

Summary of Findings Reported for Family Drug Court Programs: 2000 – Present

PART ONE

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	Focus of Study	Population Studied	Comparison Group
1	October 21, 2004	<i>FTDC Evaluation Status Update: FTDC Evaluation Coordination Meeting.</i> NPC Research and ABT Associates, Inc.	4 year longitudinal evaluation of FTDCs in four sites: San Diego, Reno, Santa Clara Co. and Suffolk Co., NY	Families whose cases started in 2002-2003; 1,092 individuals for administrative review; 296 individuals for interview samples	Reno and Suffolk Cos: Eligible parents in dependency cases in each county who are not referred to or who refuse entry to FTDC; Santa Clara and San Diego Cos. : (system-wide programs) matched demographic sample of parents involved in dependency cases in San Bernardino and Contra Costa Counties where no FTDC programs exist but whose demographic and child welfare caseload is comparable.
2	2004	<i>Treating Substance Abusing Parents: A Study of the Pima County Family Drug Court Approach</i>	To examine effectiveness of the Pima County Court Assisted Treatment Services (CATS) program and its drug court intervention, by comparing summary statistics for volunteers to family drug court (33 parents/46 children) – all of whom lived in the same zip code area associated with a high percentage of drug involved child protective referrals; with treatment refusal group (42 parents/51 children) and treatment as usual group (45 parents/72 children) from a matched geographical area.	33 voluntary participants in Pima Family Drug Court	42 individuals who refused treatment and 45 individuals in a “treatment as usual group” from a matched geographic area
3	October 2000	<i>Evaluation of the Suffolk County Family Treatment Court (Suffolk County)(Central Islip), New York.</i> Child Welfare Training Program. School of Social Welfare. State University of New York (SUNY)	Study of first two years of program (January 1, 1998 – December 31, 1999)	98 participants in first two years of program (91 groups of siblings (7 participants had spouses/partners in program) and 221 children under court supervision	N/A

Summary of Findings Reported for Family Drug Court Programs: 2000 – Present

PART TWO

#	Publication Date	Methodology	<u>Findings Relating to Process and Services Provided</u>			
			<u>Time/Process of System Intervention</u>	<u>Impact on Systems Involved and Services Delivered</u>		
				<u>Child Welfare</u>	<u>Treatment</u>	<u>Court</u>
<i>I</i>	October 21, 2004	Collecting administrative data on services provided and parent interviews beginning 2 years after petition is filed; begin recruitment of parents for study within 3 months of petition: current recruitment rates are: -San Diego: 81% -Santa Clara Co.: 79% -Suffolk Co.: 45% -Washoe Co.: 75%	- More frequent judicial monitoring; - More screening and assessment (parents and children); - More timely substance abuse assessments - More case management services - More access to ancillary service - More frequent drug testing	- more use of kinship placements; - more social worker involvement - more services for children-	- more likely to enter ; San Diego: 71% vs. 53% Santa Clara Co.: 90% vs. 62% Suffolk Co.: 93% vs. 68% Washoe Co.: 85% vs. 81% - faster treatment entry	- fewer contested hearings - shorter case length <u>San Diego:</u> -closed under 12 mos: 11% vs. 0 -closed under 24 mos.: 56% vs 19% -closed under 36 mos.: 89% vs 50% -closed under 48 mos: 99% vs. 75% closed under 60 mos: 100% vs. 100% <u>Santa Clara:</u> Closed under 12 mos.: 2% vs. 3% Closed under 24 mos.: 54% vs. 30% Closed under 36 mos: 86% vs. 85 % Closed under 48%: 93% vs. 95 % Closed under 60%: 100% vs 100% <u>Suffolk Co.</u> Closed under 12 mos: 0 vs 2% Closed under 24 mos: 41% vs. 44% Closed under 36 mos.: 82% vs. 81% Closed under 48 mos: 95 % vs. 95% Closed in over 48 mos: 1005

Summary of Findings Reported for Family Drug Court Programs: 2000 – Present

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Findings Relating to Process and Services Provided			
			<u>Time/Process of System Intervention</u>	<u>Impact on Systems Involved and Services Delivered</u>		
				<u>Child Welfare</u>	<u>Treatment</u>	<u>Court</u>
						vs. 100% <u>Washoe Co.:</u> Closed under 12 mos: 6% vs. 27% Closed under 24 mos: 75% vs. 81% Closed under 36 mos: 96% vs. 94% Closed under 48 mos: 100% vs. 98 % Closed under 60 mos: 100 % vs. 100% -more compliance with ASFA timelines-
2	2004	Compared summary statistics for volunteers to family drug court (33) with treatment refusal group (42) and treatment as usual group (45) from matched geographical area			family drug court group had higher engagement an completion rates of residential treatment than was true of other comparison groups;	
3	October 2000	Utilized various information sources including state court data; program data; records of Child Protective Services; written records of court hearings; and semi-structured interviews with selected team members	93% of the 98 participants had successfully graduated or were still active; 75% of participants admitted within one month of screening; 75% of participants had dispositional hearing within 3 mos. of screening			

Summary of Findings Reported for Family Drug Court Programs: 2000 – Present

PART THREE

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	Preliminary Outcomes Noted			Period of Time Followed	Other Findings
			Parental Attitudes	Treatment and Other Services Provided	Child Welfare/ASFA Case Outcomes		
1	October 21, 2004	<i>FTDC Evaluation Status Update: FTDC Evaluation Coordination Meeting.</i>	-feel more motivated -feel more supported and less overwhelmed feel more in control over their case greater understanding of process and requirements more frequent visitation more positive parent-child interactions	<u>-more days in treatment</u> San Diego: 143 vs. 105 Santa Clara Co.: 365 vs. 101 Suffolk Co.: 384 vs. 268 Washoe Co.: 297 vs. 115 -less substance use -more likely to complete treatment San Diego: 28% vs. 22% Santa Clara Co.: 44% vs. 23% Suffolk Co.: 50% vs. 42% Washoe Co.: 32% vs. 33% -more positive parenting skills developed greater service order compliance	<u>Shorter time to permanency for children</u> <u>San Diego:</u> Placement: 276 days vs. 518 days Order: 524 days vs. 1,095 days <u>Santa Clara Co.:</u> Placement: 356 days vs. 319 days Order: 674 days vs. 564 days <u>Suffolk Co.:</u> Placement: 287 days vs. 323 days Order: 860 days vs. 947 days <u>Washoe Co.:</u> Placement: 312 days vs. 295 days Order: 431 days vs. 434 days More reunifications and fewer terminations of parental rights <u>San Diego:</u> -reunified/remained with original parent: 33% vs. 25% -parental rights terminated: 19% vs. 22% <u>Santa Clara Co.:</u>	4 year longitudinal study from time petition is filed	

Summary of Findings Reported for Family Drug Court Programs: 2000 – Present

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	Preliminary Outcomes Noted			Period of Time Followed	Other Findings
			Parental Attitudes	Treatment and Other Services Provided	Child Welfare/ASFA Case Outcomes		
					<p>Reunified/remained with original parent: 42% vs. 18%</p> <p>Parental rights terminated: 23% vs. 31%</p> <p>Suffolk Co:</p> <p>Reunified/remained with original parent: 63% vs. 58%</p> <p>Parental rights terminated: 11% vs. 7%</p> <p>Washoe Co.:</p> <p>Reunified /remained with original parent: 44% vs. 49%</p> <p>Parental rights terminated: 9% vs. 14%</p> <p>Fewer living situation changes for children</p> <p>Children spending less time in out-of-home placements</p> <p>Children having fewer behavioral and school problems</p>		

Summary of Findings Reported for Family Drug Court Programs: 2000 – Present

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	Preliminary Outcomes Noted			Period of Time Followed	Other Findings
			Parental Attitudes	Treatment and Other Services Provided	Child Welfare/ASFA Case Outcomes		
2	2004	<i>Treating Substance Abusing Parents: A Study of the Pima County Family Drug Court Approach</i>		<p>Family drug court participants had higher rate of entry into treatment: Treatment entry: 97% of family drug court participants vs 69% of treatment refusal group and 67% of treatment as usual group;</p> <p>Family drug court participants had higher percentage of parents in residential treatment (67%) vs. 14% for treatment refusal group and 36% for treatment as usual group;</p> <p>Family drug court had higher representation of parents entering outpatient treatment (85%) vs treatment refusal (60%) and treatment as usual group (45%)</p> <p>Family drug court was most successful group in retaining individuals in any type of substance abuse treatment: 48% of parents were retained in treatment long enough to complete their treatment program, regardless of whether it was residential or outpatient; lowest level of treatment retention and completion was treatment refusal group (26%)</p>	<p>Higher percentage of permanency decisions reached within one year; (79% of family drug court and 75% of treatment refusal group vs. 49% of treatment as usual group)</p> <p>Earlier permanency decisions;; 8.367 months for family drug court; 7.707 for treatment refusal group; and 11.377 for treatment as usual group</p> <p>Higher (52%) percentage of children placed with parents vs. 30% of treatment as usual group</p>	At least one year following entrance into dependency process	<p>Fewer parental rights severed;</p> <p>Treatment as usual group had a higher mean number of protective factors that was true for the family drug court and treatment refusals;</p> <p>Seriousness of substance abuse programs of treat group and treatment refusal group were similar;</p> <p>Family drug court participant comments suggested that, if the family drug court judge was also the dependency court judge, they might not have been able to be as honest about their substance abuse issues</p>

Summary of Findings Reported for Family Drug Court Programs: 2000 – Present

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	Preliminary Outcomes Noted			Period of Time Followed	Other Findings
			Parental Attitudes	Treatment and Other Services Provided	Child Welfare/ASFA Case Outcomes		
3	October 2000	<i>Evaluation of the Suffolk County Family Treatment Court (Suffolk County)(Central Islip), New York.</i> Child Welfare Training Program. School of Social Welfare. State University of New York (SUNY)		81% of parents initially attended outpatient treatment; 50% had at least one inpatient experience; mean no. of recorded treatment visits for participants was 30-39 per three month period.	50 of the 221 children (23%) were in foster care for some part of the 2 year study period; 18 of the children were placed in foster care and returned to the family during the investigation period (time I foster care ranged from 2 weeks or less to 664 days) An additional 32 children placed in foster care and not returned to family during study period;	Two years maximum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> O Inherent stresses of inter-org. collaboration, including (1) differing organizational cultures among team components; and (2) FTC functions may be additional to those team member already handles; O attention needs to focus on accurate data entry O being FTC team member entails extra work for most team members O “practice” guidelines needed re: (1) safe return of children; (2) defining a “failing client”; and (3) application of sanctions