

## **Appendix B1**

**County Drug Court Profiles:**

**King County Drug Court  
Program Profile**

# **KING COUNTY ADULT DRUG COURT**

## **PROGRAM PROFILE**

June 2000

### **BACKGROUND**

The King County Drug Court program, the oldest in the State, began operation in August, 1994, under the auspices of the King County Superior Court. A Drug Court Planning Grant from the Office of Justice Programs/ Department of Justice funded the development and early implementation of the program. Judge Ricardo Martinez, the first judge of the Drug Court, was a leading member of the development and implementation team and served as Drug Court Judge until August, 1997. The program in King County is a pre-adjudication program in which defendants enter the program prior to sentencing. Individuals who choose to enter Drug Court waive their trial rights, agree to stipulated facts in the police report, and enter into a treatment contingency contract with the Court. Upon successful completion of the program, the charges are dismissed. If the defendant fails to meet program requirements, s/he is sentenced on the standing charges.

For the first three years of the program, August 1994-August 1997, Central Seattle Recovery Center (CSRS), a private non-profit treatment agency in King County, was the lead agency in a consortium of local treatment providers that formed in response to a request for proposals for a Drug Court treatment program. In addition to providing treatment for a number of Drug Court participants, CSRS served as gatekeeper to treatment services and liaison between consortium members and the Drug Court. Two program evaluations were done during the first three years of operation. The first, completed in September 1995, (Urban Policy Institute) examined the development and implementation of the Drug Court during the first year of operation. The second study (Bell, 1998) focused on participant characteristics and outcomes of drug court participation as well as the costs and cost offsets of the program.

In August 1997, a number of significant program changes occurred. Judge Martinez, a major influence in shaping the initial program, left the Drug Court and was replaced by Judge Nicole MacInnes who was replaced by Judge Michael Trickey in February 2000. CSRC was replaced by King County Treatment Alternatives to Street Crime (TASC) as the manager or "gatekeeper" of the treatment program, which remained a consortium of the seven original treatment agencies. This program description will focus on the Drug Court program as it has evolved since the changes implemented in August 1997. The earlier evaluations are a rich source of information about the development, implementation, participant characteristics, and outcomes of the first three years of the King County Drug Court Program.

### **DRUG COURT PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS**

#### **Funding Source(s)**

The Office of Justice Programs/Department of Justice funds provided the major resources for the initiation and early operation of the King County Drug Court. While these funds are still important to Drug Court operation they are time limited and are decreasing. As DOJ funds have decreased the major funding sources have become the BRYNE grant (a Federal program administered by the State Community Trade and Economic Development Commission), City of Seattle and King County funds, and the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area (HIDTA). This funding mix is adequate to support the current program through 2000. Any growth in the program would require additional funding. Without continuation of Department of Justice funding beyond 2000 adequate funding is less certain. The Drug Court Team is currently working diligently to secure additional funding from the State, County, and City, as well as continued support for treatment services from BRYNE grant funds, to replace Department of Justice funding.

#### **Planning Process**

*Who were the players?*

Initial planning for the Court was initiated by the Prosecutor's Office and continued for a year before the

program was implemented. Funding was provided by a DOJ Drug Court Planning grant. Although initiated by a small group of interested individuals, program planning was an inclusive process and eventually involved almost 60 individuals. Among the key players were representatives of the Prosecutor's Office, the Office of the Public Defender, Judge Martinez, city and county law enforcement agencies, the County Budget Office, TASC, the City and County Council and various treatment agencies. In addition, a number of interested community members were a part of the planning group.

### *Program goals and objectives*

The goals of the initial program were to centralize court management of certain drug offenses and offer court supervised treatment rather than incarceration in the expectation that these interventions would increase treatment compliance and decrease the defendants' substance usage and criminal activity. These goals remain fundamental to the current program.

### *Target Population*

Individuals who meet the following criteria are considered as potential participants in the King County Drug Court.

- 18 or older;
- Charged in Superior Court with possession of Schedule I or II controlled substances; or a forged prescription, with no evidence of intent to sell;
- No other pending felony charges at arrest, other than drug possession;
- No prior adult conviction for sex or serious violent offenses.

### **Implementation Process**

#### *What facilitated implementation?*

Implementation of the program was facilitated by a number of factors. A key factor was the inclusive nature of the planning process that, in turn, was facilitated by the Department of Justice Planning grant. The funded planning process provided an opportunity for key players as a team to attend a national training session where they examined various approaches to drug court programs and were coached on team and program development. The planning process encouraged participants to identify potential areas of disagreement and conflict, and to design a program that they could all support. The relationships and mutual understandings that developed during the planning process fostered a sense of identify as a drug court team and provided a context and framework for solving the inevitable problems associated with program implementation. Several individuals involved with the program describe a drug court team that works largely by consensus which they consider rare in a legal setting.

Other important implementation factors included the commitment of the Drug Court Judge to the program, and the consistent leadership he provided. Judge Martinez supported the development of the program from the beginning and provided leadership for the first 3 years of the program.

#### *Degree of Implementation*

The King County Drug Court is a fully implemented program having been in operation since August 1994. Bell (1998) reported the following patterns of participation in the first three years of the program. From August 1994 to August 1997, 2554 individuals were arraigned in King County Drug Court. Seventy-eight percent (1986) were referred to the clinical agency for assessment. Those (22%) who were not referred either failed to appear for arraignment or opted out immediately. Approximately 62% (1228) of the referrals were assessed while the remaining 38% failed to appear for assessment. Fifty-seven percent (705) of those assessed decided to participate and were accepted by the Drug Court. The remaining 43% (429) either opted out (35%) or were refused by the Drug Court (8%). Only 542 (77%) of the 705 individuals actually entered treatment. The other 23% either dropped out, failed to show, or had a warrant issued. By August 1997, 20% (109) of those entering treatment had graduated from Drug Court. Another 44% remained active while the remaining 35% had either dropped out (13%), failed (17%), or had warrants issued (5%). Using a careful definition of retention and completion rates, Bell (1998) reported a retention rate of 64% and a completion rate of 36% for participants entering the King County program between August, 1997

and 30 June, 1997. The national averages for retention and completion are 71% and 48% respectively.

A comparable study of outcomes of individuals in the Drug Court program between September 1997 and January 2000 is currently being conducted by a team of researchers at the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Institute at the University of Washington. The findings of this study should be available in December 2000. Discussions with the Drug Court Coordinator and other Drug Court team members indicate that there have been no major changes in the number of drug court referrals or patterns of Drug Court participation.

### *Program Modifications*

The major change in the Drug Court program has been in the management of the treatment program. In August 1997, the Drug Court team decided to replace Central Seattle Recovery Center as the lead agency among a consortium of seven treatment providers. The King County Treatment Alternatives to Street Crime (TASC) was selected as the manager of and "gatekeeper" to treatment services. TASC is responsible for the initial assessments and referral to a treatment agency and acts as liaison between the treatment agencies and the Court. In July 2000 three additional treatment providers joined the consortium. The new providers were agencies that offer mental health as well as chemical dependency treatment thus strengthening the ability of the Drug Court program to provide appropriate services to participants with co-occurring chemical dependency and mental illness.

A number of staff changes have occurred since the program started. Judge Martinez left the Court in August 1997 and was replaced by Judge Nicole MacInnes who served until February, 2000 when she was replaced by Judge Michael Trickey. A new Drug Court Coordinator was appointed in May 1998 and there have also been changes in the Defense Counsel. While changes in key staff have an impact, these changes have all occurred after the program was well established and quite stable and have occasioned no substantive changes in the Drug Court program operation.

## **Organization**

### *Frequency of Court*

The Drug Court meets daily from 9:00-12:00. The Drug Court Team meets before Court is convened to review the cases that will be heard. Participants describe the team meeting as a time of information sharing, case discussion and decision making, and as a forum where differences of opinion are identified and resolved before the public court session.

### *Team Members/Key Players*

The Drug Court team members include the Judge, a Deputy Prosecutor and an attorney from the Public Defenders Office both of whom are assigned to the Program for a minimum of 12 months, the Drug Court Coordinator, and two permanently assigned TASC staff members, a Drug Court Liaison and a Drug Court Case Manager. The Liaison is responsible for providing the Team with relevant information from the treatment agencies and for keeping the treatment agencies informed of court actions. The case manager conducts initial, on-site screenings of potential participants immediately after their arraignment and, at that time, also makes an appointment for the participant at a treatment agency where a more in-depth assessment is done.

### *Who are the treatment providers?*

All referrals of drug court participants to specific treatment agencies are managed by TASC. Referral decisions are based on participant characteristics including place of residence, nature of the addiction, and available openings in the treatment program. The ten referral agencies include Central Seattle Recovery Center, Center for Human Services, Community Psychiatric Clinic, Downtown Emergency Services Center, Eastside Recovery Center, Evergreen Treatment Services, Harborview Medical Center Addictions Center, Therapeutic Health Services, Seadrunar, and South King County Drug/Alcohol Recovery Center. Participants can also be referred to Cedar Hill Treatment Center and Seadrunar for intensive inpatient treatment. Salvation Army and the Veterans Administration Hospital Chemical Dependency Treatment Program are used as alternative treatment agencies in some cases.

## **Participant Movement Through Drug Court Program**

### *Criteria for Drug Court Admission*

The first level criteria for drug court admission include arrest for possession of Schedule I or II drugs, or a forged prescription, with no evidence of intent to sell. Other criteria include no other pending felony charges, and no prior adult conviction for sex or violent offenses. The King County Drug Court program has developed the flexibility to accept some individuals with a history of misdemeanor domestic violence. These decisions are made on a case-by-case basis at the discretion of the Judge.

While the Prosecutor is the first and primary gatekeeper of drug court admissions, information from the clinical assessment done by the treatment agencies can also influence entry. While it is uncommon, treatment agencies can recommend against drug court entry, usually on the basis of a history of non-compliance with treatment. When this occurs, the Drug Court Judge makes the final decision about the defendant's participation in the program.

### *How/When is the decision made to offer Drug Court option?*

Potential participants are identified and referred to drug court in several ways. The majority of cases are identified as potential participants at the time of arrest. Many of these cases are "rush filed" which brings them to the immediate attention of the Prosecutor's Office where they are screened for legal eligibility for Drug Court by the Drug Court Prosecutor who makes an immediate decision about referral based on the available information. Individuals who are not referred to Drug Court go through regular court processing.

This fast track or "rush filing" process depends on the ability of the police department to complete on-site analysis of substances along with their ability to complete all the necessary reports. The major advantage of rapid processing and early referral to drug court is that only days elapse between arrest and arraignment and the option to enter a treatment program. In jurisdictions unable to provide analysis at the time of arrest, processing time is much slower and while defendants may eventually be referred to drug court, several months may elapse between arrest and referral during which the individual either remains in custody or is released pending laboratory analysis. Finally, defendants may self-refer to drug court or attorneys may request drug court referral.

### *What information about Drug Court is the defendant provided?*

The Prosecutor's initial decision to refer the defendant to Drug Court for arraignment is made with minimal defendant involvement. During arraignment the defendant is given both verbal and written information about the program by the Judge, Public Defender, and TASC case manager. Individuals are informed of the charges and the sentence range associated with the offense. They are also told of the conditions, duration, and expectations of treatment, as well as the consequences of failure. At the time of arraignment defendants are also provided an opportunity to consult with the Public Defender. Individuals who enter the Drug Court program are given a Participant Handbook that provides detailed information about the expectations and requirements of participation. The Handbook also includes a copy of the Drug Court Contract

### *Evaluation for treatment*

The first screening is done by the TASC Drug Court Case Manager immediately after arraignment. The screening includes: a brief social history, a brief medical and mental health history, substance use and treatment history, and legal history. The individual is then referred to a treatment agency for a more complete intake and assessment. While there is some variation among the treatment agencies in these procedures, all of the agencies use the King County Division of Alcohol and Substance Abuse Services (KCDASAS) assessment instruments which include ASAM (American Society of Addictive Medicine) criteria for assessing the appropriate level of treatment. Although it is rare, treatment agencies may recommend against drug court entry. This is usually done on the basis of the defendant's failure to comply with treatment requirements during the time between treatment referral and the first status hearing.

### *When does the defendant actually become a Drug Court participant?*

Defendants do not formally enter Drug Court until the status hearing. At that time those who elect Drug Court sign a Drug Court Waiver in which they agree to treatment requirements, stipulate to the facts contained in the police report, waive rights to a speedy trial, and acknowledge an understanding of the probable sentence that will be imposed if they fail to complete the program. Individuals who decide against Drug Court at the status hearing are considered program opt-outs and return to regular Superior Court processing.

Several options are available to the defendant at arraignment. S/he may decide not to participate (opt out) and return to regular superior court processing, or to plead guilty in Drug Court. If the defendant makes an initial decision to enter the program, s/he is seen immediately after the arraignment by the TASC case manager who does a brief assessment, and makes an immediate (within 3 days) appointment with a treatment agency for intake and further assessment. These defendants remain out of custody conditioned upon their compliance with all treatment conditions. A status hearing is scheduled for about two weeks at which time the individual is expected to make a final decision about entering the Drug Court program. If the defendant decides not to enter the program s/he returns to regular court processing.

Failure to appear may occur at any stage of the drug court process. Bell (1998) in her study of the first three years of the King County program, found that there were more than 300 outstanding warrants for individuals who had failed to appear for the first status hearing. The Drug Court program is currently making an effort to act more consistently and quickly in relation to warrants. The outcomes of these efforts will be evaluated in the outcome component of the evaluation.

### *Consequences of non-completion.*

The decision to terminate a defendant from the Drug Court program is made by the Judge and usually is based on repeated failure to meet the program requirements. On occasion a defendant may request to be terminated from program. Regardless of the reason (s) for termination, the consequences of non completion are that the defendant is sentenced by the Drug Court Judge to serve the sentence appropriate to the charges. Although the treatment agencies provide input about the participant's compliance with treatment requirements and may recommend program termination, the final decision about program retention remains with the Drug Court Judge.

## **Court/Participant Interaction**

### *With whom? How often?*

Upon entry into the Drug Court program the participant's primary interaction with the Court is with the Judge. Most of the other participant/drug court program interactions are with treatment staff. In King County, unlike some of the other programs, the Drug Court Liaison is an employee of TASC, the treatment management agency, rather than an employee of the Court. Participant interaction with the Judge occurs during court sessions with the frequency determined by the participant's program level and treatment compliance of which the Judge is informed by the Drug Court Liaison. Levels of participation are more fully described in a later section.

During Level 1 the participant usually returns to court every four weeks, although if s/he is not doing well court appearances may be more frequent. In these court sessions the Judge asks the participant about treatment participation, and an explanation of any lapses in participation. The Judge actively reinforces expectations, and may impose other requirements or sanctions to encourage better compliance. The Judge takes a very active role with the participant during this period. In Level 2, a period of stabilization that typically lasts 90-120 days, court appearances are extended to six weeks intervals. While the Judge remains active in monitoring the participant's participation and progress, the court-participant interaction is less immediate unless problems develop. The Judge continues to play an important role providing incentives to the participant to continue the program. The incentives include publicly acknowledging the participant's progress with changes in participation levels, and other more concrete rewards such as appearing earlier on the Court schedule. In Level 3 the focus is on maintaining a drug free life style. During this time, typically three to six months, participant-court interactions occur on an as needed basis, usually at six week intervals.

The importance of the Judge-participant interactions and the sense of relationship that develops is apparent in observing the King County Drug Court. Participants share details of their lives such as the progress of relationships with significant others, problems with children, and problems they are having meeting treatment requirements. Both Judge MacInnes and Judge Trickey seem to know the participants as individuals and provide firm limits as well as praise and encouragement.

## **Monitoring Participant Compliance**

The Court has a primary role in monitoring compliance with all aspects of the treatment program and in responding consistently and quickly to incidents of non-compliance. Aspects of treatment that are monitored include abstinence from substance use, participation in Twelve Step programs, and court ordered treatment activities.

### *Urine Analysis*

Court ordered urine analysis, done at the treatment agencies on a random schedule, is used to monitor substance use. Frequency of testing depends on program level assignment and may be increased regardless of program level requirements if results are positive. Participants in Level 1 start with a baseline analysis at the time of assessment and are tested twice weekly. Level 2 and Level 3 participants are tested weekly. Although these are the standard test frequencies, individual UA requirements vary based on treatment progress, drug of choice, and overall compliance.

Positive UA results are reported to the Drug Court Liaison who informs the Judge and other team members who decide what actions should be taken. Sanctions are a common response to positive urine analysis findings. Sanctions are discussed later in the report.

### *Treatment Participation*

Participants are expected to attend three (3) sober support meetings weekly while in Level 1 and 2 of the program. Two weekly meetings are required during Level 3. Each participant has an attendance record sheet that must be signed at the meeting and presented either to the treatment agency or to the Court. The Drug Court Liaison keeps the Court informed of individuals who fail this requirement and failure leads to an appearance before the Judge. Sanctions are a common response to failure to attend sober support meetings.

Participation in out-patient treatment activities, usually individual and group treatment, at graduated frequency depending on program level is monitored at the agency level, and reported to the Drug Court Liaison who keeps the Court informed. Participation is reviewed with the participant in regularly scheduled court appearances. Individuals who fail to meet treatment expectations may be scheduled for more frequent court appearances and may receive judicial sanctions. Treatment services are also reported in TARGET. Although the Court is working toward a linked electronic data system that will allow the treatment agencies, Drug Court Liaison, and Court staff including the Judge, to access immediate on-line reports, this is not yet possible. The multiple steps required to get participation information to the court can lead to delays in judicial response to non-compliant behavior.

In summary, the responsibility for monitoring participant behavior in relation to Drug Court program requirements is shared among treatment providers, the Drug Court Liaison, and the Court. While members of the Drug Court team have input into the response to non-compliant behavior, the Judge has the final responsibility for the judicial response to participants who do not meet the requirements.

## **Sanctions**

Progressive sanctions are used in response to violation of program requirements. Sanctions are expected to emphasize the strict expectations and requirements of the program including participant accountability, and to provide more structure and support when it is needed. Although final sanction decisions are made by the Judge, the public defender, prosecuting attorney, and case management services are involved in the process. Sanctions include: 1) return to a more intensive treatment level including in-patient treatment; 2) increased urine analysis and other monitoring such as day reporting; 3) attending drug court as an observer; 4) written homework assignments; 5) jail time; and, finally, 5) dismissal from the program and sentencing for the original charge. Participants are provided

a brief description of the kinds of sanctions that may be imposed in the Participant Handbook they are given when they enter drug court. This material does not address specific sanctions related to specific behavior.

Consistent, swift imposition of sanctions, an important tenant in Drug Court programming, depends on several factors: timely information sharing between the treatment providers and the court; consistent application of sanctions by the Judge, and strong working relationships between law enforcement and the Drug Court. Without the necessary law enforcement-court relationship, warrants issued by the Drug Court Judge for individuals who do not show for either treatment or court appointments are not enforced in a consistently and timely manner. In the past all of these factors have been problematic in the King County Drug Court and sanctions have not always been consistently and swiftly imposed (Bell, 1998; interview data, 1999). The current Drug Court team is working to address these problems.

### **Incentives**

Incentives are used to recognize and reward participation and progress. The most frequently used incentive is publicly recognizing progress during court sessions and acknowledging to the participant and the entire court the participant's hard work and accomplishments. Individuals who are doing well may also be put into an "express" group and placed early on the Court calendar thereby decreasing the time the participant must spend in Court. Other important incentives include advancing to the next level of participation, reducing the frequency of required drug court appearances, and reducing the frequency of urine analysis.

### **Graduation**

To graduate the Participant must have successfully completed the treatment program and show evidence of a period of stable recovery including participation in some meaningful activity usually either employment, an educational program, or other vocational training endeavor. Unlike many other programs, King County Drug Court has not established a specific length of time that the participant must be abstinent before graduation. Successful completion of the program is marked by a graduation ceremony in which the participant's progress and accomplishments, as well as plans to support continued recovery are reviewed. Participants are encouraged to bring friends and family members to graduation. Charges for the offense that led to admission to Drug Court are dismissed at that time.

## **TREATMENT PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS**

### **Number of Provider Agencies**

In August 1997 King County Treatment Alternatives to Street Crime (TASC) became the manager or "gatekeeper" of the treatment program with a consortium of seven treatment agencies providing treatment services for drug court participants. In July 2000 three additional agencies joined the consortium: Community Psychiatric Clinic, Downtown Emergency Treatment Services, and, Harborview Medical Center Addictions Center. These three agencies provide mental health as well as chemical dependency treatment thus strengthening the ability of the program to provide access to appropriate treatment of co-occurring mental health and substance abuse disorders. All referrals of drug court participants to treatment agencies are made by TASC after a brief assessment following arraignment.

Referrals are based on participant characteristics including place of residence and treatment needs, the nature of the addiction, and available openings in the treatment programs. The treatment agencies include Central Seattle Recovery Center, Center for Human Services, Community Psychiatric Clinic; Downtown Emergency Services Center, Eastside Recovery Center, Evergreen Treatment Services, Harborview Medical Center Addictions Center, Therapeutic Health Services, South King County Drug/Alcohol Recovery Center, and Seadrunar. Participants can also be referred to Cedar Hills Treatment Center for inpatient treatment. Salvation Army and the VA Hospital Chemical Dependency Treatment Program may also be used as alternative treatment agencies if appropriate.

TASC is also responsible for managing communication between the court and the treatment agencies. A TASC employee, the Drug Court Liaison, is a permanent member of the Drug Court team and is responsible for providing the team with all relevant information about treatment participation and urine analysis results as participants are reviewed by the Court. He also informs the treatment agencies of court decisions related to treatment and monitoring requirements. A second TASC employee, the Drug Court Case Manager, is also assigned to the Court to



do the initial screening and referral and to provide other case management services as appropriate.

## **Funding**

Treatment services are funded in a number of ways. In addition to the funding for treatment included in the DOJ Drug Court Grant, every effort is made to fund eligible low-income/indigent participants through state contracts such as ADATSA or Title 19 programs such as TANF (Temporary Assistance for Needy Families). Veteran Administration benefits are used for participants who are eligible for VA services. Participants who have insurance or the resources for private payment are expected to pay for treatment. BRYNE, HIDTA, and City and County funds are also used for treatment services. All participants are required to contribute to the cost of treatment to the extent that they are able. In addition, participants are required to pay a \$100.00 participant fee to the court at graduation.

## **Overall Treatment Services**

Although the core treatment approach is out-patient services, a comprehensive continuum of services is available among the agencies. Services include detoxification, in-patient treatment, a range of out-patient services including group and individual counseling, education, and relapse prevention, and a methadone program. Central Seattle Recovery Center is the primary provider of detoxification services while Cedar Hills provides the majority of in-patient treatment. Residential treatment is also available at Seadrunar. Evergreen Treatment Center is the sole provider of methadone treatment. Treatment agencies vary in the support and ancillary services such as case management, vocational and job related assistance, and assistance with housing that they provide.

## **Treatment Program**

While there are program differences among treatment agencies, all work within a program structure specified by the Drug Court. This structure and related program requirements are based on recommendations and standards from the National Institute of Justice (NIJ), Center for Substance Abuse Treatment, US Department of Health and Human Services (1996), and the National Association of Drug Court Professionals (1997), and are common to drug court programs across the country.

Treatment is expected to last between 1 year and 18 months and is divided into three levels or phases. Unlike some other drug court programs, King County Drug Court does not have specific criteria for movement between levels or for graduation. The time the participant spends in each level is determined by the Judge based on the Drug Court team's assessment of the participant's progress.

Treatment in Level 1 is focused on developing abstinence and engagement in the treatment process. Although not common, Level 1 may include detoxification or in-patient services. Out-patient treatment expectations typically include group or individual counseling 3-4 times weekly as well as two random urine tests each week. In addition, participants are expected to attend 3 treatment-approved sober support group meetings each week. While in Level 1 the participant returns to Court on a monthly basis although frequency of Court appearances may be increased if the Judge feels more supervision and support is indicated.

Treatment in Level 2 is focused on stabilization and establishing a drug free life style. Frequency of contact with the treatment agency may be reduced to 2-3 group meetings weekly and groups such as anger management, social skills, relapse prevention, and vocational readiness may be included. Urine testing is continued on a twice weekly basis. The requirement for 3 weekly sober support group meetings is also continued. Typically, participants remain in Level 2 for 90 to 120 days. Court appearance are reduced to every 6 weeks depending on participant progress.

The focus of treatment in Level 3 is on developing the skills and abilities important to maintaining a drug free life style. Relapse prevention, vocational and other educational programs, and employment placement and support are key activities during Level 3 treatment. The frequency of individual and/or group counseling is reduced to weekly, and urine testing is done weekly. Court appearances usually occur at 6 week intervals. Upon successful completion of Level 3 the participant is eligible for graduation from Drug Court. To successfully complete Level 3 and graduate from Drug Court the participant must either be employed, be in an approved job training program, or be enrolled in school.

## **Length of Treatment Program**

The national standard length of drug court treatment programs is approximately 1 year. However, the length of treatment varies among programs and is influenced by a number of factors including the tolerance of a specific Judge and Drug Court team to relapse, and the requirements for graduation or dismissal. For example, courts that require longer periods of abstinence for completion have longer treatment programs than those with more flexible requirements. King County Drug Court participants who successfully complete the program remain in the program for at least 1 year. It is not unusual for participants to spend 18 months in the program (King County Drug Diversion Court).

## **Treatment Reporting**

All of the treatment agencies use TARGET, DASA's computerized information system, to report group and individual treatment services to Drug Court participants. However because TARGET data is not accessible to the Drug Court team, participant participation in treatment services must be reported to the Drug Court Liaison who makes it available to the Court. Although the Court is working toward a linked electronic data system that will allow the treatment agencies, Drug Court Liaison, and Court staff including the Judge, to access on-line reports, the system is not expected to be fully operational before late 2000.

Revised with input from KC DC staff June-July 2000.

## **References**

Bell, M.M., Inc. (February, 1998) King County Drug Court Evaluation Final Report. Submitted to King County Department of Judicial Administration, Seattle, WA.

Center for Substance Abuse Treatment, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. (1996) Treatment Drug Courts: Integrating Substance Abuse Treatment with Legal Case Processing. (DHHS Publication No. SMA 96-3113), Rockville, MD.

King County Drug Diversion Court. Participant Handbook.

National Association of Drug Court Professionals, Drug Court Standards Committee. (January 1997) Defining Drug Courts: The Key Components. Drug Court Programs Office, U.S. Department of Justice.

Urban Policy Institute. (September, 1995) Evaluation of the King County Drug Diversion Court. Submitted to the King County Department of Judicial Administration, Seattle, WA. (also referred to as the Schram Report)