

## Chapter 1: Project Overview

### Background

The first drug treatment court (DTC) was established in 1989 to address substance abuse among adult drug offenders. Prior to this time, offenders with substance abuse often received punitive responses with little treatment. Punitive responses, however, proved to have little impact on long-term use. Consequently, Dade County, Florida piloted an innovative program in which courts partnered with treatment providers to integrate treatment and court supervision (OJP, 1998).

Drug court programs attempt to reduce recidivism by integrating treatment and supervision; increasing court contacts with the offender; rewarding offender progress; and sanctioning non-compliance. To accomplish this mission, the Dade County Drug Court redefined the roles of and relationships across criminal justice personnel and substance abuse providers (OJP, 1998). Perhaps the most notable change was an emphasis on interagency partnership and treatment over adversarial and punitive justice.

Positive results and widespread support for the drug court concept led to its introduction to juvenile justice system in the late 1990s. Drug courts fit well within juvenile justice because the drug court philosophy was consistent with the original purpose of the juvenile court. Both drug courts and the juvenile court, for instance, stress rehabilitation and non-adversarial partnerships to address the source of delinquency. By 2001, 167 drug courts were operating and 113 programs were the planning stage (OJP, 2001). The purpose of the current study is to evaluate three juvenile drug courts currently operating in Nebraska. These courts include the Douglas County Juvenile Drug Court, the Lancaster County Juvenile Drug Court, and the Sarpy County Juvenile Drug Court.

### Juvenile Drug Courts in Nebraska

In 1999, Sarpy County Separate Juvenile Court received a drug court-planning grant from the Department of Justice, Drug Court Program Office. The planning grant provided funds to develop a drug court that would meet offender needs and fit within the current juvenile court process. The planning committee was comprised of juvenile court judges, probation administration and officers, Office of Juvenile Service supervisors, school representatives, juvenile detention representatives, and local university researchers. Within a year, the committee had designed the drug court and located resources to implement the drug court as well as an evaluation of the program.

Building on Sarpy County's experience, Douglas and Lancaster Counties were awarded planning grants in 2000. Both counties created planning teams and began developing drug courts to meet their needs. Ultimately, the planning teams created programs unique to each county without "recreating the wheel." The collaborative spirit reflected in Nebraska's juvenile drug court movement continued throughout the planning and implementation process. The courts joined forces to compete for implementation funding from the Department of Justice, Drug Court Program Office and centralized

oversight of the grant within the Nebraska State Probation Administration. When funding was awarded, the coordinators of all three courts met on a monthly basis to discuss their individual programs. In sum, the willingness of the courts to work together created a foundation from which consistency and standardization were possible. Specifically, the juvenile drug courts shared the following:

- Post-adjudication structure
- Centralized oversight and supervision authority within State Probation
- Program goals and objectives
- Program evaluation design
- Screening tools, criteria, and processes
- Web-based information system

### Overview of the Tri-County Juvenile Drug Court Evaluation

The purpose of the current study was to conduct an outcome and process evaluation of the Tri-County drug treatment courts. The outcome evaluation was designed to measure the programs' ability to accomplish its goals and objectives. A quasi-experimental research design was used to structure the outcome evaluation. Using a standardized screening process, youths placed in drug court were identified as the "treatment" group and a "comparison" group was selected by matching offender characteristics with eligible youths not selected for drug court. Pre/post-test surveys were administered to DTC youths, and case file information, drug test results, and new arrests were collected for youths in both DTC and Non-DTC groups. These data were compared to determine whether participation in drug court resulted in more desirable outcomes than traditional processing.

The process evaluation examined whether program implementation matched expectations. In particular, this portion of the evaluation focused on the integrity with which the screening and selection process was applied, the number of drug tests and supervision contacts received by offenders, offender treatment progress, the program's use of rewards and sanctions, and offender academic performance.

Evaluation began when each of the programs started and continued through April 30, 2003. Data collection was stopped at this time in order to meet contractual obligations to state and federal agencies. As a result, this report reflects a "point in time" rather than the completion of the program for a cohort of offenders.

Table 1.1 provides a summary of participant program status across each drug court program. As indicated in the table, Sarpy County's drug court program has been operating for approximately three years, whereas the programs in Douglas and Lancaster have operated for approximately two years. During this period of operation, each drug court program provided services to 15-20 youths per year. Half (51%) of Douglas County's participants were still participating in the program on April 30, 2003; slightly more than a third were still participating in Lancaster County (38%); and 23% were active in Sarpy County. As of April 30, 2003, Douglas County DTC terminated 33% of

its participants compared to 29% in Lancaster County, and 21% in Sarpy County. Sarpy County had the most graduates (57%), followed by Lancaster County (32%), and Douglas County (18%).

**Table 1.1: Summary of Participant Program Status across Counties**

	<b>Douglas</b>	<b>Lancaster</b>	<b>Sarpy</b>
Program Start Date	2/26/2001	4/18/2001	2/14/00
Evaluation End Date	4/30/03	4/30/03	4/30/03
Total No. of Participants	39	34	53
<b>Participant Status on April 30, 2003</b>			
Still in Program	20 (51%)	15 (44%)	16 (30%)
Phase I	8	2	1
Phase II	10	6	7
Phase III	2	5	8
Phase IV	n/a	2	n/a
Terminated/Withdrew	13 (33%)	10 (29%)	11 (21%)
Graduated	6 (15%)	9 (26%)	26 (49%)

The Tri-County Drug Court Evaluation Project was founded on goals and objectives developed by Douglas, Lancaster, and Sarpy Counties (see Table 1.2). In sum, there were two overriding goals and 34 related objectives. The current evaluation was built to measure the majority of these goals and objectives; however, it was beyond the scope of the current project to measure all of them. The current study measures 18 of these measures. Table 1.2 lists all of the goals and objects as well as their status in the current evaluation.

**Table 1.2: Summary of DTC Goals and Objectives**

Goals & Related Objectives	Study Status	
	Measured	Not Measured
<b>GOALS</b>		
1. To reduce substance abuse.	X	
2. To reduce recidivism.	X	
<b>OBJECTIVES</b>		
<b>A. Improve Family Functioning</b>		
1) Involve parents in the treatment process.		X
2) Provide a support system to parents.		X
3) Increase family communication.	X	
4) Increase family supervision.	X	
5) Decrease family conflict.	X	
<b>B. Improve School Functioning</b>		
6) Increase school attendance.		X
7) Increase school performance.	X	
8) Improve school behavior.		X
9) Increase access to educational and occupational opportunities.		X

**Table 1.2: Summary of DTC Goals and Objectives—Continued**

Goals & Related Objectives	Study Status	
	Measured	Not Measured
<b>OBJECTIVES</b>		
C. Improve Individual Social Functioning (Reduce Offender Risk)		
10) Decrease feelings of helplessness (increase self-esteem).	X	
11) Decrease attitudes favorable to drug use.	X	
12) Decrease attitudes favorable to delinquency.	X	
13) Decrease negative peer relationships.	X	
14) Increase positive use of time.	X	
15) Increase exposure to positive role models.	X	
16) Decrease denial of problem.		X
17) Increase conflict-resolution skills.		X
18) Increase positive choice making.	X	
19) Increase offender's awareness of consequences.		X
D. Increase Offender Accountability		
20) Increase supervision through regularly scheduled court hearings.	X	
21) Increase supervision through increased contact with supervision officer.	X	
22) Increase supervision through increased urine testing.	X	
23) Ensure immediate sanctions for non-compliance.	X	
24) Ensure rewards for compliance.	X	
E. Improve Juvenile Justice System Response		
25) Standardize the assessment and evaluation process.	X	
26) Conduct assessments as early as possible in the process.		X
27) Include individual and family strengths in the evaluation process.		X
28) Develop comprehensive, individualized treatment plans.		X
29) Match offender need to appropriate services.		X
30) Increase information exchange with the school system.		X
31) Increase collaborations with community-based programming.		X
32) Decrease amount of time spent at the youth center.	X	

Organization of the Report

Study findings are organized into the following sections: screening and selection (Chapter 2), outcome evaluations results (i.e., results related to program goals and objectives; Chapter 3); process evaluation results (i.e., results related to the administration of program components; Chapter 4); and summary of findings and recommendations (Chapter 5). Results are presented for each county in alphabetical order.

## **Chapter 2: Screening and Selection**

### Description of the Drug Court Selection Process

In all three counties, the drug courts operated as post-adjudication programs. After adjudication, juvenile court judges typically ordered offenders to complete a pre-disposition investigation prior to the disposition hearing. Screening for the drug court was completed on all offenders completing this interview, and program placements were made at the youth's disposition hearing.

DTC screening was based on the completion of a screening form, which captured the presence of (1) a substance abuse or dependency problem, and (2) family conflict, school problems, and previous involvement with the juvenile justice system. Each county then applied a scoring system to determine DTC eligibility. Although scoring systems differed slightly across counties, each county targeted offenders who had high scores. Specifically, the DTC programs targeted offenders who were both high in risk and need. The only offenders who exceeded the target population in these areas were (1) offenders who were extremely high risk and had severe substance abuse problems; and/or (2) offenders who were high risk but did not have a substance abuse problem.

Once eligible offenders were identified, each county utilized its own process for selecting participants. In Sarpy, the DTC coordinator informed the judge about the offender's eligibility at the disposition hearing, and the judge decided whether or not to place the offender in the program. In Douglas and Lancaster, the DTC coordinator provided the DTC team with a list of eligible offenders. The team reviewed the cases and decided which offenders to place in the program. This decision was returned to the presiding judge at disposition, who decided whether or not to place the offender in the drug court program. Regardless of the county, then, the ultimate decision to place an offender in drug court rested with the presiding judge at disposition. Once placement in drug court was made, the offender was considered a drug court participant. Although willingness of the offender and his/her family to participate in the program was considered in the selection process, it was not required.

The purpose of this chapter is to examine the selection process for DTC programs in each county, starting with all offenders ordered to complete pre-disposition investigations and ending with placement in the DTC.

### Data and Methods

To examine participant selection, screening data were accessed. Screening data included the information collected and used to determine offender eligibility and to select participants for the drug court program. These data were collected using a screening form designed in each county. The Douglas and Lancaster drug courts used the same screening form, while Sarpy's drug court used a slightly different form. Despite form differences, all counties collected general information about the offender and case (i.e.,

offense), evidence of a substance abuse problem, problems at school, conflict at home, and prior experience in the juvenile justice system.

Screening data were case based rather than offender based because an offender may have returned to the system multiple times during the evaluation study timeframe. In this case, he/she would have been entered more than one time. Although this did not occur often, it occurred in enough instances to consider the data representative of “cases” rather than “individual offenders.”

Descriptive analyses were used to compare the cases selected for drug court to the youths not selected for drug court. These analyses document the similarities and differences between DTC participants and the population from which they are drawn. When appropriate, tests for statistical significance were conducted using the t-test statistic and Chi-Square statistic.

Overall Program Selection

Table 2.1 summarizes the results of the screening and selection process. Consistent with arrest and court statistics, Douglas County, the largest county, completed the most pre-disposition investigations (PDIs) of all three counties. Although Sarpy County typically processes fewer cases than Lancaster County, the number of screened cases in Sarpy was higher than expected because its program was established earlier (for more details of this point see Chapter 1, Table 1.1). The figures shown in this table indicate that ineligibility and eligibility was similar across all three programs. Approximately half or slightly more than half of all screened cases were ineligible for program participation and between 20-30% were eligible. With regard to placing offenders into the drug court program, Sarpy County placed the highest percentage of eligible offenders into its program (30%) followed by Lancaster County (17%) and Douglas County (11%).

**Table 2.1: Summary of DTC Screening and Selection across Counties**

	County		
	Douglas	Lancaster	Sarpy
<b>Drug Court Screenings</b>			
Total Cases in PDI Database*	1754	669	719
Total Cases Eligible	859 (49%)	410 (61%)	444 (62%)
Total Eligible for Drug Court	397 (23%)	201 (30%)	175 (24%)
Cases with Missing Information	498 (28%)	58 (9%)	100 (14%)
<b>Drug Court Placements</b>			
Total Cases Eligible for Drug Court	397	201	175
Total Placed in Drug Court	42 (11%)	35 (17%)	53 (30%)
*The data retrieved from this database are case based rather than offender based.			

Table 2.2 provides insight into whether selected participants were actually eligible for the program. In Douglas County, 93% of participants were eligible; in Lancaster County, 100% were eligible or borderline eligible cases; and in Sarpy, 77% were eligible or borderline eligible and 23% were ineligible or unknown.

**Table 2.2: The Eligibility Status of DTC Participants across Counties**

	<b>Douglas</b>	<b>Lancaster</b>	<b>Sarpy</b>
Total No. Participants	N=42	N=34	N=53
Eligible	39 (93%)	32 (91%)	30 (58%)
Borderline		2 (9%)	10 (19%)
Ineligible	3 (7%)		10 (19%)
Unknown			3 (4%)

Participant Characteristics

Screening data also provided the opportunity to compare offenders who are selected as participants for the drug court to the cases not selected for drug court. This comparison documents the extent to which drug court participants are similar or different from all cases screened for the drug court program.

*Results for Douglas County*

Table 2.3 contains the results for Douglas County offender characteristics at the time of screening. According to Table 2.3, drug court participants were slightly more likely to be male compared to the overall population of PDI cases. The race/ethnicity of participants was similar to that in the population, with white and African-American offenders each accounting for slightly less than half of participants. The majority of adjudicated offense charge types were misdemeanor for both groups, but revocation (i.e., revocation of probation or parole) charges were more prevalent among drug court participants. No differences were found for insurance status. Approximately half of the screened cases were Medicaid eligible regardless of group.

**Table 2.3: Case Characteristics at Screening—Douglas County**

	<b>Selected for DTC (N=42)</b>		<b>Not Selected for DTC (N=1,712)</b>	
	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>
Gender <sup>1</sup>				
Male	33	79	1132	66
Female	9	21	580	34

**Table 2.3: Case Characteristics at Screening—Douglas County, Continued**

	Selected for DTC (N=42)		Not Selected for DTC (N=1,712)	
	n	%	n	%
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>				
White	20	48	790	46
African-American	18	43	723	42
Hispanic	1	2	133	8
Other	3	7	65	4
<b>Charge Type</b>				
Status	6	14	328	19
Misdemeanor	33	79	1187	69
Felony	3	7	197	11
Revoke Case*	10	24	139	8
<b>Insurance</b>				
None	8	19	269	16
Private	16	38	502	29
Medicaid	17	41	940	55
DK/Missing	1	2	1	<1

\*p<.05; †p<.10

The most dramatic differences between drug court participants and the cases not selected for drug court were found in the areas of substance abuse and mental health (see Table 2.4). All of the drug court participants had a diagnosis for abuse or dependency, but the type of problem was missing in three cases. Conversely, 48% of the cases not selected for drug court did not have a substance abuse problem and only 23% had a diagnosis of abuse or dependency. Accounting for missing data (29%), the prevalence of substance abuse problems would still be much higher in the drug court group. The pattern was similar for mental health problems. Drug court participants were more likely to have mental health problems (64%) compared to cases not selected for drug court (29%). Although the disparity could change if missing data were available, it is unlikely that all cases would be classified as having a mental health problem.

**Table 2.4: Substance Abuse & Mental Health Status at Screening—Douglas County**

	Selected for DTC (N=42)		Not Selected for DTC (N=1,712)	
	n	%	n	%
<b>Substance Abuse/Dependency Diagnosis*</b>				
None			826	48
Abuse	10	24	181	11
Dependency	26	62	202	12
DK/Missing	6	14	503	29

\*p<.05; †p<.10

**Table 2.4: Substance Abuse & Mental Health Status at Screening—Douglas County  
Continued**

	Selected for DTC (N=42)		Not Selected for DTC (N=1,712)	
Mental Health Diagnosis*				
No	9	21	645	38
Yes	27	64	494	29
Don't Know/Missing	6	14	571	33

\*p<.05; †p<.10

Taken together, DTC participants in Douglas County were more likely to be male; their case was more likely to be a revocation; they had greater substance abuse problems; and, they were more likely to have mental health problems than cases not selected for participation.

*Results for Lancaster County*

Table 2.5 contains Lancaster County offender characteristics for all cases selected for drug court compared to cases screened but not selected for drug court in Lancaster County. There was only one significant difference between the groups: DTC participant cases were more likely to be a revocation than cases not selected for drug court. Otherwise, the two groups of cases were more similar than different. Approximately three-quarters of the groups were male and white, almost all of the cases were charged with misdemeanors, and approximately half of the cases had private insurance.

**Table 2.5: Case Characteristics at Screening—Lancaster County**

	Selected of DTC (N=34)		Not Selected for DTC (N=635)	
	n	%	n	%
Gender				
Male	27	79	457	72
Female	7	21	178	28
Race/Ethnicity				
White	27	79	485	76
African-American	4	12	77	12
Hispanic	3	9	21	3
Other			52	8
Charge Type				
Status			3	1
Misdemeanor	33	97	577	91
Felony	1	3	54	8
Revoke Case*	22	65	38	6

\*p<.05; †p<.10

**Table 2.5: Offender and Case Characteristics at Screening—Lancaster County  
Continued**

	Selected of DTC (N=34)		Not Selected for DTC (N=635)	
	n	%	n	%
Insurance				
None	9	26	129	20
Private	19	56	290	46
Medicaid	6	18	215	34
DK/Missing			1	<1

\*p<.05; †p<.10

Similar to the results for Douglas County, group differences appeared when the prevalence of substance abuse and mental health was examined (see Table 2.6). Whereas 65% of cases not selected for DTC had no substance abuse problem, 100% of DTC participants were diagnosed with abuse or dependency (data for 3% or one case was missing with regard to the type of problem). Drug court participants were also more likely to have mental health problems (41%) compared to cases not selected for drug court (29%). Missing data throws question on the difference between groups, but it is unlikely that results would change if data were made available.

**Table 2.6: Substance Abuse & Mental Health Status at Screening  
—Lancaster County**

	Selected of DTC (N=34)		Not Selected for DTC (N=635)	
	n	%	n	%
Substance Abuse/Dependency Diagnosis*				
None			411	65
Abuse	13	38	87	14
Dependency	20	59	76	12
DK/Missing	1	3	61	10
Mental Health Diagnosis*				
No	14	53	337	53
Yes	18	41	118	29
Don't Know/Missing	2	6	117	18

\*p<.05; †p<.10

Taken together, DTC participants in Lancaster County were more likely to have substance abuse and mental health problems, and their cases were more likely to involve revocations. Otherwise, DTC cases reflected similar characteristics to those in cases not selected for DTC.

*Results for Sarpy County Results*

Table 2.7 displays similar results for Sarpy County. With the exception of gender, both groups were similar with regard to race/ethnicity, charge type, and revocation status. In Sarpy County, DTC participants were more likely to be males than offenders in cases not selected for DTC, but the majority (89% and 82%) of offenders were white and charged with a misdemeanor. Although the prevalence of revocation cases was slightly higher in DTC cases, the difference was not significant.

**Table 2.7: Case Characteristics at Screening—Sarpy County**

	Selected of DTC (N=53)		Not Selected for DTC (N=667)	
	n	%	n	%
<b>Gender*</b>				
Male	47	89	483	72
Female	6	11	184	28
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>				
White	47	89	544	82
African-American	3	6	47	7
Hispanic			28	4
Other	3	5	33	5
Missing			14	2
Revoke Case	7	13	62	9
<b>Charge Type</b>				
Status	6	11	85	13
Misdemeanor	45	87	568	85
Felony	1	2	13	2
DK/Missing	1	2		

\*p<.05; <sup>1</sup>p<.10; Note: Sarpy County did not collect information on insurance status.

Again, the most noticeable difference between groups was substance abuse (see Table 2.8). All DTC participants had a substance abuse problem compared to only 31% of cases not selected for drug court. The type of problem was missing for six of the DTC cases.

**Table 2.8: Substance Abuse Status at Screening—Sarpy County**

	Selected of DTC (N=53)		Not Selected for DTC (N=667)	
	n	%	n	%
None			361	54
Abuse	5	10	94	14
Dependency	41	79	115	17
DK/Missing	6	12	97	15

\*p<.05; <sup>1</sup>p<.10; NOTE: Sarpy County did not collection information on mental illness.

Taken together, DTC participants in Sarpy County were more likely to be male, and they were more likely to have a substance abuse problem than all cases screened for the program.

### Summary

The results presented in this chapter document the use of a standardized process to screen cases for drug court eligibility. Based on the findings reported for each county, it appears that all counties maintained the integrity of the screening and selection process. In other words, they applied the screening process in a consistent manner and selected cases that met the eligibility criteria. In Douglas and Sarpy Counties, ineligible youths were placed in the program, but this practice occurred in the beginning of the program and was discontinued when it was clear that this practice was not advantageous to the youth or the program.

DTC participants in all three counties reflect the general characteristics of the greater population of cases screened for drug court. The largest differences were found for substance abuse and mental health. Since substance abuse was a primary criterion of program selection, this finding supports the notion that the counties are utilizing and following a standard screening and selection process.

Although the findings are positive with regard to screening and selection, two findings desire further attention. First, each county had missing information in a portion of cases. This is problematic because it throws question on whether the screening process was consistently applied to all pre-disposition cases. Secondly, males were more likely to be selected for DTC in two counties. This may simply reflect the need for substance abuse treatment in the population of offenders; however, it may also be the consequence of limited resources or selection bias.

### **Chapter 3: Outcome Evaluation Results**

The outcome evaluation focused on whether drug court participants were more likely than non-drug court participants to experience reductions in substance abuse and recidivism and improvements in pro-social functioning. A key component to outcome evaluation is equivalent group comparisons, which involves comparing the results of program participants to an equivalent group of individuals who did not receive the intervention. Group selection is best accomplished through random assignment to ensure statistical equivalency across the treatment and comparison groups. To date, drug court evaluations typically rely on non-experimental designs or non-equivalent comparison groups. The current study attempts to improve upon previous research by increasing the equivalent nature of treatment and comparison groups. Since random assignment was not possible, a quasi-experimental design was used to identify a comparison group matched to DTC participants on key characteristics.

#### Description of the Group Selection Process

As discussed in Chapter 2, all pre-disposition cases were screened for DTC eligibility. This procedure created a pool of eligible offenders who, by definition, shared the characteristics necessary for program selection. Since the drug court programs could not serve all eligible offenders, most eligible offenders received traditional disposition outcomes (i.e., probation, placement with the Office of Juvenile Services, placement at a Youth Rehabilitation Treatment Center). UNO staff, in turn, used this pool of offenders to select a comparison group. Specifically, eligible offenders not selected for DTC participation were matched to each of the offenders selected for the program using the following criteria (1) disposition date; (2) gender; and (3) race/ethnicity.

The primary criterion for matching was disposition date. The disposition date for matched offenders had to fall within one month before or after the drug court placement date. After this criterion was met, attempts were made to match on the gender and race/ethnicity of the offender. When multiple cases were available for selection, a case was picked randomly. In cases where no date match was possible, race and gender were matched.

Although date matches were not available in many cases (see Table 3.1), the matching process was quite successful with regard to gender and race/ethnicity (see Appendix A for more comparisons between these two groups). The range of date difference ranged from two months to ten months before or after the DTC youth began the drug court program.

**Table 3.1: Summary of Matched Characteristics across Treatment and Comparison Youths**

Match Criteria	Douglas		Lancaster		Sarpy	
	DTC	Non-DTC	DTC	Non-DTC	DTC	Non-DTC
No. Assigned	39	39	34	34	53	51
Gender						
Male	31	31	28	28	47	45
Female	8	8	6	6	6	6
Race						
White	18	21	28	30	47	50
African-Am.	17	17	4	4	3	1
Hispanic	1	1	2		2	
Asian	2					
Native Am.	1				1	
Date Match	17 (40%)		23 (68%)		20 (38%)	

Program outcomes were measured using a variety of data, including pre/post test surveys, drug testing results; out-of-home placements; new arrest data; and case file information. Data sources and the methods used to analyze the data are described in separate sections that follow.

Pre/Post Test Surveys

*Data and Methods*

All youth selected for the DTC were asked to complete a pre-test at the beginning of the program and a post-test at graduation. Both surveys contained self-report measures that captured delinquency, alcohol and drug use, attitudes toward alcohol and drug use, parent conflict and communication, self-esteem, respect for authority, and many other dimensions related to program goals and objectives. Attempts were made to administer pre/post test surveys to comparison youths. This effort was eventually abandoned due to high refusal rates and limited accessibility comparison youths within one month of his/her disposition.

Pre-testing procedures began once a DTC coordinator informed UNO research staff that a new subject was entering the program. Within two to four weeks, UNO staff made contact with the participant’s family to obtain consent for study participation. When approaching a potential subject, UNO researcher staff introduced themselves to the parents/guardians and explained the study protocol using an institutional review board-approved consent form. After obtaining parental consent, the investigators spoke to the youth and explained the study protocol. After obtaining the youth’s assent, the investigators pre-tested the youth at that time or at the next court hearing.

The coordinators informed UNO research staff when participants were ready to graduate. A UNO research staff person then arrived prior to the graduation ceremony and

administered the post-test to the graduating youth. In some cases, the investigator arranged to meet with the youth prior to the actual graduation ceremony. If a child was terminated, post-tests were not administered because he/she was usually sent to a youth rehabilitation treatment center, placed out of the area, or were “on the run.”

As displayed in Table 3.2, the response rates for pre-tests ranged from 72% in Sarpy County to 82% in Lancaster County. Post-test survey response rates were slightly higher than pre-test rates in Sarpy and Lancaster Counties, but they were lower in Douglas County. The low response rate in Douglas may be attributable in part to the low number of graduates. Completion of both tests mirrored the rates for post-test survey completion.

**Table 3.2: Distribution of Pre/Post Test Completion by County**

	<b>Douglas (N=39)</b>		<b>Lancaster (N=34)</b>		<b>Sarpy (N=53)</b>	
<b>Pre-Test Survey</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>
Completed	30	77	28	82	38	72
Refused	9	23	6	18	15	28
	<b>Graduates (N=7)</b>		<b>Graduates (N=9)</b>		<b>Graduates (N=26)</b>	
<b>Post-Test Survey</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Completed	3	50	9	100	21	81
Refused	3	43	0	---	5	19
<b>Both Surveys</b>						
Completed*	3	57	9	100	21	81

The analysis in this section is limited to participants who graduated from the drug court program and completed a pre-test survey. On April 30, 2003, a total of 33 youths had graduated from drug court programs and completed the pre/post test surveys. Since individual county numbers were low, data from all counties was aggregated for these analyses.

Pre/post test surveys were created to measure drug court program objectives using standardized scales available in the public domain. Alphas were computed for all scales. Appendix A contains the number of items and the alpha values for each scale. Missing data for individual items prevented the calculation of a scale in some cases. To avoid the deletion of cases from a small number of cases, missing data were replaced with the median value for each scale .

In sum, scales were used to measure the goals and objectives of the Tri-County drug court programs. These scales comprised four areas including self-report delinquent behavior, self-reported substance abuse, family functioning and school functioning, and individual social functioning. Differences between pre-test scale means and post-test scale means were computed and the statistical significance of mean differences was tested using a t-test statistic.

*Results for Self-Reported Delinquency*

The results for delinquency are contained in Table 3.3. DTC graduates reported a significant decrease in the total amount of person and property delinquency committed since the beginning of the program. Specifically, post-test delinquency decreased 82% compared to delinquency reported at pre-test. Consistent with these findings, peer delinquency decreased 33% and respondents were also more likely to report that deception was wrong (-14%). Although the change related to the wrongfulness of crime was not significant, the change was also in the positive direction.

**Table 3.3: Pre/Post Test Mean Comparisons for Delinquency**

Scale Name	Pre-Test		Post-Test		Mean Difference	Direction of Change
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Delinquency	0.88	1.02	0.16	0.24	-0.72 *	Decreased 82%
Peer Delinquency	1.88	0.82	1.26	0.30	-0.62 *	Decreased 33%
Wrongfulness of Deception	3.60	0.95	4.09	0.91	0.49 *	Increased 14%
Wrongfulness of Crime	4.27	0.61	4.38	0.48	0.12	

\*p <.05; NOTE: Higher scores indicate higher amounts of the scale name. See Appendix A for the scale ranges.

*Results for Alcohol and Other Drug Use*

Several measures were used to measure alcohol and drug use. First, respondents were asked to report the number of times they used alcohol and other drugs in the past year and in the past 30 days. Next, they were asked about their perceived risks and disapproval of alcohol and other drug use. These items were included because research indicates that use is directly correlated to attitudes about use. In other words, the more a youth disapproves of drug use, the less likely he/she is to use drugs. Finally, drug use is often correlated with peer use so respondents were asked whether their close friends used alcohol and/or other drugs.

Table 3.4 contains the results for each of these scales. Most measures were in the desired direction, indicating increased disapproval and decreased use of alcohol and other drugs. Five of the nine changes obtained statistical significance. The largest percentage decrease was for alcohol and marijuana use, which ranged from a reduction of 81% to 100%. Correspondingly, respondents' disapproval of marijuana use increased 21% and peer drug use decreased 21%.

**Table 3.4: Pre/Post Test Mean Comparisons for Alcohol and Other Drug Use**

Scale Name	Pre-Test		Post-Test		Mean Difference	Direction of Change
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Alcohol Use-Past Year	10.91	14.74	1.36	2.61	-9.55 *	Decreased 88%
Marijuana Use-Past Year	23.73	16.85	4.52	11.92	-19.21 *	Decreased 81%
Alcohol Use-Past 30 Days	0.45	1.46	0.18	1.04	-0.27	
Marijuana Use-Past 30 Days	1.48	4.00	0.00	0.00	-1.48 *	Decreased 100%
Marijuana Perceived Risk	2.11	0.82	2.31	0.87	0.20	
Alcohol Perceived Risk	2.72	0.63	2.89	0.72	0.17	
Disapproval of Marijuana Use	1.33	0.56	1.61	0.68	0.28 *	Increased 21%
Disapproval of Alcohol Use	1.64	0.61	1.60	0.61	0.04	
Peer Drug Use	3.08	0.84	2.42	0.51	-0.65 *	Decreased 21%

\*p <.05; NOTE: Higher scores indicate higher amounts of the scale name. See Appendix A for the scale ranges.

### *Results for Family and School Functioning*

Table 3.5 displays the results for family and school functioning. According to these results, respondents experienced changes in desired directions on all measures related to family functioning except consensus with parents; however, the only statistically significant differences were found for the level of caring and trust between respondent and parent/guardian(s) (+8%) and the extent to which respondents believed that their parents associated them with negative images (-16%).

Conversely, responses in school commitment did not change in the desired direction and there was virtually no change in school performance. The items used for school commitment focused on the desirability of school-related tasks. Unfortunately, the school functioning measures were limited in the current study. For instance, measures of actual academic performance were not available for the current study (for more information on this point, see Chapter 4, p. 41).

**Table 3.5: Pre/Post Test Mean Comparisons for Family and School Functioning**

Scale Name	Pre-Test		Post-Test		Mean Difference	Direction of Change
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Parental Supervision	3.00	0.64	3.15	0.41	0.16	
Caring and Trust	3.05	0.57	3.29	0.46	0.23 *	Increased—8%
Intimate Communication	2.96	0.50	3.06	0.72	0.10	
Consensus with Parents	2.55	0.76	2.41	0.91	-0.14	
Negative Labeling	2.01	0.64	1.69	0.52	-0.31 *	Decreased 16%
School Commitment	2.70	0.51	2.55	0.42	-0.15	
School Performance	2.95	0.64	2.94	0.81	-0.02	

\*p <.05; NOTE: Higher scores indicate higher amounts of the scale name. See Appendix A for the scale ranges.

### *Results for Individual Social Functioning*

Individual social functioning refers to a variety of respondent psychosocial characteristics. Scales in this area included the way in which the respondent used his/her time, his/her perceptions of self-worth and efficacy, his/her emotional well-being, and his/her respect for authority. Seven measures moved in the desired direction, but only identity support (9%) increased significantly. Conversely, two measures, self-worth and social acceptance (i.e., extent to which one feels like he/she “fits” in) changed in an undesired direction (see Table 3.6), but social acceptance (-16%) was the only statistically significant change.

**Table 3.6: Pre/Post Test Mean Comparisons for Individual Social Functioning**

Scale Name	Pre-Test		Post-Test		Mean Difference	Direction of Change
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Artistic Leisure Activities	2.07	1.17	2.18	1.33	0.11	
Identity Support	2.76	0.59	3.01	0.57	0.25 *	Increased 9%
Emotional Control	3.36	1.12	3.50	1.04	0.14	
Positive Mood State	3.88	0.64	3.91	1.01	0.03	
Self Control	2.88	0.75	2.91	0.78	0.02	
External Locus of Control	1.83	0.71	2.02	0.57	0.18	
Self Worth	3.99	0.69	3.92	0.69	-0.08	
Social Acceptance	4.12	0.63	3.45	1.19	-0.67 *	Decreased 16%
Respect for Authority	3.67	0.66	3.85	0.60	0.18	

\*p <.05; NOTE: Higher scores indicate higher amounts of the scale name. See Appendix A for the scale ranges.

### Drug Use

#### *Data and Methods*

Data were collected on the number and results of drug tests for both DTC and Non-DTC youths. Drug test data were drawn from a web-based management system operated in each county for DTC participants and from the Nebraska State Probation database for comparison group youths. Missing data was not an issue for DTC youths, but there were concerns related to data for comparison group youths. First, a few youths were not found in Probation’s database. The youths missing from the database were possibly placed in the custody of the Office of Juvenile Services, which does not maintain a centralized database to record drug tests. Secondly, it is believed an administrative change for entering drug tests may have temporarily interrupted consistent and accurate data entry. Unfortunately, there is no way to determine how many drug tests were missed, but Probation administrators estimated the number to be low.

For DTC youths, drug test data reflected the number of drug tests completed between the time they were placed in drug court and (1) their successful completion of DTC; (2) their termination from drug court; or (3) the end of the evaluation, April 30, 2003. For

comparison group youths, these data reflect the number of drug tests completed between the start of their disposition and (1) the successful completion of their disposition, or (2) the end of the evaluation, April 30, 2003.

Descriptive statistics were used to identify general patterns related to positive tests. Tests for statistical significance were not possible due to missing data for comparison youths.

*Results for Douglas County*

Consistent with the intent of drug courts, alcohol and other drug use among DTC youths were monitored far more than Non-DTC youths. DTC youths were given a total of 2,149 drug tests and Non-DTC received 182 tests. The percentage of positive tests for offenders in both groups is presented in Table 3.7. According to these results, Non-DTC youths were more likely than DTC youths (58% compared to 22%, respectively) to test negative for alcohol/drug use, and DTC youths (65%) were more likely to test positive 1-50% of the time than Non-DTC youths (39%). DTC youths were also more likely to test positive over 50% of the time than Non-DTC youths (13% compared to 3%).

**Table 3.7: Number of Positive Drug Tests (by Offender)—Douglas County**

% Positive	DTC (N=37)		Non-DTC (N=31)	
	n	%	n	%
None	8	22	18	58
1-25%	18	49	4	13
26-50%	6	16	8	26
51-75%	2	5	1	3
75-100%	3	8		

Table 3.8 captures the relationship between the amount of testing and the percentage of positive tests for offenders in Douglas County. Offenders in the low category received 1-25 tests, offenders in the moderate category received 26-75 tests, and offenders in the high category received over 75 tests. The average percentage of positive tests was calculated for each testing category. The results in this table indicate that more testing resulted in less alcohol and/or drug use for DTC youths. This pattern does not apply to Non-DTC youths because they were not tested more than 25 times.

**Table 3.8: Average Percentage of Positive Drug Tests by Level of Drug Testing —Douglas County**

Test Level	DTC			Non-DTC		
	n	Mean	SD	n	Mean	SD
Low (1-24)	14	38.66	38.18	31	13.73	19.10
Moderate (25-74)	11	14.57	11.72			
High (75-100)	12	8.53	8.29			

*Results for Lancaster County*

In Lancaster County, DTC youths were given a total of 1,828 drug tests and Non-DTC received 237 tests. The percentage of positive tests for offenders in both groups is presented in Table 3.9. According to these results, Non-DTC youths were more likely than DTC youths (46% compared to 29%, respectively) to test negative for alcohol/drug use, and DTC youths (62%) were more likely to test positive 1-50% of the time than Non-DTC youths (27%). Only 9% of DTC youths, however, tested positive more than 50% of the time in contrast to 27% of comparison group youths.

**Table 3.9: Number of Positive Drug Tests by Offender—Lancaster County**

% Positive	DTC (N=34)		Non-DTC (N=26)	
	n	%	n	%
None	10	29	12	46
1-25%	21	62	7	27
26-50%	3	9	4	15
51-75%			1	4
75-100%			2	8

Table 3.10 captures the relationship between the amount of testing and the percentage of positive tests for offenders in Lancaster County. Offenders in the low category received 1-25 tests, offenders in the moderate category received 26-75 tests, and offenders in the high category received over 75 tests. The average percentage of positive tests was calculated for each testing category. Similar to Douglas County, the results indicate that more testing results in less alcohol and/or drug use for DTC youths, but the opposite held for Non-DTC youths, for whom percentage positives increased with the amount of drug testing.

**Table 3.10: Average Percentage of Positive Drug Tests by Level of Testing—Lancaster County**

Test Level	DTC (N=34)			NON-DTC (N=26)		
	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD
Low (1-24)	6	21.01	14.16	23	18.64	28.66
Moderate (25-74)	20	3.86	5.60	3	32.22	20.34
High (75-100)	8	2.25	1.74			

*Results for Sarpy County*

Sarpy County DTC youths received a total of 1,646 drug tests and Non-DTC received 307 tests. The percentage of positive tests for offenders in both groups is presented in Table 3.11. According to these results, Non-DTC youths were more likely than DTC youths (66% compared to 25%, respectively) to test negative for alcohol/drug use, and DTC youths (71%) were more likely to test positive 1-50% of the time than their Non-DTC counterparts (27%). The proportion of youths testing positive 50-100% of the time was the same in both groups (4% for DTC youths compared to 7% for Non-DTC youths).

**Table 3.11: Number of Positive Drug Tests by Offender—Sarpy County**

% Positive	DTC (N=52)		Non-DTC (N=44)	
	n	%	n	%
None	13	25	29	66
1-25%	25	48	9	20
26-50%	12	23	3	7
51-75%	2	4	2	5
75-100%		0	1	2

Table 3.12 captures the relationship between the amount of testing and the percentage of positive tests for offenders in Sarpy County. Offenders in the low category received 1-25 tests, offenders in the moderate category received 26-75 tests, and offenders in the high category received over 75 tests. The average percentage of positive tests was calculated for each testing category. Similar to the other counties, results indicate that more testing results in less alcohol and/or drug use for DTC youths, and consistent with Lancaster County results, Non-DTC youths were more likely to test positive as testing increased.

**Table 3.12: Average Percentage of Positive Drug Tests by Level of Testing—Sarpy County**

Test Level	DTC (N=52)			Non-DTC (N=44)		
	n	Mean	SD	n	Mean	SD
Low (1-24)	22	18.26	18.92	40	10.11	20.41
Moderate (25-74)	30	14.48	15.23	4	20.57	23.94
High (75-100)	0			0		

Out of Home Placements

*Data and Methods*

Out of home placements refer to any event in which an offender (DTC or Non-DTC) was taken out of the community and placed in a residential setting. Out of home placements include short-term (e.g., a weekend) and long-term (e.g., several months) placement at a detention center, the Youth Rehabilitation Treatment Centers (i.e., Geneva or Kearney), and/or a residential treatment program. Both DTC and Non-DTC youths were given out

of home placements during their disposition, but not all youths received them. Both treatment and detention/YRTC placement data were available for DTC youths, but only detention/YRTC data were available for Non-DTC youths. Treatment placements for youths after DTC termination were also unknown.

Placement results were included in this chapter because they are directly related to drug testing, and they have implications for recidivism. Detention is an option for sanctioning alcohol and drug use among DTC youths, and as a result, drug courts potentially impact the use of detention within a jurisdiction. Since substantial debate surrounds this issue, presentation of this topic seemed best suited in this chapter.

Placement data were analyzed to compare the number of detentions and the total number of days spent in detention by both DTC and Non-DTC youths. Additionally, the reason for DTC youth placements and the type of placements used for these placements were examined when data were available. When applicable, t-test statistic procedures were used to test for group differences.

### *Results for Douglas County*

Out-of-home placements provide the juvenile court with the ability to increase an offender’s level of supervision, sanction violations, and access more services. They are particularly important to drug court programs because they provide a swift sanction to non-compliance and access to a higher level of treatment care. Table 3.13 provides insight into how often detentions were used in Douglas County. As mentioned earlier, out-of-home placements can include detention placements (i.e., county detention facilities or OJS Youth Rehabilitation Treatment Centers) or treatment programming. As shown in this table, the same proportion of youths in both groups were detained at some point in their disposition (67% DTC and 69% Non-DTC), but DTC youths were placed more times than Non-DTC youths. For instance, 41% of DTC youths were detained three or more times compared to 5% of Non-DTC youths.

With regard to treatment placements, DTC youths received fewer treatment placements than detention placements. Only 46% of DTC participants needed a treatment placement compared to 67% placed in detention. A similar comparison for Non-DTC youths was not possible because treatment placement information for this group was not available.

**Table 3.13: Distribution of Placements—Douglas County**

Number of Placements	Detention Placements (Detention Center or YRTC)				Treatment Placements	
	DTC (N=39)		Non-DTC (N=39)		DTC (N=39)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
None	13	33	12	31	21	54
One	5	13	17	44	13	33
Two	5	13	5	13	2	5
Three	11	28	4	10	2	5

**Table 3.13: Distribution of Placements—Douglas County, Continued**

Number of Placements	Detention Placements (Detention Center or YRTC)				Treatment Placements	
	DTC (N=39)		Non-DTC (N=39)		DTC (N=39)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Four	2	5	1	3		
Five	2	5			1	3
Six	1	3				

Table 3.14 compares means related to out-of-home placements across groups. Although the means for groups may seem different, they are not statistically different if the difference does not reach statistical significance. For instance, the average number of days in the system for DTC youths was 324 compared to 284 for Non-DTC youths, but the difference was not statistically different; thus, the time spent in the system was comparable across groups. Conversely, the average number of detentions was statistically significant across groups, indicating that DTC youths were detained more often than Non-DTC youths (1.85 detentions compared to 1.10 detentions). DTC youths, however, spent fewer days on average in detention than Non-DTC youths (21.31 days compared to 46.71, respectively). As expected, the total number of placements also differed because treatment placements were added to the total number of placements for DTC youths.

**Table 3.14: Mean Comparisons for Placements—Douglas County**

	DTC (N=39)		Non-DTC (N=39)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Total Days in the System	324.10	309.74	284.21	251.22
No. of Detentions After Disposition	1.85	1.69	1.10	1.05 *
No. Days Spent in Detention Placements	21.31	30.19	46.71	60.39 *
No. of Treatment Placements After Disposition	0.72	1.07	n/a	n/a
No. Days Spent in Treatment Placements	87.00	144.27	n/a	n/a
Total Number of Placements	2.64	2.43	1.10	1.05 *

\* Difference is statistically significant at the  $p < .05$  using t-test statistic procedures.

*Results for Lancaster County*

Table 3.15 provides insight into how often detentions were used in Lancaster County. As shown in this table, the same proportion of youths in both groups were detained at some point in their disposition (59% DTC and 56% Non-DTC), but DTC youths were placed more times than Non-DTC youths. For instance, 24% of DTC youths were detained three or more times compared to 4% of Non-DTC youths.

With regard to treatment placements, DTC youths received fewer treatment placements than detention placements. Only 18% of DTC participants needed a treatment placement compared to 59% placed in detention. A similar comparison for Non-DTC youths was not possible because treatment placement information for this group was not available.

**Table 3.15: Distribution of Placements—Lancaster County**

Number of Placements	Detention Placements (Detention Center or YRTC)				Treatment Placements	
	DTC (N=34)		Non-DTC (N=34)		DTC (N=34)	
	n	%	N	%	n	%
None	14	41	15	44	28	82
One	7	21	11	32	5	15
Two	5	15	4	12	1	3
Three	4	12	4	12		
Four	2	6				
Five	1	3				
Six	1	3				

Table 3.16 compares means related to out-of-home placements across groups. Although the means for groups may seem different, they are not statistically different if the difference does not reach statistical significance. For instance, the average number of detention placements for DTC youths was 1.4 compared to .91 for Non-DTC youths, but this difference was not statistically significant. Conversely, the average number of days spent in detention was statistically significant across groups, indicating that Non-DTC youths stayed longer in detention than DTC youths (46.56 days in detention compared to 14.79 days). As expected, the total number of placements also differed because treatment placements were added to the total number of placements for DTC youths.

**Table 3.16: Mean Comparisons for Placements—Lancaster County**

	<b>DTC (N=34)</b>		<b>Non-DTC (N=34)</b>	
	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>
Total Days in the System	244.76	261.42	239.65	254.18
No. of Detention Placements After Disposition	1.41	1.64	0.91	1.03
No. Days Spent in Detention Placements	14.79	21.90	46.56	80.59 *
No. of Treatment Placements After Disposition	0.21	0.48	n/a	n/a
No. Days Spent in Treatment Placements	14.62	34.37	n/a	n/a
Total Number of Placements	1.71	1.99	0.91	1.03 *

\* Difference is statistically significant at the  $p < .05$  using t-test statistic procedures.

Lancaster County recorded the reasons for detaining DTC youths. As illustrated in Table 3.17, continued alcohol/drug use and violations of court order/program rules accounted for 71% of detention placements. Additionally, placements were used when participants committed a new offense, were terminated from treatment, or were terminated the DTC program.

**Table 3.17: Reasons for Detaining DTC Participants—Lancaster County (N=58)**

<b>Reason</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>
Alcohol/Drug Use	26	45
Alcohol/Drug Use & Violation	15	26
Treatment Placement	7	12
Rule Violation/New Arrest	5	9
Termination Outcome	3	5
Kicked Out of Treatment	2	3

*Results for Sarpy County*

Table 3.18 provides insight into how often detentions were used in Sarpy County. As shown in this table, DTC youths were detained more often than Non-DTC youths (49% DTC and 25% Non-DTC), and DTC youths were placed more times than Non-DTC youths. For instance, 18% of DTC youths were detained three or more times compared to 4% of Non-DTC youths.

With regard to treatment placements, DTC youths were only slightly less likely to receive a treatment placement than detention placement. Forty-four percent of DTC participants needed a treatment placement compared to 49% placed in detention. A similar comparison for Non-DTC youths was not possible because treatment placement information for this group was not available.

**Table 3.18: Distribution of Placements—Sarpy County**

Number of Placements	Detention Placements (Detention Center or YRTC)				Treatment Placements	
	DTC (N=53)		Non-DTC (N=51)		DTC (N=53)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
None	27	51	38	75	35	66
One	13	25	11	22	12	23
Two	4	8	2	4	4	8
Three	2	4			2	4
Four	3	6				
Five	1	2				
Six	2	4				
Seven	1	2				

Table 3.19 compares means related to out-of-home placements across groups. For Sarpy County, all comparisons were significantly different. DTC youths were in the system longer than Non-DTC youths, they received more placements than Non-DTC youths (1.19 compared to .29), and they spent 13.02 days in detention compared to 4.75 days for Non-DTC youths. As expected, the total number of placements also differed because treatment placements were added to the total number of placements for DTC youths.

**Table 3.19: Mean Comparisons for Placements—Sarpy County**

	DTC (N=53)		Non-DTC (N=51)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Total Days in the System	186.57	229.94	67.22	149.02 *
No. of Detentions After Disposition	1.19	1.79	0.29	0.54 *
No. Days Spent in Detention Placements	13.02	29.47	4.75	12.59 *
No. of Treatment Placements After Dispositions	0.49	0.80	n/a	n/a
No. Days Spent in Treatment Placements	26.17	61.39	n/a	n/a
Total Number of Placements	1.70	1.84	0.29	0.54 *

\* Difference is statistically significant at the  $p < .05$  using t-test statistic procedures.

## Recidivism

### *Data and Methods*

Arrest data offer a direct measure of recidivism after court intervention. New arrests were measured in the current study by obtaining arrest records for all treatment and comparison youths from DTC coordinators in each county. Arrests refer to any new offenses committed after disposition. The type of behaviors for which an arrest was

made varies from minor infractions (i.e., in the park after dark) to more serious ones (i.e., assault).

Each coordinator generated a list of new arrests by study subjects between the time they were placed in the drug court or traditional disposition and the end of the evaluation, April 30, 2003. Since juvenile arrest data are not centralized in Nebraska, the arrest data in this study are limited to new arrests within the county of disposition. Arrests do not always result in formal charges, and it is important to note that the current study does not distinguish between the two. Offenses were coded into one of the following categories: person offense, property offense, alcohol/drug offense, other offense, and status offense. When analyses account for the type of arrest, the most serious charge is considered.

Descriptive analyses were used to compare the number of offenders arrested across groups. Two comparisons were made. The first comparison accounts for a raw number of arrests, and the second comparison accounts for days spent in a placement by comparing arrest rates relative to the number of days available to commit an offense. T-test statistics were computed when applicable to determine whether the difference between groups was significant.

Additionally, OLS regression was used to examine the relationship between recidivism and drug court participation, disposition status (i.e., still in disposition, terminated, and completed), offender demographics, arrest type, supervision contacts, and mental health status. The dependent variable used for these analyses was the number of new arrests. This analysis is presented to provide a comprehensive understanding of the impact that DTC participation and/or components of the DTC program may have on the reduction of new arrests.

Included in the regression analysis was information collected from offender case files. Case files included court records and when available, pre-disposition investigation (PDI) reports, Office of Juvenile Services (OJS) evaluations, and/or non-OJS substance abuse and mental health evaluations. Some files contained all three reports while others included some combination of the three. UNO research staff reviewed case files and coded the following information for each of the treatment and comparison youths: charge type, disposition outcome, previous experience with the juvenile court, service referral recommendations, presence of substance abuse and mental health problems, family conflict, school problems, and placement in detention.

Case files were found for almost all treatment and control youths. In Douglas County, case files were found for 100% of treatment youths and 92% of comparison youths; in Lancaster County, 98% of treatment case files and 94% of comparison case files were found; and, in Sarpy County, 97% of case files for both groups of youths were located.

The types of information contained in case files differed by county and group. Basic court information was found in all case files. In Douglas, most case files contained a PDI report and an OJS evaluation. In Sarpy, most youth case files contained a PDI report and a non-OJS evaluation or a PDI, OJS evaluation, and a non-OJS evaluation. In Lancaster, most case files contained a PDI report and an OJS evaluation or just a PDI report.

Even though case files were available in almost all cases, specific information on social characteristics and substance abuse and mental health problems was not consistently reported. To reduce missing data, a combined measure was created, using the most recent evaluation as the base measure of the characteristic. When there were multiple evaluations within a short (2 to 3 weeks) time periods, the OJS evaluation information was used because it generally contained more information than other reports. If possible, missing data in remaining cases was replaced with the same variable from a different evaluation. For instance, if family conflict was missing in the OJS evaluation, family conflict in the PDI report was used to reduce missing data.

*Results for Douglas County*

Table 3.20 displays the distribution of new arrests for Douglas County youths. As shown in this table, 41% of DTC youths recidivated compared to 36% of Non-DTC youths. Among offenders who committed new offenses, the majority committed only one new offense. Nine percent of DTC youths and 10% of Non-DTC youths committed four or more offenses after their placement in DTC or traditional disposition.

**Table 3.20: Number of New Arrests—Douglas County**

No. Arrests	Total New Arrests			
	DTC (N=39)		Non-DTC (N=39)	
	n	%	n	%
None	23	59	25	64
One	9	23	6	15
Two	2	5	3	8
Three	2	5	1	3
Four	1	3	2	5
Five	1	3		
Six				
Seven			2	5
Eight				
Nine	1	3		

Table 3.21 contains mean comparisons for new arrests. The absence of statistically significant differences indicates that offending patterns for both groups was more similar than different. According to the results in this table, youths in both groups were nearly identical in their offending. DTC youths had slightly fewer offenses during their programming, but this difference was not significant.

**Table 3.21: Mean Comparisons of New Arrests—Douglas County**

	DTC (N=39)		Non-DTC (N=39)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Total No. of New Arrests After Disposition	0.95	1.79	0.95	1.79
Offended During Programming (Y/N)	0.31	0.47	0.28	0.46
No. of Offenses During Programming	0.41	0.75	0.49	0.91

\* Difference is statistically significant at the  $p < .05$  using t-test statistic procedures.

The pattern changes slightly when terminated youths are removed from the analysis. As shown in Table 3.22, excluding terminated youths improves the overall average offending pattern of DTC youths. The total number of arrests drops noticeably and the number of offenses committed during programming also decreased. None of these changes, however, was statistically significant.

**Table 3.22: Mean Comparisons of New Arrests Excluding Terminated DTC Youths—Douglas County**

	DTC (N=26)		Non-DTC (N=39)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Total No. of New Arrests After Disposition	0.42	0.76	0.95	1.79
Offended During Programming (Y/N)	0.27	0.45	0.28	0.46
No. of Offenses During Programming	0.35	0.69	0.49	0.91

\* Difference is statistically significant at the  $p < .05$  using t-test statistic procedures.

*Results for Lancaster County*

Table 3.23 displays the distribution of new arrests for Lancaster County youths. As shown in this table, 53% of DTC youths recidivated compared to 32% of Non-DTC youths. Among offenders who committed new offenses, the majority committed only one new offense. Nine percent of DTC youths and 12% of Non-DTC youths committed two or more offenses after their placement in DTC or traditional disposition.

**Table 3.23: Number of New Arrests—Lancaster County**

No. Arrests	Total New Arrests			
	DTC (N=34)		Non-DTC (N=34)	
	n	%	n	%
None	16	47	23	68
One	15	44	7	21
Two	1	3	1	3
Three	2	6	1	3
Four			2	6

Table 3.24 contains mean comparisons for new arrests. In general, DTC youths' average offending was slightly higher than Non-DTC youths, but this difference was not statistically significant. There was only one exception: DTC youths were more likely to have a new arrest during their programming than Non-DTC youths.

**Table 3.24: Mean Comparisons of New Arrests—Lancaster County**

	DTC (N=34)		Non-DTC (N=34)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Total No. of New Arrests After Disposition	0.68	0.81	0.59	1.10
Offended During Programming (Y/N)	0.38	0.49	0.15	0.36 *
No. of Offenses During Programming	0.41	0.56	0.24	0.65

\*Difference is statistically significant at the  $p < .05$  using t-test statistic procedures.

The pattern changes slightly when terminated youths are removed from the analysis. As shown in Table 3.25, excluding terminated youths improves the overall average offending pattern of DTC youths. The total number of arrests drops noticeably and the number of offenses committed during programming also decreased. None of these changes, however, was statistically significant.

**Table 3.25: Mean Comparisons of New Arrests Excluding Terminated DTC Youths—Lancaster County**

	DTC (N=24)		Non-DTC (N=34)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Total No. of New Arrests After Disposition	0.46	0.59	0.59	1.10
Offended During Programming (Y/N)	0.29	0.46	0.15	0.36
No. of Offenses During Programming	0.33	0.56	0.24	0.65

\*Difference is statistically significant at the  $p < .05$  using t-test statistic procedures.

### *Results for Sarpy County*

Table 3.26 displays the distribution of new arrests for Sarpy County youths. As shown in this table, 26% of DTC youths recidivated compared to 14% of Non-DTC youths. Among offenders who committed new offenses, the majority committed only one new offense. Seventeen percent of DTC youths and 6% of Non-DTC youths committed two or more offenses.

**Table 3.26: Number of New Arrests—Sarpy County**

No. Arrests	Total New Arrests			
	DTC (N=53)		Non-DTC (N=51)	
	n	%	n	%
None	39	74	44	86
One	4	8	4	8
Two	8	15	2	4
Three	1	2		
Four				
Five				
Six			1	2
Seven				
Eight				
Nine	1	2		

Table 3.27 contains mean comparisons for new arrests. DTC youths’ average offending was higher than Non-DTC offending in all categories. DTC were statistically more likely to offend during programming and the average number of offenses was higher than Non-DTC youths. Although the average number of all new arrests was also higher for DTC youths, the difference was not statistically significant.

**Table 3.27: Mean Comparisons of New Arrests—Sarpy County**

	DTC (N=53)		Non-DTC (N=51)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Total No. of New Arrests After Disposition	0.60	1.43	0.27	0.94
Offended During Programming (Y/N)	0.13	0.34	0.02	0.14 *
No. of Offenses During Programming	0.15	0.41	0.02	0.14 *

\* Difference is statistically significant at the  $p < .05$  using t-test statistic procedures.

The pattern changes slightly when terminated youths are removed from the analysis. As shown in Table 3.28, excluding terminated youths improves the overall average offending pattern of DTC youths. The total number of arrests drops noticeably and the number of offenses committed during programming also decreased. None of these changes, however, was statistically significant.

**Table 3.28: Mean Comparisons of New Arrests Excluding Terminated DTC Youths  
—Sarpy County**

	DTC (N=42)		Non-DTC (N=51)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Total No. of New Arrests After Disposition	0.26	0.63	0.27	0.94
Offended During Programming (Y/N)	0.07	0.26	0.02	0.14
No. of Offenses During Programming	0.07	0.26	0.02	0.14

\* Difference is statistically significant at the p<.05 using t-test statistic procedures.

### *Regression Model Results*

The findings reviewed for recidivism indicate that DTC and Non-DTC youths recidivated at similar rates. The next step in this process is to consider recidivism while controlling (or accounting for) a variety of factors that predict recidivism. Regression analysis allows for this type of examination using the number of new arrests as the dependent variable and various characteristics as independent (or predictor) variables. An Ordinary Least Squares Regression (OLS) Model was used for these analyses and the data from all counties were aggregated.

An initial model containing both groups together verified the t-test results: DTC participants were equally as likely to recidivate as Non-DTC participants (model not shown). The next step was to examine what factors led to or decreased the likelihood of recidivism for each of the two groups. Table 3.29 displays the results of this analysis.

Statistically significant effects are bolded under the column “Prob” (i.e., probability). Relative to Sarpy County, the comparison youths in Douglas and Lancaster County were more likely to recidivate. There was no difference for DTC youths across counties. Additionally, male offenders were more likely to recidivate than female offenders in both groups. Finally, an important finding appears with regard to terminated youths in the DTC model. Terminated DTC youths were more likely to recidivate than youths who were not terminated. This finding reinforces the results presented above and has implications for improving programming in all three counties.

**Table 3.29: OLS Regression Models for DTC and Non-DTC Recidivism**

	DTC (N=126)				Non-DTC (N=124)			
	B	Std. Error	t-Value	Prob.	B	Std. Error	t-Value	Prob.
(Constant)	-5.09	1.98	-2.57	<b>0.01</b>	-2.83	1.70	-1.67	0.10
Lancaster Co.	-0.13	0.36	-0.36	0.72	0.66	0.31	2.13	<b>0.04</b>
Douglas Co.	0.29	0.39	0.74	0.46	0.82	0.33	2.49	<b>0.01</b>
Terminated	1.10	0.36	3.07	<b>0.00</b>				
In Program	0.04	0.31	0.14	0.89	-0.85	0.25	-3.38	<b>0.00</b>

**Table 3.29: OLS Regression Models for DTC and Non-DTC Recidivism, Continued**

	DTC (N=126)				Non-DTC (N=124)			
	<b>B</b>	<b>Std. Error</b>	<b>t-Value</b>	<b>Prob.</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>Std. Error</b>	<b>t-Value</b>	<b>Prob.</b>
African-American	0.55	0.35	1.60	0.11	0.31	0.35	0.88	0.38
Other	-0.10	0.46	-0.22	0.83	-0.50	1.30	-0.38	0.70
Male	0.57	0.32	1.76	<b>0.08</b>	0.63	0.31	2.06	<b>0.04</b>
No. Detentions	0.04	0.09	0.41	0.68	-0.25	0.19	-1.34	0.18
Days in Detention	0.00	0.01	0.08	0.94	0.00	0.00	0.67	0.51
Positive UA	-0.03	0.02	-1.21	0.23	-0.01	0.04	-0.33	0.74
Face Contacts	0.00	0.00	-0.12	0.90	-0.01	0.02	-0.30	0.76
MH Problem	0.17	0.27	0.63	0.53	0.29	0.28	1.01	0.31
Age	0.27	0.11	2.52	<b>0.01</b>	0.16	0.09	1.72	<b>0.09</b>
Model R <sup>2</sup>	28%							

Table 3.30 shows the results from an OLS model for DTC youths, excluding participants who were terminated. The results for Non-DTC remain the same because Non-DTC were not “terminated” from programming. The findings from this model indicate that more days spent in detention results in a reduction in recidivism.

**Table 3.30: OLS Regression Models for DTC Recidivism Excluding Terminated Cases**

	<b>B</b>	<b>Std. Error</b>	<b>t-Value</b>	<b>Prob.</b>
(Constant)	-1.13	1.33	-085	0.40
Lancaster Co.	0.07	0.25	0.28	0.78
Douglas Co.	0.27	0.27	0.98	0.33
Terminated	-0.04	0.18	-0.21	0.83
In Program	0.12	0.23	0.50	0.62
African-American	0.04	0.27	0.16	0.87
Other	0.09	0.20	0.42	0.68
Male	0.05	0.06	0.85	0.40
No. Detentions	0.00	0.00	-0.09	0.93
Days in Detention	-0.03	0.02	-2.03	<b>0.05</b>
Positive UA	0.00	0.00	0.54	0.59
Face Contacts	0.08	0.16	0.47	0.64
MH Problem	0.07	0.07	0.99	0.33
Model R <sup>2</sup>	10%			

## Termination of DTC Participants

The findings reviewed in the previous section stress the importance of selecting appropriate youths for DTC and retaining them in the program. Two questions are related to termination. First, how do they differ from youths who graduated from the program, and secondly, why were they terminated from the program? With regard to the first question, a comparison of terminated and graduated youths in each county reveals that terminated youths required higher levels of supervision (i.e., in general, they received more detentions, drug tests, supervision contacts). Terminated youths also experienced more problems in the home. In other words, they had higher levels of family conflict, abusive histories, or domestic violence in the home (See Appendix D for statistical comparisons by county).

Tables 3.31 addresses the second question. The majority of terminations resulted from program non-compliance, which would include any program or court order violations. The lack of progress and need for a higher level of care accounted for the remaining terminations. These factors stress the importance of reviewing program screening and selection criteria relative to the programming offered by the DTC. If this is the population that drug court programs wish to serve, then programming needs to be enhanced to address the needs of this level of offender (see Chapter 5 for more discussion of this point).

**Table 3.31: Reasons for Terminating DTC Participants**

<b>Termination Reason</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Douglas County (N=13)</b>		
Program Noncompliance	5	38
No Progress	3	23
Needed a Higher Level of Care	3	23
Absconded (i.e., on the run)	1	8
New Law Violation	1	8
<b>Lancaster County (N=10)</b>		
Needed a Higher Level of Care	4	40
Alcohol/Drug Use & Absconded	4	40
Alcohol/Drug Use & New Violation	2	20
<b>Sarpy County (N=11)</b>		
Program Noncompliance	7	64
Absconded (i.e., on the run)	2	18
New Law Violation	2	18

## Summary

Overall, outcome results indicated that drug courts in all three counties were impacting participant attitudes and behavior. The clearest evidence of this was found in the pre/post test surveys completed by DTC graduates. Self-reported delinquency and drug use decreased significantly and there was also some evidence that family and individual social functioning was improving. Unfortunately, these results were limited to DTC graduates (i.e., no comparison group) so it is impossible to conclude that these effects were the direct result of drug court programming.

Positive outcomes were also found for reduced substance use using urinalysis results. DTC participants were positive more often than Non-DTC youth, but the more tests that DTC youth received the less likely they were to test positive. Non-DTC youths were tested at a much lower rate in all three counties, and increased testing resulted in more positive tests in Lancaster and Sarpy Counties. The same pattern did not emerge in Douglas because all comparison youths fell into the low testing category.

In general, youths in both groups were placed in a detention setting at similar rates; however, the number of detentions for DTC youths exceeded that for Non-DTC youths. The increased number of detentions may be related to the use of detention to swiftly respond to continued alcohol/drug use, program/court violations, or a new arrest. Consistent with the drug court concept, responses to non-compliance are immediate. In contrast, sanctions for similar non-compliance among traditionally processed youth may take several months.

The results for recidivism using new arrests indicated that DTC and Non-DTC youths were equally likely to recidivate. When terminated DTC participants were removed from the analysis, DTC participant recidivism decreased noticeably but the differences between groups did not reach significance. Multiple regression analyses confirmed these results, supporting the notion that terminated youths were significantly more likely to recidivate than graduated participants or youths still in the program.

## Chapter 4: Process Evaluation Results

### Description of Process Evaluation

The purpose of the process evaluation was to determine whether the drug courts met implementation expectations. Specifically, the process evaluation focused on the number of drug tests completed, the number and type of supervision contacts completed, drug court participant progress at treatment, educational progress, and the use of rewards and sanctions.

### Drug Testing

#### *Data and Methods*

Data were collected on the number of drug tests given for both DTC and Non-DTC youths. Drug test data were drawn from a web-based management system operated in each county for DTC participants and from the Nebraska State Probation database for comparison group youths. Missing data was not an issue for DTC youths, but there were concerns related to data for comparison group youths. First, a few youths were not found in Probation's database. The youths missing from the database were possibly placed in the custody of the Office of Juvenile Services, which does not maintain a centralized database to record drug tests. Secondly, it is believed an administrative change for entering drug tests may have temporarily interrupted consistent and accurate data entry. Unfortunately, there is no way to determine how many drug tests were missed, but Probation administrators estimated the number to be low.

For DTC youths, drug test data reflected the number of drug tests completed between the time they were placed in drug court and (1) their successful completion of DTC; (2) their termination from drug court; or (3) the end of the evaluation, April 30, 2003. For comparison group youths, these data reflect the number of drug tests completed between the start of their disposition and (1) the successful completion of their disposition, or (2) the end of the evaluation, April 30, 2003.

Descriptive statistics were used to identify general patterns related to positive tests. Tests for statistical significance were not possible due to missing data for comparison youths.

#### *Results for Douglas County*

In total, Douglas County DTC participants received 2,149 urines compared to 182 for comparison youths. Although missing data complicates a comparison between groups, it is unlikely that missing data accounted for over 1,900 urines. Table 4.1 provides a closer look at how many tests individual offenders received. Whereas 26% of comparison youths received no drug tests and 74% received between one and twenty-five drug tests, 38% of DTC participants received between one and twenty-five tests and 62% received more than 26 drug tests.

**Table 4.1: Number of Drug Tests Received—Douglas County**

Number of Drug Tests	DTC (N=37)		NON-DTC (N=31)	
	n	%	n	%
None			8	26
1-5			11	35
6-10			5	16
11-25			7	23
1-25	14	38		
26-50	6	16		
51-75	5	14		
75-100	12	32		

*Results for Lancaster County*

In total, Lancaster County DTC participants received 1,828 urines compared to 237 for comparison youths. Missing data complicates a comparison between groups; however, it is unlikely that missing data accounted for over 1,500 urines. Table 4.2 provides a closer look at how many tests individual offenders received. Nineteen percent of comparison youths received no drug tests and 81% received between one and twenty-five drug tests. Conversely, 18% of DTC participants received between one and twenty-five tests, and 82% received more than 26 drug tests.

**Table 4.2: Number of Drug Tests Received—Lancaster County**

Number of Drug Tests	DTC (N=34)		NON-DTC (N=26)	
	n	%	n	%
None			5	19
1-5			8	31
6-10			5	19
11-25			5	19
1-25	6	18	3	12
26-50	11	32		
51-75	9	26		
75-100	8	24		

*Results for Sarpy County*

In total, Sarpy County DTC participants received 1,646 urines compared to 307 for comparison youths. Missing data complicates a comparison between groups; however, it is unlikely that missing data accounted for over 1,200 urines. Table 4.3 provides a closer look at how many tests individual offenders received. Thirty-two percent of comparison youths received no drug tests, 59% received between one and twenty-five drug tests, and 9% received 26 to 50 drug tests. In contrast, 15% of DTC participants received between

one and twenty-five tests, and 85% received more than 26 drug tests during the study timeframe.

**Table 4.3: Number of Drug Tests Received—Sarpy County**

Number of Drug Tests	DTC (N=52)		Non-DTC (N=44)	
	n	%	n	%
None			14	32
1-5			11	25
6-10			9	20
11-25			6	14
1-25	8	15		
26-50	3	6	4	9
51-75	11	21		
75-100	22	42		

### Supervision Contacts

Supervision contact data document every contact made with the DTC participant from the start of the program until (1) their graduation from drug court; (2) their termination from the drug court; or (3) the end of the evaluation, April 30, 2003. These data for DTC youths were retrieved from the web-based information system maintained by each county. For comparison group youths, the data were more difficult to collect. The first step in this process was to obtain “chrono” sheets from DTC coordinators on all comparison group youths from the beginning of their disposition to the completion of their disposition or April 30, 2003. Chrono sheets were county-based computer records that document a probation officer’s supervision contacts with an offender. UNO research staff then coded the total number and type of contacts using these sheets.

Supervision contacts may be missing for comparison youths who were placed in the custody of OJS, and unfortunately, this agency does not store this information in a centralized database. In Douglas and Lancaster Counties, research staff met with an OJS officer and retrieved as much information as possible, but this was not possible in Sarpy County. Thus, supervision contacts made between an OJS officer and an offender may be missing from the data presented in this report.

In general, data timeframes range from the beginning of the program to April 30, 2003; however, much of the analysis contained in this chapter is offender based. Timeframes for offenders depend on the range of time spent in the DTC and/or on disposition. This varies from one offender to the next. It is impossible to determine whether and to what extent data is missing. Its accuracy depends on the reliable use of the DTC information system for DTC youths and the Probation information system for Non-DTC youths. We have significant confidence in the drug tests and contacts provided in the DTC information system, and we have moderate to strong confidence in the data provided from the Probation information system. Descriptive statistics were used to identify general patterns related to positive tests.

*Results for Douglas County<sup>1</sup>*

Similar to drug tests, the number of supervision contacts was substantially higher for drug court participants than non-drug court youths: DTC youths received 5,351 more supervision contacts than Non-DTC youths (see Table 4.4). Although type of contact was similar across groups, DTC participants were more likely than Non-DTC youths to receive face-to-face contacts. Face-to-face contacts for DTC youths represented 43% of contacts compared to only 26% for Non-DTC youths. Comparison youths were more likely to receive collateral contacts (64%) compared to DTC youth (44%).

**Table 4.4: Summary of Supervision Contacts Received—Douglas County**

Contacts Received	DTC (N=6,285)		Non-DTC (N=934)	
	n	%	n	%
Total No. of Contacts	6285		934	
Face-to-face	2685	43	247	26
Phone	853	14	92	10
Collateral	2777	44	594	64

On average, DTC youths received more contacts of all kinds than Non-DTC youths (see Table 4.5). The average number of contacts per individual substantially differed between groups, regardless of type. On average, for example, a Douglas County DTC youth received 75 face-to-face contacts compared to only 7 for Non-DTC youths.

**Table 4.5: Average Number of Supervision Contacts Received—Douglas County**

Contacts Received	DTC (N=35)			NON-DTC (N=35)		
	Range	Mean	SD	Range	Mean	SD
Face-to-Face Contacts	0-236	75.71	65.05	0-27	7.06	6.23
Phone Contacts	0-68	24.37	22.22	0-11	2.71	3.22
Collateral Contacts	0-360	79.34	81.67	0-73	16.97	19.79

*Results for Lancaster County*

In Lancaster County, DTC youths received 2,352 more supervision contacts than Non-DTC youths. As shown in Table 4.6, the majority of contacts with DTC youths were (1) home visits (48%); (2) face-to-face contacts (24%) and (3) DTC hearings (20%). The majority of contacts with Non-DTC youths were collateral (48%), face-to-face (26%), and phone contacts (20%).

<sup>1</sup>Douglas County did not keep track of its contacts through the DTC information system. Both DTC and Non-DTC contacts were coded from Probation information system “chronos”.

**Table 4.6: Summary of Supervision Contacts Received—Lancaster County**

Contacts Received	DTC (N=3,000)		Non-DTC (N=648)	
	N	%	n	%
Home Visits	1435	48		
Face-to-face Contacts	725	24	208	32
DTC Court Hearings	590	20		
Phone Contacts	206	7	131	20
Collateral Contacts	29	1	309	48
Off-Week Staffings	15	1		

The average number of contacts per individual substantially differed between groups (see Table 4.6). On average, a DTC youth received 21 face-to-face contacts compared to only 7 for Non-DTC youths. This difference is amplified if home visits and court visits are included in face-to-face contacts. For instance, DTC youths received an average of 42 home visits compared to no home visits for comparison youths. The average number of phone contacts was similar across groups, but collateral contacts were much greater for Non-DTC youths than DTC participants.

**Table 4.7: Average Number of Supervision Contacts Received—Lancaster County**

Contacts Received	DTC (N=34)			NON-DTC (N=27)		
	Range	Mean	SD	Range	Mean	SD
Face-to-face Contacts	0-68	21.32	21.45	0-33	7.70	8.95
Phone Contacts	0-18	6.06	5.73	0-47	4.85	10.12
Collateral Contacts	0-4	0.82	1.14	0-53	11.44	14.62
DTC Court Hearings	0-50	17.35	12.25			
Home Visits	0-182	42.21	46.43			
Off-Week Staffings	0-2	0.44	0.61			

*Results for Sarpy County*

In Sarpy County, DTC youths received 1,731 more supervision contacts than Non-DTC youths. As shown in Table 4.8, the majority of contacts with DTC youths were (1) face-to-face contacts (court hearings + home visits + face-to-face--62%) and (2) curfew checks (25%). Similar to DTC contacts, the majority of contacts made with Non-DTC youths were also face-to-face (50%) and collateral (39%).

**Table 4.8: Summary of Supervision Contacts Received—Sarpy County**

Contacts Received	DTC (N=2,520)		Non-DTC (N=789)	
	n	%	N	%
DTC Court Hearings	683	27		
Curfew Checks	628	25		
Home Visits	468	19		
Face-to-face Contacts	414	16	394	50
Phone Contacts	255	10	86	11
Collateral Contacts	72	3	309	39

The average number of contacts per individual also differed in Sarpy County. According to the means presented in Table 4.9, Non-DTC youths received, on average, two more contacts than DTC youths; however, this finding reverses when home visits and court hearings are considered. DTC youths had 13 average court hearings and 9 home visits compared to none for Non-DTC youths. The average number of phone contacts was slightly higher for DTC youths (5 compared to 2), but collateral contacts were greater for Non-DTC youths than DTC youths (8 compared to 1).

**Table 4.9: Average Number of Supervision Contacts Received—Sarpy County**

Contacts Received	DTC (N=52)			Non-DTC (N=39)		
	Range	Mean	SD	Range	Mean	SD
Face-to-face Contacts	0-31	7.88	10.01	0-40	10.10	8.93
Phone Contacts	0-22	4.86	6.70	0-22	2.20	4.75
Collateral Contacts	0-8	1.33	2.28	0-29	7.92	8.31
DTC Court Hearings	3-35	13.06	5.33			
Home Visits	0-31	8.98	10.37			
Curfew Checks	0-28	12.00	9.84			

### Treatment Progress

Treatment progress was examined for DTC participants only. The web-based information system created for the DTC programs in each county contained a database for treatment attendance and progress ratings. The data retrieved from these databases, however, was incomplete for the entire study timeframe and incomplete across DTC youths. Attendance, for example, does not count times when an individual should have been in treatment but was “on the run” or in detention. It also does not reflect entire time periods across or within offenders. While treatment results are presented to provide a glimpse into the type of data available to measure DTC participants’ progress in this area, these results should be interpreted cautiously because the data are not complete across individuals or study time period.

*Results for Douglas County*

Average attendance at treatment sessions was 98%. On average, DTC youths were most likely to be rated as doing “somewhat good” (or a 3 on a 1-5 scale), followed by “good” and “fair.” Ratings of “excellent” or “poor” were seldom received (see Table 4.10).

**Table 4.10: Treatment Attendance and Progress Ratings—Douglas County**

	<b>Range</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>
<b>Attendance (N=17)</b>			
Percent Attend Treatment Sessions	77.14-100	97.68	5.72
<b>Progress Ratings (N=17)</b>			
Excellent Progress	0-100	18.56	34.31
Good Progress	0-100	48.67	40.46
Somewhat Good Progress	0-100	57.37	29.78
Fair Progress	0-100	46.95	40.54
Poor Progress	63.64-100	7.53	17.17

\*Participants were ranked by treatment providers on (1) group involvement (2) personal insight (3) positive attitude , and (4) motivation.

*Results for Lancaster County*

Average attendance at treatment sessions was 98% (see Table 4.11). On average, DTC youths were most likely to be rated as doing “good” followed by “fair.” Ratings of “excellent” or “poor” were seldom received.

**Table 4.11: Treatment Attendance and Progress Ratings—Lancaster County**

	<b>Range</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>
<b>Average Attendance (N=24)</b>			
Percent Attend Treatment Sessions	83.62-100	97.63	4.47
<b>Progress Ratings (N=33)</b>			
Excellent Progress	0-8.33	1.15	2.28
Good Progress	0-97.62	58.16	23.85
Fair Progress	0-83.33	30.01	19.70
Poor Progress	0-43.33	4.35	8.71

\*Participants were ranked by treatment providers on (1) group involvement (2) personal insight (3) positive attitude (4) motivation (5) family involvement, and (6) participation

### *Results for Sarpy County*

Unfortunately, attendance data was not available from Sarpy County. On average, DTC youths were most likely to be rated as doing “fair” followed by “good.” Ratings of “excellent” or “poor” were seldom received (see Table 4.12).

**Table 4.12: Treatment Progress Ratings—Sarpy County**

	<b>Range</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>
<b>Average Progress Ratings (N=47)</b>			
Excellent Progress	0-56.82	7.55	13.26
Good Progress	0-100	32.40	23.52
Fair Progress	0-95.83	48.99	25.14
Poor Progress	0-83.33	11.07	18.85

\*Participants were ranked by treatment providers on (1) group involvement (2) personal insight (3) positive attitude, and (4) motivation.

### Educational Performance

#### *Data and Methods*

Educational progress data included the class grades reported for DTC participants and the number of DTC participants who completed their high school education. Douglas County drug court was the only program with recorded data for educational progress at the time of this evaluation. Consistent and reliable educational data were only available from Douglas County web-based information system. Both Lancaster and Sarpy Counties are currently improving their ability to record this information as part of their web-based case management system.

#### *Results for Douglas County*

Educational data from Douglas County provided insight into the DTC program’s ability to support academic performance and achievement. Table 4.13 contains the grades reported to the DTC for 100 classes attended by DTC participants. As shown in this table, the majority of grades were A’s and B’s (36% and 32%, respectively). Only 13% of reported grades were D’s or F’s.

**Table 4.13: Summary of Grades Reported for DTC Participant School Classes (N=100)**

<b>Grade Reported</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>
A	36	36
B	32	32
C	18	18
Passing	1	1
D	7	7
F	6	6

School involvement was consistent with the data presented in Table 4.13. All drug court participants attended some type of educational programming, and six DTC participants completed their high school education while in DTC or directly after completing the drug court program.

### Use of Rewards & Sanctions

#### *Data and Methods*

The data for rewards and sanctions provided insight into the number and type of rewards and sanctions that participants received by participants. Douglas County drug court was the only program with recorded data for rewards and sanctions at the time of this evaluation. Consistent and reliable educational data were only available from Douglas County web-based information system. Both Lancaster and Sarpy Counties are currently improving their ability to record this information as part of their web-based case management system.

#### *Results for Douglas County*

The use of rewards and sanctions represents a centerpiece of the DTC program. Rewards are used to encourage good behavior and program progress while sanctions are used to deter inappropriate behavior and program non-compliance. Tables 4.14 to 4.16 illustrate the types of reward and sanctions used by the Douglas County DTC.

The primary type of reward use to encourage behavior was relaxing program requirements (see Table 4.14). Thirty percent of the rewards used, for example, temporarily or permanently waived a supervision requirement (i.e., increased curfew or exempted day reporting), and 21% relaxed a treatment requirement (i.e., permission to skip a treatment session). Tangible rewards were often used as well. Twenty-three percent of rewards were gift certificates or a purchased object, and 16% were tokens. Less frequent rewards included family visits and hobby related activities.

**Table 4.14: Rewards Received by Douglas County DTC Participants (N=201)**

<b>Reward Description</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>
Supervision Requirement was Relaxed	60	30
Treatment Requirement was Relaxed	42	21
Gift certificate or Purchased Object	47	23
Token	33	16
Family Visits/Activities	11	5
Driving Privileges Given/Reinstated	4	2
Hobby Related Activity	4	2

Sanctions were used to discourage behaviors. As shown in Table 4.15, increased supervision was the sanction most often used to respond to problem behavior. Fourteen percent of sanctions were day reporting, 25% were placement in detention or another type of out-of-home placement, 13% were community service, 10% involved more tracker contacts, and 30% were classified as “other.”

**Table 4.15: Sanctions Received by Douglas County DTC Participants (N=256)**

<b>Sanction Description</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>
Day Reporting	37	14
Detention	36	14
Out-of-Placement	27	11
Community Service	33	13
Tracking	25	10
Other	78	30
Warrant Issued	15	6
Report Writing	5	2

Table 4.16 provides a distribution of sanctions used across phases. Two findings are apparent from this table. First, sanctions were used more often in Phase 1 (N=156) than in later phases. Secondly, the use of certain types of sanctions varied by program phase. Day reporting, for instance, was used in all three phases, but (proportionately) it was used slightly more often in Phase 3. Placements (detention or other) and community service were used consistently across program phases, and “other” types of sanctions were most likely to be used in Phase 3. Tracking, warrant orders, and report writing, on the other hand, were not used at all in Phase 3.

**Table 4.16: Sanctions Received by Program Phase**

<b>Type of Sanction</b>	<b>Phase 1 (N=156)</b>		<b>Phase 2 (N=91)</b>		<b>Phase 3 (N=9)</b>	
	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>
Day Reporting	23	15	12	13	2	22
Detention	20	13	15	16	1	11
Out-of-Placement	20	13	6	7	1	11

**Table 4.16: Sanctions Received by Program Phase, Continued**

Type of Sanction	Phase 1 (N=156)		Phase 2 (N=91)		Phase 3 (N=9)	
	n	%	N	%	n	%
Community Service	21	13	11	12	1	11
Tracking	22	14	3	3		
Other	35	22	39	43	4	44
Capias Issued	12	8	3	3		
Report Writing	3	2	2	2		

Summary

The intent of drug courts in each county was to increase the supervision of participants through the use of drug tests, supervision contacts, educational monitoring, and the use of rewards and sanctions. The results presented in this chapter indicate that all three programs were successful in applying additional supervision to drug court participants. Specifically, DTC youths received more drug tests and supervision contacts than Non-DTC youths. DTC participants were supervised with face-to-face contacts more often than Non-DTC participants while phone and collateral contacts were primarily used to monitor Non-DTC youth behavior. Unfortunately, treatment data were incomplete and difficult to interpret; consequently, no conclusions were possible in this area (see Chapter 5 for more discussion of this issue).

Data from Douglas County also provided some evidence that drug courts successfully supported academic achievement. Grades for participants were predominately in the A and B range, and participants had either completed their high school education or were actively attending school. Additionally, Douglas County data documented the use of rewards and sanctions to encourage and discourage behavior. A reduction in program monitoring or treatment requirements was most often used to reward participants, and increased program monitoring (e.g., increased tracking or out of home placements) was consistently used as a sanction.

Taken together, these findings document the ability of the drug courts to provide intensive services to drug court participants and to meet many of the objectives that were used to guide program implementation.

## Chapter 5: Do Douglas, Lancaster, and Sarpy Juvenile Drug Courts Work?

Program evaluation provides an important vehicle to objectively determine (1) if a program is achieving what it was intended to achieve; (2) if a program is being implemented in the way it was intended to be implemented; (3) what elements are helping the program accomplish its expectations; and (4) the ways a program must change to reach its expectations. The study represents an important step in this direction for juvenile drug courts in Nebraska and nationwide, but it is only a step. This evaluation did not examine every element of programming and it ended before the entire cohort of offenders completed their drug court programming. With this in mind, the results produced by this study offer substantial insight into what drug courts are doing well and areas in which drug courts need to improve.

### Discussion of Findings

The findings contained in this report indicate that juvenile drug courts are working in many ways, but they also shed light on areas for improvement. Of the 18 goals and objectives measured, positive and statistically significant results were found for 13 (72%), positive but not significant effects were found for 2 (11%), and mixed support was found for 3 (17%)

**Table 5.1: Summary of Results for Measured DTC Goals and Objectives**

Measured Goals & Related Objectives	Result
<b>Goals</b>	
1. To reduce substance abuse.	Positive
2. To reduce recidivism.	Mixed
<b>Objectives</b>	
<b>Improve Family Functioning</b>	
o Increase family communication.	Positive/Not Significant
o Increase family supervision	Positive/Not Significant
o Decrease family conflict	Positive
<b>Improve School Functioning</b>	
o Increase school performance.	Mixed
<b>Improve Individual Social Functioning (Reduce Offender Risk)</b>	
o Decrease feelings of helplessness (increase self-esteem).	Positive
o Decrease attitudes favorable to drug use.	Positive
o Decrease attitudes favorable to delinquency.	Positive
o Decrease negative peer relationships.	Positive
o Increase exposure to positive role models.	Positive
<b>Increase Offender Accountability</b>	
o Increase supervision through regularly scheduled court hearings.	Positive
o Increase supervision through increased contact with supervision officer.	Positive
o Increase supervision through increased urine testing.	Positive
o Ensure immediate sanctions for non-compliance.	Positive
o Ensure rewards for compliance.	Positive
<b>E. Improve Juvenile Justice System Response</b>	
o Standardize the assessment and evaluation process.	Positive
o Decrease amount of time spent at the youth center.	Mixed

All measures related to substance use indicated a reduction in use. Self-report measures (i.e., pre/post tests results) showed a dramatic decrease among DTC graduates, and drug testing results improved as testing increased. The results for delinquency, however, were mixed.

According to the findings presented in this report, delinquency among DTC graduates declined significantly, but a comparison of official measures (i.e., new arrests) across DTC and Non-DTC youths resulted in statistically similar rates. Without consideration of other findings, then, the inference is that DTC programming results in outcomes similar to those for traditional processing. This finding, however, cannot be interpreted conclusively because the juvenile justice system is complex. An arrest, for instance, does not necessarily mean that an individual is formally charged with the offense by the county attorney's office. In many cases, in fact, charges are dropped because they are not supported. Additionally, DTC programming is based on increased, intensive supervision. Increased levels of supervision dramatically increase the chances that an offender will be charged with a violation or new arrest compared to his/her counterpart who receives a lower level of supervision. Thus, conclusions using new arrests as a measure of recidivism are equivocal and tenuous.

It is also important to note that effectiveness is not a standard or concrete measure. It is relative and dependent upon a comprehensive picture of the offender, his/her family, and his/her environmental influences. It is unrealistic to expect any juvenile justice program for high risk and high treatment need offenders to result in no problem behavior. Programming is often built for less serious offenders rather than more serious offenders for this reason.

The complexity of high risk/high need offenders rests in the developmental nature of the problem. Many of the study subjects came from disruptive family situations that were historical and in some cases, generational. Appropriate programming must be available for these offenders and their families, but unfortunately, researchers and practitioners are still learning how to define and build appropriate programming. A necessary step in this process is to look at what DTC programming does well compared to traditional programming. Based on the results contained in this study, DTC programs were successful at many things, including:

- The utilization of and adherence to a standard screening and selection process. At the time DTC programs started, they represented the only juvenile justice programming initiative to apply selection criteria equally to all adjudicated offenders.
- Based on self-reports from DTC graduates, drug court programming impacted pro-social functioning among DTC graduates in the areas of delinquency, alcohol and drug use, family functioning, and individual social functioning.
- DTC programming increased offender accountability through increased drug testing, and in at least two counties, reduced the number of positive tests with this increase.

- DTC programming also increased the number of overall supervision contacts, particularly the average number of face-to-face contacts.
- DTC programming ensured participant access to substance abuse treatment and in some cases, mental health programming.

### Recommendations for Juvenile Drug Courts in Nebraska

As discussed above, evaluation is also intended to help programs identify areas for improvement. We strongly recommend that each of the counties review these results in light of their knowledge of the day-to-day operations and determine how they can support what is working and improve upon their weaknesses. To guide this process, we offer the following recommendations as a starting point:

1. Continue program evaluation with as much as intensity as possible. Each of the DTC programs has set up evaluation procedures that are easily continued if the counties devote time and resources to do so. At a minimum, the counties should continue the following aspects of this evaluation:
  - a. Monitor the screening process for DTC to ensure that all targeted offenders are being screened and all DTC participants fall into the “eligible” or “borderline” categories.
  - b. Produce on-going analysis of drug testing and supervision contacts.
  - c. Continue to monitor new arrests among drug treatment court participants, including those in the program, terminated from the program, and graduated from the program.
  - d. Monitor the use of rewards and sanctions by the drug court.
  - e. Monitor how placements are used and the duration of stays for DTC participants.
2. More directly evaluate the treatment programming received in all three counties. In particular, the DTC and the treatment provider should develop specific objectives and standards. Treatment providers should agree to and in practice comply with all the requirements of evaluation (i.e., production of data and placement of data into common information system). Courts should provide treatment providers with the basic necessities to comply with the evaluation (i.e., databases and appropriate web access) and should hold treatment accountable for full compliance in the evaluation.
3. More directly evaluate school programming with measures including (but not necessarily limited to) attendance, performance and behavior. School programming was not a primary focus of the current evaluation, but given the role of educational deficits in case file information and the lack of change demonstrated in the pre/post comparisons, the educational component of DTC should be examined more closely.

4. Review program screening criteria and processes. It appears that terminated youths are slightly higher in need and risk. The current process, however, does not incorporate a risk/need assessment as part of the screening criteria or process. Risk assessment may play a critical role in the success of drug courts.
5. Upon incorporating risk assessment into the screening process and criteria, DTC Teams will find it necessary to either:
  - a. Target low to moderate risk/need youths for their program OR
  - b. Build their programming to appropriately match and address the risks and needs of moderate to high-risk youths.
6. Identify strategies to reduce terminations and voluntarily withdrawals. Based on the results of this study, it appears that more family programming and interventions for previous trauma (e.g., abuse and domestic violence) are critical components to retaining and helping these youths.
7. Build cognitive behavioral interventions and structured, intensive family intervention programs into DTC programming. It appears that DTC are successful at reducing alcohol and drug use, but they may not be addressing antisocial behavior and the source cause of that behavior adequately.
8. Screen for mental health problems and build appropriate mental health treatment (especially counseling for trauma) into DTC programming (for more discussion of this point, see Herz and Poland, 2001).
9. Thoroughly investigate the reasons for gender disparity in programs and address this disparity through the selection process and/or more appropriate programming.
10. Continue and expand the collaborative efforts that exist among the Tri-County drug court programs. Utilize the research and materials generated from other, related projects such as the Youth Level of Service Inventory (Kadleck, Herz, and Gallagher, 2003) and continue to incorporate the standardization of screening and assessment advocated by the Nebraska Substance Abuse Treatment Task Force (Herz, 2001).
11. Maintain the web-based management information systems that were created for the drug court programs and enhance them by building them into future juvenile justice statewide information system plans. The more consistent and available information is, the more capable programs are to evaluate their progress.

## Conclusion

The drug court programs in each county demonstrated significant signs of progress after only two to three years of operation. By “tweaking” their programs to address their weaknesses, drug court programs hold the potential to reach all of their goals and objectives and contribute to the overall effectiveness of the juvenile justice system. The

success of drug court as well as any juvenile justice programming, however, requires recognition of the multi-dimensional nature of addressing the risks and needs of this target population, the commitment and patience of administrators and legislators, adequate resources, formal collaboration, and adherence to program standards and expectations.

In sum, this evaluation reinforces the belief that blending treatment and supervision can help improve the lives of youths. The extent to which this blended programming “works” depends upon the accuracy with which programs select appropriate participants and the integrity with which programs build and implement appropriate programming. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, accountability is measure of effective programming. We commend the DTC coordinators and team members in all the counties for the ir on-going commitment and participation in an intricate evaluation process as well as the Nebraska Probation Administration and the Nebraska Crime Commission for their commitment and support to assess the impact of juvenile drug courts on the youths and families that participate in them.

## References

Herz, Denise C. (2001). Statewide Task Force on Substance Abuse Treatment: Final report, 2001. Lincoln, NE: Nebraska Crime Commission.

Herz, Denise C. & Poland, Amy. (2001). Assessing the need for and access to mental health treatment for juvenile offenders in Nebraska. Lincoln, NE: Nebraska Crime Commission.

Kadleck, C., Herz, Denise C., & Gallagher, K. (2003). An Evaluation of Substance Abuse Screening and Risk Assessment in Nebraska's Juvenile Justice System. Lincoln, NE: Nebraska Crime Commission.

Office of Justice Programs. (2001). Juvenile drug Court Activity Update: Summary Information: July 1, 2001. Washington, DC: OJP Drug Court Clearinghouse and Technical Assistance Project. <http://www.american.edu/academic.depts/spa/justice/publications/juvenilecourtactivity.pdf>

Office of Justice Programs (1998). Looking at a decade of drug courts. Washington, DC: OJP Drug Court Clearinghouse and Technical Assistance Project. <http://www.american.edu/spa/justice/publications/decade1.htm>

**Appendix A: Comparability of DTC and Non-DTC Participant Groups**

**Table A1: Comparison of Demographic and Case Information—Douglas County**

	<b>DTC</b>		<b>Non-DTC</b>	
	<b>(N=39)</b>		<b>(N=36)</b>	
	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Most Serious Offense Charge</b>				
Status Offense	4	10	8	22
Person Offense	3	8	1	3
Property Offense	5	13	9	25
Alcohol/Drug Offense	11	28	8	22
Other Offense	2	5	4	11
Probation Violation	14	36		
Missing Offense Info.			6	17
<b>Did any of the Charges Involve Drugs?</b>				
No	27	69	21	58
Yes	12	31	9	25
Missing			6	17
<b>SA Diagnosis</b>				
None			1	3
Abuse	11	33	13	39
Dependency	18	55	5	15
Missing Data	4	12	14	42
<b>MH Diagnosis</b>				
No	9	27	11	33
Yes	22	67	19	58
Missing Data	2	6	3	9

**Table A2: Comparison of Demographics and Case Information—Lancaster County**

	<b>DTC (N=33)</b>		<b>Non-DTC (N=33)</b>	
	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Offense Charge</b>				
Status Offense				
Person Offense	1	3	3	9
Property Offense	2	6	7	21
Alcohol/Drug Offense	10	30	12	36
Other Offense	5	15	1	3
Probation Violation	15	45	10	30
Missing Offense Info.				
<b>Offense Involve Drugs?</b>				
No	23	70	20	61
Yes	10	30	13	39
<b>SA Diagnosis</b>				
None			1	3
Abuse	11	33	13	39
Dependency	18	55	5	15
Missing Data	4	12	14	42
<b>MH Diagnosis</b>				
No	9	27	11	33
Yes	22	67	19	58
Missing Data	2	6	3	9

**Table A3: Comparison of Demographics and Case Information—Sarpy County**

	<b>DTC (N=52)</b>		<b>Non-DTC (N=48)</b>	
	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Offense Charge</b>				
Status Offense	2	4	6	13
Person Offense	5	10	5	10
Property Offense	3	6	6	13
Alcohol/Drug Offense	29	56	27	56
Other Offense	9	17	2	4
Probation Violation	4	8	1	2
Missing Offense Info.			1	2
<b>Offense Involve Drugs?</b>				
No	20	38	18	38
Yes	32	62	29	60
Missing Offense Info.			1	2
<b>SA Diagnosis</b>				
None	1	2	3	6
Abuse	10	19	15	31
Dependency	36	69	23	48
Missing Data	5	10	7	15
<b>MH Diagnosis</b>				
No	22	42	16	33
Yes	24	46	24	50
Missing Data	6	12	8	17

## Appendix B: Pre/Post-Test Survey Scale Information

**Table B1: Summary of Scale Items, Response Categories, & Alpha Coefficients**

Scale Name	Items	Response Categories*	Alpha
<b>Delinquency</b>			
Total Delinquency	In the past 12 months, how often have you: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Gotten into a serious fight?</li> <li>○ Taken part in a fight where a group of your friends were against another group?</li> <li>○ Hurt someone badly enough to need bandages or a doctor?</li> <li>○ Used a knife or a gun or some other thing to get something from a person?</li> <li>○ Taken something not belonging to you worth under \$50?</li> <li>○ Taken something not belonging to you worth over \$50?</li> <li>○ Taken something from a store without paying for it?</li> <li>○ Taken a car without the permission of the owner?</li> <li>○ Gone into some house or building when you weren't supposed to be there?</li> <li>○ Set fire to someone's property on purpose?</li> <li>○ Damaged property on purpose?</li> <li>○ Gotten into trouble with police because of something you did?</li> </ul>	0=Not at all 1=Once 2=Twice 3=3 or 4 Times 5=5 or More Times	.923
Peer Delinquency	How many of your close friends have done the following in the past 12 months: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Gotten into a serious fight?</li> <li>○ Hurt someone badly enough to need bandages or a doctor?</li> <li>○ Used a knife or a gun or some other thing to get something from a person?</li> <li>○ Taken something not belonging to them?</li> <li>○ Taken something from a store without paying for it?</li> <li>○ Gone into some house or building when you weren't supposed to be there?</li> <li>○ Set fire to someone's property on purpose?</li> <li>○ Damaged property on purpose?</li> <li>○ Gotten into trouble with police because of something you did?</li> </ul>	1=None 2=A Few 3=Some 4=Most 5=All	.940
Wrongfulness of Deception	How wrong do you think the following actions are: Skipping school? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Lying to your parents?</li> <li>○ Lying to your friends?</li> <li>○ Lying to your teachers?</li> </ul>	1=Very Wrong 2=Wrong 3=Don't Know 4=Slightly Wrong 5=Not Wrong	.782
Wrongfulness of Crime	How wrong do you think the following actions are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Stealing an item worth less than \$50?</li> <li>○ Stealing an item worth more than \$40?</li> <li>○ Hitting others?</li> <li>○ Breaking into a building?</li> <li>○ Purposely damaging property?</li> </ul>	1=Very Wrong 2=Wrong 3=Don't Know 4=Slightly Wrong 5=Not Wrong	.831

Scale Name	Items	Response Categories*	Alpha
<b>Alcohol and Other Drug Use</b>			
Marijuana Perceived Risk	How much do you think people risk harming themselves, if they: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Try marijuana once or twice?</li> <li>○ Smoke marijuana occasionally?</li> <li>○ Smoke marijuana regularly?</li> </ul>	1=No Risk 2=Slight Risk 3=Moderate Risk 4=Great Risk	.892
Alcohol Perceived Risk	How much do you think people risk harming themselves if they: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Try one or two drinks of an alcoholic beverage?</li> <li>○ Take one or two drinks nearly every day?</li> <li>○ Take four or five drinks nearly every day?</li> <li>○ Have five or more drinks once or twice each weekend?</li> </ul>	1=No Risk 2=Slight Risk 3=Moderate Risk 4=Great Risk	.792
Disapproval of Marijuana Use	Do you disapprove of people (who are 18 or older) doing the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Try marijuana once or twice?</li> <li>○ Smoke marijuana occasionally?</li> <li>○ Smoke marijuana regularly?</li> </ul>	1=Don't Disapprove 2=Disapprove 3=Strongly Disapprove	.874
Disapproval of Alcohol Use	Do you disapprove of people (who are 18 or older) doing the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Try one or two drinks of an alcoholic beverage?</li> <li>○ Take one or two drinks nearly every day?</li> <li>○ Take four or five drinks nearly every day?</li> <li>○ Have five or more drinks once or twice each weekend?</li> </ul>	1=Don't Disapprove 2=Disapprove 3=Strongly Disapprove	.879
Alcohol Use--Past Year	On how many occasions in the PAST YEAR have you used alcohol?	0=None 1=1-2 Times 3=3-5 Times 6=6-9 Times 10=10-19 Times 20=2-39 Times 40=40 or More Times	---
Marijuana Use--Past Year	On how many occasions in the PAST YEAR have you used marijuana?	0=None 1=1-2 Times 3=3-5 Times 6=6-9 Times 10=10-19 Times 20=2-39 Times 40=40 or More Times	---
Alcohol Use--Past Month	On how many occasions in the PAST MONTH have you used alcohol?	0=None 1=1-2 Times 3=3-5 Times 6=6-9 Times 10=10-19 Times 20=2-39 Times 40=40 or More Times	---
Marijuana Use--Past Month	On how many occasions in the PAST MONTH have you used marijuana?	0=None 1=1-2 Times 3=3-5 Times 6=6-9 Times 10=10-19 Times 20=2-39 Times 40=40 or More Times	---

Scale Name	Items	Response Categories*	Alpha
Peer Drug Use	How many of your friends would you estimate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Smoke cigarettes?</li> <li>○ Drink alcoholic beverages?</li> <li>○ Get drunk at least once per week?</li> <li>○ Smoke marijuana or hashish?</li> <li>○ Take LSD?</li> </ul>	1=None 2=A Few 3=Some 4=Most 5=All	.808
<b>Family and School Functioning</b>			
Parental Supervision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ My parents want to know who I am going out with when I go out with friends.</li> <li>○ In my free time away from home, my parents know who I'm with and where I am.</li> <li>○ My parents want me to tell them where I am if I don't come home right after school.</li> </ul>	1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Disagree 4=Strongly Disagree	.815
Caring and Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ One of the worst things that could happen to me would be finding out that I let my parent/guardian(s) down.</li> <li>○ My parent/guardian(s) are usually proud of me when I've finished something I've worked hard at.</li> <li>○ My parent/guardian(s) trust me.</li> <li>○ I do not feel close to my parent/guardian(s).</li> </ul>	1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Disagree 4=Strongly Disagree	.729
Intimate Communication	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ I can talk to my parent/guardian(s) about problems with my friends.</li> <li>○ I can talk to my parent/guardian(s) about problems at school.</li> <li>○ I talk to my parent/guardian(s) when I am mad at them.</li> <li>○ My parent/guardian(s) are easy to talk to.</li> </ul>	1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Disagree 4=Strongly Disagree	.701
Consensus with Parents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ I often disagree with my parent/guardian(s).</li> <li>○ I often argue with my parent/guardian(s).</li> </ul>	1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Disagree 4=Strongly Disagree	.794
Negative Labeling	In your opinion, would your parent/guardian describe you as a: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Good kid?</li> <li>○ Responsible kid?</li> <li>○ Mature kid?</li> <li>○ Bad kid?</li> <li>○ Kid that often gets into trouble?</li> </ul>	1=Very Likely 2=Likely 3=Not Likely 4=Very Unlikely	.886
School Commitment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ I enjoy going to school.</li> <li>○ I think school is boring.</li> <li>○ I think homework is a waste of time.</li> <li>○ Going to school is a waste of time.</li> </ul>	1=Strongly Agree 2=Agree 3=Disagree 4=Strongly Disagree	.504
School Performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ It is difficult for me to succeed in school.</li> <li>○ I don't often understand the lessons at school.</li> </ul>	1=Strongly Agree 2=Somewhat Agree 3=Somewhat Disagree 4=Strongly Disagree	.659

Scale Name	Items	Response Categories*	Alpha
<b>Individual Social Functioning</b>			
Identity Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ My parent/guardian(s) sometimes put me down in front of other people.</li> <li>○ My parent/guardian(s) listen to my opinions.</li> <li>○ My parent/guardian(s) sometimes give me the feeling that I'm not living up to their expectations.</li> <li>○ My parent/guardian(s) seem to wish that I were a different type of person.</li> </ul>	1=Strongly Agree 2=Somewhat Agree 3=Somewhat Disagree 4=Strongly Disagree	.690
Emotional Control	In the past 12 months: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ I have trouble keeping my emotions under control.</li> <li>○ I often feel like yelling or hitting my teachers.</li> <li>○ I often feel like yelling or hitting my parents.</li> <li>○ It doesn't take much to frustrate and anger me.</li> </ul>	1=Agree 2=Mostly Agree 3=Neither 4=Mostly Disagree 5=Disagree	.840
Positive Mood State	In the past 12 months: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Feeling depressed</li> <li>○ Feeling the urge to injure or harm someone</li> <li>○ Having difficulty making decisions</li> <li>○ Feeling nervous or shaky inside</li> <li>○ Feeling unliked or disrespected by others</li> </ul>	1=All the Time 2=Frequently 3=Sometimes 4=Rarely 5=Never	.728
Self Control	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ I will often say whatever comes into my head without thinking first.</li> <li>○ Often, I don't spend enough time thinking over a situation before I act.</li> <li>○ I often say and do things without considering the consequences.</li> <li>○ I get a real kick out of doing things that are a little dangerous.</li> <li>○ I like to test myself every now and then by doing something a little risky.</li> </ul>	1=All the Time 2=Frequently 3=Sometimes 4=Rarely 5=Never	.814
External Locus of Control	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ I believe that a person can achieve anything if he/she works hard.</li> <li>○ My success depends on ability rather than luck.</li> <li>○ I can control the outcomes of events.</li> <li>○ When good things happen to me, they usually happen because of ability rather than luck.</li> </ul>	1=Strongly Agree 2=Somewhat Agree 3=Neutral 4=Somewhat Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree	.645
Self Worth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ I take a positive attitude toward myself.</li> <li>○ I am able to do things as well as most other people.</li> <li>○ Overall, I am satisfied with myself.</li> <li>○ Sometimes, I think I am no good at all.</li> <li>○ I feel that I can't do anything right.</li> </ul>	1=Strongly Agree 2=Somewhat Agree 3=Neutral 4=Somewhat Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree	.770
Social Acceptance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ I have difficult making friends.</li> <li>○ I feel out of place at parties.</li> <li>○ I dislike people who look different from me.</li> <li>○ I dislike people who think differently from me.</li> </ul>	1=Strongly Agree 2=Somewhat Agree 3=Neutral 4=Somewhat Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree	.541

<b>Scale Name</b>	<b>Items</b>	<b>Response Categories*</b>	<b>Alpha</b>
Respect for Authority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Police officers deserve my respect.</li> <li>○ I treat police officers with respect.</li> <li>○ Police officers treat me with respect.</li> <li>○ I treat teachers with respect.</li> <li>○ Teachers treatment me with respect.</li> <li>○ In general it is important to respect adults.</li> <li>○ In general, I treat adults with respect.</li> <li>○ In general, adults treat me with respect.</li> </ul>	1=Strongly Agree 2=Somewhat Agree 3=Neutral 4=Somewhat Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree	.868

\*Value ranges are listed in their original form. Values were recoded when scales were computed so that higher values indicated higher amounts of the scale name.

**Appendix C: Distribution of New Arrests by Most Serious Charge**

**Table C1: Distribution of New Arrests by Most Serious Charge—Douglas County**

No. Arrests	Total Person Offense Arrests				Total Property Offense Arrests				Total Alcohol/Drug Related Offense Arrests				Total Other Offense Arrests			
	DTC (N=39)		Non-DTC (N=39)		DTC (N=39)		Non-DTC (N=39)		DTC (N=39)		Non-DTC (N=39)		DTC (N=39)		Non-DTC (N=39)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
0	32	82	34	87	36	92	35	90	31	79	33	85	33	85	35	90
1	5	13	3	8	2	5	2	5	7	18	4	10	3	8	1	3
2	1	3	2	5	1	3	1	3	1	3			2	5	2	5
3	1	3					1	3			1	3				
4											1	3				
5																
6																
7													1	3	1	3

**Table C2: Distribution of New Arrests by Most Serious Charge—Lancaster County**

No. Arrests	Total Person Offense Arrests				Total Property Offense Arrests				Total Alcohol/Drug Related Offense Arrests				Total Other Offense Arrests			
	DTC (N=39)		Non-DTC (N=39)		DTC (N=39)		Non-DTC (N=39)		DTC (N=39)		Non-DTC (N=39)		DTC (N=39)		Non-DTC (N=39)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
0	31	91	32	94	28	82	31	91	28	82	30	88	27	79	27	79
1	3	9	2	6	6	18	3	9	5	15	2	6	7	21	6	18
2									1	3	1	3			1	3
3											1	3				

**Table C3: Distribution of New Arrests by Most Serious Charge—Sarpy County**

No. Arrests	Total Person Offense Arrests				Total Property Offense Arrests				Total Alcohol/Drug Related Offense Arrests				Total Other Offense Arrests			
	DTC (N=39)		Non-DTC (N=39)		DTC (N=39)		Non-DTC (N=39)		DTC (N=39)		Non-DTC (N=39)		DTC (N=39)		Non-DTC (N=39)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
0	50	94	48	94	49	92	50	98	44	83	47	92	50	94	50	98
1	1	2	2	4	4	8	1	2	4	8	3	6	2	4		
2	1	2	1	2					4	8	1	2	1	2		
3									1	2						
4															1	2
5																
6	1	2														

**Appendix D: Comparability of Terminated and Graduated DTC Participants**

**Table D1: Terminated and Graduated DTC Participants Comparisons —Douglas County**

	Terminated (N=13)		Graduated (N=30)		Mean Difference	Which Group Was Higher?
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Douglas County						
African-American	0.46	0.52	0.30	0.47	0.16	Terminated
White	0.46	0.52	0.67	0.48	-0.21	Graduated
Other Race	0.08	0.28	0.03	0.18	0.04	Terminated
Male	0.77	0.44	0.80	0.41	-0.03	Graduated
No. of Drug Tests	43.85	37.51	31.10	42.97	12.75	Terminated
No. of Positive Urines	5.00	5.18	4.23	5.33	0.77	Terminated
No. of Contacts	144.00	111.72	101.63	148.08	42.37	Terminated
No. of Face-to-Face Contacts	58.69	47.22	40.67	61.49	18.03	Terminated
Family Conflict	1.77	0.44	1.87	0.78	-0.10	Graduated
Abused in the Past	0.00	0.00	0.10	0.31	-0.10 <sup>1</sup>	Graduated
Experienced Domestic Violence	0.15	0.38	0.17	0.38	-0.01	No Difference
Level of Substance Abuse Problem	1.54	0.52	1.70	0.60	-0.16	Graduated
Mental Health Problem	.85	.37	.73	.45	.11	Terminated

\*p<.05; <sup>1</sup>p<.10

**Table D2: Terminated and Graduated DTC Participants Comparisons  
—Lancaster County**

	Terminated (N=10)		Graduated (N=23)		Mean Difference	Which Group Was Higher?
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
African-American	0.20	0.42	0.04	0.21	0.16	Terminated
White	0.80	0.42	0.91	0.29	-0.11	Graduated
Other Race	0.00	0.00	0.04	0.21	-0.04	Graduated
Male	0.90	0.32	0.83	0.39	0.07	Terminated
No. of Drug Tests	35.00	26.65	38.48	36.26	-3.48	Graduated
No. of Positive Urines	1.90	1.37	2.22	3.52	-0.32	Graduated
No. of Contacts	75.10	59.67	66.35	57.13	8.75	Terminated
No. of Face-to-Face Contacts	70.80	60.02	55.17	60.83	15.63	Terminated
Family Conflict	2.20	0.63	1.74	0.75	0.46	Terminated
Abused in the Past	0.60	0.52	0.13	0.34	0.47 <sup>*</sup>	Terminated
Experienced Domestic Violence	0.50	0.53	0.04	0.21	0.46 <sup>*</sup>	Terminated
Level of Substance Abuse Problem	1.80	0.42	1.52	0.51	0.28	Terminated
Mental Health Problem	.80	.42	.48	.51	.32 <sup>1</sup>	Terminated

<sup>\*</sup>p<.05; <sup>1</sup>p<.10

**Table D3: Terminated and Graduated DTC Participants Comparisons  
—Sarpy County**

	Terminated (N=15)		Graduated (N=63)		Mean Difference	Which Group Was Higher?
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
African-American	0.13	0.35	0.03	0.18	0.10	Terminated
White	0.80	0.41	0.95	0.21	-0.15	Graduated
Other Race	0.07	0.26	0.02	0.13	0.05	Terminated
Male	0.80	0.41	0.89	0.32	-0.09	Graduated
No. of Drug Tests	30.20	18.78	19.51	18.28	10.69 <sup>*</sup>	Terminated
No. of Positive Urines	5.20	5.03	2.05	3.28	3.15 <sup>*</sup>	Terminated
No. of Contacts	32.73	16.91	34.56	25.73	-1.82	Graduated
No. of Face-to-Face Contacts	15.93	10.07	20.51	18.74	-4.57	Graduated
Family Conflict	2.40	0.51	1.84	0.65	0.56 <sup>*</sup>	Terminated
Abused in the Past	0.13	0.35	0.17	0.38	-0.04	Graduated
Experienced Domestic Violence	0.07	0.26	0.25	0.44		Graduated
Level of Substance Abuse Problem	1.73	0.59	1.71	0.49	0.02	Terminated
Mental Health Problem	.67	.49	.63	.48	.03	Terminated

<sup>\*</sup>p<.05; <sup>1</sup>p<.10