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INTRODUCTION

This report presents the findings for the evaluation of the Kansas City Municipal Drug Court Program funded through the Bureau of Justice Assistance. The purpose of the grant is to expand the drug court through increased case management, housing assistance, and the utilization of urine analysis.

The mission of the Kansas City Municipal Drug Court is to break the cycle of addiction for individuals who have chronic substance abuse issues by linking those individuals to local community-based treatment programs. The overall goal is to reduce recidivism and prevent further involvement with the criminal justice system.

Kansas City Municipal Drug Court offers a 180 day treatment program and a 365 day case management program which targets individuals who are incarcerated at the Regional Correctional Center (RCC) and are charged with a city offense or on probation in KCMO. The individual must also meet the following criteria: have chronic substance abuse problems, are chronic offenders who are not charged with serious violent felonies, are KCMO residents, and voluntarily choose to participate in the program. The program identifies inmates at RCC who have chronic and severe substance abuse problems as well as previous convictions for incidents such as prostitution, stealing, and/or possession of drug paraphernalia. Many of the participants also face issues of severe trauma, homelessness, and unemployment. The program utilizes community-based treatment programs, self-help groups, case management, and court supervision to prepare for post-release planning, as well as connecting participants to appropriate community resources to better ensure successful re-entry into the community.

The six measurable program outcomes analyzed and reported in this report were:

- Increased length of court supervision,
- Increased number of UAs directed by the court,
- Increased number of clients obtaining housing,
- Increased wrap around services,
- Increased knowledge by Drug Court Staff, and
- Recoup cost.
MILESTONES

Since the beginning of the grant period September 1, 2009, the Kansas City Municipal Drug Court has made progress in several areas. Milestones included:

- Hired Drug Court Coordinator and additional Case Manager.
- Updated Client contracts to include the full 12-month treatment period now being implemented.
- Identified locations for use of housing vouchers.
- Provided housing vouchers to clients.
- Purchased and distributed bus passes to clients.
- Identified and contracted with a company to complete urine analysis.
- Began court ordered urine analysis.
- Three Drug Court staff members attended training on SSI and Medicaid.
- Began the use of Drug Court Access Database.
- Added 2 new treatment partners (Salvation Army ARC Program and City Union Mission Christian Life Program).

Since the goal of the current grant is expansion, continuing to add services, services providers, and increased case management are keys to success. The Kansas City Municipal Drug Court is dedicated to increasing services to clients, thus increasing client success.

METHODOLOGY

Kansas City Municipal Drug Court staff administered, collected, entered and stored all program instruments and data in the Drug Court Access Database. Program data were then provided to RDI for analysis and reporting of outcome measures.

It should be noted that while results are presented using the word clients or participants, this wording can be misleading. Due to clients having multiple referrals or multiple admissions, results are actually presented by cases unless otherwise noted.
Since September 1, 2009, 173 clients have been referred to the program or placed into treatment. Over half of the 173 clients were male (56%), 64% were African American and the remaining clients were Caucasian. Participants’ ages ranged from 19 to 59 with an average age of 38.

**Education**
Participants were asked to indicate their level of education. One-hundred-twenty-five clients provided a response. Results are shown in Figure 1.

**Children**
At intake, 40% indicated that they had children. Of those with children, most reported that their children were currently living with the other biological parent. Seven reported that their children were living with other family members, six reported that their children had been adopted, and five reported that their children were currently in foster care. Six women reported being pregnant at intake.

**Employment**
Approximately 7% of participants reported being currently employed. Almost half (40%) reported working part-time, 30% reported working full-time, 20% worked cash jobs, and 10% indicated on-call work.

**Housing**
Housing information at intake was provided for 120 clients. Of these clients, 52 (43%) were homeless, 15% lived in a rented or owned home or apartment, 38% lived with friends or family, and 2% were in transitional living.
Substance Use
Clients reported using a variety of substances with alcohol being the drug most often cited; responses are presented in Figure 2. Since respondents may have abused more than one drug and some did not provide a response, the total percentage does not equal 100%.

![Figure 2. Drug of Choice (n=142)](image)

Previous Criminal History
Just fewer than two out of five participants (39%) reported having a felony on record (only clients with non-violent felonies were included in this report). A similar amount (37%) indicated that the have previously been on state probation, while, 16% were currently on state probation.

Most participants have charges against them prior to the charges initiating their Drug Court participation. Most prior charges were for Robbery/Burglary/Stealing. A summary of all results is presented in Figure 3. Other includes panhandling, trafficking, receiving stolen property, and public intoxication. Since participants may have more than one charge and some did not provide a response, the total does not equal 100%.

![Figure 3. Types of Charges (n=96)](image)
Charges
Charges that initiated participant’s Drug Court participation were reported for 50 clients. The most common charge was Stealing (52%) and Drug Paraphernalia (50%). A summary of all results is presented in Figure 4. Since participants may have more than one charge and some did not provide a response, the total does not equal 100%.

Mental Health
Participants were asked to report if they have a Mental Health Diagnosis. Thirty percent of the respondents indicated they have a Mental Health Diagnosis. Results are shown in Table 1.

Participants were asked if they were on medication for their Mental Health Diagnosis. Thirty-seven percent of the respondents that reported a mental health diagnosis indicated they were taking medications as prescribed.

Previous Treatment

Community Treatment
Participants indicated the number of times they have previously received treatment in the community. Over half of
respondents (58%) indicated having previously received treatment in the community. Results are shown in Table 2.

**Department of Corrections Treatment**
Participants indicated the number of times they had received treatment through the Department of Corrections treatment program(s). Thirty-six respondents (21%) indicated they have received treatment through the Department of Corrections treatment program(s). Results are shown in Table 3.

### Results

**Assessment**

At the time of data collection 103 screenings had been completed. Of the 103 screenings, 80% were deemed appropriate for inpatient treatment, 1% was deemed appropriate for outpatient treatment. Five participants (5%) were found not appropriate for treatment, seven (7%) chose not to participate, and 7 (7%) were already in a treatment program when they arrived at court. Overall assessment results are shown in Table 4.

**Completion**

Clients are tracked through the four phases of the program:

- Phase 1: Inpatient
- Phase 2: Outpatient (10 hours a week)
- Phase 3: Outpatient (5 hours per week)
- Phase 4: Case Management (As Needed)

Currently 41 clients are in treatment. Of the clients currently in treatment, 6 clients are in Phase 1, 23 are in Phase 2, 7 clients are currently in Phase 3, and 5 are in Phase 4. Success rates for clients not currently in treatment are presented in Figure 5. It should be noted that only clients that

---

**Table 3. Department of Corrections Treatment (n=36)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment Attempts</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4. Assessment Results (n=103)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Number/Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inpatient</td>
<td>82 (80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outpatient</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue Current Treatment/Add-On</td>
<td>7 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chose Not to Participate</td>
<td>4 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Appropriate</td>
<td>5 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4 (4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
successfully completed the previous phase were included in the subsequent success rate. Due to the length of Phase 4, no clients have been in the program long enough to complete the phase. Overall, since the treatment aspect of the program is scheduled for six months, higher success rates are expected as the program matures.

**Treatment Facility**

Participants identified for treatment were placed at 10 different treatment centers. Of the clients screened appropriate for treatment, 85 clients were placed at a center (two clients had placement at two different centers). The top three centers were Imani House with 29 placements (33%), Kansas City Community Center with 22 placements (26%), and Renaissance West (Ren West) with 22 placements (26%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment Center</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imani</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCCC</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ren West</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvation Army</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ReDiscover</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Other: Pathways (2), Alt Care (1), Comprehensive (1), KC Free & Clean (1), C-Star (1)

**Court Supervision**

Since September 2009, there have been 445 court appearances made by 88 Drug Court clients. Appearances by month are provided in Table 6. The number of court appearances is expected to increase as clients move through the program.

The Drug Court has given sanctions to 18 clients since September 2009. Four Drug Court clients have received incentives.

The court is now able to order urine analysis from clients. So far, 31 clients have submitted to an analysis, with only nine (29%) returning positive results. Additionally, seven clients admitted to
the drug use during their court appearance. It is expected that self-reports of drug use will increase as more clients become aware of the use of UAs.

Case Management

Currently, three Case Managers handle the Drug Court case load. There were a total of 1,300 case manager contacts between September 1, 2009 and March 31, 2010. Presented in Table 7 are the numbers of Case Management contacts by month. It should be noted, that with the additional case managers, drug court staff has surpassed the number of contacts during the previous grant period in only half the time (7 months vs. 14 months).

Community Resources

Program staff tracked services they referred clients to and a list of 20 services were provided as options. Of the 20 services options, participants were referred to 19.

Sixty-eight percent of clients receiving Case Management services received a referral. A majority of participants requested information on bus services (45%) with 1,200 bus passes being purchased for clients. Other key services were clothing (39%), legal aid (21%), and recovery groups (17%). Results are shown in Table 8.

Outcomes

Presented in Table 9 are the program outcomes and results. Results for only three outcomes are currently available. Due to this report only examining the last seven months, the program tracking tools have not been in place long enough to provide evidence of completion for all outcomes. It is expected that all outcomes will be examined for the Annual Report produced in October 2010.
SUMMARY

Since September 1, 2009, 173 clients have been referred to the Kansas City Municipal Drug Court Program or sent to treatment. Eighty percent of participants who were screened were assessed as being appropriate for inpatient treatment; 1% was assessed as appropriate for outpatient treatment. These high rates indicate that appropriate referrals are being made to the program.

At the time of data collection, 76% of clients referred to Phase One completed inpatient treatment, 38% Phase Two, and 56 completed Phase Three. Due to the length of Phase 4, no clients have been in the program long enough to complete the phase. Overall, since the treatment aspect of the program is scheduled for six months, higher success rates are expected as the program matures.

There have been 445 court appearances made by 88 Drug Court clients since September 1, 2009. The number of court appearances is expected to increase as clients progress through the program. UA’s are now used by the court to assist in assessing compliance. So far, 31 clients have submitted to an analysis, with only nine (29%) returning positive results. Additionally, seven clients admitted to the drug use during their court appearance. Less positive results are expected as UA’s become more regular for clients.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Target Rate</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased length of court supervision</td>
<td>30% will remain in contact with case manager for 12 months.</td>
<td>Program material has been updated to reflect 12 month program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased number of UAs directed by the court</td>
<td>50% of clients will be directed by the court for a UA.</td>
<td>35% of clients appearing in court have completed a UA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased number of clients obtaining housing</td>
<td>70% of clients successfully completing treatment will have housing; 50% after 12 months.</td>
<td>TBD*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased wrap around services</td>
<td>Case load will be decreased to 1:25</td>
<td>Current case load is 1:20 for 2 case managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased knowledge by Drug Court Staff</td>
<td>100% will report knowledge increases</td>
<td>TBD*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recoup Cost</td>
<td>10% will pay restitution</td>
<td>TBD*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*More information will be available at the annual report produced in October 2010
Participants were referred to a variety of community resources. Sixty-eight percent had been referred, with bus assistance being the most common followed by clothing assistance. It is anticipated that the number participants who become employed will increase as they progress through the levels of treatment.

Overall results indicated that the program was successful in achieving desired outcomes and program goals. Additional outcomes will be assessed as the program progresses. Focus groups and interviews scheduled for September 2010 will assist in understanding outcomes in more detail.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Based on the results presented in this report, the following is recommended.

- It is recommended that Drug Court staff continue identifying and enrolling clients appropriate for the program.
- It is recommended that program staff and evaluators continue to work together to ensure the Drug Court Database is effectively meeting program staff needs.