Project Description:
This project will examine the screening process of the 4th Judicial District Recovery Court Adult Criminal Drug Court track and compare it to the standards set forth by the state of Colorado.

Organizational Context:
A problem-solving court focuses on rehabilitation by holding the offender accountable through more engagement, more access to treatment resources, and an entire team of professionals suited to help the individual succeed. Specifically this research focuses on a recovery court, that assists individuals struggling from severe addiction to substances located in 4th JD in El Paso County, Colorado.

Professional/Scholarly Background:
It is crucial to problem-solving courts to utilize evidence-based practices. This specific court uses different approaches than a traditional court. Marlowe discusses the risk principle which argues that only high-risk high need individuals are appropriate for problem-solving courts. A non-high risk-high need individual participating in this type of program could have unwanted consequences.

Methodology:
Screening data was collected by the agency and provided for this project completely de-identified. The totals for accepted, denied, and refused program were calculated. For the purpose of this project there were two factors that were analyzed one being reason for denial and the other being maximum risk defendants who were accepted and denied. The data was coded numerically and reasons for denial were grouped into 8 categories.

Findings:
• 52% were denied entry into the program
• 29% were accepted
• 17% refused the program
• Major reasons for denial were dealer and charges not being appropriate for the program
• 75% accepted were maximum risk
• Reasons for denial were consistent with the State of Colorado Standards

Takeaways/Recommendations:
• Data proves that the 4th Judicial District Recovery Court is following the key concepts set forth by the State of Colorado
• Data proves the 4th Judicial District Recovery Court complying with evidence-based practices
• Specific screening process allows for resources to go to the appropriate individuals
• Agency should continue to practice their specific screening process
• Having access to more resources and an increased budget for the Court would allow for the opportunity to accept more potential candidates (e.g. Mental Health)
• Expanding the program could have beneficial results for the community but more research should be conducted to answer this

Findings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for Denial</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violent</td>
<td>15.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealer</td>
<td>21.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Drug Conn</td>
<td>13.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charges not app</td>
<td>20.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health</td>
<td>11.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Partip</td>
<td>4.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous DOC</td>
<td>11.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Case</td>
<td>2.10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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