

Adult Drug Court Discretionary Grant Performance Measure Quality Assurance Plan— October 2011 to March 2012

Prepared for:
Bureau of Justice Assistance
Room 3623
810 7th Street NW
Washington, DC 20531

Prepared by:
CSR, Incorporated
Suite 1000
2107 Wilson Blvd.
Arlington, VA 22201
www.csrincorporated.com

Contract No. GS-10F-0114L, Task Order No. 2008-F_08151

August 3, 2012



BJA
Bureau of Justice Assistance
U.S. Department of Justice

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents	i
RECOMMENDATIONS	1
Overview	2
IMPLEMENTATION GRANTEES	3
General Award	3
Program Characteristics	3
Participant-Level Measures	3
ENHANCEMENT GRANTEES	8
General Award	8
Program Characteristics	8
Program-Level Measures	9
Participant-Level Measures	9
Table 19. Revised Performance Measures for Implementation Grantees.....	13

TABLES

Table 1. Implementation Grantees Reported, October 2011–March 2012 (N=64)	3
Table 2. Demographic Makeup of Candidates Deemed Ineligible for the Program (Percent).....	4
Table 3. ADC Candidates Deemed Ineligible for the Program (Percent).....	4
Table 4. Eligible ADC Candidates Who Refused to Enter the Program (Percent).....	4
Table 5. Demographic Makeup of ADC Candidates who Refused to Enter the Program (Percent).....	4
Table 6. ADC Participants with High Criminogenic Risks and High Needs (Percent).....	5
Table 7. Demographic Makeup of ADC Participants Admitted into the Program (Percent)	6
Table 8. ADC Participants Who Did Not Enter the Program, Reasons for Program Exit, and Program Length of Stay (Percent).....	7
Table 9. Enhancement Grantees Reported, October 2011–March 2012 (N=146).....	8
Table 10. ADC Candidates Deemed Ineligible for the Program (Percent).....	9
Table 11. Demographic Makeup of ADC Candidates Deemed Ineligible for the Program (Percent)	9
Table 12. Demographic Makeup of Eligible ADC Candidates that Refused Program Entry (Percent).....	10
Table 13. Eligible ADC Candidates Refused Program Entry (Percent)	11
Table 14. ADC Participants with High Criminogenic Risks and High Needs (Percent).....	11
Table 15. Demographic Makeup of ADC Participants Admitted into the Program (Percent)	11
Table 16. ADC Participants Who Did Not Complete the Program, Reasons for Program Exit, and Time of Exit (Percent).....	12
Table 17. Five Key Participant-Level Outcomes—Implementation Grantees (Percent)	13
Table 18. Five Key Participant Level Outcomes—Enhancement Grantees (Percent)	13
Table 19. Revised Performance Measures for Implementation Grantees.....	13
Table 20. Revised Performance Measures for Enhancement Grantees	16

RECOMMENDATIONS

In light of the data limitations revealed in this analysis, the following recommendations are being implemented for those performance measures found to be most problematic. For more details on these recommendations, please see Tables 19 and 20.

- Include a program characteristics question on the number of participants that grantees indicated they would serve in their grant applications.
- Provide outreach to grantees to explore the possibility of expanding categories for ineligible candidates and those who are eligible but refuse entry into drug court programs.
- Insert a business rule into the Performance Management Tool (PMT) that will prohibit grantees from answering service-related questions if they indicate they did not expend funds providing that particular service.
- Create separate service-related questions and insert business rules into the PMT to link the service types to the number of participants currently enrolled.
- Provide instruction to grantees to report only risk assessment information for newly admitted participants during the reporting period.
- Consider deleting the judicial interaction question altogether, or asking it as part of the series of program characteristics questions.
- Provide outreach to grantees to gauge the consistency and accuracy of the post-program recidivism measures they are collecting and to see what tracking mechanisms they are using (e.g., court or arrest records). Outreach will help to gauge the practicality of this question. Revise instructions in the questionnaire for the in-program recidivism measures to ensure consistent tracking mechanisms across grantees.

OVERVIEW

Between January and October 2011, the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) engaged a number of grantees, technical assistance (TA) providers, and drug court experts to discuss data quality issues with existing performance measures and obtain their feedback on new, recently developed measures. The feedback from BJA stakeholders led to several notable changes to the Adult Drug Court (ADC) Discretionary Grant Program's performance measures. A recent Government Accountability Office (GAO) audit included a recommendation that BJA document the contents of meetings with key stakeholders and develop a plan to assess the quality of performance data and further refine the measures for the ADC program. In response to the GAO's recommendation, BJA proposed the following corrective action plan:

- BJA will produce a summary report on possible inaccuracies, including but not limited to missing data, outliers, and duplicate counts.
- BJA will develop a timeline that details the revision process, as well as a crosswalk that provides information on the action taken on each performance measure and on the rationale for revising the measures.¹
- BJA will assess data on the completeness, quality, and accuracy of the new measures for two quarters and produce a summary report of its findings.

From October 2011 to March 2012, ADC grantees with open and active awards submitted performance data on the revised measures for the first two reporting periods (October 1, 2011 to December 31, 2011 and January 1, 2012 to March 31, 2012). This is the last of a series of reports designed to respond to the GAO's recommendation. This summary is based on analysis of two quarters of performance data, along with information provided by American University's staff from their outreach with Implementation and Enhancement grantees.² Recommendations for further refinement of the performance measures are also discussed.³

¹ See *Adult Drug Court Discretionary Grant Program Closeout Report, October 2010 to September 2011*.

² The grantee-level information was based on outreach efforts by staff members at American University's Justice Programs Office, who are the TA providers for Implementation and Enhancement grantees.

³ See GAO 2011 Report, *Adult Drug Courts: Studies Show Courts Reduce Recidivism, but DOJ Could Enhance Future Performance Measure Revision Efforts*, at www.gao.gov/new.items/d1253.pdf.

IMPLEMENTATION GRANTEES

Implementation grants are available to jurisdictions that have completed a substantial amount of planning and are ready to implement an adult drug court. These grantees may fund court operations and services; offender supervision, management, and services; or provision and coordination of non-treatment recovery support services, including education, job training and placement, housing placement assistance, primary and mental health care, or childcare and other family supportive services. During the 2 reporting periods between October 2011 and March 2012, 64 Implementation grantees submitted performance information across 3 broad categories of questions: general award, program characteristics, and participant-level measures (Table 1).

Table 1. Implementation Grantees Reported, October 2011–March 2012 (N=64)

Implementation Grantees	Total Responding to at Least One Question
2008 (N = 6)	5
2009 (N = 19)	19
2010 (N = 24)	24
2011 (N = 16)	16
Total (N=65)	64

General Award

General award questions are one-time-only measures that provide basic information about the grantees, such as whether they have commenced grant activities, the geographic location of their drug court program, and whether they admitted program participants. During the first 2 reporting periods, only 2 of the 64 grantees did not provide responses to the general award questions.

Program Characteristics

Program characteristics are pre-populated, one-time-only questions that provide information on the design and implementation of the program such as the dates the grantees first enrolled participants in the general and BJA-funded portions of their drug court program, and whether they communicate a system of graduated sanctions, administer random drug testing, and use evidence-based treatment services. During the last 2 reporting periods, 34 of 64 grantees responded to the program characteristics questions. Results for each of the program characteristics questions are as follows:

Enrollment Dates. No discrepancies were observed.

Graduated Sanctions. Thirty-four out of 64 grantees answered this question. All answered “yes” except one.

Random Drug Testing. Only one grantee answered “no,” which was consistent with their response in the previous reporting period.

Evidence-based Treatment Services. No discrepancies were observed across the two reporting periods.

Participant-Level Measures

Participant-level measures are reported quarterly. These questions require grantees to provide information on screening and program eligibility (eligible participants, ineligible participants and reasons

for ineligibility, and demographic information), risk assessments, participants receiving services (including demographic information), amount and type of services received (recovery support or treatment services, outpatient or inpatient), program completion, judicial interaction, program exits and length of stay, alcohol and substance use, and criminal involvement.

Screening and Program Eligibility. There were no discrepancies in numbers. For each grantee across the two reporting periods, the sum of the total eligible and total ineligible candidates equaled the total screened.

Candidates Deemed Ineligible. Across the two reporting periods, a few programs entered numbers incorrectly so that not all ineligible candidates were accounted for. As Table 2 illustrates, there were changes in demographic groups between the first and second reporting periods among Whites (-18 percentage points) and Blacks or African Americans (-25 percentage points). All other demographic groups either did not change or only increased slightly by up to 7 percentage points (Table 2). Unlike the demographic information, the change in each ineligible category remained relatively stable (Table 3).

Table 2. Demographic Makeup of Candidates Deemed Ineligible for the Program (Percent)

Race and Ethnicity	Oct.–Dec. 2011	Jan.–March 2012	Change
Hispanic or Latino	12	5	-7
White	45	27	-18
Black or African American	47	22	-25
Asian, AI/AN, or PI/NH*	2	2	0
Multiracial	3	2	-1
Unknown	1	4	3

*American Indian/Alaska Native or Pacific Islander/Native Hawaiian.

Table 3. ADC Candidates Deemed Ineligible for the Program (Percent)

Reasons for Ineligibility	Oct.–Dec. 2011	Jan.–March 2012	Change
No Drug Problem	26	26	0
Exclusionary Prior Offense	6	5	-1
Violent Behavior	25	24	-1
Mental Health Problem	3	4	1
Other	41	42	1

Eligible Candidates Who Refused Program Entry. As for refusal of program entry, there appears to be some confusion with reporting numbers on participants found eligible but who did not enter a program. For example, a grantee indicated that two screened candidates were found to be eligible and four were found to be ineligible, but that grantee then noted that four eligible candidates did not enter the program because of “Prosecutor or Defense Objection.” It stands to reason that, in the opinion of some grantees, if an eligible candidate is rejected through “Prosecutor or Defense Objection,” they are ineligible. In total, two programs made this error of indicating more eligible candidates who did not enter than were originally found eligible. It is likely that such confusion accounts for the wide disparity in two of the refusal reason categories between the first and second reporting periods (Table 4). As for the demographic information, the number reported for each demographic group between the first two reporting periods either remained the same or changed slightly by 1 to 7 percentage points (Table 5).

Table 4. Eligible ADC Candidates Who Refused to Enter the Program (Percent)

Reasons for Refusal	Oct.–Dec. 2011	Jan.–March 2012	Change
Participant Refusal	67	49	-18
Prosecution or Defense Objection	5	5	0
Judicial Objection	2	6	4
Out of Jurisdiction	6	9	3
Arrest, Conviction, or Incarceration	2	3	1
Other	0	28	28

Table 5. Demographic Makeup of ADC Candidates Who Refused to Enter the Program (Percent)

Race and Ethnicity	Oct.–Dec. 2011	Jan.–March 2012	Change
Hispanic or Latino	13	7	-6
White	56	49	-7
Black or African American	35	35	0
Asian, AI/AN, or PI/NH*	3	6	3
Multiracial	1	1	0
Unknown	1	2	1

*American Indian/Alaska Native or Pacific Islander/Native Hawaiian.

Criminogenic Risks and Needs. Some grantees found it difficult to determine the appropriate cohort to report risk assessment information (e.g., new participants or total current enrollments). For example, North Carolina administered the assessment to nine individuals, while indicating that only seven individuals were found eligible for the program. They did, however, screen a total of nine individuals. This makes sense, given the likelihood that they administer a risk/needs assessment to all screened candidates, not just those admitted to drug court programs. However, given that the question specifically asks for the total of admitted drug court participants, this number is unreliable. The nature of the question also does not clarify whether grantees are supposed to include only newly admitted participants or all participants. Despite this information, the risk level remained relatively flat (Table 6).

Table 6. ADC Participants with High Criminogenic Risks and High Needs (Percent)

Oct.–Dec. 2011	Jan.–March 2012	Change
71	68	-3

Admitted Participants. For every grantee that provided a response, the number of new drug court participants admitted was less than or equal to the number of candidates screened and found eligible. However, there were some reporting discrepancies between admitted participants and eligible participants. In the case of six programs, more participants were *admitted* than were *screened*. Despite problems with information from some grantees, demographic information for each group was either the same or only changed slightly by 1 to 5 percentage points (Table 7).

Table 7. Demographic Makeup of ADC Participants Admitted into the Program (Percent)

Race and Ethnicity	Oct.–Dec. 2011	Jan.–March 2012	Change
Hispanic or Latino	6	7	1
White	79	82	3
Black or African American	11	9	-2
Asian, AI/AN, or PI/NH*	9	9	0
Multiracial	0	1	1
Unknown	0	5	5

*American Indian/Alaska Native or Pacific Islander/Native Hawaiian.

Service-Related Questions. Results for the service-related questions across the first and second reporting periods were inconsistent and did not produce meaningful information. For example, at least seven grantees who answered “no” about whether they expended BJA funds on recovery support services or treatment service proceeded to enter information in the service categories. Many grantees are also unclear on what units of measurement are being counted. For these reasons, the number ranges for the recovery support and treatment services question are widely divergent between the first two reporting periods.

Program Completion and Judicial Interaction. Results for the number of judicial interactions across the first and second reporting periods suggest that the grantees are unclear on whether they should report the total appearances with a judge for the duration of a participant’s involvement with drug court or just within that time period. For example, in all cases where zero participants were indicated graduating, zero appearances in front of the judge were indicated. In one instance, a grantee reported 4 program completers during the reporting period and also reported the total drug court appearances for these completers at 230. If this number is for the reporting period only, that comes out to each participant appearing before the drug court judge an average of 19 times per month (230 appearances/4 participants/3 months). In another instance, a grantee reported one program completer during the reporting period and reported the total drug court appearances for that completer at three. This is a much more reasonable amount for the final 3 months of a drug court participant, but it is an unreasonable amount for a total. A similar pattern was observed in information submitted by 10 additional grantees. As for the successful completion, the percentage of participants successfully completing the program remained relatively consistent between the first and second reporting periods—47 percent to 40 percent, respectively (Table 17).

Program Exit Reasons and Program Length of Stay. There were no discrepancies observed, as the sum of all failure reasons equaled the sum of the program exit time frames. As illustrated in Table 8, the change in percentage for both program exit reasons and program length of stay either remained the same or showed a slight to moderate increase between the first and second reporting periods.

Table 8. ADC Participants Who Did Not Enter the Program, Reasons for Program Exit, and Program Length of Stay (Percent)

Reasons for Program Exit	Oct.–Dec. 2011	Jan.–March 2012	Change	Length of Stay	Oct.–Dec. 2011	Jan.–March 2012	Change
Court or New Criminal Involvement	39	49	10	0 to 3 Months	29	29	0
Lack of Engagement	27	19	-8	4 to 6 Months	25	23	-2
Absconding	21	20	-1	7 to 9 Months	17	15	-2
Relocating or Case Transfer	6	1	-5	10 to 12 Months	29	34	5
Death or Serious Illness	2	3	1				
Other Reasons	4	8	4				

Alcohol Substance Use. All positive testing participant totals were less than or equal to total tested participants for all participants enrolled at least 90 days. However, the total number of participants tested did not add up to the total number of participants enrolled in the program before the reporting period and thus in the program for 90 days. Despite this discrepancy, the percentage of participants testing positive for alcohol and substance use and who were enrolled at least 90 days remained at 24 percent for the first and second reporting periods (Table 17).

Court and Criminal Involvement. Accurately tracking in-program and post-program criminal activity remains a challenge for grantees, since it seems that recidivism rates are underreported at both stages of the program. In addition, the direction given to grantees in the questionnaire—“criminal history information should be based on official arrest information from a local, state, or national law enforcement reporting system or official court records”—may lead to recidivism measures that are not comparable across grantees, because the various reporting systems and court record systems noted in the questionnaire track different data. The post-program 1-year tracking period requirement is also unclear as written. However, as Table 17 illustrates, this rate remained at or near 4 percent between the first and second reporting periods.

ENHANCEMENT GRANTEES

Enhancement grants are awarded to a number of jurisdictions with a fully operational (at least 1 year) adult drug court that seeks to (1) expand its target population, (2) enhance its court operations, (3) improve its court services, or (4) enhance its offender services.⁴ The work of Enhancement grantees included but was not limited to developing training programs for drug court practitioners, developing and implementing an automated management information system, improving the quality and/or intensity of services, and adding program capacity. During the two reporting periods between October 2011 and March 2012, 146 Enhancement grantees submitted performance information across four broad categories of questions: general award, program characteristics, program-level measures, and participant-level measures (Table 9).

Table 9. Enhancement Grantees Reported, October 2011–March 2012 (N=146)

Enhancement Grantees (Including Joint)	Total Responding to at Least One Question
2008 (N = 2)	1
2009 (N = 31)	30
2010 (N = 74)	72
2011 (N = 43)	43
Total (N=150)	146

General Award

General award questions are one-time-only measures that provide basic information about the grantees, such as whether they have commenced grant activities, where their drug court program is located, and whether they admitted program participants. During the first 2 reporting periods, 146 of the 150 grantees responded to the general award questions.

Program Characteristics

Program characteristics are pre-populated, one-time-only questions that provide information on the design and implementation of the program. These include the dates grantees first enrolled participants in the general and BJA-funded portions of their drug court program, and whether they communicate a system of graduated sanctions, administer random drug testing, and use evidence-based treatment services. During the last 2 reporting periods, 146 grantees responded to the program characteristics questions. Results for each of the program characteristics questions are as follows.

Enrollment Dates. No discrepancies were observed across the two reporting periods.

Graduated Sanctions. Eighty-six grantees answered this question. Only one answered “no.”

Random Drug Testing. Eighty-six grantees answered this question. Only one answered “no.”

Evidence-based Treatment Services. Eighty-six grantees answered this question, and all responded “yes.” The implications are that this question does not offer enough nuance to help BJA distinguish programs offering good treatment from those offering inadequate treatment.

⁴ As of October 1, 2011, Enhancement grantees were required to report on participant-level measures such as completion rates and recidivism.

Program-Level Measures

Participant-level measures are quarterly reported questions that require grantees to provide information on the amount of services added (inpatient, outpatient, case management/offender supervision) and delivered.

Amount of Services Added. There were no discrepancies observed across the two reporting periods with these questions, as every grantee that responded answered “yes.”

Service-Provided Questions. Grantees remain unclear as to how many services were provided and what constitutes a service. Most of the information reported by grantees differs widely within a single reporting period and between the first and second reporting periods. For some service categories, responses ranged from 0 to 205. Those grantees who answered “yes” to using BJA funds to fund inpatient services indicated values ranging between 2 and 10,000; those who answered “yes” to adding substance abuse treatment services had values ranging between 1 and 1,415; those who answered “yes” to providing recovery support services had values ranging between 0 and 500; and those who reported providing inpatient or outpatient services had values ranging between 0 and 10,000. This signals substantial confusion in determining what goes into a “day.” It also shows that although some programs indicated services were provided, they were unable or chose not to divulge how many days by entering “0.” For this reason, it was difficult to calculate meaningful outcomes on the share of participants who receive service by type and level of intensity.

Participant-Level Measures

Participant-level measures are questions reported quarterly that require grantees to provide information on screening and program eligibility (eligible participants, ineligible participants and reasons, and demographic information), risk assessment, participant receiving services (including demographic information), program completion, judicial interaction, program exits and length of stay, alcohol and substance use, and criminal involvement.

Screening and Program Eligibility. There were no discrepancies with this series of questions, as each grantee response correctly added up total ineligible and total eligible to create total screened. The percentage of candidates deemed eligible for the Enhancement drug court program increased moderately by 12 percentage points between the first and second reporting periods (Table 18).

Candidates Deemed Ineligible. As for the categories of ineligibility, there were frequent occasions when the total reasons did not total or exceed the total count ineligible. For example, a grantee reported 32 ineligible candidates, 1 prior nonviolent, 1 violent history, and 16 other; and another grantee reported 41 ineligible, 3 prior nonviolent, 4 violent history, 1 mental health problem, and 29 other. It would be useful to determine additional categories of ineligibility, since high proportions of candidates are placed in the “other” category. Despite these discrepancies, the percentages for each ineligible category either remained the same or only changed by 2 percentage points between the first and second reporting periods (Table 10). A similar pattern of consistency was seen in the demographic information (Table 11).

Table 10. ADC Candidates Deemed Ineligible for the Program (Percent)

Ineligible Reasons	Oct.–Dec. 2011	Jan.–March 2012	Change
No Drug Problem	7	7	0
Exclusionary Prior Offense	23	21	-2
Violent	16	14	-2
Mental Health Problem	4	4	0
Other	51	53	2

Table 11. Demographic Makeup of ADC Candidates Deemed Ineligible for the Program (Percent)

Race and Ethnicity	Oct.–Dec. 2011	Jan.–March 2012	Change
Hispanic or Latino	15	14	-1
White	40	43	3
Black or African American	20	19	-1
Asian, AI/AN, or PI/NH*	4	3	-1
Multiracial	2	0	-2
Unknown	26	25	-1

*American Indian/Alaska Native or Pacific Islander/Native Hawaiian.

Eligible Candidates Who Refused Program Entry. There appears to be some confusion about reporting numbers on participants found eligible but who did not enter a program (Table 13). For example, a grantee indicated that two screened candidates were found to be eligible and four were found to be ineligible, but this grantee then indicated that four eligible candidates did not enter the program because of “Prosecutor or Defense Objection.” While it is possible to have a total number of reasons greater than the total found to be eligible, these four candidates were all in the same category. It stands to reason that in this grantee’s mind, if an eligible candidate is rejected through “Prosecutor or Defense Objection,” that candidate is ineligible. In total, two programs made this error of indicating more eligible candidates who did not enter a program than were originally found eligible. Despite this, information reported for each demographic group between the first two reporting periods either remained the same or changed slightly by 1 to 6 percentage points (Table 12).

Table 12. Demographic Makeup of Eligible ADC Candidates that Refused Program Entry (Percent)

Race and Ethnicity	Oct.–Dec 2011	Jan.–March 2012	Change
Hispanic or Latino	9	7	-2
White	63	66	3
Black or African American	17	23	6
Asian, AI/AN, or PI/NH*	3	4	1
Multiracial	1	5	4
Unknown	16	17	1

*American Indian/Alaska Native or Pacific Islander/Native Hawaiian.

Table 13. Eligible ADC Candidates Refused Program Entry (Percent)

Refusal Reasons	Oct.–Dec. 2011	Jan.–March 2012	Change
Participant Refused	55	45	-10
Prosecution or Defense Objection	16	10	-6
Judicial Objection	8	10	2
Out of Jurisdiction	1	4	3
Arrest, Conviction, Incarceration	5	5	0
Other	0	26	26

Criminogenic Risk and Needs. Similar to Implementation grantees, it is unclear for some Enhancement grantees whether they included only newly admitted participants, all candidates screened, or all drug court participants screened. For example, a grantee reported 18 eligible candidates, 30 given a risk/need assessment, and 10 new drug court participants; another reported 20 eligible candidates, 10 given a risk/need assessment, and 14 new drug court participants. Despite this, the number of participants assessed as having high criminogenic risk and high needs remained relatively stable between the first and second reporting periods (Table 14).

Table 14. ADC Participants with High Criminogenic Risks and High Needs (Percent)

Oct.–Dec. 2011	Jan.–March 2012	Change
69	73	4

Admitted Participants. Although there were eight instances where newly admitted participants outnumbered those screened and found eligible, the demographic makeup of participants admitted to Enhancement drug court programs either remained the same or changed by 1 to 8 percentage points (Table 15).

Table 15. Demographic Makeup of ADC Participants Admitted into the Program (Percent)

Race and Ethnicity	Oct.–Dec. 2011	Jan.–March 2012	Change
Hispanic or Latino	12	12	0
White	57	65	8
Black or African American	24	28	4
Asian, AI/AN, or PI/NH*	4	3	-1
Multiracial	3	2	-1
Unknown	12	12	0

*American Indian/Alaska Native or Pacific Islander/Native Hawaiian.

Program Completion and Judicial Interaction. Enhancement grantees demonstrated a better understanding of how to report on the number of successful completions and judicial interactions. In fact, only three grantees provided inaccurate information regarding these questions. Regarding program completion, the **rate of** successful completion increased moderately by 10 percentage points between the first and second reporting periods (Table 18). As for the number of judicial interactions, since it was unclear whether the number of appearances reported by grantees was for punitive or “business as usual” hearings, it was difficult to discern what the information was communicating (i.e., whether it was negative or positive).

Program Exit Reasons and Length of Stay. There were only three instances where the sum of the program exit reasons did not equal the sum of the program length of stay. As for the program exit reasons, there were slight to moderate differences in the percentage points for each category between the first and second reporting periods (Table 16). As for program length of stay, the number reported by grantees remained the same or relatively flat between the first and second reporting periods.

Table 16. ADC Participants Who Did Not Complete the Program: Reasons for Program Exit and Time of Exit (Percent)

Reasons for Program Exit	Oct.–Dec. 2011	Jan.–March 2012	Change	Time of Exit	Oct.–Dec. 2011	Jan.–March 2012	Change
Court or New Criminal Involvement	41	28	-13	0 to 3 Months	27	29	2
Lack of Engagement	24	28	4	4 to 6 Months	20	16	-4
Absconding	16	25	9	7 to 9 Months	14	14	0
Relocating or Case transfer	4	3	-1	10 to 12 Months	39	42	3
Death or serious illness	1	2	1				
Other Reasons	14	15	1				

Alcohol and Substance Use. The numbers reported by grantees suggest that in many cases not all participants are being tested. In other cases, the numbers do not make sense, assuming that ideally participants tested should equal total participants in the program. For example, 1 grantee reported 2 participants, with 35 participants drug tested; another grantee reported 12 participants, with 0 participants drug tested; and a third grantee reported 463 participants, with 5,623 participants drug tested. In some cases, more participants are listed as having tested positive for drugs than participants listed as being tested. For example, a grantee reported 31 participants tested, with 51 testing positive for illegal substances; and another grantee reported 57 participants tested, with 71 testing positive for illegal substances. Despite this, the percentage of participants testing positive for alcohol or illegal substances remained relatively stable between the first and second reporting periods, decreasing by 6 percentage points (Table 18).

Court and Criminal Involvement. Accurately tracking in-program and post-program criminal activity remains a challenge for grantees. Recidivism rates are underreported at both stages of the program. In addition, the direction given to grantees in the questionnaire—“criminal history information should be based on official arrest information from a local, state, or national law enforcement reporting system or official court records”—may lead to recidivism measures that are not comparable across grantees, because the various reporting systems and court record systems noted in the questionnaire track different data. The post-program 1-year tracking period requirement is also unclear as written. However, as Table 18 illustrates, the rate remained at 4 percent between the first and second reporting periods.

Table 17. Five Key Participant-Level Outcomes—Implementation Grantees (Percent)

	Oct.–Dec. 2011	Jan.–March 2012	Change
Eligible	44	51	7
Admitted	53	52	-1
Successful Completion	47	40	-7
Tested Positive	24	24	0
Recidivism	3	4	1

Table 18. Five Key Participant Level Outcomes—Enhancement Grantees (Percent)

	Oct.–Dec. 2011	Jan.–March 2012	Change
Eligible	62	74	12
Admitted	66	70	4
Successful Completion	39	49	10
Tested Positive	32	26	-6
Recidivism	4	4	0

Table 19. Revised Performance Measures for Implementation Grantees

Performance Indicator	Recommendation	Justification
Number of drug court candidates who were screened (pi2354A)	Grantees should continue to report on these measures.	Total Screened, Total Eligible, Total Ineligible. There were no discrepancies in numbers. In all cases, total eligible + total ineligible = total screened.
Number of individuals who were determined to be eligible for drug court participation (pi2355A)		
Number of individuals who were determined to be ineligible for drug court participation (pi2356A)		
Ineligible Reasons No Drug Problem (pi2357A to pi2357E)	Grantees should continue to report on these measures; however, additional training or TA followup with grantees is needed.	There appears to be some confusion with reporting numbers on participants found eligible but who did not enter a program. For example, a grantee indicated that two screened candidates were found to be eligible and four to be ineligible, but they then indicated that four eligible candidates did not enter the program because of “Prosecutor or Defense Objection.” While it is possible to have a total number of reasons greater than the total number of candidates found to be eligible, these four were all in the same category. It stands to reason that, in this grantee’s mind, if eligible candidates are rejected through “Prosecutor or Defense Objection,” they are ineligible. This error of indicating more eligible candidates who did not enter than were originally found eligible was made by two programs.
Ineligible Demographics (pi2359A to pi2360N)	Grantees should continue to report on these measures; however, additional training or TA followup with grantees is needed.	There were no meaningful discrepancies observed in the first two reporting periods for most of the demographic categories. However, there were two groups where the numbers differed by 18 to 25 percentage points.
Eligible but Refused Entry Reasons (pi2361A to pi2361F)	Grantees should continue to report on these measures.	Analysis of PMT data and TA provider outreach revealed no meaningful differences between the first two reporting periods.
Eligible but Refused Entry Demographic (pi2362A to pi2363N)	Grantees should continue to report on these measures.	Analysis of PMT data and TA provider outreach revealed no meaningful differences between the first two reporting periods.
Number of drug court participants who were administered a risk and need assessment during the reporting period (pi2364A)	Grantees should continue to report on these measures, provided there is more outreach instructing	It was difficult to determine what cohort receives the risk assessment, and thus, it cannot be determined whether grantees are only including admitted individuals. For example, one grantee administered the assessment to nine
Risk Assessment Instrument (pi2365A)		

High Criminogenic Risks and High Abuse Treatment Needs (pi2366A)	grantees to report only on assessments for newly admitted clients that occurred during the reporting period. Also update this definition in the PMT.	individuals, while indicating that only seven individuals were found eligible for the program. However, they did screen a total of nine individuals. This makes sense, given the likelihood that they administer a risk/needs assessment to all screened candidates, not just those admitted to drug court programs. But since the question specifically asks for the total number of admitted drug court participants, this number is unreliable. The nature of the question also does not clarify whether grantees are supposed to include only newly admitted participants or all participants.
Number of new drug court participants admitted (pi2367A)	Grantees should continue to report on these measures; however, additional training or TA followup with grantees is needed.	For every grantee that provided a response, the number of new drug court participants admitted was less than or equal to the number of candidates screened and found eligible.
Number of participants who are currently enrolled(pi2368A)	Grantees should continue to report on these measures; however, additional training or TA followup with grantees is needed.	Analysis of PMT data and TA provider outreach revealed no meaningful differences between the first two reporting periods.
Newly Admitted Participants Demographics (pi2369A to pi2370N)	Grantees should continue to report on these measures; however, additional training or TA followup with grantees is needed.	Analysis of PMT data and TA provider outreach revealed no meaningful differences between the first two reporting periods.
Were your BJA drug court program funds used (indirectly or directly) to provide substance abuse and treatment services to drug court participants during the reporting period? (pi2371A)	Grantees should continue to report. However, create a separate question that asks grantees to report on the various service types based on the number currently enrolled, and insert a business rule into the PMT linking the services question to the number of participants currently enrolled in the program.	There was one instance of a grantee answering “no” to employing BJA funds for recovery support services and still answering that they provided certain services. For example, one grantee reported they did not use BJA funds for recovery support services but proceeded to enter the following: Employment 8, Housing 6, Education 2, Mental Health 12, Medical/Dental 12, Pro-social 12, Other 3.
Number of drug court participants who received substance abuse and treatment services (pi2371B)		
Were your BJA drug court program funds used (indirectly or directly) to provide recovery support services to drug court participants during the reporting period? (pi2372A)		
Recovery support service type received (pi2373B to pi2373I)		
Were your BJA program funds used to add substance abuse and treatment services during the reporting period? (pi2374B)		
Were your BJA program funds used to add recovery support services during the reporting period? (pi2375A)		
Number of recovery support services added as a result of this grant (pi2375B)		
Were your BJA program funds used to add staff who provide offender supervision services during the reporting period? (pi2377A)		
Number of offender supervision staff added as a result of this grant (pi2377B)	Grantees should continue to report on.	Analysis of PMT data revealed no meaningful differences between the first two reporting periods.
Did your BJA drug court program provide inpatient services during the reporting period? (pi2378A)	Grantees should continue to report on these measures; however, additional training or TA followup with grantees is needed.	It was difficult to calculate this as a meaningful number. Grantees are unclear as to the unit of measurement being counted. For this reason, the number related to service type and intensity was widely divergent between the first and second reporting periods.
If yes, please enter the number of days for inpatient services drug court participants received during the reporting period (pi2378B)	Grantees should continue to report on these measures; however, additional training or TA followup with grantees is needed.	It was difficult to calculate this as a meaningful number. Grantees are unclear as to the unit of measurement being counted. For this reason, the number related to service type and intensity was widely divergent between the first and second reporting periods.

Did your BJA drug court program provide outpatient services during the reporting period? (pi2379A)	Grantees should continue to report on these measures; however, additional training or TA followup with grantees is needed.	It was difficult to calculate this as a meaningful number. Grantees are unclear as to the unit of measurement being counted. For this reason, the number related to service type and intensity was widely divergent between the first and second reporting periods.
Number of sessions for outpatient services for drug court participants (pi2379B)	Grantees should continue to report on these measures; however, additional training or TA followup with grantees is needed.	It was difficult to calculate this as a meaningful number. Grantees are unclear as to the unit of measurement being counted. For this reason, the number related to service type and intensity was widely divergent between the first and second reporting periods.
Number of drug court participants who successfully completed all program requirements (pi2380A)	Grantees should continue to report on these measures.	Although there were a few discrepancies with this measure, the successful completion rate remained relatively stable across the two reporting periods.
Total number of appearances that program completers had before a drug court judge since their enrollment in the program during the reporting period (pi2381A)	Consider asking this question as part of the program characteristics questions, and provide outreach via the TA provider on how to report. Also, please delete the phrase “during the reporting period.”	In all cases where zero participants were indicated graduating, zero appearances in front of the judge were indicated. However, this series presents some confusing results. The phrase “number of appearances these participants had before a drug court judge since their enrollment in the program during the reporting period” is unclear. Are we looking for total appearances before a judge for the duration of a participant’s involvement with drug court, or just within that time period? The numbers suggest that grantees are confused about this as well.
Did Not Complete Program Reasons (pi2382A to pi2382H)	Grantees should continue to report on these measures.	The sum of the various failure reasons equaled the sum of the program exit time frames.
Unsuccessful Exit Time Frames (pi2383A to pi2383D)		
Enrolled at least 90 days—Number of participants who tested positive for the presence of alcohol or illegal substances during the reporting period (pi2384A)	Grantees should continue to report on these measures.	All positive-testing participant totals were less than or equal to total tested participants for all participants enrolled at least 90 days. However, the total number of participants tested did not add up to the total number of participants enrolled in the program prior to the reporting period and thus who were in the program for 90 days.
Enrolled at least 90 days—Total number of participants tested for alcohol or illegal substances during the reporting period (pi2385A)		
Number of drug court participants who were charged with any drug offense(s) during the reporting period (pi2386A)	Grantees should continue to report on these measures; however, additional training or TA followup with grantees is needed.	Although the in-program recidivism numbers reported by grantees were low, they were consistent for all grantees across the two reporting periods.
Number of drug court participants who were charged with any non-drug offense(s) during the reporting period (pi2387A)		
Number of participants who were charged with any drug or non-drug offense(s) within 1 year after successfully completing the drug court program (pi2388A)	Provide additional followup to monitor how grantees are currently collecting this data to help gauge the feasibility of this question. Also, define the 1-year tracking period more clearly in the questionnaire.	The post-program recidivism numbers are unreliable. A large number of grantees continue to have difficulty with accurately tracking criminal activity after program completion.

Table 20. Revised Performance Measures for Enhancement Grantees

Performance Indicator	Recommendation	Justification
		Analysis of PMT data revealed no meaningful differences between the first two reporting periods.
Number of outpatient treatment slots added (pi2312B)	Grantees should report on the filter question. However, insert a business rule into the PMT prohibiting grantees from answering the related contingency question if they indicate “no” to providing a particular type of service.	There were a number of grantees who answered “no” to providing particular services but still answered the related question about contingency service.
Were your BJA program funds used to add staff to provide new case management or offender supervision services during the reporting period? (pi2313A)		
Number of case management or offender supervision staff added (pi2313B)		
Were your BJA program funds used to provide substance abuse treatment services during the reporting period? (pi2314A)		
Were your BJA program funds used to provide substance abuse treatment services during the reporting period? (pi2314B)		
Were your BJA program funds used to provide recovery support services during the reporting period? (pi2315A)		
Recovery Support Services by Type (pi2317B to pi2317I)		
Were your BJA program funds used to provide inpatient services during the reporting period? (pi2316A)		
Were your BJA program funds used to provide inpatient services during the reporting period? (pi2316B)	Grantees should continue to report on these measures.	Screened, eligible, ineligible. Of the 145 grantees that provided numbers, each grantee correctly added up total ineligible and total eligible individuals to create total screened.
Number of drug court candidates who were screened during the reporting period (pi2318A)		
Number of individuals who were determined to be eligible for drug court participation (pi2319A)		
Number of individuals who were determined to be ineligible for drug court participation (pi2320A)	Grantees should continue to report on these measures; however, additional training or TA followup with grantees is needed to determine if the categories should be expanded.	The total reasons frequently did not add up correctly or exceeded the total count for ineligible candidates. It would be useful to determine additional categories of ineligibility due to the high proportions of candidates placed in the “other” category.
Ineligible Candidate Reasons (pi2321A to pi2321E)		
Ineligible Candidates Demographics (pi2322A to pi2323N)	Grantees should continue to report on these measures.	Analysis of PMT data and TA provider outreach revealed no meaningful differences between the first two reporting periods.
Eligible Candidates Refused Entry Reasons (pi2324A to pi2324F)	Grantees should continue to report on these measures and provide more outreach via the TA provider to determine if the categories should be expanded.	As in the case with the Implementation grantees, there appears to be some confusion with reporting numbers on participants found eligible but who did not enter a program.
Eligible Candidates Refuse Entry Demographics (pi2325A to pi2326N)	Grantees should continue to report on these measures.	Analysis of PMT data and TA provider outreach revealed no meaningful differences between the first two reporting periods.
Number of drug court participants who were administered a risk and need assessment (pi2327A)	Grantees should continue to report on these measures; however, additional training or TA followup with grantees is needed. Instruct grantees to report only on assessments for newly admitted clients that occurred during the reporting period.	As with the Implementation grantees, it is unclear for certain grantees whether they are including only newly admitted participants, all candidates screened, or all drug court participants screened.
Risk Assessment Instrument (pi2328A)		
Number of participants who were identified as having high criminogenic risks and high abuse treatment needs (pi2329A)		
Number of new drug court participants admitted (pi2330A)	Grantees should continue to report on these measures; however,	New drug court participants. There were eight instances where newly admitted participants outnumbered those screened and found eligible.
Total number of participants who are currently enrolled (pi2331A)		

Newly Admitted Participants Demographics (pi2332A to pi2333N)	additional training or TA followup with grantees is needed.	
Were your BJA program funds used to add substance abuse and treatment services during the reporting period? (pi2334A)	Grantees should continue to report. However, create a separate question that asks grantees to report on the various service types and the number currently enrolled. Insert a business rule into the PMT to link the services question to the number of participants currently enrolled in the program.	A number of grantees remain unclear as to how many services were provided and what constitutes a service. For these reasons, most service-related numbers varied widely from period to period.
Number of substance abuse and treatment services added (pi2334B)		
Were your BJA program funds used to add recovery support services during the reporting period? (pi2335A)		
Number of recovery support services added (pi2335B)		
Did your BJA drug court program provide inpatient services during the reporting period? (pi2336A)		
Number of days of inpatient services drug court participants received (pi2336B)		
Did your BJA drug court program provide outpatient services during the reporting period? (pi2337A)		
Number of sessions for outpatient services drug court participants received (pi2337B)		
Number of drug court participants who successfully completed all program requirements during the reporting period (pi2338A)	Grantees should continue to report on these measures.	
Number of appearances program completers had before a drug court judge since their enrollment in the program (pi2339A)	Consider asking this question as part of the program characteristics questions, and provide outreach on how grantees should report this information. Also, please delete the phrase “during the reporting period.”	It was unclear as to whether the numbers of court appearances reported by grantees were for punitive or “business as usual” hearings. Also, the number of appearances before the drug court judge can be a function of program tenure and not sanction based.
Did Not Complete Program Reasons (pi2341A to pi2341G)	Grantees should continue to report on these measures.	There were only three instances of the numbers not adding up (reasons do not equal time frames).
Unsuccessful Exits Time Frames (pi2342A to pi2342D)		
Number of participants who tested positive for the presence of alcohol or illegal substances (enrolled 90 days) (pi2343A)	Grantees should continue to report on these measures; however, additional training or TA followup with grantees is needed	As with the Implementation grantees, the numbers suggest that in many cases not all participants are being tested. In other cases, the numbers do not make sense, assuming that ideally participants tested would equal total participants in the program. In some cases, more participants are listed as having tested positive for drugs than participants listed as being tested.
Total number of participants tested for alcohol or illegal substances during the reporting period (enrolled 90 days) (pi2344A)		
Number of drug court participants who were charged with any drug offense(s) (pi2345A)	Grantees should continue to report on these measures.	Although the in-program recidivism numbers reported by grantees were low, they were consistent for all grantees across the two reporting periods.
Number of drug court participants who were charged with any non-drug offense(s) (pi2346A)		
Number of participants who were charged with any drug or non-drug offense(s) within 1 year after successfully completing the drug court program. (pi2347A)	Provide additional followup to monitor how grantees are currently collecting this data to help gauge the feasibility of this question. Also, define the 1-year tracking period more clearly in the questionnaire.	The post-program recidivism numbers are unreliable. A large number of grantees continue to have difficulty with accurately tracking criminal activity after program completion.