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Learn more about MI Problem-Solving Courts: www.courts.mi.gov/psc
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Problem-solving courts are special court programs that focus on providing treatment and intense supervision to offenders instead of locking them in prison. These include drug and sobriety, mental health, veterans, and other nontraditional courts.

The Michigan Supreme Court (MSC), through its State Court Administrative Office (SCAO), assists trial court judges in the management of these courts by providing training, education, operational standards, monitoring, certification requirements, and funding.

Support for these courts is part of MSC’s “driving change” initiative to measure performance, implement best practices, and improve outcomes.

Problem-solving courts save lives through strict supervision and treatment. They improve the quality of life for both graduates and for the community at large. They also reduce crime and make communities safer because graduates are much less likely to commit another offense. Finally, problem-solving courts save money by avoiding costly incarceration.

The Michigan Supreme Court recognizes the many judges across the state who voluntarily take on these additional dockets to truly solve problems and save lives.

DRUG & SOBRIETY COURT GRADUATES COMMITTED FEWER REPEAT OFFENSES

Michigan drug courts discharged 2,914 participants during FY 2017. Of those, 1,814 participants (62%) had successfully completed a program.

Because successful participants commit fewer repeat offenses, these programs are helping to reduce crime, making communities around the state safer. For instance, drug court graduates were FAR LESS likely to commit another crime after two years, as opposed to similar offenders who did not participate in a drug court program (see graph below).

**NUMBERS AS OF JAN. 1, 2018:**

- Michigan has 185 problem-solving courts.
  - 127 Drug/Sobriety
  - 25 Veterans
  - 33 Mental Health

- These courts are accessible to 97 percent of Michigan’s population.
- Michigan is a national leader with 25 veterans treatment courts.
IGNITION INTERLOCK IMPACT

Ignition interlock devices are used to control drunk driving recidivism among chronic DWI offenders who are participating in sobriety court programs.

There were 702 participants using ignition interlock devices who were discharged from a treatment court program during FY 2017. Of those, 637 (91%) successfully completed a problem-solving court (PSC) program.

Sobriety court graduates using interlock devices were SEVEN TIMES LESS LIKELY to commit another offense after two years.

DRUG AND SOBRIETY COURT GRADUATES FOUND EMPLOYMENT

Unemployment among drug court graduates was DRASTICALLY reduced, as seen in the graph below. This is so important because having steady employment and income are major factors in improving graduates’ overall quality of life. The more people are employed, the stronger the community.

Unemployment at Admission and Discharge by Program Type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>Percent of Graduates</th>
<th>Unemployed at Admission</th>
<th>Unemployed at Discharge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Drug</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sobriety</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Dependency</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VETERANS TREATMENT COURT GRADUATES IMPROVED THEIR QUALITY OF LIFE

Veterans treatment court programs integrate principles from both drug courts and mental health courts to serve military veterans who suffer from mental illness, substance use disorders, or traumatic brain injuries. There were 221 veterans discharged from a program during FY 2017 and of those, 146 participants (66%) had successfully completed a program. In addition, MORE THAN HALF of unemployed veteran participants found work by the time they graduated, as illustrated in the graph below.
IMPORTANCE OF VETERAN MENTORS

The effectiveness of Michigan’s 25 veterans treatment courts (VTCs) is due, in large part, to the unique component of the volunteer veteran mentors. Mentors are matched to participants based on war or conflict, rank, and branch of service, which has proven to be the most important criterion for developing a lasting bond.

Because veteran mentors have had some of the same experiences, VTC participants confide in their mentors, are open to discussions, and are accepting of their help. That help comes in the form of assistance in navigating the VA, transportation to appointments, support at court review hearings, and much more.

MSC hosted a Justice For Vets 2-day mentor boot camp in October 2017, which provided training for 60 veteran mentors from 12 courts across Michigan.

MENTAL HEALTH COURT GRADUATES COMMITTED FEWER REPEAT OFFENSES, IMPROVED THEIR QUALITY OF LIFE

Mental health courts (MHCs) collaborate closely with community mental health service providers to ensure that participants have access to a wide range of treatment services. As a result, graduates were FAR LESS likely to commit another crime after two years, as the graph below illustrates.

In addition, nearly 100 percent of all MHC graduates (adult and juvenile) reported improved mental health and an overall improved quality of life upon completing a program. Furthering the quality of life improvement, more than half of unemployed adults in MHCs found employment by the time they graduated, and nearly 100 percent of juveniles in MHCs improved their education levels by the time they completed a program. These successes provide a solid foundation for these individuals to improve their lives, take care of their families, and help make their communities stronger.

Asked why he became a mentor, one Marine vet instructor said simply, “I do this because I can’t save the friends I lost.”
Drug court is an umbrella term that refers to voluntary judicial programs that offer an alternative to imprisonment for nonviolent criminal offenders with substance use disorders (SUD). To combat offenders cycling in and out of the criminal justice system, problem-solving courts use a specialized therapeutic jurisprudence model designed to treat the SUD underlying the criminal behavior and, therefore, reduce recidivism.

Participants are held accountable through intensive supervision, frequent judicial status review hearings, random and frequent drug testing, and graduated incentives and sanctions. Drug courts emphasize a holistic and team approach that includes judges, prosecutors, program coordinators, probation officers and case managers, law enforcement, defense counsel, and treatment providers.

Michigan Compiled Law 600.1060(c) defines a drug treatment court as “. . . a court-supervised treatment program for individuals who abuse or are dependent upon any controlled substance or alcohol.” Drug courts have evolved over time and now include several models to serve specific offender populations, and although they share the same therapeutic jurisprudence model, each drug court model has specific program guidelines that frame its operations.

Adult drug courts are defined as programs that target drug-related non-drunk driving felony and/or misdemeanor offenses, and their framework is derived from “Defining Drug Courts: The Key Components (Ten Key Components of Drug Courts).”

Sobriety courts accept only drunk driving offenders and their framework is derived from The Ten Guiding Principles of Sobriety Courts.

Hybrid courts combine the adult drug court model and the sobriety court model because these programs accept both drunk driving and non-drunk driving offenders.

Michigan also has juvenile drug courts, which accept criminal and status offenders (i.e., juveniles deemed to be runaways, incorrigible, or truant), and their framework is derived from Juvenile Drug Court: Strategies in Practice.

The Tribal Advisory Committee describes its drug courts (tribal drug treatment courts) as “Healing to Wellness” Courts.

Lastly, family dependency treatment courts target selected child abuse and neglect cases where parental substance abuse is a primary factor. These programs have offered a solution to the problem of jail overcrowding, as well as to the problem of drug- and alcohol-related crime.

To see the official list of each PSC in Michigan and its defined program type as of January 2018, please visit http://courts.mi.gov/administration/admin/op/problem-solving-courts/pages/default.aspx and access the page for each type of problem-solving court.
During fiscal year (FY) 2017, Michigan’s drug courts:

- Screened 4,294 potential participants.
- Admitted 2,992 offenders into a program.
- Discharged 2,914 participants.

During FY 2017, the total number of participants who were active in working a drug court program was 6,582 and is broken down by program type:

- Hybrid programs totaled 4,022 participants (61%).
- Sobriety programs totaled 1,786 participants (27%).
- Adult drug programs totaled 332 participants (5%).
- Juvenile drug programs totaled 260 participants (4%).
- Family dependency programs totaled 182 participants (3%).

**Michigan’s Drug Court Graduates’ Outcome Measures**

October 1, 2016 – September 30, 2017

Outcome measures are used to determine the effectiveness of a program. Short-term goals of all drug courts include the percentage of participants who successfully completed a program, the percentage retained in the program, and whether participants improved their employment status or education level upon graduation.

Further, participant abstinence from alcohol and drug use is a goal of all drug court programs and can be measured by the number of consecutive sobriety days graduates achieved. The different types of services that drug court programs provide participants can also be measured when evaluating program success. Longer-term goals of drug courts include reducing recidivism, which also reduces costs to the community.

**Success Rate:**

- There were 2,914 participants discharged from a program during FY 2017 and of those, 1,814 participants (62%) had successfully completed a program.
- 31% were discharged unsuccessfully due to noncompliance, absconding, or a new offense.
- 7% were discharged for reasons such as voluntarily withdrew, “other,” transferred to another jurisdiction, death, medical discharge, or statutorily ineligible.
Achieving and maintaining abstinence from alcohol and drugs is another goal of drug courts. National best practice research suggests participants should have a minimum of 90 days of sobriety before graduating.

The average number of consecutive sobriety days by program type:

- Graduates of adult drug court programs averaged 316 consecutive days of sobriety.
- Graduates of sobriety court programs averaged 432 consecutive days of sobriety.
- Graduates of hybrid programs averaged 333 consecutive days of sobriety.
- Graduates of juvenile drug court programs averaged 171 consecutive days of sobriety. Juvenile drug court programs are typically shorter in duration than adult programs.
- Graduates of family dependency treatment court programs averaged 294 consecutive days of sobriety. This type of program accepts neglect and abuse petitions that are typically adjudicated within one year.
Employment

Substance abuse often interferes with productivity on the job, the ability to maintain employment, or being proactive in seeking employment among adult offenders. Employment efforts are usually encouraged once the participant has been clinically stabilized.

- Adult drug court program graduates saw a 100% reduction in unemployment.
- Sobriety court program graduates saw a 77% reduction in unemployment.
- Hybrid court program graduates saw a 61% reduction in unemployment.
- Family Dependency court program graduates saw a 42% reduction in unemployment.

“The program is not just about sobriety and being clean from drugs. That is obviously of primary importance, but once you have those things, we want you to be able to go out and live a good life.”

-Chief Judge Geno Salomone
23rd District Court Regional DWI Court, Wayne County

*Juvenile drug court offenders were not included as their main goal while working a program is to improve their education level.
Education

Juveniles had the highest rate of improved education level, suggesting they were able to stay in school and advance to the next grade while in the program.

Drug Court Recidivism

Recidivism Rates for *Graduates*

The two-year analyses of graduates who entered a program included a total of 14,321 matched pairs, and the four-year analyses included 11,247 matched pairs. The recidivism rates are broken out by program type.
Any New Conviction (Graduates) – 2 Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>Favorable</th>
<th>Percent Reduction in Recidivism</th>
<th>Statistically Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Drug</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sobriety</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Dependency</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Any New Conviction (Graduates) – 4 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>Favorable</th>
<th>Percent Reduction in Recidivism</th>
<th>Statistically Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Drug</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sobriety</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Dependency</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alcohol or Drug Conviction (Graduates) – 2 Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>Favorable</th>
<th>Percent Reduction in Recidivism</th>
<th>Statistically Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Drug</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sobriety</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Dependency</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“I am a firm believer in the treatment court model. As a judge, it has been an honor to work with our participants in their commitment to recovery.”

-Judge Stewart McDonald
65B District Court Drug Court, Gratiot County
Alcohol or Drug Conviction (Graduates) – 4 Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>Favorable</th>
<th>Percent Reduction in Recidivism</th>
<th>Statistically Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Drug</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sobriety</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Dependency</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recidivism Rates for All Participants

The two year-analyses of all participants who entered a program included a total of 24,451 matched pairs, and the four-year analyses included 19,568 matched pairs. The recidivism rates are broken out by program type.

Any New Conviction – 2 Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>Favorable</th>
<th>Percent Reduction in Recidivism</th>
<th>Statistically Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Drug</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sobriety</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Dependency</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Any New Conviction (All Participants) – 4 Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>Favorable</th>
<th>Percent Reduction in Recidivism</th>
<th>Statistically Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Drug</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sobriety</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Dependency</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-32%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alcohol or Drug Conviction (All Participants) – 2 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>Favorable</th>
<th>Percent Reduction in Recidivism</th>
<th>Statistically Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Drug</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sobriety</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Dependency</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alcohol or Drug Convictions (All Participants) – 4 Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>Favorable</th>
<th>Percent Reduction in Recidivism</th>
<th>Statistically Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Drug</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sobriety</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-13%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Dependency</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Drug Court Graduates’ Performance Measures
October 1, 2016 – September 30, 2017

Participating in a drug court program is much more regimented than standard probation. Drug courts require participants to engage in substance abuse treatment, test for drugs and alcohol frequently, and appear before the judge for updates one to two times per month. Programs reward good behavior with varying incentives and address bad behavior with program sanctions. The following graphs illustrate the average number of services that participants in the different program types received.
### Treatment
Programs offer different modalities of substance abuse treatment guided by the American Society of Addiction Medicine (ASAM) criteria. Different levels of care include residential stays, intensive outpatient services, outpatient services, and detoxification services. The average number of all types of substance abuse treatment modalities are calculated in hours and shown below by program type.

![Substance Abuse Treatment Hours by Program Type](image)

### Drug/Alcohol Tests
Random and frequent drug and alcohol testing is an objective method for monitoring abstinence and new use.

![Drug and Alcohol Tests by Program Type](image)


**Positive Drug/Alcohol Tests**
New drug and alcohol use is often met with rapid treatment interventions.

![Percent of Positive Drug and Alcohol Tests by Program Type](chart1.png)

**Incentives**
Drug courts incorporate a strength-based approach and use incentives to reinforce productive behaviors that support recovery.

![Average Number of Program Incentives by Program Type](chart2.png)
Sanctions
Many types of sanctions are used to modify behavior and the response to infractions are immediate.

Review Hearings
Drug courts vary from standard probation in that participants regularly appear before the drug court judge to discuss their progress and struggles. It affords the participant an understanding that the team is supportive and invested in their recovery.
**Length in Program**
The length of time that participants spend in a program varies by the program type.

### Ignition Interlock

In 2013, Public Act 226 allowed eligible repeat Operating While Impaired (OWI) offenders the ability to receive a restricted license through the ignition interlock program by participating in a sobriety or drug court program.

Eligible users are ordered by a drug court judge to have a Breath Alcohol Ignition Interlock Device (BAI-ID) installed on all vehicles that they own or operate. The device is designed to prevent the vehicle from starting if the driver has a blood alcohol content above a pre-established level, which is monitored by blowing into the device.

The passing of 2013 PA 226 and favorable results of the interlock pilot project, which can be found in the Michigan DWI/Sobriety Court Ignition Interlock Evaluation 2015 Report, opened other courts to offering the device to eligible participants.
• In FY 2017 there were 1,283 active participants among 70 sobriety, hybrid, veterans, and tribal Healing-To-Wellness programs who were members of the interlock program with an installed device on their vehicle(s).
• The majority of participants who had ignition interlocks installed were compliant with the terms of its use:
  > Less than one percent of users removed the ignition interlock device without approval.
  > Less than one percent of users tampered with the device.
  > One percent operated a vehicle without the device.¹

Ignition Interlock Participants’ Outcomes
October 1, 2016 – September 30, 2017

Therapy for substance abuse includes learning new coping skills to help prevent relapse. When participants are engaged in therapy it increases the likelihood that they will succeed in a treatment court program and maintain abstinence. Evaluating the rate of program completion and the number of consecutive sobriety days for interlock participants is a good measure of their success toward continued abstinence.

• There were 702 participants using ignition interlock devices who were discharged from a treatment court program during FY 2017. Of those, 637 (91%) successfully completed a PSC program.
• 8% were discharged unsuccessfully due to noncompliance, absconding, or a new offense.
• 1% was discharged for reasons such as voluntarily withdrew, “other,” transferred to another jurisdiction, death, medical discharge, or statutorily ineligible.

Graduates with ignition interlock devices:
• Achieved an average of 389 days of consecutive sobriety.
• Spent an average of 520 days in a PSC program.
• Averaged 418 drug and alcohol tests and less than one percent of those tests were positive.

“I have operated a sobriety court since 2007, and a veterans treatment court since 2009, and have experienced up close and personally the efficacy of problem-solving courts. Problem-solving courts are a win-win proposition.”
– Judge Raymond Voet
Ionia Treatment & Sobriety Court, 64A District Court Veterans Treatment Court

¹Missing data was removed from the analyses.
Interlock Recidivism

Recidivism Rates for Graduates

The two-year analyses of graduates of a drug court program who used interlock included a total of 2,061 matched pairs, and the four-year analyses included 1,125 matched pairs.

Any New Conviction (Graduates) – Two and Four Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduates Analyses</th>
<th>Favorable</th>
<th>Percent Reduction in Recidivism</th>
<th>Statistically Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two Years – Any New Conviction</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Years – Any New Conviction</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interlock Graduates
Any New Conviction Within Two and Four Years of Admission

- 2% Program Graduates
- 14% Comparison Members
- 7% Program Graduates
- 18% Comparison Members

2 Years

4 Years
Alcohol or Drug Conviction (Graduates) – Two and Four Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduates Analyses</th>
<th>Favorable</th>
<th>Percent Reduction in Recidivism</th>
<th>Statistically Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two Years – Alcohol or Drug Conviction</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Years – Alcohol or Drug Conviction</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“In a problem-solving court, you deal one-on-one with individuals. As a judge, it gives more meaning to your job and to your life to know that the work that you’re doing is truly saving lives and making your community safer.”

-Chief Judge Kathleen Brickley
Van Buren County Female Drug Treatment Court and Family Treatment Court
Recidivism Rates for All Participants

The two-year analyses of all participants in a drug court program who used interlock included a total of 2,265 matched pairs, and the four-year analyses included 1,230 matched pairs.

Any New Conviction (All Participants) – Two and Four Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Participants Analyses</th>
<th>Favorable</th>
<th>Percent Reduction in Recidivism</th>
<th>Statistically Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two Years – Any New Conviction</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Years – Any New Conviction</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alcohol or Drug Conviction (All Participants) – Two and Four Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Participants Analyses</th>
<th>Favorable</th>
<th>Percent Reduction in Recidivism</th>
<th>Statistically Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two Years – Alcohol or Drug Conviction</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Years – Alcohol or Drug Conviction</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“I wanted to show people that this happens to all kinds of people—college degree or not, wealthy or not. It can happen to anyone.”
-Stacy Salon
Sobriety Court Graduate

“Being there for other participants and sharing what worked for me is a continuation of the process for me.”
-Alan Rautio
Sobriety Court Graduate and Volunteer Mentor

“You need to stop being angry, you need to be grateful. Where would you be if it weren’t for this program? You would not have half of the opportunities to live a normal life again.”
-Tanya Swain
Sobriety Court Graduate and Volunteer Mentor

“Because I was actually treated as someone with a disease rather than a pariah of society, I was willing to accept all of the tools offered me.”
-Kristen Quinn
Sobriety Court Graduate and Volunteer Mentor
OVERVIEW OF MENTAL HEALTH COURTS

Unlike drug courts, Michigan’s mental health courts are reported by whether the mental health program operates in an adult circuit court, adult district court, or are a juvenile program for youths who are under 17 years of age.

The Michigan mental health courts (MHCs) target offenders who have been diagnosed with a serious mental illness, serious emotional disturbance, or a developmental disability as defined by MCL 330.1100a(25) and 330.1100d(2)(3), and the severe nature of the mental illness or functional impairment must necessitate intensive clinical services.

MHCs offer eligible offenders the opportunity to participate in a court-based treatment program to address their mental illness instead of sentencing them to lengthy jail or prison terms.

MHCs provide intense judicial oversight, treatment through local community mental health service providers, drug testing when appropriate, referrals to community services such as housing or clothing resources, enrollment in educational classes and certificate programs, transportation assistance, and assistance with obtaining employment.

Courts that receive Michigan Mental Health Court Grant Program (MMHCGP) state general funds from the SCAO collaborate closely with community mental health service providers to ensure that participants have access to a wide range of treatment services.

Many mental health court participants suffer from substance abuse in addition to their mental illness and thus, programs must provide treatment for co-occurring substance use disorders also.

In FY 2017, over half (53%) of active participants had a co-occurring substance use disorder when they were screened for a mental health court program.

Caseload Statistics
October 1, 2016 – September 30, 2017

During fiscal year (FY) 2017, Michigan’s mental health courts:

- Screened 1,265 potential participants.
- Admitted 625 offenders into a program.
- Discharged 598 participants.

During FY 2017, the total number of participants who were active in working a drug court program was 1,247 and is broken down by court type:

- Adult district mental health courts totaled 678 participants (54%).
- Adult circuit mental health courts totaled 476 participants (38%).
- Juvenile mental health courts totaled 93 participants (8%).
Mental Health Court Graduates’ Outcomes Measures
October 1, 2016 – September 30, 2017

Factors used to evaluate the success of MHCs include successful completion of the program, improvement in employment or education, improvement in mental health, improvement in quality of life, medication compliance, and reduced criminal recidivism.

Success Rate:
- There were 598 participants discharged from 30 mental health courts in FY 2017 and of those, 311 participants (52%) successfully completed a program.
- 40% were discharged unsuccessfully due to noncompliance, absconding, or a new offense.
- 8% were discharged for reasons such as voluntarily withdrew, “other,” transferred to another jurisdiction, death, medical discharge, or statutorily ineligible.
Employment Status
Adult mental health court graduates saw a 56% reduction in unemployment.

Unemployment at Admission and Discharge*

*Juvenile mental health court offenders were not included as their main goal while working a program is to improve their education level.

Improved Education Level
An improved education level is not the goal of every participant but youths in mental health courts were especially likely to continue their education progressing through high school.
MENTAL HEALTH COURTS (CONT.)

Improved Mental Health

![Graph showing improved mental health by court type]

Improved Quality of Life

![Graph showing improved quality of life by court type]
“The Mental Health Court is literally the best part of my job as a judge because of some of the cases and the success stories I see—best part of my job, best part of my docket.”

-Judge Joseph Skocelas
Mental Health Court at 57th District Court in Allegan

Medication Compliance

![Graph showing medication compliance by court type]

Mental Health Court Recidivism

Recidivism Rates for Graduates

The two-year analyses participants who graduated a mental health court program included a total of 874 matched pairs and the four-year analyses included 444 matched pairs across all three court types.
Recidivism (Graduates) – Two Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>Favorable</th>
<th>Percent Reduction in Recidivism</th>
<th>Statistically Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Circuit Mental Health</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult District Mental Health</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Mental Health</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recidivism (Graduates) – Four Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>Favorable</th>
<th>Percent Reduction in Recidivism</th>
<th>Statistically Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Circuit Mental Health</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult District Mental Health</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Mental Health</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“It really gives a holistic approach to criminal justice with the emphasis being not on punishment, but on rehabilitation, reducing the risk for reoffending, and crisis intervention.”

-Chief Judge Laura Redmond Mack
Western Wayne County Regional Behavioral Court
Recidivism Rates for All Participants

The two-year analyses of all participants in a mental health court program included a total of 1,779 matched pairs, and the four-year analyses included 906 matched pairs across all three court types.

Recidivism (All Participants) – Two Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>Favorable</th>
<th>Percent Reduction in Recidivism</th>
<th>Statistically Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Circuit Mental Health</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult District Mental Health</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Mental Health</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Recidivism (All Participants)– Four Years

![Chart showing recidivism rates for different mental health court programs.](chart.png)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>Favorable</th>
<th>Percent Reduction in Recidivism</th>
<th>Statistically Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Circuit Mental Health</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult District Mental Health</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Mental Health</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mental Health Court Graduates’ Performance Measures

**October 1, 2016 – September 30, 2017**

Overall, graduates of a mental health court program averaged:

- 12 Incentives and 2 sanctions.
- 25 Scheduled review hearings.
- 420 days in a mental health court program.
Performance Measures by Court Type

**Average Number of Incentives by Court Type**

- Mental Health Adult Circuit: 11
- Mental Health Adult District: 14
- Mental Health Juvenile: 12

**Average Number of Sanctions by Court Type**

- Mental Health Adult Circuit: 2
- Mental Health Adult District: 2
- Mental Health Juvenile: 3
Performance Measures by Court Type (cont.)

Average Number of Scheduled Review Hearings by Court Type

- Mental Health Adult Circuit: 31
- Mental Health Adult District: 22
- Mental Health Juvenile: 24

Average Number of Months in Program by Court Type

- Mental Health Adult Circuit: 16
- Mental Health Adult District: 13
- Mental Health Juvenile: 12
MENTAL HEALTH COURT
SUCCESS STORIES

“The love that Judge Skocelas and his team showed for me had a huge impact on my life. They truly cared, and you could see it in the way that they looked at you, in the way that they talked to you, and in the resources they informed you about. They really wanted people to succeed.”
— Makenzie Scimeca
Mental Health Court Graduate

“They gave me a chance in mental health court. Judge Tomlinson wasn’t going to give up on me. He knew I had potential, and he showed me a completely different side of the court system. He showed me that courts can help. I really appreciate the program and the people involved in it.”
—Ivy Calkins
Mental Health Court Graduate
OVERVIEW OF VETERANS TREATMENT COURTS

Michigan veterans treatment courts (VTC) follow the drug court model and require compliance with a modified version of the Ten Key Components of Drug Courts as required by statute. Michigan Compiled Law 600.1200, et seq., was passed in October 2012, and outlines the operation of veterans treatment courts in Michigan.

These programs integrate principles from both drug court and mental health court to serve military veterans who suffer from mental illness, substance use disorders, or traumatic brain injuries.

VTCs promote sobriety, recovery, and stability through a coordinated response that involves collaboration with the traditional partners found in drug courts and mental health courts, as well as the Department of Veterans Affairs, volunteer veteran mentors, and organizations that support veterans and their families.

VTCs across the country have been on the rise in answer to the growing number of veterans returning from duty.

The number of Michigan’s VTC programs has risen to 25 in FY 2017.

“It is enriching and rewarding in a way that is hard to describe. We have the opportunity to see people change their life circumstances in such a profound way, right before our eyes.”

-Chief Judge William Baillargeon
West Michigan Regional Veterans Treatment Court

Caseload Statistics
October 1, 2016 – September 30, 2017

During fiscal year (FY) 2017, Michigan’s veterans treatment drug courts:
- Screened 334 potential participants.
- Admitted 245 offenders into a program.
- Discharged 221 participants.

During FY 2017, the total number of participants who were active in working a veterans treatment court program was 551 among 23 courts.
Veterans Treatment Court Graduates’ Outcomes
October 1, 2016 – September 30, 2017

As more participants are discharged and have had time post-program for evaluation, recidivism analyses will become available for future reports.

- There were 221 veterans discharged from a program during FY 2017 and of those, 146 participants (66 percent) had successfully completed a program.
- 25% were discharged unsuccessfully due to noncompliance, absconding, or a new offense.
- 9% were discharged for reasons such as “other,” death, transferred to another jurisdiction, or voluntarily withdrew.

Graduates’ statistics:
- Averaged 396 days of consecutive sobriety.
- Despite most veterans having obtained at least a GED for an education level, 12% still had improved their education level at discharge.

Employment Status
29% of graduates were unemployed at admission and 12% of graduates were unemployed at discharge resulting in a 59% reduction in unemployment.
Veterans Treatment Court Graduates’ Performance Measures
October 1, 2016 – September 30, 2017

Graduates averaged:
• Eight incentives and one sanction while working the program.
• 21 scheduled court review hearings.
• 190 drug/alcohol tests.
• Two percent of drug/alcohol tests were positive.
• 525 days in a program.

As veterans continue to return home from active duty, Michigan will continue to honor veterans who struggle with substance abuse, mental illness, and trauma that lead to criminal or destructive behavior by providing treatment, veteran mentors, and other support systems through treatment courts.

VETERANS TREATMENT COURT
SUCCESS STORIES

“Each month, I’d leave the program and my spirits were soaring, I was rising; I couldn’t even believe how good I felt afterwards. On graduation day, I felt like I could jump up and touch the stars.”
— Kevin Hier
Veterans Treatment Court Graduate

“After talking to the judges and everyone who worked there, I could definitely tell it was something they cared about a lot. It wasn’t like being another number.”
— David Bacon
Veterans Treatment Court Graduate