




Census of Problem-Solving Courts, 2012

Suzanne M. Strong, Ph.D., and Ramona R. Rantala, *BJS Statisticians*
Tracey Kyckelhahn, Ph.D., *Former BJS Statistician*

In 2012, the Bureau of Justice Statistics' (BJS) Census of Problem-Solving Courts (CPSC) counted 3,052 problem-solving courts in the United States (figure 1). The most common types of problem-solving courts were drug courts (44%) and mental health courts (11%) (figure 1). Most courts (53%) reported that they were established prior to 2005, including drug (64%), youth specialty (65%), hybrid DWI/drug (63%), and domestic violence (56%) courts.

Problem-solving courts are a relatively recent development in the U.S. criminal justice system. These courts were created to address underlying problems that result in criminal behavior. Problem-solving courts are typically diversionary, meaning that a participant agrees to follow the guidelines of the court to avoid prosecution, incarceration, or other typical criminal justice outcomes. The criminal problem-solving court concept has been extended to civil and family court, such as family dependency matters, and to address the needs of certain populations, such as justice-involved veterans.

FIGURE 1
Problem-solving courts, 2012



^aHandles alcohol- or drug-dependent offenders also charged with a driving offense.

^bIncludes other courts not shown.

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Census of Problem-Solving Courts, 2012.

HIGHLIGHTS

- In 2012, 65% of all problem-solving courts accepted cases after the defendant entered a guilty plea.
- More than half (56%) of problem-solving courts in 2012 did not accept applicants with a history of violent crime and nearly two-thirds (65%) did not accept applicants with a history of sex offenses.
- In 38% of veterans courts and 11% of domestic violence courts, applicants with a history of violent crime were ineligible.
- Fifty-three percent of all problem-solving courts active in 2012 were established prior to 2005.
- Most veterans courts (55%) were established between 2011 and 2012.
- Participants in problem-solving courts spent a median of 1 year in the program in 2012.
- Overall, 57% of all problem-solving courts reported that more than half of the exits were successful program completions.
- Twenty-one percent of youth specialty courts reported that 100% of participants completed the program in 2012.
- Successful program completion commonly included dismissal of the case (61%) or a suspended sentence (40%).
- Fewer than half (44%) of all problem-solving courts tracked participant progress after program completion in 2012.

The CPSC was sent to 3,633 problem-solving courts thought to be operational in 2012 in all 50 states and the District of Columbia and the territories of Guam and Puerto Rico. Of the originally targeted courts, 3,052 were in existence in 2012 and 2,793 responded to the survey. (See *Methodology* for more information.)

On behalf of BJS, staff at the National Center for State Courts emailed respondents to explain the CPSC project and provided a hyperlink to the online questionnaire. For courts that were

unwilling or unable to complete the survey online, a paper questionnaire was mailed later in the data collection process or at the respondent's request. The respondent was directed to answer one questionnaire per problem-solving court. If respondents had multiple problem-solving courts under their control, they were to complete a separate questionnaire for each court. (See *Problem-solving court definitions and distribution by state* text box.)

Problem-solving court definitions and distribution by state

Problem-solving courts were established to treat other underlying causes of crime (e.g., drug addiction, mental health issues, or homelessness) or to address the needs of specific populations (e.g., veterans).

Problem-solving courts that met each of the following conditions were included in the 2012 census:

- used therapeutic justice¹ to reduce recidivism
- operated within the judiciary
- led by a judicial officer
- had an exclusive docket
- had participants that were admitted or that exited in 2012, or indicated that it was operational but did not have eligible participants enrolled in 2012.

In the 2012 Census of Problem-Solving Courts (CPSC), a problem-solving court was defined as specialized program or docket that operates within a jurisdiction or set of jurisdictions. A single jurisdiction could run multiple problem-solving courts, or multiple jurisdictions could participate in a single problem-solving court. The unit of count for the survey was the problem-solving court. If a problem-solving court had participants from multiple jurisdictions, it was counted once. If one jurisdiction runs three distinct problem-solving courts, then three problem-solving courts were counted.

The CPSC identified many types of problem-solving courts. Often, these courts can be classified under more than one type. For example, a juvenile drug court in Indian country could also be labeled as a tribal wellness court. In these situations, the respondent's self-classification was used. For a small number of surveys in which the respondent

did not affirmatively indicate a primary attribute, the problem-solving court was classified using other responses.

Problem-solving courts were classified using the following typology:

- Drug courts handle an underlying drug problem contributing to criminal behavior using nontraditional judicial proceedings and treatment with team-based services. These courts include adult drug courts, juvenile drug courts, and reentry drug courts, which could either address adult or juvenile populations.²
- Mental health courts divert defendants with mental illness, traumatic brain injury, or developmental disabilities into judicially supervised, community-based treatment. Mental health courts include adult mental health courts, juvenile mental health courts, and adult co-occurring disorder courts.
- Family problem-solving courts (referred to as family courts) handle juvenile or family court cases of child abuse or neglect, adjudication of parental rights, or custody and visitation, in which parental substance abuse is a contributing factor.
- Youth specialty courts serve juvenile offenders and address underlying issues that result in court involvement. Youth specialty courts include youth/teen courts and truancy courts.³
- Hybrid driving while intoxicated (DWI)/drug courts handle alcohol- or drug-dependent offenders who have also been charged with a driving offense.
- DWI courts focus on changing the behavior of the alcohol-dependent offender or offenders with a high blood alcohol content who were arrested for DWI or driving under the influence. DWI courts include juvenile DWI courts.

¹Therapeutic justice focuses on rehabilitating offenders using some form of counseling and on minimizing punishment.

²Although one juvenile drug court was located on tribal lands, it self-identified as a juvenile drug court and was counted in that category and not as a tribal wellness court.

³Seven courts that specifically served youth ages 16 and 17 who were charged in adult criminal courts were classified as youth specialty courts.

Continued on next page

Problem-solving court definitions and distribution by state (continued)

- Domestic violence courts handle criminal cases that involve offenses against persons who are related in some way, most often through intimate partnership or family relationship. Domestic violence courts include integrated domestic violence courts, which combines a docket for both domestic violence and family issues (e.g., custody and visitation).⁴
- Veterans courts serve justice-involved veterans and sometimes active-duty personnel. These courts include veterans drug courts, veterans mental health courts, and general veterans courts.
- Tribal wellness courts are in the tribal justice system and incorporate the wellness concept to meet the specific substance abuse needs of each tribal community. Tribal wellness courts include Tribal Healing to Wellness Courts and tribal hybrid courts.
- Other courts include adult community, homelessness, general problem-solving (courts that address multiple case types and serve a variety of defendants with underlying problems), reentry (except reentry drug courts), parole violation, gambling, gun, prostitution, elder abuse, and other specialty courts. Because this category contains many types of courts, it is rarely described in this report.

The number of problem-solving courts varied by state and territory in 2012. California (208) and New York (188) had the most problem-solving courts (table 1). Vermont (6) and Guam (5) had the fewest.

⁴Two of the five courts classified as domestic violence courts were “other” courts that indicated they were youth domestic violence courts. Three were hybrid courts handling domestic violence and drug abuse cases.

TABLE 1
Problem-solving courts, by state and selected U.S. territories, 2012

Jurisdiction	All courts	Drug	Mental health	Family	Youth specialty	Hybrid DWI/drug ^a	DWI	Domestic violence	Veterans	Tribal wellness	Other ^b
Total	3,052	1,330	337	261	244	217	183	170	133	31	146
Alabama	86	54	7	8	4	0	0	8	2	1	2
Alaska	20	0	4	2	6	2	4	0	1	0	1
Arizona	70	31	7	2	7	3	1	6	2	2	9
Arkansas	55	49	1	0	3	0	0	1	1	0	0
California	208	83	42	26	6	0	11	6	12	1	21
Colorado	85	33	6	13	14	3	8	0	1	1	6
Connecticut	17	3	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	2
Delaware	26	9	7	0	3	0	0	3	1	0	3
District of Columbia	11	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	8
Florida	164	68	22	17	38	0	4	5	8	0	2
Georgia	93	40	15	7	1	2	15	0	2	0	11
Guam	5	2	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
Hawaii	14	6	1	2	2	0	0	3	0	0	0
Idaho	70	28	10	4	3	11	6	5	3	0	0
Illinois	97	45	20	1	8	0	1	9	12	0	1
Indiana	64	36	3	4	7	1	0	0	4	0	9
Iowa	34	18	2	12	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
Kansas	15	10	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	2	0
Kentucky	78	52	3	0	22	0	0	0	1	0	0
Louisiana	54	38	2	2	3	0	5	0	1	0	3
Maine	9	5	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maryland	52	31	3	5	9	0	3	0	0	0	1
Massachusetts	23	16	3	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	1
Michigan	141	46	11	12	7	16	20	14	9	4	2
Minnesota	44	16	2	6	2	5	7	1	3	2	0
Mississippi	42	18	1	2	9	10	0	1	0	0	1
Missouri	137	62	9	12	3	23	19	4	4	0	1
Montana	21	9	2	1	1	1	4	0	1	1	1
Nebraska	21	13	0	6	1	0	1	0	0	0	0

Continued on next page

Problem-solving court definitions and distribution by state (continued)

TABLE 1 (continued)
Problem-solving courts, by state and selected U.S. territories, 2012

Jurisdiction	All courts	Drug	Mental health	Family	Youth specialty	Hybrid DWI/drug ^a	DWI	Domestic violence	Veterans	Tribal wellness	Other ^b
Nevada	54	17	4	3	1	9	9	0	4	0	7
New Hampshire	23	6	11	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	2
New Jersey	27	23	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
New Mexico	57	26	6	3	1	6	7	3	1	2	2
New York	188	50	11	21	7	18	1	59	11	0	10
North Carolina	54	15	6	7	18	0	5	1	0	1	1
North Dakota	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ohio	99	39	31	14	4	1	2	1	3	0	4
Oklahoma	72	20	13	4	2	30	1	0	0	2	0
Oregon	75	34	11	10	2	4	3	5	2	0	4
Pennsylvania	85	27	15	3	4	7	10	1	13	0	5
Puerto Rico	17	11	0	0	2	2	0	2	0	0	0
Rhode Island	7	5	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
South Carolina	28	21	3	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	0
South Dakota	10	2	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	4	0
Tennessee	46	24	3	1	3	10	3	0	2	0	0
Texas	153	42	10	13	16	25	13	6	10	1	17
Utah	58	25	10	16	1	4	0	0	1	0	1
Vermont	6	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Virginia	42	28	4	2	0	0	2	3	0	0	3
Washington	71	29	8	11	4	1	2	5	6	4	1
West Virginia	33	23	0	0	2	6	0	0	1	0	1
Wisconsin	63	18	3	2	7	8	11	1	10	2	1
Wyoming	18	9	0	0	1	5	1	0	0	1	1

Note: Counts of courts may vary from other sources due to categorical differences. See *Methodology*.

^aHandles alcohol- or drug-dependent offenders also charged with a driving offense.

^bIncludes various specialty courts.

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Census of Problem-Solving Courts, 2012.

Development of problem-solving courts

In 2012, a majority (61%) of problem-solving courts were located in counties with a population of 100,000 or more

The distribution of problem-solving courts varied by the type of court and the size of the population served. In 2012, the total resident population in the jurisdiction served by each problem-solving court ranged from 3,800 to 9,826,800.⁵ About a quarter of these courts were either in large jurisdictions with populations greater than 500,000 or in small jurisdictions with populations of 50,000 or fewer (table 2). More than a third (36%) were located in jurisdictions with populations between 100,001 and 500,000. Large jurisdictions had a disproportionately high number of veterans, domestic violence, and mental health courts, while small jurisdictions had a disproportionately high number of hybrid DWI/drug courts and a disproportionately low number of mental health, domestic violence, and veterans courts.

⁵The resident population includes all counties served by the problem-solving court. Courts identified as municipal courts included the population of the city of the court.

1 in 8 problem-solving courts active in 2012 were established in 2011 or 2012

Some problem-solving courts that were active in 2012 reported admitting their first participants as early as 1989. Half of problem-solving courts (53%) reported that they were established prior to 2005. Nearly two-thirds of drug (64%), youth specialty (65%), and hybrid DWI/drug (63%), and more than half of domestic violence (56%) courts were instituted prior to 2005 (table 3). Existing youth specialty courts reported that they were established early in the history of problem-solving courts. Half (49%) of youth specialty courts reported that they were established before 2001, including 9% that were established between 1989 and 1990 (not shown). In comparison, veterans, DWI, and mental health courts were established more recently. More than half (55%) of veterans courts reported being established in 2011 or 2012, and 37% reported being founded between 2006 and 2010. More than half (54%) of DWI courts reported being established between 2006 and 2010, and 18% reported being founded in 2011 or 2012. DWI (72%) and mental health (64%) courts reported being established between 2006 and 2012.

TABLE 2
Population of problem-solving court service areas, by type of court, 2012

Type of court	Total	50,000 or fewer	50,001–100,000	100,001–500,000	More than 500,000
All courts ^a	100%	23.6%	15.0%	35.7%	25.6%
Drug	100%	30.0	17.5	33.6	18.9
Mental health	100%	7.7	11.3	45.4	35.6
Family	100%	16.5	13.4	43.7	26.4
Youth specialty	100%	25.0	18.0	34.8	22.1
Hybrid DWI/drug ^b	100%	50.2	17.1	22.1	10.6
DWI	100%	21.9	15.3	39.3	23.5
Domestic violence	100%	9.4	10.0	41.8	38.8
Veterans	100%	3.0	9.0	39.1	48.9
Other ^c	100%	11.0	6.8	26.0	56.2

Note: Detail may not sum to total due to rounding.

^aExcludes tribal wellness courts because population of area served was unavailable.

^bHandles alcohol- or drug-dependent offenders also charged with a driving offense.

^cIncludes other courts not shown.

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Census of Problem-Solving Courts, 2012 and the U.S. Census Bureau.

TABLE 3
Year problem-solving courts active in 2012 were established, by type of court

Type of court	Total	1989–95	1996–2000	2001–05	2006–10	2011–12
All courts	100%	5.1%	17.0%	31.2%	34.4%	12.2%
Drug	100%	5.4	22.9	35.5	28.2	7.9
Mental health	100%	1.5	7.5	27.3	51.4	12.3
Family	100%	1.5	8.8	41.4	40.6	7.7
Youth specialty	100%	22.2	26.8	15.5	25.1	10.5
Hybrid DWI/drug ^a	100%	2.8	17.5	42.9	29.0	7.8
DWI	100%	0.0	7.7	20.2	53.6	18.6
Domestic violence	100%	5.4	15.6	34.7	35.3	9.0
Veterans	100%	0.8	3.1	4.6	36.6	55.0
Tribal wellness	100%	0.0	18.8	31.2	34.4	15.6
Other ^b	100%	4.1	7.6	24.8	37.9	25.5

Note: Detail may not sum to total due to rounding. Percentages are based on 99.4% item response rate. See appendix table 1 for standard errors.

^aHandles alcohol- or drug-dependent offenders also charged with a driving offense.

^bIncludes other courts not shown.

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Census of Problem-Solving Courts, 2012.

Admissions to problem-solving courts

In 2012, most problem-solving courts admitted participants after a plea was entered


Problem-solving courts varied by the point at which they intervene in a case. Some courts took cases that had reached a specific processing stage, while others took on cases at multiple processing points. Additionally, problem-solving courts accepted multiple case types and identified different entry points for criminal or civil and family cases. In 2012, 35% of problem-solving courts accepted a case at filing or prior to a plea, while 64% accepted a case after a plea was entered (table 4). Most (73%) domestic violence courts accepted cases at case filing or prior to a plea. Half (50%) of youth specialty courts accepted a case prior to a plea. Most (61%) family problem-solving courts accepted a case after a judicial order, which can occur at any point during a case's life-cycle. More than 8 in 10 (85%) hybrid DWI/drug courts accepted a case after a plea was entered.

In 2012, in most problem-solving courts applicants with a history of violent crime or sex offenses were ineligible

Participants had to meet certain criteria to be accepted into a problem-solving court. In 2012, most problem-solving court participants with a history of violent (57%) or sex (65%)

offenses were ineligible (figure 2). Domestic violence and veterans courts were exceptions to this pattern. The majority of domestic violence courts accepted participants with a history of violent crime (89%) or sex offenses (88%). The majority of veterans courts (62%) accepted participants with a history of violence.

FIGURE 2
Participants ineligible for selected problem-solving courts based on prior violent or sex offenses, 2012



Note: Percentages are based on 97.4% item response rate. See appendix table 2 for standard errors.

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Census of Problem-Solving Courts, 2012.

TABLE 4
Point of entry into problem-solving courts, by type of court, 2012

Type of court	Pre-plea or at case filing	Post-plea	Post-sentence or post-release ^a	Judicial order	Other ^b
All courts	35.5%	65.1%	35.7%	8.5%	2.4%
Drug	27.1	73.9	44.5	2.1	0.9
Mental health	44.1	73.1	41.1	3.7	0.7
Family	43.3	16.1	12.1	60.7	10.7
Youth specialty	49.5	54.3	11.7	3.2	6.4
Hybrid DWI/drug ^c	24.0	85.4	40.1	1.6	0.5
DWI	14.7	68.4	41.2	2.3	1.1
Domestic violence	72.8	39.1	14.6	15.9	2.0
Veterans	46.3	81.0	27.3	2.5	3.3
Tribal wellness	29.2	83.3	54.2	16.7	0.0
Other ^d	49.2	45.8	36.7	7.5	4.2

Note: Detail may sum to more than 100% because multiple responses were allowed. Percentages are based on 96.6% item response rate.

^aIncludes entry after violation or revocation of parole.

^bIncludes acceptance on a case-by-case basis, post-referral from outside agency, entry after child adjudicated dependent, and entry after admitting to impaired ability to care for child.

^cHandles alcohol- or drug-dependent offenders also charged with a driving offense.

^dIncludes other courts not shown.

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Census of Problem-Solving Courts, 2012.

Most problem-solving courts admitted fewer than 50 participants in 2012 and did not exceed reported capacity

In 2012, courts varied in the number of participants admitted. About 3 in 4 courts (72%) admitted fewer than 50 individuals in 2012 (table 5). Among domestic violence court, 78% admitted 50 or more individuals and 20% admitted 500 or more in 2012. The large majority of tribal wellness courts (91%) admitted fewer than 20 individuals in 2012.

Capacity was defined as the maximum number of participants a problem-solving court could manage. Most problem-solving courts (61%) reported a capacity of 20 to 99 participants (appendix table 3). Most family problem-solving courts (86%) and tribal wellness courts (100%) reported a capacity of fewer than 50 individuals. Domestic violence courts were larger, with a majority (59%) reporting a capacity of 100 or more.

Among problem-solving courts that reported the number of active participants in 2012, more than half (53%) reported between 10 and 49 active participants (appendix table 4). Tribal wellness courts had the fewest active participants, with more than half (52%) reporting nine or fewer. Domestic violence courts had the most active participants, with more than half (53%) reporting 100 or more.

Most problem-solving courts reported that the number of active participants was within or below their reported capacity. In 2012, 5% of courts with a capacity of 19 or fewer individuals operated over that capacity, as did 1% of courts with a capacity of 20 to 49 and 4% of courts with a capacity of 50 to 99 (table 6).

TABLE 6
Capacity of problem-solving courts, by number of active participants, 2012

Active participants	19 or fewer	20–49	50–99	100 or more
19 or fewer	95.1%	50.8%	7.7%	0.6%
20–49	3.3	47.9	50.3	5.2
50–99	1.2	0.7	38.5	27.4
100 or more	0.4	0.6	3.5	66.8

Note: Detail may not sum to total due to rounding. Percentages are based on 94.2% item response rate.

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Census of Problem-Solving Courts, 2012.

TABLE 5
Participants admitted to problem-solving courts, by type of court, 2012

Type of court	Total	9 or fewer	10–19	20–49	50–99	100–499	500 or more
All courts	100%	19.4%	23.1%	29.8%	13.2%	11.7%	2.8%
Drug	100%	19.7	25.3	32.1	13.0	9.1	0.9
Mental health	100%	19.6	22.8	32.6	12.0	12.0	1.1
Family	100%	30.0	30.4	25.8	9.2	4.6	0.0
Youth specialty	100%	12.8	12.8	27.4	15.2	25.0	6.7
Hybrid DWI/drug ^a	100%	16.2	27.0	40.5	10.3	5.9	0.0
DWI	100%	17.9	22.0	28.0	21.4	8.3	2.4
Domestic violence	100%	3.4	5.1	13.6	18.6	39.0	20.3
Veterans	100%	32.5	22.8	23.7	11.4	8.8	0.9
Tribal wellness	100%	45.5	45.5	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other ^b	100%	11.7	11.7	23.4	16.0	22.3	14.9

Note: Detail may not sum to total due to rounding. Percentages are based on 89.0% item response rate.

^aHandles alcohol- or drug-dependent offenders also charged with a driving offense.

^bIncludes other courts not shown.

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Census of Problem-Solving Courts, 2012.

Participation in problem-solving courts

In 2012, almost 90% of all problem-solving courts held preliminary reviews to discuss participant progress prior to the official status hearing

Problem-solving courts met periodically to monitor a participant's progress through the court's program. Depending on the type of court, an official status hearing was held daily, weekly, or monthly. The staff in most courts met prior to the official court review to discuss the participant's progress. Nearly two-thirds (63%) of all problem-solving courts reported meeting at least weekly to review the progress of their participants (table 7). Most (91%) problem-solving courts required the participant to attend the court hearing. Of these courts, 99% reported that the judge interacted directly with the participant at the court hearing.

Youth specialty courts and domestic violence courts met on a different schedule than most other problem-solving courts. Twenty-one percent of youth specialty courts met weekly, and 30% met monthly or more than once per month but less frequently than weekly (34%). Forty-two percent of youth specialty courts reported that the participant was required to attend status hearings. Of these courts, 90% reported that the judge interacted directly with the participant. More than a quarter of domestic violence courts met daily (28%), and more than a third met weekly (35%). Eighty percent of domestic violence courts required the participant to attend status hearings. Of these courts, 98% of domestic violence status hearings involved direct interaction between the judge and the participant.

TABLE 7
Characteristics of status hearings, by type of problem-solving court, 2012

Type of court	Frequency of status hearings ^a						Status hearing interaction	
	Daily	More than once per week	Weekly	More than once per month	Monthly	Other	Participant required to attend ^b	Judge interacted directly with participant ^c
All courts	4.4%	6.6%	52.1%	27.8%	6.9%	2.2%	90.9%	99.0%
Drug	2.4	6.2	59.2	26.4	3.6	2.1	97.1	99.1
Mental health	0.7	5.6	56.3	25.7	8.9	3.0	97.6	99.7
Family	0.4	4.8	62.6	29.6	1.3	1.3	96.5	99.5
Youth specialty	4.0	8.0	21.0	33.5	29.5	4.0	41.8	89.9
Hybrid DWI/drug ^d	2.6	6.8	53.6	32.3	4.7	0.0	97.4	100
DWI	2.2	6.7	43.6	44.7	2.8	0.0	97.2	100
Domestic violence	27.6	15.1	35.5	16.4	3.3	2.0	79.6	98.3
Veterans	2.5	2.5	49.2	30.3	13.1	2.5	95.9	100
Tribal wellness	3.8	7.7	57.7	23.1	3.8	3.8	100	100
Other ^e	19.0	6.6	40.5	15.7	12.4	5.8	77.5	98.9

Note: Detail may not sum to total due to rounding.

^aPercentages for frequency of status hearing are based on 98.3% item response rate.

^bPercentages for participants, presence at status hearing are based on 96.9% item response rate.

^cPercentages for status hearing interactions are based on 88.1% item response rate.

^dHandles alcohol- or drug-dependent offenders also charged with a driving offense.

^eIncludes other courts not shown.

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Census of Problem-Solving Courts, 2012.

Most (88%) problem-solving courts reported that staff held preliminary reviews of each case prior to status hearings (table 8). Forty percent of youth specialty courts and 45% of domestic violence courts met to review cases prior to the official court hearing. Of the courts that held preliminary reviews, judges and service providers were present in 93% of these reviews, while probation agents were present in 90%, and prosecutors and defense attorneys were present in 79%. Law enforcement officers were present in 40% of preliminary reviews.

Substance abuse treatment was the most commonly reported service used by problem-solving court participants in 2012

Problem-solving courts reported services used by at least 10% of active participants. Most (87%) problem-solving courts reported that they offered and participants used substance

abuse treatment, ranging from 41% of youth specialty courts to 97% of family courts (appendix table 6). Most (89%) problem-solving courts reported that they offered and participants used individual counseling sessions, ranging from 63% of domestic violence courts to 96% of tribal wellness courts. Almost three-quarters (72%) of all courts offered and participants used some form of life skills training (e.g., time management), ranging from 40% of domestic violence courts to 92% of family courts. In 2012, half (49%) of all problem-solving courts offered and participants used anger management programs, ranging from 26% of DWI courts to 71% of veterans courts.

TABLE 8
Preliminary reviews and attendance, by type of problem-solving court, 2012

Type of court	Preliminary review was held ^a	Judge	Prosecutor	Defense attorney	Service provider	Probation officer	Law enforcement officer
All courts	87.9%	92.5%	79.0%	79.0%	92.5%	89.3%	39.7%
Drug	96.7	96.0	83.6	83.5	92.0	93.6	45.3
Mental health	93.3	89.5	78.7	81.9	96.8	86.3	22.4
Family	97.8	91.9	62.9	71.0	95.0	76.5	17.6
Youth specialty ^b	40.2	54.0	39.5	32.9	76.3	55.3	26.3
Hybrid DWI/drug ^c	97.9	98.9	82.4	80.3	97.3	96.8	58.5
DWI	97.2	97.1	85.5	84.3	94.8	96.5	52.3
Domestic violence ^b	45.4	72.5	81.2	59.4	76.8	81.2	15.9
Veterans	91.8	93.8	90.2	92.0	92.9	95.5	40.2
Tribal wellness	100	100	87.5	75.0	100	95.8	70.8
Other ^d	72.5	82.8	62.1	64.4	88.5	77.0	33.3

Note: Detail may not sum to total due to rounding. See appendix table 5 for standard errors. Percentages are based on 85.2% item response rate.

^aPercentages are based on 96.9% item response rate.

^bPercentages for officials attending preliminary reviews are based on less than 50% item response rate. Interpret with caution.

^cHandles alcohol- or drug-dependent offenders also charged with a driving offense.

^dIncludes other courts not shown.

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Census of Problem-Solving Courts, 2012.


Juvenile drug and mental health courts

Drug (1,330) and mental health (301) courts were divided into subgroups based on the population served. Approximately a quarter of drug courts (23%) and a tenth of mental health courts (11%) were designated exclusively for juveniles (**figure 3**).⁶ Many court characteristics varied depending on whether the court served adults or juveniles.

- Juvenile problem-solving courts were smaller than adult courts. In 2012, nearly three-quarters of juvenile drug and mental health courts had fewer than 20 active participants, compared to roughly a third of adult drug and mental health courts.
- Individual counseling services were used in the majority of drug courts (94%) and mental health courts (95%), regardless of whether they served juveniles or adults.
- The average time in programs was less than 1 year in two-thirds of juvenile drug courts (65%) and 1 year or more in two-thirds of adult drug courts (69%).
- A significantly higher proportion of juvenile mental health courts (59%) tracked program graduates than adult mental health courts (41%).

⁶Seventeen adult drug courts accepted juvenile cases.

FIGURE 3
Drug and mental health problem-solving courts serving juveniles or adults, 2012



Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Census of Problem-Solving Courts, 2012.

Drug and mental health courts for juveniles were smaller than those for adults

The differences in size among adult and juvenile drug and mental health courts were significant. Juvenile courts tended to be smaller than adult courts. In 2012, 41% of juvenile drug courts had a capacity of 19 or fewer participants, compared to 10% of adult drug courts (**table 9**). Conversely, a higher proportion of adult drug courts (50%) had a capacity of 50 or more participants than juvenile drug courts (11%).

TABLE 9
Size characteristics of drug and mental health problem-solving courts, by type of court and population served, 2012

Court size	All courts	Drug courts			Mental health courts		
		Total	Adult*	Juvenile	Total	Adult*	Juvenile
Capacity^a	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
9 or fewer	3.2	2.1	0.9	5.4**	2.0	1.5	6.5**
10–19	17.1	16.1	9.2	35.1**	17.3	14.4	41.9**
20–49	40.4	42.2	40.1	48.2**	45.8	45.5	48.4
50–99	20.1	21.7	26.8	7.7**	20.7	22.7	3.2**
100 or more	19.2	17.9	23.1	3.6**	14.2	15.9	0.0**
Active participants	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
9 or fewer	18.5	17.8	10.4	38.7**	16.2	13.6	38.7**
10–19	22.1	22.1	17.6	35.0**	21.8	20.6	32.3**
20–49	30.6	33.2	37.7	20.7**	38.0	39.3	25.8**
50–99	13.5	14.1	17.9	3.5**	11.6	12.5	3.2**
100 or more	15.3	12.7	16.5	2.2**	12.5	14.0	0.0**

Note: Includes data from January 1 to December 31, 2012. Detail may not sum to total due to rounding. Percentages for capacity are based on item response rates of 94.9% for drug and 95.0% for mental health courts. Percentages for active participants are based on item response rates of 98.6% for drug and 97.3% for mental health courts. See appendix table 8 for standard errors.

*Comparison group.

**Difference with comparison group is significant at the 95% confidence level.

^aDefined as the amount of participants the program can treat at any one time.

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Census of Problem-Solving Courts, 2012.

Juvenile drug and mental health courts (continued)

Results were similar for mental health courts. Nearly half (48%) of juvenile mental health courts had a capacity of 19 or fewer participants, compared to 16% of adult mental health courts. Three percent of juvenile mental health courts had a capacity of 50 or more, and none had a capacity of 100 or more. In comparison, 23% of adult mental health courts had a capacity of 50 or more, and 16% had a capacity of 100 or more.

The difference in the number of active participants was also significant. Nearly three-quarters of juvenile drug courts (74%) and juvenile mental health courts (71%) had fewer than 20 active participants in 2012, compared to about a quarter (28%) of adult drug courts and about a third (34%) of adult mental health courts. The findings for admissions and exits were similar (appendix table 7).

Almost all drug and mental health courts (99%) operated at or below capacity (not shown). A majority of juvenile drug courts (65%) operated below capacity. Slightly less than half of adult drug courts (48%), adult mental health courts (44%), and juvenile mental health courts (44%) were below capacity.

Individual counseling was commonly used by participants in nearly all adult and juvenile drug and mental health courts

Some services were offered by drug and mental health courts equally for adult and juvenile participants. Individual counseling services were the most common and were used in the vast majority of drug courts (94%) and mental health courts (95%) for both juveniles and adults (appendix table 9).

For most services, the proportion of courts offering these services differed significantly between those serving adults and those serving juveniles. Services more common for adult drug courts included assistance in locating housing (56% of adult compared to 15% of juvenile drug courts), assistance in accessing benefits (48% compared to 26%), job training or assistance (65% compared to 41%), and use of medication to treat addiction (27% compared to 11%). In mental health courts, these services were also more commonly used by adults than juveniles. Conversely, cognitive behavioral therapy was used in a significantly higher percentage of juvenile mental health courts (81%) than adult mental health courts (72%).

Most juvenile problem-solving courts accepted cases after sentencing or release

Juvenile problem-solving courts intervened at different points in the life cycle of cases than adult problem-solving courts. Most adult drug (80%) and mental health (74%) courts accepted cases after a plea was entered but prior to sentencing (appendix table 11). Significantly more juvenile drug (59%) and mental health (68%) courts accepted cases after sentencing or upon release than adult drug (39%) or mental health (38%) courts.

Juveniles spent less time in programs than adults

Juveniles spent significantly less time in problem-solving court programs than adults. The average time in programs was less than 1 year in about two-thirds of juvenile drug courts (65%) and juvenile mental health courts (70%), compared to about a third of adult drug courts (31%) and nearly half of adult mental health courts (49%).

Case dismissal was the most common benefit for program graduates

The most common benefit of successful completion of a problem-solving court program was case dismissal. Nearly two-thirds of all drug courts (65%) and about three-quarters of all mental health courts (74%) could dismiss the case when the program was completed successfully. About half of adult drug courts (47%) and adult mental health courts (51%) could suspend sentences, which was significantly higher than the proportion of juvenile drug courts (31%) and juvenile mental health courts (26%) that offered this benefit to graduates. In comparison, a significantly greater percentage of juvenile drug courts could expunge records upon successful completion (32%), compared to adult drug courts (25%).

Most juvenile mental health courts tracked participants after program completion

Nearly 6 in 10 juvenile mental health courts (59%) tracked program graduates. This was significantly greater than the proportion of adult mental health courts (41%) that tracked graduates. About half of adult drug courts (52%) and juvenile drug courts (48%) tracked participants after program completion.

Funding of problem-solving courts

Most problem-solving courts were funded by state grants or through the state budget in 2012

Problem-solving courts reported the percentage of their total budgets that came from different sources. Fewer than a quarter (23%) of these courts operating in 2012 reported that they received some federal grants to support their programs. Four percent reported that the court was entirely funded with federal grants (table 10). Sixty percent reported receiving funding from the state (grants or budget), and 23% reported that the court was entirely funded by the state. Twenty percent of problem-solving courts reported that up to 50% of their funding came from court fees or fines. (See appendix table 1.)

Exits from problem-solving courts

57% of all problem-solving courts reported that more than half of the exits in 2012 were successful program completions

More than half (57%) of problem-solving courts reported that 51% of exits were successful program completions (table 11). Two-thirds (66%) of hybrid DWI/drug courts reported that 51% of exits were successful program completions in 2012. In comparison, 62% of family problem-solving courts had

50% or fewer exits by successful program completions. Tribal wellness (26%) and veterans courts (22%) reported that no participants successfully completed the court program. Veterans courts estimates were based on a low response rate to the question and must be interpreted with caution. Of the veterans courts that reported no successful program completions, 42% were instituted in 2012. Of the tribal wellness courts that reported no successful program completions, 33% (2 courts) were pilot programs (not shown). It is possible that the participants admitted had not yet met the requirements of the program by the end of 2012.

TABLE 10
Proportion of budget for all problem-solving courts, by source of funding, 2012

Source of funding	Any	1-50%	51-99%	100%
Federal	22.5	12.1	6.2	4.1
State	60.4	19.0	18.9	22.5
Local	40.4	20.0	9.2	11.2
Fees	28.0	23.3	2.5	2.2
Other*	27.7	17.2	4.1	6.4

Note: Detail may not sum to total due to rounding. Percentages are based on 77.9% item response rate. See appendix tables 13-17 for estimates and standard errors.

*Includes sources such as in-kind and other donations, fundraising, tribal funding, and private funding.

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Census of Problem-Solving Courts, 2012.

TABLE 11
Successful program completion, by type of problem-solving court, 2012

Type of court	Total number of courts ^a	None	1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-99%	100%
All courts ^b	2,447	7.9%	5.5%	29.2%	32.1%	17.1%	8.2%
Drug	1,148	6.7	5.6	35.2	35.8	10.9	5.8
Mental health	268	8.9	6.5	30.0	30.8	15.8	8.1
Family	227	9.7	11.7	40.8	22.3	10.2	5.3
Youth specialty	171	2.1	2.1	8.5	19.7	46.5	21.1
Hybrid DWI/drug ^c	199	2.8	3.4	27.7	44.6	14.1	7.3
DWI	158	7.1	0.6	10.3	32.3	40.0	9.7
Domestic violence ^d	68	19.4	11.3	19.4	16.1	25.8	8.1
Veterans ^e	90	21.7	1.2	15.7	26.5	25.3	9.6
Tribal wellness	23	26.3	10.5	26.3	21.1	5.3	10.5
Other ^f	96	12.5	5.0	20.0	28.8	16.3	17.5

Note: Detail may not sum to total due to rounding. See appendix table 18 for standard errors.

^aBased on the weighted responses and rounded to the nearest whole number.

^bPercentages are based on 80.2% item response.

^cHandles alcohol- or drug-dependent offenders also charged with a driving offense.

^dPercentages are based on 40% item response rate. Interpret with caution.

^ePercentages are based on less than 70% item response. Interpret with caution.

^fIncludes other courts not shown.

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Census of Problem-Solving Courts, 2012.

In 2012, most (93%) problem-solving courts reported at least one benefit to participants for successful program completion. Sixty-one percent of these courts reported case dismissal and 40% reported a suspended sentence as a benefit (table 12). Eighty percent of veterans, 78% of tribal wellness, 75% of youth specialty, and 74% of mental health courts reported case dismissal as a benefit for successful program completion. Twenty-two percent of courts reported that a benefit of successful program completion was that the record was expunged. Eleven percent of courts reported that a benefit of successful program completion was an expedited settlement of the case. 33% of family problem-solving courts reported this benefit.

Fifty-one percent of domestic violence courts reported that the case was dismissed. In 2012, 50% of DWI courts reported that a suspended sentence was a benefit of successful completion of court. For veterans courts, 78% reported that case dismissal and 64% reported that a suspended sentence were benefits of successful completion of the court program.

A majority of family problem-solving courts (58%) reported other benefits of successful completion. Some form of family reunification was the most commonly (50%) reported other benefit for successfully completing family problem-solving courts in 2012 (not shown). Forty-five percent of domestic violence courts reported other benefits of successful completion. Fifty percent of DWI courts reported other benefits of successful completion. Of these, the most commonly reported other benefit was partial or full driving privileges restored (12%) (not shown).

In 2012, less than half (44%) of all problem-solving courts reported that they tracked participant progress after program completion (figure 4). Eleven percent of domestic violence courts and 59% of DWI courts tracked graduates after successful completion.

TABLE 12
Benefits of successful program completion, by type of problem-solving court, 2012

Type of court	Case dismissed	Sentence suspended	Record expunged	Expedited settlement	Other ^a
All courts	61.3%	39.5%	22.4%	11.1%	34.0%
Drug	65.2	42.6	26.8	7.6	28.8
Mental health	74.1	48.6	22.1	12.1	28.3
Family	45.5	10.3	3.6	33.5	57.6
Youth specialty	75.5	11.7	36.7	4.3	18.6
Hybrid DWI/drug ^b	56.6	54.4	24.2	13.7	36.8
DWI	13.5	49.7	4.3	7.4	49.7
Domestic violence ^c	49.3	41.3	21.7	13.0	44.9
Veterans	80.0	55.0	22.5	11.7	35.8
Tribal wellness	78.3	65.2	21.7	4.3	8.7
Other ^d	58.7	33.0	12.8	11.0	45.9

Note: Detail may sum to more than 100% because multiple responses were allowed. Percentages are based on 93.1% item response rate. See appendix table 19 for standard errors.

^aIncludes benefits such as case closure, charge reduction, and successful completion of probation.


^bHandles alcohol- or drug-dependent offenders also charged with a driving offense.

^cSix percent of domestic violence courts indicated the court is mandated and reported no additional benefits associated with court completion.

^dIncludes other courts not shown.

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Census of Problem-Solving Courts, 2012.

FIGURE 4
Tracking participant progress after successful program completion, by type of problem-solving court, 2012



Note: Percentages are based on 97.0% item response rate. See appendix table 20 for standard errors.

^aHandles alcohol- or drug-dependent offenders also charged with a driving offense.

^bIncludes other courts not shown.

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Census of Problem-Solving Courts, 2012.

Methodology

Survey overview

The Census of Problem-Solving Courts (CPSC) is the Bureau of Justice Statistics' (BJS) first information collection from all problem-solving courts in the United States, Puerto Rico, and Guam. The National Center for State Courts (NCSC) fielded the survey on behalf of BJS. The survey defined problem-solving courts as those that—

- used therapeutic justice to reduce recidivism
- operated within the judiciary
- had a judicial officer in charge
- had an exclusive docket
- either admitted participants, had active participants, or exited participants between January 1 and December 31, 2012.

The CPSC collected information about the type of court, problems addressed, court capacity, cases accepted, sources of funding, services provided, number of admissions and exits, and tracking of graduates. Additional information collected but not presented in this report included stakeholder involvement in court planning, staff, training, presence of a court case management system, program evaluation, and demographic data on exiting court participants. Demographic data were not provided for a sufficient number of participants to provide reliable national estimates.

Universe identification

The universe list of problem-solving courts began with the National Drug Court Institute (NDCI) directory of state problem-solving court coordinators, which is updated every 6 months. An initial letter was sent to each contact, asking them to identify all of the problem-solving courts in their state and to provide a court-level contact for each program. This file was supplemented and verified by the Council of State Governments, Center for Court Innovation, National Association of Youth Courts, NCSC, and NDCI. The final list was further refined using information from court websites and press releases.

The unit of count for the CPSC is the problem-solving court. If a single courthouse location operated multiple problem-solving courts, each problem-solving court was counted separately. A problem-solving court that sat in multiple locations was also counted as a single court.

The original universe list included the 50 states, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. The Virgin Islands did not have any problem-solving courts in 2012. The U.S. territories of American Samoa and Northern Mariana Islands were excluded by design.

Court response rate and court verification

The survey was sent to 3,633 problem-solving courts expected to be operating in all 50 states, the District of Columbia, Guam, and Puerto Rico in 2012. If a court did not respond to the survey, staff followed up with phone calls and emails to the respondent. The verification process included the type of court. If there was no response to the phone calls or emails, and if no other person responsible for problem-solving courts could confirm the existence of the court, that court was considered to be unverifiable and was removed from the universe list. After repeated follow-up, 376 nonresponding courts could not be verified and were eliminated, leaving 259 verified nonresponding courts in the universe. After reviewing completed surveys, an additional 204 responding courts were excluded because they did not meet the criteria for inclusion.

The final universe contained 3,052 problem-solving courts, of which 2,793 responded for an overall 92% response rate. To compensate for the 259 nonresponders, all courts except drug courts had analytic weights calculated by first stratifying by court type and then weighting reporting courts so that their weighted counts equaled the universe count of the stratum. Due to their large numbers, drug courts were additionally stratified into three substrata by the size of population served, and analytic weights were calculated in a similar manner within population strata as was done with the other court types. This led to a slight underestimation of the total number of juvenile drug courts and a slight overestimation of the total number of adult drug courts because the drug court strata did not control for the juvenile or adult distinction, and 6% of adult drug courts and 7% of juvenile drug courts did not respond. These nonresponse adjustments and the resulting analytical weights for each type of court are included in appendix table 21.

Item nonresponse

The CPSC included 44 questions. For responding courts, there was no discernible pattern to item nonresponse. If a majority of items was skipped, the respondent was identified as a nonresponder and included in the weighting scheme. Overall, the item nonresponse rate for each question was less than 10%, unless otherwise noted in the tables.

Accuracy of the estimates

Because the CPSC was designed to be a census of problem-solving courts and included only verified courts, any error should come from failure to respond to the survey. Court-level (or unit) nonresponse ranged from 2% missing (driving while intoxicated courts) to 16% missing (youth courts). To account for unit nonresponse, the responses are weighted as previously discussed. Because such weighting may introduce some error into the estimates, standard errors were estimated for every table produced for this report. The standard error varies by estimate and type of court. Overall, an estimate with a small standard error is considered to be more reliable than an estimate with a large standard error. Estimates with larger

standard errors are considered to be less precise and should be interpreted with some degree of caution. All standard errors were produced using SUDAAN Statistical Software for Analyzing Correlated Data.

Additionally, readers can use the estimates and the standard errors of the estimates provided in this report to generate a confidence interval around the estimate as a measure of the margin of error. The following example illustrates how standard errors can be used to generate confidence intervals:

According to the CPSC, in 2012, an estimated 27.0% of youth specialty courts reported that the court tracked successful graduates of the program (figure 5). The standard error of this estimate is 1.3 (appendix table 20). A confidence interval around the estimate was generated by multiplying the standard errors by ± 1.96 (the t-score of a normal, two-tailed distribution that excludes 2.5% at either end of the distribution). Therefore, the 95% confidence interval around the estimate is $27.0 \pm (1.3 \times 1.96)$ or 24.5 to 29.5. In other words, if different samples of problem-solving courts using the same procedures were taken from the U.S. population in 2012, 95.0% of the time, 24.5% to 29.5% of youth courts would respond that they tracked graduates. When the confidence intervals for the counts of other types of problem-solving courts that tracked successful graduates do not overlap with the confidence interval for youth specialty courts, then those problem-solving courts can be said to have different tracking counts than youth specialty courts.

APPENDIX TABLE 1**Standard errors table for table 3: Year problem-solving courts were established, by type of court**

Type of court	1989-95	1996-2000	2001-05	2006-10	2011-12
All courts	0.14%	0.21%	0.25%	0.26%	0.18%
Drug	0.18	0.31	0.34	0.31	0.19
Mental health	0.20	0.42	0.71	0.79	0.52
Family	0.25	0.56	0.97	0.97	0.52
Youth specialty	1.21	1.29	1.06	1.26	0.89
Hybrid DWI/drug	0.38	0.91	1.19	1.09	0.64
DWI	0.00	0.30	0.44	0.55	0.43
Domestic violence	0.54	0.88	1.15	1.15	0.69
Veterans	0.22	0.44	0.54	1.20	1.24
Tribal wellness	0.00	3.17	3.71	3.82	2.90
Other	0.74	0.97	1.60	1.80	1.62

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Census of Problem-Solving Courts, 2012.

APPENDIX TABLE 2**Standard errors for figure 2: Participants ineligible for selected problem-solving courts based on prior violent or sex offenses, 2012**

Type of court	Reason for ineligibility	
	Violent offense	Sex offense
All courts	0.27%	0.26%
Domestic violence	0.76	0.78
Veterans	1.21	1.21

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Census of Problem-Solving Courts, 2012.

APPENDIX TABLE 3**Capacity of problem-solving courts, by type of court, 2012**

Type of court	Total	9 or fewer	10-19	20-49	50-99	100-499	500 or more
All courts	100%	3.2%	17.1%	40.4%	20.1%	16.8%	2.4%
Drug	100	2.1	16.1	42.2	21.7	16.3	1.6
Mental health	100	2.0	17.3	45.8	20.7	12.9	1.4
Family	100	3.5	34.4	44.1	12.8	5.3	0.0
Youth specialty	100	14.3	20.9	33.5	13.7	13.2	4.4
Hybrid DWI/drug ^a	100	1.6	15.2	40.3	24.1	15.7	3.1
DWI	100	1.1	12.1	42.0	20.1	22.4	2.3
Domestic violence	100	3.0	5.3	18.2	18.9	43.2	11.4
Veterans	100	3.3	11.6	41.3	24.0	18.2	1.7
Tribal wellness	100	13.6	27.3	54.5	4.5	0.0	0.0
Other ^b	100	0.9	13.6	33.6	20.9	26.4	4.5

Note: Detail may not sum to total due to rounding. Percentages are based on 94.3% item response rate.

^aHandles alcohol- or drug-dependent offenders also charged with a driving offense.

^bIncludes other courts not shown.

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Census of Problem-Solving Courts, 2012.

APPENDIX TABLE 4**Number of active participants, by type of problem-solving court, 2012**

Type of court	Total	9 or fewer	10–19	20–49	50–99	100–499	500 or more
All courts	100%	18.5%	22.1%	30.6%	13.5%	13.1%	2.2%
Drug	100	17.8	22.1	33.2	14.1	11.4	1.3
Mental health	100	16.2	21.8	38.0	11.6	11.9	0.7
Family	100	36.3	29.1	23.9	7.3	3.4	0.0
Youth specialty	100	27.0	20.6	25.4	10.1	14.3	2.6
Hybrid DWI/drug ^a	100	11.9	24.9	33.7	17.1	12.4	0.0
DWI	100	6.8	23.7	34.5	18.1	14.7	2.3
Domestic violence	100	5.5	8.9	15.8	17.1	37.0	15.8
Veterans	100	25.4	20.5	28.7	13.9	9.8	1.6
Tribal wellness	100	52.2	39.1	4.3	0.0	4.3	0.0
Other ^b	100	10.7	19.8	23.1	16.5	24.8	5.0

Note: Detail may not sum to total due to rounding. Percentages are based on 97.8% item response rate.

^aHandles alcohol- or drug-dependent offenders also charged with a driving offense.

^bIncludes other courts not shown.

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Census of Problem-Solving Courts, 2012.

APPENDIX TABLE 5**Standard errors for table 8: Preliminary reviews and attendance, by type of problem-solving court, 2012**

Type of court	Preliminary review was held	Judge	Prosecutor	Defense attorney	Service provider	Probation officer	Law enforcement officer
All courts	0.18%	0.17%	0.24%	0.24%	0.16%	0.19%	0.27%
Drug	0.14	0.15	0.28	0.27	0.20	0.18	0.35
Mental health	0.40	0.51	0.68	0.64	0.30	0.58	0.70
Family	0.30	0.56	0.99	0.93	0.44	0.87	0.78
Youth specialty	1.47	2.35	2.30	2.21	2.00	2.34	2.08
Hybrid DWI/drug	0.34	0.25	0.93	0.97	0.39	0.43	1.20
DWI	0.18	0.19	0.40	0.41	0.25	0.21	0.56
Domestic violence	1.20	1.60	1.40	1.76	1.51	1.40	1.31
Veterans	0.68	0.63	0.77	0.71	0.67	0.54	1.28
Tribal wellness	0.00	0.00	2.76	3.62	0.00	1.67	3.80
Other	1.66	1.65	2.12	2.09	1.39	1.84	2.06

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Census of Problem-Solving Courts, 2012.

APPENDIX TABLE 6
Services commonly used by problem-solving court participants, by type of court, 2012

Type of service	All courts	Drug	Mental health	Family	Youth specialty	Hybrid DWI/drug ^a	DWI	Domestic violence	Veterans	Tribal wellness	Other ^b
Treatment											
Substance abuse	86.8%	95.5%	77.1%	97.4%	40.8%	94.8%	94.4%	64.5%	95.1%	96.2%	78.0%
Integrated substance abuse and mental health treatment	60.4	62.5	85.5	70.9	20.7	56.8	51.1	36.8	84.4	61.5	49.2
Medication as a treatment strategy	28.1	22.5	59.9	37.9	8.2	29.2	19.7	13.2	51.6	30.8	25.4
Counseling											
Individual	89.2%	94.0%	94.9%	94.7%	65.2%	95.3%	90.4%	63.2%	95.9%	96.2%	72.0%
Outpatient	59.5	56.1	97.0	62.1	28.8	51.0	44.4	51.3	89.3	61.5	63.6
Cognitive behavioral therapy	57.3	60.1	72.7	64.3	19.6	66.1	57.3	27.6	73.0	57.7	50.0
Crisis stabilization	32.2	25.8	79.5	33.9	9.2	27.6	22.5	16.4	50.0	42.3	33.9
Inpatient mental health treatment	27.6	21.1	66.3	22.5	9.8	18.2	18.0	19.1	68.0	38.5	32.2
Personal											
Life skills	71.8%	73.5%	80.5%	91.6%	62.5%	73.4%	59.0%	39.5%	67.2%	73.1%	71.2%
GED class	56.7	66.8	49.2	59.0	23.4	75.5	48.3	21.1	45.9	73.1	61.0
Job training and employment readiness program	53.9	58.4	56.6	61.7	17.4	59.4	52.2	16.4	73.8	69.2	66.1
Transportation	50.7	48.8	76.4	74.9	20.1	46.9	51.7	11.2	64.8	65.4	50.0
Locating housing	50.3	44.8	79.8	81.1	7.6	56.3	46.1	15.8	79.5	53.8	55.1
Accessing benefits	48.5	42.2	82.2	72.7	12.0	56.8	39.3	14.5	81.1	38.5	54.2
Health education	32.3	34.2	40.1	41.9	16.8	35.9	28.1	5.3	36.1	38.5	31.4
Financial counseling	25.2	23.7	30.0	34.8	4.3	43.8	28.7	2.0	33.6	23.1	29.7
Civil legal assistance	13.7	9.8	16.8	19.4	3.3	16.1	14.6	17.1	25.4	38.5	22.9
Cultural-specific services	12.5	11.3	12.5	17.6	9.8	9.4	16.3	6.6	11.5	73.1	12.7
Victim or offender support											
Anger management	49.3%	47.1%	51.9%	53.3%	54.3%	52.6%	26.4%	55.9%	70.5%	65.4%	41.5%
Batterer	14.7	6.4	10.8	27.8	2.7	9.9	4.5	88.8	32.0	26.9	9.3

Note: Detail may sum to more than 100% because multiple responses were allowed. Percentages are based on 96.7% item response rate.

^aHandles alcohol- or drug-dependent offenders also charged with a driving offense.

^bIncludes other courts not shown.

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Census of Problem-Solving Courts, 2012.

APPENDIX TABLE 7
Admissions and exits to drug and mental health problem-solving courts, by type of court and population served, 2012

Active participants	All courts	Drug courts			Mental health courts		
		Total	Adult*	Juvenile	Total	Adult*	Juvenile
Admissions	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
9 or fewer	19.4	19.7	15.9	30.4**	19.6	18.3	30.0**
10-19	23.1	25.3	22.1	34.3**	22.8	21.5	33.3**
20-49	29.8	32.1	33.8	27.0**	32.6	32.9	30.0
50-99	13.2	13.0	15.6	5.5**	12.0	12.6	6.7**
100 or more	14.5	10.0	12.5	2.8**	13.0	14.6	0.0**
Exits	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
9 or fewer	31.0	29.3	23.5	45.8**	33.2	31.0	51.7**
10-19	21.9	23.0	22.3	25.3**	25.0	25.9	17.2**
20-49	25.3	29.0	30.9	23.7**	25.4	25.1	27.6
50-99	11.1	11.4	14.3	2.8**	9.3	10.0	3.4**
100 or more	10.7	7.3	9.0	2.5**	7.1	7.9	0.0**

Note: Includes data from January 1 to December 31, 2012. Detail may not sum to total due to rounding. Percentages for admissions are based on item response rates of 91.1% for drug and 88.7% for mental health courts. Percentages for exits are based on item response rates of 90.0% for drug and 86.1% for mental health courts. See appendix table 8 for standard errors.

*Comparison group.

**Difference with comparison group is significant at the 95% confidence level.

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Census of Problem-Solving Courts, 2012.

APPENDIX TABLE 8
Standard errors for table 9 and appendix table 7: Characteristics of drug and mental health problem-solving courts, by type of court and population served, 2012

Court size	All courts	Drug courts			Mental health courts		
		Total	Adult	Juvenile	Total	Adult	Juvenile
Capacity							
9 or fewer	0.11%	0.10%	0.07%	0.31%	0.23%	0.21%	1.23%
10-19	0.21	0.25	0.23	0.67	0.61	0.60	2.47
20-49	0.28	0.36	0.40	0.72	0.81	0.85	2.50
50-99	0.22	0.31	0.38	0.41	0.66	0.72	0.88
100 or more	0.22	0.29	0.36	0.31	0.57	0.63	0.00
Admissions							
9 or fewer	0.22%	0.27%	0.29%	0.66%	0.66%	0.69%	2.33%
10-19	0.23	0.32	0.34	0.71	0.70	0.73	2.39
20-49	0.26	0.35	0.41	0.67	0.79	0.83	2.33
50-99	0.20	0.26	0.33	0.37	0.54	0.59	1.27
100 or more	0.21	0.24	0.30	0.28	0.56	0.63	0.00
Active participants							
9 or fewer	0.21%	0.26%	0.24%	0.67%	0.59%	0.58%	2.43%
10-19	0.23	0.29	0.30	0.69	0.66	0.68	2.34
20-49	0.25	0.34	0.40	0.59	0.78	0.82	2.19
50-99	0.19	0.26	0.33	0.29	0.51	0.56	0.88
100 or more	0.20	0.25	0.32	0.23	0.53	0.58	0.00
Exits							
9 or fewer	0.26%	0.31%	0.34%	0.73%	0.80%	0.83%	2.58%
10-19	0.24	0.31	0.35	0.65	0.74	0.79	1.95
20-49	0.25	0.34	0.40	0.65	0.74	0.78	2.31
50-99	0.19	0.25	0.32	0.29	0.49	0.54	0.94
100 or more	0.19	0.21	0.27	0.27	0.44	0.49	0.00

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Census of Problem-Solving Courts, 2012.

APPENDIX TABLE 9

Services commonly used by drug and mental health problem-solving court participants, by type of court and population served, 2012

Type of service	All courts	Drug courts			Mental health courts		
		Total	Adult*	Juvenile	Total	Adult*	Juvenile
Drug or alcohol treatment							
Substance abuse treatment	86.8%	95.5%	96.1%	93.7%**	77.1%	77.8%	71.0%**
Integrated substance abuse and mental health treatment	60.4	62.5	63.8	58.8**	85.5	88.3	61.3**
Medication as a treatment strategy	28.1	22.5	26.5	11.4**	59.9	61.7	45.2**
Counseling							
Individual	89.2%	94.0%	94.2%	93.6%	94.9%	94.7%	96.8%**
Outpatient	59.5	56.1	57.5	51.9**	97.0	97.4	93.5**
Cognitive behavioral therapy	57.3	60.1	61.1	57.3**	72.7	71.8	80.6**
Crisis stabilization	32.2	25.8	26.9	22.8**	79.5	81.2	64.5**
Inpatient mental health treatment	27.6	21.1	20.1	23.7**	66.3	68.4	48.4**
Other	20.8	19.0	16.6	25.7**	23.6	21.9	38.7**
Personal support							
Life skills	71.8%	73.5%	73.4%	74.0%	80.5%	79.7%	87.1%**
GED class	56.7	66.8	69.9	58.2**	49.2	50.8	35.5**
Job training and employment readiness program	53.9	58.4	64.7	40.9**	56.6	60.5	22.6**
Transportation	50.7	48.8	48.0	51.0**	76.4	79.3	51.6**
Locating housing	50.3	44.8	55.6	14.5**	79.8	86.5	22.6**
Accessing benefits	48.5	42.2	48.1	25.7**	82.2	88.0	32.3**
Health education	32.3	34.2	35.5	30.4**	40.1	42.1	22.6**
Financial counseling	25.2	23.7	29.5	7.6**	30.0	33.1	3.2**
Financial assistance	20.2	15.9	20.2	3.8**	36.4	40.2	3.2**
Civil legal assistance	13.7	9.8	11.3	5.4**	16.8	18.4	3.2**
Culture-specific services	12.5	11.3	9.8	15.6**	12.5	12.8	9.7**
Other	39.5	36.1	42.5	18.0**	42.1	44.0	25.8**
Victim or offender support							
Anger management	49.3%	47.1%	45.9%	50.6%**	51.9%	52.3%	48.4%
Batterer	14.7	6.4	8.5	0.3**	10.8	11.7	3.2**
Other	18.1	9.5	9.6	9.5	11.4	10.9	16.1**

Note: Detail sums to more than 100% because multiple responses were allowed. Percentages are based on item response rates of 96.9% for drug and 95.6% for mental health courts. See appendix table 10 for standard errors.

*Comparison group.

**Difference with comparison group is significant at the 95% confidence level.

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Census of Problem-Solving Courts, 2012.

APPENDIX TABLE 10

Standard errors for appendix table 9: Services commonly used by drug and mental health problem-solving court participants, by type of court and population served, 2012

Type of service	All courts	Drug courts			Mental health courts		
		Total	Adult	Juvenile	Total	Adult	Juvenile
Drug or alcohol treatment							
Substance abuse treatment	0.19%	0.14%	0.16%	0.33%	0.68%	0.71%	2.27%
Integrated substance abuse and mental health treatment	0.26	0.35	0.40	0.71	0.57	0.55	2.43
Medication as a treatment strategy	0.24	0.31	0.38	0.45	0.79	0.83	2.49
Counseling							
Individual counseling	0.18%	0.18%	0.20%	0.37%	0.35%	0.38%	0.88%
Outpatient mental health treatment	0.26	0.36	0.42	0.72	0.28	0.27	1.23
Cognitive behavioral therapy	0.26	0.36	0.41	0.71	0.72	0.77	1.97
Crisis stabilization	0.24	0.32	0.38	0.61	0.65	0.67	2.39
Inpatient mental health treatment	0.23	0.30	0.34	0.61	0.76	0.79	2.50
Other	0.23	0.29	0.32	0.64	0.69	0.71	2.43
Personal support							
Life skills	0.25%	0.32%	0.38%	0.63%	0.64%	0.69%	1.68%
GED class	0.26	0.35	0.39	0.71	0.81	0.85	2.39
Job training and employment readiness program	0.26	0.36	0.41	0.71	0.80	0.83	2.09
Transportation	0.26	0.36	0.42	0.72	0.69	0.69	2.50
Locating housing	0.25	0.36	0.42	0.50	0.65	0.58	2.09
Accessing benefits	0.25	0.36	0.42	0.63	0.62	0.55	2.34
Health education	0.26	0.35	0.41	0.66	0.79	0.84	2.09
Financial counseling	0.23	0.31	0.38	0.37	0.74	0.80	0.88
Financial assistance	0.21	0.27	0.34	0.27	0.78	0.84	0.88
Civil legal assistance	0.19	0.22	0.27	0.32	0.60	0.66	0.88
Culture-specific services	0.18	0.24	0.26	0.53	0.53	0.57	1.48
Other	0.27	0.35	0.42	0.56	0.80	0.85	2.19
Victim or offender support							
Anger management	0.28%	0.37%	0.42%	0.72%	0.81%	0.85%	2.50%
Batterer	0.17	0.18	0.24	0.07	0.50	0.55	0.88
Other	0.22	0.22	0.25	0.42	0.51	0.53	1.84

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Census of Problem-Solving Courts, 2012.

APPENDIX TABLE 11
Adult and juvenile drug and mental health problem-solving court programs, by case characteristics and outcomes, 2012

Case characteristic and outcome	All courts	Drug courts			Mental health courts		
		Total	Adult*	Juvenile	Total	Adult*	Juvenile
Point of entry^a							
Pre-plea or case filing	35.5%	27.1%	26.8%	27.8%	44.1%	44.7%	38.7%**
Post-plea	65.1	73.9	79.6	58.1**	73.1	74.4	61.3**
Post-sentence or release	35.7	44.5	39.4	58.9**	41.1	38.0	67.7**
Judicial order	8.5	2.1	1.5	4.1**	3.7	3.0	9.7**
Other	2.4	0.9	0.7	1.6**	0.7	0.8	0.0**
Time in program^{b,c}							
All	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
5 months or less	20.6	12.6	11.5	15.4**	16.2	16.6	13.0
6–11 months	27.9	28.1	19.7	50.0**	35.3	32.6	56.5**
12–23 months	44.5	49.0	55.2	32.9**	43.1	44.8	30.4**
24–35 months	5.3	7.6	10.1	1.3**	4.9	5.5	0.0**
36 months or more	1.7	2.7	3.5	0.4**	0.5	0.6	0.0**
Percent of participants successfully completing program^b							
All	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
None	7.9	6.7	6.5	7.2	8.9	9.4	4.2**
1–25%	5.5	5.6	5.1	6.9**	6.5	6.7	4.2**
24–50%	29.2	35.2	35.3	35.1	30.0	29.6	33.3
51–75%	32.1	35.8	37.0	32.4**	30.8	29.1	45.8**
76–99%	17.1	10.9	11.4	9.4**	15.8	16.6	8.3**
100%	8.2	5.8	4.7	9.0**	8.1	8.5	4.2**
Benefit of successful completion^a							
Case dismissed	61.3%	65.2%	64.7%	66.4%**	74.1%	74.5%	71.0%
Sentence suspended	39.5	42.6	46.7	31.3**	48.6	51.4	25.8**
Record expunged	22.4	26.8	24.9	32.3**	22.1	22.0	22.6
Expedited settlement	11.1	7.6	7.7	7.4	12.1	13.1	3.2**
Other	34.0	28.8	29.9	25.9**	28.3	25.9	48.4**
Track after exit							
Yes	44.1%	50.6%	51.8%	47.5%**	42.6%	40.6%	59.4%**

Note: Percentages for point of entry are based on item response rates of 96.8% for drug and 95.5% for mental health courts. Percentages for successful completion are based on item response rates of 86.3% for drug and 79.5% for mental health courts. Percentages for benefits of completion are based on item response rates of 93.6% for drug and 93.2% for mental health courts. Percentages for tracking after exit are based on item response rate of 97.3% for drug and 95.8% for mental health courts. See appendix table 12 for standard errors.

*Comparison group.

**Difference with comparison group is significant at the 95% confidence level.

^aDetail may sum to more than 100% because multiple responses were allowed.

^bDetail may not sum to total due to rounding.

^cPercentages are based on item response rates of 69.5% for drug and 65.6% for mental health courts. Interpret with caution.

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Census of Problem-Solving Courts, 2012.

APPENDIX TABLE 12
Standard errors for appendix table 11: Adult and juvenile drug and mental health problem-solving court programs, by case characteristics and outcomes, 2012

Case characteristic and outcome	All courts	Drug courts			Mental health courts		
		Total	Adult	Juvenile	Total	Adult	Juvenile
Point of entry							
Pre-plea or case filing	0.27%	0.33%	0.38%	0.65%	0.80%	0.85%	2.43%
Post-plea	0.25	0.32	0.34	0.71	0.72	0.74	2.43
Post-sentence or release	0.25	0.36	0.41	0.71	0.79	0.83	2.34
Judicial order	0.14	0.10	0.10	0.27	0.30	0.29	1.48
Other	0.10	0.07	0.06	0.18	0.13	0.15	0.00
Time in program							
5 months or less	0.27%	0.28%	0.32%	0.59%	0.72%	0.77%	1.95%
6–11 months	0.30	0.39	0.40	0.82	0.93	0.97	2.88
12–23 months	0.32	0.43	0.50	0.77	0.96	1.03	2.67
24–35 months	0.14	0.23	0.30	0.20	0.42	0.47	0.00
36 months or more	0.08	0.14	0.19	0.10	0.14	0.15	0.00
Percent of participants successfully completing program							
None	0.16%	0.19%	0.22%	0.38%	0.50%	0.54%	1.13%
1–25%	0.14	0.18	0.20	0.38	0.44	0.47	1.13
24–50%	0.27	0.37	0.43	0.73	0.81	0.85	2.68
51–75%	0.28	0.37	0.44	0.73	0.82	0.85	2.83
76–99%	0.23	0.24	0.28	0.45	0.65	0.69	1.57
100%	0.18	0.17	0.18	0.42	0.48	0.52	1.13
Benefit of successful completion							
Case dismissed	0.27%	0.35%	0.41%	0.69%	0.72%	0.75%	2.27%
Sentence suspended	0.26	0.37	0.43	0.66	0.82	0.86	2.19
Record expunged	0.24	0.33	0.37	0.68	0.68	0.72	2.09
Expedited settlement	0.18	0.19	0.23	0.37	0.53	0.58	0.88
Other	0.26	0.34	0.40	0.64	0.74	0.76	2.50
Track after graduation							
Yes	0.27%	0.37%	0.43%	0.71%	0.80%	0.84%	2.42%

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Census of Problem-Solving Courts, 2012.

APPENDIX TABLE 13
Percent and standard errors of total budget from federal grants, by type of problem-solving court, 2012

Type of court	None		1-25%		26-50%		51-75%		76-99%		100%	
	Percent	Standard error	Percent	Standard error	Percent	Standard error	Percent	Standard error	Percent	Standard error	Percent	Standard error
All courts	77.5%	0.25%	7.3%	0.16%	4.8%	0.13%	3.6%	0.11%	2.6%	0.10%	4.1%	0.13%
Drug	75.4	0.36	9.1	0.24	5.7	0.20	3.6	0.15	2.6	0.13	3.5	0.16
Mental health	79.5	0.74	6.1	0.44	3.1	0.32	5.7	0.43	2.2	0.27	3.5	0.34
Family	73.8	0.99	3.8	0.43	5.5	0.51	3.8	0.43	6.6	0.56	6.6	0.56
Youth specialty	92.3	0.88	3.9	0.64	1.9	0.45	0.0	0.00	0.6	0.26	1.3	0.37
Hybrid DWI/drug ^a	80.3	1.01	9.2	0.73	5.2	0.56	2.3	0.38	1.7	0.33	1.2	0.27
DWI	75.2	0.52	5.9	0.28	5.2	0.27	4.6	0.25	3.3	0.21	5.9	0.28
Domestic violence	85.5	1.00	4.5	0.59	1.8	0.38	1.8	0.38	0.0	0.00	6.4	0.69
Veterans	70.0	1.33	6.7	0.72	6.7	0.72	6.7	0.72	4.4	0.60	5.6	0.66
Tribal wellness	35.0	4.37	10.0	2.75	5.0	2.00	20.0	3.66	10.0	2.75	20.0	3.66
Other ^b	79.8	1.69	6.4	1.03	4.3	0.85	1.1	0.43	1.1	0.43	7.4	1.10

Note: Detail may not sum to total due to rounding. Percentages based on 77.9% item response rate.

^aHandles alcohol- or drug-dependent offenders also charged with a driving offense.

^bIncludes other courts not shown.

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Census of Problem-Solving Courts, 2012.

APPENDIX TABLE 14
Percent and standard errors of total budget from state sources, by type of problem-solving court, 2012

Type of court	None		1-25%		26-50%		51-75%		76-99%		100%	
	Percent	Standard error	Percent	Standard error	Percent	Standard error	Percent	Standard error	Percent	Standard error	Percent	Standard error
All courts	39.6%	0.30%	9.8%	0.18%	9.2%	0.17%	9.1%	0.17%	9.8%	0.18%	22.5%	0.26%
Drug	27.9	0.37	11.5	0.27	10.9	0.25	10.8	0.25	12.0	0.26	26.8	0.36
Mental health	57.2	0.91	7.0	0.47	4.8	0.39	7.0	0.47	8.3	0.51	15.7	0.67
Family	41.5	1.11	10.9	0.70	10.9	0.70	7.7	0.60	5.5	0.51	23.5	0.95
Youth specialty	61.3	1.61	4.5	0.69	5.8	0.77	3.2	0.58	7.7	0.88	17.4	1.25
Hybrid DWI/drug ^a	19.7	1.01	11.0	0.79	15.0	0.91	19.1	1.00	17.3	0.96	17.9	0.97
DWI	36.6	0.58	17.0	0.45	13.7	0.41	7.8	0.32	11.8	0.39	13.1	0.40
Domestic violence	50.9	1.42	0.9	0.27	1.8	0.38	4.5	0.59	0.9	0.27	40.9	1.40
Veterans	64.4	1.39	10.0	0.87	4.4	0.60	2.2	0.43	4.4	0.60	14.4	1.02
Tribal wellness	95.0	2.00	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.00	5.0	2.00	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.00
Other ^b	61.7	2.04	6.4	1.03	3.2	0.74	6.4	1.03	4.3	0.85	18.1	1.62

Note: Detail may not sum to total due to rounding. Percentages based on 77.9% item response rate.

^aHandles alcohol- or drug-dependent offenders also charged with a driving offense.

^bIncludes other courts not shown.

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Census of Problem-Solving Courts, 2012.

APPENDIX TABLE 15

Percent and standard errors of total budget from local sources, by type of problem-solving court, 2012

Type of court	None		1-25%		26-50%		51-75%		76-99%		100%	
	Percent	Standard error	Percent	Standard error	Percent	Standard error	Percent	Standard error	Percent	Standard error	Percent	Standard error
All courts	59.6%	0.31%	12.8%	0.20%	7.2%	0.16%	5.0%	0.14%	4.2%	0.14%	11.2%	0.21%
Drug	61.4	0.40	14.2	0.28	8.4	0.23	5.7	0.20	4.4	0.18	5.9	0.20
Mental health	55.5	0.91	11.8	0.59	7.4	0.48	3.5	0.34	2.6	0.29	19.2	0.72
Family	59.6	1.10	10.4	0.69	8.7	0.63	4.4	0.46	6.0	0.53	10.9	0.70
Youth specialty	48.4	1.65	7.1	0.85	7.7	0.88	6.5	0.81	6.5	0.81	23.9	1.41
Hybrid DWI/drug ^a	59.0	1.25	23.7	1.08	7.5	0.67	3.5	0.46	2.3	0.38	4.0	0.50
DWI	59.5	0.59	17.6	0.46	3.9	0.23	6.5	0.30	2.6	0.19	9.8	0.36
Domestic violence	76.4	1.21	3.6	0.53	0.9	0.27	3.6	0.53	1.8	0.38	13.6	0.98
Veterans	53.3	1.45	12.2	0.95	7.8	0.78	5.6	0.66	4.4	0.60	16.7	1.08
Tribal wellness	85.0	3.27	5.0	2.00	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.00	10.0	2.75	0.0	0.00
Other ^b	54.3	2.09	2.1	0.61	4.3	0.85	2.1	0.61	6.4	1.03	30.9	1.94

Note: Detail may not sum to total due to rounding. Percentages based on 77.9% item response rate.

^aHandles alcohol- or drug-dependent offenders also charged with a driving offense.

^bIncludes other courts not shown.

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Census of Problem-Solving Courts, 2012.

APPENDIX TABLE 16

Percent and standard errors of total budget from fees or fines, by type of problem-solving court, 2012

Type of court	None		1-25%		26-50%		51-75%		76-99%		100%	
	Percent	Standard error	Percent	Standard error	Percent	Standard error	Percent	Standard error	Percent	Standard error	Percent	Standard error
All courts	72.0%	0.26%	19.8%	0.23%	3.5%	0.11%	1.3%	0.06%	1.2%	0.06%	2.2%	0.10%
Drug	65.4	0.38	25.4	0.35	4.3	0.16	1.7	0.10	1.4	0.09	1.6	0.10
Mental health	90.4	0.54	7.0	0.47	1.7	0.24	0.4	0.12	0.4	0.12	0.0	0.00
Family	90.7	0.65	6.0	0.53	2.2	0.33	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.00	1.1	0.23
Youth specialty	78.7	1.35	14.2	1.15	1.9	0.45	0.6	0.26	0.0	0.00	4.5	0.69
Hybrid DWI/drug ^a	46.8	1.26	41.0	1.25	5.2	0.56	2.9	0.42	2.3	0.38	1.7	0.33
DWI	54.9	0.60	27.5	0.53	5.9	0.28	2.6	0.19	4.6	0.25	4.6	0.25
Domestic violence	86.4	0.98	5.5	0.65	2.7	0.46	0.0	0.00	0.9	0.27	4.5	0.59
Veterans	83.3	1.08	10.0	0.87	2.2	0.43	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.00	4.4	0.60
Tribal wellness	80.0	3.66	15.0	3.27	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.00	5.0	2.00
Other ^b	87.2	1.40	7.4	1.10	2.1	0.61	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.00	3.2	0.74

Note: Detail may not sum to total due to rounding. Percentages based on 77.9% item response rate.

^aHandles alcohol- or drug-dependent offenders also charged with a driving offense.

^bIncludes other courts not shown.

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Census of Problem-Solving Courts, 2012.

APPENDIX TABLE 17

Percent and standard errors of total budget from other sources, by type of problem-solving court, 2012^a

Type of court	None		1-25%		26-50%		51-75%		76-99%		100%	
	Percent	Standard error	Percent	Standard error	Percent	Standard error	Percent	Standard error	Percent	Standard error	Percent	Standard error
All courts	72.3%	0.28%	12.7%	0.21%	4.5%	0.14%	1.5%	0.08%	2.6%	0.10%	6.4%	0.16%
Drug	76.4	0.34	13.3	0.27	3.8	0.16	1.0	0.09	2.7	0.13	2.8	0.13
Mental health	61.6	0.89	13.5	0.63	4.4	0.38	0.9	0.17	3.5	0.34	16.2	0.68
Family	71.0	1.02	12.0	0.73	5.5	0.51	1.6	0.29	2.7	0.37	7.1	0.58
Youth specialty	63.9	1.59	11.0	1.03	10.3	1.00	2.6	0.52	3.2	0.58	9.0	0.95
Hybrid DWI/drug ^b	71.7	1.14	16.8	0.95	4.0	0.50	2.9	0.42	2.3	0.38	2.3	0.38
DWI	71.9	0.54	14.4	0.42	5.9	0.28	0.7	0.10	0.7	0.10	6.5	0.30
Domestic violence	81.8	1.10	0.9	0.27	1.8	0.38	0.0	0.00	1.8	0.38	13.6	0.98
Veterans	68.9	1.34	8.9	0.83	4.4	0.60	3.3	0.52	3.3	0.52	11.1	0.91
Tribal wellness	40.0	4.49	30.0	4.20	5.0	2.00	0.0	0.00	5.0	2.00	20.0	3.66
Other ^c	75.5	1.81	11.7	1.35	2.1	0.61	3.2	0.74	2.1	0.61	5.3	0.94

Note: Detail may not sum to total due to rounding. Percentages based on 77.9% item response rate.

^aOther sources of funding included Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, donations, civic organizations, board of mental health, Medicaid, United Way, bar association, tribal funding.

^bHandles alcohol- or drug-dependent offenders also charged with a driving offense.

^cIncludes other courts not shown.

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Census of Problem-Solving Courts, 2012.

APPENDIX TABLE 18

Standard errors for table 11: Successful program completion, by type of problem-solving court, 2012

Type of court	None	1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-99%	100%
All courts	0.16	0.14	0.27	0.28	0.23	0.18
Drug	0.19	0.18	0.37	0.37	0.24	0.17
Mental health	0.50	0.44	0.81	0.82	0.65	0.48
Family	0.63	0.68	1.04	0.88	0.64	0.48
Youth specialty	0.50	0.50	0.96	1.37	1.72	1.41
Hybrid DWI/drug	0.42	0.45	1.12	1.25	0.87	0.65
DWI	0.31	0.10	0.36	0.56	0.58	0.35
Domestic violence	1.50	1.20	1.50	1.39	1.66	1.03
Veterans	1.25	0.33	1.10	1.33	1.31	0.89
Tribal wellness	4.14	2.88	4.14	3.83	2.10	2.88
Other	1.51	0.99	1.82	2.06	1.68	1.73

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Census of Problem-Solving Courts, 2012.

APPENDIX TABLE 19

Standard errors for table 12: Benefits of successful program completion, by type of problem-solving court, 2012

Type of court	Case dismissed	Sentence suspended	Record expunged	Expedited settlement	Other
All courts	0.27%	0.26%	0.24%	0.18%	0.26%
Drug	0.35	0.37	0.33	0.19	0.34
Mental health	0.72	0.82	0.68	0.53	0.74
Family	1.01	0.62	0.38	0.96	1.00
Youth specialty	1.29	0.96	1.44	0.60	1.17
Hybrid DWI/drug	1.22	1.23	1.06	0.85	1.19
DWI	0.40	0.58	0.24	0.30	0.58
Domestic violence	1.27	1.25	1.05	0.85	1.26
Veterans	1.01	1.25	1.05	0.81	1.21
Tribal wellness	3.52	4.07	3.52	1.74	2.41
Other	1.92	1.83	1.30	1.22	1.94

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Census of Problem-Solving Courts, 2012.

APPENDIX TABLE 20

Standard errors for figure 4: Tracking participants after successful program completion, by type of problem-solving court, 2012

Type of court	Tracks graduates
All courts	0.27%
Drug	0.37
Mental health	0.80
Family	1.00
Youth specialty	1.33
Hybrid DWI/drug	1.20
DWI	0.55
Domestic violence	0.77
Veterans	1.23
Tribal wellness	4.17
Other	1.74

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Census of Problem-Solving Courts, 2012.

APPENDIX TABLE 21

Stratification and weighting of problem-solving courts, 2012

Stratum	Total	In-scope		Scope unknown		Weight
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
All strata	3,052	2,793	91.5%	259	8.5%	...
Drug	1,330	1,244	93.5	86	6.5	...
Drug (small population)	443	419	94.6	24	5.4	1.057
Drug (medium population)	444	420	94.6	24	5.4	1.057
Drug (large population)	443	405	91.4	38	8.6	1.094
Mental health	337	311	92.3	26	7.7	1.084
Family	261	237	90.8	24	9.2	1.101
Youth specialty	244	203	83.2	41	16.8	1.202
Hybrid DWI/drug ^a	217	193	88.9	24	11.1	1.124
DWI	183	179	97.8	4	2.2	1.022
Domestic violence	170	155	91.2	15	8.8	1.097
Veterans	133	123	92.5	10	7.5	1.081
Tribal wellness	31	26	83.9	5	16.1	1.192
Other ^b	146	122	83.6	24	16.4	1.197

Note: Courts were stratified by type. Drug courts were further stratified by population of service area, as follows: Drug (small population) included drug courts in counties with populations of 55,200 or fewer; Drug (medium population), populations between 55,201 to 219,992; and Drug (large populations), populations greater than 219,993.

... Not available.

^aHandles alcohol- or drug-dependent offenders also charged with a driving offense.

^bIncludes other courts not shown.

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Census of Problem-Solving Courts, 2012.



The Bureau of Justice Statistics of the U.S. Department of Justice is the principal federal agency responsible for measuring crime, criminal victimization, criminal offenders, victims of crime, correlates of crime, and the operation of criminal and civil justice systems at the federal, state, tribal, and local levels. BJS collects, analyzes, and disseminates reliable and valid statistics on crime and justice systems in the United States, supports improvements to state and local criminal justice information systems, and participates with national and international organizations to develop and recommend national standards for justice statistics. Jeri M. Mulrow is Acting Director.

This report was written by Suzanne M. Strong, Ramona R. Rantala, and Tracey Kyckelhahn. Ramona R. Rantala, Suzanne M. Strong, and Marshay Lentini verified the report.

The late Donald J. Farole, BJS Statistician, conceptualized the Census of Problem-Solving Courts project.

Nicole Waters, National Center for State Courts, carried out data collection and processing with assistance from Jennifer Elek, Deborah Smith, Kathryn Holt, and Shauna Strickland.

Irene Cooperman, Brigitte Coulton, and Jill Thomas edited the report, and Barbara Quinn produced the report.

September 2016, NCJ 249803



NCJ 249803

Office of Justice Programs
Innovation • Partnerships • Safer Neighborhoods
www.ojp.usdoj.gov