

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of DUI
Court/Drug Court Programs**

PART THREE

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Target Population	Other Findings
1	September 2002 and Supplement of September 2004	<i>Evaluation of the Bernalillo Co., Arizona Metropolitan DWI/Drug Court.</i> Paul Guerin and Wayne J. Pitts, Institute for Social Research, University of New Mexico.(and supplement)	Program saved \$ 200,000 in combined jail costs and CCP days for drug court graduates compared with successful probation client for period: March 1, 1998-September 30, 2000.	<i>Persons with subsequent misdemeanor DWI or other misdemeanor offense Primary Substance was: alcohol: 93.8%, cocaine: 4.2%);43% of participants had 3-4 prior DWI's; 42% had two priors)</i>	N/A
2	May 2003	<i>Coconino County DUI/Drug Court Evaluation.</i> Social Research Laboratory. Frederic I Solop et al..Social Research Laboratory, Northern Arizona University. Flagstaff, Arizona	Average DUI drug court participant costs county approximately \$ 534/mo; average cost for traditional cjs processing is \$ 758/mo. (difference in cost primarily due to increased likelihood of control group members spending time in jail (\$80/day) or prison (\$ 53/day); total program costs were \$ 6,408 for DUI drug court (completed in 12 months) vs. \$ 22,740 for traditional process(requiring 2-3 years)	Defendants with current drug or alcohol related charges and no prior offenses and drug/alcohol dependent	N/A
3	December 2003	<i>Phase II Douglas County [Nebraska] Drug Court Evaluation Report.</i> Thomas J. Martin, Cassia C. Spohn, R.K. Piper, and Jill Robinson	Program cost more than traditional processing but worth the savings of lives; participants pay \$ 20/month	(1) Kootenai Co. Resident (2) Current DUI charge is 2 nd offense within 5 years OR (3) DUI BAC is .20 or more (4) No felony DUI; No prior crime of violence (including sex offense)	N/A
4	February 2007	<i>Recidivism in Alaska's Felony Therapeutic Courts.</i> Alaska Judicial Council.	N/A	Includes 46%(54) participants in Anchorage Felony DUI Court (persons with felony DUI conviction or felony refusal to take blood alcohol test; also 31% (36) participants from Bethel Therapeutic Court and 23% (27) participants from Anchorage Felony rug Court;	N/A

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of DUI
Court/Drug Court Programs**

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Target Population	Other Findings
				67% (78) had DUI conviction when they entered one of the three programs studied.	
5	January 2007 (approx.)	<i>DUI/Drug Court for Coconino County (Flagstaff), Arizona - Website for Coconino Court (Flagstaff), Arizona:</i> www.co.coconino.az.us/drugcourt.aspx?id=5852	N/A	N/A	N/A
6	April 16, 2007	<i>Georgia's DUI Court Programs Reduce Recidivism. Tammy Meredith, Ph.D. Applied Research Services, Inc.</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A
7	October 2007	<i>Michigan DUI Courts Outcome Evaluation. Final Report. NPC Research</i>	N/A	<u>Ottawa County</u> : offenders with second DUI charge or criminal charges involving drug use; residents of Ottawa County; new charge or vop that is drug or drug related; show pattern of substance abuse <u>Bay County</u> : second and third DUJI offenders; must live within 50 miles; be at least 17 yrs of age; diagnosed as chemically dependent and charged with DUI offense (various criminal justice charges will exclude participant) <u>Clarkston Co</u> : residents of the District; current DUI offense or child endangerment due to alcohol related offenses; can be first time or repeat DUI offense (excludes current probationers and other exclusion criteria applied re violent offender, INS matters, etc.)	1.also reduced illegal drug use based on decrease of positive drug (but not necessarily alcohol breathalyzer) tests over time 2.also retention and completion rates ranged from 54% - 84% 3.factors associated with lower graduation rates: illegal drug use; greater number of days spent in jail after program start; higher number of positive alcohol tests; greater numbers of sanctions imposed 4.differences between DUI court and traditional probation: DUI participants spend considerably more time in treatment; less time in jail prior to program; time enrolled in program higher; overall conclusion: "DUI court is effective in reducing recidivism and reducing drug and alcohol use while using less criminal justice system resources to accomplish these goals"

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of DUI
Court/Drug Court Programs**

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Target Population	Other Findings
8	March 2005	<i>Jones, R. K. (2005, March). Final Report: Evaluation of the DUI Court program in Maricopa County, Arizona. Winchester, MA: Mid-America Research Institute, Inc. of New England.</i>	N/A	Individuals convicted of a felony DWI offense in Maricopa County who were assigned to either the DWI Court program or to the county's standard probation program during a 63-month period beginning near the time of the founding of the program.	Among graduates, outcomes were significantly better than for probation completers. However, the magnitude of this effect according to Cohen's (1988) criteria was small ($h=.13$) and did not hold up for the original intent-to-treat sample. Requires replication in order to place confidence in the results. It is unclear what proportion of the sample entered the program after the DWI Court had been operation long enough to develop and improve its services.
9	(Approx.) January 2007	<i>MacDonald, J. M., Morral, A. R., Raymond, B., & Eibner, C. (2007). The Efficacy of the Rio Hondo DUI Court: A 2-year field experiment. Evaluation Review, 31, 4-23.</i>	N/A	Offenders in Los Angeles County convicted of a second or third misdemeanor DWI between May 2000 and December 2002.	The Rio Hondo DWI Court was created as an "experimental" program concurrently with the intention of the research study. It was not previously in existence and ceased operations upon conclusion of the research. Apparently, there was no opportunity for the program to pilot-test or improve its operations, nor was the outcome evaluation preceded by a process evaluation that documented the program's fidelity to applicable professional standards. No dosage information was reported on how often the participants actually attended treatment sessions or status hearings or had been tested for substance abuse. It is difficult to know whether the operations of this court were reflective of a typical DWI Court program. Participants in the control condition received interventions that are ordinarily associated with a DWI court and not with probation as-usual. This may have represented a negligible difference in the results.
10	2006	<i>Lapham, S.C., Kapitula, L.R., & McMillan, G.P. (2006a). Impaired-</i>	N/A	Felony and misdemeanor DWI offenders in Multnomah County, Oregon involved in the DISP (n=460) in comparison to DWI offenders	While potentially supportive of the DWI Court model, it is difficult to know whether these superior effects were attributable to the court-

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of DUI
Court/Drug Court Programs**

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Target Population	Other Findings
		<i>driving recidivism among repeat offenders following an intensive court-based intervention. Accident Analysis & Prevention, 38, 162-169.</i>		drawn from neighboring counties (n=497), and matched on relevant baseline variables including: current age, and number of prior DWI offenses.	based elements of the program as opposed to the exhaustive regimen of the probationary interventions that were also available. The DISP program differed from standard probation on so many dimensions that it is not possible to determine which aspects may have elicited the beneficial effects.
11	April 2007	<i>Meredith, T. (2007, April). Georgia's DUI Court program's reduce recidivism. Applied Research Services, Inc.</i>	N/A	Comparison samples were drawn from the same counties (n=281) prior to the founding of the DWI Court programs. Although 645 offenders initially entered the DWI Court programs, analyses were only reported on 364 (56%) graduates	Failure to report outcomes on the entire intent-to-treat sample (i.e. on all individuals who initially entered the DWI Courts) renders the comparisons of questionable utility. It is not appropriate to select out successful cases from the DWI Court group and compare them to the entire cohort of control subjects (e.g., Heck, 2006). Analyses should have been conducted on the intent-to-treat sample, or at a minimum the comparison group should have included only successful probation completers. Otherwise there is a serious risk of biased comparison unfairly favoring the DWI Court programs.
12	2000	<i>Breckenridge, J.F., Winfree, L.T, Maupin, J.R., & Clason, D.L. (2000). Drunk drivers, DWI "drug court" treatment, and recidivism: Who fails? Justice Research & Policy, 2, 87-105.</i>	N/A	First and second-time offenders in Las Cruces County, New Mexico, were randomly assigned to the DWI Court (n=39) or to adjudication as usual (n=36).	Due to small numbers in this study, there may have been insufficient statistical power to detect differences if they were present. With a larger sample size, this difference might have turned out to be statistically significant.
13	2008	<i>2008 DWI Court Evaluation Report (Minnesota) (9th Judicial District, MN: Aitkin County DWI Court, Beltrami County DWI Court, Cass County-Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe Wellness</i>	Total Cost Avoidance: Aitkin-\$107,640 Beltrami-\$56,091 Cass County/Leech Lake-\$110,520 Crow Wing-\$53,092 Koochiching-\$119,439 Lake of Woods-\$6,592 Roseau-\$8,009	Pooled district wide data for n=138 participants. Individual county sub evaluations are also presented. Participants selected are DWI offenders in the 9 th Judicial District of MN	N/A

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of DUI
Court/Drug Court Programs**

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Target Population	Other Findings
		<p><i>Court, Crow Wing County DWI Court, Koochiching County DWI Court, Lake of Woods County DWI Court, Roseau County DWI Court</i>). Dr. Troy Gilbertson. Bemidji State University-Criminal Justice Department Funded by the Minnesota Office of Traffic Safety</p>			
14	December 2009	<p><i>Howard County, Md., District Court DUI Court Program Outcome and Cost Evaluation.</i> NPC Research (for Maryland AOC).</p>	<p>The cost due to recidivism over 24 months from program entry was \$4,056 per DUI Court participant compared to \$5,438 per comparison individual, resulting in a savings of \$1,382 per participant (regardless of whether they graduate). The vast majority of the cost in outcomes for DUI Court participants over the 24 months from DUI Court entry was due to time in jail (\$3,848), mostly for participants who were unsuccessful in completing the program.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 18 years of age or older 2. Howard County resident 3. No pending sentencing, warrants, or detainers 4. Not currently on parole 5. Not currently on probation unless sentencing judge agrees to participation 6. Only charges pending in Howard County are eligible for inclusion in plea negotiations, unless parties involved in cases from other jurisdictions agree 7. The defendant has not previously been convicted of any crime of violence, abduction, child abuse, rape or sexual offense, kidnapping, robbery, robbery with a deadly weapon, carjacking, use of a weapon in commission of a felony or crime of violence, arson, or attempts at any of the above offenses. An exception may be made if the offense occurred more than 10 years earlier. 8. Charged with a DUI/DWI and has at least one prior conviction. 	<p>Probably due to the small numbers of non-graduates, few characteristics differentiate DUI Court graduates from nongraduates; however, graduates were more likely to be non-Caucasian and have fewer preprogram DUI arrests. DUI Court participants who re-offended with a DUI charge were younger and less likely to have an arrest for a person crime in the 2 years prior to the program participation. DUI Court participants who re-offended with ANY criminal charge were also younger, though this relationship disappeared when other variables were controlled for. The graduation rate is 84%. (Participants who are not meeting program requirements and/or those who reoffend or violate conditions of probation several times may be removed from the program.)</p>

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of DUI
Court/Drug Court Programs**

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Target Population	Other Findings
15	December 2009	<i>Anne Arundel County, Md. DUI Court Program Outcome and Cost Evaluation.</i> NPC Research (for Maryland AOC).	The cost due to recidivism over 24 months from program entry was \$7,390 per DUI Court participant compared to \$9,016 per comparison individual, resulting in a savings of \$1,626 per participant (regardless of whether they graduate). The vast majority of the cost in outcomes for DUI Court participants over the 24 months from DUI Court entry was due to time in jail (\$5,597), mostly for participants who were unsuccessful in completing the program.	In order to be eligible for the DUI court, an individual must be 18 years or older, a county resident, have no history of violence and no interfering mental health issues. The eligible charge may be a prospective participant's first, second or third DUI. Individuals are ineligible if they have any pending warrants, sentences or are currently on parole.	The graduation rate is 57%. The participant must meet with his/her case manager to ensure that all requirements have been met, including financial obligations. The graduate then has his/her case closed and no further sentence is imposed.). Graduates have significantly more days in the program than non-graduates, have more days in the community of those days in the program, and have fewer lifetime DUI charges prior to program participation.
16	February 1, 2009	<i>The Effectiveness of Idaho DUI and Misdemeanor/DUI Courts: Outcome Evaluation.</i> Scott M. Ronan, Peter A. Collins, and Jeffrey W. Rosky.	N/A	For each court, the admission process examines three key issues: 1) If the offender has committed any current or prior violent or sexual offenses they are not eligible, 2) if the offender has undergone an assessment to determine if they have a substance use disorder, and 3) if the offender has been assessed to determine their risk level for criminal behavior and are classified as medium-high to high risk.	The drug court group graduated 165 (76.9%) of the participants, over half (85) from the Kootenai DUI Court (Kootenai county is the most populated county in this study) alone. Of the drug court group, the two most frequent primary charges which led to their referral and participation in DUI or Misd/DUI Court, were Driving Under the Influence, (66.7%) and Driving Under the Influence; Second Offense (22.2%).
17	December 2009	<i>Maryland Problem-Solving Courts Evaluation, Phase III Integration of Results from Process, Outcome, and Cost Studies Conducted 2007-2009 Final Report.</i> NPC Research.	The results from two Maryland DUI Court Programs' cost evaluations show an average 24 - month outcome cost savings of \$1,505 per DUI court participant when compared to the comparison group.	N/A	The results of this DUI Court evaluation indicate that the programs are successful in reducing participant recidivism both for DUI charges and in the criminal justice system overall and that one program has documented a decrease in substance use among participants. Both programs are above the national average for drug court graduation rates with Howard County displaying a very high graduation rate, indicating that the DUI Court program is helping most participants successfully complete program requirements. Program participant characteristics across the two sites show that most Maryland DUI Court participants are male (83%), Caucasian (77%), and in their later 30s (average age of 37.5).

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of DUI
Court/Drug Court Programs**

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Target Population	Other Findings
18	October 2011	<i>An Evaluation of Three Driving-Under-the-Influence Courts in Georgia.</i> James C. Fell, A. Scott Tippetts, and J. DeCarlo Ciccel. <i>Annals of Advances in Automotive Medicine.</i> October 2011.	It is estimated that the DUI Courts prevented between 47 and 112 arrests for repeat DUI over the four year period of analysis. Unfortunately, costs associated with the operation of these DUI courts could not be obtained, nor could the cost savings of these DUI courts be estimated. Neither could costs associated with more traditional courts that deal with DUI offenders be obtained, nor could any estimated cost savings due to these operations be estimated for comparison purposes. This rendered a comprehensive cost-benefit analysis impossible to conduct in this study.	N/A	The other factors that might be expected to contribute to the likelihood to recidivate - namely, age, gender, race/ethnicity, and number of prior DUI offenses - were also examined to ensure that the group effect found was not an artifact of some other factor on which the groups might have been differently composed - although it was already known that the two comparison groups had been composed via stratified random sampling to match the Intervention group on these factors. (Differences among counties were also examined; this effect is discussed separately herein.) From these other variables tested, only age and prior DUIs were significant predictors of recidivism for all four groups of the offenders we examined.
19	February 2, 2012	<i>Drug Courts' Effects on Criminal Offending for Juveniles and Adults.</i> Ojmarrh Mitchell, David B. Wilson, Amy Eggers, Doris L. MacKenzie. <i>The Campbell Collaboration.</i> February 2, 2012.	N/A	N/A	N/A
20	September, 2011	<i>An Assessment of the Hall County DUI Court Program.</i> Wes Clarke, Rob Gordon; Carl Vinson Institute of Government, University of Georgia	According to the Georgia Department of Audits and Accounts, the average daily cost per drug court participant is \$13.54 per day, 70% to 80% less than the average daily cost of most traditional sentencing.	DUI defendants	-Chatham County graduates had a 10% recidivism rate (nonparticipant rate of 27%) -Clarke County graduates had an 11% recidivism rate (nonparticipant rate of 19%)