

# **The University of Southern Mississippi**

Department of Administration of Justice

Mississippi Statistical Analysis Center



## **Therapeutic Jurisprudence: An Examination of Mississippi Drug Courts**

**Lisa S. Nored, J.D., Ph.D.**

**Sheri Jenkins Cruz, M.S.**

**Ragan A. Downey, M.A.**

**Mississippi Statistical Analysis Center  
Department of Administration of Justice  
The University of Southern Mississippi  
118 College Drive #5127  
Hattiesburg, MS 39406**

**Lisa S. Nored, J.D., Ph.D.**  
*Chair, Department of Administration of Justice  
Director, Mississippi Statistical Analysis Center*

**Sheri Jenkins Cruz, M.S.**  
*Research Analyst, Mississippi Statistical Analysis Center*

**Ragan A. Downey, M.A.**  
*Research Analyst, Mississippi Statistical Analysis Center*

## **Executive Order & Mission Statement**

---

The Mississippi Statistical Analysis Center was created by executive order of Governor Ronnie Musgrove in October of 2000. The mission of the MS-SAC is to provide sound statistical information in order to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the state's criminal justice system.

This project was conducted by the Mississippi Statistical Analysis Center with financial assistance from the United States Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, Grant # 2006-BJ-CX-K006.

# Table of Contents

---

Introduction	4
Methodology	7
Overview	8
7th Circuit	12
Hinds County	
12th Circuit	16
Forrest County	
Perry County	
14th Circuit	24
Lincoln County	
Pike County	
Walthall County	
19th Circuit	38
George County	
Greene County	
Jackson County	
Juvenile Drug Courts	50
Overview	50
Adams County	54
Madison County	57
Perspectives	61
Judges	61
Administrators	62
Probation Officers	63
Conclusions and Recommendations	64

## Introduction

---

One of the most serious problems facing the criminal justice system today is the large number of drug offenders in the system. Drug offenses create a backlog of cases in the courts, contribute to jail overcrowding, overload probation departments and significantly increase prison populations. These issues provide motivation to policy makers to build more correctional facilities.

In the last two decades local, state and federal authorities have acknowledged that the drug problem has reached serious proportions. As such, policymakers seek alternatives to lessen the strain that drug offenses place on the criminal justice system. The result has been the development of hundreds of community drug programs that serve as a form of diversion for drug-related offenders. Diversion is the process of removing individuals from the formal system of prosecution and adjudication, and placing them in a less-formal setting.

A drug court is a special court given the responsibility to handle cases involving substance-abusing offenders through comprehensive supervision, drug testing, treatment services and immediate sanctions and incentives. The mission of a drug court program is to provide an alternative to incarceration for persons convicted of drug-related charges as well as for persons whose substance abuse was an underlying factor in the commission of a crime. Research has shown a causal relationship between substance use and criminal activity. The premise of therapeutic jurisprudence is that eliminating substance abuse will greatly reduce the illegal acts committed by substance abusers and, therefore, have a major impact on reducing the incidence of crime.

The design and structure of drug court programs are developed at the local level. Many sectors of the community are involved in the planning and implementation process of a drug court system including law enforcement, mental health professionals, educators and community organizations. According to the National Institute of Justice Update, the core elements of drug courts are

- judicial commitment and leadership.
- collaboration among criminal justice agencies, the courts, treatment agencies and community organizations.
- education and training programs in substance abuse, addictive behaviors and their treatment for relevant personnel within the judicial system (prosecutors, defense counsel, judges, treatment providers and public health officials).
- a specific target population, defined as such by reference to its drug involvement and risk to public safety,
- a custom-designed treatment program addressing the specific treatment needs of the target population.
- integrated information management that links the court with criminal justice and treatment agencies.
- provide adequate supervision for defendants and offenders.
- a detailed and comprehensive drug court implementation plan that would include benchmarks, orientation and training for all affected personnel, funding sources to support such drug court implementation and maintenance, and an assessment strategy that defines outcomes and identifies the kind of evidence required to measure those outcomes, as well as a timetable for reporting and analyzing

those outcomes.

In addition, the National Drug Court Institute also identifies the following as goals of drug courts:

- to decrease criminal recidivism
- to provide cost-effective intervention with drug offenders
- to concentrate expertise about drug cases into a single courtroom
- to increase retention in drug treatment through judicial supervision and sanctions
- to provide drug-involved offenders with the opportunity for affordable treatment
- to address other needs of drug-involved offenders through clinical assessment, effective case management, and to “free up” judicial, prosecutorial and defense resources for other types of cases

Requirements for admission into drug court programs vary from jurisdiction to jurisdiction, but can be summarized into three general criteria. First, the offender must be charged with an alcohol or drug-related conviction or the crime was committed under the influence or to support the substance abuse. Second, the offender has no conditions that would preclude benefit from treatment. Finally, the offender has not been convicted of a violent offense and does not pose a substantial risk to society.

As of April 2006, there were 1,557 drug courts operating in the United States, and 394 more were in the planning phases. Currently, fifty states plus the District of Columbia, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, Guam, two Federal Districts and 136 tribal programs have drug courts that are in operation or are being planned. In addition, there were 73,000 adult and 4,000 juvenile graduates from drug court programs as of 2006. There was an estimated 1,000 drug-free babies born, 3,500 parents who either regained or retained custody of their children, 4,500 resumed child support payments, and seventy-three percent (73%) retained or obtained employment (Drug Courts, 2006).

In addition, research and program evaluations suggest that drug courts save money. The National Association of Drug Court Professionals estimates incarceration of drug offenders costs between \$20,000 and \$50,000 per person per year, with the capital costs of building a prison cell at around \$80,000. In contrast, the typical drug court system costs less than \$2,500 per year per offender

- **Dade County Drug Court**

In 1989, the first drug court in the United States was implemented in the Eleventh Judicial Circuit Court of Florida under the supervision of the Honorable Herbert M. Klien. This drug court was established a diversion and treatment program for drug offenders. The main components of this program were early identification of appropriate candidates, diversion from the ordinary course of prosecutions, and rehabilitation of defendants with intensive supervision by the drug court judge and treatment specialist. This drug court program offered drug offenders the chance to avoid prosecution, get off drugs and change their lives in a positive way. Participation in the drug court program was voluntary.

- **Drug Courts in Mississippi**

The first drug court in the state of Mississippi began in Ridgeland, Miss. in 1995. The drug court concept spread quickly and four years later the first felony drug court program was created by Judge Keith Starrett in the 14<sup>th</sup> Circuit Court district. By January 2003, there were seven drug court programs in the state of Mississippi and five more in the planning stages. In April of 2003, Senate Bill 2605 was signed into law by the governor. This new law allowed for the creation of drug court programs statewide in Chancery, Circuit, County, Youth, Municipal or Justice courts. This law was codified as the Alice Griffin Clarke Drug Court Act (Mississippi Code § 9-23).

The drug court law in Mississippi states that the Administrative Office of Courts shall be responsible for certifying all drug court programs in the state, ensuring that all drug court programs comply with the rules promulgated by the State Drug Court Advisory Board and that all drug court programs operating in the state of Mississippi shall follow the key components of drug courts.

The purpose of this project was to collect data from multiple drug court programs and facilitate future research that could compare data at both the county and program level. Selecting multiple sites for data collection allowed the researchers to observe distinct operational qualities of the selected programs and to gain some insight into the daily operations of Mississippi drug courts.

## Definition of Terms

---

The following definition of terms sections is provided to assist the reader in understanding concepts included in the following report:

- **Absconded:** Client purposely fled supervision or could not be located by program staff.
- **Active:** Client was actively participating in the program at time of data collection.
- **Cocaine-p:** Refers to powder cocaine or unspecified cocaine use.
- **Cocaine-r:** Refers specifically to crack-cocaine use.
- **D.C. & Prior:** Drug Court Charge & Prior Conviction (i.e. offender had previously been convicted of the same offense as the drug court charge)
- **Drug Court Charge:** Refers to non-adjudicated offenses of pre-trial diversion clients.
- **Graduate:** Client completed program.
- **Meth:** Refers to methamphetamine use in general.
- **Other Drugs:** Refers to less common drug use, such as LSD (acid), mushrooms (psilocybin), ecstasy (MDMA), angel dust (PCP), or cigarettes dipped in formaldehyde.
- **Rx Drugs:** Refers to the use of prescription drugs.
- **Terminated:** Client failed to complete program requirements, either by voluntary withdrawal or mandated removal.

## Methodology

---

The sample for this study included drug court participants and drug court professionals. The first sample consisted of all drug court participants (active, graduated, absconded and terminated) in six programs: four adult districts (N= 951) and two juvenile districts (N=86). The sites included in this project were identified with the assistance of the Mississippi Administrative Office of Courts. The proposed sites were selected based on the following criteria:

- in operation for at least one year;
- type of jurisdiction; (adult drug courts are felony cases only);
- cooperation from the judge and administrator/ coordinator;
- demographically representative; and
- met time and budgetary restraints.

The proposed sites, both adult and juvenile, included the 7<sup>th</sup> Circuit Drug Court in Jackson (Hinds County), 12th Circuit Drug Court in Hattiesburg (Forrest and Perry Counties), 14th Circuit Drug Court in Brookhaven (Lincoln, Pike and Walthall Counties), and 19th Circuit Drug Court in Pascagoula (George, Greene and Jackson Counties), Adams County Youth Drug Court in Natchez, and Madison County Youth Drug Court in Madison.

The drug court participants were assigned identification numbers in order to maintain anonymity. The MS-SAC staff did not have any direct contact with participants. Data were collected for 1,037 drug court participants that entered the drug court programs at the designated sites.

The MS-SAC research analysts reviewed and collected data from official program records and drug court participant intake forms at each of the six drug court sites. This self-reported archival data on the drug court participants were collected using the *Participant Data Instrument* created by the MS-SAC staff.

The drug court intake forms were administered at the time of intake by the drug court personnel. Drug court intake forms collected self-reported data on demographics, residency, prior convictions, current charges, employment status, medical history, and personal and family drug use history. It is necessary to understand that all data regarding participants was collected by drug court staff at *intake*, and therefore only applies to participants at program entry. Client status was determined at the time of data collection.

In asking participants to provide information, one should continually be cautious of whether or not the participant is competent or reliable to answer questions. In addition, respondents must be willing to answer intake questions. It was not possible to obtain identical information on all participants, due to incomplete or missing files and lack of uniformity among intake questions. Missing or unknown data is indicated as such when possible.

The second sample for this study consisted of the judges, administrators and probation officers (N=18) from the above-mentioned circuits. Judges, administrators and probation officers were asked to complete a cross-sectional survey on their perception of drug courts. The respondents were to return the survey in one of the following methods: in a self-addressed stamped envelope; via e-mail, fax, or via the research analyst. The questions were developed by the MS-SAC staff with the guidance of the Department of Justice model for evaluating drug courts.

The survey was accompanied by a letter of explanation and a self-addressed stamped envelope. If potential respondents did not return their questionnaires after two weeks, a follow-up letter was mailed to the non-respondents reminding them that their participation would be greatly appreciated. This follow-up letter was accompanied by an additional copy of the original questionnaire and a self-addressed stamped envelope. If potential respondents did not return their questionnaires after two weeks, a third and final follow-up letter was mailed to nonrespondents. This final follow-up letter was accompanied by an additional copy of the original survey and a self-addressed stamped envelope.

Descriptive analysis and frequency distributions are presented to provide the reader with a general understanding regarding the compositions of the sample, individual programs and counties within those programs. Statistical analysis was performed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences.

## Overview (Adult Programs)

---

This section provides aggregate data for the adult drug court participants. It was necessary to ascertain the composition of the sample in its entirety prior to analyzing each program. The analysis represents adult drug court programs in the 7<sup>th</sup>, 12<sup>th</sup>, 14<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> circuits (N= 951), and in turn should be fairly representative of adult felony drug court programs in the state of Mississippi. Similar tables, figures and explanations are provided for each county in later sections of this report.

There are approximately 2.9 million in Mississippi, 61.2% of which are Caucasian, 36.9% of which are African-American, 0.4% of which are American Indian and Alaska Native, 0.7% of which are Asian, 0.6% of which are persons reporting two or more races, and 1.7% of which are Hispanic or Latino. Of the approximate population, 51.4% are female and 48.6% are male.

Adult drug court participants ranged in age from 16 to 64 (M = 30.93, std. dev.=9.189). Race was originally reported as: Caucasian (57.2%, n=544), African- American (39.2%, n=373), Hispanic (.2%, n=2), Native American (.4%, n=4) and other (.4%, n=4). However, due to the lack of diversity (n = 11), race was dichotomized into the categories Caucasian and minority. Gender was reported as: male (68%, n=647) and female (30%, n=285).

For this sample (n = 951), adult participants were representative of the total approximated population for the state of Mississippi: 58.8% Caucasian and 41.2% minority (see Table 1.1). Gender, however, was not equivalent to the total approximated population, in that males were overrepresented by 20.6%. For this sample, Caucasian males comprised the largest category of drug court participants (37.2%). The smallest category consisted of minority females (9.2%).

Drug court participants were designated as active (46.7%, n=444), graduate (22.6%, n=215), absconded (5.2%, n=49) and terminated (25.2%, n=240) (see Table 1.1). Active drug court participants represented the largest client status group (n = 440). Terminated participants (n = 225) and graduates (n = 209) were relatively equal in number. Finally, Caucasian drug court participants (58.8%) and minority drug court participants (41.2%) were fairly equivalent overall; however, the number of active minority drug court participants (35.2%) were well below that of Caucasian drug court participants (64.8%).




	Active		Graduate		Absconded		Terminated		Totals	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
<b>Caucasian</b>	285	64.8%	117	56%	20	41.7%	120	53.3%	542	58.8%
Female	112	25.5%	40	19.1%	8	16.7%	39	17.3%	199	21.6%
Male	173	39.3%	77	36.8%	12	25%	81	36%	343	37.2%
<b>Minority</b>	155	35.2%	92	44%	28	58.3%	105	46.7%	380	41.2%
Female	39	8.9%	27	12.9%	2	4.2%	17	7.6%	85	9.2%
Male	116	26.4%	65	31.1%	26	54.2%	88	39.1%	295	32%
<b>Totals</b>	440	100%	209	100%	48	100%	225	100%	922	100%

Of the total adult drug court population, 660 participants were Protestant (69.4%), 35 were Catholic (3.7%), 3 were Jewish (.3%), 10 were other (1.1%), and 44 did not report a religious affiliation (4.6%).

Marital Status was reported as single (50.4%, n=479), married (16.4%, n=156), divorced (20.1%, n=191), widowed (1.3%, n=12), and separated (8.1%, n=77). Of the total adult drug court population (n = 951), 298 reported having no children (31.3%), 196 reported having one child (20.6%), 209 reported having two children (22%), 121 reported having three children (12.7%), 50 reported having four children (5.3%), 23 reported having five children (2.4%), 7 reported having six children (.7%), 4 reported having seven children (.4%), and 8 reported having eight or more children (.8%). The adult drug court population includes parents of approximately 1,426 children.

Of the total adult drug court population (n = 951), 646 reported having no military experience (67.9%), 2 reported current military activity (.2%), 51 reported having honorable discharges from one of the four branches (5.4%), 6 reported dishonorable or other than honorable discharge (.6%), and 4 reported having service in the military but did not report discharge outcome (.4%).

Figure 1.1 illustrates education levels of adult drug court participants. Thirty-seven percent never graduated high school (7% had an 8th grade education or below and 30% had some high school). Twenty-six percent graduated high school and 15% had obtained a G.E.D. Fifteen percent had some college education, and 3% had earned a bachelor's degree. One participant had a graduate degree. Four percent of adult participants had unavailable or missing education data.



Employment was originally coded into twelve categories: unemployed (52.7%, n=501), construction (12.6%, n=120), food service (3.6%, n=34), sales (1.3%, n=12), industrial (4.4%, n=42), farming or livestock (.8%, n=8), education (.4%, n=4), mechanic/auto repair (3.2%, n=30), clerical/administrative assistant (.5%, n=5), student (.5%, n=5), management (.7%, n=7), and other (14.5%, n=138). Employment was recoded for manageability, resulting in the collapsed variables unemployed (52.7%, n=501) and employed (42.6%, n=405) (See Table 1.2).

	<b>Active</b>		<b>Graduate</b>		<b>Absconded</b>		<b>Terminated</b>		<b>Totals</b>	
	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>
	Unemployed	233	25.8%	99	11.1%	26	2.9%	141	15.6%	499
Employed	196	21.7%	105	11.6%	21	2.3%	82	9.1%	404	44.7%

Of the total adult drug court population (n = 951), 770 did not report having a physical disability (81%) and 607 reported never being treated for mental health issues (63.8%). The adult drug court population reported a mean age of first drug use as 16.

Table 1.3 illustrates substance abuse among client status categories. Alcohol use was high in all categories, with 78.4% of active participants, 88.5% of graduates, 72.9% of absconded participants and 85.3 % of participants reporting use at intake. Marijuana use was also prevalent in all categories, with 79.6% of active participants, 76.1% of graduates, 79.2% of absconded participants, and 80% of terminated participants reporting use. Powder or unspecified cocaine use was reported by 50.2% of active participants, 27.3% of graduates, 33.3% of absconded participants and 43.6% of terminated participants. Crack cocaine use was lower, with 20.7% of active participants, 29.2% of graduates, 14.6% of absconded participants and 28% of terminated participants reporting use at intake. Methamphetamine use was reported by 39.1% of active participants, 28.7% of graduates, 29.2% of absconded participants and 23.1% of terminated participants. Heroin use was low among all client status categories. Prescription drug use was reported by 43.6% of active participants, 34% of graduates, 27.1% of absconded participants and 23.6% of terminated participants. Other drug use was reported by 24.8% of active participants, 13.9% of graduates, 14.6% of absconded participants and 18.2% of terminated participants.

	<b>Active</b>	<b>Graduate</b>	<b>Absconded</b>	<b>Terminated</b>
	(n=440)	(n=209)	(n=48)	(n=225)
Alcohol	78.4%	88.5%	72.9%	85.3%
Marijuana	79.6%	76.1%	79.2%	80%
Cocaine - p	50.2%	27.3%	33.3%	43.6%
Cocaine - r	20.7%	29.2%	14.6%	28%
Meth	39.1%	28.7%	29.2%	23.1%
Heroin	2.5%	2.4%	0%	3.1%
Rx Drugs	43.6%	34%	27.1%	23.6%
Other Drugs	24.8%	13.9%	14.6%	18.2%

Figure 1.2 illustrates substance abuse history and race of adult drug court participants. Alcohol use was high for both Caucasians (82.3% reporting use) and minorities (79.7% reporting use). Marijuana use was also prevalent in both categories, with 76.2% of Caucasians and 81.8% of minorities reporting use at intake. Powder or unspecified cocaine use was reported by 45.6% of Caucasians and 37.6% of minorities. Crack cocaine use was more prevalent among minorities (31.3%) than Caucasians (18.5%). Methamphetamine use was overwhelmingly high among Caucasians (53.1%) when compared to minorities (2.4%). Heroin use was low for both Caucasians (3.9%) and minorities (.5%). Prescription drug use (Rx Drugs) was primarily reported by Caucasians (54.1%) in comparison to minorities (9%). Other drug use was reported by 28% of Caucasians and 8.4% of minorities.




Figure 1.3 provides program track composition for adult drug court participants. Forty percent of participants were classified as nonadjudicated at the time of data collection. Forty-three percent of adult participants were adjudicated, and were participating in drug court as a condition of probation. Fourteen percent of participants entered as nonadjudicated offenders, but were later adjudicated due to excessive program violations or rearrest. Three percent of adult drug court participants had unavailable or missing program track information.




Table 1.4 provides criminal histories for all adult drug court programs. For each offense, participants were coded as “no conviction,” “convicted,” “drug court charge” (indicating a nonadjudicated offense in a pre-trial diversion program), “D.C. & Prior” (indicating a non-adjudicated offense in a pre-trial diversion program and one or more past convictions of the same offense) and “Unknown” (indicating missing data). For the total adult drug court population (n = 951), possession of a controlled substance (Possession C/S) (59.8%) was the dominant offense among adult drug court participants, followed by probation or parole violation (22.6%) and DUI or DWI (21.8%). It should be noted that these statistics account for convictions and drug court charges, not arrests.

	No Conviction		Convicted		Drug Court Charge		D.C. & Prior		Unknown (Missing)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
	Possession C/S	328	34.5%	304	32.0%	212	22.3%	52	5.5%	55
Possession w/ Intent	853	89.7%	19	2.0%	5	0.5%	0	0.0%	74	7.8%
Property Offense	700	73.6%	154	16.2%	26	2.7%	9	0.9%	62	6.5%
Forgery (Rx)	828	87.1%	21	2.2%	27	2.8%	4	0.4%	71	7.5%
Forgery (Utterance)	840	88.3%	35	3.7%	2	0.2%	0	0.0%	74	7.8%
Possession of Precursors	810	85.2%	43	4.5%	24	2.5%	3	0.3%	71	7.5%
Embezzlement	864	90.9%	7	0.7%	5	0.5%	0	0.0%	75	7.9%
Probation / Parole Violation	674	70.9%	210	22.1%	5	0.5%	0	0.0%	62	6.5%
DUI / DWI	674	70.9%	206	21.7%	1	0.1%	0	0.0%	70	7.4%
Other Crime	640	67.3%	203	21.3%	37	3.9%	4	0.4%	67	7.0%

## 7th Circuit (Hinds County)

The Hinds County Drug Court Probation Program is located in Jackson, Mississippi. Hinds County has an approximate population of 250,000 (U.S. Census Bureau). The majority of Hinds County residents are minorities (66.7%) and females comprise 52.7% of the county population (U.S. Census Bureau).

The HCDCPP is maintained by a staff of three drug court personnel and one drug court judge. It should be noted that the HCDCPP has cycled through several judges since its inception, due to promotions and appointments to the federal bench. The staff is composed of a program director, a case manager, and a probation officer. This program is primarily utilized as a pre-trial diversion program, although some adjudicated clients request to participate in the drug court program because they want help with their addictions.

The majority of HCDCPP clients were single (67.5%, n=154) and only 8.3% were married (n=19). Caucasians comprised 73.2% (n=30) of divorced participants. Additionally, 38.5% (n=30) of Caucasians were divorced. The divorce rate among minorities was 7.3%. Minorities exhibited a slightly higher mean number of children (M=1.61) than Caucasians (M=1.19). Caucasians exhibited a higher mean number of prior marriages (M=.42) than minorities (M=.04). Caucasian clients exhibited a higher mean age (M=32.77) than minorities (28.68). There were no differences in mean number of prior convictions (M=2) between Caucasians and minority participants.

Hinds County participants (65.8% minority and 34.2% Caucasian) were fairly representative of general county demographics (66.7% minority and 33.3% Caucasian) regarding race. Gender, however, was not equivalent among participants (68.4% male) and county residents (47.3% male), in that males were overrepresented by 21.1%. Minority males (51.1%, n=118) comprised the largest group of participants, while minority females (14.7%, n=34) comprised the smallest group. Caucasian males represented 17.3% (n=40) of Hinds County participants, and Caucasian females (n=39) composed 16.9%. Active participants (n=99) composed the largest client status group. Graduates (n=67) were nearly equal in number to terminated participants (n=61). There were four absconded participants in Hinds County.

Table 2.1 Client Status, Race, & Gender (Hinds County)										
	Active		Graduate		Absconded		Terminated		Totals	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
<b>Caucasian</b>	40	40.4%	20	29.9%	0	0%	19	31.1%	79	34.2%
Female	20	20.2%	8	11.9%	0	0%	11	18%	39	16.9%
Male	20	20.2%	12	17.9%	0	0%	8	13.1%	40	17.3%
<b>Minority</b>	59	59.6%	47	70.1%	4	100%	42	68.9%	152	65.8%
Female	12	12.1%	16	23.9%	1	25%	5	8.2%	34	14.7%
Male	47	47.5%	31	46.3%	3	75%	37	60.7%	118	51.1%
<b>Totals</b>	99	100%	67	100%	4	100%	61	100%	231	100%

Figure 2.1 illustrates education levels for Hinds County participants. Fifty percent of participants never graduated high school (6% had an 8th grade education or below and 44% had some high school). Fifteen percent had high school diplomas and 9% had acquired a G.E.D. One-fifth (20%) of participants had some college education, and 6% had earned a bachelor's degree.




Table 2.2 provides collapsed employment-at-intake information for Hinds County participants. Originally, employment was reported as: unemployed (69.2%, n=162), construction (5.1%, n=12), food service (3.4%, n=8), sales (.4%, n=1), industrial (.4%, n=1), farming or livestock (.4%, n=1), student (.4%, n=1), management (.9%, n=2), other (17.9%, n=42), and missing data or unknown (1.7%, n=4). Although collapsed employment data indicate extremely high levels of unemployment at intake (see Table 2.2), many Hinds County participants likely were unemployed due to incarceration.

	Active		Graduate		Absconded		Terminated		Totals	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Unemployed	62	27%	44	19.1%	3	1.3%	53	23%	162	70.4%
Employed	37	16.1%	22	9.6%	1	0%	8	3.5%	68	29.6%

Table 2.3 provides information concerning drug use characteristics among client status categories. Regardless of category, most clients had used alcohol and marijuana at the time of intake. Powder or unspecified cocaine use was relatively low except in the active category (50% of active clients reported using cocaine). Crack cocaine exhibited higher levels of use among all client categories; in particular, it should be noted that 100% of absconded clients reported using crack cocaine. Methamphetamine use was not widely reported in any category, although 27% of active participants and 26.2% of terminated participants reported some use. Heroin use was low in general. Prescription drugs were used slightly more by active clients (31%) than graduates (27.5%) or terminated clients (21.3%). No absconded clients reported using prescription drugs. The use of other drugs was relatively low for all categories, particularly graduates (1.5%) and absconded clients (0%).

	Active	Graduate	Absconded	Terminated
	(n=100)	(n=69)	(n=4)	(n=61)
Alcohol	92%	88.4%	75%	90.2%
Marijuana	95%	94.2%	100%	93.4%
Cocaine - p	50%	17.4%	0%	29.5%
Cocaine - r	51%	55.1%	100%	62.3%
Meth	27%	14.5%	0%	26.2%
Heroin	1%	0%	0%	3.3%
Rx Drugs	31%	27.5%	0%	21.3%
Other Drugs	18%	1.5%	0%	11.5%

Figure 2.2 illustrates drug use within race categories. Alcohol use was high for both categories: 93.7% of Caucasians and 88.2% of minorities reported using alcohol. Marijuana use was also high: 91.1% of Caucasians and 96.1% of minorities reported using the drug. There were notable differences in the use of cocaine (cocaine-p, powder or unspecified cocaine use). More than half (58.2%) of Caucasian participants reported cocaine-p use, while only 22% of minorities reported the same. Crack cocaine use was elevated in both categories, with 46.8% of Caucasians and 60.5% of minorities reporting use. Caucasians reported much higher levels of methamphetamine use (64.6%) than minorities (1.3%). No minorities reported using heroine, and only 3.8% of Caucasians reported using it. Prescription drugs were used by 60.8% of Caucasians and 9.9% of minorities. Other drug use was higher for Caucasians (16.5%) than minorities (7.9%).





Figure 2.3 provides program track information for Hinds County participants. Fifty percent of clients were enrolled under non-adjudicated status, 31% were adjudicated clients, 18% entered the program as non-adjudicated offenders and were eventually adjudicated due to frequent program violations or rearrest and 1% of clients did not exhibit enough data to ascertain their program track.



Possession of a controlled substance (Possession C/S) was the dominant offense committed by Hinds County drug court participants (see Table 2.4): 42% were convicted, 33.8% had Possession C/S as a non-adjudicated charge and 7.3% had one or more convictions of Possession C/S and had this charge as a non-adjudicated offense. Probation or parole violations were the second most frequent charges (28.2% of clients convicted for violating their probation or parole). Over one-fifth of clients (23.1%) were convicted of other crimes, and 1.7% had other crimes as a nonadjudicated offense. Thirty-four clients (14.5%) were convicted of DUI or DWI. There were thirty-three clients (14.1%) convicted of a property offense, and four clients (1.7%) had a property offense as a nonadjudicated charge. Three clients (1.3%) were convicted of possession of a controlled substance with intent to sell or distribute and four clients (1.7%) had Possession with intent as a nonadjudicated charge.

	No Conviction		Convicted		Drug Court Charge		D.C. & Prior		Unknown (Missing)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Possession C/S	38	16.2%	99	42.3%	79	33.8%	17	7.3%	1	0.4%
Possession w/ Intent	226	96.6%	3	1.3%	4	1.7%	0	0.0%	1	0.4%
Property Offense	194	82.9%	33	14.1%	4	1.7%	2	0.9%	1	0.4%
Forgery (Rx)	215	91.9%	8	3.4%	9	3.8%	1	0.4%	1	0.4%
Forgery (Utterance)	233	99.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.4%
Possession of Precursors	233	99.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.4%
Embezzlement	231	98.7%	1	0.4%	1	0.4%	0	0.0%	1	0.4%
Probation / Parole Violation	167	71.4%	66	28.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.4%
DUI / DWI	199	85.0%	34	14.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.4%
Other Crime	175	74.8%	54	23.1%	4	1.7%	0	0.0%	1	0.4%

## 12th Circuit (Forrest & Perry Counties)

The 12th Circuit Adult Drug Court is located in Hattiesburg, Miss. and serves Forrest and Perry Counties. Forrest County has an approximate population of 76,000, 63% of which are Caucasian. Forrest County is 52% female. Perry County has an approximate population of 12,000, 76% of which are Caucasian. Females comprise 51.2% of the population (U.S. Census Bureau).

The 12th Circuit ADC staff is comprised of a drug court coordinator, two drug court probation officers and one drug court judge. It should be noted that the 12th Circuit ADC employs a variety of incentives and positive reinforcement, such as a softball team and group community service projects independent of regular mandatory drug court sanctions. The 12th Circuit ADC is primarily a post-plea program, but some clients do enter as a result of pretrial diversion. The majority of clients in the program were adjudicated prior to entering the 12th Circuit ADC. Graduates of the 12th Circuit ADC often form alumni groups and meet on a regular basis after completing the requirements of the program. According to the program coordinator, such activities help maintain a high level of accountability and provide ongoing support for clients. The 12th Circuit ADC provides structure and graduates of the program realize the benefits that structure provides to recovering addicts.



The majority of 12th Circuit ADC clients were single (52.7%, n=69). Only 13% of clients were married (n=17). Caucasians comprised 87.5% (n=21) of divorced clients and exhibited a divorce rate of 28.4%. The divorce rate for minorities was only 4.3%. There was little difference in mean number of children with respect to race (M=1.47, M=1.48). Caucasian clients had a higher mean number of prior marriages (M=.55) than minorities (M=.10). Clients exhibited a mean age of 31. Caucasian clients had a lower mean number of prior convictions (M=2.38) than minorities (M=3.89).

Tables 3.1 and 3.2 provide county-level demographic data as well as client status data for Forrest and Perry Counties. As seen in Table 3.1, minorities were slightly overrepresented among Forrest County participants (county demographic data indicates actual county representation as 63% Caucasian and 37% minority). Males were also overrepresented among Forrest County participants, in that 71.8% of Forrest County participants were male while Forrest County demographics indicated a male population of 48%. Active participants comprised the largest client status category (n=63) among Forrest County participants (see Table 3.1). Terminated (n=22) and absconded (12) clients considerably outnumbered graduates of the program (n=6).



Table 3.2 illustrates county-level demographic data and client status data for Perry County. Caucasians (80%, n=12) were slightly overrepresented compared to overall Perry County demographic data, which indicated a Caucasian population of 76%. Males (86.7%, n=13) were also overrepresented among Perry County participants when compared to general county demographic information, which indicated a male population of 48.8%. Active participants represented the largest group of Perry County participants (n=5). Graduates (n=4) comprised the second largest group. Absconded (n=3) and terminated (n=3) clients were the smallest client status groups.

	Active		Graduate		Absconded		Terminated		Totals	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
	<b>Caucasian</b>	44	69.8%	4	66.7%	2	16.7%	9	40.9%	59
Female	17	26.9%	1	16.7%	0	0%	4	18.2%	22	21.4%
Male	27	42.9%	3	50%	2	16.7%	5	22.7%	37	35.9%
<b>Minority</b>	19	30.2%	2	33.3%	10	83.3%	13	59.1%	44	42.7%
Female	4	6.4%	1	16.7%	0	0%	2	9.1%	7	6.8%
Male	15	23.8%	1	16.7%	10	83.3%	11	50%	37	35.9%
<b>Totals</b>	63	100%	6	100%	12	100%	22	100%	103	100%

	Active		Graduate		Absconded		Terminated		Totals	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
	<b>Caucasian</b>	4	80%	4	100%	2	66.7%	2	66.7%	12
Female	0	0%	2	50%	0	0%	0	0%	2	13.3%
Male	4	80%	2	50%	2	66.7%	2	66.7%	10	66.7%
<b>Minority</b>	1	20%	0	0%	1	33.3%	1	33.3%	3	20%
Female	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0	0	0%
Male	1	20%	0	0%	1	33.7%	1	33.3%	3	20%
<b>Totals</b>	5	100%	4	100%	3	100%	3	100%	15	100%

Figures 3.1 and 3.2 provide education data for Forrest and Perry County participants. As seen in Figure 3.1, 35% of Forrest County participants never graduated high school (6% had an 8th grade education or below, and 29% had some high school). Nearly one-fifth (19%) of Forrest County participants graduated high school, and an additional 18% had obtained a G.E.D. Nineteen percent of Forrest County participants had some college education, and 1% had earned a bachelor's degree. Six percent of the participants had unavailable or missing education data.

Education data for Perry County participants is presented in Figure 3.2. Twenty-seven percent of Perry County participants never graduated high school (7% had an 8th grade or below education and 20% had some high school). One-third (33%) of Perry County participants graduated from high school, and 13% earned a G.E.D. Twenty percent had some college, but no Perry County participants had earned a bachelor's degree. Seven percent of Perry County participants had unavailable or missing education data.



Tables 3.3 and 3.4 provide employment data concerning Forrest and Perry County clients. Originally, employment in Forrest County was reported as: unemployed (62%, n=67), construction (8.3%, n=9), food service (3.7%, n=4), industrial (2.8%, n=3), mechanic and auto repair (6.5%, n=7), other (9.3%, n=10), and missing or unavailable employment data (7.4%, n=8). As seen in Table 3.3, collapsed employment data regarding Forrest County participants indicates high levels of unemployment for active and terminated participants, while graduates and absconded participants demonstrated little or no difference in employment. As a group, Forrest County participants exhibited high levels of unemployment.

Perry County employment data were reported as: unemployed (53.3%, n=8), construction (26.7%, n=4), mechanic and auto repair (6.7%, n=1), and missing or unavailable employment data (13.3%, n=2). Collapsed employment data for Perry County participants indicates higher levels of unemployment for absconded and terminated clients as well as graduates (see Table 3.4). Active participants demonstrated a relatively high employment rate. In total, Perry County participants demonstrated high levels of unemployment.

	Active		Graduate		Absconded		Terminated		Totals	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
	Unemployed	41	42.3%	3	3.1%	5	5.2%	16	16.5%	65
Employed	16	16.5%	3	3.1%	7	7.2%	6	6.2%	32	33%

	Active		Graduate		Absconded		Terminated		Totals	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
	Unemployed	1	7.7%	3	23.1%	2	15.4%	2	15.4%	8
Employed	4	30.8%	0	0%	1	7.7%	0	0%	5	38.5%

Tables 3.5 and 3.6 illustrate Forrest and Perry County drug use among client status categories. Alcohol use was especially high among graduates and absconded clients in Forrest County (see Table 3.5). Active clients also reported elevated use of alcohol (63.5%), while only 45.5% of terminated clients reported using alcohol. Marijuana use was high among all Forrest County client status categories, especially among graduates (100% of graduates reported using marijuana at intake). Powder or unspecified cocaine use was also elevated for active (65.1%) and terminated (54.5%) participants in Forrest County. Fifty percent of graduates reported using cocaine. Absconded clients had the lowest reported levels of cocaine use. Crack cocaine was not widely used among any client status categories, although 6.3% of active participants did report using crack cocaine at intake. Methamphetamine (Meth) use was high among graduates in Forrest County (66.7% reported using methamphetamine at intake). Active clients also reported elevated levels of methamphetamine use (41.3%). Heroin use was low among all client status categories in Forrest County. Prescription drug use was highest among active participants (36.5% reported using at intake) and terminated participants (22.7%). The use of other drugs was highest among active participants (41.3%) in Forrest County.



For Perry County clients, alcohol and marijuana use was high among all client status categories (see Table 3.6). Cocaine use was elevated for active participants (40% reporting use at intake). Crack cocaine use reported by 25% of graduates and was not reported as used by any other clients. Methamphetamine (Meth) use was high among all client status categories. Graduates in Perry County also reported high levels of prescription drug use (50%). Only graduates (25%) and absconded clients (33.3%) reported using other drugs.

	<b>Active</b>	<b>Graduate</b>	<b>Absconded</b>	<b>Terminated</b>
	(n=63)	(n=6)	(n=12)	(n=22)
Alcohol	63.5%	83.3%	81.8%	45.5%
Marijuana	73%	100%	83.3%	81.8%
Cocaine - p	65.1%	50%	41.7%	54.5%
Cocaine - r	6.3%	0%	0%	0%
Meth	41.3%	66.7%	16.7%	18.2%
Heroin	3.2%	1.7%	0%	0%
Rx Drugs	36.5%	16.7%	8.3%	22.7%
Other Drugs	41.3%	33.3%	16.7%	31.8%

	<b>Active</b>	<b>Graduate</b>	<b>Absconded</b>	<b>Terminated</b>
	(n=5)	(n=4)	(n=3)	(n=3)
Alcohol	100%	75%	66.7%	100%
Marijuana	100%	75%	66.7%	100%
Cocaine - p	40%	25%	33.3%	0%
Cocaine - r	0%	25%	0%	0%
Meth	60%	75%	66.7%	66.7%
Heroin	0%	25%	0%	0%
Rx Drugs	0%	50%	33.3%	0%
Other Drugs	0%	25%	33.3%	0%



Figures 3.3 and 3.4 illustrate drug use within race categories. In Forrest County, 72.9% of Caucasian participants reported using alcohol while 52.3% of minorities reported use of the same (see Table 3.3). Marijuana use was reported by 83.1% of Caucasians and 75% of minorities. Powder or unspecified cocaine use was reported by 69.5% of Caucasians and 50% of minorities in Forrest County. Only Caucasian participants (6.8%) reported using crack cocaine in Forrest County. Methamphetamine use was especially high among Caucasian participants in Forrest County (61%), although 2.3% of minorities reported using the same. Reported heroine use was low for both Caucasians (3.4%) and Minorities (2.3%). Prescription drug use was higher for Caucasians (47.5%) than minorities (4.6%). Other drug use was also primarily reported by Caucasians (50.1%) compared to minorities (15.9%) in Forrest County.

As seen in Figure 3.4, reported higher levels of alcohol use were higher for minorities (100%) than Caucasians (83.3%) in Perry County. Marijuana use exhibited the same trend, with 100% of minorities and 83.3% of Caucasians reporting use of the same at intake. Powder or unspecified cocaine use was extremely high for minorities (66.7%) as compared to Caucasians (16.7%) in Perry County. Only 8.3% of Caucasians reported using crack cocaine. Minorities in Perry County reported no use of crack cocaine. Methamphetamine use was highly reported among Caucasian clients (83.3%), while no minorities reported use of the same. More Caucasians (25%) reported using prescription drugs than minorities (0%). Other drug use was low for both Caucasians (16.7%) and minorities (0%) in Perry County.



Figures 3.5 and 3.6 provide program track composition data for participants in Forrest and Perry County. As seen in Figure 3.5, the majority of Forrest County clients entered the program as adjudicated offenders. Nearly one-third (31%) of participants were nonadjudicated, while 3% of participants entered the program as nonadjudicated offenders but were eventually adjudicated due to excessive program violations or rearrest. Program track data was unavailable or missing for 9% of Forrest County clients.

The majority of Perry County participants (53%) entered the program as non-adjudicated offenders (see Table 3.6). Forty percent of offenders in Perry County were adjudicated. Program track data was unavailable or missing for 7% of Perry County participants.



Tables 3.7 and 3.8 illustrate criminal histories of participants in Forrest and Perry Counties. As seen in Table 3.7, possession of a controlled substance (Possession C/S) was the dominant criminal offense for Forrest County participants (35.2% were convicted and 13.9% had Possession C/S as a non-adjudicated offense, and 3.7% were previously convicted and had Possession C/S as a nonadjudicated offense). Forrest County participants also exhibited elevated levels of property offenses (21% convicted and 7.4% as non-adjudicated offenses), probation or parole violations (20.4% convicted), and other crimes (32.4% convicted and 2.8% as a nonadjudicated offense). There were also seven participants (6.5%) convicted of possession with the intent to distribute or sell as well as one participant (.9%) with Possession with intent as a nonadjudicated offense. Twelve percent of Forrest County participants had been convicted of a DUI or DWI.

Table 3.8 illustrates criminal history for Perry County participants. Possession C/S was the dominant offense in Perry County (46.7% convicted, 20% as non-adjudicated offenses, and 26.7% previously convicted and as a nonadjudicated offense). Property offenses (26.7% convicted) and other crimes (26.7% convicted) also demonstrated elevated levels. One-fifth (20%) of Perry County participants had been convicted of a DUI or DWI.

	No Conviction		Convicted		Drug Court Charge		D.C. & Prior		Unknown (Missing)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
	Possession C/S	18	16.7%	38	35.2%	15	13.9%	4	3.7%	33
Possession w/ Intent	53	49.1%	7	6.5%	1	0.9%	0	0.0%	47	43.5%
Property Offense	41	38.0%	21	19.4%	8	7.4%	0	0.0%	38	35.2%
Forgery (Rx)	58	53.7%	4	3.7%	2	1.9%	0	0.0%	44	40.7%
Forgery (Utterance)	56	51.9%	5	4.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	47	43.5%
Possession of Precursors	55	50.9%	5	4.6%	2	1.9%	0	0.0%	46	42.6%
Embezzlement	58	53.7%	1	0.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	49	45.4%
Probation / Parole Violation	49	45.4%	22	20.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	49	45.4%
DUI / DWI	50	46.3%	13	12.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	63	58.3%
Other Crime	28	25.9%	35	32.4%	3	2.8%	0	0.0%	42	38.9%

	No Conviction		Convicted		Drug Court Charge		D.C. & Prior		Unknown (Missing)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
	Possession C/S	0	0.0%	7	46.7%	3	20.0%	4	26.7%	1
Possession w/ Intent	10	66.7%	1	6.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	26.7%
Property Offense	8	53.3%	4	26.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	20.0%
Forgery (Rx)	12	80.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	20.0%
Forgery (Utterance)	12	80.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	20.0%
Possession of Precursors	12	80.0%	1	6.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	13.3%
Embezzlement	12	80.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	20.0%
Probation / Parole Violation	12	80.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	20.0%
DUI / DWI	10	66.7%	3	20.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	13.3%
Other Crime	8	53.3%	4	26.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	20.0%

## 14th Circuit (Lincoln, Pike, and Walthall Counties)

---

The 14th Circuit Drug Court Program (DCP) is located in Magnolia, Miss. Lincoln County has an approximate population of 34,000, 69.1% of which are Caucasian and 51.8% of which are female. Pike County has an approximate population of 40,000, of which 49.6% are Caucasian and of which 52.7% are female. Walthall County has an approximate population of 15,000, of which 55.1% are Caucasian and of which 52% are female (U.S. Census Bureau).

The 14th Circuit DCP is Mississippi's longest running felony drug court. The staff is composed of a drug court director (who also functions as a probation officer), a drug court administrator, a case manager, and a drug court judge. The 14th Circuit DCP is also developing a DUI probation program similar to their drug court program, and employs an additional probation officer to oversee its operation. Clients enrolled in the DUI probation program were not included in this study. However, some clients in the drug court program were participating in the 14th Circuit DCP as a result of a DUI conviction. These clients were absorbed prior to the inception of the DUI probation program, and had other substance abuse problems in addition to alcohol. The 14th Circuit DCP is available as a pretrial diversion program or a probation option for adjudicated offenders.

The 14th Circuit DCP is unique because it assists local schools in random drug testing students participating in extracurricular activities. This assists in the financing of the 14th Circuit DCP and provides a valuable community service at a reduced cost to the school district.

The majority of 14th Circuit clients were single (43%, n=157). Only 24.4% of clients were married (n=89). Caucasians comprised 74% (n=54) of divorced clients, and exhibited a divorce rate of 24.4%. Minorities had a slightly higher mean number of children (M=1.94) than Caucasians (M=1.52). Caucasians averaged a higher mean number of prior marriages (M=.56) than minorities (M=.19). Minorities averaged 33.23 years of age at intake while Caucasians averaged 31.89 years of age at intake. Caucasians and minorities exhibited similar mean numbers of prior convictions (M=1.9, M=1.87 respectively).

Tables 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 provide demographic and client status data for Lincoln, Pike and Walthall Counties. As seen in Table 4.1, Lincoln County participants (70.4% Caucasian and 29.6% minority) were fairly equivalent in representing racial demographics of the overall county (69.1% Caucasian and 30.9% minority). Male participants in Lincoln County (69.4%) are overrepresented when compared to general county demographic data (48.2%). Caucasian males represented the largest group of Lincoln County participants (47.2%, n=51) while minority females represented the smallest group (7.4%, n=8). Caucasian females (23.1%, n=25) and minority males (22.2%, n=24) were fairly equal in size. Active participants comprised the largest client status group in Lincoln County (n=45). Graduates (n=33) outnumbered terminated clients (n=26), and absconded participants represented the smallest client status group (n=4).



	Active		Graduate		Absconded		Terminated		Totals	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
<b>Caucasian</b>	38	84.4%	22	66.7%	2	50%	14	53.8	76	70.4%
Female	20	44.4%	4	12.1%	0	0%	1	3.8%	25	23.1%
Male	18	40%	18	54.6%	2	50%	13	50%	51	47.2%
<b>Minority</b>	7	15.6%	11	33.3%	2	50%	12	46.2%	32	29.6%
Female	1	2.2%	3	9.1%	0	0%	4	15.4%	8	7.4%
Male	6	13.3%	8	24.2%	2	50%	8	30.8%	24	22.2%
<b>Totals</b>	45	100%	33	100%	4	100%	26	100%	108	100%


As seen in Table 4.2, Pike County participants (52.6% Caucasian and 47.4% minority) were not representative of racial demographics for the county in general (49.6% Caucasian and 50.4% minority). Additionally, male participants in Pike County (73.4%) were overrepresented when compared to general county demographic data (47.3%). Caucasian males (36.7%, n=72) and minority males (36.7%, n=72) were the largest groups in Pike County. Caucasian females represented 15.8% (n=31) of Pike County participants, and minority females comprised the smallest group of participants (10.7%, n=21). Active participants represented the largest client status group in Pike County (n=79). Terminated clients (n=55) slightly outnumbered graduates (n=51). Absconded participants represented the smallest client status group (n=11).

	Active		Graduate		Absconded		Terminated		Totals	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
<b>Caucasian</b>	37	46.8%	28	54.9%	2	18.2%	36	65.5%	103	52.6%
Female	13	16.5%	8	15.7%	0	0%	10	18.2%	31	15.8%
Male	24	30.4%	20	39.2%	2	18.2%	26	47.3%	72	36.7%
<b>Minority</b>	42	53.2%	23	45.1%	9	81.8%	19	34.5%	93	47.4%
Female	13	16.5%	4	7.8%	1	9.1%	3	5.5%	21	10.7%
Male	29	36.7%	19	37.3%	8	72.7%	16	29.1%	72	36.7%
<b>Totals</b>	79	100%	51	100%	11	100%	55	100%	196	100%

Table 4.3 illustrates demographic and client status data for Walthall County. Walthall County participants (64.7% Caucasian and 35.3% minority) were not representative of general demographic data for the county overall (55.1% Caucasian and 44.9% minority). Additionally, male participants (61.7%) were also overrepresented when compared to general county demographics (48%). Caucasian males (33.8%, n=23) represented the largest group in Walthall County while Caucasian females were the second largest (30.9%, n=21). Minority males represented 27.9% (n=19) of Walthall County participants, and minority females comprised the smallest group (7.4%, n=5). Active participants (n=28) comprised the largest client status group in Walthall County. Graduates (n=19) slightly outnumbered terminated clients (n=18), and absconded participants represented the smallest client status group (n=3).

	Active		Graduate		Absconded		Terminated		Totals	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
<b>Caucasian</b>	21	75%	12	63.2%	2	66.7%	9	50%	44	64.7%
Female	13	46.4%	4	21.1%	0	0%	4	22.2%	21	30.9%
Male	8	28.6%	8	42.1%	2	66.7%	5	27.8%	23	33.8%
<b>Minority</b>	7	25%	7	36.8%	1	33.3%	9	50%	24	35.3%
Female	3	10.7%	2	10.5%	0	0%	0	0%	5	7.4%
Male	4	14.3%	5	26.3%	1	33.3%	9	50%	19	27.9%
<b>Totals</b>	28	100%	19	100%	3	100%	18	100%	68	100%

Figures 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 illustrate education levels in Lincoln, Pike and Walthall Counties. As seen in Figure 4.1, 25% of Lincoln County participants did not graduate high school (6% had an 8th grade education or below and 19% had some high school). Forty-two percent graduated high school and 17% obtained a G.E.D. Ten percent of Lincoln County participants had some college education and 2% had earned a bachelor's degree. Four percent of clients had unavailable or missing education data.



As seen in Figure 4.2, 27% of Pike County participants did not graduate high school (5% had an eight grade education or below and 22% had some high school). Over one-third (36%) of participants graduated high school and 17% obtained a G.E.D. Ten percent of Pike County participants had some college education, and 1% had earned a bachelor's degree. One participant had a graduate degree (shown as 0% in Figure 4.2). Nine percent of Pike County clients had unavailable or missing education data.





Table 4.3 provides education data for Walthall County participants. Thirty-one percent never graduated high school (7% had an eight grade education or below and 24% had some high school). Twenty-eight percent of participants graduated high school and 22% had obtained a G.E.D. Fifteen percent of Walthall County participants had some college education. Four percent of Walthall County participants had unavailable or missing education data.



Tables 4.4, 4.5 and 4.6 provide employment data for Lincoln, Pike and Walthall Counties. Employment in Lincoln County was reported as: unemployed (30.4%, n=34), construction (14.3%, n=16), food service (6.3%, n=7), sales (4.5%, n=5), industrial (12.5%, n=14), farming or livestock (1.8%, n=2), mechanic and auto repair (1.8%, n=2), clerical or administrative assistant (1.8%, n=2), management (1.8%, n=2), and other (20.5%, n=23). Employment data was unavailable or missing for 4.5% (n=5) of Lincoln County participants. Collapsed employment data for Lincoln County, presented in Table 4.4, indicates high levels of employment regardless of client status categories, with the exception of absconded participants, who were equally likely to be employed or unemployed.

	Active		Graduate		Absconded		Terminated		Totals	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Unemployed	15	14.2%	8	7.5%	2	1.9%	9	8.5%	34	32.1%
Employed	30	28.3%	23	21.7%	2	1.9%	17	16%	72	67.9%

Employment data for Pike County participants was reported as: unemployed (41.5%, n=88), construction (15.6%, n=33), food service (2.4%, n=5), sales (1.4%, n=3), industrial (5.2%, n=11), farming or livestock (.9%, n=2), education (.9%, n=2), mechanic and auto repair (4.7%, n=10), student (1.4%, n=3), management (.9%, n=2), and other (16.5%, n=35). Eighteen participants (8.5%) had unavailable or missing employment data. Collapsed employment data for Pike County, as seen in Table 4.5, indicates a slightly elevated level of employment. Employment levels were consistently elevated among all client status categories except terminated, in that terminated clients were more likely to be unemployed.

	Active		Graduate		Absconded		Terminated		Totals	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Unemployed	38	19.6%	17	8.8%	3	1.5%	30	15.5%	88	45.4%
Employed	41	21.1%	34	17.5%	8	4.1%	23	11.9%	106	54.6%

Employment in Walthall County was reported as: unemployed (54.4%, n=37), construction (11.8%, n=8), food service (2.9%, n=2), sales (1.5%, n=1), industrial (2.9%, n=2), farming or livestock (4.4%, n=3), mechanic and auto repair (4.4%, n=3), clerical or administrative assistant (1.5%, n=1), student (1.5%, n=1), management (1.5%, n=1), and other (11.8%, n=8). One Walthall County participant (1.5%) had unavailable or missing employment data. Collapsed employment data for Walthall County, illustrated in Table 4.6, indicates elevated levels of unemployment for participants. Unemployment levels were consistently elevated among client status categories except for graduates, who were more likely to be employed (at intake).

	Active		Graduate		Absconded		Terminated		Totals	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Unemployed	18	26.9%	6	9%	2	3%	11	16.4%	37	55.2%
Employed	9	13.4%	13	19.4%	1	1.5%	7	10.4%	30	44.8%

Tables 4.7, 4.8 and 4.9 provide substance abuse history among client status categories. As seen in Table 4.7, alcohol use was elevated among all client status categories in Lincoln County, in that 66.7% of active participants, 90.9% of graduates, 75% of absconded participants and 84.6% of terminated participants reported past use of alcohol. Marijuana use was also elevated among all client status categories: 71.1% for active participants, 54.5% for graduates, 100% for absconded participants and 69.2% for terminated participants. Lincoln County participants reported relatively low levels of powder or unspecified cocaine use except in the terminated category (61.5% of terminated participants reported past use). Reported use of crack cocaine was also low among all client status categories (17.7% of active participants, 6.1% of graduates, 0% of absconded participants, and 11.5% of terminated participants reported past use). Methamphetamine use among Lincoln County participants was relatively low for terminated clients (3.8%), but somewhat elevated for active participants (44.4%), graduates (21.2%) and absconded participants (25%). Heroin use was low among all client status categories. Prescription drug use was somewhat elevated among active participants (37.8%) and graduates (27.3%). Only 15.4% of terminated participants reported past use prescription drugs, and absconded clients did not report any use. Other drug use was moderate for active participants (15.6%) and graduates (15.2%), while absconded participants (0%) and terminated participants exhibited little or no use of the same.

	Active	Graduate	Absconded	Terminated
	(n=45)	(n=33)	(n=4)	(n=26)
Alcohol	66.7%	90.9%	75%	84.6%
Marijuana	71.1%	54.5%	100%	69.2%
Cocaine - p	44.4%	30.3%	0%	61.5%
Cocaine - r	17.8%	6.1%	0%	11.5%
Meth	44.4%	21.2%	25%	3.8%
Heroin	4.4%	3%	0%	3.8%
Rx Drugs	37.8%	27.3%	0%	15.4%
Other Drugs	15.6%	15.2%	0%	7.7%

Table 4.8 illustrates substance abuse history among client status categories in Pike County. Alcohol use was widely reported in all categories: 77.2% of active participants, 92.2% of graduates, 90.9% of absconded participants and 90.9% of terminated clients reported past use of alcohol. Marijuana use was slightly less elevated, with 70.9% of active participants, 66.7% of graduates, 72.7% of absconded participants and 69.1% of terminated participants reporting past use. Powder or unspecified cocaine use was elevated among active participants (51.9%), absconded participants (54.6%) and terminated participants (52.7%). Only 31.4% of graduates reported past use of cocaine. Reported use of crack cocaine was low among active participants (12.7% reported past use) and absconded participants (9.1%). Crack cocaine use was slightly higher among graduates (19.6%) and terminated participants (20%). Methamphetamine use was relatively low for all client status categories: 15.2% of active participants, 17.6% of graduates, 9.1% of absconded participants and 10.9% of terminated participants reported past use. Heroin use was low in all client status categories. Reported use of prescription drugs were: 31.6% of active participants, 37.3% of graduates, 9.1% of absconded participants and 23.6% of terminated participants. Other drug use was slightly elevated for all client status categories: 11.4% of active participants, 17.6% of graduates, 9.1% of absconded participants and 14.5% of terminated participants reported past use.

	<b>Active</b> (n=79)	<b>Graduate</b> (n=51)	<b>Absconded</b> (n=11)	<b>Terminated</b> (n=55)
Alcohol	77.2%	92.2%	90.9%	90.9%
Marijuana	70.9%	66.7%	72.7%	69.1%
Cocaine - p	51.9%	31.4%	54.6%	52.7%
Cocaine - r	12.7%	19.6%	9.1%	20%
Meth	15.2%	17.6%	9.1%	10.9%
Heroin	2.5%	3.9%	0%	5.5%
Rx Drugs	31.6%	37.3%	9.1%	23.6%
Other Drugs	11.4%	17.6%	9.1%	14.5%

Table 4.9 provides substance abuse history among client status categories for Walthall County. Alcohol use was prevalent in all client status categories with 57.1% of active participants, 84.2% of graduates, 66.7% of absconded participants and 83.3% of terminated participants reporting past use. Reported use of marijuana was also elevated among all categories: 57.1% of active participants, 68.4% of graduates, 100% of absconded participants and 72.2% of terminated clients reporting past use. Powder or unspecified cocaine use (Cocaine-p) was relatively low among active participants (25%) and graduates (26.3%), while absconded participants (66.7%) and terminated participants (55.6%) reported higher use of the same. Crack cocaine (Cocaine-r) use was low in among all client categories. Methamphetamine use was slightly elevated among active participants (39.3%), graduates (36.8%) and absconded participants (33.3%) while terminated participants (11.1%) reported lower use of the same. No Walthall County clients reported using heroine. Prescription drug use (Rx drugs) exhibited elevated levels of use among active participants (46.3%) and slightly elevated use among graduates (36.8%), absconded participants (33.3%), and terminated participants (22.2%). Reported use of other drugs was relatively low among active participants (14.3%), graduates (21.1%) and terminated participants (22.2%). No use of other drugs was reported by absconded clients.

	<b>Active</b>	<b>Graduate</b>	<b>Absconded</b>	<b>Terminated</b>
	(n=28)	(n=19)	(n=3)	(n=18)
Alcohol	57.1%	84.2%	66.7%	83.3%
Marijuana	57.1%	68.4%	100%	72.2%
Cocaine - p	25%	26.3%	66.7%	55.6%
Cocaine - r	7.1%	5.3%	0%	5.6%
Meth	39.3%	36.8%	33.3%	11.1%
Heroine	0%	0%	0%	0%
Rx Drugs	46.4%	36.8%	33.3%	22.2%
Other Drugs	14.3%	21.1%	0%	22.2%

Figures 4.4, 4.5 and 4.6 provide substance abuse histories with regard to race in Lincoln, Pike and Walthall Counties. As seen Figure 4.4, alcohol use was more prevalent among Caucasians (80.3% reporting past use) than minorities (68.8% reporting past use) in Lincoln County. Reported marijuana use was nearly equal for Caucasians (67.1%) and minorities (65.6%). Minorities reported slightly higher powder or unspecified cocaine use (46.9%) than Caucasians (39.5%). Crack cocaine use was more prevalent among Caucasians (13.2%) than minorities (6.3%). Methamphetamine use was dominated by Caucasians (35.5%) compared to minorities (3.1%). Heroin use was strictly reported by Caucasians (5.3%). Prescription drug use among Lincoln County participants was nearly equivalent among Caucasians (3.8%) and minorities (3.1%). Caucasians were the predominant reporters of using other drugs (17.1%) over minorities (3.1%).




Figure 4.5 illustrates substance abuse with regard to race for Pike County participants. Alcohol use was slightly higher among minorities (85% reporting past use) than Caucasians (78% reporting past use). Marijuana use was more prevalent among minorities (71%) than Caucasians (62.4%). Additionally, minorities reported using powder or unspecified cocaine (48.4%) at a higher rate than Caucasians (40.4%). Reported use of crack cocaine was slightly higher for minorities (19.4%) than Caucasians (12.8%). Reported use of methamphetamine was predominantly Caucasian (23.9%) compared to minorities (2.2%). Heroin use was strictly reported by Caucasians (6.4%). Prescription drug use was highly prevalent among Caucasians (44%) when compared to minorities (8.6%). Reported use of other drugs were also predominantly Caucasian (21.1%). Only 4.3 % of minorities reported using other drugs.







Figure 4.6 illustrates substance abuse history with regards to race for Walthall County. Alcohol use was reported by 87% of minorities and 65.9% of Caucasians. Reported marijuana use was slightly higher for Caucasians (68.2%) than minorities (65.2%). Powder or unspecified cocaine use was slightly higher for minorities (39.1%) than Caucasians (34.1%). Crack cocaine use was low for both races, with 6.8% of Caucasians reporting past use and 4.4% of minorities reporting past use. Methamphetamine use in Walthall County was relatively high and was limited to Caucasian participants (47.7%). No heroin use was reported by Walthall County participants. Prescription drug use was dominated by Caucasians (52.3%) as compared to minorities (8.7%). Other drug use was also primarily Caucasian (25%) when compared to minorities (4.4%).



Tables 4.7, 4.8 and 4.9 provides program track information for Lincoln, Pike and Walthall County participants. As seen in Table 4.7, thirty-nine percent of Lincoln County participants were non-adjudicated offenders. Forty-three percent were adjudicated, and 15% entered the program as non-adjudicated offenders and were eventually adjudicated due to excessive program violations or rearrest. Three percent of Lincoln County participants had unavailable or missing program track data.






Figure 4.8 illustrates program track data for Pike County participants. One-third (33%) of Pike County participants were non-adjudicated offenders. Nearly half (47%) were adjudicated offenders. Eighteen percent of Pike County participants entered the program as nonadjudicated offenders and were eventually adjudicated due to excessive program violations or rearrest. Two percent had unavailable or missing program track data.



As seen in Figure 4.9, over one-third (37%) of Walthall County participants were non-adjudicated offenders. Thirty-eight percent were adjudicated offenders. One-fourth (25%) of Walthall County participants entered the drug court program as nonadjudicated offenders and were eventually adjudicated due to excessive program violations or rearrest.



Tables 4.10, 4.11 and 4.12 provide criminal histories for Lincoln, Pike and Walthall County participants. For Lincoln County participants, possession of a controlled substance (Possession C/S) was the dominant offense: 24.1% convicted, 17.9% had Possession C/C as a nonadjudicated offense and 2.7% had previously been convicted and had Possession C/S as a non-adjudicated offense. No Lincoln County participants reported convictions or nonadjudicated offenses of possession with intent to distribute or sale (Possession with intent). Eighteen participants (16.1%) were convicted of property offenses and two participants (1.8%) had the same as a non-adjudicated offense. Six participants (5.4%) had prescription forgery as a nonadjudicated offense and one participant (.9%) had prior convictions for forgery in addition to a nonadjudicated offense of the same. Four Lincoln County participants (3.6%) were convicted of uttering forgery. One Lincoln County participant (.9%) had been convicted of possession of precursors, and two participants (1.8%) had non-adjudicated offenses for the same. Twenty-one participants (18.8%) were convicted of a probation or parole violation and 31 (27.7%) participants were convicted of DUI or DWI. Twenty-one participants (18.8%) were convicted of other crimes, nine participants (8%) had other crimes for non-adjudicated offenses, and four participants had previously been convicted of other crimes as well as having the same for a non-adjudicated offense.

	No Conviction		Convicted		Drug Court Charge		D.C. & Prior		Unknown (Missing)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
	Possession C/S	58	51.8%	27	24.1%	20	17.9%	3	2.7%	4
Possession w/ Intent	108	96.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	3.6%
Property Offense	88	78.6%	18	16.1%	2	1.8%	0	0.0%	4	3.6%
Forgery (Rx)	101	90.2%	0	0.0%	6	5.4%	1	0.9%	4	3.6%
Forgery (Utterance)	104	92.9%	4	3.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	3.6%
Possession of Precursors	105	93.8%	1	0.9%	2	1.8%	0	0.0%	4	3.6%
Embezzlement	108	96.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	3.6%
Probation / Parole Violation	87	77.7%	21	18.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	3.6%
DUI / DWI	78	69.6%	31	27.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	2.7%
Other Crime	74	66.1%	21	18.8%	9	8.0%	4	3.6%	4	3.6%

Table 4.11 illustrates criminal histories for Pike County participants. Possession of a controlled substance (Possession C/S) was the most frequently committed offense: 23.1% convicted, 20.3% had Possession C/S as a non-adjudicated offense, and 2.4% had been previously convicted and had Possession C/S as a non-adjudicated offense. Three Pike County participants (1.4%) were convicted of possession with intent to distribute or sale. Property offenses were reported as: 12.7% convicted, 1.4% as a nonadjudicated offenders, and .5% as having prior property offense convictions as well as a nonadjudicated offense for the same. Three Pike County participants (1.4%) were convicted of prescription forgery, four participants (1.9%) had forgery as a nonadjudicated offense, and two participants (.9%) had prior convictions and a nonadjudicated offense for the same. Thirteen Pike County participants (6.1%) were convicted of uttering forgery (Forgery-Utterance) and one participant (.5%) had a nonadjudicated offense for the same. Embezzlement was reported as two participants convicted (.9%) and three having embezzlement as a nonadjudicated offense. Thirty-one Pike County participants (14.6%) were convicted of a probation or parole violation, and 79 participants (37.3%) were convicted of DUI or DWI. Forty Pike County participants (18.9%) were convicted of other crimes and ten participants (4.7%) had a nonadjudicated offense for the same.

	No Conviction		Convicted		Drug Court Charge		D.C. & Prior		Unknown (Missing)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Possession C/S	105	49.5%	49	23.1%	43	20.3%	5	2.4%	10	4.7%
Possession w/ Intent	198	93.4%	3	1.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	11	5.2%
Property Offense	170	80.2%	27	12.7%	3	1.4%	1	0.5%	11	5.2%
Forgery (Rx)	192	90.6%	3	1.4%	4	1.9%	2	0.9%	11	5.2%
Forgery (Utterance)	187	88.2%	13	6.1%	1	0.5%	0	0.0%	11	5.2%
Possession of Precursors	201	94.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	11	5.2%
Embezzlement	197	92.9%	2	0.9%	3	1.4%	0	0.0%	10	4.7%
Probation / Parole Violation	170	80.2%	31	14.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	11	5.2%
DUI / DWI	122	57.5%	79	37.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	11	5.2%
Other Crime	153	72.2%	40	18.9%	10	4.7%	0	0.0%	9	4.2%

Table 4.12 illustrates criminal histories for Walthall County participants. Possession of a controlled substance (Possession C/S) was the dominant offense in Walthall County: 26.5% of participants convicted, 20.6% of participants had Possession C/S as a nonadjudicated offense, and 1.5% had prior convictions and a non-adjudicated offense for the same. One participant in Walthall County (1.5%) was convicted for possession with intent to distribute or sell. Six Walthall County participants (8.8%) were convicted of a property offense, and one participant (1.5%) had the same for a nonadjudicated offense. Prescription forger was reported as: two participants (2.9%) convicted and two participants (2.9%) having the same for a nonadjudicated offense. One participant (1.5%) was convicted of uttering forgery. Fifteen Walthall County participants (22.1%) were convicted of a probation or parole violation, and fifteen participants (22.1%) were convicted of DUI or DWI. Other crimes were reported as: 23.5% of participants convicted and 11.8% of participants having the same as a prior conviction and a nonadjudicated offense.

	No Conviction		Convicted		Drug Court Charge		D.C. & Prior		Unknown (Missing)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
	Possession C/S	33	48.5%	18	26.5%	14	20.6%	1	1.5%	2
Possession w/ Intent	65	95.6%	1	1.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	2.9%
Property Offense	59	86.8%	6	8.8%	1	1.5%	0	0.0%	2	2.9%
Forgery (Rx)	62	91.2%	2	2.9%	2	2.9%	0	0.0%	2	2.9%
Forgery (Utterance)	65	95.6%	1	1.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	2.9%
Possession of Precursors	66	97.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	2.9%
Embezzlement	66	97.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	2.9%
Probation / Parole Violation	51	75.0%	15	22.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	2.9%
DUI / DWI	51	75.0%	15	22.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	2.9%
Other Crime	42	61.8%	16	23.5%	8	11.8%	0	0.0%	2	2.9%

## 19th Circuit (George, Greene, and Jackson Counties)

The 19th Circuit Judicial Drug Court (JDC) is located in Pascagoula, Miss. George County has an approximate population of 21,000, 89.7% of which are Caucasian and 49% of which are female. Greene County has an approximate population of 13,000, 73% of which are Caucasian and 42.1% of which are female. Jackson County has an approximate population of 130,000, 74.9% of which are Caucasian and 50.3% of which are female (U.S. Census Bureau).

The 19th Circuit JDC was relocated to a county fairground following Hurricane Katrina. The staff, comprised of a drug court coordinator, case manager, two probation officers, and two drug court judges, restored the program immediately following the storm. No time or energy was wasted in locating clients and reorganizing program meetings and community service initiatives. Many clients devoted their own time to others in need after the storm, and the staff were quick to assess their program's role in these acts. The 19th Circuit JDC serves as a pretrial diversion program and post-sentence probation option.

The majority of 19th Circuit clients were single (49.2%, n=94). Only 15.7% of clients were married (n=30). Caucasians comprised 92% (n=46) of divorced clients and exhibited a divorce rate of 28%. Minorities had a slightly higher mean number of children (M=2.04) than Caucasians (M=1.43). Caucasians exhibited a higher mean number of prior marriages (M=.48) than minorities (M=.19). Caucasians averaged 29.19 years of age at intake, while minorities averaged 27.56. Caucasians and minorities exhibited similar mean numbers of prior convictions (2.47 and 2.96, respectively).

Tables 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3 provide demographic and client status data for George, Greene and Jackson Counties. As seen in Table 5.1, George County participants (90.9% Caucasian and 9.1% minority) were equivalent to general county demographics (89.7% Caucasian and 10.3% minority) with regards to race. Males were slightly overrepresented among George County participants (59% male) when compared to general county demographics (51% male). Caucasian males (54.5%, n=24) represented the largest group of George County participants, while minority males (4.5%, n=2) and minority females (4.5%, n=2) composed the smallest groups. Caucasian females (n=16) represented 36.4% of George County participants. Active participants (n=25) composed the largest client status group. Graduates (n=9) and terminated participants (n=10) were nearly equal in number. There were no absconded participants in George County.

	Active		Graduate		Absconded		Terminated		Totals	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
<b>Caucasian</b>	23	92%	9	100%	0	0%	8	80%	40	90.9%
Female	10	40%	4	44.4%	0	0%	2	20%	16	36.4%
Male	13	52%	5	55.6%	0	0%	6	60%	24	54.5%
<b>Minority</b>	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	2	20%	4	9.1%
Female	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	1	10%	2	4.5%
Male	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	1	10%	2	4.5%
<b>Totals</b>	25	100%	9	100%	0	0%	10	100%	44	100%

Table 5.2 illustrates demographic and client status data for Greene County. With regards to race, Green County participants (93.8% Caucasian and 6.3% minority) were not equivalent to the general county population (73% Caucasian and 28% minority), in that minorities were highly underrepresented. Males participants in Greene County (50.1%) were also underrepresented compared to general county demographics (57.9% male). Caucasian females (50%, n=8) composed the largest group of Greene County participants. Caucasian males (43.8%) were the second largest group. The only minority participant (6.3%) in Green County was male. Terminated clients represented the largest client status group (n=6). Active participants (n=5) and graduates (n=5) were equal in number. There were no absconded participants in Greene County.

	Active		Graduate		Absconded		Terminated		Totals	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
	<b>Caucasian</b>	4	80%	5	100%	0	0%	6	100%	15
Female	3	60%	4	80%	0	0%	1	16.7%	8	50%
Male	1	20%	1	20%	0	0%	5	83.3%	7	43.8%
<b>Minority</b>	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	6.3%
Female	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Male	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	6.3%
<b>Totals</b>	5	100%	5	100%	0	0%	6	100%	16	100%

Table 5.3 illustrates demographic and client status data for Jackson County. Jackson County participants (83.2% Caucasian and 16.8% minority) did not represent general county demographics (74.9% Caucasian and 25.1% minority), in that Caucasians were overrepresented. Males (67.2%) were also overrepresented when compared to general county demographic data (49.7% male). Caucasian males (56.5%, n=74) composed the largest group of Jackson County participants. Caucasian females (26.7%, n=35) composed the second largest group. Minority males (n=14) accounted for 10.7% of Jackson County participants. Minority females (6.1%, n=8) composed the smallest group of participants. Active participants (n=88) comprised the largest client status group. Terminated clients (n=20) outnumbered graduates (n=13) and absconded participants (n=10).

	Active		Graduate		Absconded		Terminated		Totals	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
	<b>Caucasian</b>	72	81.8%	11	84.6%	10	100%	16	80%	109
Female	16	18.2%	5	38.5%	8	80%	6	30%	35	26.7%
Male	56	63.6%	6	46.2%	2	20%	10	50%	74	56.5%
<b>Minority</b>	16	18.2%	2	15.4%	0	0%	4	20%	22	16.8%
Female	5	5.7%	1	7.8%	0	0%	2	10%	8	6.1%
Male	11	12.5%	1	7.8%	0	0%	2	10%	14	10.7%
<b>Totals</b>	88	100%	13	100%	10	100%	20	100%	131	100%

Figures 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3 provide data regarding education levels for George, Greene and Jackson County participants. As seen in Figure 5.1, 45% of George County participants did not graduate high school (11% had an 8th grade education or below and 34% had some high school). Over one-third (34%) of participants graduated high school, and 14% had obtained a G.E.D. Five percent of George County participants had some college education, and 2% had a earned a bachelor's degree.




Figure 5.2 provides education data for Green County participants. Over half (53%) of Greene County participants never graduated high school (6% had an 8th grade education of below and 47% had some high school). Thirty-five percent of participants graduated high school and 12% had obtained a G.E.D. No Greene County participants reported having any college education.







Figure 5.3 illustrates education data regarding Jackson County participants. Thirty-six percent of participants in Jackson County never graduated high school (12% had an 8th grade education or below and 24% had some high school). Twenty-one percent graduated high school and 20% received their G.E.D. Eighteen percent of Jackson County participants had some college education, and 4% had earned a bachelor's degree. One percent of Jackson County clients had unavailable or missing education data.



Tables 5.4, 5.5 and 5.6 provide collapsed employment data for George, Greene and Jackson Counties. Originally, employment at intake for George County participants was reported as: unemployed (50%, n=22), construction (22.7%, n=10), food service (6.8%, n=3), industrial (6.8%, n=3), education (2.3%, n=1), mechanic and auto repair (2.3%, n=1), and other (6.8%, n=3). One George County participant had unavailable or missing employment data. As seen in Table 5.4, George County participants were slightly more likely to be unemployed at intake (51.2%). Active participants were equally likely to be unemployed or employed. Graduates were twice as likely to be unemployed at intake, while terminated participants were more likely to be employed at intake.

	Active		Graduate		Absconded		Terminated		Totals	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
	Unemployed	12	27.9%	6	14%	0	0%	4	9.3%	22
Employed	12	27.9%	3	7%	0	0%	6	14%	21	48.8%

Table 5.5 illustrates collapsed employment data concerning Green County participants. Prior to collapsing employment data, employment for Green County participants was reported as: unemployed (52.9%, n=9), construction (17.6%, n=3), industrial (11.8%, n=2), and other (11.8%, n=2). One Green County participant had unavailable or missing employment data. As seen in Table 5.5, Green County participants were more likely to be unemployed at intake (56% unemployed). Graduates were more likely to be unemployed at intake, while terminated participants were more likely to be employed at intake. Active participants were equally likely to be unemployed or employed at intake.

	Active		Graduate		Absconded		Terminated		Totals	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Unemployed	2	12.5%	4	25%	0	0%	3	18.8%	9	56.3%
Employed	2	12.5%	1	6.3%	0	0%	4	25%	7	43.8%

Table 5.6 illustrates collapsed employment at intake data for Jackson County participants. Originally, employment for Jackson County participants was reported as: unemployed (55%, n=72), construction (18.3%, n=24), food service (3.8%, n=5), sales (.8%, n=1), industrial (3.8%, n=5), education (.8%, n=1), mechanic / auto repair (3.8%, n=5), clerical / administrative assistant (1.5%, n=2), and other (10.7%, n=14). Employment data was unavailable or missing for two (1.5%) Jackson County participants. As seen in Table 5.6, Jackson County participants were more likely to be unemployed at intake. Additionally, participants were more likely to be unemployed regardless of client status category.

	Active		Graduate		Absconded		Terminated		Totals	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Unemployed	44	33.6%	8	6.1%	9	6.9%	11	8.4%	72	55%
Employed	42	32.1%	5	3.8%	1	.7%	9	6.9%	59	45%

Tables 5.7, 5.8 and 5.9 provide substance abuse history for George, Greene and Jackson Counties. As seen in Table 5.7, alcohol use was prevalent among all client status categories, with 88% of active participants reporting use, 100% of graduates reporting use, and 80% of terminated clients reporting use. Marijuana use was also relatively high among all client status categories. Powder or unspecified cocaine use was elevated for graduates (66.7%), but relatively low for active participants (36%) and terminated participants (20%). Graduates also reported higher use of crack cocaine (33.3%) than active participants (12%) and terminated participants (10%). Methamphetamine use was prevalent among all client status categories, with 72% of active participants, 88.9% of graduates and 60% of terminated participants reporting use. Heroin use was only reported by active participants (4%). Prescription drug use (Rx Drugs) was high among active participants (76%) and graduates (77.8%), but relatively low for terminated participants (10%). Other drug use was reported by 48% of active participants, 33.3% of graduates and 30% of terminated participants.

	<b>Active</b> (n=25)	<b>Graduate</b> (n=9)	<b>Absconded</b> (n=0)	<b>Terminated</b> (n=10)
Alcohol	88%	100%	0%	80%
Marijuana	84%	77.8%	0%	90%
Cocaine - p	36%	66.7%	0%	20%
Cocaine - r	12%	33.3%	0%	10%
Meth	72%	88.9%	0%	60%
Heroin	4%	0%	0%	0%
Rx Drugs	76%	77.8%	0%	10%
Other Drugs	48%	33.3%	0%	30%

Table 5.8 illustrates substance abuse data for Greene County. Alcohol use was prevalent among all client status categories: 100% of active participants, 80% of graduates and 100% of terminated participants reporting use. Marijuana use was high for active participants (80%) and terminated participants (100%), but relatively low for graduates (20%). Powder or unspecified cocaine use was relatively low among graduates (20%) and terminated participants (16.7%) and slightly higher for active participants (40%). Crack cocaine use was relatively low among all client status categories, with 20% of active participants 20% of graduates and 16.6% of terminated participants reporting use. Methamphetamine use was markedly high for graduates (80%) and terminated participants (100%). Prescription drug use was reported by 80% of active participants and 33.3% of terminated participants. Other drug use was reported by 20% of active participants and 33.3% of terminated participants.

	<b>Active</b> (n=5)	<b>Graduate</b> (n=5)	<b>Absconded</b> (n=0)	<b>Terminated</b> (n=6)
Alcohol	100%	80%	0%	100%
Marijuana	80%	20%	0%	100%
Cocaine - p	40%	20%	0%	16.7%
Cocaine - r	20%	20%	0%	16.7%
Meth	40%	80%	0%	100%
Heroin	0%	0%	0%	16.7%
Rx Drugs	80%	0%	0%	33.3%
Other Drugs	20%	0%	0%	33.3%

Table 5.9 illustrates substance abuse data regarding Jackson County clients. Alcohol use was elevated among all client status categories, with 80.7% of active participants, 69.2% of graduates, 60% of absconded participants and 95% of terminated participants reporting use at intake. Marijuana use was also relatively high among all categories. Powder or unspecified cocaine use was elevated among active participants (53.4%) and terminated clients (45%). Crack cocaine use was relatively low in all categories, with 13.6% of active participants, 30.8% of graduates, 20% of absconded participants and 35% of terminated participants reporting use. Methamphetamine use was relatively high in all client status categories. Heroin use was only reported by active participants (3.4%). Prescription drugs were used by 65.9% of active participants, 53.8% of graduates, 90% of absconded participants and 50% of terminated participants. Other drug use was reported by 34.1% of active participants, 30.8% of graduates, 30% of absconded participants, and 35% of terminated participants.

	<b>Active</b> (n=88)	<b>Graduate</b> (n=13)	<b>Absconded</b> (n=10)	<b>Terminated</b> (n=20)
Alcohol	80.7%	69.2%	60%	95%
Marijuana	83%	84.6%	70%	75%
Cocaine - p	53.4%	15.4%	20%	45%
Cocaine - r	13.6%	30.8%	20%	35%
Meth	60.2%	61.5%	70%	45%
Heroin	3.4%	0%	0%	0%
Rx Drugs	65.9%	53.8%	90%	50%
Other Drugs	34.1%	30.8%	30%	35%

Figures 5.4, 5.5 and 5.6 illustrate substance abuse with regards to race in George, Greene and Jackson Counties. As seen in figure 5.4, alcohol use was primarily reported by Caucasians (92.5%) compared to minorities (50%). Marijuana use was reported by 100% of minorities and 82.5% of Caucasians. Powder or unspecified cocaine use was reported by 40% of Caucasians and 25% of minorities. Crack cocaine use (Cocaine-r) was reported by 17.5% of Caucasians (no minorities reported use of the same). Methamphetamine use was also strictly reported by Caucasians (80%). Heroin use was reported by 2.5% of Caucasians (no minorities reported use). Additionally, prescription drug use was strictly reported by Caucasians (67.5%). Other drug use was reported by 40% of Caucasians and 50% of minorities.




Figure 5.5 illustrates drug use and race for Greene County participants. Alcohol use was high for both Caucasians (93.3% reporting use) and minorities (100% reporting use). Marijuana use was higher among minorities (100%) than Caucasians (66.7%). Minorities in Green County only reported use of alcohol and marijuana. Powder or unspecified cocaine use was reported by 26.7% of Caucasians, while crack cocaine use use was reported by 20%. Methamphetamine use was reported by 73.3% of Caucasians. Heroin use was reported by 6.7% of Caucasians. Prescription drug use was reported by 40% of Caucasians, and other drug use was reported by 13.3%.





Figure 5.6 provides substance abuse and race data for Jackson County. Alcohol use was reported by more Caucasians (81.7%) than minorities (72.7%). Marijuana use was reported by a greater number of minorities (86.4%) than Caucasians (79.8%). Powder or unspecified cocaine use was also reported by more minorities (59.1%) than Caucasians. Crack cocaine use was relatively low among both minorities (22.7% reporting use) and Caucasians (18.4%). Methamphetamine use was reported primarily by Caucasians (67.9%) as compared to minorities (13.6%). Heroin use was also low, with 4.6% of minorities reporting use and 1.8% of Caucasians reporting use. Prescription drug use was dominated by Caucasians (71.6%) in comparison to minorities (2.7%). Other drug use was reported by 36.7% of Caucasians and 18.2% of minorities.



Figures 5.7, 5.8 and 5.9 illustrate program track composition of George, Greene and Jackson Counties. As seen in Figure 5.7, 41% of George County participants were non-adjudicated offenders. Over half (54%) of George County participants entered the program as adjudicated offenders. Five percent of participants entered the program as nonadjudicated offenders, but were eventually adjudicated due to excessive program violations or rearrest.




Figure 5.6 illustrates program track composition for Greene County participants. Nineteen percent of participants in Greene County were non-adjudicated offenders. Three-fourths (75%) of participants entered the program as adjudicated offenders. Six percent of Greene County participants entered the program as nonadjudicated offenders, but were eventually adjudicated due to excessive program violations or rearrest.





Figure 5.9 provides program track data regarding Jackson County. Almost half (46%) of Jackson County participants were non-adjudicated. An additional 46% of participants entered the program as adjudicated offenders. Eight percent of Jackson County participants entered the program as non-adjudicated offenders, but were eventually adjudicated due to excessive program violations or rearrest.



Tables 5.10, 5.11 and 5.12 provide criminal history among George, Greene and Jackson County participants. As seen in Table 5.10, possession of a controlled substance (Possession C/S) was the dominant offense in George County: 40.9% of participants were convicted, 20.5% of participants had Possession C/S as a non-adjudicated offense, and 9.1% had Possession C/S as a nonadjudicated offense and at least one prior conviction for the same. Property offenses were relatively low among George County participants, with 11.4% of participants convicted and 4.5% of participants having a property offense as a nonadjudicated offense. Possession of precursors was reported as 22.7% convicted and 15.9% having the same as a non-adjudicated offense. Almost one-third (31.8%) of George County participants were convicted of a probation or parole violation. Nine participants (20.5%) were convicted of DUI or DWI. Other crimes were reported as 9.1% convicted and 2.3% having the same as a non-adjudicated offense.

**Table 5.10 Criminal History (Convictions) - George County**

	No Conviction		Convicted		Drug Court Charge		D.C. & Prior		Unknown (Missing)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Possession C/S	13	29.5%	18	40.9%	9	20.5%	4	9.1%	0	0.0%
Possession w/ Intent	44	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Property Offense	37	84.1%	5	11.4%	2	4.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Forgery (Rx)	44	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Forgery (Utterance)	44	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Possession of Precursors	27	61.4%	10	22.7%	7	15.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Embezzlement	44	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Probation / Parole Violation	30	68.2%	14	31.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
DUI / DWI	35	79.5%	9	20.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Other Crime	39	88.6%	4	9.1%	1	2.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

Table 5.11 illustrates criminal histories among Greene County participants. Five participants (29.4%) were convicted of possession of a controlled substance (Possession C/S), and one participant (5.9%) had Possession C/S as a nonadjudicated offense as well as at least one prior conviction of the same. Four participants (23.5%) were convicted of a property offense, and one participant (5.9%) had a property offense as a nonadjudicated offense. Two Greene County participants (11.8%) were convicted of uttering forgery (Forgery-Utterance). Six participants (35.3%) were convicted of possession of precursors, and one participant had possession of precursors as a nonadjudicated offense in addition to at least one prior conviction of the same. Probation or parole violation was the dominate offense among Greene County participants, with ten convicted participants (58.8%). Three participants (17.6%) had been convicted of DUI or DWI. Only one participant (5.9%) was convicted of other crimes.

	No Conviction		Convicted		Drug Court Charge		D.C. & Prior		Unknown (Missing)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Possession C/S	11	64.7%	5	29.4%	0	0.0%	1	5.9%	0	0.0%
Possession w/ Intent	17	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Property Offense	12	70.6%	4	23.5%	1	5.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Forgery (Rx)	17	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Forgery (Utterance)	15	88.2%	2	11.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Possession of Precursors	10	58.8%	6	35.3%	0	0.0%	1	5.9%	0	0.0%
Embezzlement	17	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Probation / Parole Violation	6	35.3%	10	58.8%	1	5.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
DUI / DWI	14	82.4%	3	17.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Other Crime	16	94.1%	1	5.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%



Table 5.12 illustrates criminal histories of Jackson County participants. Possession of a controlled substance (Possession C/S) was the dominant offense among Jackson County participants: 30.5% of participants were convicted, 20.6% had Possession C/S as a nonadjudicated offense, and 9.2% had Possession C/S as a nonadjudicated offense as well as at least one prior conviction of the same. Three participants (2.3%) had been convicted of possession with intent to distribute or sell. Twenty-six percent of Jackson County participants had been convicted of a property offense, 3.1% had a property offense as a nonadjudicated offense, and 4.6% had a property offense as a nonadjudicated offense as well as having at least one prior conviction for the same. Four Jackson County participants (3.1%) were convicted of prescription forgery and an additional 3.1% of participants had Forgery as a nonadjudicated offense. Ten participants (7.6%) were convicted of uttering forgery, and one participant (.8%) had the same as a nonadjudicated offense. Nineteen participants (14.5%) in Jackson County had been convicted of possession of precursors, 9.9% had the same as a nonadjudicated offense, and 1.5% had possession of precursors as a nonadjudicated offense as well as at least one prior conviction of the same. Three participants (2.3%) were convicted of embezzlement, and one participant had the same as a non-adjudicated offense. Thirteen percent of Jackson County participants had been convicted of DUI or DWI. One participant had DUI or DWI as a nonadjudicated offense. Other crimes were reported as: 20.6% of participants convicted and 1.5% of participants having the same as a nonadjudicated offense.

	No Conviction		Convicted		Drug Court Charge		D.C. & Prior		Unknown (Missing)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Possession C/S	52	39.7%	40	30.5%	27	20.6%	12	9.2%	0	0.0%
Possession w/ Intent	127	96.9%	3	2.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.8%
Property Offense	86	65.6%	34	26.0%	4	3.1%	6	4.6%	1	0.8%
Forgery (Rx)	122	93.1%	4	3.1%	4	3.1%	0	0.0%	1	0.8%
Forgery (Utterance)	119	90.8%	10	7.6%	1	0.8%	0	0.0%	1	0.8%
Possession of Precursors	96	73.3%	19	14.5%	13	9.9%	2	1.5%	1	0.8%
Embezzlement	126	96.2%	3	2.3%	1	0.8%	0	0.0%	1	0.8%
Probation / Parole Violation	97	74.0%	31	23.7%	2	1.5%	0	0.0%	1	0.8%
DUI / DWI	112	85.5%	17	13.0%	1	0.8%	0	0.0%	1	0.8%
Other Crime	101	77.1%	27	20.6%	2	1.5%	0	0.0%	1	0.8%

## Juvenile Drug Courts

---

Following the establishment of adult drug courts in 1989, jurisdictions began to establish juvenile versions of these specialized programs in 1995. The first juvenile and family drug courts were developed in Birmingham, Ala. Juvenile drug courts have the same basic philosophy, goals and structures as their adult counterparts; however, they also have many unique challenges that influence and challenge their operation. Juvenile drug courts are based around the ideals of rehabilitation and a team-oriented philosophy. In addition, these specialized dockets maintain the *parens patriae* orientation of the juvenile court, and the drug court team is expanded to include juvenile probation officers and school officials.

A juvenile drug court is a special program within a juvenile court to which substance-abusing juveniles are referred. A family drug court is a special docket for cases in which the parental rights of adult parties have been placed in jeopardy because of their substance abuse. Family drug court cases may be either criminal or civil in origin. They may include custody, visitation disputes, abuse, neglect, dependency proceedings, petitions to terminate parental rights and guardianship matters. In either type of court, the judge, through frequent status hearings and active collaboration with a drug court team of prosecuting and defense attorneys social services workers, and treatment providers, uses the court's oversight authority to induce the defendant to commit to a course of treatment and rehabilitation.

Currently, there are five juvenile drug courts in operation in the state of Mississippi. Juvenile drug courts are different than adult drug courts in that all cases are adjudicated. Clients enter these courts as a condition of their probation and often remain under the supervision of the Department of Youth Services after their eighteenth birthday. Juvenile records are confidential, and not considered "criminal records"; therefore juvenile clients have the option to expunging their records or of entering a program via pre-trial diversion.

## Overview (Juvenile Drug Courts)

---

This section provides aggregate data for the juvenile court participants. It was necessary to ascertain the composition of the sample in its entirety prior to analyzing each program. The analysis is of the two juvenile drug court programs in Adams and Madison Counties ( $n = 86$ ). Similar tables, figures and explanations are provided by county in later sections of this study.

Mississippi has an approximate population of 2,900,000, 61.2% of which are Caucasian, 36.9% are African American, 0.4% are American Indian and Alaska Native, 0.7% are Asian, 0.6% are persons reporting two or more races, and 1.7% are Hispanic or Latino. Of the approximate population, 51.4% are female and 48.6% are male.


The juvenile drug court participants ( $n = 86$ ) ranged in age from 14 to 19 ( $M = 16.54$ ,  $std. dev. = 1.304$ ). Of the 86 juvenile drug court participants 48 were Caucasian (55.8%), 37 were African-American (43%), and 1 Hispanic (.1.2%). However, due to the lack of diversity in the population for this study, race was dichotomized into Caucasian (55.8%) and Minority (44.2%). Gender was reported as 75 males (87.2%) and 11 females (12.8%).

Of the total juvenile drug court population ( $n = 86$ ), 94.2% were Protestant ( $n = 81$ ) and 5 did not report religious affiliation (5.8%). None of the 86 juvenile drug court participants reported having children. Physical disability was coded 73 having no physical disability (84.9%), 12 with present disability (14%), and 1 past disability (1.2%). Mental disability was coded 62 never treated (72.1%), 10 past treatment (11.6%), and 13 present treatment (15.1%).

Table 6.1 illustrates demographic and client status data for both juvenile drug courts. For this sample (n = 82), juvenile participants were fairly representative of the total approximated population for the state of Mississippi with regards to race (client status data were missing for four juvenile participants). Caucasians were under-represented by 2.7%. Like their adult counterparts, juvenile drug court participants' gender is not representative of the total approximated population in Mississippi (48.6% male), in that males were over represented in the juvenile drug courts (76.5% male). Caucasian males comprised the largest category of juvenile drug court participants (36.3%, n=38). Minority males composed the second largest group (40.2%, n=33). Caucasian females represented 12.2% (n=10) of juvenile drug court participants. There was only one minority female (1.2%) participating in a juvenile drug court. Active participants comprised the largest client status group (n=58) among juvenile drug court participants. Graduates (n=13) were the second largest group, outnumbering both absconded participants (n=4) and terminated participants (n=7).

	Active		Graduate		Absconded		Terminated		Totals	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
<b>Caucasian</b>	34	58.6%	6	46.2%	4	100%	4	57.1%	48	58.5%
Female	6	10.3%	1	7.7%	2	50%	1	14.3%	10	12.2%
Male	28	48.3%	5	38.5%	2	50%	3	42.9%	38	36.3%
<b>Minority</b>	24	41.4%	7	53.8%	0	0%	3	42.9%	34	41.5%
Female	1	1.7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1.2%
Male	23	39.7%	7	53.8%	0	0%	3	42.9%	33	40.2%
<b>Totals</b>	58	100%	13	100%	4	100%	7	100%	82	100%

Figure 6.1 illustrates education data for juvenile drug court participants. Nearly three-fourths (74%) of juvenile participants had not graduated high school (15% had an 8th grade education or below and 59% had some high school). Three percent had graduated high school. Ten percent of juvenile participants had obtained a G.E.D. Seven percent had some college education (likely made possible by dual enrollment programs). There were unavailable or missing education data for 6% of juvenile participants.



It was unnecessary to compute aggregate employment data regarding juveniles, in that there were excessive amounts of missing employment information. Individual employment data for each county is presented later in this report.

Table 6.2 provides substance abuse data among client status categories in juvenile drug courts. Alcohol use was frequently reported among all client status groups, with 58.6% of active participants, 75.9% of graduates, 50% of absconded participants and 85.7% of terminated participants reporting alcohol use at intake. Marijuana use was also highly reported in all categories: 82.8% of active participants, 92.3% of graduates, 100% of absconded participants and 46.2% of terminated participants reporting use of the same. Powder or unspecified cocaine use was only reported by active participants (24.1% reporting use at intake). Reported use of crack cocaine was extremely low, with only active participants reporting any use (1.7%). Methamphetamine use was also low, with 8.6% of active participants reporting use at intake. No juvenile participants reported using heroine. Prescription drug use (Rx Drugs) was slightly elevated for active participants (27.6% reporting use) and absconded participants (25% reporting use), while graduates reported lower use of the same (15.4% reporting use at intake). Reported use of other drugs exhibited an identical trend: 27.6% of active participants, 15.4% of graduates and 25% of absconded participants reporting use at intake.

	<b>Active</b> (n=58)	<b>Graduate</b> (n=13)	<b>Absconded</b> (n=4)	<b>Terminated</b> (n=7)
Alcohol	58.6%	76.9%	50%	85.7%
Marijuana	82.8%	92.3%	100%	46.2%
Cocaine - p	24.1%	0%	0%	0%
Cocaine - r	1.7%	0%	0%	0%
Meth	8.6%	0%	0%	0%
Heroine	0%	0%	0%	0%
Rx Drugs	27.6%	15.4%	25%	0%
Other Drugs	27.6%	15.4%	25%	0%

Figure 6.2 illustrates juvenile drug use with regards to race. Alcohol use was reported by more Caucasians (79.2%) than minorities (44.1%). Marijuana use was more equivalent, with 83.3% of Caucasians and 88.2% of minorities reporting use at intake. Crack cocaine use was confined to one minority participant (2.9%). Methamphetamine was only used by Caucasian participants (10.4%). No heroine use was reported. Prescription drug use (Rx Drugs) was mainly reported by Caucasians (33.3%) as compared to minorities (8.8%). Other drug use was reported by 37.5% of Caucasians and 2.9% of minorities.




Table 6.3 provides criminal histories among client status categories for juvenile drug court participants. Possession of a controlled substance (Possession C/S) was a widely reported offense among juveniles, with 36% (n=31) having Possession C/S as a nonadjudicated offense and 5.8% (n=5) having Possession C/S as a nonadjudicated offense as well as at least one prior conviction of the same. Two juveniles (2.3%) had possession with intent to distribute or sell as a nonadjudicated offense. Property offenses were reported as: three juveniles (3.5%) convicted, 12 juveniles (14%) having a property offense as a nonadjudicated offense, and five juveniles (5.8%) having a property offense as a nonadjudicated offense as well as at least one prior conviction of the same. Prescription forgery, Uttering forgery, possession of precursors, and embezzlement were not reported by any juveniles. Two juveniles (2.3%) were convicted of violating probation or parole, one juvenile (1.2%) had a probation or parole violation as a nonadjudicated offense, and one juvenile (1.2%) had a probation or parole violation as a nonadjudicated offense as well as at least one prior conviction of the same. One juvenile (1.2%) was convicted of DUI or DWI. Juveniles reported other crimes as the dominant offense, in that 9.3% were convicted (n=8), 43% had other crime as a nonadjudicated offense (n=37), and 11.6% had other crime as a nonadjudicated offense as a nonadjudicated offense as well as one or more prior convictions of the same. There were extensive amounts of missing criminal history data among juvenile offenders, which likely lessens the accuracy of data reported in Table 6.3.

	No Conviction		Convicted		Drug Court Charge		D.C. & Prior		Unknown (Missing)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
	Possession C/S	6	7.0%	0	0.0%	31	36.0%	5	5.8%	44
Possession w/ Intent	10	11.6%	0	0.0%	2	2.3%	0	0.0%	74	86.0%
Property Offense	8	9.3%	3	3.5%	12	14.0%	5	5.8%	58	67.4%
Forgery (Rx)	10	11.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	76	88.4%
Forgery (Utterance)	10	11.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	76	88.4%
Possession of Precursors	10	11.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	76	88.4%
Embezzlement	10	11.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	76	88.4%
Probation / Parole Violation	8	9.3%	2	2.3%	1	1.2%	1	1.2%	74	86.0%
DUI / DWI	10	11.6%	1	1.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	75	87.2%
Other Crime	2	2.3%	8	9.3%	37	43.0%	10	11.6%	29	33.7%

## Adams County Juvenile Drug Court

---

Adams County has an approximate population of 32,626, 43.5% of which are Caucasian, 55.7% are African American, 0.1% are American Indian and Alaska Native, 0.3% are Asian, 0.4% are persons reporting two or more races, and .9% are Hispanic or Latino. Of the approximate population 53.7% are female and 46.3% are male.

Adams County juvenile drug court participants (n = 42) ranged in age from 14 to 19 (x = 16.34, std. dev. 1.260). Of the 42 Adams County juvenile drug court participants 13 were white/Anglo (31%), and 29 were African American (69%). Gender was coded as 39 males (92.9%) and 3 females (7.1%). Four Adams County participants had unavailable or missing client status data. Additionally, no employment information was available for Adams County participants. It is important to note that 8 of the 42 unemployed participants either were not eligible for work (n = 5) or would have needed a work permit to do so (n = 3) due to child labor laws.

Of the Adams County drug court sample (n = 42), 100% were Protestant. No participants reported being married or ever having been married, and no children were reported. NO Adams County participants reported having had any physical disability, past or present. Mental disability was reported as 33 never treated (78.6%), 3 past treatment (7.1%), and 5 present treatment (11.9%).

With regards to race, Adams County participants (34% Caucasian and 65.8% minority) were not representative of the approximated county population (43.5% Caucasian and 56.5% minority), in that minorities were overrepresented by 9.3% (see Table 7.1). Furthermore, Adams County participants (92.1% male) were not representative of the general county population in respect to gender (46.3% male). Minority males (n = 25) comprised the largest category of drug court participants (63.2%). Caucasian males represented 28.8% of Adams County participants (n=11). Caucasian females comprised 5.3% of participants (n=2) and minority females (2.6%, n=1) represented the smallest group among Adams County participants. Active participants (n=28) represented the largest client status group among Adams County participants. Graduates (n=5) and terminated participants (n=5) were equal in number. There were no absconded participants in the Adams County program.

	Active		Graduate		Absconded		Terminated		Totals	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
<b>Caucasian</b>	9	32.1%	1	20%	0	0%	3	60%	13	34.2%
Female	1	3.6%	0	0%	0	0%	1	20%	2	5.3%
Male	8	28.6%	1	20%	0	0%	2	40%	11	28.9%
<b>Minority</b>	19	67.9%	4	80%	0	0%	2	40%	25	65.8%
Female	1	3.6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	2.6%
Male	18	64.3%	4	80%	0	0%	2	40%	24	63.2%
<b>Totals</b>	28	100%	5	100%	0	0%	5	100%	38	100%

Figure 7.1 illustrates education data for Adams County participants. Nearly three-fourths (72%) of Adams County participants had not graduated high school (14% had an 8th grade education or below and 58% had some high school). Two percent had graduated high school and 19% had obtained a G.E.D. Two percent of Adams County participants reported having some college education, likely through a dual enrollment program. Education data was unavailable or missing for 5% of Adams County participants.




Table 7.2 provides substance abuse history among client status categories for Adams County participants. Alcohol use was widely reported among graduates (100% reporting use at intake) and terminated clients (80% reporting use at intake), and slightly less reported by active participants (21.4% reporting use at intake). Marijuana use was elevated for all client status categories: 75% of active participants, 100% of graduates, and 80% of terminated participants. Powder or unspecified cocaine use was only reported by active participants (21.4%). Additionally, crack cocaine use was only reported by active participants (3.6%). Prescription drugs (Rx Drugs) were also only reported by active participants (7.1%). No participants in Adams County reported using methamphetamine, heroine, or other drugs.

	<b>Client Status and Substance Abuse History (Adams County)</b>			
	<b>Active</b> (n=28)	<b>Graduate</b> (n=5)	<b>Absconded</b> (n=0)	<b>Terminated</b> (n=5)
Alcohol	21.4%	100%	0%	80%
Marijuana	75%	100%	0%	80%
Cocaine - p	21.4%	0%	0%	0%
Cocaine - r	3.6%	0%	0%	0%
Meth	0%	0%	0%	0%
Heroine	0%	0%	0%	0%
Rx Drugs	7.1%	0%	0%	0%
Other Drugs	0%	0%	0%	0%



Figure 7.2 illustrates substance abuse history among Adams County participants with regards to race. Alcohol use was reported by more Caucasians (53.9%) than minorities (36.0%), Marijuana use was high among both Caucasians (82.9%) and minorities (88.9%). Powder or unspecified cocaine use was reported by 7.7% of Caucasians and 20% of minorities. Crack cocaine use was limited to minorities (4%). Prescription drug use was low for both Caucasians (7.7%) and minorities (4%). No heroine methamphetamine, heroine or other drug use was reported by Adams County participants.




Table 7.3 provides criminal history data among for Adams County participants. Seventeen participants (40.5%) had possession of a controlled substance (Possession C/S) as a nonadjudicated offense. One participant (2.4%) had possession with intent to distribute or sell as a nonadjudicated offense. Eleven Adams County participants (26.2%) had a property offense as a nonadjudicated offense. Other crime was the dominant offense reported by Adams County participants, with 69% (n=29) of participants reporting having the same as a non-adjudicated offense. There were no reported prior criminal convictions among Adams County participants.

**Table 7.3 Criminal History (Convictions) - Adams County**

	No Conviction		Convicted		Drug Court Charge		D.C. & Prior		Unknown (Missing)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Possession C/S	1	2.4%	0	0.0%	17	40.5%	0	0.0%	24	57.1%
Possession w/ Intent	3	7.1%	0	0.0%	1	2.4%	0	0.0%	38	90.5%
Property Offense	2	4.8%	0	0.0%	11	26.2%	0	0.0%	29	69.0%
Forgery (Rx)	3	7.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	39	92.9%
Forgery (Utterance)	3	7.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	39	92.9%
Possession of Precursors	3	7.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	39	92.9%
Embezzlement	3	7.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	39	92.9%
Probation / Parole Violation	3	7.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	39	92.9%
DUI / DWI	3	7.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	39	92.9%
Other Crime	1	2.4%	0	0.0%	29	69.0%	0	0.0%	12	28.6%



## Madison County Juvenile Drug Court

Madison County has an approximate population of 87,419, 59.8% of which are Caucasian, 38% are African-American, 0.1% are American Indian and Alaska Native, 1.6% are Asian, 0.5% are persons reporting two or more races, and 1.3% are Hispanic or Latino. Of the approximate population 52.3% are female and 47.7% are male.

Madison County juvenile drug court participants (n = 44) ranged in age from 14 to 19 (x = 16.73, std. dev. 1.339). Of the 44 Madison County juvenile drug court participants there were 35 white/Anglo (79.5%), 8 African-American (18.2%), and 1 Hispanic (2.3%). Gender was coded as 36 males (81.8%) and 8 females (18.2%). Due to the lack of diversity in the population and manageability race was dichotomized. The new dichotomized variables are Caucasian (n = 35) and Minority (n = 9).

Of the total juvenile drug court population (n = 44), 88.6% were Protestant. None of the 44 juvenile drug court participants reported being married or ever having been married, and no children were reported. Physical Disability Status was coded as 31 None (70.5%), 1 Past Disability (2.3%), and 12 Present Disability (27.3). Mental disability was coded 29 never treated (65.9%), 7 past treatment (15.9%), and 8 present treatment (18.2%).

Table 8.1 illustrates general demographic characteristics among client status categories with regard to race and gender. Madison County participants (79.5% Caucasian and 20.5 minority) did not represent the total approximated population for Madison County (59.8% Caucasian and 40.2% minority) with regards to race. Caucasians (n = 35) were over-represented by 19.7%. Furthermore, Madison County juvenile drug court participants (81.9% male) were not representative of the total approximated population in Madison County (47.7% male), in that males were overrepresented by 34.2%. Caucasian males (61.4% n = 27) comprised the largest category of drug court participants. Minority males represented 20.5% (n=9) of Madison County participants. Caucasian females comprised 18.2% (n=8) of participants, and there were no minority females participating in the Madison County program. Active participants (n=30) represented the largest client status group in Madison County. Graduates (n=8) outnumbered both absconded participants (n=4) and terminated participants (n=2).

	Active		Graduate		Absconded		Terminated		Totals	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
<b>Caucasian</b>	25	83.3%	5	62.5%	4	100%	1	50%	35	79.5%
Female	5	16.7%	1	12.5%	2	50%	0	0%	8	18.2%
Male	20	66.7%	4	50%	2	50%	1	50%	27	61.4%
<b>Minority</b>	5	16.7%	3	37.5%	0	0%	1	50%	9	20.5%
Female	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Male	5	16.7%	3	37.5%	0	0%	1	50%	9	20.5%
<b>Totals</b>	30	100%	8	100%	4	100%	2	100%	44	100%

Figure 8.1 illustrates education data for Madison County participants. Three-fourths (75%) of Madison County participants had not graduated high school (16% had an 8th grade education or below and 59% had some high school). Five percent of participants had graduated high school, and 2% had obtained a G.E.D. Eleven percent of Madison County participants had some college education (likely through dual enrollment programs). Seven percent of Madison County participants had unavailable or missing education data.




Table 8.2 provides collapsed employment data for Madison County participants. Employment data regarding juvenile clients were limited; however, for Madison County employment was reported as unemployed (61.4%, n=27), food service (9.1%, n=4), sales (4.5%, n=2), student (13.6%, n=6), and other (6.8%, n=3). Two Madison County participants (4.5%) had unavailable or missing employment data. It is important to note that nine of the twenty-seven unemployed participants either were not eligible for work (n = 3) or would have needed a work permit to do so (n = 6) due to child labor laws. As seen in Table 8.2, Madison County participants were likely to be unemployed regardless of client status.

	Active		Graduate		Absconded		Terminated		Totals	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Unemployed	16	38.1%	6	14.3%	3	7.1%	2	4.8%	27	64.3%
Employed	13	31%	2	4.8%	0	0%	0	0%	15	35.7%

Table 8.3 illustrates substance abuse history among client status categories for Madison County participants. Alcohol use was prevalent in all client status categories, with 93.3% of active participants, 62.5% of graduates, 50% of absconded participants, and 100% of terminated participants reporting use at intake. Marijuana use was reported by 90% of active participants, 87.5% of graduates, 100% of absconded participants, and 100% of terminated participants. Powder or unspecified cocaine use was only reported by active participants (26.7%). No Madison County participants reported using crack cocaine at intake. Reported methamphetamine use was limited to active participants (16.7%). No heroine use was reported among Madison County participants. Prescription drug use was elevated among active participants (46.7%), but slightly lower for graduates (25%) and absconded participants (25%). Other drug use was reported by 53.3% of active participants, 25% of graduates and 25% of absconded participants.

	<b>Active</b> (n=30)	<b>Graduate</b> (n=8)	<b>Absconded</b> (n=4)	<b>Terminated</b> (n=2)
Alcohol	93.3%	62.5%	50%	100%
Marijuana	90%	87.5%	100%	100%
Cocaine - p	26.7%	0%	0%	0%
Cocaine - r	0%	0%	0%	0%
Meth	16.7%	0%	0%	0%
Heroine	0%	0%	0%	0%
Rx Drugs	46.7%	25%	25%	0%
Other Drugs	53.3%	25%	25%	0%

Figure 8.2 illustrates substance abuse history with regards to race for Madison County participants. Alcohol use was reported by 88.6% of Caucasians and 66.7% of minorities. Marijuana use was nearly equivalent among Caucasians (82.9%) and minorities (88.9%). The use of powder or unspecified cocaine was limited to Caucasians (22.9%). No crack cocaine use was reported by Madison County participants. Methamphetamine use was also limited to Caucasians (14.3%). No heroine use was reported. Prescription drug use was more prevalent among Caucasians (42.9%) than minorities (22.2%). Other drug use was reported by 51.4% of Caucasians and 11.1% of minorities.




Table 8.4 provides criminal history data for Madison County participants. It should be noted that this table illustrates statistics based on convictions or drug court charges, not simply arrests. Possession of a controlled substance (Possession C/S) was the dominant offense among Madison County participants. Fourteen participants (31.8%) had Possession C/S as a nonadjudicated offense and five participants (11.4%) had Possession C/S as a nonadjudicated offense as well as at least one prior conviction of the same. One participant (2.3%) had possession with intent to distribute or sell as a nonadjudicated offense. Three participants (6.8%) were convicted of property offenses, one participant (2.3%) had a property offense as a nonadjudicated offense, and five participants (11.4%) had a property offense as a nonadjudicated offense as well as having at least one prior conviction of the same. Prescription forgery (Forgery-Rx), uttering forgery (Forgery-Utterance), possession of precursors, and embezzlement were not reported as committed offenses by Madison County participants. Two participants (4.5%) were convicted of probation or parole violation, one participant (2.3%) had a probation or parole violation as a nonadjudicated offense, and one participant (2.3%) had a probation / parole violation as a nonadjudicated offense as well as at least one prior conviction of the same. One participant (2.3%) in Madison County was convicted of DUI or DWI. Other crimes were reported as: 18.2% convicted (n=8), 18.2% as a nonadjudicated offense (n=8), and 22.7% as a nonadjudicated offense as well as at least one prior conviction of the same (n=10). There was a great deal of unavailable or missing data regarding Madison County participants' criminal history, and as such the figures in Table 8.4 may not fairly represent participants' actual criminal behavior.

	No Conviction		Convicted		Drug Court Charge		D.C. & Prior		Unknown (Missing)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
	Possession C/S	5	11.4%	0	0.0%	14	31.8%	5	11.4%	20
Possession w/ Intent	7	15.9%	0	0.0%	1	2.3%	0	0.0%	36	81.8%
Property Offense	6	13.6%	3	6.8%	1	2.3%	5	11.4%	29	65.9%
Forgery (Rx)	7	15.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	37	84.1%
Forgery (Utterance)	7	15.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	37	84.1%
Possession of Precursors	7	15.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	37	84.1%
Embezzlement	7	15.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	37	84.1%
Probation / Parole Violation	5	11.4%	2	4.5%	1	2.3%	1	2.3%	35	79.5%
DUI / DWI	7	15.9%	1	2.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	36	81.8%
Other Crime	1	2.3%	8	18.2%	8	18.2%	10	22.7%	17	38.6%

## Perspectives

---

Drug court staff members were asked to complete individual surveys ascertaining their opinions on drug courts as well as demographic information. Surveys were administered to each drug court judge, administrator, and probation officer. The staff members were asked to complete the surveys and return them by mail. The surveys were used as a qualitative evaluation instrument and do not necessarily reflect individual program performance. Responses are presented below.

## Drug Court Judges

---

Seven drug court judges were surveyed in this study. Four returned usable questionnaires for an overall response rate of 57%. The judges ranged in age from 52 to 64 (M=57). The respondents were all Caucasian males. The average length of service as a drug court judge was two to three years. Half of the drug court judges reported attending six to ten drug court training programs or conferences.

**Judges were asked how drug court programs impacted the judicial system, and reported the following:**

- reduction of jail/prison overcrowding
- reduction of recidivism
- ensures that drug offenders received treatment
- combats crime in general
- offers correctional alternatives for drug offenders
- reduces the costs associated with processing and incarcerating drug offenders

**Additionally, the respondents reported the most positive aspects of drug court as:**

- a second chance for juvenile offenders
- restoration of family structure
- positive impact on the community as a whole
- drug courts save lives

**The judges reported negative aspects of drug courts as:**

- participants trying to “work” the system
- long delays from arrest to participation due to staff shortages in the public defenders’ and district attorneys’ offices
- drug courts are time consuming

## **Drug Court Administrators and Coordinators**

---

Six drug court administrators were surveyed in this study, and all returned useable questionnaires for an overall response rate of 100%. The respondents ranged in age from 35 to 52 (M=43). All of the respondents were female; five were Caucasian (83.3%), and one was African-American (16.7%). Education varied among the respondents: one had some college (16.7%); two had bachelor degrees (33.3%); and three had graduate degrees (50%).

### **The administrators reported positive aspects of drug courts as:**

- opportunity for recovery
- opportunity to become productive members of society
- restoration of family units
- development of life skills
- provision of services for juveniles and their families who would otherwise not be able to afford them
- increases self-esteem
- educates the community about drug use and abuse

### **Respondents reported negative aspects of drug courts as:**

- lack of detention centers
- delays in consequences for behavior
- positive drug tests
- lack of adequate gender specific treatment facilities (total female beds for juveniles in the state of Mississippi is less than 15)
- waiting lists for residential drug treatment centers
- not having a treatment center designed specifically for drug court offenders (for long term treatment)
- client termination

## **Drug Court Probation Officers**

---

Eight drug court probation officers were surveyed in this study. All returned useable questionnaires for an overall response rate of 100%. Respondents ranged in age from 32-53 (M=43). Of the eight officers, two were female (25%), and six were male (75%); five were Caucasian (62.5%) and three were African-American (37.5%).

Four officers had one year of service as a probation officer (50%); two had two to three years of service (25%); one had six to ten years of services (12.5%); and one had more than 10 years of service (12.5%). Five officers reported having some college (62.5%); two reported having a bachelor's degree (25%); and one reported having a graduate degree (12.5%).

### **Officers reported positive aspects of drug court as:**

- the relationship between child, parents, and drug court personnel
- saving the participant's life
- giving participants back their families
- helping participants create a more rewarding life style
- low recidivism
- reduction in child neglect

### **Negative aspects of drug court were reported as:**

- failures
- not having the resources to provide needed services
- uneducated law enforcement community
- high client-to-drug court staff ratio
- lack of financial support
- out-of-date drug testing equipment
- warrants
- inconsistent sanctions
- politics

# Conclusions

---

- **Initial Collection of Information**

Although most drug court programs strive to collect as much information as possible, it was generally found that client data (both intake and tenure) were inconsistent. Each drug court program had an individual intake form specific to that program and each form collected various personal characteristics and history from each client-candidate. Some courts allowed the candidates to fill out the intake forms, while others utilized case managers or administrators to complete intake forms. Typically, intake forms were modeled after the 14th Circuit's initial intake form. The specific needs and characteristics of each drug court program facilitated various changes in intake forms, policies and procedures.

- **Program Structure**

Drug courts are unique, in that organizational structure is determined by the drug court judge and program administrator or coordinator. Job descriptions and titles differ among each program; client entry and staff qualification requirements vary. Interestingly, some drug courts hire their own graduates to act as quasi-case managers.

Program requirements are similar, but vary in distinct ways: one program only required the *pursuit* of a high school diploma or GED—not attainment; some programs allowed clients to enter with a charge of *possession with intent to sell*; one program allowed a client to enter even though they were previously convicted of domestic violence.

Obviously, these differences manifest themselves due to variations in client demographics, program location and specific community needs; they should not necessarily be viewed as negative. These differences illustrate the inevitability of evolution in developing court programs.

- **Data Management**

Collecting the data proved to be the most difficult task in this project. Each program had unique methods of creation, organization and maintenance of client files. Only two programs organized their files by county and phase. Most programs were consistent in inter-program file composition, but older programs had large portions of missing client information due to staff turnover, limited storage space and limited data management capabilities. Notably, these inconsistencies did not appear to affect program operations.

Program administrators were extremely knowledgeable concerning their clients, staff and daily operations. They kept an enormous amount of information committed to memory, though not by choice. Every administrator was acutely aware of their limitations in data management and expressed a strong desire for creation of a central drug court data management system that would eventually facilitate a paperless drug court program.

- **Treatment Options**

Treatment regimens were also varied among programs. Most programs required at least 30 days in an inpatient treatment facility before entering drug court. Some programs allowed intensive outpatient treatment for clients who were not able to complete an inpatient treatment program (due to employment obligations, child care or financial hardship). Treatment while in the program consisted of Alcoholics Anonymous or Narcotics Anonymous meetings. Aftercare programs were also utilized by many clients.



One administrator suggested that a centralized drug court treatment facility be created to serve the needs of Mississippi drug court clients. Other administrators thought this was impossible due to logistics. Clients typically pay for and choose the location of the treatment center. Indigent clients receive treatment through funds acquired in many different ways. One program funds treatment through the board of supervisors; some programs pay for client treatment outright; other programs “lend” clients the money to pay for treatment or partially fund their treatment. Treatment is tantamount to client success. Research has shown that retention, or time in treatment (both initial and ongoing), is a significant factor in ensuring program completion.

## Recommendations

---

- **Increase public and system awareness about drug court programs.**

It is absolutely essential that the general public be made aware of these programs. It is also essential for law enforcement, corrections and court personnel to understand the goals of drug court programs. Increased awareness of drug courts would likely facilitate increased enrollment and public support, both of which are vital to the stability of drug court programs.

- **Increase drug court personnel.**

The increase of personnel would certainly benefit the clients as well as the general public, by increasing the number of clients a program can sufficiently supervise, therefore increasing program revenue and reducing the population of nonviolent drug offenders in jail and prison.

- **Secure additional resources from state and local governments.**

Additional revenue would allow for increased treatment options for clients, staff expansion, and increased client supervision. Increasing resources could also facilitate program growth or expansion.

- **Increase uniformity among program operations.**

Uniformity in program operations would allow clients to transfer drug court programs without repeating program requirements. It could also lead to uniform training among drug court personnel (on a state level) as well as intra-program personnel exchanges. Increased uniformity would also allow for the creation of an oversight entity that could monitor the progress of each program.

- **Implement a statewide MIS system to facilitate data management.**

Data management is vital to any organization. The evidence supporting a central data management system is overwhelming, and program administrators are eager to implement such a system upon availability and state approval. Uniform data management would also benefit future process evaluations and research, providing investigators with a way to compare Mississippi drug court programs with each other, nationally, and internationally.

## **Mississippi Drug Courts**

**Mississippi Statistical Analysis Center**  
*Department of Administration of Justice*  
*The University of Southern Mississippi*

<http://www.usm.edu/mssac>

**Office: (601)266-4760**

**Fax: (601)266-4391**

**MS-SAC**  
**118 College Drive #5127**  
**Hattiesburg, MS 39406**

---