



National Institute of Justice

Research Preview

Jeremy Travis, Director

August 1998

Drug Courts and the Role of Graduated Sanctions

Summary of a Presentation by Adele Harrell, The Urban Institute

The movement toward specialized drug courts began in the late 1980s in response to rising rates of drug-related court cases and to the inability of traditional law enforcement and justice policies to reduce the supply of and demand for illegal drugs. Since the first drug court was created in Miami, Florida, in 1989, these courts have focused on providing, through the court system, treatment to drug-involved criminal justice populations, with judges having primary authority over case handling. Evaluations of the Miami program and others have shown promising results—Miami experienced a 33-percent reduction in rearrests for drug court graduates compared with non-drug-court offenders.

Beginning in 1994, The Urban Institute has been evaluating a drug court within the Superior Court of the District of Columbia. Preliminary results of this NIJ-sponsored study reveal useful information about the effectiveness of such programs and provide guidelines for drug court design and operations.

Demonstration program for pretrial intervention

In 1993, the Superior Court of the District of Columbia received a grant from the Center for Substance Abuse Treatment to develop a pretrial intervention program aimed at drug-involved felony defendants with the goal of reducing drug use and criminal activity. The data presented in this Research Preview are based on the drug court's operations from September 1994 through January 1996. Three characteristics of the District of Columbia drug court distinguished it from others:

- The programs reached offenders at the pretrial stage rather than at adjudication.
- The programs primarily served felony defendants—two-thirds of whom had prior criminal convictions—instead of first-time and misdemeanor offenders.
- The superior court already had in place a highly automated and sophisticated drug testing system; a laboratory in the courthouse could provide results to judges 30 minutes after testing.

Key operational features of the drug court included early intervention, judicial involvement in defendants' progress, frequent drug testing, and immediate access to drug test results.

The program's interventions were based on three felony dockets, already set up to expedite drug cases, to which defendants were randomly assigned. The first involved an intensive day treatment program. The second used graduated sanctions coupled with drug testing and judicial monitoring. The third docket—involving regular drug testing and judicial monitoring—served as the control.

Defendants became eligible for intervention by failing while on pretrial release two of the twice-weekly drug tests required of those who tested positive for drugs at arrest. A failed test could mean that the defendant tested positive, missed a test, or tampered with the sample.

Day treatment docket. Of the 346 defendants on the treatment docket, 140 joined the program. They were enrolled in a 6-month program consisting of six stages, each of which was to last 1 month: orientation, stabilization, cognitive structuring, new concepts development, instructive action, and community leadership. Participants met in

the courthouse from 9 a.m. to 3 p.m. every weekday and were tested for drugs daily.

Researchers found that completion of the program took much longer than anticipated: Cases were open an average of 11 months as opposed to the 6 months estimated. The average cost per participant was \$4,500 more than the costs of court processing and pretrial supervision for control docket defendants. Treatment docket costs included funding for program operations, additional hearings held (treatment participants required more than twice as many hearings as those on the standard docket), warrants, staff, and additional services to which defendants were referred.

Sanctions docket. The sanctions program used the twice-weekly drug tests as its basis. Of the 365 defendants on the sanctions docket, 240 joined the program. Upon entering the program, participants signed a contract stating that the first time they failed a test they would spend 3 days in the jury box observing court proceedings, and after the second failed test, 3 days in jail. After the third failure, they would be sent to a detoxification program, with the fourth resulting in 7 days in jail. Each failed test while the participant was involved in the program was to receive a sanction, no matter how much time had passed between failures.

Sanctions cases were open an average of 8 months—1 month longer than the control docket; average costs were \$2,000 more than for the control docket. About 72 percent of sanctions defendants failed once and spent 3 days in the jury box, 50 percent received 3 days in jail, 34 percent were placed in a detoxification program, and 22 percent received 7 days in jail. At the end of the process, 95 percent of defendants who were drug free during the month before sentencing received probation compared with 55 percent of those who continued their drug use.

Control docket. The 311 defendants on the control docket received twice-weekly drug tests, but had no compliance hearings, case management, or special treatment efforts. Judges on the standard docket used drug-use status as a sentencing factor, but not to the same extent as those on the sanctions docket. Eighty-eight percent of defendants on the control docket who stayed drug free received probation compared with 63 percent of those still using drugs at sentencing.

Lessons learned

Treatment. Researchers found that participation in the treatment program was poor—only 41 percent of those eligible participated. Participating defendants attended only about one-third of their scheduled sessions. Nineteen percent graduated. Although some left while doing well in the program, most who did not graduate dropped out, failed the program, or left for more intensive treatment programs.

Researchers suggested that using a rigorous assessment procedure and offering a menu of treatment program options might better match treatment to clients' needs. They also felt that a strong incentive could convince defendants to participate. (In the District of Columbia drug court, an increased likelihood of receiving probation helped motivate offenders to become and remain drug free.) Finally, researchers felt treatment quality must be carefully monitored. The District of Columbia program experienced many facility-related problems—dilapidated quarters, flooding, lack of heat, poor air quality—that may have lowered participation rates.

Sanctions vs. control. According to data gathered during the month before defendants were sentenced, defendants on the sanctions docket were more than three times as likely to be found drug free when tested than those on the control docket. Sanctions participants averaged 4.0 failed drug tests compared with the standard docket participants' 5.3, a statistically significant difference.


To measure repeat criminal activity, researchers reviewed official District of Columbia arrest records for 74 percent of the sample for the first year after release from the program. After 100 days from release, 2 percent of sanctions program participants had been rearrested compared with 6 percent of control docket defendants. The rearrest rates were 3 percent and 11 percent, respectively, at day 200 and 11 percent and 17 percent, respectively, at 1 year.

On the basis of their findings, researchers concluded that the sanctions program influenced such indicators of program effectiveness as drug use and rearrest rates and identified several fundamental characteristics of successful sanctions programs: an up-front agreement demonstrating that the defendant understands the rules he or she must abide by, swiftness of sanctions after violating the rules, and certainty that the sanctions will be imposed.

This document is based on Dr. Adele Harrell's presentation to an audience of researchers and criminal justice practitioners as part of NIJ's Research in Progress Seminar Series. The study was sponsored by NIJ (grant number 94-IJ-CX-K011). Dr. Harrell is a principal research associate and program director for The Urban Institute. A 60-minute VHS videotape of the seminar, *Drug Courts and the Role of Graduated Sanctions*, is available for \$19 (\$24 in Canada and other countries). Ask for NCJ 169597. Use the order form on the next page to obtain this videotape and any of the other tapes now available in the series.

Findings and opinions in this document do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

The Latest Criminal Justice Videotape Series from NIJ:



Research in Progress Seminars

Learn about the latest developments in criminal justice research from prominent criminal justice experts.

Each 60-minute tape presents a well-known scholar discussing his or her current studies and how they relate to existing criminal justice research and includes the lecturer's responses to audience questions. In addition to *Drug Courts and the Role of Graduated Sanctions*, reported on in this Research Preview, the other tapes available in VHS format are:

NCJ 152235—Alfred Blumstein, Ph.D., Professor, Carnegie Mellon University: *Youth Violence, Guns, and Illicit Drug Markets*.

NCJ 152236—Peter W. Greenwood, Ph.D., Director, Criminal Justice Research Program, The RAND Corporation: *Three Strikes, You're Out: Benefits and Costs of California's New Mandatory-Sentencing Law*.

NCJ 152237—Christian Pfeiffer, Ph.D., Director, Kriminologisches Forschungsinstitut Niedersachsen: *Sentencing Policy and Crime Rates in Reunified Germany*.

NCJ 152238—Arthur L. Kellermann, M.D., M.P.H., Director, Center for Injury Control, and Associate Professor, Emory University: *Understanding and Preventing Violence: A Public Health Perspective*.

NCJ 152692—James Inciardi, Ph.D., Director, Drug and Alcohol Center, University of Delaware: *A Corrections-Based Continuum of Effective Drug Abuse Treatment*.

NCJ 153271—Marvin Wolfgang, Ph.D., Director, Legal Studies and Criminology, University of Pennsylvania: *Crime in a Birth Cohort: A Replication in the People's Republic of China*.

NCJ 153730—Lawrence W. Sherman, Ph.D., Professor, University of Maryland: *Reducing Gun Violence: Community Policing Against Gun Crime*.

NCJ 153272—Cathy Spatz Widom, Ph.D., Professor, State University of New York-Albany: *The Cycle of Violence Revisited Six Years Later*.

NCJ 153273—Wesley Skogan, Ph.D., Professor, Northwestern University: *Community Policing in Chicago: Fact or Fiction?*

NCJ 153850—Scott H. Decker, Ph.D., Professor, University of Missouri-St. Louis, and Susan Pennell, San Diego Association of Governments: *Monitoring the Illegal Firearms Market*.

NCJ 154277—Terrie Moffitt, Ph.D., Professor, University of Wisconsin: *Partner Violence Among Young Adults*.

NCJ 156923—Orlando Rodriguez, Ph.D., Director, Hispanic Research Center, Fordham University: *The New Immigrant Hispanic Populations: Implications for Crime and Delinquency in the Next Decade*.

NCJ 156924—Robert Sampson, Ph.D., Professor, University of Chicago: *Communities and Crime: A Study in Chicago*.

NCJ 156925—John Monahan, Ph.D., Professor, University of Virginia: *Mental Illness and Violent Crime*.

NCJ 157643—Benjamin E. Saunders, Ph.D., and Dean G. Kilpatrick, Ph.D., Medical University of South Carolina: *Prevalence and Consequences of Child Victimization: Preliminary Results from the National Survey of Adolescents*.

NCJ 159739—Joel H. Garner, Ph.D., Research Director, Joint Centers for Justice Studies: *Use of Force By and Against the Police*.

Additional tapes are listed on the back



To order any of these tapes, please complete and return this form with your payment (\$19, U.S.; \$24, Canada and other countries) to National Criminal Justice Reference Service, P.O. Box 6000, Rockville, MD 20849-6000. Call 800-851-3420, or e-mail askncjrs@ncjrs.org if you have any questions.

Please send me the following tapes:

Qty.	Presenter Name and NCJ Number	Subtotal
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
		Total _____

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ ZIP _____ Daytime phone () _____

____ Payment enclosed (U.S. dollars) ____ Deduct this item from my NCJRS Deposit Account, account no. _____

Charge my: ____ MasterCard ____ VISA Account no. _____

Exp. Date _____ Signature _____

NCJ 159740—Kim English, Research Director, Colorado Division of Criminal Justice: *Managing Adult Sex Offenders in Community Settings: A Containment Approach.*

NCJ 160765—Michael Tonry, Ph.D., Professor, University of Minnesota: *Ethnicity, Crime, and Immigration.*

NCJ 160766—David M. Kennedy, Ph.D., Professor, Harvard University: *Juvenile Gun Violence and Gun Markets in Boston.*

NCJ 161259—Robert Crutchfield, Ph.D., Professor, University of Washington: *Labor Markets, Employment, and Crime.*

NCJ 161836—Geoff Alpert, Ph.D., Professor, University of South Carolina: *Police in Pursuit: Policy and Practice.*

NCJ 163056—Dan Brookoff, M.D., Ph.D., Associate Director, Medical Education, Memphis Methodist Hospital: *Drug Use and Domestic Violence.*

NCJ 163057—Marcia Chaiken, Ph.D., Research Director of LINC, Alexandria, VA: *Youth Afterschool Programs and the Role of Law Enforcement.*

NCJ 163058—Eric Wish, Ph.D., Director, Center for Substance Abuse Research, University of Maryland: *Dependence and Drug Treatment Needs Among Adult Arrestees.*

NCJ 163059—Jeffrey Fagan, Ph.D., Professor, Columbia University: *Adolescent Violence: A View From the Street.*

NCJ 163921—Patricia Tjaden, Ph.D., Senior Researcher, Center for Policy Research: *The Crime of Stalking: How Big Is the Problem?*

NCJ 164262—Andrew Golub, Ph.D., Principal Research Associate, National Development and Research Institutes, Inc.: *Crack's Decline: Some Surprises Across U.S. Cities.*

NCJ 164725—Ronald Huff, Ph.D., Professor, Ohio State University: *Criminal Behavior of Gang Members and At-Risk Youths.*

NCJ 164726—James Austin, Ph.D., Executive Vice-President: National Council on Crime & Delinquency: *Sentencing Guidelines: A State Perspective.*

NCJ 165585—Garen Wintemute, M.D., Director, Violence Prevention Research Program, University of California–Davis: *Predicting Criminal Behavior Among Authorized Purchasers of Handguns.*

NCJ 167027—Lorraine Green Mazerolle, Ph.D., Director, Center for Criminal Justice Research, University of Cincinnati: *Using Gunshot Detection Technology in High-Crime Areas.*

NCJ 167028—Stephen Mastrofski, Ph.D.; Roger B. Parks, Ph.D.; Albert J. Reiss, Jr., Ph.D.; Robert E. Worden, Ph.D.: *Community Policing in Action: Lessons From an Observational Study.*

NCJ 167882—Dennis Kenney, Ph.D., Research Director, Police Executive Research Forum: *Crime in the Schools: A Problem-Solving Approach.*

NCJ 168626—Pamela Lattimore, Ph.D.; Kevin Jack Riley, Ph.D., National Institute of Justice: *Homicide in Eight Cities: Trends, Contexts, and Responses.*

NCJ 170033—David Altschuler, Ph.D., Johns Hopkins University: *Reintegrating Juvenile Offenders Into the Community: OJJDP's Intensive Community-Based Aftercare Demonstration Program.*

NCJ 170603—Felton Earls, M.D., Harvard School of Public Health: *Linking Community Factors and Individual Development: Progress in the Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods.*

NCJ 171156—Todd Clear, Ph.D., and Dina Rose, Ph.D., Florida State University: *When Neighbors Go to Jail: Impact on Attitudes About Formal and Informal Social Control.*

U.S. Department of Justice

Office of Justice Programs

National Institute of Justice

Washington, DC 20531

Official Business

Penalty for Private Use \$300

BULK RATE U.S. POSTAGE PAID DOJ/NIJ Permit No. G-91
--