
Juvenile	487	10	722	9
Total	4,930	100	7,846	100

This table includes new admissions and active cases during fiscal years 2007 and 2008 from 76 drug courts.

Michigan drug courts provide services to persons charged with a variety of nonviolent offenses and persons involved in family division child abuse or neglect petitions. Of the participants with active cases during fiscal years 2007 and 2008, 34 percent were charged with one or more felony, 62 percent were charged with one or more misdemeanor, and 2 percent were involved in civil petitions or status offenses.

Table 4
Most Serious Charge

Type of Drug Court	Felony		Misdemeanor		Civil Petition		Status/ Other	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Adult Circuit	2,028	99	27	1	0	0	1	0
Adult District	100	6	1,525	94	0	0	2	0
DWI	359	11	2,911	89	2	0	2	0
Family Dependency	1	0	0	0	154	99	1	1
Juvenile	205	29	434	60	26	4	39	5
Total	2,693	34	4,897	63	182	2	45	1

This table includes active cases during fiscal years 2007 and 2008 from 76 drug courts.

Ninety-nine percent of the offenders admitted into an adult circuit drug court were charged with at least one felony. The remainder, with misdemeanor charges, was a result of one circuit court program becoming a district court program during the reporting time frame, and DWI third offense cases pled down to DWI second offense cases. For 94 percent of the offenders admitted into adult district courts, the most serious offense charged was a



Michigan Drug Treatment Courts

2008 Annual Report

misdemeanor. The remaining 6 percent were mostly felony controlled substance use and possession charges, and cases accepted by rural courts without a local circuit drug court program. Participants in the family dependency drug court are involved in civil petitions in the family division, which may involve allegations of child abuse or neglect. Ninety-nine percent of participants in family dependency court were civil petitions. The majority (89 percent) of the offenders admitted to DWI courts were charged with a misdemeanor. Exceptions were likely the result of drug court programs that accept felony cases. Juveniles in drug court were charged with a variety of offenses, including felonies (29 percent) and status offenses (5 percent).

The primary drug of choice for participants in an adult circuit drug court includes alcohol (31 percent), cocaine/crack (24 percent), marijuana (15 percent), and heroin (13 percent). Multiple drugs (7 percent), opiate (5 percent), and methamphetamine/amphetamine (4 percent) were also somewhat common.

Table 5
Drug of Choice

Type of Drug Court	Alcohol %	Marijuana %	Cocaine/ Crack %	Heroin %
Adult Circuit	31	15	24	13
Adult District	52	18	19	7
DWI	84	8	4	1
Family Dependency	17	26	42	3
Juvenile	14	83	1	0
Total	56	19	13	6

Type of Drug Court	Multiple Drugs %	Opiate %	Methamphetamine Amphetamine %	Other %
Adult Circuit	7	5	4	1
Adult District	2	1	0	1
DWI	2	1	0	0
Family Dependency	3	3	4	2
Juvenile	1	0	0	1
Total	3	2	1	0

This table includes active cases during fiscal years 2007 and 2008 from 76 drug courts. Barbiturates, benzodiazepine, club drugs, hallucinogens, inhalants, sedatives, and hypnotics are included as other drugs.

Over half (52 percent) of the participants in adult district drug courts choose alcohol as their primary drug. Cocaine/crack was the drug of choice for 19 percent and marijuana was the drug of choice for 18 percent. An additional 7 percent choose heroin as their primary drug of choice.

The majority (84 percent) of participants in the DWI drug courts choose alcohol as their primary drug of choice. Eight percent choose marijuana and 4 percent choose cocaine/crack.



Michigan Drug Treatment Courts

2008 Annual Report

The most common drug of choice for 42 percent of the participants in the family dependency drug courts was cocaine/crack. Marijuana (26 percent) and alcohol (17 percent) were also relatively common for participants in the family dependency drug courts. Methamphetamine or amphetamine was the drug of choice for 4 percent of the participants in the family dependency drug courts.

The majority (83 percent) of juveniles in the juvenile drug courts reported marijuana as their primary drug. An additional 14 percent indicated alcohol was their primary substance. Very few juveniles choose any other drug as their primary drug of choice.

Table 6
Gender

Type of Drug Court	Females		Males		Total
	#	%	#	%	#
Adult Circuit	532	26	1,524	74	2,056
Adult District	572	35	1055	65	1,627
DWI	812	25	2,473	75	3,285
Family Dependency	136	87	20	13	156
Juvenile	175	24	547	76	722
Total	2,227	28	5,619	72	7,846

This table includes active cases during fiscal years 2007 and 2008 from 76 drug courts.

Overall, males were almost three times more likely than females to be admitted to a drug court. However, the majority (87 percent) of participants in family dependency drug courts were female. Over three-quarter of the participants in the DWI courts, which handled 3,285 cases, were male.



Michigan Drug Treatment Courts

2008 Annual Report

The 2007 Michigan Census¹ identified 81.2 percent of Michigan residents as White which includes Hispanics. The drug court population is reflective of the ethnic composition of Michigan. Hispanic and White individuals totaled 80.1 percent of the drug court population. Eighty-two percent of the participants in DWI courts were White.

Table 7
Ethnicity

Type of Drug Court	White %	African American %	Hispanic %	Other %
Adult Circuit	72.7	23.5	1.9	1.9
Adult District	73.1	23.0	2.0	1.9
DWI	81.9	8.7	6.8	2.5
Family Dependency	64.7	27.6	3.8	3.8
Juvenile	65.9	23.7	3.9	6.5
Total	75.9	17.3	4.2	2.7

This table includes active cases during fiscal years 2007 and 2008 from 76 drug courts. Asian/Pacific Islander, Multi-racial, Native American, and individuals not identifying with any of the above categories included in other.

A substantial portion (30 percent) of drug court participants were between the ages of 22 and 30 when screened for admission. An additional 22 percent 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	9	32	27	22	7
Adult District	0	6	14	32	23	19	6
DWI	0	5	12	33	22	19	9
Family Dependency	0	1	6	47	31	12	2
Juvenile	93	7	0	0	0	0	0
Total	9	5	10	30	22	18	7

This table includes active cases during fiscal years 2007 and 2008 from 76 drug courts.

Offenders admitted to DWI courts had a higher level of education than offenders admitted to other types of drug courts. Forty-one percent had more than a high school education. Additionally, over half (58 percent) of the offenders admitted to DWI courts were employed full-time. In comparison, 48 percent of offenders admitted to a family dependency court had less than a high school education and 72 percent were unemployed. Sixty-three percent of the juveniles admitted to juvenile drug court were in 9th or 10th grade at screening.

¹ U.S. Census Bureau: State and County Quick Facts. Data derived from Population Estimates, Census of Population and Housing, Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates, State and County Housing Unit Estimates, County Business Patterns, Nonemployer Statistics, Economic Census, Survey of Business Owners, Building Permits, Consolidated Federal Funds Report



Michigan Drug Treatment Courts
2008 Annual Report

Table 9
Education at Admission

Type of Drug Court	Less Than 12th Grade %	HS Diploma or GED %	More Than HS %	Total %
Adult Circuit	30	49	21	100
Adult District	30	45	25	100
DWI	20	39	41	100
Family Dependency	48	31	21	100
Juvenile	Less Than 9th Grade	9th and 10th Grades	11th and 12th Grades	Total
	29	63	8	100

This table includes active cases during fiscal years 2007 and 2008 from 76 drug courts.

Table 10
Employment Status at Admission

Type of Drug Court	Unemployed %	Employed Part Time %	Employed Full Time %	Not in Labor Force %	Total %
Adult Circuit	55	11	26	7	100
Adult District	36	15	39	10	100
DWI	22	15	58	4	100
Family Dependency	72	10	8	10	100
Juvenile	20	7	0	73	100

This table includes active cases during fiscal years 2007 and 2008 from 76 drug courts.

Performance Outcomes

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, post-graduation 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.



Table 11
Retention

Type of Drug Court	Percent Retained in Program
Adult Circuit	68.5
Adult District	66.5
DWI	76.8
Family Dependency	57.6
Juvenile	72.0

This table includes a subset of cases that were active during fiscal years 2007 and 2008. 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 76.8 percent. Adult district courts retained 66.5 percent for at least 12 months. Adult circuit (68.5 percent) and juvenile drug courts (72.0 percent) also achieved high retention rates. The family dependency drug courts, which serve relatively few individuals, retained over half of their participants (57.6 percent) for at least 12 months.

Completion

Over fifty percent of all individuals discharged from Michigan drug courts, totaling 2,391 individuals, successfully completed a drug court treatment program in fiscal years 2007 and 2008. Nearly 60 percent of individuals discharged from DWI courts completed the program. Almost half of the participants in juvenile drug courts completed the program. Forty-four percent of individuals discharged from adult circuit and adult district drug courts and 32 percent of participants discharged from family dependency drug courts successfully completed the program upon discharge. These rates are within the range of completion rates reported by the U.S. Government Accountability Office for adult drug courts throughout the nation.² In that report, the national range of completion rates for the adult drug courts ranged from 27 percent to 66 percent.

² 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.



Table 12
Completion

Type of Drug Court	Successfully Completed	
	#	%
Adult Circuit	550	43.7
Adult District	471	43.9
DWI	1,086	59.6
Family Dependency	31	32.3
Juvenile	253	49.4
Total	2,391	50.2

This table includes successful and unsuccessful discharges from 76 drug courts.

Improvement in Employment and Education

Despite poor employment rates in Michigan, many participants were able to improve their employment status by the time they were discharged from drug court or successfully graduated from drug court. Over half (58 percent) of the graduates from adult circuit drug courts and over half (55 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 and Education

Type of Drug Court	Employment		Education	
	All Discharges	Successful Discharges	All Discharges	Successful Discharges
	%	%	%	%
Adult Circuit	32	58	10	18
Adult District	24	41	11	17
DWI	36	49	14	19
Family Dependency	21	55	8	26
Juvenile	23	40	62	87

This table includes discharges from 76 drug courts.

Improved Access to Treatment and Increased Alcohol Use Monitoring

Six Michigan DWI courts were evaluated in 2008. Each of the evaluations included a comparison group of individuals with similar DWI charges and criminal history who would have been eligible for participation in each of the respective programs. While the results for each of the DWI court programs were favorable, most notable about all programs was the improved access to drug and alcohol treatment at each of the sites and the increased monitoring of alcohol use through testing. The data from each of the DWI court evaluation sites is presented below in the following two tables.



Table 14
Improved Access to Treatment

DWI Court	Comparison Group	DWI Court
Bay County	27.48	103.37
Clarkston	21.30	28.40
Farmington Hills	19.24	75.08
Lansing	283.00*	38.00
Novi	23.81	79.73
Ottawa County	16.14	34.49

*This table includes treatment contact hours for DWI court participants who successfully completed the program and comparison group probationers who successfully completed probation. *This reflects data from a residential treatment center.*

Table 15
Increased Monitoring of Alcohol Use

DWI Court	Comparison Group		DWI Court	
	Total Tests	% Positive	Total Tests	% Positive
Bay County	41	13	111	0.9
Clarkston	38	0	174	0.1
Farmington Hills	126	0	283	0
Lansing	-	-	265	1
Novi	58	0.13	245	0.1
Ottawa County	38	18	331	0.2

This table includes DWI court participants who successfully completed the program and comparison group probationers who successfully completed probation.

Postgraduation Recharge

An examination of adult circuit, adult district, and DWI drug courts revealed that 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 or adult district drug court program, only 11 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. Of the individuals who successfully completed a DWI court, only one percent were charged with committing a new



Michigan Drug Treatment Courts

2008 Annual Report

drunk driving offense and only 6.8 percent were charged with committing either a new drunk driving offense or a criminal offense.

Table 16
Postgraduation Recharge

Drug Court	Drug Court Graduates	Graduates Recharged	Recidivism Rate
Adult Circuit Drug Courts	637	71	11.1
Adult District Drug Courts	478	56	11.7
DWI Courts			
Drunk Driving Charges	1,112	14	1.3
Drunk Driving and Criminal Charges	1,112	76	6.8

Participants were followed 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 prior to December 31, 2007. The column of graduates recharged includes those who successfully completed a drug court prior to December 31, 2007, and were charged with a new offense in the first 365 days after graduation.

