THE DOUGLAS COUNTY DRUG COURT:

CHARACTERISTICS OF PARTICIPANTS, CASE OUTCOMES AND RECIDIVISM

Final Report
March 2004

Cassia Spohn
Department of Criminal Justice
University of Nebraska at Omaha

R.K. Piper
Public Policy Choices Office
University of Nebraska at Omaha

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to describe the characteristics of all offenders (N = 255) who were bound over to Douglas County District Court in 2001 and who were subsequently diverted to the Douglas County Drug Court. We present descriptive data on the characteristics of the drug court participants, focusing on their background characteristics and prior criminal record and on their case characteristics. We also present descriptive data on recidivism for drug court participants and for traditionally adjudicated offenders and compare the recidivism rates of these two groups of offenders, controlling for other predictors of the likelihood of recidivism.

The major findings of our analysis of the Douglas County Drug Court are as follows:

1. **Compared to traditionally adjudicated drug offenders**, offenders assigned to the drug court were more likely to be white and female. There was a significantly larger percentage of white females and a significantly smaller percentage of African American males in the drug court population than in the traditionally adjudicated population. The underrepresentation of African American males can be attributed in part to the fact that African American males were more likely than other defendants to have prior criminal records that made them ineligible for the drug court. In contrast, white females were less likely than other defendants to be ineligible for drug court based on their criminal histories.

2. The mean age of the **drug court participants** was 34. Over three-quarters of the participants were either white males (45.1%) or white females (32.9%). Most drug court participants were not married and were employed at the time of arrest. Their average age of first use of alcohol was 15; their average age of first use of drugs was 17. Almost 60 percent of the drug court participants had no previous misdemeanor arrests and 90 percent had no prior felony arrests; only 41 had more than one prior misdemeanor arrest.

3. Drug court participants were arrested for drug offenses involving several different **types of drugs** and were assigned to different **types of drug treatment programs**. Of the offenders arrested for drug offenses (rather than drug-related property offenses), 53 percent were arrested for offenses involving methamphetamine, 20 percent for offenses involving crack cocaine, and 10 percent for offenses involving powder cocaine. The most common type of substance abuse treatment program was outpatient treatment, followed by residential treatment. By the summer of 2003, half of the drug court participants had either completed their treatment program or were still enrolled in treatment.

1

4   In terms of **case outcomes**, 129 of the offenders diverted to drug court in 2001 were terminated from the program by the summer of 2003; 98 of the 129 were terminated involuntarily and 32 left the program voluntarily. Of the remaining offenders, 88 had graduated and 35 were still in the program.

5.   The **predictors of graduation from drug court** were the offender's gender, employment status, age of first use of illegal drugs, and number of positive drug tests during the first six months of the program. The odds of graduation were higher for females, for those who were employed at the time of their arrest, for those who began using illegal drugs at a later age, and for those who had fewer positive drug tests**.**

6.   Drug court participants/graduates generally had **lower recidivism rates** than drug court failures and traditionally adjudicated offenders. Participants/graduates had a lower likelihood of arrest or conviction for failure to appear, a lower likelihood of arrest or conviction for a new felony offense, and a lower likelihood of being incarcerated for a new crime. However, participants/graduates were more likely than traditionally adjudicated offenders to be arrested for or convicted of a misdemeanor. There were no differences in time-to-failure between drug court participants/graduates and the other types of offenders.

INTRODUCTION

This report summarizes the characteristics of all offenders (N = 255) who were bound over to Douglas County District Court in 2001 and who were subsequently diverted to the Douglas County Drug Court. We first describe the Douglas County Drug Court and present descriptive data on the characteristics of the drug court participants, focusing on their background characteristics and prior criminal record and on their case characteristics. We then present descriptive data on recidivism for drug court participants and for traditionally adjudicated offenders. The final section of the report discusses the results of our multivariate analyses of recidivism.

The Douglas County Drug Court

The Douglas County Drug Court was established in April of 1997 in an attempt to implement a more effective and less costly alternative to traditional adjudication and sentencing of drug-involved felony offenders. This pre-adjudication drug court consists of three components: (1) judicial monitoring of participants, with a specialized court docket presided over by a dedicated district court judge; (2) case management provided by Douglas County Drug Court Program Office counselors; and (3) drug treatment provided by Behavioral Services Administration (BSA) Region 6 and its network of alcohol and drug treatment providers.[1] Pending felony charges against the offender are dismissed following completion of all drug court requirements.

---

[1] In August of 2003, the Douglas County Drug Court modified this aspect of the program. Drug Court Program Office personnel now refer participants to treatment providers and coordinate treatment services.

To be considered for drug court, defendants must meet all of the following eligibility criteria: no more than one prior non-violent felony conviction; demonstrated need for substance abuse treatment; and medium or high Level of Service Inventory (LSI) risk/need level.[2] Defendants with any of the following characteristics are ineligible for drug court: prior felony conviction for a crime of violence; prior offense involving the use or possession of a dangerous weapon; prior or current offense resulted in death or bodily injury; unable to attend drug court sessions; unwilling to submit to random drug testing; and multiple misdemeanor convictions for crimes against persons.[3]

Offenders assigned to the drug court are required to attend bi-weekly or monthly drug court hearings and regularly scheduled treatment sessions; they also must submit to random urinalysis. Although most offenders are monitored for 12 months, some are supervised for up to 18 months. Graduation from drug court is contingent upon satisfactory completion of substance abuse treatment, attendance at drug court hearings, full-time continuous employment for at least six months (unless waived), no positive or diluted drug tests for at least six months, and no felony or serious misdemeanor charges while participating in drug court.

---

[2] The LSI sorts individuals into higher and lower risk categories and links their scores to meaningful outcome events in ten areas: criminal history, education/employment, financial, family/marital, accommodations, leisure/recreation, companions, alcohol/drug problems, emotional/personal, and attitude/orientation.

[3] In February of 2003, Douglas County implemented a post-plea track for drug offenders who do not qualify for Drug Court because of multiple felony convictions or more serious prior felony convictions. If the offender successfully completes the drug court program, the charges are dismissed.

Defendants Assigned to the Douglas County Drug Court

The characteristics of offenders assigned to the drug court are compared to those of offenders charged with a drug offense (possession of narcotics with intent, possession of marijuana with intent, and possession of narcotics) but not assigned to the drug court in Table 1. Compared to traditionally adjudicated drug offenders, offenders assigned to the drug court were more likely to be white and female. Seventy-eight percent of the drug court offenders, but only 62 percent of the traditionally adjudicated drug offenders, were white, and 38.8 percent of the drug court offenders, but only 18.9 percent of the traditionally adjudicated drug offenders, were female.

As the race and gender interactions reveal, there were about equal proportions of white males and African American females in the two groups, but a significantly *larger percentage* of *white females* in the drug court population (32.9%) than in the traditionally adjudicated population (13.4%) and a significantly *smaller percentage* of *African American males* in the drug court population (12.9%) than in the traditionally adjudicated population (27.5%). [Note: white females comprised 18.6 percent of the total population of offenders charged with drug offenses; African American males comprised 23.6 percent of the total population.] Stated another way, whereas white females were overrepresented in the drug court population, African American males were underrepresented. The underrepresentation of African American males can be attributed in part to the fact that African American males were more likely than other defendants to have prior criminal records that made them ineligible for the drug court. In contrast, white females were less likely than other defendants to be ineligible for drug court based on their criminal histories. The mean number of prior

felony convictions is 0.27 for white females and 1.28 for African American males. Moreover, none of the white females, but 29 of the 222 African American males, had a prior violent felony conviction.

As one would expect, given the eligibility criteria for participation in the drug court, offenders assigned to the drug court hadless serious prior criminal records than traditionally adjudicated drug offenders. Whereas almost 90 percent of the drug court offenders did not have a prior felony conviction, over 40 percent of the traditionally adjudicated offenders had at least one prior felony conviction and 10.3 percent of these offenders had three or more convictions. None of the drug court offenders, but 53 (7.7%) of the traditionally adjudicated offenders, had a prior violent felony conviction; only 15 (5.9%) of the drug court participants, but 172 (25.0%) of the traditionally adjudicated offenders had at least one prior felony drug conviction.

Table 1.   Offender Characteristics: Defendants Assigned to Drug Court and Other Drug Offenders

	Drug Court Defendants (N=255)		Traditionally Adjudicated Drug Offenders (N=687)	
	N	%	N	%
Demographic Characteristics				
Race./Ethnicity				
White	199	78.0	426	62.0
African American	48	18.8	226	32.9
Hispanic	4	1.6	28	4.1
Native American	3	1.2	3	0.4
Asian	1	0.4	4	0.6
Gender				
Female	99	38.8	130	18.9
Male	156	61.2	557	81.1
Race and Gender				
White Male	115	45.1	334	48.6
African American Male	33	12.9	189	27.5
Hispanic Male	4	1.6	28	4.1
Native American Male	3	1.2	3	0.4
Asian Male	1	0.4	3	0.4
White Female	84	32.9	92	13.4
African American Female	15	5.9	37	5.4
Hispanic Female	0	0.0	0	0.0
Native American Female	0	0.0	0	0.0
Asian Female	0	0.0	1	0.1
Age	Mean = 33.94		Mean = 33.38	
17-20	9	3.5	17	2.5
21-25	58	22.7	151	22.0
26-30	39	15.3	134	19.5
31-35	38	15.3	124	18.0
36-40	44	17.3	98	14.3
41-45	33	12.9	92	13.4
46-50	20	7.8	44	6.4
51 and over	14	5.5	27	3.9
Prior Criminal Record				
Number of Prior Felony Arrests	Mean = 0.73		Mean = 2.37	
0	152	59.6	273	39.7
1	61	23.9	126	18.3
2	20	7.8	65	9.5
3	12	4.7	45	6.6
4	6	2.4	48	7.0
5	1	0.4	38	5.5
6	1	0.4	25	3.6
7 or more	2	0.8	67	9.8
No. of Prior Felony Convictions	Mean =0.12		Mean = 0.87	
0	229	89.8	403	58.7
1	23	9.0	141	20.5
2	2	.08	72	10.5
3 or more	1	0.4	71	10.3
Prior Violent Felony Convictions)	0	0.0	53	7.7

A Focus on Drug Court Participants. In this section of the report, we focus specifically on drug court participants, for whom we collected more detailed data. In Table 2 we present descriptive data on the background characteristics of these offenders, including the age at which they reported first using alcohol and illegal drugs and (for offenders for whom the information was available) their LSI (level of service inventory) level of risk. Because the drug court management information system typically did not include offender's LSI scores, we randomly selected 57 offenders and obtained these offenders' scores (and other data) from paper files maintained by drug court program staff. For the other background characteristics, we report the number of cases for which the information was missing. The case characteristics of drug court offenders are presented in Table 3.

As shown in Table 2, the typical drug court participant was unmarried and was employed at least part time when he/she was assigned to the drug court program. Although data on dependent children was missing for nearly two thirds of the offenders, among those for whom the information was available, 54 percent had at least one dependent child. A third of the participants did not have a high school degree or a GED and over three quarters of them had no education beyond high school. The LSI level of risk (for the 57 randomly selected offenders) was either low/medium (36.8%) or medium/high (43.9%) for more than three quarters of the offenders. The typical offender began using alcohol and illegal drugs in his/her mid-teens. The mean age at which these offenders first used alcohol was 14.92; the mean age of first use of illegal drugs was 16.91.

Table 2. Background Characteristics: Offenders Assigned to the Douglas County Drug Court, 2001

	N	%
Marital Status		
Married	48	22.1
Not married	169	77.9
[**Unknown/missing data**	**38**	**14.9]**
Offender Has Dependent Children		
Yes	47	54.0
No	40	46.0
[**Unknown/missing data**	**168**	**65.9]**
Employment Status		
Unemployed	78	35.5
Employed	141	64.1
Student	1	0.5
[**Unknown/missing data**	**35**	**13.7]**
Education		
No high school diploma or GED	78	33.1
High school diploma or GED	103	43.6
Vocational school	6	2.5
Some college	44	18.6
College degree	5	2.1
[**Unknown/missing data**	**19**	**7.5]**
AgeBFirst Use of Alcohol (unknown/missing = 18)	Mean = 14.92	
AgeBFirst Use of Illegal Drugs (unknown/missing = 20)	Mean = 16.91	

The case characteristics and treatment experiences of the drug court participants are presented in Table 3. The most serious charge filed by the county attorney typically was a drug offense, either possession of narcotics (74.5%), possession of narcotics with intent (7.5%), or possession of marijuana with intent (1.2%). The remaining offenders were charged with property offenses such as larceny/theft (9.4%) and fraud/forgery (5.1%). Of the offenders who were charged with a drug offense, 52.7% were charged with an offense involving methamphetamine, 20% were charged with an offense involving crack cocaine, and 9.8% were charged with an offense involving powder cocaine.

Table 3.   Case Characteristics: Offenders Assigned to the Douglas County Drug Court, 2001

	N	%
Case Characteristics		
Most Serious Charged Filed by County Attorney		
Assault	1	0.4
Burglary	2	0.8
Larceny or Theft	24	9.4
Weapons Offense	1	0.4
Possess Narcotics with Intent	19	7.5
Possess Narcotics	190	74.5
Possess Marijuana with Intent	3	1.2
Fraud or Forgery	13	5.1
All Other Felonies	2	0.8
Type of Drug (Offenders charged with drug offenses only)		
Methamphetamine	108	52.7
Crack Cocaine	41	20.0
Powder Cocaine	20	9.8
Marijuana or Other Drug	5	2.5
Unknown Drug	31	15.1
Status in Program (July 2003)		
Involuntarily terminated	97	38.5
Voluntarily terminated	32	12.7
Still assigned to drug court	35	13.9
Graduated from drug court	88	34.9
Number of Drug Tests Given (Mean = 27.95)		
1-10	40	15.9
11-20	50	19.8
21-30	57	22.6
31-40	50	19.8
41-50	35	13.9
51 or more	17	6.7
Positive Drug Test		
Yes	211	83.7
No	41	16.3
Number of Positive Drug Tests, First 6 Months (Mean = 5.56)		
0	51	20.2
1-5	103	40.9
6-10	51	20.2
11-15	31	12.3
16 or more	15	6.3
Number of Positive Drug Tests, After 6 Months (Mean = 1.93)		
0	152	60.3
1-5	66	26.2
6-10	19	7.5
11-15	12	4.8
16 or more	3	1.2

Table 3, continued	N	%
Initial Type of Treatment		
Therapeutic community	8	3.2
Intensive residential	13	5.2
Short-term residential	37	14.9
Halfway house	36	14.5
Day treatment	1	0.4
Intensive outpatient	85	34.1
Outpatient	60	24.1
Aftercare/relapse prevention	1	0.4
Other	5	2.0
No treatment	3	1.2
Status of Treatment		
Treatment completed	71	36.3
Active in treatment	25	12.9
Assigned and waiting for placement	3	1.5
Failed to complete assigned treatment	73	37.3
Never started treatment	19	9.8
Treatment waived	4	2.2

Table 3 also presents the status (as of June/July of 2003) of the 255 offenders who were assigned to the drug court in 2001. Ninety-seven (38.5%) of the offenders were involuntarily terminated and an additional 32 offenders (12.7%) voluntarily withdrew from the program. Eighty-eight (34.9%) of the 2001 participants had graduated. The remaining 35 offenders were still assigned to the drug court in the summer of 2003.

The offenders assigned to the drug court were subjected to frequent tests (i.e., urinalysis) for illegal drugs. The mean number of drug tests was 27.95; 102 (39.4%) of the offenders had more than 30 drug tests. Most offenders had at least one positive drug test while they were assigned to drug court, particularly during the early months of the program. Whereas 80 percent of the offenders had at least one positive test during the first six months, only 40 percent tested positive after six months. The number of offenders with more than five positive drug tests also declined, from 97 (38.8%) during the first six months to 34 (13.5%) after six months.

The most common type of substance abuse treatment program for drug court participants was outpatient treatment. Fifty-eight percent of the offenders initially were placed in either intensive outpatient (34.1%) or regular outpatient (24.1%) treatment. Most of the remaining offenders were placed in a residential treatment program, typically either a short-term residential treatment program or a halfway house. By the summer of 2003, approximately half of the drug court participants had either completed their substance abuse treatment (36.3%) or were still enrolled in a treatment program (12.9%). Ten percent of the participants never started substance abuse treatment and an additional third (37.3%) failed to complete the assigned treatment program. Further analysis (not shown) of participants who did and did not successfully complete substance abuse treatment revealed that the highest success rates were found for offenders who were initially assigned to outpatient treatment (21 of the 42 offenders (50%) completed treatment) or intensive outpatient treatment (26 of the 68 offenders (38.2%) completed treatment). The highest failure rates were found for offenders who were initially assigned to a therapeutic community (five of eight failed to complete treatment), intensive residential treatment (four of ten failed), or short-term residential treatment (13 of 32, or 40.6%, failed).

The Likelihood of Graduation From Drug Court. As shown in Table 3, whereas 88 of the 252 offenders diverted to drug court in 2001 had graduated by summer of 2003, 129 had been terminated from the program. To identify the correlates of drug court success, we used logistic regression to analyze the likelihood of graduation. We controlled for the offender's background characteristics (race, gender, age) and for the offender's education,

12

employment status, and prior criminal record. We also controlled for the age at which the offender first used alcohol and drugs, the type of drug involved in the offense, and the number of positive drug tests during the first six months of the drug court program. Because their final status (graduated or not) was unknown, we eliminated the 35 offenders who were still active in the drug court from the analysis.

The results of the analysis of the likelihood of graduation from drug court are summarized in Table 4 (complete results of the analysis are presented in Table A1 of the Appendix). They indicate that males were significantly less likely than females and that those who were unemployed were significantly less likely than those who were employed to graduate. Drug court success also was affected by the age at which the offender first used drugs and by the number of positive drug tests the offender had during the first six months in the program. The odds of graduation increased as the age at which the offender first used illegal drugs increased. In contrast, the likelihood of graduation decreased as the number of positive drug tests increased. The other variables in the model, including the offender's race and the type of drug involved in the crime for which the offender was arrested, did not affect the likelihood that the offender would successfully complete the drug court program.

Table 4. The Likelihood of Graduation from Drug Court: Results of the Logistic Regression Analysis

	Statistically Significant Predictors
Race (offender is black)	Not Significant
Gender (offender is male)	* (-)
No High School Degree or GED	Not Significant
Unemployed at Time of Arrest	* (-)
Prior Felony Arrest	Not Significant
Age—First Use of Alcohol	Not Significant
Age—First Use of Drugs	* (+)

Type of Drug
   Cocaine (reference category)
   Methamphetamine
   Other Drug
	Not Significant
	Not Significant

No. of Positive Drug Tests, First Six Months	* (-)

Recidivism Among Drug Court Participants and Traditionally Adjudicated Offenders

One measure of a drug court's success is its effectiveness in preventing or reducing recidivism. To address this, we compare recidivism rates for drug court participants and traditionally adjudicated offenders. We eliminated traditionally adjudicated cases in which all of the charges against the defendant were dismissed, as well as cases that were transferred to juvenile court and cases in which the disposition was pending. To ensure that each offender had a one-year follow-up period, we also eliminated cases in which the offender was sentenced to jail or prison for more than 12 months.

We compare the recidivism rates of two groups of drug court participants to those of two groups of traditionally adjudicated offenders. The drug court participants are divided into those who either graduated from the drug court program or were still assigned to the drug court (N = 123) and those who were terminated from the program, voluntarily or involuntarily (N = 129). The traditionally adjudicated offenders include offenders who were charged with possession of drugs but who were not assigned to the drug court (N = 201) and offenders who were charged with possession of drugs with intent or with a non-drug offense (N = 893). In the multivariate analyses, drug court participants/graduates is the reference category. Thus, we are comparing the recidivism rates of these offenders to those of drug court failures, traditionally adjudicated drug offenders (the most appropriate comparison group) and traditionally adjudicated offenders who were charged with drug trafficking or a non-drug offense.

There are seven dichotomous indicators of recidivism and nine interval-level indicators of recidivism. We measure recidivism as arrests/convictions for failure to appear for court appearances, arrests/convictions for new misdemeanors, and arrests/convictions for new

felonies. We also measure the length of time (in days) to the first new misdemeanor or felony arrest or conviction.

Results of the Bivariate Analysis (Table 5).   As one would expect, the recidivism rates of drug court failures were significantly higher than those of clients who were still assigned to or had graduated from drug court. Compared to participants/graduates, those who were terminated from the drug court were significantly more likely to be arrested for failure to appear, arrested for a felony, convicted of a felony, and sentenced to jail or prison for a new offense.   They also had significantly more new arrests than the drug court participants/graduates. On the other hand, there were no differences in the number of days to a new arrest or conviction.

Drug court participants/graduates also had lower recidivism rates than the traditionally adjudicated offenders. There were statistically significant differences between the drug court participants/graduates and the traditionally adjudicated drug offenders on all but one of the dichotomous measures of recidivism (the exception was conviction for a new misdemeanor). For one of these measures (arrest for a new misdemeanor), however, drug court participants/graduates had significantly *higher* odds of recidivism than traditionally adjudicated drug offenders. In contrast, drug court participants/graduates were substantially less likely than traditionally adjudicated drug offenders to be arrested for a new felony (12.2% versus 23.4%), convicted of a new felony (1.6% versus 15.4%), or sent to jail or prison for a new crime (1.6% versus 13.9%). Drug court participants/graduates also had fewer arrests for failure to appear and fewer new felony arrests than the traditionally adjudicated drug offenders.

Table 5. Indicators of Recidivism: Drug Court Participants and Traditionally Adjudicated Offenders

	Drug Court Participants				Traditionally Adjudicated Offenders			
	Graduated or still in program (N = 123)		Terminated from program (N = 129)		Charged with possession of drugs (N = 201)		Charged with possession with intent and non-drug offenses (N=893)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Dichotomous Measures (% yes)								
Arrested for failure to appear	44	35.8	90	69.8*	95	47.3*	336	37.6
Convicted of failure to appear	9	7.3	16	12.4	32	15.9*	105	11.8
Arrested for misdemeanor	42	34.1	57	44.2	44	21.9*	211	23.6*
Convicted of misdemeanor	30	24.4	35	27.1	43	21.4	177	19.8
Arrested for felony	15	12.2	52	40.3*	47	23.4*	236	26.4*
Convicted of felony	2	1.6	13	10.1*	31	15.4*	133	14.9*
Sentenced to jail or prison	2	1.6	9	7.0*	28	13.9*	116	13.0*
Interval Measures (Mean)								
No. of arrests for failure to appear		0.60		1.81*		1.18*		0.85
No. of misdemeanor arrests		0.58		1.12*		0.51		0.58
No. of misdemeanor convictions		0.28		0.43		0.44		0.35
No. of felony arrests		0.20		0.68*		0.38*		0.42*
No. of felony convictions		0.02		0.12*		0.22		0.18*
No. of days to 1st misdemeanor arrest		227.56		189.26		224.95		225.73
No. of days to 1st misdemeanor conviction		323.43		294.60		225.19		262.95
No. of days to 1st felony arrest		222.60		304.90		256.11		286.48
No. of days to 1st felony conviction	only 2 convictions		463.46		277.97		312.53	

* $P \leq .05$; T tests for differences between drug court participants/graduates and (1) those who were terminated from the drug court program, (2) offenders charged with possession of drugs but not assigned to the drug court, and (3) defendants charged with possession of narcotics with intent and non-drug offenses.

We found a similar pattern of results when we compared the recidivism rates of drug court participants/graduates to traditionally adjudicated offenders who would not have been eligible for the drug court. The drug court clients were more likely than these offenders to be arrested for a misdemeanor, but were substantially less likely to be arrested or convicted of a felony or to be sentenced to jail or prison for a new crime.

Results of the Multivariate Analyses of Recidivism. The results discussed thus far suggest that drug offenders who were not terminated from the drug court program generally hadlower recidivism rates than drug court failures and traditionally adjudicated drug and non-drug offenders. These differences, however, might reflect differences in the types of offenders found in each group. To control for this possibility and to isolate the effect of participation in the drug court, we conducted a series of multivariate analyses. We used logistic regression analysis to analyze five dichotomous outcomes: misdemeanor arrest, misdemeanor conviction, felony arrest, felony conviction, and sentence to jail/prison. We used ordinary least squares regression to analyze the number of new misdemeanor arrests, the number of new misdemeanor convictions, the number of new felony arrests, and the number of new felony convictions.   In all of the analyses, we control for the type of offender (drug court participant/graduate is the reference category); for the offender's race, gender, and age; and for three indicators of the offender's prior criminal record.

Table 6. Multivariate Analyses of Recidivism: Misdemeanor Arrests and Convictions

	Statistically Significant Predictors			
	Misdemeanor Arrest	No. of Misdemeanor Arrests	Misdemeanor Conviction	No. of Misdemeanor Convictions

Type of Offender
  Drug Court Participant/Graduate (ref)
  Drug Court-Terminated
  Traditionally Adjudicated Drug Offender
  Non-drug Offender or Possess with Intent
	
	Not Significant
	* (-)
	* (-)
		
		* (+)
		Not Significant
		* (-)
			
			Not Significant
			* (-)
			* (-)
				
				Not Significant
				Not Significant
				Not Significant

Offender's Background Characteristics
  Race = Black
  Gender = Male
  Age
	
	* (+)
	Not Significant
	Not Significant
		
		* (+)
		Not Significant
		Not Significant
			
			* (+)
			Not Significant
			* (+)
				
				* (+)
				Not Significant
				* (-)

Offender's Prior Criminal Record
  No. of Prior Felony Convictions
  Prior Violent Felony Conviction
  Prior Felony Drug Conviction
	
	Not Significant
	Not Significant
	Not Significant
		
		* (+)
		* (-)
		Not Significant
			
			Not Significant
			Not Significant
			* (+)
				
				Not Significant
				Not Significant
				* (+)

   $* P \leq .05$.

The results of our analysis of misdemeanor arrests and convictions are summarized in Table 6; complete results are presented in Table A2 of the Appendix. These results indicate that drug court participants/graduates were significantly *more likely* than either type of traditionally adjudicated offender to be arrested or convicted for a misdemeanor. They also had significantly *more* new misdemeanor arrests than non-drug offenders. On the other hand, drug court participants/graduates had fewer new misdemeanor arrests than drug court failures. Black offenders had higher recidivism rates than white offenders, and older offenders were less likely than younger offenders to have a new misdemeanor conviction. There were no differences between men and women on these measures of recidivism.

Table 7.   Multivariate Analyses of Recidivism: Felony Arrests and Convictions

	Statistically Significant Predictors				
	Felony Arrest	No. of Felony Arrests	Felony Conviction	No. of Misdemeanor Convictions	Sentenced to Jail or Prison
Type of Offender					
Drug Court Participant/Graduate (ref)					
Drug Court-Terminated	* (+)	* (+)	* (+)	Not Significant	Not Significant
Traditionally Adjudicated Drug Offender	Not Significant	Not Significant	* (+)	* (+)	* (+)
Non-drug Offender or Possess with Intent	Not Significant	Not Significant	* (+)	Not Significant	* (+)
Offender's Background Characteristics					
Race = Black	* (+)	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant
Gender = Male	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant
Age	Not Significant		Not Significant	* (-)	* (-)
Offender's Prior Criminal Record					
No. of Prior Felony Convictions	* (+)	* (+)	* (+)	* (+)	* (+)
Prior Violent Felony Conviction	* (-)	* (-)	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant
Prior Felony Drug Conviction	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant

* $P \leq .05$.

The results of our analysis of the remaining indicators of recidivism are summarized in Table 7 (complete results are presented in Table A3 of the Appendix). On these more serious indicators of recidivism, drug court participants/graduates generally had lower levels of recidivism than the other types of offenders did. Drug court participants/graduates were less likely than drug court failures to be arrested and convicted for a new felony; they also had fewer total new felony arrests than those who were terminated from the drug court. Drug court participants/graduates also were less likely than traditionally adjudicated offenders to be convicted of a new felony or sentenced to jail or prison for a new crime. Although neither race nor gender affected these indicators of recidivism in a consistent manner, older offenders were less likely than younger offenders to have a new felony conviction or to be sentenced to jail or prison for a new offense. The offender's prior criminal record also affected the likelihood of

recidivism. The greater the number of prior felony convictions, the more likely it was that the offender would be arrested or convicted for a new felony offense or incarcerated for a new crime.

Summary of Recidivism Analysis. Offenders who were assigned to the Douglas County Drug Court in 2001 and who were not terminated from the program generally had lower recidivism rates than drug court failures and traditionally adjudicated offenders. Although drug court participants/graduates were more likely than traditionally adjudicated offenders to be arrested for and convicted of a misdemeanor offense, they were less likely than other offenders to be arrested for failure to appear for court appearances, to be convicted of a new felony offense, or to be sentenced to jail or prison for a new crime. They also had fewer new felony convictions than traditionally adjudicated drug offenders. At least in the short term, then, drug court participants/graduates were less likely than drug court failures and traditionally adjudicated offenders to be brought back to court for a new felony offense.

APPENDIX

RESULTS OF THE MULTIVARIATE ANALYSES

Table A1. The Likelihood of Graduation from Drug Court: Results of the Logistic Regression Analysis

	B	SE	Odds Ratio[a]
Race (offender is black)	.68	.45	
Gender (offender is male)	-.74*	.35	0.48
No High School Degree or GED	-.61	.38	
Unemployed at Time of Arrest	-.80*	.34	0.45
Prior Felony Arrest	-.06	.14	
AgeBFirst Use of Alcohol	-.06	.05	
AgeBFirst Use of Drugs	.08*	.04	1.09

Type of Drug
    Cocaine (reference category)
    Methamphetamine
    Other Drug
	
	-.09
	.21
		
		.48
		.45	

No. of Positive Drug Tests, First Six Months	-.07*	.03	0.93

[a]Odds ratios are presented for statistically significant variables only.

* $P \leq .05$

Table A2.   Multivariate Analyses of Recidivism: Misdemeanor Arrests and Convictions

	Misdemeanor Arrest		No. of Misdemeanor Arrests		Misdemeanor Conviction		No. of Misdemeanor Convictions	
	B	SE	B	Beta	B	SE	B	Beta
Type of Offender								
Drug Court Participant/Graduate (ref)								
Drug Court-Terminated	.39	.27	.53*	.10	.06	.30	.15	.04
Traditionally Adjudicated Drug Offender	-.88*	.26	-.21	-.05	-.57*	.28	.04	.01
Non-drug Offender or Possess with Intent	-1.05*	.22	-.29*	-.09	-.88*	.24	-.10	-.05
Offender's Background Characteristics								
Race = Black	.70*	.12	.34*	.12	.56*	.13	.21*	.12
Gender = Male	.12	.14	.15	.04	.30	.16	.07	.03
Age	-.01	.006	-.01	-.04	-.02*	.007	-.004*	-.05
Offender's Prior Criminal Record								
No. of Prior Felony Convictions	.07	.04	.07*	.08	.06	.04	.01	.03
Prior Violent Felony Conviction	-.18	.20	-.24*	-.05	.02	.21	-.06	-.02
Prior Felony Drug Conviction	-.10	.18	-.16	-.04	.36*	.18	.12*	.05

* $P \leq .05$.

Table A3. Multivariate Analyses of Recidivism: Felony Arrests and Convictions, Incarceration in Jail or Prison

	Felony Arrest		No. of Felony Arrests		Felony Conviction		No. of Felony Convictions		Sentenced to Jail or Prison	
	B	SE	B	Beta	B	SE	B	Beta	B	SE
Type of Offender										
Drug Court Participant/Graduate (ref)										
Drug Court-Terminated	1.54*	.33	.48*	.15	1.89*	.77	.10	.06	1.48	.79
Traditionally Adjudicated Drug Offender	.45	.33	.08	.03	2.14*	.74	.15*	.11	1.92*	.75
Non-drug Offender or Possess with Intent	.49	.29	.07	.04	1.82*	.72	.08	.07	1.60*	.72
Offender's Background Characteristics										
Race = Black	.27*	.12	.07	.05	.16	.15	.01	.01	.16	.16
Gender = Male	.07	.15	.05	.02	.09	.19	.03	.03	.11	.21
Age	-.007	.01	-.002	-.03	-.02*	.01	-.003*	-.06	-.03*	.01
Offender's Prior Criminal Record										
No. of Prior Felony Convictions	.11*	.04	.03*	.07	.22*	.04	.05*	.17	.23*	.05
Prior Violent Felony Conviction	-.83*	.23	-.15*	-.06	-.29	.24	-.05	-.03	-.10	.24
Prior Felony Drug Conviction	.17	.17	.07	.03	.01	.20	-.01	-.005	.00	.21

  * P ≤ .05.