



Development of Dependency Drug Court Performance Measures

FINAL REPORT

SEPTEMBER 2010



ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE
OF THE COURTS

CENTER FOR FAMILIES, CHILDREN
& THE COURTS

Development of Dependency Drug Court Performance Measures

FINAL REPORT

SEPTEMBER 2010



ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE
OF THE COURTS

CENTER FOR FAMILIES, CHILDREN
& THE COURTS

This report was developed under a grant provided by State Justice Institute (Award # SJI-09-N-067). The opinions, findings, and conclusions in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of State Justice Institute. The views expressed are those of the authors and may not represent the view of the Judicial Council of California or the funder.

Copyright © 2010 by the Judicial Council of California/Administrative Office of the Courts. All rights reserved.

Except as permitted under the Copyright Act of 1976, no part of this publication may be reproduced in any form or by any means, electronic, online, or mechanical, including the use of information storage and retrieval systems, without permission in writing from the copyright owner. Permission is granted to nonprofit institutions to reproduce and distribute for educational purposes all or part of the work if the copies are distributed at or below cost and if the Judicial Council of California/Administrative Office of the Courts and the Center for Families, Children & the Courts are credited.

This report is also available on the California Courts Web site:
www.courtinfo.ca.gov/programs/cfcc/resources/publications/articles.htm.

For additional copies or more information about this report, please call the Center for Families, Children & the Courts at 415-865-7739, or write to:

Judicial Council of California
Administrative Office of the Courts
Center for Families, Children & the Courts
455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, California 94102-3688

Printed on recycled and recyclable paper

**Judicial Council of California
Administrative Office of the Courts**

Hon. Ronald M. George
*Chief Justice of California and
Chair of the Judicial Council*

William C. Vickrey
Administrative Director of the Courts

Ronald G. Overholt
Chief Deputy Director

Center for Families, Children & the Courts

Diane Nunn
Director

Charlene Depner, Ph.D.
Assistant Director

Don Will
Manager

Amy Nuñez
Supervising Research Analyst

Francine Byrne
Supervising Research Analyst

Nadine Blaschak-Brown
Senior Court Services Analyst

Sonya Tafoya
Senior Research Analyst

Anthony Villanueva
Research Analyst

Alma Balmes
Administrative Coordinator

Contents

Project Goals and Objectives	1
Dependency Drug Courts: Background & Purpose	1
The Dependency Drug Court Model.....	2
Dependency Drug Court Model Variance	3
Pilot Study	7
Dependency Drug Court Performance Measure Development	7
County Selection Criteria & Description of Each County.....	8
Superior Court of San Joaquin County and PROP I & II Courts.....	10
Superior Court of Orange County and its Dependency Drug Court.....	11
Pilot Study Results.....	12
Orange County Dependency Drug Court.....	13
San Joaquin County Dependency Drug Court.....	16
Lessons Learned, Results & Recommendations	17
Discussion of Pilot Implications	17
Categorizing Variables.....	17
Appendixes	
Appendix A: National Center for State Courts Performance Measures	19
Appendix B: Dependency Drug Court Performance Measures Attempted.....	27
Appendix C: AOC Dependency Drug Court Performance Measures.....	37
Appendix D: Sources	47

Project Goals and Objectives

In November 2006, the California Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) began designing the state's case management system in the area of family, juvenile and collaborative courts with the need for accurate data, statistical counts, statewide uniformity and performance measures in mind. Simultaneously, the AOC's Center for Families, Children & the Courts began designing the data warehouse for the statewide court case management system. These activities provided the impetus to advocate for performance measure in various types of courts statewide. National efforts to establish performance measures in dependency court are evident in the publication of the *Toolkit for Court Performance Measures in Child Abuse and Neglect Cases* (American Bar Association et al, December 2008). California's Rule of Court 5.505 demonstrates the state's effort to adopt the measures included in the toolkit, as that rule requires the courts to collect and submit dependency court performance measures once the statewide case management system is completed. In California, the Administrative Office of the Courts is also undertaking the development of performance measures in delinquency.

The State Justice Institute's grant provided an opportunity to expand this work into the area of dependency drug court. While various localized evaluations of family treatment drug courts/dependency drug courts have occurred in California, the focus of this project was to develop, test and disseminate dependency drug court performance measures and not to evaluate programs. As the toolkit proposes, the dependency drug court performance measures are intended for courts to measure the effectiveness of court operations and programs. These measures ensure that court resources are being utilized efficiently since courts should be held accountable to deliver fair and equal justice to the public.

Dependency Drug Courts: Background & Purpose

In April 2008, the California Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) was awarded a grant by the State Justice Institute to develop and pilot test dependency drug court performance measures. The grant proposal also included a plan for the Center for Families, Children & the Courts at the AOC to disseminate the dependency drug court performance measures after they had been pilot tested. This document provides an overview of the steps and results produced at each stage of this research project.

In preparation for identifying dependency drug court performance measures, researchers reviewed current literature on national trends in court performance measures. A central document to this task was a publication produced in 2008 by the National Center for State Courts titled, *Performance Measurement of Drug Court: The State of the Art* with a grant provided by the Bureau of Justice Assistance. While other states, like Tennessee, Wyoming and Florida have produced publications on court performance measures, few have focused strictly on dependency drug court (DDC) or family treatment court.

The Dependency Drug Court Model

These courts differ significantly from adult and juvenile drug courts in that they provide more comprehensive support and resources to the entire family and work intensively on sobriety with the family as they aspire toward reunification. In a monograph on drug court models, the Bureau of Justice Assistance describes these courts as follows:

A family dependency treatment court is a court devoted to cases of child abuse and neglect that involve substance abuse by the child's parents or other caregivers. Its purpose is to protect the safety and welfare of children while giving parents the tools they need to become sober, responsible caregivers. To accomplish this, the court draws together an interdisciplinary team that works collaboratively to assess the family's situation and to devise a comprehensive case plan that addresses the needs of both the children and the parents. In this way, the court team provides children with quick access to permanency and offers parents a viable chance to achieve sobriety, provide a safe and nurturing home, and hold their families together.¹

At the time that this report was being prepared, it was estimated that in California approximately 30 of 58 counties have a dependency drug court. The California AOC aids these courts by providing technical assistance, training and grant opportunities and some funding. Each of the courts design their dependency drug court to appropriately serve their local constituents. For this reason, varying models exist from one county to the next. However, each drug court applies elements from the key components established by the National Association of Drug Court Professionals Drug Court Standards Committee and several have been through federally-funded training specific to dependency courts, such as the Drug Court Planning Initiative.

The “Key Components” include the following:

- 1) Drug courts integrate alcohol and other drug (AOD) treatment services with justice system processing.
- 2) Using a non-adversarial approach, prosecution and defense counsel promote public safety while protecting participants' due process rights.
- 3) Eligible participants are identified early and promptly placed in the drug court program.
- 4) Drug courts provide access to a continuum of alcohol, drug, and other related treatment and rehabilitation services.
- 5) Abstinence is monitored by frequent alcohol and other drug testing.
- 6) A coordinated strategy governs drug court responses to participants' compliance.
- 7) Ongoing judicial interaction with each participant is essential.

¹ Bureau of Justice Assistance. (2004). *Family Dependency Treatment Courts: Addressing Child Abuse and Neglect Cases Using the Drug Court Model*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs.

- 8) Monitoring and evaluation measure the achievement of program goals and gauge effectiveness.
- 9) Continuing interdisciplinary education promotes effective drug court planning, implementation, and operations.
- 10) Forging partnerships among drug courts, public agencies, and community-based organizations increases the availability of treatment services, enhances drug court effectiveness, and generates local support.²
- 11) Effective collaborative justice courts emphasize a team and individual commitment to cultural competency. Awareness of and responsiveness to diversity and cultural issues help ensure an attitude of respect within the collaborative justice court setting.³

Dependency Drug Court Model Variance

Nationally and locally, courts have designed their courts based on a variety of factors such as local and state statutory framework, community involvement, the availability of local and statewide resources, stakeholder commitment, level of collaboration, funding streams, and grant requirements. Other areas that contribute to the variance among dependency drug/family treatment courts involve the case types included in dependency drug court programs (whether criminal and civil cases are incorporated), which court jurisdiction handles the DDC cases (between juvenile dependency, family or criminal court), whether a court employs a “one family/one judge” model or whether DDC participants work with multiple judicial officers, and whether DDC programs are focused on specific types of litigants, such as mothers of drug-exposed infants.

In 2009, the AOC conducted a survey of all dependency drug courts in California. The survey collected information about local standards, practices, operation, goals, caseload, and capacity. The data reveal that in California, all of the DDC cases are heard in juvenile dependency court and are heard by commissioners, judges, pro tempore judges, and referees. Some counties utilize a unified court approach, a “one family/one judge” model, where the same judicial officer hears all matters for the parents involved in DDC (juvenile dependency and DDC review hearings). Other courts employ a bifurcated or “parallel” model where one judicial officer hears all DDC matters and another judicial officer hears the juvenile dependency matters.

All counties shared three program goals to “increase reunification rates,” “increase successful treatment completion rates,” and “increase child safety.” Ninety-five percent of the counties reported to “achieve early success to treatment” and “decrease recidivism/recurrence of child abuse/neglect incidents” as program goals. Lastly, 90 percent of the counties reported “timely permanency for children” and “increase family recovery” as program goals. In terms of the

² National Association of Drug Court Professionals Drug Court Standards Committee. (1997). *Defining Drug Courts: the Key Components*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs.

³ The 11th key component was adopted by the AOC Collaborative Justice Advisory Committee. The complete list of drug court key components is available at: <http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/programs/collab/>

frequency of DDC status review hearings, the California courts vary in practice between biweekly and weekly and based the frequency of hearings primarily on the participants' specific phase – with early phase participants coming to court with greater frequency. California courts vary in the type of incentives and sanctions utilized from one court to the next. Reasons for incentives and sanctions also differ from one courtroom to the next. Prior to the California Supreme Court decision, *In re Nolan W.*, (2009) 45 Cal.4th 1217, some dependency drug courts used jail sanctions.⁴ The caseload for dependency drug courts vary from county to county in California, but one common characteristic is that not all courts are able to serve all eligible families. Many courts maintain a waitlist for eligible families that cannot be served by the dependency drug court.

Not all dependency drug court coordinators are employed by the courts; some are based in other agencies, including county-level Alcohol and Drug Program (ADP), Department of Public Health (DPH), and other health-related service departments. Aside from the positions being based at different agencies, the composition of each multi-disciplinary team varies from county to county. Nearly all courts include a drug court coordinator, judicial officer, and county social service agency representative. Eighty percent of the counties reported including treatment providers on their multidisciplinary teams.

Program requirements for successful completion of dependency drug court vary from one location to the next. The three most prevalent requirements include the following: (1) 95 percent of the counties reported “successful treatment completion,” (2) 91 percent reported “required period of program participation,” and (3) another 91 percent reported “engagement in other recommended services” as completion criteria. Forty-eight percent of the counties reported having a completion rate of between 50 and 75 percent while 9.5 percent of the courts reported having a 75 percent program completion rate or higher. Lastly, 75 percent of the counties reported having aftercare support (post-program completion or post-family reunification).

These stark differences in program court practice pose a challenge for the development of performance measures for the uniform data collection and county comparisons and they also limit generalizability about programs in California. In developing performance measures in California, there may be measures that apply to all, some, or few courts. Court personnel and dependency drug court stakeholders need to note not all performance measures will apply to every court.

Courts that do not have data management systems for their dependency drug courts struggle at data sharing with treatment providers, child protective services, and the court. Partnerships and collaborations impact the data collection process and data sources. For example, when a court does not establish a data sharing protocol with child protective services, gathering data on

⁴ *In re Nolan W.*, (2009) 45 Cal.4th 1217, 203 P.3d. 454, 91 Cal.Rptr.3d 140.

placement changes, post-exit recidivism (at 12 and 18 months), and time to reunification is nearly impossible.

Courts that utilize computerized systems to collect intake and demographic data, test and treatment results, court appearance history, and progress and outcomes tracking, are at a significantly greater advantage to measure dependency drug court performance. In California, few courts are able to do this. Currently, the state is developing a case management system that will interface with the department of social services, the department of justice, and the department of child support. The system is being designed to facilitate data sharing while ensuring confidentiality and due process. In anticipation of this system, courts are being discouraged from enhancing their current case management systems. While the new California case management system may eventually interface with other agencies, it will not have the capacity to collect treatment and participant information that is typically required to monitor the progress of drug court participants. Another data collection system is still required for this to occur.

Pilot Study

Dependency Drug Court Performance Measure Development

Researchers borrowed extensively from the National Center for State Court's technical assistance bulletin on performance measures to develop measures for the pilot study. An advisory team with representatives from the courts, California Drug Court Coordinators' Work Group, Alcohol and Drug Programs, Department of Social Services, and National Center for State Courts was established by the AOC. This advisory team met on multiple occasions to discuss a draft of the dependency drug court performance measures.

The National Center for State Courts' work on the relevant domains for performance measures provided guidance to develop California's measures. Based on their work with other states developing performance measures, the NCSC chose the following domain areas as important areas to include when developing measures for drug stakeholders:

- NRAC Core and Recommended Measures
- Accountability
- Social Functioning
- Processing
- Interaction with Other Agencies
- Cost and Cost Avoidance
- Compliance with Quality Standards

The AOC attempted to test nearly all of the measures recommended to drug courts by the NCSC. At least four of the domains were included, such as NRAC Core and Recommended Measures, Accountability, Social Functioning, and Processing.

The AOC also intended to adhere to the "Court Performance Framework" (CPF) when testing the measures. The CPF is a method that organizes measures along two dimensions. One dimension includes the two directions that the court functions under, the need for the court to have discretion on resources and personnel, and the need to remain flexible and responsive to adjust court personnel and resources to respond to litigants' needs appropriately and effectively. The second dimension focuses on the external and internal impacts on court programs. An example of how this dimension manifests itself is how courts utilize information to report to external court partners and litigants on operations and how it uses that same information to report internally on court operations. To adhere to the CPF means that items have been selected within these two dimensions, which create four quadrants: effectiveness, procedural satisfaction, efficiency, and productivity. Given that data collection was limited to court, child welfare, and dependency drug court data and did not utilize data from litigants (such as customer satisfaction surveys), three of the four CPF quadrants were covered in the pilot test. This included all but procedural satisfaction.

The discussions held with the advisory groups were focused on the feasibility and appropriateness of the proposed measures. Appendix A illustrates the results of those discussions, as these became the measures pilot tested in San Joaquin County and Orange County.

County Selection Criteria & Description of Each County

For the pilot study two differing courts were selected. Some of the criteria that were considered for selecting the two courts included the fact that the courts had to have different data collection systems from one another so that data collection modes could be tested (between automated and “paper and pencil” systems). Courts needed to have some form of data collection as part of their basic court operation. In California, nearly all of the DDCs collect data for funding and operation purposes. The AOC sought those DDCs with more comprehensive data collection processes. Lastly, the AOC selected two differing DDC models: San Joaquin County utilizes the bifurcated or “parallel” model while Orange County’s DDC operates as a “one judge/one family” model. The two courts were also very different from one another in terms of population size, income, and child welfare populations. Tables I, II, and III demonstrate these differences and include California’s statistics.

Table I: Orange County General Population & Foster Care Statistics

Category	Number of Children in the County Population (for Children Ages 0–17)			Number of Children in Child Welfare Supervised Foster Care (for Children Ages 0–17)		
	Fiscal Year			Fiscal Year		
	2007	2008	2009	2007	2008	2009
Black	9,755	9,538	9,327	215	196	178
White	280,621	274,238	267,668	959	871	729
Hispanic	371,775	376,775	381,274	1,742	1,740	1,586
Asian/Pacific Islander	107,220	109,383	111,332	128	122	131
Native American	2,168	2,192	2,216	6	5	9
Total	771,539	772,126	771,817	3,050	2,934	2,633
General Population Data (all ages)						
	Fiscal Year		Fiscal Year		Fiscal Year	
	2007	2008	2009	2009	2009	2009
Number of people	2,957,902		2,989,141		3,026,786	
Median household income	\$73,107		\$74,862		No data	

Table II: San Joaquin County General Population & Foster Care Statistics

Category	Number of Children in the County Population (for Children Ages 0–17)			Number of Children in Child Welfare Supervised Foster Care (for Children Ages 0–17)		
	Fiscal Year			Fiscal Year		
	2007	2008	2009	2007	2008	2009
Black	14,870	15,194	15,557	390	331	308
White	61,208	60,757	60,482	455	363	308
Hispanic	101,745	105,449	108,967	652	583	593
Asian/Pacific Islander	37,276	39,228	41,105	70	68	76
Native American	837	830	826	14	7	11
Total	215,936	221,458	226,937	1,581	1,352	1,296
General Population Data (all ages)						
	Fiscal Year		Fiscal Year		Fiscal Year	
	2007	2008	2009	2009	2009	2009
Number of people	665,246		668,753		674,860	
Median household income	\$51,784		\$54,350		No data	

Table III: California General Population & Foster Care Statistics

Category	Number of Children in the County Population (for Children Ages 0–17)			Number of Children in Child Welfare Supervised Foster Care (for Children Ages 0–17)		
	Fiscal Year			Fiscal Year		
	2007	2008	2009	2007	2008	2009
Black	597,216	585,702	575,538	18,998	17,131	15,312
White	3,146,601	3,103,380	3,062,442	18,082	15,932	14,563
Hispanic	4,849,726	4,891,254	4,921,886	32,568	29,817	27,259
Asian/Pacific Islander	988,078	1,002,929	1,017,185	1,711	1,670	1,577
Native American	47,139	46,780	46,522	957	865	754
Total	9,628,760	9,630,045	9,623,573	72,316	65,415	59,465
General Population Data (all ages)						
	Fiscal Year		Fiscal Year		Fiscal Year	
	2007	2008	2009	2009	2009	2009
Number of people	36,266,122		36,580,371		36,961,664	
Median household income	\$59,928		\$61,021		No data	

San Joaquin's dependency drug court utilizes an external database to capture DDC participant data called "Phases." The court is relatively small and is located in a rural community. Orange County's dependency drug court serves fewer litigants despite its larger size and urban setting. Orange County's DDC does not use an automated system for data collection; their participation in this project required significant amounts of time for case file extraction. While San Joaquin required resources for case file extraction, many of the data elements required to calculate or create a performance measure were already captured in the Phases database.

Superior Court of San Joaquin County and PROP I & II Courts

San Joaquin County is a largely rural county that has a population of 674,860 spread across 1,400 square miles. Thirty-nine percent of the San Joaquin County population is White (non-Hispanic), 37 percent is Hispanic, 14 percent is Asian and 8 percent is African-American. The median household income in 2008 was \$54,350 with 17 percent of the population living below the poverty level. The Superior Court of San Joaquin County has 34 judicial officers presiding in six different locations throughout the county. All juvenile dependency matters are heard in the Stockton Courthouse.

The County of San Joaquin's dependency drug court also known as the Parental Recovery Options Plan (PROP) was established in 2002. The goals of PROP are to successfully reunify families in a timely manner and reduce the amount of time children remain in foster care settings. Fundamentally, PROP provides intensive court monitoring as a means to increase family reunification rates. Program participants include mothers, fathers, children and extended family members that have substance abuse problems. The court uses a "parallel" model and does not use the "one family/one judge" model.

The PROP team consists of representation from the San Joaquin County Superior Court and treatment providers. Referral to the PROP program is prepared by the court, Child Protective Services (CPS), or in rare cases, an attorney. At the time of the detention hearing, assessment for the participant occurs for program eligibility. Program admittance takes place once the drug court case manager makes the determination and recommendation for eligibility. Upon admittance, substance abuse treatment begins within one to four business days. The PROP program consists of two levels: PROP I, these participants have limited or no prior case history and PROP II, typically these participants are monitored weekly, bi-weekly, or monthly depending on how much progress they have achieved throughout the year. On average, PROP II cases include prior history with the following: CPS/reunification failure, substance abuse treatment, mental health diagnoses, domestic violence, criminal history, positive toxicity with an infant, and PROP I failure. During program participation, participants work through a point system towards program completion and graduation. This point system also tracks the use of incentives, such as gift cards that are used for good behavior. Alternatively, the judicial officer may order the use of sanctions, which include random alcohol and drug testing, community service, progress reports on the attainment of education or vocational opportunities, updates on job training, and the maintenance of gainful employment. To complete the program successfully, participants must obtain stable housing, endure sobriety at a minimum of 120 days before

graduation, and complete PROP program goals. Upon successful completion, a yearly graduation from the PROP program is planned as an acknowledgment of the participants' overall accomplishments. As of April 2010, the juvenile dependency judicial officers implemented a standing order for all dependency cases with a substance abuse referral to participate in the DDC court.

Superior Court of Orange County and its Dependency Drug Court

Orange County is principally an urban county with a population of 3,026,786 spread across 798 square miles of land. Forty-six percent of the Orange County population is White (non-Hispanic), 34 percent is Hispanic, 16 percent is Asian and 2 percent is African-American. The median household income in 2008 was \$74,862 with 10 percent of the population living below the poverty level. The Orange County Superior Court includes 149 judicial officers presiding in eight different locations throughout the county. The Lamoreaux Justice Center hears family, juvenile, and probate matters and includes 32 judicial officers. Dependency Drug Court cases are heard at this court location.

The dependency drug court in Orange County is a family reunification program designed to handle issues of parents whose children have been removed from the home due to parental abuse of alcohol or drugs. Program participants include mothers, fathers, children, and extended family members. The goal of the DDC program is to assure the safety and welfare of children by helping the parents deal with their substance abuse issues. The program team includes the judicial officer and representatives from the Probation Department, the Health Care Agency (HCA)'s Alcohol and Drug Abuse Services and Children and Youth Services, the Social Services Agency (SSA)'s Children and Family Services Division, battered women's shelters, law enforcement agencies, and the Victim Witness Assistance Program.

Once a dependency action has been filed, and at the time of the detention hearing, cases are referred to the DDC program upon the request of the parent's counsel or by HCA or SSA staff. Participants sign a request for admission into DDC, and, if accepted, an assessment date is scheduled within six days. Cases are scheduled for court hearings on a calendar management system based on the "one family/one judge" model where the same judicial officer hears both dependency drug court and juvenile dependency matters for the same family. During the assessment period, the family will be interviewed by both HCA and SSA to determine both eligibility and suitability for the program. At the next court date, the request for admission into DDC is discussed, determining both eligibility and suitability for the program, and if found both eligible and suitable, participants are formally admitted into the program. All program participants are required to comply with all program requirements through the four program phases, which include random alcohol and drug tests, weekly individual and group counseling, journaling, attendance at recovery support/self-help groups, regular court appearances, and attendance in perinatal or parenting classes.

Below are the four phases required for successful completion of the DDC program:

Phase I – Recovery and Planning

Children and Youth Services staff and Social Services Agency staff provide Treatment Orientation and Case Plan development in partnership with the participant.

Phase II – Assertion Skills & Conflict Resolution

The Case Plan is developed and updated to recognize treatment goals and objectives. Treatment centers focused on coping skills occur at this phase to assist in the successful management of daily challenges.

Phase III – Parenting

The participant is provided transitional support in order for the participant to exercise skills to return to the community as a productive and responsible parent.

Phase IV – Relapse Prevention/Graduation

A participant's graduation from the program is supported through reinforcement of skill attainment and progression toward becoming a better parent, while achieving sobriety.

Successful completion of the above phases promotes family reunification and better parenting skills, thus providing a safe and secure living environment for the children.

Pilot Study Results

The measures were reviewed by the counties and multiple meetings were held to discuss the process for obtaining the data and to ensure that appropriate local stakeholders got involved. The primary goal of the pilot study was to study the feasibility of collecting these performance measures. A few common parameters were established during these planning discussions for both counties:

- A study cohort was established from which to pull data: Admissions from 07/01/05 through 12/31/06.
- An exit cohort was decided upon for Orange County, which would allow for retrospective data collection. This was to be used for data on families post-graduation or post-reunification: Exits between 01/01/2007 and 06/30/09. The retrospective data gathering needed to allow for an 18-month timeframe to have passed.
- No personally-identifying data would be delivered to the AOC; all data were submitted in aggregate form.
- When counties could not collect the performance measure as defined in Appendix B, an alternative measure was sought.

As was anticipated, neither court was able to collect all of the performance measures that were pilot tested. The courts successfully pulled dependency court cases for that study period and used child welfare and dependency drug court cases to validate their caseloads. As Appendix B indicates, both counties collected approximately 22 of the 35 performance measures. San Joaquin DDC developed three alternative measures while Orange DDC developed seven. The variables that proved challenging to gather included those that were non-court based data sources, like treatment provider information (“Percent of Positive Drug Test Results” or “Longest Continuous Sobriety”) and child welfare data (“In-Program Recidivism” and “Time to Permanency”). Another data collection challenge involved those variables measuring change in a variety of aspects (education, housing status, living situation, employment status, etc.) and many programs do not collect these data at both intake and at exit. Some programs collect this information at intake but do not follow up with these variables at exit time. The two counties have decided to start collecting these after the pilot study. At the end of the pilot study, AOC researchers conducted a debriefing session at each county with the court, treatment partners, child welfare partners and drug court coordinators.

Both counties needed to ensure that the data were valid – that the parents noted as dependency drug court participants in the court matched those noted as DDC participants with social services and with the treatment centers. Reconciling these cases took time and effort between the agencies and court. Each data collection partner then used a “hand off” approach with their data; the first group to gather the full data set was the dependency drug court case managers who passed it on to social services and ensured that the numbers and participants matched. This process took a few rounds of data checking for the correct number of DDC participants to be agreed on. In Orange County, that data file then went to the department of human services for another attempt to match DDC participants and to incorporate services data. In San Joaquin County, this was not necessary since services data is already collected and stored in the Phases system. Lastly, both counties delivered that merged data file to the dependency court staff. This concluded the last “hand off” and data validation process by checking that all dependency cases noted as “DDC” cases were included and that court data was incorporated in the data file.

Orange County Dependency Drug Court

Orange County (OC) was able to separate some findings by exit type, between those completing programs successfully (graduates) and unsuccessfully (terminated or quit). By separating their findings into these two groups, they were able to see differences in immediate outcomes. Table IV displays child welfare data comparisons with DDC OC findings. In Orange County, 2 percent of graduates re-entered foster care within 12 months of completing the DDC program versus 16 percent of terminates (unsuccessful DDC completers) who re-entered foster care within 12 months of exiting the DDC program. The overall post-exit recidivism rate was approximately 9 percent. The median time to reunification also differed significantly between graduates and terminates. For cases where at least one parent graduated from DDC, the median time to reunification was 303 days and when one of the parents was terminated the median number of days was 433. Table V displays the difference in time to reunification between DDC and all child welfare cases in the county. The child welfare comparison uses child welfare data so that

median time is based on placement with parent while the DDC data uses court data to measure median time from child welfare initial filing to the court’s definition of reunification (which may not be the placement change but case termination). Any discrepancy may be attributed to the difference in those definitions. Orange County’s DDC collected time in days but they have been converted to months for this comparison. While the reunification time for DDC participants is a little higher than all dependency cases in Orange County, it is important to note that the re-entry rate is significantly lower, especially for those who successfully complete DDC.

Table IV: Post Exit Recidivism

	Child Welfare Data				Dependency Drug Court Performance Measures
	2005	2006	2007	2008	July 1, 2005 – December 31, 2006
Orange County	9.1%	9.4%	5.7%	5.5%	Graduates: 2% Terminates: 15.5% Overall rate: 9.4%
San Joaquin County	15.0%	12.2%	15.3%	15.2%	3% Re-entered the program with a new or old case within 12 months of completing.
California	12.9%	12.6%	11.6%	11.9%	

Note: Orange County's DDC program defined post exit recidivism as the number of DDC graduates that have re-entered child welfare (with new or old case) within 12 months of completing / graduating DDC program. The number of terminates include DDC non-compliant individuals that have re-entered child welfare (with new or old case) within 12 months of program termination.

San Joaquin County's DDC program defined post exit recidivism as the number of DDC graduates that have re-entered with a new or old case within 12 months of completing or graduating from the DDC program.

Table V: Median Time to Reunification

Median time in Months from Latest Removal to Reunification For Exits to Reunification from Child Welfare Supervised Foster Care						Median Time in Months to Reunification Using Entry Cohort	Median Time in Months to Reunification Using Exit Cohort
Fiscal Years						Dependency Drug Court	Dependency Drug Court
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	Study Cohort: Entry Dates Between 7/1/05 - 12/31/06	Study Cohort: Exit Dates Between 01/01/07 to 06/30/09
Orange County	8.9	7.2	8.1	10	9.9	10.1 (Graduates) 14.4 (Terminates)	11.3 (Graduates) 18.7 (Terminates)
California	8.5	7.9	7.9	8.5	8.2		

Entry Cohort: Orange County's DDC calculates median time to reunification as time from initial child welfare filing to reunification for all DDC cases that reunified (grouped by those who graduated the DDC program and those who were terminated from DDC program).

Exit Cohort: Orange County's DDC calculates median time to reunification as time from initial child welfare filing to reunification for all DDC cases that reunified (grouped by those who graduated the DDC program and those who were terminated from DDC program).

The collaboration between HSA, child welfare, and the DDC in Orange County contributed to a successful data collection process. During the debriefing session in Orange County, the pilot study team noted that this data collection task required a case file review to extract the data utilizing the court case file, the child welfare file, and the treatment file. An instrument for this data extraction was created to collect data on hearing types that had occurred, sanctions, incentives, termination reasons, accomplishments, and status checks.

When asked for any modifications to the performance measures, Orange County noted that the percentage of positive drug tests results would be more meaningful if they were stratified by phases, that is, if the percent of positive drug test results were separated by participant phases. Knowing that relapse can be part of rehabilitation and that DDC phases are designed to graduate participants in the rehabilitation process, the idea of separating drug and alcohol positive test results by phases is more appealing. One would expect that the earlier phases will have higher positive test results than the latter phases.

The timeliness and process measures also required some modification in Orange County due to local court operations. Some timeliness measures were not possible to calculate because they are not tracked, such as the time between the referral date and the eligibility assessment date. Since these occur on the same day for the most part, this statistic is not captured. Based on how the court has designed their program, the days between eligibility assessment date and admission date had to be converted to days between evaluation date and admission date.

Orange County's DDC also noted that "no fault" terminations impact the retention rate. Considering that the calculation for retention rate equals the number of active and graduate DDC participants divided by the number of those admitted to DDC overall, "no fault" terminations should be removed from the numerator and denominator to ensure that they do not impact the retention rate. A "no fault" termination refers to cases where the parent and program have concluded that the parent and program are not compatible and that DDC participation will not benefit that family or case.

San Joaquin County Dependency Drug Court

As was the case in Orange County, dependency drug court performance measure data gathering in San Joaquin County required case file review for data extraction. San Joaquin County's ability to create performance measures was limited by their local collaboration with their local child welfare office. Establishing data sharing protocols with the local child welfare agency would have made more data accessible in that county. Court personnel noted that more collaboration with their health services agency and social services would have lead to an easier and more comprehensive data collection experience. DDC court personnel have added more variables to their Phases system to facilitate future performance measure data collection.

Among the San Joaquin County DDC results, positive drug test results were impressive: only 8 percent of all drug tests were positive, especially taking into account that this figure includes 4,415 tests. Their change in vocational status (26 percent of participants obtained employment after program completion) appears to be a positive program output. Lastly, the DDC program has a 61 percent graduation rate.

Lessons Learned, Results & Recommendations

Performance measure results can be useful to courts when the data are meaningful and reflective of their work. For example, collecting data on the vocational status of DDC participants before and after program participation is not meaningful for programs that do not target that. For this reason, the elements that appear to be most helpful include retention rate, in-program recidivism, positive and negative drug and alcohol test results, timeliness between referral and admission, number of judicial status hearings, graduation rate, and time to permanency. These measures reflect nearly all of the goals of all DDC programs statewide and therefore appear to be most meaningful and helpful. They have been included as California's "core" dependency drug court performance measures.

Discussion of Pilot Implications

Collaboration between the court and DDC stakeholder agencies is critical to collecting dependency drug court performance measures. Aside from basic commitment, a few prerequisites are highly recommended for this level of data sharing. This includes a data sharing policy and agreement, a delivery method and plan for ensuring quality control for these data, and contacts at each agency for follow-up and to facilitate data interpretation. The first data gathering process may be the longest process; the greater the frequency that these data are gathered, reviewed, and discussed with partners, the easier the process becomes. A data sharing policy and agreement needs to address the level of confidentiality required for some data. When the data sharing policy and agreement represents the effort of the entire local DDC-serving community, it ensures that it becomes a functioning policy. Omitting a DDC service provider limits data availability which may prohibit the data collection of dependency drug court performance measures. Quality control measures should address missing data and discrepancies in counts (between the court and agencies or between agencies). A committee of local stakeholders, which nearly all DDC courts have, needs to be available to address data issues.

Categorizing Variables

Once the pilot study was completed, researchers revised and resubmitted the proposed dependency drug court performance measures for public comment. The comments noted that the number of performance measures may prove to be overwhelming for any single given DDC program to collect. A strong recommendation from the reviewers was to categorize the performance measures into the following three groups: "core," "recommended," and "when possible/relevant" elements. Core elements refer to data elements that all programs are encouraged to collect as they are relevant to every DDC. Recommended elements are elements that everyone should aspire to collect but are not as essential as the core ones. Those elements notes as "when possible/relevant" include variables that may not be relevant to all programs. This includes many of the social functioning elements, such as change in housing status, births of drug free babies, etc.

Knowing that programs are designed around their local constituents and resources and that DDC performance measures are not collected statewide, DDCs might aspire to start collecting "core"

elements in their initial year of data collection. By the second year, “recommended” elements should be collected and in their third year DDCs should incorporate as many “when possible/relevant” elements as each program deems feasible and appropriate to that program. The timeliness performance measures need to be adopted based on court operation. For example, courts that conduct the eligibility assessment on the day of admission should not be required to collect data on the days between the eligibility assessment and the admission date. Appendix C notes the California dependency drug court performance measure elements by category: “core,” “recommended,” and “when possible/relevant.”

The results of this pilot study will also be incorporated into an implementation guide that will be disseminated to all dependency drug courts statewide. Currently, a project called the In-Depth Technical Assistance (IDTA) is seeking methods to support and sustain dependency drug courts in every county statewide. This project will provide an opportunity to disseminate and promote these performance measures.

Appendix A

NATIONAL CENTER FOR STATE COURTS (NCSC)
PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Appendix A: National Center for State Courts Performance Measures

PERFORMANCE MEASURE	DATA DEFINITION	POTENTIAL DATA SOURCES
Retention Rate	Number of participants retained in the court program, calculated as = [Active + Graduates] / Overall Admitted	Court System, DDC Participant Data, Social Service Data/ Child Welfare
In Program Recidivism/ Child Re-entry Rate	<p>Recidivism is defined as the number and percent of children and parents or primary caregivers with in-home reports with documented findings of “substantiated” or “some indicators” of at least one maltreatment with a type of abuse, neglect, or threatened harm AND a report received date (or incident date) through the Department of Children and Families for drug court participants while in the program.</p> <p>The above measure:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Includes only maltreatments where the parents or caregivers who were included as a subject in the original report, or were named in the original report that was the cause of the dependency drug court participation, are also caregivers in the subsequent report. 2) Includes only those intact homes, where the child remained with, or was returned to, the parent involved in drug court. 3) Excludes reports occurring in out-of-home care so as not to count if the child was maltreated after being removed from the parent and in placement. 	Social Services Data/Child Welfare
Sobriety -- % Positive Drug Tests: Total number of positive test results (drug)	Total # of ALL positive drug test results / Total # of ALL drug tests administered	DDC Participant Data, Social Services Data/Child Welfare or Treatment Provider Data
Sobriety -- % of longest continuous	Median of the longest continuous number of days of sobriety for all DDC participants	DDC Participant Data & Treatment Provider Data

Appendix A: National Center for State Courts Performance Measures

PERFORMANCE MEASURE	DATA DEFINITION	POTENTIAL DATA SOURCES
NRAC RECOMMENDED MEASURES		
Time in Program	Median length of time in DDC (counted in months)	Court System, DDC Participant Data
Post Exit Recidivism	Number of graduates (DDC completers) that have re-entered child welfare (with new or old case) within 12 months of completing/graduating program divided by all DDC graduating/completing program	Social Services Data/Child Welfare or Treatment Provider Data
ACCOUNTABILITY		
Number of Sanctions Imposed	Sanctions should be categorized by type and counted	DDC Participant Data
SOCIAL FUNCTIONING		
Change in Educational Status	Educational attainment of DDC participants at program entry compared to educational attainment at the end of DDC divided by total number of DDC participants	DDC Participant Data, Social Service Data/Child Welfare or Treatment Data
Treatment Completion Rate	Number of DDC participants that completed treatment by the end of the program divided by all DDC participants	DDC Participant Data, Treatment Provider Data
% Pursuing Post Secondary Education	Number of DDC participants who are pursuing post secondary education while in DDC divided by total number of DDC participants	DDC Participant Data, Social Service Data/Child Welfare or Treatment Provider Data
% Completing or Actively Pursuing Education or Vocational Training	The percentage of DDC participants that are enrolled in vocational training or pursued education while in the program, calculated as the number of DDC participants enrolled in vocational training or pursuing education while in the program, divided by total number of DDC participants	DDC Participant Data

Appendix A: National Center for State Courts Performance Measures

PERFORMANCE MEASURE	DATA DEFINITION	POTENTIAL DATA SOURCES
Change in Vocational Status	Count of the number of DDC participants that went from unemployed to employed while in DDC	DDC Participant Data, Social Service Data/ Child Welfare or Treatment Provider Data
Days Employed While Participating	Median number of days employed while DDC participant was in program for all DDC participants	DDC Participant Data, Social Service Data/ Child Welfare or Treatment Provider Data
Employment Status Two Years After Exit	Status of Employment two years after leaving the program	Unknown
Change in Housing Status	Number of DDC participants that went from having no stable, permanent housing to stable and permanent housing while in DDC divided by total number of DDC participants	DDC Participant Data, Social Service Data/ Child Welfare or Treatment Provider Data
Change in Living Situation	Number of DDC participants that went from being homeless, "on the streets" to no longer being homeless or "being on the street" while in DDC divided by total number of DDC participants	DDC Participant Data, Social Service Data/ Child Welfare or Treatment Provider Data
Births of Drug-Free Babies	Number of births by DDC participants where the child is born drug-free/unexposed divided by total number of births to DDC mothers	DDC Participant Data, Social Service Data/ Child Welfare or Treatment Provider Data
PROCESSING & TIMELINESS		
% Referrals Admitted	Number of participants accepted in program/Number of referrals made	DDC Participant Data
Timeliness: Days between referral & eligibility assessment	Median time from date that referral was made to date that eligibility assessment was completed	DDC Participant Data
Timeliness: Days between eligibility assessment & staffing	Median time from date that eligibility assessment was completed and date of first staffing	DDC Participant Data
Timeliness: Days between staffing & first court appearance	Median time from date of first staffing and first DDC court appearance	DDC Participant Data

Appendix A: National Center for State Courts Performance Measures

PERFORMANCE MEASURE	DATA DEFINITION	POTENTIAL DATA SOURCES
Timeliness: Days between eligibility assessment & admission	Median time from date of eligibility assessment and admission date	DDC Participant Data
Timeliness: Days between referral & admission	Median time from referral date and admission date	DDC Participant Data
Timeliness: Days between admission & treatment entry	Median time from admission date and first treatment date	DDC Participant Data
Timeliness: Days between treatment referral & treatment entry	Median time from treatment referral date and first treatment date	DDC Participant Data
Number of Drug Tests Administered	Median number of drug tests administered	DDC Participant Data, Social Service Data/ Child Welfare or Treatment Provider Data
Number of Alcohol Tests Administered	Median number of alcohol tests administered	DDC Participant Data, Social Service Data/ Child Welfare or Treatment Provider Data
% of Positive Alcohol Tests	Number of positive alcohol test results divided by total number of alcohol tests administered	DDC Participant Data, Social Service Data/ Child Welfare or Treatment Provider Data
Number of Sanctions Imposed	Sanctions should be categorized by type and counted	DDC Participant Data

Appendix A: National Center for State Courts Performance Measures

PERFORMANCE MEASURE	DATA DEFINITION	POTENTIAL DATA SOURCES
Number of Incentives Granted	Incentives should be categorized by type and counted	DDC Participant Data
Number of Judicial Status Hearings	Median number of DDC and dependency court hearings for all DDC participants. (Note: Need to differentiate and count DDC and Dependency court hearings)	Court System Data
Graduation Rate	The rate of DDC participants graduating, calculated as [graduates]/exiting which includes graduates and terminated from program	Court System, DDC Participant Data
Number of Program Violations	Program violations should be categorized by type and counted	Court System, DDC Participant Data
Reasons for Termination	Termination reasons should be categorized by type and counted	DDC Participant Data
Time to Permanency	Median time to reunification for all DDC cases that reunified, calculated from latest child welfare filing date to reunification date (counted in months)	Social Services Data/Child Welfare

Appendix B

DEPENDENCY DRUG COURT PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Appendix B: Dependency Drug Court Performance Measures Attempted

Measures Attempted	MEASURES ATTEMPTED BY SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY		MEASURES ATTEMPTED BY ORANGE COUNTY	
	Local Definition/Calculation	Result/Number	Local Definition/Calculation	Result/Number
NRAC CORE MEASURES				
Retention Rate	The total number of DDC graduate's since project inception + Active participants /Total number of admissions to project since inception, calculated as a percentage.	57% (691 / 1217)	The number of DDC participants retained in the court program, calculated as = [Active participants + Program Graduates] / Overall Clients Admitted.	54% (61/114): 114 admissions, 58 graduates, 3 active clients
In Program Recidivism		San Joaquin was unable to capture child welfare data, see alternative measure below	Children re-entered foster care during DDC participation] / [Total Number of Children for All Active Participants with In-home Placements].	Children are reunited after program completion so child would not re-enter foster care during program.
Alternative Measure for In Program Recidivism: Returning Clients	The number of in-program, returning CPS clients defined as "returning or 387 (Supplemental Petition Hearing)" divided by all DDC cases from the entry cohort study period (Admissions from 7/1/05 to 12/31/06).	Returning Clients 87 (14%) If clients' prior episode was within 7/1/05 - 1/1/07): Total number of criminal charges incurred during the project: 22 (3%)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Sobriety --% of Positive Drug Tests	The percentage of positive drug and alcohol tests for all alcohol and drug tests administered during the project. Defined as the number of positive test results for drugs and alcohol divided by total number of drug and alcohol tests administered.	Positive: 341 (8%) Negative: 4074 (92%) Total tests: 4415		Orange County was unable to capture these figures, see alternative measures below
Alternative Measure for Sobriety--% of Positive Drug Tests: Total number of positive test results	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Total number of alcohol and drug test results.	29% of participants (33 of 112) had a positive, diluted alcohol or drug test
Alternative Measure for Sobriety--% of Positive Drug Tests: Number of Relapses	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Total number of relapse (data from HCA).	HCA data shows 73 positive tests of 9,745 (less than a 1% positive test rate)
Sobriety --% Longest Continuous		No data		No data
Units of Service		No data		No data

Appendix B: Dependency Drug Court Performance Measures Attempted

		MEASURES ATTEMPTED BY SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY		MEASURES ATTEMPTED BY ORANGE COUNTY	
Measures Attempted	Local Definition/Calculation	Result/Number	Local Definition/Calculation	Result/Number	Result/Number
NRAC RECOMMENDED MEASURES					
Post Exit Recidivism	The number of DDC graduates that have re-entered with a new or old case within 12 months of completing or graduating from DDC program.	N=540, 15 re-entered and 11 re-entered the program with a new or old case within 12 months of completing.	The number of graduates (DDC completers) that have re-entered child welfare (with new or old case) within 12 months of completing/ graduating DDC program & The number of terminates (DDC non-compliant individuals) that have re-entered child welfare (with new or old case) within 12 months of program termination.	Graduates: 3 of 149 re-entered foster care (2%) Terminates: 13 of 84 (15.5%) Overall rate of Foster Care re-entry is 9.4% (22 of 233)	
Time in Program	The length of time in program (months and days).	11 months and 26 days or (339 Days or 48 weeks)	The length of time in DDC program (by months) by type of exit (graduates and unsuccessful terminations).	For all exit statuses. The average length of program 8.5 months or 259 days. 12.7 months (386 days) for Graduates 4.8 months (145 days) for Unsuccessful terminations	
ACCOUNTABILITY					
Number of Sanctions Imposed	Sanctions imposed.	No data	Sanctions imposed.	Average of 3.6 sanctions imposed for all exit statuses. Graduates average 3.2 sanctions, while unsuccessful terminates average 4.1 sanctions	
SOCIAL FUNCTIONING					
Change in Educational Status		Unable to capture, see alternative measure below	Educational status at program entry: Change not available and not a DDC requirement (unlike adult drug court).	Unable to capture, see alternative measure below	
Alternative Measure for Change in Educational Status: Educational Status at Program Entry	The percentage of DDC Participants who entered program with GED or HS diploma.	23% Participants entered with GED or HS Diploma (148) 1% participants entered program with a college degree (6)	Educational status at DDC program entry.	No Diploma/GED= 39% H.S. Diploma or GED=31% Some College=27% College Degree=4%	

Appendix B: Dependency Drug Court Performance Measures Attempted

Measures Attempted	MEASURES ATTEMPTED BY SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY		MEASURES ATTEMPTED BY ORANGE COUNTY	
	Local Definition/Calculation	Result/Number	Local Definition/Calculation	Result/Number
Treatment Completion Rate	The percentage of DDC participants that completed treatment by the end of the program.	Outpatient: 26% Residential: 40%	Number of DDC participants that completed treatment.	Same as graduation rate: treatment is required for graduation rate
% Pursuing Post Secondary Education	The percentage of DDC participants pursuing POST secondary education.	4% of participants attended Community College while in program (28 participants) 2% of Participants were enrolled in school while in the program (undefined , 10 Participants)	The percentage of DDC participants pursuing POST secondary education.	Less than 1% (1 of 114) enrolled in college during program participation.
% Completing or Actively Pursuing Education or Vocational Training	The percentage of DDC participants that are enrolled in vocational training.	2% of participants were enrolled in vocational training while in the program (13 Participants) 0% of participants were enrolled in G.E.D. classes while in the program (3 Participants)	The percentage of DDC participants that are enrolled in education or vocational training.	Overall, 4.3% (5 of 114) pursued education or vocational training. 2% (2 of 114) pursued education 3% (3 of 114) enrolled in vocational training
Change in Vocational Status	The frequency of the DDC participants that went from unemployed to employed while in program.	169 Participants obtained employment while in the program (26%) 16 Participants were employed at Intake (2%)	Count of the number of DDC participants that went from unemployed to employed while in DDC.	Court Statistics: 29 of 112 (26%) got a job while in the DDC program. SSA Statistics: 78 participants were unemployed at entry & 43 of these participants obtained Full Time or Part Time job status while in the program. SSA Statistics: 32 of 41 Graduates (78%) obtained a job while 11 of 37 (30%) Terminates obtained a job.
Days Employed While Participating		No data		No data

Appendix B: Dependency Drug Court Performance Measures Attempted

Measures Attempted	MEASURES ATTEMPTED BY SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY		MEASURES ATTEMPTED BY ORANGE COUNTY	
	Local Definition/Calculation	Result/Number	Local Definition/Calculation	Result/Number
Employment Status Two Years After Exit		San Joaquin does not capture post-exit data		Orange County does not capture post-exit data
Change in Housing Status	The number of DDC participants that eventually obtained safe housing while in program.	124 of 646 (19%) obtained safe housing while in the program.	The count of the number of DDC participants, that went from having no stable, permanent housing to stable and permanent housing while in the DDC program.	<p>Court Statistics: 11 of 112 (10%) obtained stable housing</p> <p>SSA Statistics: 17 of 45 (38%) DDC participants who did not have stable housing at program entry, obtained stable housing at the time of their exit.</p> <p>SSA Statistics: 14 of 20 Graduates (70%) who had no stable housing at program entry obtained stable housing by program completion while only 3 of 25 Terminates (12%) did so.</p>
Change in Living Situation		No data	The count of the number of DDC participants that went from being homeless, "on the streets" to no longer being homeless or "being on the street" while in the DDC program.	<p>Court Statistics: 11 of 114 (10%) obtained stable housing during the program participation.</p> <p>HCA Statistics: There were no participants recorded as homeless at program entry.</p>
Births of Drug-Free Babies	The number of births by DDC participants where the child is drug-free.	30 out of 31 babies were born drug free	The number of births by DDC participants where the child is drug-free.	No data
Alternative Measure to Births of Drug-Free Babies: Number of substance exposed children at program entry	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	The number of births by DDC participants where the child is drug-free & Number of substance exposed children at program entry refers to the number of children born substance exposed (assessed when DDC participant enters program).	1 baby born during program (Mother had positive tests while pregnant)

Appendix B: Dependency Drug Court Performance Measures Attempted

		MEASURES ATTEMPTED BY SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY		MEASURES ATTEMPTED BY ORANGE COUNTY	
Measures Attempted	Local Definition/Calculation	Result/Number	Local Definition/Calculation	Result/Number	
Child Custody Status	The number of Children that are returned to DDC parents.	223 Dependents were reunified with their families	No data	No data	
PROCESSING & TIMELINESS					
% Referrals Admitted	The percentage of DDC participants accepted in program / Number of referrals made to the DDC program.	100%	The number of participants accepted in DDC program / The number of DDC referrals made.	33% acceptance rate (112 admitted of 339 referrals)	In 2009 collaborative court report indicated 94 assessments occurred in 2009, with 37 admitted. This amounts to a 39% acceptance rate.
Timeliness: Days between referral & eligibility assessment	The number of days from first time case on calendar (after referred by judge & not from initiation of evaluation) to intake of DDC program.	Average number of days is 4. Range: 0 - 5 days (100%)	The referral and eligibility assessment occur on the same day.	Not Applicable	
Timeliness: Days between eligibility assessment & staffing	Time from "on calendar for evaluation" to date of official admission to program.	Average number of days is 4. Range: 0 - 5 days (100%)	No data	No data	
Timeliness: Days between eligibility assessment & admission	No data	No data	Orange County developed an alternative measure (see below).		
Alternative Measure for Timeliness-- Days between eligibility assessment & admission Timeliness: Days between evaluation and admission	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	The Time from "on calendar for evaluation" to date of official admission to program.	Average number of days is 12.2 Range from six days to 54 days	
Timeliness: Days between referral & admission	The number of days between treatment referral to DDC treatment admission.	Average number of days is 4. Range: 0 - 5 days (100%)	No data	No data	

Appendix B: Dependency Drug Court Performance Measures Attempted

Measures Attempted	MEASURES ATTEMPTED BY SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY		MEASURES ATTEMPTED BY ORANGE COUNTY	
	Local Definition/Calculation	Result/Number	Local Definition/Calculation	Result/Number
Timeliness: Days between admission & treatment Entry	The number of days it takes DDC participants to enter into the program after admission.	Average number of days is 4. Range: 0 - 5 days (100%)	No data	
Timeliness: Days between treatment referral & treatment entry	The number of days between DDC treatment referral to DDC treatment intake.	Average number of days is 4. Range: 0 - 5 days (100%)	Orange County does not collect this because it's a very short time span.	
Timeliness--Days Between Admission to Graduation	No data	No data	The time from "official date of admission" to formal completion of the court .	Average = 298 days + 88 days of aftercare Total days = 386 days Program range from 231 to 441 Days. Aftercare ranges from 21 to 133 days. Total program days range to 294 to 539 Days
Time to Permanency	San Joaquin County developed an alternative measure- see below.	No data	Orange County calculated this using an entry and exit cohort and by exit type- see below.	
Alternative Measure for Time to Permanency: Permanency Rate	The percentage of DDC reunified cases during DDC participation (total # of cases that reunified / total number of cases).	12% of Participants (148 out of 1217) It was estimated that 50% of reunification occur post exit, while 50% occur during program participation.	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternative Measure for Time to Permanency: Median Time to Reunification Using Entry Cohort	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	The median time to reunification (from initial CW filing to reunification) for all DDC cases, that reunified (grouped by those who graduated the DDC program and those who failed DDC program).	Entry Cohort (Admission: 7/1/05-12/31/07) Median time to reunification was 303 days when at least one parent graduated from DDC and 433 days when parents terminated from DDC.

Appendix B: Dependency Drug Court Performance Measures Attempted

Measures Attempted	MEASURES ATTEMPTED BY SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY		MEASURES ATTEMPTED BY ORANGE COUNTY	
	Local Definition/Calculation	Result/Number	Local Definition/Calculation	Result/Number
Alternative Measure for Time to Permanency: Median Time to Reunification Using Exit Cohort	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	The median time to reunification (from initial CW filing to reunification) for all DDC cases that reunified (grouped by those who graduated DDC and those who failed DDC).	Exit Cohort (Exits between 1/1/07-6/30/09) Median time to reunification was 338 days when at least one parent graduated from DDC and 561 days when parents terminated from DDC.
Number of Drug Tests Administered	The number of drug and alcohol tests administered to DDC participants.	4415 drug and alcohol tests were administered	The number of drug and alcohol tests administered to DDC participants.	HCA Statistics: 9,745 total tests (alcohol and drug combined)
Time Between Precipitating Event and Sanction			Count of sanctions by exit types.	Average of 3.6 sanctions imposed for all exit statuses Graduates avg. 3.2 sanctions, unsuccessful terms. Average 4.1 sanctions
Number of Incentives Granted	Incentives granted.	216 participants (31%) received incentives on 264 occasions.	Incentives granted.	Average of 10.8 incentives granted for all exit statuses. Graduates average 13.6 incentives. Unsuccessful terminates average 7.6 incentives
Number of Judicial Status Hearings	Judicial status hearings.	Average of 8 hearing for all exit statuses. Graduates average 7 hearing while in program.	Judicial status hearings.	Average of 19 status hearings for all exit statuses. Graduates average 23 hearings, plus an additional 3 aftercare hearings. Total is 26 hearings.

Appendix B: Dependency Drug Court Performance Measures Attempted

Measures Attempted	MEASURES ATTEMPTED BY SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY		MEASURES ATTEMPTED BY ORANGE COUNTY	
	Local Definition/Calculation	Result/Number	Local Definition/Calculation	Result/Number
Number of Program Violations	No data	No data	Count of program violations (non-compliance) by exit type.	Average of 3 DDC program violations for all exit statuses (2.9). Graduates average 2.5 program violations while unsuccessful terminates average 3.3 program violations.
Graduation Rate	The number of DDC participants graduated, Program Graduates / Exiting number of DDC clients (includes graduates and terminated).	61% (305 graduates of 500 exits)	The rate of DDC participants graduating, calculated as = [graduates]/exiting, includes graduates and terminated.	52% (58 graduates /111 exits)
Reasons for Termination	Termination reasons.	Transfer: 3 (5%) Deceased: 0 (%) Voluntary Withdrawal: 3 (5%) Unsuccessful Discharge: 189 (29%)	Termination reasons.	Non-compliance: 38% Withdrew: 19% Dishonesty: 13% Unfit/need more services:6% Arrests: 6% Refuse Residential Tx: 6% Violate custody order: 4% FTA: 2% & Other /Unknown: 7%

Appendix C

AOC DEPENDENCY DRUG COURT
PERFORMANCE MEASURES
(Core, Recommended, When Possible/Relevant)

Appendix C: AOC Dependency Drug Court Performance Measures (Core, Recommended, When Possible/Relevant)

PERFORMANCE MEASURE	DATA DEFINITION	DATA ELEMENTS	NOTES
AOC CORE MEASURES			
Retention Rate	Number of participants retained in the court program, calculated as = [Active + Graduates] / Overall Admitted	Number of participants currently enrolled in program, number of participants that have graduated from the program & total number of participants ever admitted	This variable requires a pre-defined study period for interpretation and to create parameters for each variable. For example, retention rate in 2007 was 65% compared to the retention rate of 2008 which was 68%.
In Program Recidivism/ Child Re-entry Rate	Recidivism is defined as the percent of cases with children and parents or primary caregivers with in-home reports with documented findings of “substantiated” or “some indicators” of at least one maltreatment with a type of abuse, neglect, or threatened harm AND a report received date (or incident date) through the Department of Children and Families for drug court participants while in the program.	Number of active DDC parents with a "substantiation" or "allegation" of abuse, Number of active DDC parents	This measure should: 1) Only Include maltreatments where the parents or caregivers who were included as a subject in the original report, or were named in the original report that was the cause of the dependency drug court participation, are also caregivers in the subsequent report. 2) Include only those intact homes, where the child remained with, or was returned to, the parent involved in drug court. 3) Excludes reports occurring in out-of-home care so as not to count if the child was maltreated after being removed from the parent and in placement.

Appendix C: AOC Dependency Drug Court Performance Measures (Core, Recommended, When Possible/Relevant)

PERFORMANCE MEASURE	DATA DEFINITION	DATA ELEMENTS	NOTES
Sobriety -- % Positive Drug Tests: Total number of positive drug test results	Total # of ALL positive drug test results / Total # of ALL drug tests administered.	Total number of positive drug test results, Total number of drug tests administered	An alternative recommended method of reviewing these data is to separate the number of tests and their corresponding result by participant phase. This would create drug test results by phases.
Sobriety -- % Positive Alcohol Tests: Total number of positive alcohol test results	Total # of ALL positive alcohol test results / Total # of ALL alcohol tests administered.	Total number of positive alcohol test results, Total number of alcohol tests administered	An alternative recommended method of reviewing these data is to separate the number of tests and their corresponding result by participant phase. This would create alcohol test results by phases.
% Referrals Admitted	Number of participants accepted in program/Number of referrals made	Number of participants accepted in program, Number of referrals made	
Timeliness: Days between eligibility assessment & admission	Median time from date of eligibility assessment and admission date	Date of eligibility assessment, Admission Date	
Timeliness: Days between referral & admission	Median time from referral date and admission date	Referral Date, Admission Date	

Appendix C: AOC Dependency Drug Court Performance Measures (Core, Recommended, When Possible/Relevant)

PERFORMANCE MEASURE	DATA DEFINITION	DATA ELEMENTS	NOTES
Timeliness: Days between admission & treatment entry	Median time from admission date and first treatment date	Admission Date, First Treatment Date	
Number of Judicial Status Hearings	Median number of DDC and dependency court hearings for all DDC participants	Dependency Court Hearing Dates, Dependency Drug Court Review & Hearing Dates	Need to differentiate between dependency drug court and dependency court hearings and count
Graduation Rate	The rate of DDC participants graduating, calculated as [graduates]/exiting which includes graduates and terminated from program	Number of graduating DDC participants, Number of DDC participants exiting unsuccessfully (terminated)	Rate can be calculated for any time specific period
Reasons for Termination	Termination reasons should be categorized by type and counted	DDC Termination Reasons	
Time to Permanency	Median time to reunification for all DDC cases that reunified, calculated from latest child welfare filing date to reunification date (counted in months)	Initial or most recent child welfare filing date, Reunification date	

Appendix C: AOC Dependency Drug Court Performance Measures (Core, Recommended, When Possible/Relevant)

PERFORMANCE MEASURE	DATA DEFINITION	DATA ELEMENTS	NOTES
AOC RECOMMENDED MEASURES			
Time in Program	Median length of time in DDC (counted in months)	Length of time in DDC for all participants	An alternative recommended method of reviewing these data is to separate these figures between those that successfully completed DDC (graduates) compared to those with unsuccessful exits (terminations).
Post Exit Recidivism Rate	Number of graduates (DDC completers) that have re-entered child welfare (with new or old case) within 12 or 18 months of completing/graduating program divided by all DDC graduating/completing program	Number of DDC parents who graduated and have a "substantiation" or "allegation" of abuse within 12 months of leaving the program, Number of DDC graduating/Completing program	An alternative recommended method of reviewing these data is to separate these figures between those that successfully completed DDC (graduates) compared to those with unsuccessful exits (terminations).
Number of Sanctions Imposed	Sanctions should be categorized by type and counted	Sanctions	An alternative recommended method of reviewing these data is to separate these figures between those that successfully completed DDC (graduates) compared to those with unsuccessful exits (terminations).
Change in Vocational Status	Count of the number of DDC participants that went from unemployed to employed while in DDC	Vocational Status at Program Entry, Vocational Status at Program Exit	

Appendix C: AOC Dependency Drug Court Performance Measures (Core, Recommended, When Possible/Relevant)

PERFORMANCE MEASURE	DATA DEFINITION	DATA ELEMENTS	NOTES
Treatment Completion Rate	Number of DDC participants that completed treatment by the end of the program divided by all DDC participants	Number of DDC participants that completed treatment, Number of all DDC participants	An alternative recommended method of reviewing these data is to separate these figures between those that successfully completed DDC (graduates) compared to those with unsuccessful exits (terminations).
% Completing or Actively Pursuing Education or Vocational Training	The percentage of DDC participants that are enrolled in vocational training or pursued education while in the program, calculated as the number of DDC participants enrolled in vocational training or pursuing education while in the program, divided by total number of DDC participants	Number of DDC participants enrolled in vocational training or pursuing education while in the program, Total number of DDC participants	
Number of Program Violations	Program violations should be categorized by type and counted	DDC Program Violations	An alternative recommended method of reviewing these data is to separate these figures between those that successfully completed DDC (graduates) compared to those with unsuccessful exits (terminations).

Appendix C: AOC Dependency Drug Court Performance Measures (Core, Recommended, When Possible/Relevant)

PERFORMANCE MEASURE	DATA DEFINITION	DATA ELEMENTS	NOTES
AOC "WHEN POSSIBLE/APPROPRIATE" MEASURES			
Sobriety --% Longest Continuous	Median time of the longest continuous number of days of sobriety for all DDC participants.	Number of continuous sober days by participant	
Change in Educational Status	Educational attainment of DDC participants at program entry compared to educational attainment at the end of DDC divided by total number of DDC participants	DDC participant educational status at program entry, DDC participant educational status at program completion, Total Number of DDC participants	
Percent Pursuing Post Secondary Education	Number of DDC participants who are pursuing post secondary education while in DDC divided by total number of DDC participants	Number of DDC participants pursuing post secondary education, Total number of DDC participants	
Days employed While Participating	Median number of days employed while DDC participant was in program for all DDC participants	Number of days employed while in program	

Appendix C: AOC Dependency Drug Court Performance Measures (Core, Recommended, When Possible/Relevant)

PERFORMANCE MEASURE	DATA DEFINITION	DATA ELEMENTS	NOTES
Employment Status Two Years After Exit	Status of Employment two years after leaving the program	Employment status two years after exiting program	
Change in Housing Status	Number of DDC participants that went from having no stable, permanent housing to stable and permanent housing while in DDC divided by total number of DDC participants	Housing status at program entry, Housing status at program exit, Total number of DDC participants	
Change in Living Situation	Number of DDC participants that went from being homeless, "on the streets" to no longer being homeless or "being on the street" while in DDC divided by total number of DDC participants	Living situation at program entry, Living situation at program exit, Total number of DDC participants	
Percent of Births of Drug-Free Babies	Number of births by DDC participants where the child is born drug-free/unexposed divided by total number of births to DDC mothers	Number of drug-free/unexposed births, Total number of births to DDC mothers	
Timeliness: Days between referral & eligibility assessment	Median time from date that referral was made to date that eligibility assessment was completed	Referral Date, Eligibility assessment date	

Appendix C: AOC Dependency Drug Court Performance Measures (Core, Recommended, When Possible/Relevant)

PERFORMANCE MEASURE	DATA DEFINITION	DATA ELEMENTS	NOTES
<p>Timeliness: Days between eligibility assessment & staffing</p>	<p>Median time from date that eligibility assessment was completed and date of first staffing</p>	<p>Eligibility assessment date, First Staffing Date</p>	
<p>Timeliness: Days between staffing & first court appearance</p>	<p>Median time from date of first staffing and first DDC court appearance</p>	<p>Date of first staffing, Date of first DDC court appearance</p>	
<p>Timeliness: Days between treatment referral & treatment entry</p>	<p>Median time from treatment referral date and first treatment date</p>	<p>Treatment referral date, First treatment date</p>	
<p>Number of Incentives Granted</p>	<p>Incentives should be categorized by type and counted.</p>	<p>Incentives</p>	<p>An alternative recommended method of reviewing these data is to separate these figures between those that successfully completed DDC (graduates) compared to those with unsuccessful exits (terminations).</p>

Appendix D

SOURCES

Sources

Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA). (2004). *Family Dependency Treatment Courts: Addressing Child Abuse and Neglect Cases Using the Drug Court Model*. U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs.

Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) Drug Court Clearinghouse. (2007). *Frequently Asked Questions Fact Sheet Series: Juvenile Drug Court Performance Measures*. Justice Programs Office, School of Public Affairs. American University, Washington, D.C.

Child Welfare Dynamic Report System. (2009). *California data (Q4 09 Data Extract)*. A collaboration of the California Department of Social Services and the University of California, Berkeley. From: http://cssr.berkeley.edu/ucb_childwelfare/>

Child Welfare Dynamic Report System. (2009). *California data. 2007–2009*. A collaboration of the California Department of Social Services and the University of California, Berkeley. From: http://cssr.berkeley.edu/ucb_childwelfare/Ccfsr.aspx

Harrell, A., Goodman, A. (1999). *Review of Specialized Family Drug Courts: Key Issues Handling Child Abuse and Neglect Cases*. The Urban Institute.

Monchick, R., Scheyett, A., Pfeifer, J. (2006). *Drug Court Case Management: Role, Function, and Utility*. Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA), National Drug Court Institute.

National Center for State Courts. (2005). *CourTools. Giving Courts the Tools to Measure Success. Trial Court Performance Measures*. Available at: www.courtools.org

National Center for State Courts and the Advisory Committee for the Drug Court Treatment Act of 2003. *Performance Measures for Tennessee Drug Courts*. Legislation: Section 16-22-102 (b).

Rubio, J.D., D.M., Cheesman, Ph.D., F., and Federspiel J.D., W. (2008). *Performance Measurement of Drug Courts: The State of the Art*. National Center for State Courts. Statewide Technical Assistance Bulletin, Volume 6.

Scott, J. Conversations. (2010). *Personal Communication*, July 22.

Shapiro, P. and L. Fenton. (2010). Conversations. *Personal Communication*, August 11.

- Superior Court of California, County of Orange. (2005). *Annual Report*, p. 100–101.
Available at: <http://www.occourts.org/directory/collaborative-courts>
- Superior Court of California, County of Orange. (2009). *Annual Report*, p. 27.
Available at: <http://www.occourts.org/directory/collaborative-courts/>
- Superior Court of California, County of San Joaquin. (2010). *Collaborative Courts Dependency Drug Court Parental Recovery Options Plan*. Pamphlet.
- The National Association of Drug Court Professionals, Drug Court Standards Committee. (Reprint: 2004. Original: 1997). *Defining Drug Courts: The Key Components*.
- United States Census Bureau. Department of Commerce. (2008). *Import Data for California*. Quickfacts, People Quickfacts. August 17, 2008. Accessible at:
<http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/06000.html>.
- United States Census Bureau. Department of Commerce. (2008). *Import Data for Orange County*. Quickfacts, People Quickfacts. August 17, 2008. Accessible at:
<http://quickfacts.census.gov/cgi-bin/qfd/extract-xls?06059>
- United States Census Bureau. Department of Commerce. (2008). *Important Data for San Joaquin County*. Quickfacts, People Quickfacts. August 17, 2008. Accessible at:
<http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/06/06077.html>
- United States Census Bureau. Department of Commerce. Small Area Estimates. (2008). *Important Data for California, Orange County, San Joaquin County*. August 17, 2008. Accessible at: <http://www.census.gov/did/www/saipe/downloads/estmod07/est07ALL.xls>
- Worcel, S. D., Green, B. L., Furrer, C. J., Burrus, S. W. M., Finigan, M. W. (March 2007). *Family Treatment Drug Court Evaluation: Final Report*. NPC Research: Portland, OR. Accessible at: http://www.npcresearch.com/publications_drug_treatment_courts.php
- Wyoming Department of Health. The Court Consulting Division & Research Division of the National Center for State Courts. (2007). *Wyoming Drug Court Performance Measures Project*.