

Juvenile Drug Treatment Court



David M. Ledgerwood, PhD^{a,*}, Phillippe B. Cunningham, PhD^b

KEYWORDS

- Juvenile drug treatment court • Adolescent • Substance use • Cannabis
- Caregivers • Parents • Therapeutic jurisprudence

KEY POINTS

- Juvenile Drug Treatment Courts (JDTCs) were established in the 1990s to reduce the cycle of crime, drug use, and delinquency among youthful offenders.
- JDTCs are made up of multidisciplinary teams, including a judge, district attorneys, public defenders, juvenile probation officers, and drug treatment providers who collaborate to address the unique needs of each participant, guided by the principle of therapeutic jurisprudence.
- The effectiveness of JDTCs has been mixed. Several efforts have been made to improve their effectiveness through further development of the most efficacious components, development of adjunctive treatments designed to improve outcomes, utilization of community resources, and encouragement of family participation.

INTRODUCTION

Substance-abusing and delinquent adolescents involved in the juvenile justice system represent a large and underserved population that is at high risk for significant deleterious outcomes and long-term costs for themselves, their families, their community, and society. Furthermore, without effective interventions, substance-abusing and delinquent adolescents are likely to continue to abuse substances and maintain their criminal activity well into adulthood.^{1–3} The costs of substance abuse and crime to society (eg, criminal justice expenditures, fear of crime, pain, and suffering) are staggering, with annual estimates ranging from \$820 billion⁴ to \$3.4 trillion.⁵ This article describes Juvenile Drug Treatment Courts (JDTCs), their theoretic underpinnings, common elements and goals, and research-based and practice-informed federal guidelines. The remainder of the article describes how JDTCs operate and summarizes the latest outcome research on their effectiveness.

^a Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Neurosciences, Wayne State University, Suite 2A, 3901 Chrysler Drive, Detroit, MI, 48201 USA; ^b Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Division of Global and Community Health, Family Services Research Center, Medical University of South Carolina, 176 Croghan Spur Road, Suite104, Charleston, SC, 29407 USA

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: dledgerw@med.wayne.edu

Pediatr Clin N Am 66 (2019) 1193–1202

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pcl.2019.08.011>

0031-3955/19/© 2019 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

WHAT ARE JUVENILE DRUG TREATMENT COURTS AND WHAT ARE THEIR COMMON ELEMENTS?

Beginning in the mid-1990s, JDTCs emerged as a promising juvenile justice program model in response to the perceived need to intervene more effectively in reducing the cycle of drug use, crime, and delinquency among youthful offenders. Modeled after the success of adult drug courts in reducing recidivism, a JDTC is a specialized docket within juvenile courts for cases involving youth identified as having problems with alcohol or other drugs severe enough to require treatment. A basic assumption of any JDTC is that youth (and their families) entering court have a complex array of needs that vary considerably from defendant to defendant based on their level of maturation. This assumption is congruent with the theoretic underpinnings of JDTCs, which is the theory of therapeutic jurisprudence (TJ).

TJ asserts that the law and court are social agents for positive therapeutic change.⁶ Judicial goals, and the design, operation, procedures, and court personnel (judges, lawyers, probation staff; who value the psychological well-being of its participants), can positively affect criminologic and psychosocial outcomes.^{7,8} An essential component of JDTCs, derived from the TJ perspective, is a clear focus on developing treatment and rehabilitative services that can address the unique needs of each youth and his or her family.⁷ Consistent with a TJ conceptualization, JDTCs are expected to extend intervention beyond just the youth's substance use and criminal behavior, into his or her mental health (eg, traumatic history, learning disabilities) and that of the family (eg, parental mental health, substance abuse, unemployment, parenting practices, practical needs). That is, from the TJ lens, JDTCs are family focused and expected to play an important role in connecting youth and their families with services needed to address the myriad social and practical factors (eg, poor parenting practices, inadequate housing, limited employment and vocational activities, lack of social support) that contribute directly or indirectly to a youth's substance use and criminal offending.

Although JDTCs may differ across jurisdictions, they all share several common therapeutic elements and goals. At their core, JDTCs provide substance-abusing youth offenders with specialized treatment and rehabilitative services that require effective partnering with a youth's family to address substance use and prevent legal problems.⁸ To establish effective relationships with families requires JDTCs to maintain a creative problem-solving stance built on the principles of collaboration, case management, and a balance between treatment and accountability,⁹ with a clear focus to maximize therapeutic benefits while recognizing and maintaining legal safeguards (due process, community safety).^{10,11} Other common therapeutic elements of JDTCs include immediate intervention and continuous supervision of the youth/family (parent or guardian); treatment and rehabilitative services to address the unique needs of each youth/family; judicial oversight and coordination of services (treatment, education, social services) to promote accountability across systems (youth, family, treatment providers, probation staff, and so forth); and immediate judicial response to youth/family noncompliance with treatment or court requirements.⁷

These common elements have been codified by leading drug treatment court organizations (National Drug Court Institute, a division of the National Association of Drug Court Professionals, and the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges) into 5 goals for JDTC programs. As suggested by these organizations, the goals of any JDTC are to (1) provide immediate intervention and treatment of offenders through ongoing oversight and monitoring by the court; (2) improve an offender's psychosocial functioning across each domain of functional impairments (eg, social, familial,

academic) contributing to their drug use or criminal offending; (3) provide offenders with the necessary skills to lead productive lives free of substances and crime; (4) help strengthen the offender’s family functioning to improve their capacity to provide the necessary structure to effectively monitor and guide their child; and (5) promote accountability by all involved systems (eg, family, school, probation, treatment, and rehabilitative service providers).¹²

JUVENILE DRUG TREATMENT COURT GUIDELINES

Between December 2003 and June 2013, the number of JDTCs increased from 268 to 476 courts. In June 2015, there were an estimated 409 JDCs operating in the United States.¹³ As JDTCs proliferated, mixed evidence of their effectiveness began to emerge in the scientific literature. In the mid-2000s, several reviews and meta-analyses reported only modest effect sizes and slight reductions in recidivism among program participants.^{14–17} In response to these mixed findings and to increase the effectiveness of JDTCs, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), in partnership with the scientific community, conducted a systematic review of the extant literature. The goal was to synthesize the available evidence from JDTCs to identify implementation components associated with the most positive outcomes to create research-based and practice-informed guidelines for JDTCs.¹⁸ This review also included research from the fields of drug treatment, juvenile justice, and effective interventions in child welfare, public health, and education. This effort resulted in OJJDP publishing Juvenile Drug Treatment Court Guidelines (**Table 1**), which can be found at <https://www.ojjdp.gov/Juvenile-Drug-Treatment-Court-Guidelines.html>.

Ultimately, the focus of these guidelines is to ensure improved JDTC outcomes by making sure these courts promote adolescent development, reduce substance use, and reduce delinquency.¹⁹ Concerning healthy adolescent development, implicit in these guidelines is a realization that courts must inculcate a developmental perspective that understands the importance of improving family functioning, personal well-being, healthy family and peer relationships, and educational/vocational functioning.¹⁹

According to the federal eligibility guidelines, JDTCs should only serve those youth who meet eligibility criteria. These eligibility criteria include the following: youth with a substance use disorder based on assessments from validated risk and needs

Table 1	
OJJDP juvenile treatment court guidelines	
Objectives	Guideline
1	Focus the JDTC philosophy and practice on effectively addressing substance use and criminogenic needs to decrease future offending and substance use and to increase positive outcomes
2	Ensure equitable treatment of all youth by adhering to eligibility criteria and conducting an initial screening
3	Provide a JDTC process that engages the full team and follows procedures fairly
4	Conduct comprehensive needs assessments that inform individualized case management
5	Implement contingency management, case management, and community supervision strategies effectively
6	Refer participants to evidence-based substance use treatment, to other services, and for prosocial connections
7	Monitor and track program completion and termination

instruments (eg, urinalysis, global appraisal of individual needs); youth aged 14 to 17.5 years; and youth with moderate to high risk of reoffending (eg, nonviolent, first-time offenders). In most jurisdictions, youth adjudicated for a violent or sexual-oriented offense are ineligible for a JDTC.

HOW DO JUVENILE DRUG TREATMENT COURTS OPERATE?

JDTCs take a multidisciplinary team approach in addressing the unique needs of each participant. A multidisciplinary team of professionals, who take a nonadversarial team approach, coordinate the day-to-day operations of the court and provide a wide range of complementary services germane to healthy child development and public safety. JDTC teams include a judge, court coordinator/supervisor, district or prosecuting attorney, defense attorney or public defender, case manager or probation officer, and a substance abuse treatment provider (roles of each member of the JDTC team are summarized in **Table 2**). Teams may also include a school representative, as well as representatives from child welfare, social services, and adult counseling services (eg, parents who may require their own mental health services or educational/vocational counseling). Each member of the team reviews a participant's progress since the last status hearing and makes legal or treatment recommendations based on the results of their respective assessments. The latter occurs during weekly team meetings designed to provide the judge with information to inform their decision during the upcoming status hearing.

JDTC status hearings (legal proceedings) typically occur every 1 to 4 weeks where the judge has an opportunity to review each participant's progress (eg, treatment, school, home, community). During the hearing, a participant is called before the judge with his or her caregiver and accompanied by their defense attorney or public defender. The judge may ask the adolescent participant to give an update on how well (or not) the youth has been doing since the last hearing. Caregivers are also asked to provide their own independent evaluation of the youth's progress. The judge then directs members of the team to provide their assessment of the youth's progress, and results from the most recent urine drug screen (UDS). Once the review is complete, the judge makes a decision to provide an incentive (ie, reward) for compliance or sanction for noncompliance (ie, not meeting program requirements).²⁰

Consistent with operant learning principles, the judge selects from a wide range of available incentives for program compliance (eg, abstinence, school/treatment attendance) and sanctions for noncompliance (eg, positive UDS, failure to attend treatment, truancy), to help youth progress through program phases (see later discussion). Successful progression through each phase (individual courts may have 3 to 5 phases) can last anywhere from 6 to 12 months. Phase progression is facilitated by immediate and contingent consequences designed to reinforce or modify the behavior of the participant and his or her family.²¹ Incentives for program compliance may include praise and encouragement from the judge, gifts (eg, movie passes, tokens, gift cards, tickets to sporting events), less frequent court appearances or UDSs, and ultimately, graduation. Sanctions for noncompliance or noncompliant events (eg, drug relapse, law violations, unexcused absence from treatment, court, or school, inappropriate dress, inappropriate behavior in court) may range from a verbal warning to brief detention (hours to days/weekends) in a juvenile facility. Sanctions may also include community service or a writing assignment. A major law violation (eg, felony) often results in immediate termination from JDTC.

Each phase has a specific focus and requirements designed to hold participants accountable and to track their progress in areas pertinent to adolescent development,

Table 2 Roles and responsibilities of juvenile drug treatment court team members	
Team Member	Roles and Responsibilities
Judge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presides over court proceedings and makes all final decisions regarding a youth participant's involvement, including treatment, incentives, and sanctions • Reviews weekly status reports for each adolescent (usually during a team meeting where members provide updates on each participant), which detail their compliance with treatment and the treatment provider, drug testing, progress at home and school, and progress toward abstinence and obeying the law. • Administers a system of graduated sanctions and rewards during hearings to increase each participant's accountability and to enhance the likelihood of abstinence
District attorney	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Takes a nonadversarial stance and balances role of prosecutor (ie, maintaining public safety) with the rehabilitative needs of the participant • Collaborates with the treatment team in monitoring the youth's progress, and makes recommendations regarding sanctions and treatment recommendations • Attends weekly status and other court hearings (eg, detention, probation violations, revocations, and any other special hearings associated with a JDTC participant) • Reviews weekly progress reports of each case, and if a youth is rearrested, reviews each new charge and assesses the appropriateness of the youth's continued participation in JDTC
Public defender	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attorney who works for a public offender's office, which is a government-funded agency that represents indigent criminal defendants • Responsible for ensuring participant's legal and constitutional rights are not violated in court proceedings • Promotes participant health and well-being • Attends weekly status hearings, appears at all court hearings and proceedings, reviews weekly progress reports, and takes a nonadversarial stance with the court • Negotiates legal and treatment recommendations consistent with participant needs
Juvenile probation officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assigned to JDTCs by the Department of Probation and provides quality assurance for each youth's participation in the program • Responsible for the direct supervision of each participant's compliance with court mandates (eg, sanctions, recommendations) • Oversees implementation of an appropriate level of supervision in the community, serving as a liaison with relevant agencies (eg, Department of Health and Human Services, adolescent treatment providers, school), and monitoring the day-to-day activities and home environment of each participant
Drug treatment provider	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participates in the weekly status hearings • Makes treatment recommendations to the court based on the specific needs of each youth and family (eg, mental health, social services, and so forth) and provides weekly updates as needed • Provides the multidisciplinary team with information regarding the adolescent's attendance and participation in treatment (substance abuse, mental health) • Levels of care available to JDTC usually include outpatient treatment, intensive outpatient treatment, hospital-based detoxification, and short-term (30-day) and long-term (60–90 day) residential treatment

relapse prevention, and aftercare. The team tracks and reviews drug abstinence (results from the most recent UDS), school attendance, grades, and behavior at home (eg, compliance with caregiver behavioral expectations, curfew compliance). In phase 1, the focus is often on participant stabilization with the following requirements: weekly status hearing (ie, drug court attendance), drug treatment and random UDS, regular school attendance, weekly contact with the assigned juvenile probation officer, and obeying the law. With a continued focus on school and treatment attendance, phase 2 adds a primary focus on drug abstinence, and begins aftercare planning. In the final phase 3, the primary focus is transitioning to aftercare and JDTC graduation. A major benefit for graduation from a JDTC, in addition to reducing or eliminating drug use, is that an offender's criminal record is sealed or expunged by the court.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THOSE WHO PARTICIPATE

Youth who participate in JDTCs vary based on the demographics and policies of the various jurisdictions, but there are some commonalities. Several studies have found that male youth make up more than 80% of JDTC enrollees.^{22–27} Racial and ethnic minorities are also overrepresented among JDTCs. For example, an early investigation in the Orange County JDTC revealed that just over half of the youth were white and 35% were African American.²⁸ In a large clinical trial by Henggeler and colleagues,²³ conducted in a JDTC in South Carolina, 67% of youth were African American, 31% were white, and 2% were biracial. Similarly, a study conducted in Birmingham, Alabama, recruited 71% African American youth.²⁷ Dakof and colleagues²² also found high proportions of African American (33%–39%) and Hispanic (56%–62%) youth in their clinical trial conducted in Miami-Dade Florida.

Families of JDTC participants are often characterized by single parenthood and poverty. Henggeler and colleagues²³ found that 52% of JDTC youth lived with a single biological or adoptive parent, and only 21% lived with both biological parents. Furthermore, primary caregivers had a median 12th grade education and a median family income ranging from US\$10,000 to US\$15,000, with 38% of families receiving public assistance. Similarly, Henggeler and colleagues²⁴ found that 53% lived with a single biological parent, median household income ranged from US\$20,000 to US\$30,000, and 47% were receiving assistance. Sloan and colleagues²⁷ reported that about 67% of JDTC participants lived in a single-parent home. Dakof and colleagues²² found that more than 50% of participants lived in a single-parent home, with a median family income around US\$20,000 or less. Other studies have found similar rates of single-parent households and low family income.²⁵ Liddle and colleagues²⁵ also found that 75% of teens had a parent with criminal justice system involvement.

Cannabis use was the most frequently used illicit substance across JDTC studies, with rates as high as 98%.^{22–25,28} These studies also showed alcohol abuse and dependence to be prevalent, whereas use of other substances (eg, cocaine, opioids) was relatively uncommon. In many cases, drug-related offenses were the most common crimes that resulted in JDTC referral.^{27,28}

Psychiatric comorbidity is prevalent among youth attending JDTCs. High rates of externalizing disorders (eg, conduct disorder, oppositional defiant disorder, attention deficit disorder) have been reported in several studies.^{22–24} These studies also found increased rates of internalizing disorders (eg, anxiety disorders, major depression, obsessive-compulsive disorder).

Overall, JDTC studies reveal that most teens experience several disadvantages. Many identify as African American or Hispanic and come from socioeconomically

disadvantaged homes often headed by a single caregiver. Most use marijuana, but other drugs of abuse are also present. Finally, many experience significant internalizing and externalizing psychiatric disorders that have the potential to interfere with the drug court process.

DRUG COURT EFFECTIVENESS

Recent research examining the effectiveness of JDTCs has provided mixed results. One meta-analysis of 46 evaluation studies, for example, revealed that JDTCs were no more or less effective than usual court proceedings.²⁹ However, the investigators noted a great deal of variability in study findings and criticized the research literature as using mostly poor methodology and lacking randomized trials. Another meta-analysis found that JDTCs had a modest positive effect on recidivism, but that the effects tended to be less pronounced among the more rigorous clinical trials.²⁷

Individually, several studies have provided evidence for the effectiveness of JDTCs. In one of the most rigorous studies to date, Henggeler and colleagues²³ revealed that JDTCs resulted in decreased alcohol and polysubstance use and fewer criminal offenses during the follow-up period compared with family court. In another study, a retrospective examination comparing 24-month post-drug court reincarceration rates found that JDTC was comparable with a more intensive intervention that incorporated continuation of pre-adjudicatory probation, dropping charges on program completion, drug education and treatment, parenting classes, and urinalysis monitoring.²⁷

Cost-effectiveness analyses have shown JDTCs to have some advantages over family courts. For example, Sheidow and colleagues³⁰ found that although JDTC was more than 3 times the cost of family court, it was still more cost-effective for reducing criminal behavior. Cost-effectiveness was similar between the 2 court types for substance abuse outcomes.

Other studies have revealed specific youth characteristics that may predict success in JDTC. For example, a secondary analysis of data from Henggeler and colleagues²³ examined youth-based (pre-treatment marijuana use, arrests, anxiety/depression), family-level (caregiver illegal substance use, family legal problems, parental supervision), and extrafamilial (peer drug activities, school status, treatment condition) variables.³¹ Only 1 variable, parental illegal substance use, predicted treatment nonresponse as measured by continued cannabis use. Thus, it may be important to consider and encourage treatment of caregiver substance use problems for teens who are engaged in JDTCs.

Community collaboration is viewed as an essential way to improve drug court services. In a qualitative study of drug court representatives, Korchmaros and colleagues³² found that community collaboration, engaging families, and improved service matching are key features that would enhance JDTC effectiveness. However, there are barriers in each of these areas. For example, engaging families in their teens' JDTC process is difficult in part because families may be unable or unwilling to participate. Thus, strategies to reduce such barriers are viewed as essential for improving effectiveness.

EFFORTS TO IMPROVE DRUG COURT USING EVIDENCE-BASED TREATMENTS

Given the mixed findings to date with regard to JDTC, there has been an effort to improve outcomes by incorporating evidence-based treatment (EBT) and conducting clinical trials to examine whether these adjunctive therapies might improve primarily substance use or criminal recidivism outcomes. To date, most of the studies that have explored the use of EBTs have used individual behavioral interventions such

as contingency management (CM) treatment, or family-based interventions such as multisystemic therapy (MST).³³

Henggeler and colleagues²³ conducted a randomized clinical trial to examine the relative efficacy of 4 treatment conditions: (1) family court; (2) JDTC alone; (3) JDTC plus MST; or (4) MST plus a CM intervention where teens could receive reinforcement for target behaviors related to drug abstinence (MST + CM). As already noted, participants who received JDTC had better outcomes than did those who attended family court. This study also found that teens randomly assigned to MST and MST + CM conditions experienced significantly greater drug abstinence than those assigned to JDTC alone, as measured by UDS. JDTC conditions demonstrated improvements in recidivism measures relative to family court, but addition of MST or CM did not improve rates further. Results of this study showed that the addition of an EBT (in this case MST and CM) significantly improved the cost-effectiveness of JDTC.³⁰

In a second trial by this group, Henggeler and colleagues²⁴ randomly assigned 6 JDTCs to provide a treatment that included either family engagement and contingency management interventions (CM-FAM) or to continue to provide treatment as usual. In total, 104 juvenile offenders received treatment over an 18-month period. Participants in the CM-FAM condition exhibited significant reductions in marijuana use as measured by UDS data (but not self-report) compared with treatment as usual. CM-FAM participants also experienced significantly greater decreases in general delinquency, offenses against persons, and property offenses compared with usual care.

Another clinical trial by Dakof and colleagues²² randomized JDTC participants to an EBT, multidimensional family therapy, or adolescent group therapy (which is somewhat more consistent with treatments typically provided in JDTC). Both groups experienced significantly reduced offending and substance abuse at 6-month follow-up, and improvements in self-reported delinquency at 24 months. Over the longer term, substance use and re-arrest rates tended to worsen, but did not reach baseline levels. Multidimensional family therapy was associated with fewer felony arrests and less substance use at 24-month follow-up compared with adolescent group therapy. Clearly, adding evidence-based family therapy resulted in significantly better long-term outcomes than a more traditional treatment approach.

Taken together, these studies demonstrate that the addition of EBTs to JDTC may enhance the efficacy of these interventions. However, relatively few studies have tested the incorporation of EBTs into the JDTC model.

SUMMARY

JDTCs are one of the few promising juvenile justice interventions that help substance-abusing offenders turn their lives around by providing specialized treatment services and intensive judicial supervision as an alternative to incarceration. Overall, JDTCs provide an opportunity for justice-involved youth to receive help for substance abuse and mental health problems rather than confinement in juvenile detention. However, the results of research conducted thus far have demonstrated that JDTCs are not universally effective at reducing recidivism and substance use. Further, there are relatively few trials designed to test adjunctive treatment to JDTCs, but those that have been conducted demonstrate that addition EBTs can be used to bolster their effectiveness. Recommended future directions include assessment of factors that affect JDTC effectiveness and development and testing of adjunct treatments that may help to engage families into the JDTC process.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by National Institutes of Health Grant R01MD011322 awarded to co-principal investigators: P.B.C. and D.M.L.

REFERENCES

1. Godley SH, Godley MD, Dennis ML. The assertive aftercare protocol for adolescent substance abusers. In: Wagner EF, Waldron HB, editors. *Innovations in adolescent substance abuse interventions*. New York: Pergamon; 2001. p. 313–31.
2. Henggeler SW, Clingempeel WG, Brondino MJ, et al. Four- year follow-up of multi-systemic therapy with substance abusing and dependent juvenile offenders. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry* 2002;41:868–74.
3. Liberman AM, editor. *The long view of crime: a synthesis of longitudinal research*. New York: Springer; 2008.
4. National Institute on Drug Abuse. Trends and statistics 2018. Available at: <https://www.drugabuse.gov/related-topics/trends-statistics>. Accessed January 9, 2019.
5. Government Accountability Office. *Costs of crime: experts report challenges estimating costs and suggests improvements to better inform policy decisions*. GAO publication no. 17-732. Washington, DC.: U.S. Government Printing Office; 2017.
6. Wexler D. Therapeutic jurisprudence: an overview. *Disability law symposium issue: legal and treatment issues*. *Thomas M Cooley L Rev* 2000;17:125–34.
7. Gilbert J, Grimm R, Parnham J. Applying therapeutic principles to a family-focused juvenile justice model (delinquency). *Ala Law Rev* 2001;52:1153.
8. Shaffer DK. Looking inside the black box of drug courts: a meta-analytic review. *Justice Q* 2011;28:493–521.
9. van Wormer J, Lutze F. Exploring the evidence: the value of juvenile drug courts.” *Juvenile and family justice today* 2011. Available at: <http://www.ncjfcj.org/sites/default/files/jdc%20evidence.pdf>. Accessed April 6, 2019.
10. Rottman D, Casey P. *Therapeutic jurisprudence and the emergence of problem-solving courts*. Rockville (MD): National Institute of Justice Journal; 1999. p. 12–9.
11. Winick BJ. Therapeutic jurisprudence and problem solving courts. *Fordham Urban Law J* 2003;30:1055–103.
12. National Association of Drug Court Professionals. *Defining drug courts: the key components*. Alexandria (VA): National Association of Drug Court Professionals; 2004. Available at: <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/bja/205621.pdf>. Accessed May 10, 2019.
13. National Criminal Justice Reference System. *In the spotlight: Drug courts - facts and figures*. Available at: https://www.ncjrs.gov/spotlight/drug_courts/facts.html. Accessed September 17, 2019.
14. Aos S, Miller M, Drake E. *Evidence-based public policy options to reduce future prison construction, criminal justice costs, and crime rates*. Olympia (WA): Washington State Institute for Public Policy; 2006.
15. Latimer J, Morton-Bourgon K, Chretien J. *A meta-analytic examination of drug treatment courts: do they reduce recidivism?* Ottawa (Ontario): Department of Justice Canada; 2006.
16. Shafer DK. Reconsidering drug court effectiveness: a meta-analytic review. *Diss Abstr Int* 2006;67:09A (AAT No. 323113).
17. Wilson DB, Mitchell O, MacKenzie DL. A systematic review of drug court effects on recidivism. *J Exp Criminol* 2006;2:459–87.
18. Wilson D, Olaghere A, Kimbrell CS. *Developing juvenile drug court practices on process standards: a systematic review and qualitative synthesis*. Washington

- (DC): Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice; 2016.
19. Office of Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention. Juvenile drug treatment court guidelines. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs; 2016.
 20. Festinger DS, Marlowe DB, Lee PA, et al. Status hearings in drug court: when more is less and less is more. *Drug Alcohol Depend* 2002;2:151–7.
 21. Gatowski S, Miller NB, Rubin SM, et al. OJJDP juvenile drug treatment court guidelines project: juvenile drug treatment court listening sessions. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice; 2016.
 22. Dakof GA, Henderson CE, Rowe CL, et al. A randomized clinical trial of family therapy in juvenile drug court. *J Fam Psychol* 2015;29:232–41.
 23. Henggeler SW, Halliday-Boykins CA, Cunningham PB, et al. Juvenile drug court: enhancing outcomes by integrating evidence-based treatments. *J Consult Clin Psychol* 2006;74:42–54.
 24. Henggeler SW, McCart M, Cunningham PB, et al. Enhancing the effectiveness of juvenile drug courts by integrating evidence-based practices. *J Consult Clin Psychol* 2012;80:264–75.
 25. Liddle HA, Dakof GA, Henderson C, et al. Implementation outcomes of multidimensional family therapy-detention to community: a reintegration program for drug-using juvenile detainees. *Int J Offender Ther Comp Criminol* 2011;55: 587–604.
 26. Mitchel O, Wilson DB, Eggers A, et al. Assessing the effectiveness of drug courts on recidivism: a meta-analytic review of traditional and non-traditional drug courts. *J Crim Justice* 2012;40:60–71.
 27. Sloan JJ, Smykla JO, Rush JP. Do juvenile drug courts reduce recidivism?: outcomes of drug court and an adolescent substance abuse program. *Am J Crim Justice* 2004;29:95–115.
 28. Applegate BK, Santana S. Intervening with youthful substance abusers: a preliminary analysis of juvenile drug court. *Justice System Journal* 2000;21:281–300.
 29. Tanner-Smith EE, Lipsey MW, Wilson DB. Juvenile drug court effects on recidivism and drug use: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Exp Criminol* 2016;12:477–513.
 30. Sheidow AJ, Jayawardhana J, Bradford D, et al. Money matters: cost-effectiveness of juvenile drug court with and without evidence-based treatments. *J Child Adolesc Subst Abuse* 2012;21:69–90.
 31. Halliday-Boykins CA, Schaeffer CM, Henggeler SW, et al. Predicting nonresponse to juvenile drug court interventions. *J Subst Abuse Treat* 2010;39:318–28.
 32. Korchmaros JD, Thompson-Dyck K, Haring RC. Professionals' perceptions of and recommendations for matching juvenile drug court clients to services. *Child Youth Serv Rev* 2017;73:149–64.
 33. Henggeler SW, Schoenwald SK, Borduin CM, et al. *Multisystemic therapy for antisocial behavior in children and adolescents*. 2nd edition. New York: Guilford Press; 2009.