
Joe Vigil (he/him)
Treatment Court Analyst
Office of the State Court Administrator (OSCA)

Danielle Hanson (she/her)
Treatment Court Analyst
Office of the State Court Administrator (OSCA)

Oregon Judicial Department Treatment Court Programs: Overview of Current Practices in Sample Program

HB 4001 Specialty Court Taskforce
July 26, 2024



PRESENTATION OVERVIEW

Goal

- Provide limited, high-level snapshot of program operations to show examples of variation across programs and understand local factors that influence operations

Areas of Focus

- Funding
- Eligibility Criteria
- Monitoring Success

Process

- Survey sent to TCA, Judge, Coordinator
- Information compiled by Statewide OSCA Treatment Court Team
- Limited snapshot

LOCAL COURT EXAMPLES

Urban – Adult Drug Court, Mental Health Court, Veterans Treatment Court, and Juvenile Drug Treatment Court

Rural – Family Treatment Court

Frontier – Mental Health Court

ALL PROGRAMS DO THEIR BEST TO CREATIVELY MEET COMMUNITY NEEDS AND TO ALIGN WITH BEST PRACTICES

Funding	Eligibility	Monitoring
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Sustainable funding depends on system partners and local collaboration ➤ CJC grants are a critical stable funding source ➤ Challenges to applying for and managing grant funds in all communities ➤ Creative local partnerships are needed to enhance funding options ➤ Insurance pays for treatment services in all programs, when possible 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Guided by research ➤ Differs by court type and community size ➤ Stakeholder values ➤ Local resources and availability ➤ Federal funding limitations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Participant exit surveys ➤ Local and statewide review of program data ➤ Consistent review for data quality and compliance with best practice standards ➤ Formal program reviews more common in certain treatment court types and funding availability

URBAN COUNTY TREATMENT COURTS – FUNDING MODEL EXAMPLE

Funding Source	Funding Supports	General Factors Influencing Funding Model
State and County General Funds	Treatment court team personnel contributions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Restriction on serving violent offenders with federal funding ➤ Limited funding for incentives ➤ Relationships are leveraged to fill gaps when funding streams are changed ➤ Resources to apply for grants and bandwidth from partners to administer and monitor funds ➤ Relationships with key partners ➤ Limited team staff resources prevent expanded capacity
CJC Specialty Court Grant Program (ADC,VTC, MHC, JDTC)	SUD/MH Treatment uninsured slots; drug testing, training; PO; DA; recovery housing and peer support.	
Federal Grants - Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) Grant (JDTC) - Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) grant (ADC)	SUD/MH Treatment, incentives; training and program evaluation (JDTC) Enhancement supports for early engagement and county wide resources (ADC)	
DOC Measure 57 (ADC,VTC and MHC)	PO; Sheriff’s Office sanctions; rental assistance and treatment provider court liaison	
Private donations	Participant supports and gap funding for services not covered by State or Federal grants	
Foundation grants		
Health Insurance	Billable treatment services	

URBAN COUNTY TREATMENT COURTS – ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

Eligibility Considerations	Additional Considerations
Research	➤ Utilization of validated screening tool (ADC)
Resource Availability	➤ Expansive referral sources – No wrong door ➤ Minimal exclusionary criteria

URBAN COUNTY TREATMENT COURTS – MONITORING SUCCESS

Local Monitoring Strategies	Formal Reviews	Additional Considerations
Participant exit surveys	Independent evaluations (ADC,VTC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Statewide peer review pilot project (JDTC) ➤ Independent evaluation tied to OJJDP grant (JDTC) ➤ Ongoing state level technical assistance provided
Team member surveys	Grant related program assessment	
Regular review of program data	Peer review (JDTC)	
Sharing of program data with policy team		
Sharing of program data w/community advisory group		

RURAL COUNTY FTC – FUNDING MODEL EXAMPLE

Funding Source	Funding Supports	General Factors Influencing Funding Model
State and County General Funds	Treatment court team personnel contributions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Resources to apply for grants and bandwidth from partners to administer and monitor funds. ➤ New to grant funding within last four years ➤ Treatment and team partnerships lead to system support ➤ Statewide OJJDP funds provide additional program support ➤ Non-profit funds support graduations and alumni groups
CJC Specialty Court Grant Program	Peer mentor, urine analysis testing, housing, transportation, and training	
Federal Grant - Statewide OJJDP Grant	Participant supports	
Non-Profit Funds	Incentives and grant unallowable costs	
Health insurance	Billable treatment services	

RURAL COUNTY FTC – ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

Eligibility considerations	Additional Considerations
Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ Family Treatment Court Best Practice Standards specific to child welfare involvement and substance use➤ ODHS early referral and timeline for case closure policy
Resource Availability	
Local Dynamics	

RURAL COUNTY FTC – MONITORING SUCCESS

Local Monitoring Strategies	Formal Reviews	Additional Considerations
Participant exit surveys	Peer review	<ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ Peer Review from statewide OJJDP grant (FTC)➤ Ongoing state level technical assistance provided
Regular review of program data	Grant related program assessment	
Shares program data with team at policy meetings		

FRONTIER COUNTY MHC – FUNDING MODEL EXAMPLE

Funding Source	Funding Supports	General Factors Influencing Funding Model
State and county general funds	Treatment court team personnel contributions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Resources to apply for grants and bandwidth from partners to administer and monitor funds ➤ New program within last four years ➤ First time grant recipient
CJC Specialty Court Implementation Grant	Staff time for weekend drug testing, team training, housing, and participant supports	
Private donations	Emergency housing, uninsured medical, assessment fees, incentives, and graduation costs	
Foundation Grants		
Health Insurance	Billable treatment services	

FRONTIER COUNTY MHC – ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

Eligibility Considerations	Additional Considerations
Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ Funding improves eligibility and capacity➤ Additional resources would allow for creation of tracks to better serve distinct populations
Resource availability	
Local dynamics	

FRONTIER COUNTY MHC – MONITORING SUCCESS

Local Monitoring Strategies	Formal Reviews	Additional Considerations
Participant exit surveys	No formal reviews currently	<ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ Ongoing state level technical assistance provided➤ Formal review five years following implementation
Regular review of program data		
Shares program data with team at policy meetings		

SUCCESSFUL PROGRAMS

14

When all the pieces come together, programs can be high functioning and successful!

- Collaboration at local and state levels
- Secure funding sources
- Adherence to Best Practice Standards and Oregon Specialty Court Standards
- Program development takes time as programs grow and research evolves



DANIELLE.C.HANSON@OJD.STATE.OR.US
JOSEPH.J.VIGIL@OJD.STATE.OR.US

THANK YOU

