



# California Association of Drug Court Professionals NEWSLETTER

November 2004◆◆◆◆Issue 3

Dianne Marshall, Editor  
Therapeutic Courts Administration  
Mendocino County Superior Court  
P.O. Box 337, Ukiah, CA 95482  
707-463-4793 (p) 707-463-4424 (f)

Website: [www.cadcp.org](http://www.cadcp.org)

Email: [dianne.marshall@mendocino.courts.ca.gov](mailto:dianne.marshall@mendocino.courts.ca.gov)

## President's Message By Judge Stephen Manley

We will start the New Year with the release of new State funding to our Dependency Drug Courts. This competitive grant process through the CDCI has once again demonstrated the leadership of California Drug Courts in developing new collaborations at the State level and to accept challenges that are tied to additional funding –increase family renunciations and save State costs in foster care. We have found a new partner in the Department of Social Services, and a concerted effort by our own ADP and the AOC to make this program a success.

As drug courts continue to demonstrate their effectiveness, additional State agencies see the value in supporting an investment in drug courts. Perhaps the most noteworthy outcome of this process is that we anticipate grant applications from over 20 Drug Courts for funding far in excess of the \$1.8 million allocated by the Legislature. If we demonstrate the ability to expand and improve existing drug courts and implement new drug courts within six months, presenting our case for the transfer of additional funding to the Governor and the Legislature will be greatly strengthened. Once again, our enthusiasm and willingness to expand the drug court model cannot be doubted in a budget climate that demands accountability and results.

On an equally important front, ADP has released the mandated CDCI report to the Legislature, after approval by the Health and Human Services Agency and the Governor's Office. An article in this edition of the Newsletter will highlight the Executive Summary. (cont page 2)

## Team-Oriented Decision Making: Effective, As Opposed to Efficient, Decision Making By Judge Douglas Elwell

Each week I preside over a felony trial calendar for four days out of five. On the fifth day, I preside over a drug court calendar. Something I learned from my dad many years ago has served me well in handling the different approaches to decision making that these two calendar assignments call for.

My dad spent his entire professional career working in the areas of human resources and industrial relations. Smart man, my dad; maybe the smartest man I've ever known. I grew up listening to dinner table conversations about the differences between *efficient* decision making and *effective* decision making. I have noted, with some amusement, that business literature has recently been touting effective, as opposed to efficient, decision making as one of the "secrets du jour" of a successful business management style. This isn't a new concept – but it remains an important one. What, you ask, does all this have to do with team decision making in the drug court context? Plenty.  
(cont page 4)

## SAVE THIS DATE: April 28-29, 2005! By Judge Stephen Manley and Thomas Alexander

The Second Annual CADCP Membership and Training Conference will be held on **April 28 and 29, 2005 in Sacramento, California at the Doubletree Hotel Conference Center.**

Take advantage of this wonderful opportunity to network with other drug courts, learn best practices, learn about new areas for drug court expansion, how to resolve team issues and win-over new partners (or those who are having doubts), how to be more effective in difficult economic times when all agencies are under financial stress.

Encourage the entire Team, as well as new collaborators to come and learn why drug courts give meaning to your professional life and succeed where other approaches fail.

Carry the message to the non-believers, as well as those that you would like to see more involved in your local efforts. We promise to keep the registration costs low, and do our best to provide you with a very meaningful program.

### Inside This Issue:

- 2** Your Professional Association, CADCP!; President's Message (cont); Collaborative Justice on the Web; NADCP & NDCI Gear Available
- 3** State ADP Interim Report to the Legislature, March 2004; Articles Request
- 4** Outside the Walls; Team Oriented Decision Making (cont); Congress of Drug Court Associations
- 5** Call for Topics & Presenters for the 2<sup>nd</sup> Annual CADCP Conference
- 6-7** CADCP Individual and Organizational Membership Application Forms
- 8** MARK YOUR CALENDAR, APRIL 2005!

## **YOUR PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION, CADCP!**

**By Deb Cima, Membership Chair**

Membership in the California Association of Drug Court Professionals provides:

(1) A united voice for treatment court professionals in communications with the Legislature; (2) Funds for more CADCP sponsored annual training events; and (3) Funds to develop the organizational newsletter and website to make it current, informative, and interactive for members.

The cost of individual membership is \$25 annually (cheap!) and the organizational is \$150 for seven (7) members (even cheaper!) based on the calendar year.

**Membership applications for both individuals and for organizations are included with this newsletter.**

## **President's Message**

(cont from page 1)

The results are impressive. In a two and one-half year study of more than 3,500 adult criminal drug court participants, a total of 949,299 prison days were saved through successful completions of the program, resulting in an averted cost to the State of nearly \$35 million dollars. The accomplishments of graduates in returning to the community were equally impressive. For example, nearly 40% of all participants obtained employment while in the drug court program. Once again, this study underscores that our collaborative drug court model produces not only better human outcomes, but also challenges the assumption that incarceration must be our ongoing and expensive response to addiction.

Another avenue for the expansion of Drug Courts that I want to bring to your attention in this edition is the increasing awareness of the effectiveness of DUI Drug Courts, and the support for this effort at the State and Federal level. Our AOC has released an RFP for 3 pilot grants through State funding, and legislation presently

pending in Congress may open the way for a dramatic expansion in funding for DUI Drug Courts. Again, we must be responsive to change. We all realize that the mandated Drinking Driver Programs are not Drug Court accountable treatment and do not produce the outcomes that Drug Courts are capable of producing. We will need more Judges and Teams willing to step up to this new challenge in the near future.

On the Proposition 36 front, I find it very noteworthy that the independent evaluation of UCLA noted that those Counties and Courts that utilized the drug court model, had far more success in moving defendants into treatment, than those who did not utilize the model.

And this brings me to my final point, which is simply to remind you that we will be holding our **Second Annual Conference and Training on April 28 and 29, 2005 in Sacramento.**

This will be an opportunity to bring us all together for exposure to the latest information on best practices for drug courts, networking and reinforcement of that simple concept that as professionals when we work together in the most successful model that has been implemented in the last 20 years, we make a difference in people's lives as well as our own. **Please save the date, and join us.** Our strength is in our commitment to continue to work together, listen to one another and to be prepared to change our perspectives, as we better understand the most effective ways to improve and expand our Drug Courts.

## **NADCP/NDCI "Drug Court Works" Gear Available**

**By Helen Harberts**

By going to [www.drugcourtworks.com](http://www.drugcourtworks.com), you may purchase National Association of Drug Court Professionals and National Drug Court Institute clothing including hats, shirts and "Drug Court Works" gold lapel pins. A portion of the proceeds from the NADCP and NDCI products goes to those organizations.

## **Collaborative Justice on the Web By Tim Newman**

Internet goes searching for information about drug court and other collaborative justice programs should make a point of stopping by the Web site for the California Judicial Council [www.courtinfo.ca.gov/](http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/). The Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) maintains several pages at the site that are committed to covering collaborative justice both locally and nationally. Staff for the Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee maintains the site in order to promote collaborative justice to public users of the Internet and to serve the courts as an important resource.

Maintained now for a couple of years, the site hosts a variety of links that connect users to instant information on topics ranging from community and homeless courts, to mental health and drug courts. To keep users abreast of all things collaborative justice, the site is updated on a monthly basis. Stories contained on the site cover local initiatives like those taking place during California's Drug Court Month last May, to national announcements for drug court trainings by the National Association of Drug Court Professionals (NADCP).

Staff at the AOC often field phone calls and emails from Internet users seeking more information on collaborative justice. As the popularity of collaborative justice continues to grow nationally, sites like this one serve as an important point of contact for those seeking quick access to the field. "We receive calls from local law students to staffers at the state capitol looking for information on collaborative justice" says Patrick Danna, an AOC analyst.

**Next time you're on the Web, stop by and check it out!** For more information about the Web site please contact Tim Newman (AOC) at 415-865-7614. Visit the Web site at:

[www.courtinfo.ca.gov/programs/collab](http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/programs/collab).



*State of California*  
Department  
of  
Alcohol and Drug  
Programs

Kathryn P. Jett, Director

**Comprehensive  
Drug Court  
Implementation Act of 1999**

**Interim Report to the  
Legislature  
March 2004**

**I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The Comprehensive Drug Court Implementation (CDCI) Act of 1999 established the CDCI Program and states that the CDCI Program shall be administered by the State Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs (ADP). In collaboration with the Judicial Council, ADP was directed to design and implement the CDCI Program through the Drug Court Partnership Executive Steering Committee established under the Drug Court Partnership Act of 1998, for the purpose of funding cost-effective local drug court systems for adults, juveniles, and parents of children who are detained by, or are dependents of, the juvenile court.

The Act establishes a non-competitive grant program to which county alcohol and drug program administrators may submit grant requests as part of multi-agency plans. These plans identify the resources and strategies needed for effective drug court programs. The Act further requires an interim and final report describing the progress and achievements of the CDCI Program. This report has been prepared pursuant to the Act and describes the interim programmatic progress achieved.

The findings of this report reflect the calendar period immediately prior to these changes in the program, and all references to the "program" reflect the law, regulations, and program guidelines in effect during the study period. Findings that reference participants as "completers" refer to participants who successfully completed the CDCI program during the study period.

Finally, findings that reference participants as "terminated" refer to participants who were terminated from the CDCI program during the study.

**Summary of Findings**

The findings presented here reflect data collected during the two and one-half year time period, from January 2001 through June 2003, referred to as the "study period". Findings that reference participants as "new participants" are referring to offenders that period. Findings are further characterized by type of court: adult criminal, juvenile, dependency/family drug court.

The key findings from the study period are as follows:

- 3,563 participants completed adult drug court, avoiding a total of 948,299 prison days. This resulted in an averted cost of approximately \$34,233,593 million to the State.
- The ratio of prison costs averted by participants, to the amount invested for the counties who reported adult drug court data is 1.53 to 1.
- 618 adult criminals reported making child support payments regularly.
- Thirty-nine percent (39%, n=7,790) of adult criminal participants obtained employment while in the program, thus contributing to California's economy.
- Twelve percent (12%, n=966) of new adult participants admitted to the program were homeless. Of this number, 785 participants (81%) obtained housing during the study period.
- 990 adult criminals either enrolled or completed parenting classes.

- 1,358) adult criminals were reunified with family members.
- 358 juveniles and 206 dependency drug court participants completed the program during the study period.
- Almost all participants in the CDCI Program (96%) had negative urinalysis drug test results while participating in the program.
- Together, adult criminal and juvenile drug court participants completed 42,788 hours of community service.
- Among juveniles, 64,521 Juvenile Hall days, 16,556 group home days, and 2,725 California Youth Authority days were avoided by completers.
- Of female drug court participants who gave birth, 93% gave birth to drug free babies.
- 600 parents of dependents were compliant with the reunification plan, and 293 dependents were reunified with one or both parents.
- Dependents avoided 15,697 days in foster care and/or guardianship custody.

**ARTICLE SOLICITATION**

Articles regarding **a)** incentives that are particularly effective with specific populations; **b)** methadone use by drug court participants; **c)** effective treatment strategies for 18 year olds in Juvenile Drug Court and Adult Drug Court and **d)** successful strategies for Dependency Drug Court teams. E-mail attach your writing (limit: 700 words) to: [dianne.marshall@courts.mendocino.ca.gov](mailto:dianne.marshall@courts.mendocino.ca.gov).

Due dates to be included in future articles are: January 10<sup>th</sup> for the February '05 issue and April 10<sup>th</sup> for the May '05 issue.

## Outside the Walls: A National Snapshot of Community-Based Prisoner Reentry Programs

By Hugo Boeckx, Inmates Services Coordinator, Mendocino County Sheriff's Office

The REENTRY NATIONAL MEDIA OUTREACH CAMPAIGN funded by a grant from The Annie E. Casey Foundation is offering a free video through its website:

[www.reentrymediaoutreach.org](http://www.reentrymediaoutreach.org) Also provided are downloadable resource guides that go along with the video as well as specific information on the individual reentry programs presented in the video. The video profiles a number of reentry programs around the country; presents a basic description of services, highlights the partnerships and collaborations involved and describes the outcomes that show why the programs are effective. Diverse viewpoints are presented from different people who are involved in the criminal justice system including former consumers of correctional services, crime victims, policymakers, parole and probation officers, corrections officials, government agencies and community leaders. As someone who has worked in the field for over 23 years I know that most people in our jails and prisons eventually get out and will need assistance transitioning back into the community. Hence, this recommendation.

### Team-Oriented Decision Making (cont. from page 1)

Efficient decision making is process oriented. It is a model of decision making that is focused on keeping whatever it is that's "in the pipeline" moving forward. I'm not saying that a focus on efficient decision making is devoid of thought or concern; only that the primary focus is on moving things forward to the next decision. A system-program-enterprise that is primarily based on a model of efficient decision making prizes the decision maker who uses the fewest resources (time, personnel, materials, etc.) possible while still keeping things moving along. One of the fundamental cornerstones of the "efficiency model" of decision making is the fact of a solitary decision maker. The solitary decision maker may receive input from any number of sources, but the decision is based on that one decision maker's assessment of the input. The concept of "decision by

committee" is an anathema to the efficient decision maker.

Trial judges are complimented for being efficient decision makers. Judges are encouraged to "resolve" their cases, to "close" their cases, to "clear" their cases from today's calendar and move them on to the next calendar setting. The more quickly and conveniently a case can be settled (or moved forward to preliminary hearing, or tried, or...), the more favorably the handling of that case is viewed by colleagues on the bench: "Ol' so-and-so- may be a crusty s...o...b..., but he sure can handle a calendar!" Again, I am not suggesting that trial judges are mindless automatons who blindly push files from one side of their bench to the other. I am simply saying that the type of decision making that we are most often called upon to do is very clearly based on an efficiency model of decision making.

Effective decision making, on the other hand, is result oriented rather than process oriented. Effective decision making is focused on making a decision that makes a permanent difference. In other words, effective decision making is preventative, proactive decision making. It requires that one address not only the issue at hand but also the precedent factors that brought the issue to the fore so that the issue can be seen "in context." This allows for viewing the issue both in the present and in the future with some degree of consistency and continuity. Effective decision making unlike efficient decision making, lends itself to collaborative, consensus building, team oriented thinking. The sort of issue analysis that is most commonly produced by such team oriented thinking is a product not only of the intake of multiple sources of information but also of the internal, reciprocal critiquing of that information within the team. Also unlike efficient decision making, effective decision making lends itself to revisiting an issue as more and different information is obtained within the team. Also unlike efficient decision making, effective decision making lends itself to "revisiting" an issue as more and different information is obtained.

### Does the model of effective decision making sound familiar?

I understand that approaches to

decision making are not painted in simple shades of black and white and that efficient and effective decision making methodologies will overlap in many instances. I think it helpful, however, for a trial judge to be sensitive to which methodology s/he happens to be primarily using in any one instance. I also understand that the drug court team must have the one final decision maker to resolve differences and disputes within the team, and that that one final decision maker is the judge. I think that it is important to note, however, that that the final drug court decision will be made in the context of the exchange of opinion and information which has taken place within the team.

To a significant degree, trial judges are called upon to engage in efficient decision making while drug court judges are called upon to engage in effective decision making. Different skills; more importantly, different mind set. To the extent that we, as drug court judges, can keep our *efficient* decision making mind set from intruding on our ability to make *effective* drug court decisions we will become better at making the kinds of decisions that are called for in the drug court context.

### Congress of State Drug Court Associations

Recognizing that federal funding for drug courts will disappear, NADCP's Congress of State Drug Courts was launched in 1997 as a vehicle to empower, support and nurture leadership at the state and local levels. Comprised of two representatives from each state association, (one criminal justice professional and one treatment professional), the congress advocates for state and federal resources and funding and helps NADCP establish national policy.

The congress meets twice a year. The first meeting is combined with an annual training conference for state drug court associations that focuses on developing leadership at the state and local levels. The second meeting is held in conjunction with the annual national conference.

California Association of Drug Court Professionals  
P.O. Box 1089  
San Leandro CA 94577-0126

**REQUEST FOR WORKSHOP TOPICS:** What does the 2<sup>nd</sup> Annual CADCP Conference need to address to be worth your while? E-mail your suggestions to Dianne Marshall ([dmarshall@pacific.net](mailto:dmarshall@pacific.net)).

**REQUEST FOR PRESENTORS:** Is there a workshop topic that you are experienced in presenting? Are you available April 28-29, 2005 to facilitate a session on that topic as part of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Annual CADCP Conference? E-mail a one page abstract to Maureen Bauman ([mbauman@placerhhs.com](mailto:mbauman@placerhhs.com)) for consideration.

The 11<sup>th</sup> Annual National Association of Drug Court Professionals Drug Court Training Conference will be held June 9 -12, 2005 in Orlando, Florida!

**NEWSLETTER CONTRIBUTOR SIGN UP**

February 2005 Issue (1/10/05 Due Date)  
TOPIC: EST. LENGTH:

May 2005 Issue (4/10/05 Due Date)  
TOPIC: EST. LENGTH:

Fax this along with your Address Label to 707-463-4424. Thank you



# California Association of Drug Court Professionals

## CALENDAR YEAR 2005

### INDIVIDUAL MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION

*(See Reverse for Organizational Membership Application)*

**Renewal**                       **New**

Organizational Name _____	County _____
Address _____	City/St/Zip _____

Name _____
Title _____
Organization/Agency _____
Address _____
City _____ State _____ Zip _____ Country _____
Phone (_____) _____ Fax (_____) _____ E-Mail _____

Which category best describes your involvement in Drug Court?	
<input type="checkbox"/> Judicial Officer (01)	<input type="checkbox"/> Law Enforcement (06)
<input type="checkbox"/> Probation/Parole (02)	<input type="checkbox"/> Admin./Planning (07)
<input type="checkbox"/> Treatment (03)	<input type="checkbox"/> General Government (08)
<input type="checkbox"/> Prosecution (04)	<input type="checkbox"/> Elected Official (09)
<input type="checkbox"/> Defense (05)	<input type="checkbox"/> Other _____

If you wish to serve on a **CADCP Committee**, what is your particular area of interest? \_\_\_\_\_

<p>Membership dues for the current calendar year are \$25.00  Checks payable to <b>CADCP</b> should be sent to:  <b>CADCP, P.O. Box 1089, San Leandro CA 94577-0126</b></p>
---

For questions call Deborah Cima, Membership Chair  
Tel: 909-387-4730  
E-mail: dcima@courts.sbcounty.gov

**CALENDAR YEAR 2005  
ORGANIZATIONAL MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION**  
*(See Reverse for Individual Membership Application)*

**Renewal**                       **New**

Organizational Name _____ County _____
Address _____ City/St/Zip _____

Please list up to **seven** individuals included in the Organizational Membership. Also, indicate one category code (see over for listing).

1. Name \_\_\_\_\_ Title \_\_\_\_\_  
Phone (\_\_\_\_) \_\_\_\_\_ Fax (\_\_\_\_) \_\_\_\_\_  
E-Mail \_\_\_\_\_ Category Code \_\_\_\_\_

2. Name \_\_\_\_\_ Title \_\_\_\_\_  
Phone (\_\_\_\_) \_\_\_\_\_ Fax (\_\_\_\_) \_\_\_\_\_  
E-Mail \_\_\_\_\_ Category Code \_\_\_\_\_

3. Name \_\_\_\_\_ Title \_\_\_\_\_  
Phone (\_\_\_\_) \_\_\_\_\_ Fax (\_\_\_\_) \_\_\_\_\_  
E-Mail \_\_\_\_\_ Category Code \_\_\_\_\_

4. 1. Name \_\_\_\_\_ Title \_\_\_\_\_  
Phone (\_\_\_\_) \_\_\_\_\_ Fax (\_\_\_\_) \_\_\_\_\_  
E-Mail \_\_\_\_\_ Category Code \_\_\_\_\_

5. Name \_\_\_\_\_ Title \_\_\_\_\_  
Phone (\_\_\_\_) \_\_\_\_\_ Fax (\_\_\_\_) \_\_\_\_\_  
E-Mail \_\_\_\_\_ Category Code \_\_\_\_\_

6. Name \_\_\_\_\_ Title \_\_\_\_\_  
Phone (\_\_\_\_) \_\_\_\_\_ Fax (\_\_\_\_) \_\_\_\_\_  
E-Mail \_\_\_\_\_ Category Code \_\_\_\_\_

7. Name \_\_\_\_\_ Title \_\_\_\_\_  
Phone (\_\_\_\_) \_\_\_\_\_ Fax (\_\_\_\_) \_\_\_\_\_  
E-Mail \_\_\_\_\_ Category Code \_\_\_\_\_

If any member wishes to serve on a **CADCP Committee**, please list below:

Name _____	Area of Interest _____
Name _____	Area of Interest _____
Name _____	Area of Interest _____
Name _____	Area of Interest _____

<b>Organizational Membership dues for the current calendar year are \$150.00</b> <b>Please make check payable to CADCP and remit to:</b> <b>CADCP, P.O. Box 1089, San Leandro, CA 94577-0126</b>
--