



# Judicial Council of Georgia Administrative Office of the Courts

Chief Justice Hugh P. Thompson  
*Chair*

Marla S. Moore  
*Director*

## Georgia Accountability Courts Program Data Report: October – December 2013 April 2014

### Introduction

As a result of 2012 criminal justice reform legislation and Judicial Council policy directives, Georgia accountability courts funded in part by state grants must submit detailed, quantitative program data to support a longitudinal study of the relationship between treatment programs and criminality. Quarterly data reports will serve as interim snapshots of program activity and lay the foundation for measuring court performance and analyzing reform initiatives over time. The importance of accurate, reliable, and valid data cannot be overstated if policy makers are to draw realistic conclusions from the long term study.

### Programs Analysis

All Accountability Courts	Q1	Percentage	Q2	Percentage	% Change Q1-Q2
Courts reporting <sup>1</sup>	75	75.8%	79	78.2%	5.3%
Participants <sup>2</sup>	3,786	-	3,872	-	2.3%
Reviewed <sup>3</sup>	1,920	63.4%	1,708	52.8%	-11.0%
Accepted <sup>4</sup>	761	39.6%	640	37.5%	-15.9%

Sixteen courts that submitted reports for quarter one (Q1) did not submit reports for quarter two (Q2). Conversely, eleven courts that did not submit a report for Q1 did submit for Q2. The number of offenders reviewed for entry into a program showed an overall decrease from sixty-three percent of the existing population to fifty-two percent. The sharpest decrease from Q1 to Q2 was a sixteen percent drop in the number of offenders accepted into a program, which can at least partially be attributed to the lower number of offenders reviewed for program entry.

<sup>1</sup> Total number of accountability courts increased from 99 to 101 in Q2.

<sup>2</sup> Includes new and existing participants.

<sup>3</sup> Newly accepted participants were removed from percentage calculations.

<sup>4</sup> Offenders reviewed that accepted entry into a program.

	<b>Q1</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Q2</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>% Change Q1-Q2</b>
Accepted	761	39.6%	640	37.5%	-15.9%
High Risk	439	57.7%	275	43.0%	-37.4%
Moderate Risk	194	25.5%	169	26.4%	-12.9%
Rejected	873	45.5%	805	47.1%	-7.8%
Prior history	223	25.5%	313	38.9%	40.4%
Other	650	74.5%	492	61.1%	-24.3%
Declined	286	14.9%	215	12.6%	-24.8%

### *Acceptance/Rejection Analysis*

A decreased acceptance rate suggests an increased rate of rejection, which is reflected in the data. Rejection frequencies increased two percentage points from Q1 to Q2, with more participants being rejected due to prior criminal history in the latter. The proportion of offenders that declined to enroll in an accountability court program decreased by two percentage points, indicating increased interest among those offenders that are offered entry into a program.

The number of high risk participants accepted in Q2 is markedly lower than Q1. Nearly fifty-eight percent of participants accepted in Q1 were labeled high risk. That figure fell to thirty-eight percent for Q2. While the number of moderate risk participants increased slightly, the increase was not enough to account for the decrease in high risk participants. Either a substantial enrollment increase in low risk offenders occurred or there was a reduction in the number of courts that track offender risk reporting during the second quarter.

	<b>Q1</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Q2</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>% Change Q1-Q2</b>
Exited	572	-	491	13.0%	-14.2%
Graduates	358	62.6%	296	60.3%	-17.3%
Released	214	37.4%	195	39.7%	-8.8%
Non-compliance	183	85.5%	154	79.0%	-15.9%
Discharged	23	10.7%	26	13.3%	13.0%
Dismissed	8	3.7%	15	7.7%	87.5%
Abusers	2,963	78.3%	3,106	80.2%	4.8%
Users	660	17.4%	574	14.8%	-13.0%

### *Participants Exiting Programs*

Thirteen percent of the Q1 population exited accountability court programs during the second quarter, sixty percent as graduates. Of the remaining participants exiting, more than three-fourths were terminated due to non-compliance. The rates of substance abusers and substance users remained fairly static across quarters with subtle differences likely explained by variation in types of accountability courts (Drug, Mental Health, Veterans, etc.) reporting.