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NCSC | EUGENE COMMUNITY COURT – PROCESS AND OUTCOME EVALUATION
Executive Summary

The city of Eugene launched its Community Court in 2016 as a response to defendants being cited for nonviolent misdemeanors in Eugene’s downtown core. The individuals coming before the court were often struggling with persistent quality-of-life issues, including chronic homelessness, substance abuse, and mental health issues. By developing a Community Court, the court was able to offer an opportunity for individuals to become connected to services that are co-located at the court, which is held in the downtown Eugene Public Library. The program also accepts walk-in clients who are seeking to access services. The goal of the community court is to reduce crime and public nuisance by addressing the underlying issues that lead to justice system engagement.

The current study, completed by the National Center for State Courts, sought to better understand how the Eugene Community Court operates and how the services provided through the program are perceived by program participants, staff, and community partners.

In addition, the researchers sought to understand the program’s impact on recidivism rates and costs to the taxpayer. To do this, they created a sample made up of 104 Community Court participants (the study group) and 104 defendants who were referred to the Community Court program but chose to go through the standard court process instead (the comparison group), and compared these two groups on new arrests, new convictions, and new incarcerations within one year of completing their respective programs. Individuals who successfully or unsuccessfully completed each program were included. The two groups were matched on EM-CAT risk score, gender, race, and age in an effort to make them as similar as possible.

The following represents the key findings from the study:

- A little more than 1 in 3 (38%) Community Court participants were arrested within one year of completing the program compared to about 2 in 3 (66%) in the comparison group.
- Fewer than 1 in 4 (22%) Community Court participants were convicted of a new offense within one year of completing the program compared to almost 2 in 4 (47%) in the comparison group.
- One in 5 (20%) Community Court participants were incarcerated within one year of completing the program compared to more than 2 in 5 (45%) in the comparison group.
- Community Court participants were arrested within one year of completing the program far fewer times on average than the comparison group (0.4 for Community Court versus 5.5 for comparison group).
- Community Court participants were convicted within one year of completing the program far fewer times on average than the comparison group (0.3 for Community Court versus 3.1 for comparison group).
Introduction

In May 2019, the City of Eugene Municipal Court (EMC) contracted with the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) to perform an independent, professional program evaluation and impact assessment services for the City of Eugene Community Court (ECC) to include process evaluation and impact and cost-benefit evaluation. The following process evaluation report will review court observation, historical program data, interviews with team members and program staff, and participant focus groups to answer process evaluation questions identified in the project evaluation plan.

Introduction of NCSC and Relevant Experience and Qualifications

NCSC, founded in 1971, is a non-profit organization that promotes justice through leadership and service at the state and local levels. For over 40 years, NCSC has fulfilled its mission to improve the administration of justice through leadership and service to state courts. Chaired by the President of the Conference of Chief Justices (CCJ), NCSC’s Board of Directors consists primarily of state court representatives, including chief justices, state court administrators, and trial court leaders. NCSC’s multidisciplinary staff provides evaluation, education, and direct technical assistance to state and local courts and related programming.

This project was managed through the Court Consulting Services division, which is charged with knowing and applying best practices to address the needs of courts. It was uniquely qualified to carry out this project due to its considerable experience in conducting court evaluation and research, cost-benefit analyses, operational reviews, impact studies, and organizational and administrative assessments. NCSC is particularly skilled at helping deliver court-based services that require a coordinated and collaborative approach to be successful, specifically programs that rely on complicated interrelationships of courts, prosecutors, public and private defense counsel, probation departments, treatment providers, and a wide range of social service providers.

NCSC Court Consulting Division advises state and local agencies on the full continuum of best practice services available for diversion, pretrial, problem-solving courts, and probation services. NCSC has a wealth of experience in analyzing data and providing recommendations based on the information. NCSC’s Court Consulting experts include practitioners and researchers with experience in court diversion and alternatives, pretrial services, probations services, evidence-based decision making, and all problem-solving court models. The specific types of services NCSC routinely provide include:

- Conducting process, outcome, impact, and cost-benefit analyses of court-related community programming.
- Facilitating the development and implementation of performance measures and standards.
- Conducting community resource mapping and needs assessments.
- Developing data collection tools and assisting with the development of databases to track program data.
- Addressing common policy issues such as information-sharing and complying with federal confidentiality laws.
• Assessing court-based collaborative programs and conducting team development and training to address common team challenges.

• Facilitating strategic planning and organizational needs assessments.

• Conducting training on best practices relevant to community supervision strategies, such as targeting the right defendants, case planning, and community-based sanctions and incentives.

• Providing technical assistance to address state or locality-specific issues.

• Implementing state oversight structures and establishing state funding models.

The following is a selection of current and past projects the division has worked on regarding community court and cost-benefit analyses:

Community Court Research

• **New York: Red Hook Community Justice Center (2013).** NCSC conducted process and outcome evaluations and a cost-benefit analysis for Brooklyn’s Red Hook Community Court.

• **Pennsylvania: Philadelphia Community Court (2007).** NCSC conducted a process evaluation for the Philadelphia Community Court to document the history, structure, and procedures of the program and to assess the extent to which the Philadelphia Community Court adhered to the operational plan, the key elements of the community court model, and the principles of problem-solving courts.

• **New York: Midtown Manhattan Community Court (2005).** NCSC, in collaboration with the Center for Court Innovation, conducted an impact evaluation and cost-benefit analysis of the Midtown Community Court.

• **New York: Midtown Manhattan Community Court (2001).** NCSC, in collaboration with the Center for Court Innovation, conducted a process/implementation evaluation of the Midtown Community Court.

Cost-Benefit Analysis

• **Michigan: Ottawa County Adult Drug Court (ongoing).** NCSC is presently conducting a cost-benefit analysis of the 20th Circuit Adult Drug Treatment Court.

• **Nebraska: Adult and DUI Courts Statewide (ongoing).** NCSC is presently working with Nebraska to conduct a two-year project to assess the impact and cost-effectiveness of Nebraska’s Adult Drug and DUI Courts.

• **Virginia: Adult Drug Courts Statewide (2012).** NCSC completed a cost-benefit analysis and impact study of the Adult Drug Treatment Courts, identifying defendant characteristics and program characteristics associated with graduation and recidivism rates in comparison to a matched sample of “business as usual” defendants. The analysis determined the cost per participant in the drug court and impact on the criminal justice system of the drug court model in comparison to traditional case processing.  

---

Report Purpose and Structure

NCSC utilized a multi-method approach to determine the City of Eugene Community Court’s level of compliance with best practices, including qualitative methods such as semi-structured interviews, semi-structured focus groups, court and staffing observation, and document reviews. The NCSC evaluation team observed court and staffing, met with key stakeholders, and conducted focus groups during a site visit in June 2019. The team also reviewed the program’s policies and procedures, handbooks, forms, and other relevant narrative data to better understand the program’s structure.

During meetings and interviews with the program staff and partners, information was gathered about program implementation, service expansions and enhancements, accomplishments, and challenges. The process evaluation portion of this report incorporates the results of interviews and focus groups with NCSC observations and findings to answer the following questions:

- To what extent does the community court comply with best practices?
- What are the significant characteristics of participants when they enter the program?
- How are cases processed by the program?
- Are treatment and supervision individualized and appropriate?
- How are behaviors incentivized or sanctioned?
- How do participants perceive the program?

Methods

The data in this report was provided by community court program staff from the Tyler InCode system, program spreadsheets, jail data files, and from site visits conducted by NCSC.

Community Court Model

Community courts use the problem-solving court model to address “nuisance” and quality-of-life cases and take a proactive approach to public safety. The concept takes many practical forms, but at its core are partnership and problem-solving. Community justice is about creating new relationships both within the justice system and with stakeholders in the community, such as residents, merchants, churches, and schools, and testing new and aggressive approaches to public safety rather than merely responding to crime. Community courts are designed for low-level misdemeanants and are intended to provide a restorative response for program participants while also addressing the victim and the community’s needs. The community court’s commitment to changing offenders’ lives and the quality of life in the neighborhoods that it serves is evident in its stated goals and objectives. It is also evident in the sentences imposed by the court with a strong emphasis on community service. The common principles and practices of community courts are described in Table 1.2

---

Table 1: Community Court Principles and Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Information</td>
<td>Community courts are dedicated to the idea that better staff training combined with better information (about litigants, victims, and the community context of crime) can help improve the decision-making of judges, attorneys, and other justice officials. The goal is to help practitioners make more nuanced decisions about individual defendants, ensuring that they receive an appropriate level of supervision and services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Engagement</td>
<td>Community courts recognize that citizens, merchants, and neighborhood groups have an important role to play in helping the justice system identify, prioritize, and solve local problems. By actively engaging citizens in the process, community courts seek to improve public trust in justice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>Community courts engage a diverse range of people, government agencies, and community organizations in collaborative efforts to improve public safety. By bringing together justice players and reaching out to potential partners beyond the courthouse (e.g., drug treatment and other social service providers, victims groups, schools), community courts improve interagency communication, encourage greater trust between citizens and government, and foster new responses to local problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized Justice</td>
<td>By using evidence-based risk and needs assessment instruments, community courts seek to link offenders to individually tailored community-based services (e.g., drug treatment, job training, safety planning, mental health counseling) where appropriate. In doing so (and by treating defendants with dignity and respect), community courts help reduce the use of incarceration and recidivism, improve community safety, and enhance confidence in justice. Linking offenders to services can also aid victims, improving their safety and helping restore their lives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Community courts send the message that all criminal behavior—even low-level “quality-of-life” crime—has an impact on community safety. By promoting community restitution and insisting on regular and rigorous compliance monitoring (including by the judge)—and clear consequences for noncompliance—community courts seek to improve the accountability of offenders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Community courts emphasize the active and ongoing collection and analysis of data—measuring outcomes and process, costs and benefits. Dissemination of this information is a valuable symbol of public accountability.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Community courts must have a commitment to changing the lives of offenders as well as the quality of life in the neighborhoods that it serves. This should be evident in its stated goals and objectives, and also in the sentences imposed by the court, which should combine treatment, services, incentives, and sanctions with a strong emphasis on community service. The logic model in Figure 1 describes the theory of how individual offender change and community change are linked by community courts.
Figure 1: Theory of Community and Criminal Justice System Change

- Specific Deterrence of offenders processed by Community Court
  - General deterrence of potential offenders eliminates replacement effects
  - Diversion of low-level offenders from the criminal justice system

- Reductions in crime rate in catchment area
- Reductions in the volume of costs in the criminal justice system
- Community service work performed by Community Court participants

- Improvement in quality of life in catchment areas
- Decrease in signs of social disorder

- Increased public confidence in the Community Court to address community problems
- Ongoing mechanism for communicating with the public

---

Eugene Community Court

History

The City of Eugene has one of the highest per capita homeless populations in the nation. The population has been increasing since 2016, and had a 32% jump in 2019, with a 44% increase in the number of those who were unsheltered.4 See Figure 2 for more information. A large percentage of these individuals make camp in or near the City of Eugene, and many frequent or stay in the downtown area.

Figure 2: Lane County Homeless Population Point in Time (PIT) Count, 2011–2019

This has created tension between those who work in or visit downtown and the homeless individuals who make it their home or day location. As such, Eugene’s downtown core has suffered from persistent quality-of-life crimes, often committed by those who have intensive treatment and service needs, and do not generally respond well to traditional justice system processing.

In response to these increasing issues in the downtown core, a needs assessment was initiated in 2013. A March 2014 community survey indicated the intersection of public safety with homelessness, addiction, and mental health in the downtown core was of primary concern. In response to that survey, planning for the ECC began. In April 2016, the City of Eugene was selected to receive funding and technical assistance from the Bureau of Justice Assistance to implement the ECC, which serves the city’s downtown core, seeking to resolve misdemeanors through community service and service mandates. The geographic catchment area is the equivalent to the Eugene Police Department Downtown Patrol Team’s boundaries. This encompasses 5th Avenue to 15th Avenue and Lincoln Street to High Street (see Figure 3).

---

The full needs assessment, including the March 2014 survey, was published in December 2018. The needs assessment was a four-year (2013–2017) systematic examination of quantitative and qualitative data from a variety of government and community sources, including stakeholder interviews, the community survey, focus groups, community forums, and review of Eugene police and court data. The needs assessment continues to play a pivotal role in the operation of the ECC five years later, as community engagement is a core value in the City of Eugene’s community justice strategy.

The ECC is based on the “Spokane Model” in that it holds community court sessions at the Eugene Public Library in an effort to decrease the stigma of participants having to come to the courthouse while providing a safe, warm or cool place to take shelter from the elements and engage in community supports.

Mission. The ECC’s mission is to enhance community trust and quality of life by promoting participant accountability and providing links to individualized services. The ECC has developed goals and objectives to ensure that mission is met, as outlined in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve safety and the quality of life for all community members in downtown Eugene.</td>
<td>Immediacy&lt;br&gt;Reduce time from citation/arrest to first appearance and from first appearance to treatment.&lt;br&gt;Court Engagement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participants will have a voice throughout the Community Court process. All interactions will work towards participants’ success.

Reduce reoffending.

Accountability

Court operations staff, attorneys, and judges will assist participants with responsible program participation through an individualized service plan and problem-solve with participants on any obstacles they may face.

Enhance trust of the community in the justice system.

Problem-Solving Focus

Use evidence-based practices to determine the most appropriate level of supervision by identifying participants’ risk of reoffending and individual needs.

Increase efficiency.

Partnership and Collaboration

Build a network of community partners, including government and community-based organizations, who are essential to participant success.

Community Court Team Roles and Responsibilities

Community Court Judge. The community court judge is the primary judge for the community court and presides over the community court sessions. The judge works in concert with the presiding judge and the court administrator to oversee the community court. Along with presiding over the program, the judge finalizes the court-ordered individualized case plan and adjudicates all aspects of community court cases. The judge dispenses incentives and addresses accountability for noncompliance through appropriate sanctions. The judge takes the lead in media and community engagement activities.

City Prosecutor. The city prosecutor’s office identifies cases and individuals eligible for community court. The prosecutor is responsible for raising objections to entry and highlighting relevant criminal history in consideration of an individual’s participation. The prosecutor consistently attends community court sessions and works collaboratively with the core team on problem-solving for the court participant and the program as a whole.

Defense Attorney. The majority of participants in community court are indigent and require the assistance of a court-appointed attorney. The rights of the participant must be recognized and protected. The defense attorney advocates for their clients to ensure the protection of due process. Defense attorneys work collaboratively with the core team on problem-solving for the court participant and the program as a whole.

Court Administrator. The court administrator oversees the community court in collaboration with the presiding judge and community court judge. The administrator supervises and facilitates communication with the court and other city staff and oversees court operation aspects of the program. The administrator oversees file maintenance, contracts, documentation of procedures, written materials, intercity partnerships, data collection, and is responsible for facilitating discussion and analysis regarding performance measures and other data points from the core team. The administrator
also oversees the preparation and management of dockets, donations, and volunteer programs. The administrator works with court operations and the core team to problem-solve logistical and operational issues that arise. The administrator is the lead planner overseeing grant seeking and expansion efforts, is the first point of contact for the city regarding media and community engagement activities, and is involved in cross-departmental and interagency committee work related to the community court program.

Court Supervisor. The court supervisor oversees the administration of the screening and assessment tool and maintains individualized case plans for each participant. The supervisor monitors the accountability of program compliance and provides recommendations to the staffing team as appropriate. The supervisor is the primary point of contact for service providers and manages reports from providers. The supervisor also problem-solves with the community court participant as challenges arise, reports participant compliance and other relevant program information at the weekly staffing meeting, and works with the core team on problem-solving for the court participant and/or case management issues. The supervisor also compiles statistical data and assists with the preparation and management of community court dockets and volunteer programs. The supervisor builds, maintains, and evaluates community restoration events and partnerships.

Court Management Analyst. The court management analyst oversees data collection, writes operational procedures, and is responsible for analyzing and creating reports for performance measures and other data points. The analyst helps identify gaps, additional data points needed for the program, and makes data-based recommendations regarding the program.

Court Clerk. There are two court clerks that support the community court in a variety of roles. Duties include preparing and providing data entry support for case files, attending ECC sessions to provide forms necessary for case adjudication, and administering the short screener (EM-CAT) during community court sessions. Lastly, clerks assist the supervisor, providers, volunteers, and others in navigating the community court site.

Eugene Police Department (EPD). The Eugene Police Department’s Downtown Patrol Team helps identify cases eligible for ECC for the city prosecutor. The downtown patrol helps monitor and report positive and negative participant behaviors in the downtown area to the supervisor and during the weekly staffing meeting. The downtown patrol works collaboratively with the core team on problem-solving for court participants and the program as a whole. An officer is assigned to attend community court each week.

Staffing

Staffing is held weekly at 9:00 am on Friday mornings at the Eugene Public Library and is facilitated by the court supervisor. Prior to staffing, the court supervisor shares the list of new referrals to the team and service providers and follows up with service providers on current participant progress. Team members attending court include the judge, prosecutor, defense, court administrator, court supervisor, clerk, EPD representatives, and service providers.
Court

Court is held weekly on Fridays at 10:00 am at the Eugene Public Library. The court manages all setup for court while the team is in staffing. They set up the courtroom, security station, service provider room with equipment (printer, laptops, etc.), and whiteboard (list of appearances, and where they are in the process). They provide customer service to referrals, participants, and service providers, and also manage teardown and cleanup at the end of court. Once staffing is finished, the team moves to the courtroom. There are also volunteers to help do check-in, manage the whiteboard, assist with community restoration, hand out lunches, and more.

Referrals and participants come to the library and are screened at the security station, then check in and are put on the whiteboard and given directives for the next steps. Anyone determined to be under the influence of a substance or exhibiting potentially volatile behavior meets with their attorney and have their case set over for a week.

Referrals are screened by the court clerks with the EM-CAT, while participants wait in the gallery for their status hearings, report to community restoration, or meet with service providers. Once referrals have their EM-CAT and case plan complete, they meet with the defense attorney to discuss the pros and cons of entering community court. The participant may make an immediate decision or have until the following Friday to determine if they want to opt into the program. Those who opt out of the program have a court date set for regular court processing. Those who opt into the program then enter a plea of guilty or no contest to the judge, which is held in abeyance and will be dismissed if the program is completed successfully. The judge then explains the requirements and consequences of not completing the program before accepting the plea. The participant is sent to the case manager to go over their case plan and then directed to the service provider room. At that point, a volunteer points them in the direction of their required service providers.

Observations of staffing and court reflected the policies and procedures outlined in the community court manual, indicating that the program is sticking to the model. Figure 4 illustrates how cases flow into, through, and out of community court.
Figure 4: Eugene Community Court Flow Chart
Target Population, Referral, and Program Eligibility

Target Population. As previously noted, participation in the ECC is limited by the geographical boundaries of the downtown catchment area. Anyone cited with any of the eligible charges within the downtown core catchment area is cited in community court. Upon arrival to the community court, referrals must agree to submit to and complete a risk/needs assessment, fully engage and comply with all components of their case plan and agree to complete community restoration hours to be admitted into community court.

Referrals. Anyone arrested or cited in the downtown core, as noted above, is given verbal instruction to appear at community court on the Friday morning immediately following the citation or arrest, except for those cited between Tuesday afternoon and Friday morning—who are instructed to appear the following Friday morning as their citation cannot be processed quickly enough for immediate appearance.

Eligibility

Eligible offenses for ECC include:
- Consumption Unlicensed Premises/Open Container
- Criminal Mischief 2 (no restitution, or restitution paid by end of program period)
- Criminal Mischief 3
- Criminal Trespass 2
- Disorderly Conduct
- Furnishing Alcohol
- Inhaling Toxic Vapors
- Interfering with Public Transportation (no intent to physically injure)
- Prohibited Noise
- Theft (no restitution, or restitution paid by end of program period)
- Theft of Services (no restitution, or restitution paid by end of program period)
- Theft by Receiving (no restitution, or restitution paid by end of program period)
- Violation of Park Rules

Citations and arrest reports are reviewed by the prosecutor’s office to determine legal eligibility. Prosecutors review both the current charges as well as the individual’s criminal history when determining legal eligibility. Referrals may be deemed ineligible if they have active ineligible charges that are not going to be dismissed. Other objections are discussed with the team. Participation in the ECC is voluntary, so participants can opt out of program participation at the time of referral or at any point in the program.

Risk-Needs Assessment

When a new referral appears in community court, they are first assessed for risk and need by a trained court clerk utilizing the Eugene Municipal Court Assessment Tool (EM-CAT). This is an adaptation of the Criminal Court Assessment Tool (CCAT), developed by the Center for Court Innovation (CCI) for high-
volume courts. The CCAT is designed to be a brief instrument that evaluates risk and flags needs, such as mental health and substance abuse issues. It was validated in 2018 by CCI for general use, but they recommend local validation and validation for race and gender subgroups. Common concerns from field testers included reliability of the mental health symptomology data due to assessors not being clinically trained, frequent housing changes increasing the risk factor, and being too long for high-volume courts. These concerns were reflected by ECC staff in their interviews.

The EM-CAT consists of nine administrative items collected for data tracking purposes and 25 items that make up the core risk and needs assessment. Seven of these core items involve a review of official criminal justice records, and 18 items are asked of the participant. There are an additional 19 “flag” items used exclusively to understand which needs may warrant further assessment or referral. ECC was a part of the field testing for the CCAT, which was revised by CCI to accommodate Oregon’s marijuana laws, but the EM-CAT has not yet been validated to the local jurisdiction.

**Case Plan**

Once the EM-CAT is completed, the clerk scores the assessment and develops a case plan based on the results. There are three tiers based on level of risk. Those scoring between 0–18 are considered low risk/low need and are categorized Tier 1. Those scoring between 19–29 are considered moderate risk and moderate to high need and are categorized Tier 2. Those scoring 29+ are considered moderate to high risk and high need and are categorized Tier 3. There is also a Tier 4 category for those who score 29+ and are considered very high or chronic need. Minimum expectations for the four tiers are outlined in Table 3 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Tier 1</th>
<th>Tier 2</th>
<th>Tier 3</th>
<th>Tier 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Length</td>
<td>4 weeks</td>
<td>8 weeks</td>
<td>12 weeks</td>
<td>6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Restoration</td>
<td>8 hours</td>
<td>8 hours</td>
<td>8 hours</td>
<td>8 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Manager Check-Ins</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>Weekly or as directed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Court Appearances</td>
<td>Two: Arraignment and Graduation</td>
<td>Three: Arraignment, Mid-Point, and Graduation</td>
<td>Four: Arraignment, Once per Month, Graduation</td>
<td>Dependent on Team Plan: Arraignment, as Team Prescribes, Graduation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-Offense</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program time may be extended due to noncompliance or delayed response to treatment. Court sessions may be waived for cause (e.g., in residential treatment or having to work) with prior approval from the judge. Community restoration occurs as an adjunct to Friday’s court events, or individually with court approval and case manager direction. Friday community restoration lasts two hours and includes downtown cleanup, putting together hygiene kits, cleaning library books and other library work, and reflective writing assignments. Court hearings generally occur once every four weeks but may be increased if there are issues or noncompliance. Re-offense will generally just result in longer time in the
program unless the offense is outside the scope of the ECC, then it may lead to termination from the program if the participant is convicted or jailed pre-trial.

To assess the extent to which EM-CAT scores are being used to follow the program design for program services, we examined the extent to which EM-CAT scores match assigned tiers. When we examined the community court participants by risk level and tier assignment, we found that 60% of low-risk participants were assigned to Tier 1 while 40% of low-risk individuals were assigned to a higher tier (mostly Tier 2). Eighty-four percent (84%) of moderate-risk participants were assigned to Tier 2. Sixteen percent (16%) of moderate-risk individuals were assigned to a higher or lower tier. Ninety-five percent (95%) of high-risk participants were assigned to Tiers 3 or 4 (mostly Tier 3). Five percent (5%) of high-risk participants were assigned to a lower tier (mostly Tier 2). See Table 4.

Table 4: Community Court Participant Risk Levels, by Tier

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier</th>
<th>Low Risk</th>
<th>Moderate Risk</th>
<th>High Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 3</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 4</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Length of Stay

The average length of stay for program participants, overall, was 81 days (see Table 5). In examining the average length of stay by risk level, higher-risk participants stayed in the program longer, but it is unlikely that higher-risk participants are staying in the program for the optimal amount of time based on their level of needs.

Figure 5: Community Court Average Length of Stay, by Risk Level (N = 469)
Each tier level has an expected length of stay in the program. When we examined tier level by average length of stay, we found that Tier 1 and Tier 2 participants were in the program a little longer than expected, and Tier 3 and Tier 4 participants were in the program a little shorter than expected.

As laid out in Table 5, the highest-risk clients are likely underserved by the current program in ways that may contribute to future recidivism.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Length of Stay</th>
<th>Average Length of Stay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td>4 weeks (30 days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>8 weeks (60 days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 3</td>
<td>12 weeks (90 days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 4</td>
<td>6 months (180 days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>122 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Supervision

#### Case Management.
The ECC case manager provides supervision and service coordination for all participants. The case manager meets with participants after induction to the program to go over their case plan and direct them to the service provider room. A volunteer then points them in the direction of their required service providers. The case manager then has weekly check-ins with participants throughout the program, unless their contacts are increased due to treatment provider recommendations or sanction. The court supervisor communicates weekly with service providers to follow up on participants’ progress.

#### Incentives.
The following is a list of incentives that may be earned for those who accomplish a milestone (sobriety, new employment, housing, etc.) in the program or exhibit exceptional program compliance:

- Verbal praise
- Recognition on the court whiteboard for 100% compliance
- Filling a volunteer role in the court environment for community restoration hours
- Public recognition/applause
- Being seen first at court
- Gift cards (a drawing for those on the 100% list)
- Candy bars (for those on the 100% list that do not win a gift card or for special recognition)
- Pocket calendar
- Certificate
- Early graduation

#### Sanctions.
The ECC utilizes graduated sanctions with four distinct levels. Each level expresses indications of the current behavior and the goal for sanctioning. Level 1 noncompliance or lack of engagement is seen in the early stages of participation or is new to the participant, and the goal of sanctioning is to improve engagement. Level 2 noncompliance or lack of engagement may indicate a disregard for or lack of comprehension or previous intervention, and the goal is to strengthen participant engagement through identification and problem-solving barriers to engagement. Level 3 noncompliance or lack of engagement may indicate significant decompensation in the participant’s ability to perform in the program, and the goal is to stabilize and reengage the participant to prevent
rearrest. Level 4 noncompliance or lack of engagement indicates continued decompensation or extraordinary circumstances, and the goal is to stabilize and reengage the participant to prevent rearrest. Table 6 is a simplified version of the ECC sanctioning matrix and illustrates the graduated responses to noncompliance and lack of engagement.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Failure to Appear</td>
<td>Outreach to client</td>
<td>Write an essay on the importance of making a change (becoming clean, housing, etc.)</td>
<td>Increased meetings with case manager</td>
<td>See Below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Refer to defense attorney for understanding of legal consequences</td>
<td>• Increased community restoration hours or other added program requirements</td>
<td>• Increased appearances before judge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Discussion with judge about engagement with program</td>
<td>• Require calendar with written appointments and signatures for attendance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to Engage in Services</td>
<td>Discussion with judge about engagement with program</td>
<td>Write an essay on the importance of making a change (becoming clean, housing, etc.)</td>
<td>Increased community restoration hours or other added program requirements</td>
<td>See Below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increased community restoration hours or other added program requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Require calendar with written appointments and signatures for attendance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missed Community Restoration</td>
<td>Discussion with judge about engagement with program</td>
<td>Write an essay on the importance of making a change (becoming clean, housing, etc.)</td>
<td>Increased community restoration hours or other added program requirements</td>
<td>See Below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increased meetings with case manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Drug or Alcohol Screen</td>
<td>Discussion with judge about engagement with program</td>
<td>Increased community restoration hours or other added program requirements</td>
<td>Mandatory 5 days at Buckley House</td>
<td>See Below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>Level 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• More frequent appearances with the judge&lt;br&gt;• Mandatory days at Buckley House</td>
<td>• Letter of apology&lt;br&gt;• Court observation hours</td>
<td>• Increased community restoration hours or other added program requirements&lt;br&gt;• Letter of apology</td>
<td>See Below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtroom Misconduct</td>
<td>Discussion with judge about engagement with program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rearrest for ECC Eligible Misdemeanor</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Increased community restoration hours or other added program requirements</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>See Below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rearrest for ECC Ineligible Misdemeanor</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Increased community restoration hours or other added program requirements</td>
<td>See Below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued Noncompliance in Multiple Areas</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>• Jail&lt;br&gt;• Require calendar with written appointments and signatures for attendance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Services

Service providers attend community court and are set up in a room adjacent to the courtroom, creating a “one-stop” popup on Friday mornings. On the day court was observed, there were representatives from 15 agencies represented with services that included dental, medical, housing, employment and vocational training, behavioral health assessment and treatment, benefit assistance, veterans assistance, computer/internet and mailing access, energy assistance, food and meal assistance, parenting classes, medication assistance, transportation, and assistance with attaining legal identification. New participants are directed to the service provider room by the case manager and may be assisted by a volunteer to find their required services. The participant is thereby given the opportunity to enroll in services right after their court session is completed. The court supervisor has weekly contact with the service providers regarding client progress and to update them on potential new participants that week. See Table 7 for a summary of the services received by the full ECC sample and by program completion type.

Table 7: Community Court Programmatic Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full ECC Sample N=469</th>
<th>Graduates (n=184)</th>
<th>Discharged (n=36)</th>
<th>Non-Completers (n=155)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SERVICES ORDERED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA Treatment Order (% Yes)</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH Treatment Order (% Yes)</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services Include in Sentence (% Yes)</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan changed (% Yes)</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY RESTORATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Hours Completed</td>
<td>1,944</td>
<td>1,541</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Hours Completed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAM EVENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Events Completed</td>
<td>4,281</td>
<td>2,120</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>1,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Events Completed</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program Exit

Graduation. Participants who complete the program successfully are provided a graduation celebration. Graduation ceremonies happen at 1:00 pm in the ECC courtroom. The ceremony includes the dismissal of their case by the judge, verbal recognition or a speech by the judge and other team members, a chance for the participant to speak, applause, a certificate of completion, and a small token/gift. Service providers and other participants are encouraged to attend graduation. Graduates may also be allowed to perform further community restoration hours as credit toward fines and fees.

Termination. Participants may have their participation in the program terminated if they have continued noncompliance or engagement despite intervention, or if they commit new crimes that preclude continued participation in community court. If participation in the program is revoked, the ECC judge may sentence the participant or may set the case over for sentencing in traditional court. Participants may also be sentenced at the jail.
As shown in Figure 6, during the study period, 375 of the 469 individuals in the sample had completed the ECC. Of the 375 individuals who had exited the ECC, 49.1% graduated, 41.3% did not complete the program, and 9.6% were discharged.

Figure 6: Program Exits by Type (N=375)
Participant Feedback

Focus Groups

NCSC staff held two focus groups during the site visit for past and present participants. Across both groups, there were thirteen total individuals. Due to the nature of the program and the fact that some current participants had been through the program multiple times, no distinction will be made between past and present participants' responses. Participants were asked about their experiences in the program, what went well, and what they would change if they could. The following is a summation of their answers grouped by general experiences and experiences related to procedural justice. Any recommended changes to the ECC received from the focus group participants can be found later in the Recommendations section of the report. All responses have been changed to present tense and should be read as responses that may reflect one or more participant responses rather than quotes.

General Experience

Participants shared positive feedback around the co-location of services and appreciation of the help provided by the program. Consultants received a wide range of comments about service provision ranging from the services not being beneficial to not liking the requirements of the program but understanding why they are necessary. Focus group participants reported receiving help with housing, substance abuse, addiction and medical issues, getting an ID, and paying for sober housing. Specifically, participants provided the following direct feedback about the program:

- “The program helps participants make a commitment to themselves.”
- “I wouldn’t be here without community court.”
- “The only motivation to get through the program is to get the charge off the record and get a reduction in fines, otherwise it is a waste of time.”
- “Community court causes me anxiety.”
- “Community court is very helpful.”
- “I am very thankful for community court.”
- “It is a positive experience.”
- “There are lots of great services offered.”
- “Treatment was only adequate.”
- “Services were difficult to coordinate around other responsibilities.”

Procedural Justice

In the area of procedural justice, participants provided consultants with feedback about their experiences. Procedural justice feedback is broken out into four categories: Community Court Structure and Expectations, Community Court Team, Community Court Session, and Service Providers.

Community Court Structure and Expectations

- Some noted not knowing what to expect coming into the program, particularly around consequences and the time commitment.
- No participants seemed to know there were more tiers to the program than the one they were assigned.
- It was noted more time should be allowed to decide whether to come into the program.
- It was noted that the program does not always follow through on promises made to participants.
- Community court is viewed as unorganized by many and tedious by some.
- It was noted that there is no way to contact community court staff outside of court on Friday.
- Some noted the requirement to plea to get services as a negative.
- Some noted that the EM-CAT process felt coerced.
- It was noted that everyone seems to lack a sense of urgency and that it feels like a lot of time is wasted.
- It was noted that community restoration feels denigrating. It was also noted that community restoration is positive and that maybe it should be a bit denigrating.
- Some noted that they felt seen, heard, and supported.
- Some noted getting information in writing on what they needed to do for the program, but others noted they did not.

Community Court Team

- When asked about the case manager, one respondent was uncertain who that person is.
- Some noted the long wait times to see their attorney and that the attorney asks the wrong questions—“Were you intoxicated when you got arrested?” instead of “Did the police have probable cause to arrest you?” They felt their defense was not robust.
- It was noted that everyone is nice, and that “even the worst police officers are still the nicest people.”
- Some participants felt judged and denigrated as people.
- People that work/volunteer for the court assume you are under the influence when you are not.

Community Court Session

- Community court is unpredictable. It can last 15 minutes or hours.
- It was noted that the judge is not always on time.

Service Providers

- Some noted services were required they thought they didn’t need, and some noted wanting services and not having any required. Others felt the services were appropriate.
- Some noted difficulty having to set up all of their own appointments, especially in the short time left after court on Friday.
- Some noted community court could be doing a lot more, particularly regarding collaboration between court staff and service providers, and ensuring service providers are following through with their end of things.
- Some noted feeling unknown or unheard, particularly by court/volunteer staff and service providers.
There appeared to be a large disconnect between meeting with service providers after the initial appearance and later showing up at a provider for services. Many noted that the agencies didn’t know who they were or why they were there.

Some noted that the case plans are the same for everyone; others noted that everyone gets a different case plan for their needs.

Concerns about community court giving the wrong information or minimizing participant symptoms to service providers were raised, as was the issue of ECC providing bus passes to those that are banned from public transportation. There were issues that led to arrest and issues getting information corrected discussed.

The difficulty with managing their own services without a contact to help coordinate was discussed. It was noted there is no real case management.

It was noted that the mission has mold in the bathroom.

It was noted that not everyone has drug and alcohol abuse issues but have to do assessments for them anyway.

It was noted that services coordinated from jail are more organized than if you have to do it yourself at community court.

Participants felt that multiple assessments at multiple places are a barrier for them.

Some felt prejudged by service providers and not treated well.

One participant noted they were assaulted at a service provider and is still waiting on a response from community court.

Procedural Justice Survey

The Multi-Site Adult Drug Court Evaluation (MADCE) study found that the strongest predictor of reduced future criminality among drug court participants was the defendant’s attitude toward the judge. Having a positive perception of the judge was also the greatest predictor of reduced drug use and reduced violations. The MADCE study did not examine the participant’s view of other team members, such as treatment providers and probation staff. Researchers have identified the key elements of procedural justice to be:

- Voice – defendants are given the opportunity to tell their story;
- Respect – defendants perceive they are treated with respect and dignity;
- Neutrality – defendants believe the decision-making process is fair;
- Understanding – defendants understand the decisions that are made; and
- Helpfulness – defendants believe the judge and staff are interested in their personal situation.

The Procedural Justice Survey developed by the NCSC is designed to assess the components of procedural justice in a problem-solving court setting. The survey was administered to participants and previous participants of the ECC during the focus groups in June 2019. Participants and graduates were

---

6 Ibid
asked to voluntarily complete this written survey anonymously. A total of 13 present and former participants elected to complete the survey.

The survey asked the participants to rate their experiences with three sets of critical actors—the judge, case manager, and service providers. Participants were asked about their experiences with areas typically associated with procedural justice, as noted above. Participants responded on a 7-point scale to the statements. Response options ranged from “Strongly Agree” (reflecting a score of 7) to “Strongly Disagree” (reflecting a score of 1). A score of “5” indicates that the participant somewhat agrees with the statements.

The results report average and polarization scores. The average score is comprised of the average of all responses for each question. All questions were measured on a 7-point scale, with 7 being the most desired response. On the other hand, the polarization score measures the degree of disagreement in response between the survey participants. The polarization score refers to the standard deviation, or amount of variation, in responses. The higher the polarization score, the more disagreement in the responses of survey participants. The polarization scores for the survey ranged from 0.8 to 2.6. A copy of the full survey can be found in Appendix A.

The ECC survey participants indicated their perceptions of procedural justice were moderate for all three sets of actors, but the judge had the greatest range in answers, as reflected by the higher polarization scores. The judge had two items that were not answered by one of the respondents. The judge scored highest in case knowledge and politeness. The area that had the lowest score and highest standard deviation for the judge was giving participants a chance to tell their side of the story. Overall, the judge was rated between the “somewhat agree” to “agree” range with a high polarization score (2.1), indicating high disagreement on all factors except case knowledge. Table 8 details the scores regarding the judge.

Table 8: Procedural Fairness Results for the Judge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Average (N=13) *</th>
<th>Polarization Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The judge applies rules consistently to everyone.</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The judge makes me feel comfortable enough to say how I really feel about things.</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The judge gives me a chance to tell my side of the story. (N=12) *</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The judge treats me politely. (N=12) *</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The judge is knowledgeable about my case.</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The judge makes decisions about how to handle my problems in a fair way.</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Except where indicated.

The case manager was scored more consistently across items. The highest scores were for professionalism and allowing the participants a chance to speak. The lowest score, with a higher deviation in answers, was for creating a feeling of safety and making the participant feel like the case manager truly wants to help. The question regarding a true desire to help had the highest polarization score, indicating greater disagreement among participants. Overall, the case manager was rated in the “somewhat agree” to “agree” range, with a moderately high polarization score. Table 9 details all results regarding the case manager.
Table 9: Procedural Fairness Results for Case Manager

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Average (N=13)</th>
<th>Polarization Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My case manager interacts with me in a professional manner.</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know that my case manager truly wants to help me.</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My case manager gives me enough of a chance to say what I want to</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>say.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The way my case manager handles my case is fair.</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My case manager treats all of his or her clients equally.</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel safe enough to be open and honest with my case manager.</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Items</td>
<td><strong>5.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The service provider is the most unique of the survey subjects, as it is the only one where multiple subjects are represented. Participants were likely responding to the provider agency that worked with them most and/or last during their time in the program, and some may have answered for more than one service provider. Furthermore, one participant did not respond to this section, so there were only 12 surveys counted in this section. The service providers rated highest in genuine interest in helping, and lowest in equitable treatment and creating a feeling of safety. The area of greatest polarization score was in creating a sense of safety. Overall, service providers were rated “somewhat agree” with a moderately high polarization score. Table 10 details all responses for treatment from the survey.

Table 10: Procedural Fairness Results for Service Providers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Average (N=12)</th>
<th>Polarization Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The provider staff gives me a chance to tell my side of the story.</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe the provider staff is genuinely interested in helping me with my problems.</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The provider staff treats me in a professional manner.</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The provider staff treats all clients equally.</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel safe enough to be open and honest with provider staff.</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The way the provider handles my case is fair.</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Items</td>
<td><strong>5.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results indicate that the experience of the ECC is very different for each individual. The judge’s knowledge of individual cases and all actors’ politeness and professionalism were the highest rated across categories. These also had the lowest polarization scores of the survey, indicating they are the most agreed upon characteristics for this sample. Fairness, safety, and listening rated the lowest and had the highest polarization scores, indicating that these experiences vary widely for participants. These results indicate that the team should examine ways in which they may be treating participants disparately. Creating the space to allow participants to be heard and validated will help foster participants’ perceptions of equity.

Table 11: Procedural Fairness Results for All
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Polarization Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consistent treatment of participants (N=38)</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates a feeling of safety (N=38)</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listens to participant (N=37)</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is polite and professional (N=37)</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is knowledgeable about individual’s cases-Judge Only (N=13)</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truly wants to help the participants—CM and SP Only (N=25)</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is fair (N=38)</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Items</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Staff and Stakeholder Feedback

Interviews

NCSC staff interviewed community court team members, the City of Eugene court staff, and stakeholders. All expressed a commitment and dedication to the ECC being a successful model for community court and having a positive impact on the community.

Library

- Need more distance between the judge/team and the gallery.
- Like that it is an informal location where the public feels more welcome.
- Flows well for the small space, but there is no room for expansion.
- The library has contracted security, and there are participants who are prohibited from the premises. They can come in for court, but it is difficult to get all participants to abide by the rules.
- They have been looking at the first floor of the municipal court building, which would allow for a more full-time operation. There has been discussion of a payroll tax referendum that would provide funding for court. The largest concern with that is that the municipal court does not currently have security.
- The library allows the community court to operate outside the traditional judicial environment. It lets participants know they aren’t going to get the “same old treatment,” so they have more buy-in to the program.
- The participants like the library. It feels like home for them. It is a safe place that many of them already frequent. It changes their view of court. Because it doesn’t feel like court, they aren’t as scared to come in, and we get a higher rate of involvement.
- Some participants are confused by it, some feel more comfortable, and some are distrustful because they don’t think it is real. It is a much easier, friendlier venue for them to go to, but it is difficult for them to understand why they go to a different location, and then they have to go elsewhere to get fingerprinted (fingerprints have to be done in a secured area and by an officer).
- The library is a great location that many participants already utilize for day services. Many of the people who walk in for services are community members, not court clients. Accessibility is key. The building is welcoming, library staff have been very gracious, and recognize they serve a lot of the same people. The participants seem to find it convenient.
Community Court Strengths

The following were noted by stakeholders in interviews as present strengths of the community court:

- They are seeing a direct decrease in the crime downtown. Before, you saw a participant on every corner. Now the outreach team has a hard time finding them in the downtown core. Many of them got housed and are not offending; others are maybe still not housed but are not offending and are getting treatment.
- The service providers perceive their participation in the community court to be beneficial to them professionally.
- The team members communicate frequently.
- We utilize the EM-CAT case plan to set participants up with providers, get updates regarding if they are doing what they were requested to do, and help hold participants accountable for the treatment. It's a different approach to trying to solve a problem—not just punishing someone.
- It is incredibly rewarding seeing the progress that people make—especially the young people. Community court is a really important program in our community.
- ECC is an amazing program, very impressive. Have never seen anything like it. Would like to make it even bigger and better, but it is a great thing that the court is supportive rather than punitive.
- There is a good connection between treatment and case management. There is no significant unevenness in terms of data quality.
- EPD helped the Conestoga Huts Program expand by convincing property owners (churches, vacant lots, etc.) to allow them to erect them on their property. EPD also selects recipients of huts, who become owners. Then, through pride of ownership, give back to the community by keeping the area clean.
- Taking chances on participants who maybe should have been revoked has had a payoff. Instead of jail, they went to treatment and got housed.
- There has been an overall reduction in the severity of cases in the catchment zone, and the number of custodies has decreased.
- The relationship between the case manager and the service providers has helped many people be more successful. The recipe has to be right, but when the EM-CAT and service referrals are accurate, that’s when they see real, lasting change.
- The relationship-building between the case manager and the participants creates accountability, but also a relationship that is caring and that they don’t get elsewhere. The participants don’t want to let the case manager down.
- We get participants to walk through the door, we treat them well, and get them to think differently. We also help them with housing, employment, and get them off drugs, but changing how they think is most important.
- Having providers in court so participants can get services immediately is the most impactful. Without that, there would hardly be any purpose.
- We provide a lot of positive reinforcement for people who are doing well or even just making an effort. Some people who are exposed to community court for the first time can be shocked, especially law enforcement. We don’t let chaos reign, but we understand the population and are more inclined to not sweat the small stuff.
The judge is a great motivator to the participants. They want his praise, which was unexpected.

We push positivity, praising even small behaviors like showing up.

The judge is very consistent in how they approach the participants and dispense justice, sanctions, and rewards. Are fair. Very positive and encouraging, and clear about expectations.

Getting people state identification is a huge positive for them.

Community Court is one of the most important things Eugene is doing around homelessness because the service providers are co-located and welcoming to the population. Participants can go and get a front door assessment without a waitlist. It’s not everything, but it’s a model for how partners can collaborate in ways they had not previously. The ongoing weekly opportunities to share information is invaluable.

This is the future of justice system reform.

The program is great for outreach and addressing underlying participant needs. We work to understand why the participant is behaving this way and walk with them to figure out how to get them out of the situation they’re in.

The team is good at problem-solving.

No arrests may be made inside community court.

Everyone works together to try and do the right thing.

The police officers are good at keeping things safe. They are right there and ensure no behaviors become a problem during court.

This program is one of the few opportunities where all partners work together for what is best for the client. It is non-adversarial, and we have a good recipe.

When we accept someone that turns out to be not in our target population, the providers and team try to work with them or move them to something more appropriate. The good thing is they really do case by case. Much more case management minded.

Less than 10% of program graduates reoffend within the next year.

Community Court Challenges

The following were noted by stakeholders in interviews as present challenges of the community court:

- When you go to core team meetings, you go to listen—not many get to talk. The agenda is set by court administration and the Community Court judge and the meeting facilitated by the court administrator. People try to offer input but do not always have opportunity to talk.

- Recently community court has started making participants leave the library then come back at 1:00 pm. Most do not come back, and then they end up getting arrested. The natural sanction is the weekend they spend in jail.

- Sanctions are inconsistent and depend on the participant. Sanctioning discussions are antagonistic between the prosecutor and defense.

- Dealing with a high-needs population can be stressful.

- The primary challenge for the service providers is that, since the library is not their office location, they sometimes experience a loss in productivity during times when the client flow is slow. If they were in their office, the impact of the downtime would be minimal because they
could do other work. Being away from the office also limits their access to resources they might otherwise have if they were in their normal agency setting.

- Some service providers used to come and don’t anymore because they are stretched super thin due to the number of people needing services and too much turnover.

- The participants often express complete confusion about the expectations about setting up services. They are only told, “Go to see this provider,” but they lose the paper that says what to do.

- Providers typically get an email on Wednesday about the referrals, but often it is late or after the fact. And some providers are not on the email chain.

- When people are referred for assessments, they would like the court to also refer them to peer support.

- If court were done on a different day, the follow-up would be greater. Most service providers are closed on Friday. If court were done on Wednesday, participants could more directly access services. Friday is the WORST day to try to get people into the program. If someone waits at court all day long, they don’t get to the agency until late afternoon and are likely going to have to come back on Monday. They lose them over the weekend. Wednesday mornings would be the perfect time to meet. Providers also want to be able to take vacation Friday.

- Shelter Care is the only agency that does front door assessments at community court, and they do 800–1,000 assessments a year. Shelter Care doesn’t get paid to be at court, and they can’t continue to support that volume.

- It would be ideal if people could get immediate counseling rather than having to make an appointment and follow up. Would like to have drop-in counseling or brief intervention therapy for substance use.

- There is a waitlist for the state hospital, so if a defendant is found unfit, they may sit in jail for up to two months.

- The current court structure allows high- and low-risk defendants to mix.

- The EM-CAT is self-report, so you can’t change it if they give an answer you know to be false.

- Being off-site creates minimal challenges, such as having to run to the office for files if someone on a warrant shows up.

- There have been inconsistencies on EM-CAT. A defendant may come in on an alcohol-related misdemeanor, but then no treatment is recommended on the case plan.

- There have been training issues on the EM-CAT and a lot of turnover of staff.

- The opt-in rate seems low. We need to figure out how to get more people into the program.

- Orientation for new participants does not always flow well. Would be nice to have a tablet or something with a video that could play.

- Revocations happen. It can take a year for someone to prove they aren’t going to comply. They may get revoked from CC and sent to be processed in regular court.

- The prosecutor is new and has been more adversarial than they are used to. More objections to people coming in, more revocations.
The city/municipal justice system has been neglected. There are only three full-time prosecutors. Hopefully, a new change coming soon will create a more permanent funding situation. To not be able to provide justice at the level that you want is frustrating.

Service Gaps and Barriers to Success

Common service gaps and community barriers to client success noted during stakeholder interviews were:

- People can’t get immediate counseling on the spot—they have to make an appointment and follow up, and that’s a barrier.
- Goodwill job connections need to be closer to downtown because their distance is an obstacle.
- In terms of homelessness, overall, capacity is an issue. They have people who are graduating, but what good does it do if they are still homeless? They are going to regress if they don’t have a home.
- Inpatient treatment is lacking. It is difficult to confine someone long term. We are getting pushback from the circuit court for using the state hospital for misdemeanors, but there is no inpatient facility in Lane County.
- Homelessness is a barrier if they are not on the FUSE list. People who are not on the FUSE list have trouble getting housing.
- Long wait times in court.
- Providers who are not organized.
- The judge needs to be direct and clear about expectations. There are too many confused participants.
- We need a clear sanctions and incentives list, so participants know what to expect. We need more consistency, transparency, and clarity overall.
- There have been issues with providers reporting participant progress, being able to deliver services promised, and having long waitlists.
- There is friction around the revocation process.
- The sanction/reward process could be better. We could have more rewards and more graduated sanctions. There are very few consequences for negative behavior currently, and then suddenly, they are at revocation. Jail is not really utilized.
- Housing is a barrier. Even with a housing voucher, it’s hard to find something priced appropriately. But the providers are very skilled at finding it if it exists. Unfortunately, participants often lose hope after being told they are second on the list, but it still takes six months.
- We are definitely more successful with those whose drug of choice is alcohol compared to those who prefer meth or heroin. We need more robust services for those participants too.
- Mental health services always have waitlists and turnover.
- We cannot get Lane County Behavioral Health to consistently provide services for community court.
- Eugene and Lane County are lacking in public housing.
• Some participants that really need their fitness examined are being pushed into community court.

• There is very little to address those with severe and persistent mental illness, particularly if they are not already self-motivated.

• Some team members have unrealistic expectations for courtroom behavior. These are not people who just sit quietly without getting disruptive or upset. Referrals who do seem more “normal”—are employed or are not homeless—are getting different diversion deals. This is not fair to other participants who need to do 12 weeks of treatment.

• The failure-to-appear rate is high. The opt-in rate is low.

• Some team members seem to lack investment in the program.

• Sometimes transportation is an issue. They have bus passes to deal with that. And for those who have been excluded from the bus system, if they are community court participants, they can get a bus pass that is modified (8-5M-F) that allows them to be on the bus.

• Housing is always an issue here, and there is room to grow. There are shelters, and there is housing, but not enough, especially clean sober housing for those in outpatient who are not ready for an Oxford House just yet. Need transitional housing from inpatient to Oxford House. Single Room Occupancy housing is in process right now but is maybe five years out.

• Lane Transit District LTD (bus system) has banned many participants, so they can’t ride. The ban can be temporary or permanent, so even if they are doing well, they can’t ride.

• The EM-CAT does not seem to be as accurate as it should be regarding mental health. The participant can have three mental health questions flagged yes, but no recommendation for mental health services are included in the case plan.

These barriers and issues were reflected in the changes stakeholders said they would like to see.

Desired Changes

All individuals interviewed were given an opportunity to list desired changes as a result of the assessment. The major themes in their responses were:

• Track incentives the same way we track sanctions.

• Have a space to co-locate service providers permanently that includes a day access center.

• Build in harm reduction models such as adding brief interventions for mental health and substance abuse on-site.

• Expand the catchment area to include places where the homeless tend to congregate, such as the Highway 99 camp. Adding the places people sleep (because they have been run out of downtown) would likely triple our filings.

• Reduce turnover for team members and service providers.

• Reduce revocations. There are too many for “failure to engage” when we are not doing a lot of outreach. Others are being revoked for new charges when that is actually sanctionable.

• Go paperless.

• Increase peer support staff.
The order of appearance in court should go veterans and then first appearances, as it is what makes the most of the service providers’ time. It would also be nice if someone notified the providers when the last person is heard by the court.

Provide service providers with copies of any case plan so they know who should be checking in with them and what services the court expects them to receive.

Give service providers a list of people scheduled to appear that day. That would allow them to bring the information the court needs and do preemptive case management.

Cross-training for service providers and justice system partners to better help understand processes and expectations for both sides.

Update the Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs).

Include service providers in graduations.

Change the day of the court.

The court needs to not order substance abuse treatment through the Veterans Administration if the person has a suspended or revoked license. The DMV does not accept VA treatment, so participants end up having to go through treatment twice to get their licenses back.

Have a formal ending to the court day. It is currently unclear when court ends.

Expand community court to the entire city.

Add a day center that operates 40 hours/week.

Less handholding and more tough love.

More continuous quality improvement activities.

Training

Members of the team and stakeholders were asked what training they would like to receive to improve their work regarding the community court.

- Team dynamics that include team building to build trust and respect.
- Visit/revisit other community courts. Some have already gone, but others have not. It would be good to take the entire team again.
- Training for everyone in the CC model.
- Mental illness and substance abuse disorders: What to look for, how to deal with them.
- Training on empathy, dealing with the homeless, and conflict resolution.
- Implicit bias training.
- Cross-training for the providers on the criminal justice system, and for those in the justice system on the treatment providers.
Team Collaboration Introduction

The goal of any collaboration is to access and share resources to create a better outcome than could otherwise be achieved. This is achieved through “...a process in which autonomous or semi-autonomous actors interact through formal and informal negotiation, jointly creating rules and structures governing their relationships and ways to act or decide on the issues that brought them together; it is a process involving shared norms and mutually beneficial interactions” (Thomson, Perry, & Miller, 2007).

The purpose of measuring team collaboration is to evaluate the progress that has been made since the court’s inception and help to identify areas that need improvement. The questions and areas of focus are modeled after the Reclaiming Futures system reform initiative. As part of a national evaluation of ten Reclaiming Futures demonstration sites, biannual surveys of community participation were conducted. This survey served as the foundation of the ECC team collaboration survey.

Survey Methodology

Twenty-two questions were asked to 17 participants from the ECC team, service providers, and participating agencies. Questions were asked in the form of brief statements to which respondents indicated whether they strongly disagreed, disagreed, were neutral, agreed, or strongly agreed. Some statements were worded negatively, but all items were coded so that a one indicates strongly disagreed and a five indicates strongly agreed.

The original Reclaiming Futures system reform initiative outlined 13 indices of systemic change, and the ECC survey models six of its seven indices after the biannual survey of community participation. A community engagement index was incorporated as the seventh index. The survey questions are organized in collaboration groups and indices as follows:

| Administration Indices | • Access to Services  
| • Data Sharing |
| Collaboration Indices | • Partner Involvement  
| • Client Information  
| • Community Engagement |
| Quality Indices | • Alcohol and other Drug Assessment  
| • Treatment Effectiveness |

Survey Respondents

A total of 17 individuals responded to the survey. Of the 17, ten identified as members of the community court team. Two reported that their agency participates in the community court, but they do not sit on the community court team. Five identified as service providers who receive referrals from the community court team.

Survey Analysis

Survey questions are measured on a scale from one to five and are answered by selecting from the following choices. Regardless of the location of “strongly agree” on the scale, we coded it to equal five.
Questions that are answered “Don’t Know” were dropped from the result analysis, thereby reducing the total number of responses for those questions.

### Typical 5-Point Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>NEUTRAL</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
<th>DON’T KNOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reverse Coded 5-Point Scale

Scales are reverse coded for a few questions, meaning that the answer choices deviate from the typical assignment of 5=Strongly Agree to 5=Strongly Disagree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>NEUTRAL</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
<th>DON’T KNOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average team scores are reported in the survey results. The average team score is comprised of the average of all responses for each question.

### Administration Indices

#### Community Court Access to Services Survey Results

Access to services questions “ask respondents to assess how much their ability to serve clients is limited by logistical difficulties and resource shortages. Questions address such issues as lack of transportation, poor location, waiting lists, and reductions in funding.”

The community court team and participating agencies were asked the questions below. The results indicate that they reported the most problems with engaging participants in the community court due to waiting lists for services, lack of engagement from participants, and reductions in funding. They did not have problems engaging participants due to lack of transportation and the location of services.

---
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Additional Feedback

When asked if other areas impacted their agency’s ability to engage participants in the community court, two individuals provided the following information:

- Lack of consistent and accurate reporting from some service providers.
- Lack of resources, staff turnover, funding.

Service Providers Access to Services Survey Results

Service providers indicated that community court participants had some problems engaging in services at their agency due to lack of transportation and lack of engagement from the participants. Poor location of services, waiting lists for services, and reductions in funding did not affect participants’ access to services.

Community Court and Service Providers Data Sharing Survey Results

Data sharing questions ask respondents to rate the degree of difficulty their community experiences in sharing information across agencies. The index measures each community’s ability to share information,
not only willingness to share. Questions address such issues as legal and regulatory limitations on information sharing, as well as technological difficulties. Community court team members and service providers indicated that they had some difficulties sharing information due to resource issues. The group generally did not have difficulties sharing information due to local, state, and federal policies and regulations, legal issues, and technological issues.

\textit{In the past three months agencies engaged with our Community Court found it difficult to share information due to...}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal issues (N = 11)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local policies and regulations (N = 12)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State policies and regulations (N = 12)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal policies and regulations (N = 12)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technological issues (N = 10)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource issues at their location (e.g. limited...)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Community Court Team and Service Provider Averages

Both the community court team and service providers indicated that accessing services was a greater challenge than data sharing. The community court team indicated greater challenges with accessing services than service providers. Both the community court team and services providers did not indicate significant challenges to data sharing overall.

\textbf{Average Index Scores}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access to Services</th>
<th>Community Court</th>
<th>Service Providers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N = 6</td>
<td>N = 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 8</td>
<td>N = 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Sharing

\textbf{Administration Averages}

Overall, the community court team and service providers did not indicate significant administrative challenges.
Average Administration Index Score

Service Provider (N = 4) 2.5
Community Court Team (N = 6) 2.9

1 2 3 4 5
Neutral

More Challenges
Collaboration Indices

Partner Involvement

The Partner Involvement index asks survey respondents to rate their community’s success in building and maintaining working relationships with key stakeholders. Questions address efforts to recruit and gain access to key partners, the coordination of decision-making, and building support across key sectors in the community. The community court team, service providers, and participating agencies responded to the five questions below. They indicated that the community court was most effective at recruiting and/or retaining essential partners and sharing information among partners. The other items were scored slightly lower but still generally effective.

In the past three months, the Community Court was effective in...

![Bar chart showing the effectiveness of various collaboration indices.]

Client Information

The Client Information index measures the extent to which interagency sharing of client-specific information is an integral part of service delivery. Questions in this index address whether information sharing improves service delivery, the quality of information provided, and whether agencies provide regular feedback and client status updates. Survey results indicate that the community court team agrees that they are receiving the type of information they need to connect and engage participants and are provided regular status updates on client progress. They trended toward agreement when asked if service providers gave regular feedback about participants to the court. They were generally neutral on whether service providers were effective at sharing client information to improve services and worked hard to provide other agencies with accurate and reliable information.
Community Engagement

The community court team, service providers, and participating agencies responded to the questions below. Higher numbers indicate higher quality community engagement. There was no neutral option. Partnerships with individuals and organizations in the community ranked the highest. The lowest score was in the area of shared responsibility for community engagement.

Please select the answer that best describes the following...

- Service providers in our Community Court provided regular status updates on client progress (e.g., utilization, compliance, termination).
- Service providers in our Community Court receive the type of information they needed to connect with participants and engage them in services or treatment.
- Service providers in our Community Court gave regular feedback about participants to the court.
- Service providers in our Community Court generally worked hard to provide other agencies with accurate and reliable information.
- Service providers in our Community Court were effective at sharing information to improve services for participants.

In the past three months...

- Community Court team’s plan for each phase or process of community engagement, including goals and steps (N = 13)
- Community Court team’s understanding of community engagement (N = 13)
- Community Court team’s support and resources from the institutions and organizations the team members represent (N = 14)
- Community Court’s level of shared responsibility for community engagement (N = 10)
- Community Court’s quality of communication with their broader staff and constituents about community engagement (N = 13)
- Community Court team’s partnerships with individuals and organizations in the community (N = 15)
Community Court Team Averages

Community court team members’ average index scores trended towards more effective in partner involvement, sharing client information, and community engagement.

Average Index Scores - Community Court Team

Service Provider Averages

Service provider index scores trended toward more effective for partner involvement and community engagement.
Quality Indices

Alcohol and Other Drug Assessment

The Alcohol and other drug (AOD) Assessment questions ask respondents to rate their community’s success at using appropriate screening and assessment tools for alcohol and other drug (AOD) problems. Questions address the routine use of assessment, the reliability of the information gathered through assessment, and the use of assessment results in matching youth to appropriate services.

Community court team members mostly agree that substance abuse treatment agencies in their community routinely use standard protocols or instruments to assess for drugs and alcohol problems. The higher the score, the more the team members agree with this statement.

![Graph showing average AOD assessment index for community court (N = 8) and service providers (N = 4)]

When breaking out the responses into two groups—community court team members or service providers—the community court team agreed that substance abuse treatment agencies in their community routinely use standard protocols or instruments to assess for drugs and alcohol problems slightly more than the service provider group.
Treatment Effectiveness

The treatment effectiveness index asks respondents to rate the success of their communities in meeting the substance abuse and mental health needs of youth, the use of graduated sanctions, the range of services provided, and the overall performance of youth-serving agencies.9

All 17 participants were asked the treatment effectiveness questions. The group trended towards agreement when asked if agencies providing treatment resources for community court participants generally did a good job serving participants and if graduated sanctions were used effectively to support treatment goals of community court participants. The group was generally neutral when asked if the substance abuse treatment needs of community court participants were adequately met. They did not agree that the mental health needs and housing needs of community court participants were adequately met.

In the past three months...

[Bar chart showing responses to various questions related to treatment effectiveness]
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Treatment Effects Averages

Community court team members trended more towards disagreement, and service providers trended more towards agreement in regard to overall treatment effectiveness.

Average Treatment Effects Index

The speed of service measures the time it takes from intake to the commencement of services.

Intake

Sixty percent of service providers responded that it takes four to seven days for a community court participant to get an intake appointment after making initial contact, and 40% responded that it takes less than 24 hours.

Additional Feedback

When asked if they would like to explain more about their intake process or answer, three individuals provided the following information:

- I meet and/or speak with and assess at the initial contact.
- The first step to entering my program is an intake appointment; once the intake is complete, they can start the program the next week.
- They can schedule to do an intake, or we have three walk-in days where they can come and do an intake on a first-come, first-serve basis.
After Initial Intake

When asked how long it takes for a community court participant to be assessed after the initial appointment, 40% of services providers responded that it takes less than 24 hours, 20% responded that it takes 4–7 days, 20% responded that it takes between one and two weeks, and 20% responded N/A because an assessment is typically performed during the initial intake or their agency does not evaluate as part of their services.

![Bar chart showing assessment times](chart)

On average, how long does it take, after the initial intake appointment, for a participant to be assessed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 24 hours</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 3 days</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 7 days</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 1 and 2 weeks</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 2 and 3 weeks</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 3 and 4 weeks</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 30 days</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Feedback

When asked if they would like to explain more about their assessment process or answer, one individual provided the following information:

- I meet and/or speak with and assess at the initial contact.

Commencement of Services

When asked how long it takes for a participant to begin their services after the initial intake appointment, 20% of service providers responded that it takes less than 24 hours, 40% responded that it takes one to three days, 20% responded that it takes four to seven days, and 20% responded that it takes one to two weeks.

![Bar chart showing service commencement times](chart)

On average, how long does it take, after the initial intake appointment, for a participant to begin services at your agency?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 24 hours</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 3 days</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 7 days</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 1 and 2 weeks</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 2 and 3 weeks</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 3 and 4 weeks</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 30 days</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Feedback

When asked if they would like to explain more about how participants enter services, two individuals provided the following information:
- If an individual is a candidate for services, I present them with necessary documentation right then and there.
- They always start with an intake and then are offered services relating to housing. It depends on services needed; we either place into one or more of our services or refer out as individual needs.
Participant Profile and Services

Community Court Referrals

From August 2016 to January 2020, a total of 1,594 referrals were made to the ECC. A total of 469 individuals participated in the community court program. Approximately 10% of the community court participants entered the program more than once. Given the variety of sentencing options available to individuals, and the fact that the program is voluntary in nature, the rate of program participation is not unusual. Among individuals who opt out of the program, the most frequent reason is they elected to proceed through the normal trial process (58% of opt-outs) or had a negotiated disposition (27% of opt-outs).

As shown in Table 12, the typical community court participant is a white male aged 18–35. Individuals who were referred to the program but opted out were typically white males as well but tended to be a little older than those who opted into the program.

Table 12: Demographics of Referrals to Community Court

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full Community Court Sample</th>
<th>All Opt-Outs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=469</td>
<td>N=1,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>353 (75%)</td>
<td>847 (75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>88 (19%)</td>
<td>220 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>28 (6%)</td>
<td>58 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>287 (61%)</td>
<td>799 (71%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>37 (8%)</td>
<td>60 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>4 (1%)</td>
<td>27 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7 (1%)</td>
<td>30 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>13 (29%)</td>
<td>209 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE AT ENTRY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18–25</td>
<td>119 (25%)</td>
<td>153 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26–35</td>
<td>124 (26%)</td>
<td>282 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36–45</td>
<td>89 (19%)</td>
<td>241 (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46–55</td>
<td>67 (14%)</td>
<td>293 (26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55+</td>
<td>70 (16%)</td>
<td>160 (14%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As previously noted, the EM-CAT is used by the community court to assess the criminogenic risk and needs of individuals referred to the program. The results of the EM-CAT are used to determine the case plan for the individual.

At the point of program entry, approximately half of the community court participants were assessed as moderate risk, and about one-third were assessed as high risk (see Figure 7). Data is not widely available for individuals in the opt-out group, as 80% of the opt-out group did not appear to be assessed.
In addition to the risk score, as part of the assessment process, participants’ behavioral health needs are identified, and a service plan is created. As shown in Figure 8, at program entry, approximately 60% of community court participants were identified as needing substance use or abuse services, and 51% were identified as having a need for mental health services. Almost all participants (94%) had a case plan that included treatment services.

Figure 7: Risk Level of All Community Court and Opt-Out Cases

Figure 8: Treatment Needs of Community Court Participants (N = 469)
Post-Program Recidivism Rates

The NCSC evaluation team examined recidivism rates one-year post-program as a key measure of program impact. Recidivism was examined through three measures—percent of program completers (regardless of exit status) who were rearrested within one year of program completion; convicted of a new offense within one year of program completion; re-incarcerated within one year of program completion.

To provide context to community court participants' recidivism rates, we compared the recidivism rates of community court participants to a group of individuals referred to the community court program but did not enter. As shown in Table 15, the community court study group was fundamentally different than the comparison group on key variables, most notably risk level, at the outset. As demonstrated in the previous analysis, an individual’s risk level is strongly associated with recidivism rates. Therefore, it is critical that the two study groups be matched on risk level before comparing each group’s outcomes.

To ensure that the groups were balanced, meaning that the characteristics of the community court study group were as equal as possible to the “business as usual” group, we matched the samples based on the following variables: 1) EM-CAT risk score; 2) gender; 3) race; and 4) age at the time of referral. The goal of matching is to produce two study groups that are as similar as possible to prevent unjustified extrapolation when comparing outcomes of the two groups. Note that matching is not an estimation technique, but rather a data processing step that precedes the analysis of the data (Ho, et al., 2007).

Only individuals who had been out of the community court program for at least one year could be included in the pool of individuals to be matched. A majority (80%) of the “business as usual” comparison group did not have EM-CAT scores, which dramatically reduced the available pool of individuals to be matched to the community court participants to 144 people initially.

Statistical Significance

Throughout this section, the term “statistically significant” is used. In any analysis, there is a possibility that a result is simply due to random chance or error, even if it looks convincing. A statistically significant result tells us there is strong evidence that a relationship is not due simply to random chance. We can more confidently say a result is true when it is statistically significant. The smaller the p-value, the more confident we are that the result is reliable. The conventional, accepted p-value of a statistically significant result is .05, although p-values between .10 and .051 are described in the report as approaching significance. Table 13 below provides an explanation for the p-values found throughout this report.

Table 13: Explanation of Statistical Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Possibility Finding is a Result of Chance/Error</th>
<th>Possibility Finding is the Result of Factors Studied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.05</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>99.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.001</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14 below summarizes the differences between the community court study group and the comparison group before matching and after matching. It can be seen that the matching procedure dramatically reduced possible sources of bias between the two samples, particularly with risk.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original Community Court N=184</th>
<th>Original Comparison Group N=144</th>
<th>Matched Community Court N=104</th>
<th>Matched Comparison Group N=104</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENDER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RACE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18–25</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26–35</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36–45</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46–55</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 55</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EM-CAT RISK</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ECC sample of 104 individuals includes both graduates and non-graduates. As shown in Figure 9, 43% of the study sample graduated, 45% did not complete the program, 11% were discharged, and 1% were deceased.
Using the matched community court and comparison group sample, we examined the difference in recidivism one year following program exit. As can be seen in Figure 10, a higher percentage of participants in the comparison group had a new arrest, new conviction, and/or new incarceration. The differences in the percentage of participants with new arrests, new convictions, and new incarcerations between these two groups were statistically significant.
Figure 10: Matched Sample One-Year Follow-Up Cohort Recidivism

Table 15 provides additional information about the types of offenses committed by both groups in the study post-program, as well as the average number of new arrests and new convictions committed by each group.

Table 15: Offenses Associated with Recidivism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Matched Community Court</th>
<th>Matched Comparison Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=104</td>
<td>N=104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEW ARRESTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving offense</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Order</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUI</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violation of a Court Order</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average # of New Arrests</strong></td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEW CONVICTIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving offense</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Order</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUI</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violation of a Court Order</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average # of New Convictions</strong></td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recidivism Analysis of ECC Participants Only

The following section provides additional analysis specific to the ECC study group. Figure 11 examines new arrests, new convictions, and new incarcerations in the one year following program exit by exit type (for those who graduated or did not complete only). A far greater percentage of non-completer had a
new arrest, new conviction, and/or new incarceration. The differences in new arrests, new convictions, and new incarcerations between graduates and those who did not complete the program were all statistically significant.

**Figure 11: Post-Program One-Year Recidivism, by Completion Type**

![Chart](image1.png)

**Figure 12** examines the rate of new arrests, new convictions, and new incarcerations in the one year following program exit by participant risk level (high and low risk only). Notably, low-risk participants did not have any new arrests, convictions, or incarcerations in the year following program exit. The differences in new arrests, new convictions, and new incarcerations between low- and high-risk individuals were all statistically significant.

**Figure 12: Post-Program One-Year Recidivism, by Risk Level**

![Chart](image2.png)

**p < .001, **p < .01, * p < .05

**Figure 13** examines the rate of new arrests, new convictions, and new incarcerations in the one year following program exit by tier level. Tier 3 participants had the highest percentage of new arrests, convictions, and incarcerations in the year after they exited the program. The differences in new arrests,
new convictions, and new incarcerations between people in different tiers were all statistically significant.

Figure 13: Post-Program Year-One Recidivism, by Tier (N = 102)

Housing information was only available for 79 of the 104 individuals (or 76%) of the study group in the one-year follow-up cohort. For those with available housing data, the vast majority were not housed. We examined the new arrests, new convictions, and new incarcerations in the one year following program exit by housing status. Generally, those who were not housed had a higher percentage of new arrests, convictions, and incarcerations. None of the differences in post-program recidivism for people housed versus not housed were statistically significant.

Figure 14: Post-Program Year-One Recidivism, by Housing Status
Table 16 examines the types of offenses being committed by ECC participants who have reoffended. The vast majority of all recidivism is for property or public order offenses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense Type</th>
<th>Public Order</th>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Drug</th>
<th>DUI</th>
<th>Violation of a Court Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arrests</strong></td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Convictions</strong></td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Incarcerations</strong></td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Figure 15, we compare recidivism (arrests, convictions, and incarcerations) two years before program entry to recidivism one year after program exit. Generally, a lower percentage of participants had an arrest, conviction, or incarceration one-year post-program compared to the two years pre-program. The differences in arrests, convictions, and incarcerations for participants two years before and one-year post community court were all statistically significant.

Figure 15: Community Court Participant Criminal Justice Involvement Pre-and Post-Program (N = 104)

Impact of Substance Abuse and Mental Health on Recidivism. Most participants in the matched sample had an identified substance abuse issue (60%) and/or an identified mental health issue (52%). As shown in Figure 16, 26% of those with an identified substance abuse issue had a new conviction within one year of program exit compared to 17% of those with no identified substance abuse issue. Similar to the finding above, 25% of those with an identified mental health issue had at least one post-program conviction within one year compared to 18% of those with no identified mental health issue. The difference between the two groups is not statistically significant, although that may be due, in part, to the small sample size.
Figure 16: Post-Program Convictions Among Those with an Identified Substance Abuse or Mental Health Issue (N = 104)
Additional EM-CAT Risk Score Analysis

As part of the recidivism analysis, the individual’s risk scores were identified as a strong predictor of recidivism. We graphed the proportion of individuals with a new arrest at each individual risk score. For example, 3 out of 4 (proportion = .75) individuals with a risk score of 35 had a new arrest. The red lines represent the original risk level cutoffs (low risk 0–18, moderate risk 19–29, high risk 30–70).

Figure 17: Community Court Proportion Arrested, by Risk Score (Original Cutoffs)

As reflected in Table 17, the original cut-off scores for the EM-CAT are good predictors of recidivism rates, with some room to refine the cut-off scores in the moderate and high range.

Table 17: Community Court Arrests, by Risk Level (Original Cutoffs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrests</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Arrests</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>76.6%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 18 below, arrests are broken out by risk level if cut-off scores were shifted downward by three points with the resulting scoring ranges as follows: a) low risk 0–15; b) moderate risk 16–26; c) high risk 27–70). This shift results in more of the new arrests to individuals in the highest risk category.

Table 18: Community Court Arrests, By Risk Level (-3 Cutoffs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrests</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Arrests</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cost-Benefit Ratio for the Community Court

There are a variety of methodological approaches to calculating cost-benefit in a problem-solving setting. Many of these approaches rely upon precise and detailed cost and programmatic data about all aspects of program operations. It was not feasible to gather original data for program costs. Based on a review of the available data, we selected an approach used to estimate the cost and benefit of three problem-solving courts in Minnesota (Anton, 2007).

Data Sample

For the cost-benefit section of this report, data were collected on both ECC participants who completed the program and also on participants who left the program and were subsequently returned to the regular court system for processing. A total of 208 individuals were included in this portion of the analysis, including 45 individuals who successfully completed the ECC program, 59 individuals who began the ECC program but then dropped out or were terminated, and 104 individuals in the matched probation comparison group (see Table 19). Unsuccessful ECC participants were included in this portion of the analysis since costs were incurred for these individuals.

Table 19: Cost-Analysis Study Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Successful ECC Completers</th>
<th>Non-Completers of ECC</th>
<th>Matched Comparison Group</th>
<th>Total Records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ECC Costs

While the ECC maintains excellent records related to the number of individuals served, some data needed to comprehensively calculate the cost per person are not maintained by the ECC. In the absence of this data, we based our estimates on the cost of the ECC in FY 2018, which was $139,130.

Number of Arrests and Convictions by Type of Crime

Data on the number of convictions that occurred both while in the program and the one year following program completion were collected for each subject in the study. Convictions for both successful and unsuccessful ECC completers were included in the matched ECC sample. As Table 20 suggests, the ECC program “saved” 59 convictions during the study period.

Table 20: Number of Convictions Saved by Type of Crime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Matched Community Court Sample</th>
<th>Matched Comparison Group</th>
<th>Estimated arrests and convictions saved by type of crime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drug-related</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWI</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Non-drug, non-violent & 44 & 103 & 59  
Non-drug, violent & 0 & 0 & 0  
Total & 46 & 105 & 59 

Saved Costs of Initial Offense

While the cost of ECC participation is important to account for, eliminating the alternate cost of probation and/or incarceration in the “business as usual” scenario is a benefit to the community. The initial savings are the foregone costs of prosecuting drug offenders through the regular criminal courts. Rather than calculate the cost per trial directly, we used an estimate of $1,522 per case that was developed as part of a study published by the Washington State Institute for Public Policy (WSIPP) in 2006 (Aos, et al., 2006). This dollar figure was multiplied by the number of ECC graduates to estimate the benefit to taxpayers. Unsuccessful participants were not included in this calculation since these clients would likely return to court for disposition, thus incurring additional court costs.

Court cost avoided by community court placement:

45 graduates x $1,522/case = $68,490

Saved Costs of Subsequent Arrests and Convictions

We estimate that the ECC reduced subsequent convictions by 59 offenses. The two areas of cost savings associated with new convictions are: (1) saved prosecution costs and (2) saved incarceration costs. As before, we used the estimates from the ECONorthwest study. We multiplied the number of saved convictions by $1,522 to yield an estimate of the savings to the courts and county prosecutors.

Table 21: Saved Costs of Subsequent Arrests – Court Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of arrests saved</th>
<th>Court and Prosecutor Costs</th>
<th>Court Cost Savings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drug-related</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWI</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>$1,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-drug, non-violent</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>$1,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-drug, violent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$1,522</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$89,798

A total of 21 individuals in the ECC group were incarcerated within the one-year follow-up period, while a total of 47 individuals in the comparison group were incarcerated during the follow-up period. The total number of jail days served is not known, but we have estimated an average length of incarceration of five days. To estimate the saved incarceration costs, the number of saved convictions was multiplied by the average length of incarceration. The incarceration costs for each offense type was calculated using $155 per day for jail costs.10

Table 22: Saved Costs of Subsequent Convictions – Incarceration Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of jail stays avoided</th>
<th>Average length of incarceration for each conviction</th>
<th>Incarceration Cost Savings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of jail stays avoided</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Saved Costs from Community Restoration

The contributions to the community associated with the community service completed by ECC participants are significant. Using the community restoration hours reflected in Table 23 and multiplying 1,040 hours times the minimum wage of $11.25 results in a total community contribution of $11,700.

Table 23: Community Court Programmatic Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Restoration</th>
<th>ECC hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Hours Completed</td>
<td>1,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Hours Completed</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings</td>
<td>$11,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Estimated Benefits

This total estimated benefits of $190,138 reflected in Table 24 represents the return on investment to the justice system and the general public as potential crime victims during the one-year follow-up period. This total must be compared to the costs of operating the ECC program for one year, which we will do in Table 25.

Table 24: Estimated Benefits from the ECC by Type of Benefit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Benefit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Saved costs of initial offense</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court costs - initial offense</td>
<td>$68,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$68,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Saved cost of subsequent convictions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court costs avoided</td>
<td>$89,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incarceration costs avoided</td>
<td>$20,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$121,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Saved cost from community restoration</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community restoration savings</td>
<td>$11,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$133,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total estimated benefits during the one-year follow-up period</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$190,138</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparing Benefits and Costs to the Justice System

Table 25 shows the annual estimated benefits and annual net cost of the ECC program during the study period. The annual cost figure used for the ECC includes the cost of one full-time equivalent (FTE) Case Manager, .25 FTE of a Court Operations Specialist-A, security for one day a week, and materials and
services related to the program. Other costs that would occur whether the program exists or not, such as judicial time, are not included in the cost of the community court.

Table 25: Comparison of Estimated Benefits and Actual Costs of ECC Operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saved cost of initial offense during the one-year follow-up period</td>
<td>$68,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saved cost of subsequent convictions during the one-year follow-up period</td>
<td>$89,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saved cost of subsequent incarceration during the one-year follow-up period</td>
<td>$20,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saved cost from community restoration during the one-year follow-up period</td>
<td>$11,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total estimated benefits during the one-year follow-up period</strong></td>
<td><strong>$190,138</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total cost of the ECC program for one year</strong></td>
<td><strong>-$139,130</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Annual Savings of the ECC</strong></td>
<td><strong>$51,008</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Benefits to the Taxpayers

Health Care Cost Savings. At NCSC and ECC’s request, Trillium Community Health Plan conducted an analysis that compared the health care usage of Medicaid members who engaged with the ECC program versus Medicaid members who did not between September 1, 2016, and December 31, 2018. For this analysis, three groups were examined (those who completed and graduated from the ECC program, those who did not complete the program [were revoked], and those who chose not to participate) over three time periods (90, 180, and 365 days after the date of graduation, revocation, or opting out).

Utilization per thousand for ten service types and total cost per member per month (PMPM) are compared across the groups and time periods. This analysis found that graduates had the lowest cost PMPM of the groups examined, while the opt-out group had the highest cost PMPM. The ECC graduates also had the lowest utilization rates for the highest cost services, which are inpatient stays and emergency room visits. Graduates also had the highest rates for primary care utilization. See Tables 26 and 27 and Figure 18.

Table 26: Utilization by Exit Cohort
Table 27: Member Counts and Average Member Months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduated</th>
<th>Opted Out</th>
<th>Revoked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count of Members</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Member Months</td>
<td>306.66</td>
<td>589.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 18: Average Cost Per Member Per Month

- Graduates
  - 3 Months: $951.4
  - 6 Months: $976.6
  - 1 Year: $1,163.0
- Opted Out
  - 3 Months: $927.7
  - 6 Months: $1,161.2
  - 1 Year: $1,161.2
- Revoked
  - 3 Months: $0
  - 6 Months: $1,067.9
  - 1 Year: $1,067.9
Conclusions and Recommendations

The ECC is to be commended for their critical work within the community to serve defendants that are unhoused and repeatedly before the court charged with trespassing and a long list of other low-level, nonviolent crimes. ECC has established a mechanism that connects defendants with mental health programs, substance abuse treatment, and other services that address underlying behavioral health issues. The ECC is also to be commended for their openness to receiving feedback and the changes they have made to the program since this project began, including the addition of a case manager to assist with the supervision of participants.

The outcome data from this report is clear—the ECC program is substantially improving criminal justice outcomes for some participants and is more effective than “business as usual” for a subset of defendants in need. The benefits are clear based on the cost savings to the community.

The following are recommendations designed to assist the ECC in continuing the strengthen the program and respond to those most in need.

Recommendation 1: Incorporate the EM-CAT scores into case planning and strengthen services for moderate-high and high-risk individuals.

The ECC serves an important role in the community and is effectively working with a subset of clients whose risk of reoffending is low or moderate but have significant needs. The outcomes from this study suggest that the existing programming is effective with this population. However, the relatively short length of stay in the program and the challenges associated with accessing key treatment and recovery support services such as housing creates significant obstacles to success for higher risk clients who may enter the program. The findings from this report should be used as a springboard for a larger discussion within the team and the community about how high-risk defendants charged with lower-level offenses may be best served in the community. The outcome of this conversation may result in a new track within the ECC program, a change in services, or the creation of a new program. Regardless of the outcome of this conversation, it’s important for the ECC team to set aside time for these conversations. If the ECC decides to enhance its existing program to serve this population, NCSC would recommend requesting technical assistance and additional training to support the planning process.

Recommendation 2: Use this report, and the feedback from participants and staff, to work as a team to review and prioritize identify opportunities to enhance the program.

The participants and staff provided important feedback that merits consideration by the team. Opportunities identified by the staff and participants include:

- Streamlining communication between the court and service providers, recruit additional service providers outside of the downtown area, and expand the treatment options available through the court. To effectively achieve this goal, there may need to be an additional staff member who focuses on strengthening this component of the program.
- Evaluating how the EM-CAT is administered and what adjustments can be made to make the experience more private for participants. This will likely be addressed as the court is considering moving to a different location that provides more flexible space.
- Determining whether the current day court is held (Friday) is the most effective court day for creating immediate service linkages between the participants and community-based providers.

- Developing a frequently asked question flyer or brochure to clarify key information about the program for referral sources and potential participants.

- Investing in training on motivational interviewing and open-ended, affirming, reflective listening to strengthen the participant’s perception of being heard and validated by the team.

- Considering current roles and responsibilities of community court team members and service agencies around community engagement and have a discussion about expectations of members to engage the community in support of and support for the community court. Consider whether or not expectations and responsibilities should differ between community court team members and service agencies/providers.

- Reviewing the current referral and intake process to identify ways the process can be streamlined to reduce the number of days between the initial contact with a participant and a formal intake with a service provider. Identify any barriers to reducing this timeframe and work collaboratively to increase linkages and reduce the gap between contact and intake.

**Recommendation 3: Modify the EM-CAT scoring by 3 points to more closely align scores with risk of recidivism.**

The ECC should use the data from this report to optimize the alignment of risk scores with risk cut-off scores. The analysis within the report suggests that adjusting the ranges by 3 points may improve the accuracy of the scale.
Appendix A: Procedural Justice Survey

Procedural Fairness Survey

Thank you for your willingness to complete this survey. We are interested in learning more about your personal experiences with the court staff and services to date. The following four sections specifically target the judge, probation, treatment staff, and the court generally. In each section, please consider all of your interactions with the indicated person or persons and indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement listed in the left-hand column. For each statement, please select the response option that best represents your opinion by placing an X in the corresponding box.

Today’s Date: ______________________________________

What is the name of the court you are involved in?
___________________________________________________________

What is your current phase in the program?
___________________________________________________________

How long have you been in the program?
____________________ months

---

1Measure items were developed by the National Center for State Courts or taken and amended from the following sources:
### Section 1: Your Experiences with the Judge

In this section, please consider all of your interactions with the primary judge with whom you have had contact throughout your dealings with the court.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree (7)</th>
<th>Agree (6)</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree (5)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (4)</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The judge applies rules consistently to everyone.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The judge makes me feel comfortable enough to say how I really feel about things.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The judge gives me a chance to tell my side of the story.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The judge treats me politely.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The judge is knowledgeable about my case.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The judge makes decisions about how to handle my problems in a fair way.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section 2: Your Experiences with your Case Manager

In this section, please consider all of your interactions with your primary case manager.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree (7)</th>
<th>Agree (6)</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree (5)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (4)</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. My case manager interacts with me in a professional manner.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I know that my case manager truly wants to help me.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. My case manager gives me enough of a chance to say what I want to say.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The way my case manager handles my case is fair.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. My case manager treats all of his or her clients equally.

12. I feel safe enough to be open and honest with my case manager.

### Section 3: Your Experiences with Social Services

In this section, please consider all of your interactions with your primary treatment provider.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (7)</th>
<th>Agree (6)</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree (5)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (4)</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. The provider staff gives me a chance to tell my side of the story.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I believe the provider staff is genuinely interested in helping me with my problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The provider staff interacts with me in a professional manner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The provider staff treats all clients equally.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I feel safe enough to be open and honest with provider staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. The way the provider handles my case is fair.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section 5: Your Experiences with the Court in General

In this section, please consider all of your interactions with the staff of the court that have not been specifically mentioned above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (7)</th>
<th>Agree (6)</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree (5)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (4)</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19. They treat all people and groups equally.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. They are fair in their dealings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. They care about me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. They treat me with courtesy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. They listen to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. They are trustworthy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Team Collaboration Tool

The National Center for State Courts is conducting a survey to learn more about how your community court functions. In particular, the National Center for State Courts is interested in how the community court makes decisions and set goals. All survey responses will be kept confidential and anonymous. Please complete this survey by Monday, January 27, 2020.

q2
Please indicate what your current role is in relation to the Community Court:

☐ I am a member of the Community Court team (1)
☐ My agency participates in the Community Court, but I do not sit on the Community Court team (2)
☐ I am a service provider who receives referrals from the Community Court team (3)

q3
In the past three months, service providers reported they had problems engaging participants in the Community Court due to . . .

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neutral (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
<th>Don't Know (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lack of transportation (1)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poor location of services (e.g., dangerous areas, inaccessible areas) (2)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>waiting lists for services (3)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reductions in funding (4)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lack of engagement from the participants (5)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale mask

q4
In the past three months, Community Court participants have had problems engaging in services at our agency due to . . .

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neutral (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
<th>Don't Know (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lack of transportation (1)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poor location of services (e.g., dangerous areas, inaccessible areas) (2)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>waiting lists for services (3)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reductions in funding (4)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lack of engagement from the participants (5)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Scale mask

#### q5
In the past three months, the Community Court was effective in . . .

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neutral (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
<th>Don't Know (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recruiting and/or retaining essential partners, both individuals and agencies (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing decision-making among various partners (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing information among various partners (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaining access to key local leaders and decision-makers (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining cooperation and support from community-based organizations and other nongovernmental organizations (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### q6
In the past 3 months . . .

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neutral (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
<th>Don't Know (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Substance abuse treatment agencies in my community routinely used standard protocols or instruments to assess for drug and alcohol problems. (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The substance abuse treatment needs of participants enrolled in the Community Court were adequately met. (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The mental health needs of participants enrolled in the Community Court were adequately met. (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The housing needs of participants enrolled in the Community Court were adequately met. (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated sanctions were used effectively to support treatment goals of Community Court participants.</td>
<td>²</td>
<td>²</td>
<td>²</td>
<td>²</td>
<td>²</td>
<td>²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agencies providing treatment resources for participants engaged with the Community Court generally did a good job serving participants.</td>
<td>²</td>
<td>²</td>
<td>²</td>
<td>²</td>
<td>²</td>
<td>²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agencies in my community were usually able to provide participants with the range of services they needed.</td>
<td>²</td>
<td>²</td>
<td>²</td>
<td>²</td>
<td>²</td>
<td>²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**q8**
Please select the answer that best describes the Community Court's level of shared responsibility for community engagement. Community engagement involves informing, consulting, involving, and empowering the court's stakeholders. "Stakeholders" in a community court context include the participants being served by the community court, service providers and partner agencies, and the community at large.

- There is no Community Court team member responsible for engaging the community. (1)
- There are a few Community Court team members who can contribute minimally to community engagement. (2)
- There are Community Court team members from different stakeholder groups who can share responsibility for community engagement. (3)
- There is a strong Community Court team from different stakeholder groups who can share responsibility for deep community engagement. (4)
- Don't know (5)

**q9**
Please select the answer that best describes the Community Court's understanding of community engagement.

- Community Court team members do not understand what constitutes community engagement. (1)
- Community Court team members are limited or confused in their understanding of what constitutes community engagement. (2)
- Community Court team members have an understanding of what constitutes community engagement. (3)
- Community Court team members have a clear understanding of what constitutes authentic community engagement. (4)
- Don't know (5)

**q10**
Please select the answer that best describes your Community Court team's support and resources from the institutions and organizations the team members represent.
There is little or no institutional/organizational support for Community Court team members to conduct community engagement. (1)

There is limited institutional/organizational support for Community Court team members to conduct community engagement and a need for more time, resources, and/or funding. (2)

There is some institutional/organizational support for Community Court team members to conduct community engagement and some time, resources, and funding. (3)

There is ample institutional/organization support for site leaders to conduct community engagement, including plenty of time, resources, and funding. (4)

Don't know (5)

q11
Please select the answer that best describes your Community Court team's quality of communication with their broader staff and constituents about community engagement.

The Community Court team members have not communicated with their broader staff and constituents about the value of community engagement. (1)

The Community Court team members communicate with some of their broader staff and constituents about the value of community engagement but send mixed or confusing messages about its value. (2)

The Community Court team members adequately communicate with their broader staff and constituents about the value of community engagement. (3)

The Community Court team members communicate a strong message to their broader staff and constituents about the value of community engagement. (4)

Don't know (5)

q12
Please select the answer that best describes your Community Court team's partnerships with individuals and organizations in the community.

The Community Court team members have no relationships or challenged relationships with individuals or organizations in the community. (1)

The Community Court team members have limited relationships with individuals or organizations in the community. (2)

The Community Court team members have some relationships with individuals or organizations in the community. (3)

The Community Court team members have worked to create strong relationships with individuals and/or organizations in the community. (4)

Don't know (5)

q13
Please select the answer that best describes your Community Court team's plan for each phase or process of community engagement, including goals and steps.

The Community Court team members have no plan or goals for community engagement. (1)

The Community Court team members have thought about community engagement but do not have an explicit plan with clear goals or steps. (2)

The Community Court team members have a plan for community engagement, which includes some goals and the details of steps. (3)
The Community Court team members have worked together to create a clear plan for community engagement that will engage a range of voices and includes broad goals as well as details of individual steps. (4)
Don't know (5)

q14
In the past three months . . .

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neutral (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
<th>Don't Know (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agencies engaged with our Community Court found it difficult to share information due to legal issues (1)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agencies engaged with our Community Court found it difficult to share information due to local policies and regulations (2)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agencies engaged with our Community Court found it difficult to share information due to state policies and regulations (3)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agencies engaged with our community found it difficult to share information due to federal policies and regulations (4)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agencies engaged with our Community Court found it difficult to share information due to technological issues (5)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agencies engaged with our Community Court found it difficult to share information due to resource issues at their location (e.g., limited staffing) (6)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale mask

q15
In the past three months . . .

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neutral (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
<th>Don't Know (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service providers in our Community Court were effective at sharing</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We would like to better understand, on average, how quickly participants from the Community Court are able to access services within your agency. Please consider the typical participant referred from the Community Court when answering the next three questions:

On average, how long does it take for a Community Court participant to get an intake appointment at your agency once they first make contact?

- [ ] less than 24 hours (1)
- [ ] 1 to 3 days (2)
- [ ] 4 to 7 days (3)
- [ ] between 1 and 2 weeks (4)
- [ ] between 2 and 3 weeks (5)
- [ ] between 3 and 4 weeks (6)
- [ ] more than 30 days (7)
- [ ] N/A (8)

If you would like to explain more about your intake process or your answer, please provide additional information in the text box below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale mask</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

q17

q18
q19
On average, how long does it take, after the initial intake appointment, for a participant to be assessed? If an assessment is typically performed during the initial intake or your agency does not perform an assessment as part of your services, please select "N/A."

- less than 24 hours (1)
- 1 to 3 days (2)
- 4 to 7 days (3)
- between 1 and 2 weeks (4)
- between 2 and 3 weeks (5)
- between 3 and 4 weeks (6)
- more than 30 days (7)
- N/A (8)

q20
If you would like to explain more about your assessment process or your answer, please provide additional information in the text box below:

q21
On average, how long does it take, after the initial intake appointment, for a participant to begin services at your agency?

- less than 24 hours (1)
- 1 to 3 days (2)
- 4 to 7 days (3)
- between 1 and 2 weeks (4)
- between 2 and 3 weeks (5)
- between 3 and 4 weeks (6)
- more than 30 days (7)
- N/A (8)

q22
If you would like to explain more about how participants enter services, please provide additional information in the text box below:
q23
Please share any other areas that have impacted your agency’s ability to engage participants in the Community Court.

STOP

Complete –

Thank you for completing our survey! Please hit the "OK" button to submit your survey.