Program Funding

Federal Fiscal Year	Drug Courts Budget Authority
2014	$ 40,500,000
2015	$ 41,000,000
2016	$ 42,000,000
Total	$ 123,500,000

Program Goals

Adult Drug Court is designed to equip courts and court systems with the necessary tools and resources to intervene with substance-abusing offenders while preparing citizens for successful community reintegration. To accomplish this goal, Adult Drug Court discretionary grant funds will be awarded to build and/or expand drug court capacity at the state, local, and tribal levels to reduce crime and substance abuse among high-risk, high-need offenders.

Adult Drug Court Program

Purpose of Report

The Grantee Feedback Report is a biannual report that allows you, the grantee, to compare your project's performance measurement data to the Adult Drug Court Program as a whole. The Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) produced this report with the hope that you may better understand how your project fits into the larger BJA-funded program. All the data reported represents the 6-month period noted in the report's header, unless otherwise noted in the table or figure finding.

Program Purpose[1]

The purpose of the Adult Drug Court Program is to implement and enhance drug treatment courts that integrate substance abuse treatment, mandatory drug testing, sanctions and incentives, and transitional services in a judicially supervised court setting with jurisdiction over nonviolent participants. BJA encourage courts to target participants with a high risk for recidivating and a high need for treatment to address substance addiction.

Program Highlights

Highlights of the Adult Drug Court Program from April to September 2016:

- The overall graduation rate increased 2.6 percent to 57.2 percent in April to September 2016 compared to 54.6 percent in April to September 2015.
- BJA is accomplishing its goal of encouraging BJA-funded drug courts to accept more high-risk/high need participants. During this time, a total of 77.3 percent of new participants assessed were high risk and/or high need.
- A total of 11,415 participants were enrolled in BJA-funded drug courts. This is a 7 percent reduction (827) in participants from the April to September 2015 reporting period.
- Of the participants in the program at least 90 days who were administered drug tests, 30.1 percent tested positive for illegal substance. This rate is much higher than the 18 percent who tested positive during the April to September 2015 reporting period.

[1] The Biannual Grantee Feedback Report includes performance data reported by BJA Drug Court grant recipients that conducted grant activities through September 2016. The following data come from the Performance Measurement Tool (PMT) data covering Drug Court grants from fiscal year (FY) 2009 through FY 2015. The data reflected in this report represent information as entered by grantees. Some grantee data will be verified that may have a slight impact on the calculated values throughout this report.

Statewide grants are awarded to state agencies (Table 1 and Figure 1). Statewide grantees can use these funds to "improve, enhance, or expand drug court services statewide"[2] such as performing court evaluations or establishing a statewide drug court data system. These grantees can also financially support other drug courts in their jurisdiction that are not currently receiving funding from BJA by making enhancements to the courts.[3]

Table 1. Grant Breakdown as of September 30, 2016

Type of Grant (Total *N* = 239)	Fiscal Years Present	Average Funds Received	Minimum Amount	Maximum Amount
Statewide (*n* = 63)	2012–2015	$902,410.40	$143,234*	$1,500,000
Implementation (*n* = 56)	2010–2015	$339,303.60	$166,018	$350,000
Enhancement (*n* = 113)	2011–2015	$219,168.20	$48,885	$300,000

*Statewide spending varies on whether the state spreads the total funding to certain subgrantees or uses it to fund certain items in all of its courts.

Enhancement grants are awarded to operational Adult Drug Courts which have been operating at least 1 year and which seek to do one or more of the following:

1. Expand the number of participants served who meet the existing target population description
2. Expand the target population description and serve additional participants who meet the expanded description
3. Enhance court operations
4. Enhance court and/or supervision services
5. Enhance recovery support services.[4]

Implementation grants are awarded to jurisdictions that have "completed a substantial amount of planning" [5] and are ready to implement a new drug court into their community.

Table 2. Location of Drug Court Grantees as of September 30, 2016

Type of Grant	Rural	Suburban	Urban	Tribal
Statewide (*n* = 63)[6]	19% (12)	24% (15)	52% (33)	0% (0)
Implementation (*n* = 56)	41% (23)	14% (8)	40% (22)	5% (3)
Enhancement (*n* = 113)	24% (29)	16% (19)	56% (60)	4% (5)
Total Courts (*N* = 232)	**27% (64)**	**18% (42)**	**51% (122)**	**4% (8)**

[2] BJA Adult Drug Court Solicitation 2016. Available at: https://www.bja.gov/adultdrugcourts16.

[3] https://www.bja.gov/adultdrugcourts16.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Ibid.

[6] Not all statewide grantees will report in this section. Only those that have subgrantees will report what type(s) of court(s) the grant is serving (Figure 2).

Figure 1. Drug Court Grantees as of September 30, 2016



Figure 2. Types of Courts Funded as of September 30, 2016[7,8,9]



*Grantees that marked "other" mostly did so to indicate that their court serves more than one population such as an adult court that also serves veterans or mental health services participants or to indicate that the grantee courts have a separate track within the main court.

[7] *Hybrid Driving While Intoxicated (DWI)/Drug Court:* A specialized court that accepts both Drug and DWI/Driving Under the Influence (DUI) cases. Most Hybrid courts started out as a Drug Court but now offer a specialized DWI/DUI docket to deal with DWI/DUI participants. For more information, please go to www.DWIcourts.org.

[8] Some courts marked more than one court served by the grant. The total number of court types may exceed the total number of grantees. See Table 2 for a more accurate number.

[9] Tribal drug courts can also apply for funding under Coordinated Tribal Assistance grants.

Participants

Table 3. Program Participants by Location Type: April–September 2016

Court Location	New Participants		Total Participants	
	Total	Average	Total*	Average
Urban (*n* = 97)	3,102	12.3	7,461	76
Suburban (*n* = 33)	473	6.5	1,279	39
Rural (*n* = 54)	921	7.5	2,618	48.5
Tribal (*n* = 8)	41	2.7	57	7
Total (*N* = 192)	**4,537**	**11**	**11,415**	**56**

*Total number of participants as of September 30, 2016.

Successful Participants

Table 4. Graduation Rates by Location Type:[10] April–September 2016

Court Location	Graduation Rate (Percentage)		
	Average	Minimum	Maximum
Urban (*n* = 97)	59.8%	0.0%	100%
Suburban (*n* = 33)	64.1%	0.0%	100%
Rural (*n* = 54)	48.4%	0.0%	100%
Tribal (*n* = 8)	36.4%	0.0%	100%
Overall Average (*N* = 192)	**57.2%**	**0.0%**	**100%**

[10] Only those grantees that input data into the questions asking for the number of successful participants and the number of unsuccessful participants were included in Table 4. All grantees have their entire graduation rate calculated (from start of grant to September 2016) and averaged. The range is from 0 to 100 percent.

Figure 3. Time Spent in Program for Participants Who Graduated from Drug Court (Total Participants = 2,102)



- Research suggests that participants should remain in the Drug Court Program a minimum of 6 months and no more than 18 months to maximize the positive treatment effects.[11] There were 1,191 participants (56.6 percent) who completed the program successfully ("graduated") in this time frame (Figure 3).
- 80 percent of participants are graduating in less than 2 years which is consistent with the National Association of Drug Court Professional's "Best Practice Standards."[12]

Race of Participants

- Participants who are American Indian/Alaska Native tend to have a higher enrollment rate in drug courts than other racial categories do (Table 5).
- Black/African American and Asian/Pacific Islander as well as minorities classified in the "other" categories have a much lower enrollment rate in the program. This was particularly true for Black/African American individuals where almost 90 percent of those eligible to enter did not enroll in the Drug Court Program. Some research shows that minority participants are going into other programs even though they are eligible for drug court. Additionally, capacity is limited in some sites to collect this data. More research is needed to understand enrollment decisions among minority offenders.

[11] Peters, R.H. (2011). *Translating drug court research into practice—Drug Court treatment services. Applying research findings to practice* [Issues Commentary and Resource Brief]. Washington, DC: Adult Drug Court Research to Practice Initiative. Available at http://research2practice.org/projects/treatment/pdfs/Issues%20Commentary%20and%20Resource%20Brief.pdf

[12] http://www.nadcp.org/Standards

Table 5. Race of New Participants and Those Eligible Who Did Not Enter (Total Grantees = 188[13])

Race	Percentage of Those Eligible Who Did Not Enter (Number)	Percentage of Those Eligible Who Enrolled Who Are New Participants (Number)	Total Eligible (Number)
White	61.9% (5,283)	38.1% (3,245)	100% (8,528)
Black/African American	87.4% (6,003)	12.6% (867)	100% (6,870)
American Indian/Alaska Native	37.9% (66)	62.1% (108)	100% (174)
Asian/Pacific Islander/ Multi/Other/Unknown	84.3% (1,808)	15.7% (337)	100% (2,145)
Total	**74.3% (13,160)**	**25.7% (4,557)**	**100% (17,717)**

Enrollment rates between Hispanic/Latino(a)s and Non-Hispanic/Latino(a)s are relatively similar, with 27 and 24 percent enrolling into the program (Table 6). It should be noted that many courts are not able to track this information, which leads to a higher number of ethnicity unknowns.

Table 6. Hispanic/Latino Ethnicity of New Participants and Those Eligible Who Did Not Enter (Total Grantees = 186[14])

Ethnicity	Percentage of Those Eligible Who Did Not Enter (Number)	Percentage of Those Eligible Who Enrolled Who Are New Participants (Number)	Total Eligible (Number)
Hispanic/Latino(a)	75.7% (1,619)	24.3% (519)	100% (2,138)
Non-Hispanic/Latino(a)	72.8% (10,272)	27.2% (3,842)	100% (14,114)
Ethnicity Unknown	66.1% (306)	33.9% (157)	100% (463)
Total	**73% (12,197)**	**27% (4,518)**	**100% (16,715)**

Although most races had a higher percentage of successful exits than unsuccessful exits, American Indian participants were in the only group with a higher rate of unsuccessful exits, at almost 53 percent (Table 7).

[13] Four grantees were left out of the table for they had a very high number of "unknowns" in their data. This high number would skew the data.

[14] Six grantees were removed from this analysis due to a high number of "unknowns" that skewed the data. Additional follow-up with these grantees is being conducted.

Table 7. Race of Successful and Unsuccessful Participants (Total Grantees = 192)

Race	Percentage Successful Exits (Number)	Percentage Exited Unsuccessfully (Number)	Total (Number)
White	58.4% (1,515)	41.6% (1,080)	100% (2,595)
Black/African American	50.3% (373)	49.7% (368)	100% (741)
American Indian	47.3% (26)	52.7% (29)	100% (55)
Asian/Pacific Islander/ Multi/Other/Unknown	65.2% (178)	34.8% (95)	100% (273)
Total	**57.1% (2,092)**	**42.9% (1,572)**	**100% (3,664)**

Although all ethnicities had a higher rate of successful participants, those of Hispanic/Latino(a) origin had the highest, with an overall successful exit rate of 73 percent (Table 8).

Table 8. Hispanic/Latino Ethnicity of Successful and Unsuccessful Participants (Total Grantees = 192)

Ethnicity	Percentage Successful Exits (Number)	Percentage Exited Unsuccessfully (Number)	Total (Number)
Hispanic/Latino(a)	73.1% (283)	26.9% (104)	100% (387)
Non-Hispanic/Latino(a)	55% (1,678)	45% (1,375)	100% (3,053)
Ethnicity Unknown	58.5% (121)	41.5% (86)	100% (207)
Total	**57.1% (2,082)**	**42.9% (1,565)**	**100% (3,647)**

Reasons Participants Did Not Enter the Program

Table 9, below, displays the reasons participants did not enter the Adult Drug Court Program.

Table 9. Reasons Participants Did Not Enter the Program[15]

	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Tribal	Total
Other	73.6% (9,247)	22.8% (218)	40.9% (510)	16.6% (4)	**67.5% (9,979)**
Prosecutor objection	8.5% (1,061)	6.4% (61)	7.5% (94)	4.2% (1)	**8.3% (1,217)**
Participant refused entry	4.8% (598)	11.8% (113)	8.9% (111)	33.3% (8)	**5.6% (830)**
Violent history	2.3% (285)	16.2% (154)	4.4% (55)	8.3% (2)	**3.4% (496)**
Candidate waiting for program slot (will enroll next quarter)	2.8% (352)	2.5% (24)	8.5% (106)	8.2% (2)	**3.3% (484)**
Insufficient risk (low risk)	1.6% (198)	11.5% (110)	7.6% (94)	4.2% (1)	**2.7% (403)**
Out of jurisdiction	1.7% (217)	6.1% (58)	1.9% (24)	0% (0)	**2% (299)**
No drug problem	1.3% (159)	1.9% (18)	7% (87)	4.2% (1)	**1.8% (265)**
Candidate did not complete screening	0.7% (91)	3.4% (33)	6.5% (81)	12.5% (3)	**1.4% (208)**
Exclusionary prior nonviolent offense	0.9% (114)	6.8% (65)	1.3% (16)	0% (0)	**1.3% (195)**
Arrest, conviction, or incarceration on another charge	0.7% (91)	5.1% (49)	2.2% (27)	4.2% (1)	**1.1% (168)**
Judicial objection	0.5% (66)	2.7% (26)	1.9% (24)	0% (0)	**0.8% (116)**
Mental health diagnosis that cannot be handled by the court	0.4% (46)	2.6% (25)	1.4% (18)	4.2% (1)	**0.6% (90)**
Ineligible for VA services	0.2% (2)	0.2% (2)	0% (0)	0% (0)	**0.2% (34)**
Defense objection	0% (5)	0% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	**0% (5)**
Accident involving injury	0% (3)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	**0% (3)**
Total	**100% (12,565)**	**100% (956)**	**100% (1,247)**	**100% (24)**	**100% (14,792)**

The main "Other" reasons participants did not enter the program include the following:

- Entered another program (369)
- Program at capacity (242)
- Participant still in screening/pending (182)
- Not enough time on sentence (130)
- Statutory ineligibility/ ineligible (79)
- Not actioned (67)

[15] After potential participants are screened, they may or may not be found eligible for drug court participation.

- Voluntary withdrawal (52)
- Waiting on court dates/plea agreements (48)
- Did not have proper mental health/ co-occurring/ substance use disorder (44)
- Not target population (41)
- Absconded (38)
- Previous participant (35)
- Medical issue/ Death (35)
- Charge/case reduced or dismissed (29) (Table 9).

There are a few grantees with a large number of screened participants (8,386) who are not able to track this part of the questionnaire. These participants are also placed in the "Other" category.

Participants Who Left the Program Unsuccessfully

Figure 4. Time Spent in Program for Participants Who Did Not Complete Program Requirements (Total Participants = 1,573)



- 39 percent of unsuccessful participants (617) left drug court within 6 months of starting the program (Figure 4). Reasons for leaving the program unsuccessfully included continued use of drugs, absconding, and not following protocol.
- Interestingly, almost 42 percent of unsuccessful participants (659) left the program without graduating but after participating for 10 or more months.

Figure 5. Reasons Participants Left the Program Without Completion (Total Participants = 1,573)



"Other" reasons why participants left the program primarily include voluntary withdrawal/self-termination from the program, not complying with the rules of the program, or participant's sentence/probation ended (Figure 5).

Risk/Assessments, Drug Testing, and Services Rendered

BJA requires Drug Court grantees to use validated risk/needs assessment tools and to target high-risk/high-need participants (Table 10). Research suggests that Drug Court programs can have the most impact by targeting offenders who are at high risk for reoffending and have significant substance abuse treatment needs (Tables 11–13). This, in turn, increases the cost-effectiveness of the program.[16]

Table 10. Average Number of New Participants Screened and Found to Be High Risk*

Location Type	Average Number of New Participants Assessed	Average Number of New Participants Found to Be High Risk	Average Percentage of New Participants Found to Be High Risk
Urban (*n* = 116)	10.5	7.7	57.6
Suburban (*n* = 44)	6.3	4.7	57.2
Rural (*n* = 68)	7.6	6.7	73.7
Tribal (*n* = 9)	2.3	1.1	28.9
Total (*N* = 237)	**8.6**	**6.7**	**61.1**

*Only those grantees that perform assessments on new participants were included in Table 10.

Figure 6 displays the types of assessment tools used by Drug Court grantees through a word cloud graphic. The larger the text in Figure 6, the more often that tool is used by grantees. The tools in smaller text were used less often. The most common assessment instrument used by grantees is the LSI-R (19.9 percent), followed by RANT (17.4 percent).

[16] Marlowe, D. B. (2012). *Alternative tracks in Adult Drug Court: Matching your program to the needs of your clients* [Drug Court Practitioner Fact Sheet, vol. 7(2)]. Alexandria, VA: National Association of Drug Court Professionals. Available at: http://www.ndci.org/sites/default/files/nadcp/AlternativeTracksInAdultDrugCourts.pdf.

Figure 6. Validated Risk Assessment Tools Listed by Drug Court Grantees

Table 11, below, displays the average number of participants who were drug tested after being in the program for 90 days.

Table 11. Average Number of Participants Drug Tested after Being in Program 90 Days[17]

	Average Number Tested	Average Number Testing Positive	Average Percentage Testing Positive
Urban (*n* = 116)	56.7	16.7	29.6%
Suburban (*n* = 44)	37.1	6.5	22.8
Rural (*n* = 68)	42.3	16	28.9
Tribal (*n* = 9)	5.9	2.3	30.5
Total (*N* = 237)	**47.3**	**14.2**	**28%**

[17] Random drug testing is a requirement of all drug courts. A few grantees had a few outliers that skewed the average percentage.

Drug Court Services Paid for with Grant Funds

Table 12, below, displays the participants receiving BJA-funded services as of September 30, 2016. Table 13, below, displays the Drug Court Program enhancements as of September 30, 2016.

Table 12. Participants Receiving BJA-Funded Services as of September 30, 2016

Services	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Tribal	Total
Other services*	31.2% (264)	44.7% (379)	23.1% (196)	1% (8)	**24% (847)**
Prosocial services	57.7% (290)	7.3% (37)	32% (161)	3% (15)	**14.3% (503)**
Mental health services	57.1% (236)	8.7% (36)	32.7% (135)	1.5% (6)	**11.7% (413)**
Health services	62.2% (244)	4.1% (16)	32.7% (128)	1% (4)	**11.1% (392)**
Employment	61.3% (195)	6.9% (22)	30.5% (97)	1.3% (4)	**9% (318)**
Housing services	68.2% (206)	8.3% (25)	22.8% (69)	0.7% (2)	**8.6% (302)**
Veteran services	91.3% (263)	1.4% (4)	6.9% (20)	0.4% (1)	**8.2% (288)**
Trauma treatment	61.5% (155)	7.1% (18)	31% (78)	0.4% (1)	**7.1% (252)**
Education services	61.1% (129)	5.2% (11)	31.8% (67)	1.9% (4)	**6% (211)**
Total	**56.2% (1,982)**	**15.5% (548)**	**27% (951)**	**1.3%(45)**	**100% (3,526)**

*Spending items under "Other services" include transportation for participants (e.g., bus passes and helping participants get their licenses), assessments, peer mentoring, case management, drug screenings, and child care/parenting classes.

Table 13. Drug Court Program Enhancements as of September 30, 2016

	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Tribal	Total
Case manager	43.5% (53)	19.7% (24)	31.1% (38)	5.7% (7)	**25.2% (122)**
Training	47.5% (48)	13.9% (14)	33.7% (34)	4.9% (5)	**20.9% (101)**
Evaluation	40.7% (22)	13% (7)	40.7% (22)	5.6% (3)	**11.2% (54)**
Other*	50% (22)	15.9% (7)	29.5% (13)	4.6% (2)	**9.1% (44)**
Equipment	51.2% (22)	9.3% (4)	34.9% (15)	4.6% (2)	**8.9% (43)**
Aftercare	55.2% (21)	5.3% (2)	31.6% (12)	7.9% (3)	**7.8% (38)**
Enhancing risk/ assessment screening	25.7% (9)	14.3% (5)	51.4% (18)	8.3% (3)	**7.2% (35)**
Performance standards measures	32% (8)	12% (3)	52% (13)	4% (1)	**5.2% (25)**
MIS (management information system)	31.8% (7)	13.6% (3)	50% (11)	4.6% (1)	**4.5% (22)**
Total	**43.8% (212)**	**14.3% (69)**	**36.3% (176)**	**5.6% (27)**	**100% (484)**

"Other" includes primarily drug testing, supplies, and compensation.

Technical Assistance to Improve Outcomes

Do you have questions about how to get the most from your Drug Court grant? Be sure to contact the National Association of Drug Court Professionals (NADCP), the Technical Assistance provider for the Drug Court Program.

Drug Court Technical Assistance Provider: National Association of Drug Court Professionals (NADCP)

The National Drug Court Institute, a division of The National Association of Drug Court Professionals, uses a multi-tiered training curriculum developed in conjunction with leading researchers in the field to provide unparalleled instruction to treatment court teams all over the world. Have a specific question? Go ahead and **Ask the Experts**!

For more information or to request technical assistance, please contact:

Melynda Benjamin, Project Director

National Drug Court Institute

1029 N. Royal, Ste. 201, Alexandria, VA 22314

D: 703-575-9500| **W:** NDCI website

Technical Assistance and Training Resources

Request TA: Onsite technical assistance customized for your needs.

Designing A Court: Start and sustain an adult, tribal or veterans' treatment Court.

Medication Assisted Treatment: Critical training on an issue facing every program.

Discipline Specific Training: Training programs designed for each member of the drug court team.

Advanced Trainings: Training programs for drug courts in operation for two or more years.

Statewide Training: Request speakers for your statewide conference or training.

On Demand: Request any NDCI training customized to fit your needs.

Visit a Court: Organized site visit to learn from other mentoring courts.

e-Learning: Online training on your schedule.

Upcoming Events

Appendix

This appendix shows grantee data from the April–September 2016 reporting period. Each chart is separated by type of location of grantee (Urban, Suburban, etc.).

Grant Type	State	Grant Name	Award Number	Award Amount ($)	Subgrantee[18]	Reporting Period	Location	Number of Participants	Number of Participants Who	Total Participants	Number of New Participants	Number of Successful	Number of Unsuccessful	Graduation Rate	Percentage Who Tested Positive for
Urban Average								**144.7**	**117.7**	**80.3**	**29.1**	**13.2**	**9.3**	**51.9%**	**87.0%**
Drug Court Implementation	WA	Spokane County	2011-DC-BX-0034	$349,959	FALSE	Both	Urban	108	97	74	24	14	0	100.0%	18.6%
Drug Court Implementation	KY	KY Administrative Office of the Courts	2012-DC-BX-0039	350,000	FALSE	Both	Urban	243	239	10	4	5	0	100.0%	14.3%
Drug Court Implementation	HI	Judiciary Courts of the State of Hawaii	2012-DC-BX-0004	349,943	FALSE	Both	Urban	31	24	30	10	5	1	83.3%	7.7%
Drug Court Implementation	MT	City of Billings	2012-DC-BX-0043	350,000	FALSE	Both	Urban	15	9	25	10	4	2	66.7%	10.8%
Drug Court Implementation	TX	Harris County, Texas	2012-DC-BX-0002	350,000	FALSE	Both	Urban	25	19	40	14	7	3	70.0%	29.4%
Drug Court Implementation	FL	City of Jacksonville	2013-VV-BX-0049	350,000	FALSE	Both	Urban	43	16	50	30	17	6	73.9%	20.2%
Drug Court Implementation	MN	Ramsey County	2013-VV-BX-0046	350,000	FALSE	Both	Urban	36	30	27	6	7	0	100.0%	23.0%
Drug Court Implementation	OR	Marion County	2013-VV-BX-0012	348,435	FALSE	Both	Urban	55	35	25	20	7	1	87.5%	27.5%
Drug Court Implementation	CO	Colorado Judicial Department	2013-VV-BX-0003	344,285	FALSE	Both	Urban	18	13	27	5	3	2	60.0%	39.2%
Drug Court Implementation	VA	Arlington County Drug Court Program	2013-DC-BX-0050	350,000	FALSE	Both	Urban	28	18	18	8	4	2	66.7%	31.0%
Drug Court Implementation	WI	Fond du Lac County	2013-DC-BX-0039	350,000	FALSE	Both	Urban	13	8	13	5	2	3	40.0%	57.7%
Drug Court Implementation	CO	Colorado Judicial Department	2013-DC-BX-0001	350,000	FALSE	Both	Urban	0	0	22	0	21	22	48.8%	15.4%

[18] "False" in the subgrantee category means that this is not a subaward.

Drug Court Implementation	MT	Judiciary Courts of the State of Montana	2014-DC-BX-0044	299,629	FALSE	Both	Urban	27	16	20	11	9	0	100.0 %	14.7%
Drug Court Implementation	FL	Seminole County	2014-DC-BX-0051	348,446	FALSE	Both	Urban	11	4	27	7	16	4	80.0%	21.9%
Drug Court Implementation	DE	Executive Office of the Governor of Delaware	2014-DC-BX-0034	350,000	FALSE	Both	Urban	749	746	43	15	13	2	86.7%	100.0 %
Drug Court Implementation	CA	San Francisco Superior Court	2014-DC-BX-0004	350,000	FALSE	Both	Urban	34	2	50	32	18	22	45.0%	52.8%
Drug Court Implementation	CA	Superior Court of California, County of Sacramento	2014-DC-BX-0003	350,000	FALSE	Both	Urban	18	5	27	13	3	1	75.0%	27.0%
Drug Court Implementation	IN	Indianapolis Community Court	2014-DC-BX-0062	320,000	FALSE	Both	Urban	41	8	29	19	1	1	50.0%	58.0%
Drug Court Implementation	KY	KY Administrative Office of the Courts	2014-VV-BX-0021	350,000	FALSE	Both	Urban	12	8	14	5	0	2	0.0%	13.0%
Drug Court Implementation	LA	24th Judicial District Court, State of Louisiana	2014-VV-BX-0019	350,000	FALSE	Both	Urban	2	1	2	1	0	1	0.0%	0.0%
Drug Court Implementation	NH	NH Administrative Office of the Courts	2014-DC-BX-0064	324,960	FALSE	Both	Urban	24	6	51	19	6	3	66.7%	44.6%
Drug Court Implementation	NM	Second Judicial District Court of New Mexico	2015-DC-BX-0041	279,919	FALSE	01 Jul 2016-30 Sep 2016	Urban	9	2	22	7	3	1	75.0%	20.8%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	IL	County of DuPage	2011-DC-BX-0130	199,691	FALSE	Both	Urban	27	12	47	15	9	6	60.0%	11.6%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	TX	MHMR of Tarrant County	2011-DC-BX-0037	249,260	FALSE	01 Apr 2016-30 Jun 2016	Urban	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	ID	Idaho Supreme Court	2012-DC-BX-0058	300,000	FALSE	Both	Urban	27	24	59	3	20	13	60.6%	20.0%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	VT	Vermont Office of the Court Administrator	2012-DC-BX-0049	300,000	FALSE	Both	Urban	27	8	59	14	9	4	69.2%	78.4%

Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	NY	New York State Unified Court System	2012-DC-BX-0038	188,908	FALSE	Both	Urban	54	8	105	47	13	18	41.9%	48.6%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	OH	Mahoning County Alcohol and Drug Addiction Services Board	2012-DC-BX-0013	199,720	FALSE	Both	Urban	47	17	64	30	19	6	76.0%	17.2%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	NY	New York State Unified Court System	2012-DC-BX-0005	195,024	FALSE	Both	Urban	171	50	467	121	95	24	79.8%	12.8%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	KY	KY Administrative Office of the Courts	2013-DC-BX-0073	300,000	FALSE	Both	Urban	106	67	187	39	31	26	54.4%	15.0%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	WA	Clark County	2013-DC-BX-0067	300,000	FALSE	Both	Urban	151	87	151	60	21	38	35.6%	38.0%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	FL	Orange County Government	2013-DC-BX-0065	300,000	FALSE	Both	Urban	36	30	27	17	6	10	37.5%	37.1%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	CO	Colorado Judicial Department	2013-DC-BX-0063	295,550	FALSE	Both	Urban	23	9	28	17	2	15	11.8%	83.3%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	FL	Miami-Dade County	2013-DC-BX-0062	298,525	FALSE	Both	Urban	340	149	362	174	139	31	81.8%	20.1%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	NM	Bernalillo County Metropolitan Court	2013-DC-BX-0061	292,968	FALSE	Both	Urban	202	95	258	127	92	19	82.9%	17.1%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	NY	New York State Unified Court System	2013-DC-BX-0027	199,615	FALSE	Both	Urban	37	28	40	9	11	2	84.6%	10.3%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	IL	Circuit Court of Cook County	2013-DC-BX-0005	200,000	FALSE	Both	Urban	3	0	2	3	1	1	50.0%	33.3%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	NY	New York State Unified Court System	2014-DC-BX-0001	300,000	FALSE	Both	Urban	32	3	13	29	23	6	79.3%	4.3%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	MN	Judiciary Courts of the State of Minnesota	2014-DC-BX-0048	200,000	FALSE	01 Apr 2016-30 Jun 2016	Urban	34	31	53	5	4	3	57.1%	20.8%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	NY	New York State Unified Court System	2014-DC-BX-0085	286,450	FALSE	Both	Urban	92	63	28	23	8	3	72.7%	26.8%

Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	OH	Cuyahoga County Common Pleas Court	2014-DC-BX-0079	300,000	FALSE	Both	Urban	48	9	101	35	0	4	0.0%	18.9%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	TX	MHMR of Tarrant County	2014-DC-BX-0076	298,900	FALSE	Both	Urban	39	20	56	24	0	7	0.0%	26.8%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	FL	City of Jacksonville	2014-DC-BX-0072	299,975	FALSE	Both	Urban	32	18	95	14	16	5	76.2%	24.2%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	CO	Colorado Judicial Department	2014-DC-BX-0071	293,457	FALSE	Both	Urban	26	22	53	8	3	2	60.0%	64.4%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	IL	Macon County	2014-DC-BX-0066	200,000	FALSE	Both	Urban	64	9	54	27	6	16	54.1%	45.3%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	NH	NH Administrative Office of the Courts	2014-DC-BX-0065	174,148	FALSE	Both	Urban	17	8	34	11	3	2	60.0%	62.7%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	MA	MA Administrative Office of the Trial Court	2014-DC-BX-0063	200,000	FALSE	Both	Urban	17	6	56	11	7	13	35.0%	16.1%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	IN	County of Marion	2014-DC-BX-0054	200,000	FALSE	Both	Urban	51	0	1124	51	20	17	54.1%	73.4%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	MO	MISSOURI 22ND JUDICIAL CIRCUIT, ST. LOUIS CITY DRUG COURT	2014-DC-BX-0022	200,000	FALSE	Both	Urban	199	136	276	84	20	116	14.7%	41.9%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	OH	Cleveland Municipal Court	2014-DC-BX-0010	200,000	FALSE	Both	Urban	12	0	6	12	0	2	0.0%	0.0%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	GA	NEWTON COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS	2014-DC-BX-0082	300,000	FALSE	Both	Urban	86	71	43	15	5	1	83.3%	12.3%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	NY	New York State Unified Court System	2014-DC-BX-0084	298,208	FALSE	Both	Urban	28	0	75	28	10	1	90.9%	35.4%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	NE	The County of Lancaster, Nebraska	2014-DC-BX-0081	210,183	FALSE	Both	Urban	64	34	79	30	10	6	62.5%	5.3%

Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	IL	County of Kane	2014-DC-BX-0077	233,570	FALSE	Both	Urban	56	26	116	24	9	6	60.0%	20.9%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	WA	Pierce County Superior Court	2014-DC-BX-0068	300,000	FALSE	Both	Urban	180	139	88	35	13	17	43.3%	31.1%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	KY	KY Administrative Office of the Courts	2014-DC-BX-0046	200,000	FALSE	Both	Urban	143	88	269	55	31	30	50.8%	17.1%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	IA	County of Johnson, Iowa	2014-DC-BX-0045	192,528	FALSE	Both	Urban	9	1	15	8	4	9	30.8%	15.4%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	OR	Benton County Sheriff's Office	2014-DC-BX-0027	199,874	FALSE	Both	Urban	20	8	47	13	7	7	50.0%	28.9%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	OR	Multnomah, County of—SSP	2014-DC-BX-0023	200,000	FALSE	Both	Urban	46	12	139	34	23	23	50.0%	30.5%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	IL	Sangamon County	2014-DC-BX-0018	200,000	FALSE	Both	Urban	32	16	46	16	6	15	28.6%	40.9%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	OH	County of Hamilton	2014-DC-BX-0083	300,000	FALSE	Both	Urban	16	1	67	16	8	6	57.1%	3.4%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	MO	13th Judicial Circuit—Boone County	2015-VV-BX-0064	199,989	FALSE	Both	Urban	9	7	14	5	4	1	80.0%	6.5%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	NY	New York State Unified Court System	2015-VV-BX-0048	199,952	FALSE	Both	Urban	64	47	30	22	6	5	54.5%	4.9%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	NY	New York State Unified Court System	2015-VV-BX-0046	199,995	FALSE	Both	Urban	74	3	71	71	1	0	100.0%	13.9%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	IL	Cook County State's Attorney's Office	2015-VV-BX-0029	200,000	FALSE	Both	Urban	8033	7725	358	231	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	AR	County of Washington	2015-VV-BX-0018	200,000	FALSE	Both	Urban	106	1	353	377	89	3	96.7%	52.4%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	CA	Superior Court of California, County of Santa Clara	2015-DC-BX-0084	300,000	FALSE	Both	Urban	9	0	9	11	1	1	50.0%	0.0%

Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	AL	Jefferson County Commission	2015-DC-BX-0082	300,000	FALSE	Both	Urban	1383	1361	23	22	0	2	0.0%	33.3%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	MI	City of Grand Rapids	2015-DC-BX-0078	300,000	FALSE	Both	Urban	228	184	82	42	5	7	41.7%	54.8%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	CA	Superior Court of California, County of Alameda	2015-DC-BX-0075	300,000	FALSE	Both	Urban	57	17	25	34	11	20	35.5%	61.0%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	FL	Pinellas County Board of County Commissioners	2015-DC-BX-0073	299,491	FALSE	Both	Urban	413	133	770	232	130	111	53.9%	36.8%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	IN	Madison County Circuit Court	2015-DC-BX-0067	200,000	FALSE	Both	Urban	96	44	111	43	20	33	37.7%	18.3%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	IN	Grant County Drug Court	2015-DC-BX-0066	137,813	FALSE	Both	Urban	29	19	51	22	15	12	55.6%	15.0%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	GA	State Court of Richmond County Accountability Court	2015-DC-BX-0063	50,000	FALSE	Both	Urban	66	18	137	56	68	16	81.0%	57.7%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	TX	Bexar County Commissioners Court	2015-DC-BX-0059	200,000	FALSE	Both	Urban	25	11	26	19	0	1	0.0%	24.0%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	RI	Judiciary of State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantation	2015-DC-BX-0057	189,746	FALSE	Both	Urban	96	92	171	55	44	10	81.5%	28.4%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	WI	Waukesha County	2015-DC-BX-0050	200,000	FALSE	Both	Urban	23	22	11	8	1	4	20.0%	15.8%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	CA	San Francisco Superior Court	2015-DC-BX-0044	200,000	FALSE	Both	Urban	7	4	7	9	1	4	20.0%	66.7%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	MN	Tenth Judicial District	2015-DC-BX-0032	200,000	FALSE	Both	Urban	53	19	35	15	6	8	42.9%	19.4%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	CO	Colorado Judicial Department	2015-DC-BX-0031	199,992	FALSE	Both	Urban	78	8	28	68	3	0	100.0%	85.9%

Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	PA	Allegheny County	2015-DC-BX-0022	166,605	FALSE	Both	Urban	119	95	163	32	41	29	58.6%	29.7%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	MN	Second Judicial District	2015-DC-BX-0052	200,000	FALSE	Both	Urban	25	15	32	10	5	3	62.5%	23.9%
Drug Court Statewide	VA	Hampton	2012-DC-BX-0050	--	TRUE	Both	Urban	0	0	6	0	0	0	0.0%	16.7%
Drug Court Statewide	IA	5th Judicial District DCS	2012-DC-BX-0060	--	TRUE	01 Apr 2016-30 Jun 2016	Urban	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
Drug Court Statewide	IA	6th Judicial District DCS	2012-DC-BX-0060	--	TRUE	Both	Urban	22	0	53	22	8	17	32.0%	100.0 %
Drug Court Statewide	IA	8th Judicial District DCS	2012-DC-BX-0060	--	TRUE	Both	Urban	3	0	6	3	2	2	50.0%	7.7%
Drug Court Statewide	IA	4th Judicial District DOC	2012-DC-BX-0060	--	TRUE	Both	Urban	9	2	13	3	4	3	57.1%	12.5%
Drug Court Statewide	OK	Garfield County Drug Court	2013-VV-BX-0042	--	TRUE	Both	Urban	6	4	4	2	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
Drug Court Statewide	OK	Muskogee County Drug Court	2013-VV-BX-0042	--	TRUE	Both	Urban	1	1	2	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
Drug Court Statewide	CA	Superior Court of California, County of Alameda	2013-DC-BX-0019	--	TRUE	Both	Urban	51	22	59	29	9	12	42.9%	26.2%
Drug Court Statewide	CA	Superior Court of California, County of San Diego	2013-DC-BX-0019	--	TRUE	Both	Urban	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
Drug Court Statewide	CA	Superior Court of California, County of Santa Clara	2013-DC-BX-0019	--	TRUE	Both	Urban	23	0	98	23	17	9	65.4%	78.6%
Drug Court Statewide	CA	Superior Court of California, County of Contra Costa	2013-DC-BX-0019	--	TRUE	Both	Urban	12	6	15	4	9	8	52.9%	26.5%
Drug Court Statewide	GA	Chatham County BOC (VTC)	2014-VV-BX-0058	--	TRUE	Both	Urban	17	11	16	6	3	2	60.0%	12.5%
Drug Court Statewide	GA	Cobb County BOC (VTC)	2014-VV-BX-0058	--	TRUE	Both	Urban	35	14	26	9	9	1	90.0%	3.8%
Drug Court Statewide	GA	Macon Judicial Circuit	2014-VV-BX-0058	--	TRUE	Both	Urban	43	33	19	10	4	4	50.0%	30.0%

Drug Court Statewide	GA	Muscogee County BOC (VTC)	2014-VV-BX-0058	--	TRUE	Both	Urban	26	17	20	8	2	4	33.3%	38.9%
Drug Court Statewide	TN	Shelby County Vet Court	2014-DC-BX-0057	--	TRUE	Both	Urban	33	11	137	22	16	4	80.0%	20.0%
Drug Court Statewide	TN	Montgomery County Vet Court	2014-DC-BX-0057	--	TRUE	Both	Urban	15	2	66	14	4	1	80.0%	16.2%
Drug Court Statewide	TN	Davidson County Vet Court	2014-DC-BX-0057	--	TRUE	Both	Urban	18	5	66	13	5	4	55.6%	28.6%

--Subgrant award totals are removed from this report.

Grant Type	State	Grant Name	Award Number	Award Amount ($)	Subgrantee	Reporting Period	Location	Number of Participants Screened	Number of Participants Who Did Not Enter	Total Participants	Number of New Participants	Number of Successful Participants	Number of Unsuccessful Participants	Graduation Rate	Percentage Who Tested Positive for Substance Use
Suburban Average								**45.4**	**30.8**	**65.8**	**14.8**	**8.2**	**5.8**	**50.3%**	**56.2%**
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	MI	44th Circuit Court of Livingston County, MI	2013-DC-BX-0076	$94,010	FALSE	Both	Suburban								
Drug Court Implementation	GA	Cherokee County	2012-DC-BX-0040	350,000	FALSE	Both	Suburban	66	40	63	25	5	1	83.3%	5.4%
Drug Court Implementation	MN	County of Winona	2012-DC-BX-0001	349,163	FALSE	Both	Suburban	95	86	18	9	6	2	75.0%	0.0%
Drug Court Implementation	CA	Behavioral Health and Recovery Services	2013-MU-BX-0012	349,900	FALSE	Both	Suburban	6	1	21	4	10	3	76.9%	13.0%
Drug Court Implementation	GA	Rockdale County	2013-DC-BX-0040	345,000	FALSE	Both	Suburban	28	22	45	13	16	3	84.2%	100.0%
Drug Court Implementation	KY	KY Administrative Office of the Courts	2015-VV-BX-0039	349,138	FALSE	Both	Suburban	13	4	29	10	0	0	0.0%	21.6%
Drug Court Implementation	KY	KY Administrative Office of the Courts	2015-VV-BX-0036	349,979	FALSE	Both	Suburban	7	3	6	2	1	1	50.0%	100.0%

Grant Type	State	Grant Name	Award Number	Award Amount ($)	Subgrantee	Reporting Period	Location	Number of Participants Screened	Number of Participants Who Did Not Enter	Total Participants	Number of New Participants	Number of Successful Participants	Number of Unsuccessful Participants	Graduation Rate	Percentage Who Tested Positive for Substance Use
Drug Court Implementation	VA	County of Fairfax	2015-VV-BX-0035	350,000	FALSE	Both	Suburban	124	122	9	4	2	1	66.6%	0.0%
Drug Court Implementation	MN	Tenth Judicial District	2015-VV-BX-0034	166,018	FALSE	Both	Suburban	3	0	5	3	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	MT	Judiciary Courts of the State of Montana	2011-DC-BX-0117	236,740	FALSE	Both	Suburban	37	16	143	7	18	6	75.0%	1.4%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	IL	Lake County, Illinois	2012-DC-BX-0007	189,693	FALSE	Both	Suburban	78	52	76	26	14	9	60.9%	12.6%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	IL	Madison County IL Project Restore	2013-DC-BX-0075	299,917	FALSE	Both	Suburban	14	0	35	14	7	12	36.8%	27.1%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	LA	22nd Judicial District Court of Louisiana	2013-DC-BX-0072	300,000	FALSE	Both	Suburban	67	23	127	44	0	6	0.0%	12.9%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	GA	Clayton County	2013-DC-BX-0031	198,901	FALSE	Both	Suburban	36	22	42	14	6	13	31.6%	28.4%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	VA	Chesterfield County	2013-DC-BX-0030	199,993	FALSE	Both	Suburban	28	19	43	9	7	3	70.0%	10.0%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	MT	Judiciary Courts of the State of Montana	2013-DC-BX-0029	199,971	FALSE	01 Apr 2016-30 Jun 2016	Suburban	5	4	29	6	6	2	75.0%	12.0%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	CA	Marin, County of	2013-DC-BX-0024	200,000	FALSE	01 Apr 2016-30 Jun 2016	Suburban	6	1	30	5	3	3	50.0%	5.0%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	PA	County of Bucks	2014-DC-BX-0073	278,156	FALSE	Both	Suburban	63	43	66	20	20	3	87.0%	15.5%

Grant Type	State	Grant Name	Award Number	Award Amount ($)	Subgrantee	Reporting Period	Location	Number of Participants Screened	Number of Participants Who Did Not Enter	Total Participants	Number of New Participants	Number of Successful Participants	Number of Unsuccessful Participants	Graduation Rate	Percentage Who Tested Positive for Substance Use
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	GA	Gwinnett County Board of Commissioners	2014-DC-BX-0043	199,973	FALSE	Both	Suburban	257	186	143	71	33	15	68.8%	11.9%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	GA	Rockdale County	2014-DC-BX-0042	199,998	FALSE	Both	Suburban	16	7	28	11	4	2	66.7%	12.0%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	LA	22nd Judicial District Court of Louisiana	2014-DC-BX-0070	300,000	FALSE	Both	Suburban	16	7	34	10	6	3	66.7%	20.3%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	WV	City of Huntington	2015-DC-BX-0083	220,005	FALSE	Both	Suburban	11	3	14	8	0	4	0.0%	20.0%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	NY	New York State Unified Court System	2015-DC-BX-0074	184,368	FALSE	Both	Suburban	47	19	73	27	10	1	90.9%	20.5%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	IN	LaPorte County	2015-DC-BX-0065	197,805	FALSE	Both	Suburban	17	6	29	13	7	3	70.0%	30.2%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	NY	New York State Unified Court System	2015-DC-BX-0047	200,000	FALSE	Both	Suburban	45	26	90	22	24	3	88.9%	28.6%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	CO	Colorado Judicial Department	2015-DC-BX-0027	199,828	FALSE	Both	Suburban	223	176	77	47	22	28	44.0%	55.1%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	NY	Rockland County District Attorney's Office	2015-DC-BX-0020	200,000	FALSE	Both	Suburban	14	8	20	4	4	2	66.7%	18.5%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	LA	24th Judicial District Court, State of Louisiana	2015-DC-BX-0014	200,000	FALSE	01 Jul 2016-30 Sep 2016	Suburban	7	0	46	8	4	0	100.0 %	2.4%

Grant Type	State	Grant Name	Award Number	Award Amount ($)	Subgrantee	Reporting Period	Location	Number of Participants Screened	Number of Participants Who Did Not Enter	Total Participants	Number of New Participants	Number of Successful Participants	Number of Unsuccessful Participants	Graduation Rate	Percentage Who Tested Positive for Substance Use
Drug Court Statewide	VA	Chesapeake Community Services Board	2012-DC-BX-0050	--	TRUE	01 Apr 2016-30 Jun 2016	Suburban	290	207	927	83	57	81	41.3%	98.1%
Drug Court Statewide	OK	Pittsburg County Drug Court	2013-VV-BX-0042	--	TRUE	Both	Suburban	0	0	1	0	0	1	0.0%	0.0%
Drug Court Statewide	MO	Missouri Office of State Courts Administrator	2014-DC-BX-0049	1,047,368	FALSE	Both	Suburban	6	1	17	5	6	1	85.7%	8.8%
Drug Court Statewide	GA	Coweta County BOC (VTC)	2014-VV-BX-0058	--	TRUE	Both	Suburban	4	2	7	2	0	0	0.0%	22.2%
Drug Court Statewide	GA	Hall County State Court (VTC)	2014-VV-BX-0058	--	TRUE	Both	Suburban	35	29	27	8	0	2	0.0%	9.1%
Drug Court Statewide	GA	Hall County HELP Veterans Track (VTC)	2014-VV-BX-0058	--	TRUE	Both	Suburban	26	22	15	7	1	1	50.0%	20.0%
Drug Court Statewide	OK	Cleveland County Drug Court	2013-VV-BX-0042	--	TRUE	Both	Suburban	2	1	9	1	3	0	100.0%	52.6%
Drug Court Statewide	OK	Payne County Drug Court	2015-DC-BX-0061	--	TRUE	Both	Suburban	3	1	3	2	0	0	0.0%	50.0%
Drug Court Statewide	OK	Washita/Custer County Drug Court	2015-DC-BX-0061	--	TRUE	Both	Suburban	5	2	3	3	0	0	0.0%	16.7%
Drug Court Statewide	OK	Inflexxion, Inc.	2015-DC-BX-0061	--	TRUE	Both	Suburban	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%

--Subgrant award totals are removed from this report.

Grant Type	State	Grant Name	Award Number	Award Amount ($)	Subgrantee	Reporting Period	Location	Number of Participants Screened	Number of Participants Who Did Not Enter	Total Participants	Number of New Participants	Number of Successful Participants	Number of Unsuccessful Participants	Graduation Rate	Percentage Who Tested Positive for Substance Use
Rural Average								**33.9**	**21.2**	**52.0**	**14.1**	**6.9**	**7.8**	**45.4%**	**26.4%**
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	KY	KY Administrative Office of the Courts	2013-DC-BX-0035	$200,000	FALSE	Both	Rural								
Drug Court Implementation	WV	Monongalia County Commission	2010-DC-BX-0039	350,000	FALSE	Both	Rural	11	10	8	3	4	6	40.0%	38.1%
Drug Court Implementation	KY	KY Administrative Office of the Courts	2013-VV-BX-0038	350,000	FALSE	Both	Rural	9	7	11	2	0	3	0.0%	0.0%
Drug Court Implementation	NH	Cheshire County	2013-DC-BX-0048	350,000	FALSE	Both	Rural	5	3	21	2	4	2	66.7%	90.0%
Drug Court Implementation	MT	Hill County, Montana	2013-DC-BX-0016	349,923	FALSE	Both	Rural	13	5	20	8	3	5	37.5%	48.6%
Drug Court Implementation	NV	Nye County Sheriff's Office	2013-DC-BX-0013	350,000	FALSE	Both	Rural	6	0	15	6	2	0	100.0%	21.4%
Drug Court Implementation	NM	State of New Mexico 13th Judicial District Court	2013-DC-BX-0011	350,000	FALSE	01 Apr 2016-30 Jun 2016	Rural	4	33	7	1	2	0	100.0%	10.0%
Drug Court Implementation	VA	Highlands Community Services Board	2011-DC-BX-4011	349,301	FALSE	Both	Rural	36	24	17	16	2	2	50.0%	36.4%
Drug Court Implementation	OH	Crawford Marion Alcohol Drug Addiction and Mental Health Boa	2014-DC-BX-0040	348,836	FALSE	Both	Rural	0	0	39	1	4	9	30.8%	51.4%
Drug Court Implementation	HI	Judiciary Courts of the State of Hawaii	2014-DC-BX-0020	309,741	FALSE	Both	Rural	7	1	20	6	0	0	0.0%	34.5%
Drug Court Implementation	AL	Dallas County Commission, Inc.	2014-DC-BX-0035	350,000	FALSE	Both	Rural	164	151	29	13	12	11	52.2%	56.4%
Drug Court Implementation	GU	Judiciary of Guam	2014-VV-BX-0017	350,000	FALSE	Both	Rural	22	17	26	9	0	0	0.0%	2.4%

Grant Type	State	Grant Name	Award Number	Award Amount ($)	Subgrantee	Reporting Period	Location	Number of Participants Screened	Number of Participants Who Did Not Enter	Total Participants	Number of New Participants	Number of Successful Participants	Number of Unsuccessful Participants	Graduation Rate	Percentage Who Tested Positive for Substance Use
Drug Court Implementation	IN	Kosciusko County	2014-DC-BX-0061	306,533	FALSE	Both	Rural	18	5	30	14	0	2	0.0%	22.5%
Drug Court Implementation	MN	Steele Waseca Drug Court	2014-DC-BX-0050	346,604	FALSE	Both	Rural	37	23	45	19	13	5	72.2%	11.1%
Drug Court Implementation	KY	KY Administrative Office of the Courts	2014-DC-BX-0031	349,821	FALSE	Both	Rural	2	1	5	1	2	0	100.0 %	25.0%
Drug Court Implementation	MT	City of Glasgow	2015-DC-BX-0071	333,167	FALSE	Both	Rural	12	7	12	7	0	1	0.0%	33.3%
Drug Court Implementation	TN	Overton County Tennessee	2015-DC-BX-0068	349,188	FALSE	Both	Rural	18	12	10	6	0	2	0.0%	35.3%
Drug Court Implementation	AK	Kenaitze Indian Tribe	2015-DC-BX-0054	349,869	FALSE	Both	Rural	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
Drug Court Implementation	VA	County of Pulaski, Virginia	2015-DC-BX-0043	345,617	FALSE	Both	Rural	5	2	10	4	2	3	40.0%	35.3%
Drug Court Implementation	MI	County of St. Joseph	2015-DC-BX-0042	350,000	FALSE	Both	Rural	32	19	24	13	0	4	0.0%	11.9%
Drug Court Implementation	TN	Roane County Government	2015-DC-BX-0038	350,000	FALSE	Both	Rural	21	16	9	5	0	2	0.0%	53.3%
Drug Court Implementation	MN	Le Sueur County	2015-DC-BX-0037	349,655	FALSE	Both	Rural	19	16	16	4	1	2	33.3%	22.2%
Drug Court Implementation	CA	Mono County Probation	2015-DC-BX-0019	349,998	FALSE	Both	Rural	7	4	5	3	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
Drug Court Implementation	MT	Beaverhead County DUI Accountability Court/State of Montana	2015-DC-BX-0072	302,482	FALSE	Both	Rural	5	2	6	3	0	0	0.0%	25.0%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	MN	Minnesota Judicial Branch	2011-DC-BX-0111	222,027	FALSE	01 Apr 2016-30 Jun 2016	Rural	35	11	134	28	16	8	66.7%	12.3%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	KY	KY Administrative Office of the Courts	2012-DC-BX-0057	300,000	FALSE	Both	Rural	26	8	38	12	9	4	69.2%	10.6%

Grant Type	State	Grant Name	Award Number	Award Amount ($)	Subgrantee	Reporting Period	Location	Number of Participants Screened	Number of Participants Who Did Not Enter	Total Participants	Number of New Participants	Number of Successful Participants	Number of Unsuccessful Participants	Graduation Rate	Percentage Who Tested Positive for Substance Use
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	VA	Cumberland Mountain Community Services Board	2012-DC-BX-0055	286,316	FALSE	01 Apr 2016-30 Jun 2016	Rural	3	1	37	3	0	0	0.0%	9.1%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	KY	KY Administrative Office of the Courts	2012-DC-BX-0048	300,000	FALSE	Both	Rural	50	40	42	18	6	12	33.3%	18.2%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	ID	Elmore County	2012-DC-BX-0009	200,000	FALSE	Both	Rural	9	1	23	9	1	0	100.0%	35.6%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	CA	Tehama County Health Services Agency	2013-DC-BX-0064	300,000	FALSE	Both	Rural	18	15	24	8	8	6	57.1%	8.2%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	NY	New York State Unified Court System	2013-DC-BX-0047	157,628	FALSE	Both	Rural	131	58	160	73	27	33	45.0%	13.2%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	KY	KY Administrative Office of the Courts	2013-DC-BX-0036	200,000	FALSE	01 Apr 2016-30 Jun 2016	Rural	13	6	10	7	4	1	80.0%	11.4%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	NC	County of Brunswick	2013-DC-BX-0028	200,000	FALSE	01 Apr 2016-30 Jun 2016	Rural	33	13	102	20	20	5	80.0%	37.3%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	GU	Judiciary of Guam	2013-DC-BX-0020	200,000	FALSE	01 Apr 2016-30 Jun 2016	Rural	57	57	112	13	12	3	80.0%	17.0%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	OR	Clackamas County Juvenile Department	2013-DC-BX-0010	200,000	FALSE	Both	Rural	30	14	46	20	4	5	44.4%	12.0%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	GA	Piedmont Judicial Circuit	2014-DC-BX-0078	300,000	FALSE	Both	Rural	23	19	22	4	5	0	100.0%	20.8%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	MO	County of Cole	2014-DC-BX-0059	182,034	FALSE	Both	Rural	27	9	15	18	8	6	57.1%	29.4%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	GA	Baldwin County	2014-DC-BX-0041	199,632	FALSE	Both	Rural	67	32	68	33	8	19	29.6%	30.6%

Grant Type	State	Grant Name	Award Number	Award Amount ($)	Subgrantee	Reporting Period	Location	Number of Participants Screened	Number of Participants Who Did Not Enter	Total Participants	Number of New Participants	Number of Successful Participants	Number of Unsuccessful Participants	Graduation Rate	Percentage Who Tested Positive for Substance Use
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	KS	31st Judicial District Adult Drug Court	2014-DC-BX-0037	142,562	FALSE	Both	Rural	28	0	44	28	9	13	40.9%	41.4%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	KY	KY Administrative Office of the Courts	2014-DC-BX-0080	300,000	FALSE	Both	Rural	13	6	27	10	5	5	50.0%	14.3%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	MS	18th Judicial District—Jones County Drug Court	2014-DC-BX-0052	199,513	FALSE	Both	Rural	16	5	95	11	0	18	0.0%	20.6%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	KY	KY Administrative Office of the Courts	2014-DC-BX-0047	200,000	FALSE	Both	Rural	71	27	141	42	15	45	25.0%	32.3%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	OR	Harney County	2014-DC-BX-0038	109,749	FALSE	Both	Rural	2	1	8	1	1	0	100.0 %	33.3%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	OR	Josephine County	2014-DC-BX-0025	200,000	FALSE	Both	Rural	37	21	43	16	20	5	80.0%	26.4%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	MO	25th Circuit Adult Drug Court	2015-VV-BX-0055	200,000	FALSE	Both	Rural	28	15	43	13	15	7	68.2%	100.0 %
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	VA	Cumberland Mountain Community Services Board	2015-VV-BX-0017	199,828	FALSE	Both	Rural	9	3	21	8	6	5	54.5%	11.9%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	KY	KY Administrative Office of the Courts	2015-DC-BX-0088	299,902	FALSE	Both	Rural	20	7	36	21	2	4	33.3%	28.0%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	KS	Reno County Community Corrections/Drug Court	2015-DC-BX-0081	55,232	FALSE	Both	Rural	19	9	35	10	2	3	40.0%	45.6%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	MO	Dunklin County, Missouri	2015-DC-BX-0056	85,690	FALSE	Both	Rural	22	9	43	13	7	6	53.8%	19.4%

Grant Type	State	Grant Name	Award Number	Award Amount ($)	Subgrantee	Reporting Period	Location	Number of Participants Screened	Number of Participants Who Did Not Enter	Total Participants	Number of New Participants	Number of Successful Participants	Number of Unsuccessful Participants	Graduation Rate	Percentage Who Tested Positive for Substance Use
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	GA	Troup County Board of Commissioners	2015-DC-BX-0053	80,335	FALSE	Both	Rural	19	5	49	15	15	4	79.0%	19.4%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	MI	23rd Cir/81st District Adult Drug/Sobriety Court	2015-DC-BX-0051	200,000	FALSE	Both	Rural	16	11	21	10	4	4	50.0%	12.5%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	KY	KY Administrative Office of the Courts	2015-DC-BX-0045	200,000	FALSE	Both	Rural	32	6	50	25	6	15	28.6%	45.0%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	MI	County of Alpena/ 88th Dist. Adult Drug & Alcohol Trmt. Court	2015-DC-BX-0028	200,000	FALSE	Both	Rural	7	0	17	7	8	2	80.0%	9.7%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	MI	County of Ottawa	2015-DC-BX-0026	143,806	FALSE	Both	Rural	37	25	37	12	12	5	70.6%	11.6%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	MI	Cass County, Inc.	2015-DC-BX-0025	200,000	FALSE	Both	Rural	57	48	27	9	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	CA	Modoc Superior Court	2015-DC-BX-0015	161,828	FALSE	Both	Rural	7	0	12	7	0	2	0.0%	60.0%
Drug Court Statewide	VA	Drug testing	2012-DC-BX-0050	--	TRUE	Both	Rural	602	392	937	210	115	164	41.2%	73.3%
Drug Court Statewide	MT	First Judicial District Court of Montana	2012-DC-BX-0035	--	TRUE	Both	Rural	15	4	23	11	8	2	80.0%	4.0%
Drug Court Statewide	TN	8th Judicial District Recovery Court	2013-DC-BX-0074	--	TRUE	Both	Rural	21	8	58	13	6	3	66.7%	13.0%
Drug Court Statewide	AR	Johnson Co Clarksville Drug Court	2013-DC-BX-0041	--	TRUE	Both	Rural	3	0	20	3	3	1	75.0%	15.0%
Drug Court Statewide	GA	Appalachian Judicial Circuit	2014-VV-BX-0058	--	TRUE	Both	Rural	6	1	17	5	6	1	85.7%	8.8%

Grant Type	State	Grant Name	Award Number	Award Amount ($)	Subgrantee	Reporting Period	Location	Number of Participants Screened	Number of Participants Who Did Not Enter	Total Participants	Number of New Participants	Number of Successful Participants	Number of Unsuccessful Participants	Graduation Rate	Percentage Who Tested Positive for Substance Use
Drug Court Statewide	OK	Canadian County Drug Court	2015-DC-BX-0061	--	TRUE	Both	Rural	40	34	18	9	0	0	0.0%	33.3%

--Subgrant award totals are removed from this report.

Grant Type	State	Grant Name	Award Number	Award Amount ($)	Subgrantee	Reporting Period	Location	Number of Participants Screened	Number of Participants Who Did Not Enter	Total Participants	Number of New Participants	Number of Successful Participants	Number of Unsuccessful Participants	Graduation Rate	Percentage Who Tested Positive for Substance Use
Tribal Average								**20.2**	**15.6**	**22.5**	**5.5**	**3.2**	**1.8**	**53.1%**	**30.5%**
Drug Court Implementation	WA	Makah Tribe	2013-DC-BX-0051	$322,158	FALSE	Both	Tribal	7	1	3	6	1	3	25%	55.6%
Drug Court Implementation	NM	Pueblo of Pojoaque	2014-DC-BX-0033	319,947	FALSE	Both	Tribal	20	5	23	14	1	0	100%	41.9%
Drug Court Implementation	OK	Citizen Potawatomi Nation	2015-DC-BX-0070	343,388	FALSE	Both	Tribal	7	5	3	2	0	1	0%	12.5%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	ID	Nez Perce Tribe	2015-DC-BX-0087	149,884	FALSE	01 Jul 2016-30 Sep 2016	Tribal	1	0	12	3	1	1	50%	44.4%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	WI	Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin	2015-DC-BX-0086	300,000	FALSE	Both	Tribal	18	5	9	12	0	8	0%	44.4%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	CO	Southern Ute Indian Tribe	2015-DC-BX-0085	48,885	FALSE	Both	Tribal	3	2	4	1	2	0	100%	25.0%
Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	KS	Prairie Band Potawatomi Nation	2015-DC-BX-0076	200,000	FALSE	Both	Tribal	3	0	2	3	1	1	50%	0.0%

Drug Court Joint/Enhancement	MI	Little Traverse Bay Bands of Odawa Indians	2015-DC-BX-0049	200,000	FALSE	Both	Tribal	6	6	1	0	2	0	100%	20.0%

The following are statewide grantees that do not fill out the Implementation or Enhancement questionnaires.

Grant Type	State	Grant Name	Award Number	Award Amount ($)	Subgrantee	Reporting Period	Location
Drug Court Statewide	IA	Iowa Governor's Office of Drug Control Policy	2012-DC-BX-0060	$81,0614	FALSE	Both	
Drug Court Statewide	CA	California Judicial Council Admin. Office of the Courts	2013-DC-BX-0019	1,299,998	FALSE	Both	
Drug Court Statewide	GA	Criminal Justice Coordinating Council	2014-VV-BX-0058	1,500,000	FALSE	Both	
Drug Court Statewide	MA	Commonwealth of Massachusetts Department of Public Health	2012-DC-BX-0034	1,299,999	FALSE	Both	Urban
Drug Court Statewide	VA	Supreme Court of Virginia	2012-DC-BX-0050	1,500,000	FALSE	Both	Urban
Drug Court Statewide	OK	OKLAHOMA DPEARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH AND SUBSTANCE ABUSE SER	2013-VV-BX-0042	1,077,380	FALSE	Both	Urban
Drug Court Statewide	NY	New York State Unified Court System	2013-DC-BX-0071	199,323	FALSE	Both	Urban
Drug Court Statewide	NY	New York State Unified Court System	2013-DC-BX-0070	196,696	FALSE	Both	Urban
Drug Court Statewide	NE	Administrative Office of the Courts and Probation	2013-DC-BX-0023	199,898	FALSE	Both	Urban
Drug Court Statewide	IN	Indiana Judicial Center	2013-DC-BX-0018	199,706	FALSE	Both	Urban
Drug Court Statewide	UT	Utah Department of Human Services	2013-DC-BX-0015	1,472,952	FALSE	Both	Urban
Drug Court Statewide	OK	OKLAHOMA DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH AND SUBSTANCE ABUSE SERVICES	2013-DC-BX-0014	175,971	FALSE	Both	Urban
Drug Court Statewide	TN	Tennessee Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services	2014-DC-BX-0057	1,500,000	FALSE	Both	Urban
Drug Court Statewide	PR	Puerto Rico Office of Court Administration	2014-DC-BX-0039	198,900	FALSE	Both	Urban
Drug Court Statewide	MD	Maryland Judiciary	2015-DC-BX-0062	175,419	FALSE	Both	Urban

Grant Type	State	Grant Name	Award Number	Award Amount ($)	Subgrantee	Reporting Period	Location
Drug Court Statewide	IA	Iowa Judicial Branch	2015-DC-BX-0030	200,000	FALSE	Both	Urban
Drug Court Statewide	ID	Idaho Supreme Court	2015-DC-BX-0023	200,000	FALSE	Both	Urban
Drug Court Statewide	CO	Colorado Judicial Department	2012-DC-BX-0037	841,667	FALSE	Both	Suburban
Drug Court Statewide	AR	AR Administrative Office of the Courts	2013-DC-BX-0041	1,281,156	FALSE	Both	Suburban
Drug Court Statewide	OK	OKLAHOMA DPEARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH AND SUBSTANCE ABUSE SERVICES	2014-DC-BX-0067	186,433	FALSE	Both	Suburban
Drug Court Statewide	WI	Wisconsin Department of Justice	2014-DC-BX-0032	200,000	FALSE	Both	Suburban
Drug Court Statewide	OK	OKLAHOMA DPEARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH AND SUBSTANCE ABUSE SERVICES	2015-DC-BX-0061	790,593	FALSE	Both	Suburban
Drug Court Statewide	OK	OKLAHOMA DPEARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH AND SUBSTANCE ABUSE SERVICES	2015-DC-BX-0060	196,843	FALSE	Both	Suburban
Drug Court Statewide	MT	Judiciary Courts of the State of Montana	2012-DC-BX-0035	422,478	FALSE	Both	Rural
Drug Court Statewide	TN	Tennessee Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Se	2013-DC-BX-0074	200,000	FALSE	Both	Rural
Drug Court Statewide	KY	KY Administrative Office of the Courts	2013-DC-BX-0043	143,234	FALSE	Both	Rural
Drug Court Statewide	WV	West Virginia Supreme Court of Appeals	2013-DC-BX-0017	1,488,514	FALSE	Both	Rural
Drug Court Statewide	NM	Judiciary Courts of the State of New Mexico	2014-DC-BX-0069	153,540	FALSE	Both	Rural
Drug Court Statewide	KY	KY Administrative Office of the Courts	2015-DC-BX-0024	199,778	FALSE	Both	Rural
Drug Court Statewide	MD	National Center for State Courts	2015-DC-BX-0062	175,419	TRUE	Both	Urban
Drug Court Statewide	IA	Criminal & Juvenile Justice Planning	2012-DC-BX-0060	810,614	TRUE	01 Apr 2016-30 Jun 2016	Urban