**[Insert Name of PSC Program]**



**Request and Application for Reaccreditation**

**Adult Problem-Solving Courts**

**Application Submission Information**

**Notice of Intent**

* **Date**

**Reviewers Assigned**

* **Date**

**Program Q&A Date**

* **Date**

**Advisory Meeting Target**

* **Date**

**Reaccreditation Applicant**

**Contact Information:**

Email:

[xyz@judicial.state.co.us](mailto:xyz@judicial.state.co.us)

Phone:

(123) 456-7890

Purpose and Eligibility

Programs granted initial accredited status which are currently valid in the year of reaccreditation application, are eligible to request Accreditation Renewal. The purpose of Accreditation Renewal is to ensure that we assess progress toward addressing practices for which waivers were previously granted, identify areas of practice that need improvement, and to continue recognizing Adult Problem-Solving Courts throughout Colorado that are utilizing/continuing to utilize evidence-based practices and showing fidelity to the model. Please list the most recent dates related to the previous “Accreditation Granted” status, for which you are requesting acknowledgment by the Colorado Judicial Brach through the Accreditation Renewal Process.

Date current accreditation status was granted: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Date current accreditation status is set expire: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Attachments in Support of Request for Accreditation Renewal (Adult Problem-Solving Courts)Programs are required to provide vital documents, to include policy and procedural manual, participant handbook, memorandum of understanding and team member roles and responsibilities and any additional documentation listed and available from the table below. Additionally, programs are required to complete a program information chart, a data summary, budget, sustainably plan and program self-assessment as a means of documentation and attestation to standards and whether or not their program meets fundamental and best practice standards. Programs will also be required to address any changes to waivers (new and previous waivers).

Labeling of Materials: Materials submitted in support of a program’s application for Accreditation Renewal must be clearly labeled and have page numbers. References to supporting documentation within the application also must be consistently

designated otherwise the application may be deemed incomplete. Please indicate for all items a brief description of what the item includes and what component of accreditation it supports. All attachments must include a cover page, be clearly labeled, and maintain pagination for ease in reference. If possible, please include tabs or coversheets between the attached documents (**see**  **final page of application for sample attachment cover page**).

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Attach.** | **Title of Attachment** | **Last Revised** | **Page Range** | **Description (optional)** |
| **A** | Policies and Procedures Manual | MM/YYYY | Pages XX - YY |  |
| **B** | Participant Handbook | MM/YYYY | Pages XX - YY |  |
| **C** | Memorandum of Understanding & Team Member Roles and Responsibilities | MM/YYYY | Pages XX - YY |  |
| **D** | List of Team members length of time in role and length time on team, List of Steering Committee Members, List of Advisory Committee Members | MM/YYYY | Pages XX - YY |  |
| **E** | Training requirements/ plan for new and current team members | MM/YYYY | Pages XX - YY |  |
| **F** | List of Service Provider(s), Treatment Provider(s) used including: Contracts/MOU,  list of services, types of treatments modalities, evidence-based curriculums used, and all groups and therapy options provided and any Gender specific, Veterans services, or other services to clients. | MM/YYYY | Pages XX - YY |  |
| **G** | Most recent evaluation (internal or 3rd party) if available and conducted within the past 5 years (e.g., Peer Review or outside evaluation) | MM/YYYY | Pages XX - YY |  |
| **H** | Any Releases of Information, Confidentiality policies, or Advisements. (e.g., ROI, Medical Release, Due Process forms, etc). | MM/YYYY | Pages XX - YY |  |
| **I** | Waivers: current waivers d/or addressing previous waiver(s) status | MM/YYYY | Pages XX - YY |  |

Colorado Problem Solving Courts

*Application Instructions and Request for Reaccreditation Form (Adult Problem-Solving Courts)*

1. Renewal of Accreditation Application Process Overview and Guidelines – Adult Problem-Solving Courts
2. Overview

The PSC Accreditation program is a process of review for determining program fidelity to the problem-solving court model. The primary method for conducting this process will be the review of a program’s application for renewal of accreditation. A final report will be produced by the Advisory Committee with a recommendation to submit to the Chief Justice. In order to initiate the accreditation program review, programs must submit an intent to apply to receive their accreditation deadline. When the deadline has been received, the following application is required to be completed in full along with any supporting materials for the information requested herein. Failure to provide a complete or thorough application may result in the delay of processing an Accreditation Renewal request or that an application is given a recommendation for denial or pending.

Materials submitted in support of a program’s application for Accreditation Renewal must be clearly labeled and have page numbers. References to supporting documentation within the application must be consistently designated otherwise the application may be deemed incomplete and will not be reviewed or given a pending or denied status. The preceding section to this page provides a sample guideline for submitting additional materials. It will not be sufficient to attach documents without providing responses to application questions; if information is provided elsewhere in the application packet or in a supporting attachment, please indicate in the application (at minimum) where the information can be found, the name of the document or attachment, a description of how that reference is relevant to the question asked, and any applicable page numbers as well.

1. Minimum Criteria

To be considered for renewal of accreditation, the applying problem-solving court must meet the following minimum criteria:

(1) Joint Approval of Chief Judge, District Administrator, and Chief Probation Officer.

(2) Initial accredited status granted and currently valid in the year of reaccreditation application

1. Submission Deadlines:

The Advisory Committee shall review applications on a rolling basis. All programs submitting an Intent to Apply by the identified deadline will be notified promptly if they have been invited to submit a full accreditation application. The Advisory Committee or its designee will meet at least twice per year to review applications and monitor the accreditation progress for programs currently under review for accreditation or renewal of accreditation. Timelines may be extended to accommodate staffing issues. The following programs will be prioritized for accreditation:

(1) Programs that have undergone a peer review or an independent review within the last two years and voluntarily provide a copy of the Final Report with the application and request for accreditation; or Programs submitting for renewal of accreditation application.

(2) Programs in fields that have established state minimum standards.

(3) Programs that do not fall under the purview of subsection (1) or (2)

Intent to apply and application submissions will be addressed with the above priority. All accreditation reviews and subsequent follow up are intended to be completed within 6 months following the close of the submission period. Delays in providing supplemental information requested by the Committee may result in an application being moved to the bottom of the review queue or another remedy as identified by the Committee. Incomplete applications may be rejected in full, in which case a program would need to wait until the next application period to apply again.

1. Submission Format:

* All submissions and attachments must be submitted electronically by end of business on the application deadline.
* Provide a single PDF document that includes the application and all attachments or referenced documents.
* All materials must be labeled and include bates-stamped or continuous page numbers throughout the application and its attachments.
* Include a page outlining the attachments in a format that is identical to or mirrors the example provided at the beginning of this application (page 2).
* Any supplemental materials should be organized and presented in a manner that references the component of accreditation that it is intended to support and includes attachment and page number.

The Advisory Committee reserves the right to reject incomplete applications, in which case the program would have to re-apply in the future. The Advisory Committee also has the discretion to request supplemental or follow-up information and clarification as deemed appropriate.

1. Technical Assistance:

Technical assistance is available for programs that would like help in preparing the application or conducting a preliminary review of a specific application section. All requests for technical assistance should be submitted in writing and detail the nature of the assistance or review needed. A request for technical assistance will not favorably or unfavorably impact the review of the program seeking accreditation. Requests for technical assistance should be submitted timely fashion and will not allow a program to delay an application deadline, absent good cause. For more information regarding accreditation, please contact the Problem-Solving Court Team at [coloradoproblemsolvingcourts@judicial.state.co.us](mailto:coloradoproblemsolvingcourts@judicial.state.co.us). Additional technical assistance may be made available to programs who are pending accreditation following review by the Advisory Committee in preparing or compiling supplemental information that may be required or requested in order for a determination regarding an accreditation recommendation to be made.

1. Review Procedure:

After the application and supporting materials have been confirmed as complete, the Accreditation Coordinator shall forward the packet to the Advisory Committee for review. In forwarding the application, the Coordinator shall provide a summary of the application and indication of whether a site visit is needed or recommended based upon the requirements of the accreditation process.

Upon forwarding the application, the Coordinator shall provide notice to the applicant that the application is under review by the Committee and the anticipated timeline for completing the review. A complete application shall initially be assigned to three committee members to serve as a preliminary Review Group for detailed analysis. One of the three shall be designated to preside over the analysis. The Review Group shall consult with the problem-solving court professionals at SCAO and other experts within or available to the Advisory Committee as the Review Group deems appropriate.

Throughout the analysis, the Review Group shall communicate with the applicant to address questions or concerns as they arise. The purpose of the communications shall be to promote explanations, clarifications, corrections, and supplemental submissions to resolve, if possible, questions and concerns prior to the submission of the application to the full Advisory Committee. The applicant shall designate a contact person responsible to engage in these communications. The communications shall be made through the Applicant Coordinator at SCAO or the coordinator’s designee. The applicant shall respond promptly to inquiries or requests from the Review Group. The Review Group shall endeavor to prepare its analysis for submission to the entire Advisory Committee at the Committee’s application review meeting next scheduled not less than three months after the submission of the application to the Review Group. The Review Group shall submit to the Advisory Committee an executive summary of its analysis 14 days prior to the Advisory Committee meeting at which the application will be considered and shall present its analysis at the Advisory Committee’s application review meeting.

Certificate of Review

As members of the problem-solving court management team, we hereby attest that the following information has been reviewed and is correct to the best of our knowledge as well as those operating the program. Please accept the following application, responses, and attachments in request of review for renewal of accreditation of the [ insert name of the problem solving court program requesting review ].

Respectfully submitted this \_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Presiding Judge, Problem-Solving Court Chief Judge for Judicial District

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

District Administrator Chief Probation Officer

Application Completed by: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_(Name, print and signed)\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, ( Title)

Email: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Phone: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Program Information and Overview\*

\* If supplemental materials have been included with this application in support of the below-referenced information, please indicate which attachment is being referred to in the answer as well as the attachment name, relevant pages numbers, and any other additional information in the table below or in the space that follows if extra space is needed. For example, “see Attachment A: Policy and Procedures Manual, Pages 23-26”, or, as follows:

**SAMPLE RESPONSE**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Accreditation Item** | **Narrative/Response** |
| AA. Services provided for non-English speaking participants in the program | Yes, treatment provider has full-time Spanish speaking clinician. Other language accommodations are available as needed.  **Attachment: G**  Location: Treatment Provider Information  Page: 10 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Accreditation Item** | **Narrative/Response** |
| 1. Official Name of Program |  |
| 1. Program Address |  |
| 1. Type of Problem-Solving Court |  |
| 1. Accreditation Status Sought | Reaccreditation |
| 1. Date of Last Accreditation Review |  |
| 1. Type of Review Conducted | Initial Accreditation / Reaccreditation |
| 1. Date of Program Implementation | MM/YYYY |
| 1. Program Capacity |  |
| 1. Program Model (e.g., post-conviction, pre-plea) |  |
| 1. Number of Phases |  |
| 1. Minimum Length of Program |  |
| 1. List all eligible agencies or entities for program referrals |  |
| 1. Do any positions rotate (e.g., Judge, DA, PD)? How frequently? |  |
| 1. How does communication between team members occur? Email? Phone? In-Person |  |
| 1. Are all agencies represented on the Problem-Solving court team that work with the participants? |  |
| 1. Are there other community partners that the program works with frequently? Describe their role with the PSC |  |
| 1. Target Population & Eligibility Criteria | Type in or reference page in documents: |
| 1. Process for Mental Illness screenings | Type in or reference page in documents: |
| 1. Exclusionary Admission Criteria | Type in or reference page in documents: |
| 1. Risk Assessment Used |  |
| 1. Levels of Risk Accepted |  |
| 1. Describe assessment and screening process | Type in or reference page in documents: |
| 1. ADA services and accommodations provided | Type in or reference page in documents: |
| 1. Frequency of staffing meetings, who attends, length, average number of participants discussed |  |
| 1. Who attends court, court length, average number of participants |  |

1. Budget and Data Summary
2. Budget Narrative & Sustainability

Please provide a brief explanation of how the court uses each of the funding sources and if there are any fiscal control, standards for determining how funds are used, or model for allocating resources to participants that have been adopted to ensure proper fiscal stewardship. This can be a brief bullet point or list for each category.

For all funding sources, whether temporary, continual, near-expiring, or perpetual, please provide a brief overview of the program’s sustainability plan for maintaining the funding level. The overview should include any plans for whether or not the funding source will be re-applied for, replaced, or expanded upon. Please attach to the application any formal or articulated plans developed which help support this narrative and indicate what the attachment(s) includes.

**If the program has provided additional materials in support of this component of reaccreditation that are not directly cited within the responses above, please complete the following table to help expedite the review of the reaccreditation request:**

Attachments Referenced: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Attachment Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Relevant Pages Numbers: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Attachment Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Relevant Pages Numbers: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Attachment Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Relevant Pages Numbers: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Program Data:

The following minimum program data is required to be provided as part of the reaccreditation application and review process. If the information is contained in an attachment or is easier to provide via a current generated report, please include it at the end of the application and indicate below where the data can be located by referencing the attachment and page number within the attachment that answers the questions. Please limit the data provided to the past 5 years/previous accreditation (calendar or fiscal acceptable, please label accordingly). Include any other program materials related to data management as well.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Question** | | **Response** |
| Average Length of Time to Complete Program | |  |
| Average Length of Time between Arrest to Referral (or an event initiating entry to the program, such as a probation revocation) | |  |
|  | Arrest to Entry |  |
| Initiating Event to Entry |  |
| Average Length of Time between Referral and Entry | |  |
| # of Participants Since last accreditation | |  |
| # of Active Participants in Program | |  |
| # of Graduations Since last accreditation | |  |
| # of Termination Since last accreditation | |  |
|  | Non-Compliance |  |
| New Offense |  |
| Other |  |
| % of Participants by Gender | Male |  |
|  | Female |  |
| Other |  |
| % Participants by Race/Ethnicity | Caucasian |  |
|  | African-American |  |
| Hispanic/Latino |  |
| Native American |  |
| Asian American |  |
| Other |  |
| % of Participants by Age | 18-24 |  |
|  | 25-34 |  |
| 35-50 |  |
| 50+ |  |
| % Drug of Choice by Type | |  |
|  | Type #1 |  |
| Type #2 |  |
| Type #3 |  |
| % of Participants with a Co-Occurring Disorder | |  |
|  | Primary Diagnosis 1 |  |
| Primary Diagnosis 2 |  |
| Primary Diagnosis 3 |  |
| % of Non-Native English Speaking Participants | |  |
|  | Primary Language 1 |  |
| Primary Language 2 |  |
| Primary Language 2 |  |
| % of Participants diagnosed with a trauma-related disorder | |  |
| % of Participants with a SUD Diagnosis | |  |

Any Additional data collected or used by the program:

*Data Narrative:* in a few sentences, please describe the process for collecting data the program utilizes and how such data is used in the ongoing management of the problem-solving court.

**If the program has provided additional materials in support of this component of reaccreditation that are not directly cited within the responses above, please complete the following table to help expedite the review of the reaccreditation request:**

Attachments Referenced: \_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Attachment Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Relevant Pages Numbers: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Attachment Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Relevant Pages Numbers: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Attachment Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Relevant Pages Numbers: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Colorado Problem-Solving Court Standards: Adult Problem- Solving Courts Assessment

In completing the program self-assessment in the table below, you are attesting that your program is or is not meeting fundamental practices. Supporting documentation should be included in the attachment sections and narrative or wavier for areas the program is not meeting requirements. Reviews may ask for additional information on fundamental practices.

Any requests for a waiver of a fundamental practice component must be submitted as a separate form (*see*: *Waiver* *of Accreditation Component*). A waiver is required for all fundamental practices that the program is unable to meet, as outlined by the Colorado Problem Solving Court Standards. A program’s request for reaccreditation may be denied for failure to submit a waiver; however, if a program does not feel a waiver is necessary in support of the request, an explanation of why a waiver was not submitted for each fundamental practice component is required to be included in the “Waiver of Accreditation Component” document or in the space that follows the table below.

**Note: for further description or explanation of key components, please consult** [**The Adult Problem-Solving Court Unified Standards**](https://www.courts.state.co.us/userfiles/file/Court_Probation/01st_Judicial_District/Problem%20Solving%20Courts/Colorado%20Unified%20Adult%20PSC%20Standards.pdf)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Colorado Adult PSC Standards:** | **Fundamental Practice** | **Prog. Meets Requirement** | **Waiver Requested** |
| **Key Component #1:** Problem-solving courts shall be comprised of a broad-based multidisciplinary group of stakeholders who shall be responsible for the day-to-day operations of the problem-solving court. Stakeholders shall work collaboratively to integrate substance use and mental health treatment services with justice system case processing. | | Y/N | Y/N |
| **[ 1.1 ]**  The problem-solving court team shall include the following roles/agencies as mandatory team members: judicial officer, problem-solving court coordinator, probation officer and/or case manager, treatment provider(s), stakeholder attorneys (to include, at a minimum, prosecuting attorney, and defense attorney), and law enforcement.  \*Veterans Treatment Court: The VTC team shall also include a Veterans Justice Outreach (VJO), Lead Peer Mentor Coordinator, and Veteran Peer Mentors.  \*Family Treatment Court: The FTC team shall include a guardian ad litem (GAL) and parent/child/county attorneys as stakeholder attorneys. The FTC shall also include a child welfare caseworker; and *may include domestic violence advocates and Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA).*  \*DUI Court: *The DUI court team may also include a jail management representative and* *should recruit a law enforcement representative specializing in DUI enforcement.*  \*Mental Health Court: *The MHC team may also include a mental health navigator and a basic needs resource representative.*  *\**All: *All problem-solving courts should include peer recovery support specialists.* | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 1.2 ]**The problem-solving court team shall develop a policy and procedures manual that the entire team collaboratively develops, reviews, and agrees upon all aspects of operations including but not limited to mission, goals, eligibility criteria, operating procedures, performance measures, orientation, sobriety testing, and program structure guidelines. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 1.2.1 ]** Written confidentiality protocols shall be in place to prevent the disclosure or re-disclosure of confidential information. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 1.2.2 ]**The policy and procedure manual shall be reviewed yearly for content updates. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 1.3 ]**The problem-solving court team shall develop a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between all participating agencies, that includes a description of roles and responsibilities for all team members and confidentiality mandates for all team members. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 1.3.1 ]** The individual(s) assigned by a mandatory team member agency to serve as its representative to the team shall execute the responsibilities defined in the MOU for the role associated with that team member agency. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 1.4 ]** All mandatory team members shall consistently attend and participate at scheduled staffing meeting. *All remaining team members should consistently attend scheduled staffing meetings.*  \*VTC: Veteran Peer Mentors shall not attend or participate in staff meetings. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 1.4.1 ]** *Peer Recovery Specialists should not attend or participate in staffing meeting but may attend court reviews.* VTC: Veteran Peer Mentors shall not attend or participate in staff meetings. *The Lead Mentor Coordinator may attend staffing meetings and court reviews.* | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 1.5 ]** All mandatory team members shall consistently attend and participate at scheduled court reviews. *All remaining team members should consistently attend scheduled court reviews.* | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 1.6 ]** Treatment Providers shall effectively communicate in a timely manner, using a secure method, with the problem-solving court team between court reviews to report on concerns with participants’ progress or treatment. | Yes |  |  |
| **Colorado Adult PSC Standards:** | **Fundamental Practice** | **Prog. Meets Requirement** | **Waiver Requested** |
| **Key Component #2:** Using a non-adversarial approach, prosecution, defense counsel, and other stakeholder attorneys promote public safety and protect participants’ due process rights while collaborating with treatment providers and other stakeholders on the team. | | Y/N | Y/N |
| **[ 2.1 ]** Stakeholder Attorneys shall be members of the problem-solving court team and shall participate in the design, implementation, and enforcement of the program’s screening, eligibility, and case-processing policies and procedures | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 2.2 ]** Stakeholder attorneys shall work to create a sense of stability, cooperation, and collaboration in pursuit of the program’s goals. Stakeholder attorneys shall pursue justice and protect public safety in a manner consistent with expectations of recovery timeframes and progress while preserving the constitutional rights of problem-solving court participants. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 2.3 ]**Stakeholder attorneys shall consistently attend all staffing meetings and court reviews. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 2.4 ]** The prosecutor shall review candidate’s cases and determine whether/if a candidate is legally and meets program eligibility and target population criteria; file all required legal documents; agree that a positive sobriety test or open court admission of drug use will not result in the filing of additional drug charges based on that test or admission; and work collaboratively with the team to decide on responses to participant behavior including the use of incentives, sanctions, therapeutic adjustments, and whether unsuccessful termination from the program is appropriate for the team to discuss.  \*FTC: Family Treatment Court County Attorneys shall review cases to determine whether a candidate is legally eligible for the problem-solving court program; file all required legal documents; and work collaboratively with the team to decide on responses to participant behavior including the use of incentives, sanctions, therapeutic adjustments, and whether unsuccessful termination from the program is appropriate for the team to discuss. *FTC’s should reach consensus with the prosecuting attorneys for their jurisdictions that positive sobriety tests or open-court admission of drug use will not result in the filing of additional drug charges based on that test or admission.* | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 2.5 ]** Defense and parent’s counsel serving as a member of the multi-disciplinary team shall work collaboratively with the team to decide on the team’s responses to participants’ behavior, including incentives, sanctions, therapeutic adjustments, and whether unsuccessful termination from the program is appropriate for the team to discuss. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 2.5.1 ]** Defense and parent’s counsel serving as a member of the multi-disciplinary team shall be available to inform participants about the nature and purpose of the problem-solving court, the rules governing participation, and the merits of the program; to inform the participant that he or she shall be expected to take an active role in the status hearings, including speaking directly to the Judicial Officer as opposed to speaking through an attorney; to encourage truthfulness with the Judicial Officer and the treatment staff; and to explain that the prosecution has agreed that a positive sobriety test or admission to drug use in open court shall not lead to additional charges. | Yes |  |  |
| **Colorado Adult PSC Standards** | **Fundamental Practice** | **Prog. Meets Requirement** | **Waiver Requested** |
| **Key Component #3:** Eligible candidates for a problem-solving court program are identified early and are promptly placed withing a problem-solving court. New participants are then linked to community-based service providers as quickly as possible. | | Y/N | Y/N |
| **[ 3.1 ]** Participant eligibility criteria shall be developed and agreed upon by all members of the problem-solving court team and shall be included in the policies and procedures manual. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 3.2 ]** The target population for all adult problem-solving courts shall be individuals who are assessed as high-risk and high-needs. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 3.2.1 ]** The problem-solving court model is not evidence-based for low-risk populations. Thus, accreditation will not be available to problem-solving court programs serving solely low-risk participants or to program tracks serving solely low-risk participants. Jurisdictions choosing to serve low risk populations using a problem-solving court model shall ensure that the participants in the low-risk program or track are not combined with the participants in the high-risk program or track. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 3.3 ]** Stakeholder attorneys shall perform their tasks as part of the eligibility process as swiftly as possible, including working with other stakeholders within the legal system to minimize the time to entry into the problem-solving court. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 3.3.1 ]** *Research establishes that problem-solving courts accomplishing candidate entry in 50 days or less from arrest have improved participant outcomes.* | No |  |  |
| **[ 3.4 ]**  Problem solving courts shall assess the eligibility of program candidates with the use of validated risk and need assessments that are appropriate for the population served and that the administration of which are required under state probation standards (e.g., LSI, LS-CMI, PSC, CJRA, etc.). Assessment shall be administered by appropriately trained and qualified professional staff. Services for participants shall be appropriate for their assessed risks and needs.   * DUI Court*: DUI Courts may also include additional validated risk assessment tools that are developed specifically for the impaired driving population (e.g., DUI-RANT/CARS/IDA/ASUDS).* * Veterans Treatment Court*: Veteran’s Treatment Courts may also identify eligible candidates by including any additional validated risk assessment tool appropriate for the specific charge(s) the candidate is facing. (e.g., RANT).* | Yes  DUI \**BP in italics* = No |  |  |
| **[ 3.5 ]** Eligibility and exclusion criteria shall be defined objectively, specified in writing, and communicated to potential referral sources for candidate referrals. The team shall not determine eligibility using subjective criteria, such as personal knowledge of candidates or subjective impressions of the candidate’s likelihood of success or motivation for change. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 3.5.1 ]** Candidate identity regarding gender, place on the LGBTQIA+ spectrum, culture, nationality, race, religion, ethnicity, language, or disability shall not be a basis for exclusion and shall not appear in exclusion criteria. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 3.5.2 ]** If appropriate treatment is available, otherwise-eligible candidates with co-occurring disorders or candidates who have been prescribed psychotropic or addictive medication shall not be excluded from program participation. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 3.5.3 ]** *Problem-solving courts should not automatically disqualify individuals charged with drug distribution or violent histories unless restricted by grant funding***.** | No |  |  |
| **[ 3.6 ]** Problem-solving courts with a capacity at or exceeding 125 participants shall include an additional section in their policies and procedures manual identifying how the program will meet and maintain compliance with the Colorado Adult Problem-Solving Courts Standards despite this capacity. The additional section shall address, at a minimum, specific strategies to adapt supervision, treatment, and program operations to be effective at this capacity, to include strategies regarding judicial interaction with participants, team member attendance at pre-court staffing meetings and court reviews, multidisciplinary team representation, sobriety testing, treatment agency communication with the program team, and team training. | Yes |  |  |
| **Colorado Adult PSC Standards** | **Fundamental Practice** | **Prog. Meets Requirement** | **Waiver Requested** |
| **Key Component #4:** Problem-solving courts provide access to a continuum of individualized assessment-driven and evidence-based treatment and other trauma-related and rehabilitation services. | | Y/N | Y/N |
| **[ 4.1 ]** Problem-solving courts shall partner with and maintain consistent representation by at least one primary treatment provider. *Problem-solving courts should partner with no more than two primary treatment providers*. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 4.2 ]** Problem solving courts shall complete a full treatment assessment, including a mental health screen by an appropriately trained and qualified provider, prior to a participant beginning treatment. *Problem-solving courts may complete a full treatment assessment prior to a candidate’s entry into the program.(BP)* | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 4.3 ]** Problem-solving courts shall offer a comprehensive range of treatment appropriate for the population served. Problem-solving courts shall provide access to the following services:  Intensive outpatient treatment  Group counseling  Individual counseling  Co-occurring assessment and treatment, if indicated  Transition planning for participants moving from more intensive treatment modalities to less-intensive treatment modalities  Withdrawal management care  Trauma-informed care  Residential treatment  Services provided in or translated into a participant’s native language if the participant does not speak English  Services that conform to the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 4.3.1 ]** Problem-solving court participants shall meet with a treatment provider or clinical case manager for at least one individual counseling session per week during the first phase of the program. *The frequency of individual sessions may be reduced subsequently if doing so would be unlikely to precipitate a behavioral setback or relapse.* | Yes  *\*BP in italics* |  |  |
| **[ 4.3.2 ]** The program shall direct the frequency of each service a participant must receive based on assessed need and identified level of care. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 4.3.3 ]** Problem- solving courts shall utilize medication-assisted treatments (MAT), with the consent of the participant, when found to be clinically appropriate. The use of MAT shall not be denied by the problem-solving court or a contracted provider of the problem-solving court, nor shall the tapering off of MAT be a required element for program entry, progression, or graduation. Please see Appendix (B) for a further description regarding practices around medication-assisted treatments. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 4.3.4 ]** The size of treatment groups shall not exceed twelve participants. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 4.3.5 ]** Tr*eatment groups should be conducted by at least two licensed clinician facilitators.* | No |  |  |
| **[ 4.4 ]** *Problem-solving courts should offer a range of additional treatment types, appropriate for the court type and participants’ individually assessed need. These services should include, but are not limited to: family counseling; domestic violence counseling; sober living facilities; anger management counseling; services appropriate to the participant’s gender identity; services appropriate to the participant’s place on the LGBTQIA+ spectrum, services appropriate to the participant’s cultural, racial, and/or ethnic identity; services addressing needs specific to disabled participants, transition planning for the participant’s recovery following court supervision; suicide prevention services; community crisis intervention services; overdose prevention; traumatic brain injury (TBI) treatment; military sexual trauma (MST) services.* | No |  |  |
| **[ 4.5 ]** *Problem-solving courts should make additional social services available that are supportive of participants’ recovery and stability in the community. These services may include but are not limited to: employment counseling and assistance (beginning in a later phase of the program); assistance in applying for public assistance benefits, including health insurance; parenting education; childcare; education and job training; medical and dental care; transportation planning; victim empathy/restorative justice; housing; peer recovery support services, peer mentoring and alumni groups.*  FTC: *may include but are not limited to the following ancillary services: CASA; medical/dental/mental health services for children; attachment-based services; developmental screens and assessments for children.* | No |  |  |
| **[ 4.6 ]** Treatment and case management plans shall be individualized for each participant based on the results of initial assessments. Assessments shall include whether individual and/or group interventions are appropriate and shall consider gender identity, trauma history, place on the LGBTQIA+ spectrum and the need for service appropriate to culture, race, or ethnicity. Participants shall be reassessed at a frequency determined by the treatment provider and treatment plans shall be modified or adjusted based on reassessment results. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 4.6.1 ]** A participant’s advancement in the treatment plan shall not be tied to the participant’s phase promotion in the program’s phase structure. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 4.7 ]** Jail shall not be used to administer treatment services if appropriate community-based treatment services are available. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 4.7.1 ]** Jail shall not be used to accomplish withdrawal management if community-based detoxification services are available/ | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 4.7.2 ]** Jail shall not be considered a sober living environment and shall not be used for the sober living needs of participants. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 4.8 ]** Problem-solving courts shall provide participants sufficient duration and dosage of treatment based on their risks and needs as determined by validated standardized assessments. *High-need participants ordinarily receive 6-10 hours per week during the initial phase and 200 hours of counseling over 9-12 months, though flexibility to accommodate individual responses to treatment is allowable.*  DUI Courts: DUI Courts shall provide the minimum number of hours over the minimum duration of months as required by the regulations for DUI Level II 4+ treatment. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 4.8.1 ]**. Problem-solving courts shall utilize evidence-based treatments.[[1]](#footnote-2) | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 4.8.2 ]** Treatment for substance use disorder shall include, but is not limited to, manualized cognitive behavioral therapy interventions. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 4.8.3 ]** Psychotropic medications shall be utilized if determined to be clinically appropriate. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 4.8.4 ]** The team shall facilitate ongoing communication with the provider(s) prescribing psychotropic medications for a participant. Participants shall execute releases of information (ROI) allowing team communication with providers(s) prescribing psychotropic medications. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 4.9** **]** Relapse prevention and/or continuing care shall be emphasized in all phases of the program | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 4.9.1]** Prob Participants shall prepare ongoing relapse prevention and/or continuing care plans prior to program graduation.  Mental Health Courts: Mental health courts shall require a relapse prevention plan only for participants diagnosed with substance use disorder. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 4.9.2]** Problem-solving courts shall offer referrals to exiting participants for continuing care and/or sober support. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 4.10]** Treatment Providers serving on the problem-solving court team shall be trained, qualified, and licensed to provide appropriate treatment services. Problem-solving court treatment providers shall be supervised regularly to ensure continuous fidelity to Office of Behavioral Health (OBH) minimum standards. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 4.10.1 ]** *All treatment providers providing services to a problem-solving court’s participants should have substantial experience working with criminal justice populations.* | No |  |  |
| **[ 4.11 ]** The problem-solving court team and treatment provider shall communicate regularly with each other regarding services provided to participants and adherence to agreed-upon treatment approaches. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 4.11.1 ]** Treatment providers shall share relevant information about participants with the team in a timely manner prior to review hearings. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 4.11.2 ]** Communication protocols shall be included in the program policies and procedures manual addressing HIPAA restrictions, releases of information (ROI), ex-parte communication, and types of information to be shared with the team. *As much as possible, information should be shared via email with confidentiality protocols in place to prevent the disclosure or re-disclosure of confidential information.* Family Treatment Court: *The release of information should additionally contain a provision that allows the FTC to enter parent and program information into the problem-solving court database for evaluation purposes.* | Yes  *\*BP in italics* |  |  |
| **[ 4.12 ]** Participants shall not be terminated, discharged, or excluded from treatment or the program based solely on continued use until all available treatment options are exhausted, provided the participant is otherwise compliant with the program. | Yes |  |  |
| **Colorado Adult PSC Standards** | **Fundamental Practice** | **Prog. Meets Requirement** | **Waiver Requested** |
| **Key Component #5:**  Substance use and the appropriate use of medications are monitored by random and frequent sobriety testing to evaluate and reassess treatment adherence and recovery progress. | | Y/N | Y/N |
| **[ 5.1 ]** Problem-solving courts shall implement a standardized system in which participants will participate in mandatory sobriety testing. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 5.1.1 ]** Testing shall be administered randomly. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 5.1.2 ]** Testing shall occur at a frequency no less than twice per week | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 5.1.3 ]** Testing shall occur on weekdays, weekends, and holidays. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 5.1.4 ]** As treatment dosage and supervision is reduced, sobriety testing for participants diagnosed with substance use disorder shall not be reduced, *except that problem-solving courts may, on a case-by-case basis, choose to reduce testing frequency for participants who are in the final phase of the program and who are not more than 60 days prior to their graduations. When determining whether a participant is ready for reduced testing frequency, programs should consider reductions in assessed risk, involvement in continuing care and outside recovery support, and other circumstances relevant to risk and need.*  Mental Health Courts: *Sobriety testing may reduce for the latter phases of a Mental Health Court,* unless a participant is diagnosed with a co-occurring substance use disorder. | Yes  \**BP in italics* =No |  |  |
| **[ 5.2 ]** Problem-solving courts shall test for all drugs of common misuse, including alcohol, and shall occasionally vary testing to detect additional substances as indicated based on specific participant behaviors or on the prevalence of the substance in the community or population served. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 5.3 ]** Problem-solving courts shall utilize urinalysis as the primary method of sobriety testing. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 5.3.1 ]** *Problem-solving courts may use a variety of alternative methods to supplement urinalysis, including breath and saliva testing and patch and electronic monitoring, as the needs of programs or participants may dictate*.  DUI Courts: *Testing for alcohol use may also include portable breath testing devices, transdermal testing, and ignition interlock breath testing in addition to urinalysis.* | No |  |  |
| **[ 5.4 ]** Sample collection shall be observed to prevent tampering and the use of fraudulent samples. Sample collection for urinalysis testing shall be provided in the presence of, and visually observed by, trained staff personnel. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 5.4.1 ]** The gender of the trained staff personnel observing the sample collection for urinalysis testing shall be the same as the gender of the participant. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 5.4.2 ]** *The staff person conducting sample collection for urinalysis testing should be trained in privacy and sensitivity practices relative to gender identity, trauma, cognitive, or other individual-specific accommodations and needs.* | No |  |  |
| **[ 5.5 ]** Results of initial sobriety testing shall be provided to the team as soon as possible after the provision of the sample. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 5.5.1 ]** *Research establishes that problem-solving courts that receive results from sobriety test within 48 hours of sample collection have improved participant outcomes.* | No |  |  |
| **[ 5.6 ]** Information that a participant provided a diluted, altered, or positive sample, or failed to submit a sample, shall be immediately communicated to the problem-solving court team | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 5.7 ]** Problem-solving courts shall address a participant about a dilute result from a urine sample at the next available review docket. Participants who provide their first dilute sample shall, as the program response, participate in education about the causes of accidental dilution and how to avoid accidental dilution in the future. Subsequent dilute samples, or any deliberately altered samples, shall subject the participant to a sanction. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 5.8 ]** A minimum of 90 consecutive days of sobriety as verified through primary sobriety testing methods shall be required before a participant is eligible to graduate from a problem-solving court | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 5.9 ]** At the beginning of the program and on a regular basis thereafter, the problem-solving court shall review with participants the expectations and parameters of sobriety testing and the consequences for non-compliance or for results that are positive or dilute. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 5.9.1 ]** Problem-solving courts shall provide educational information to participants regarding the effects of prescribed medications on sobriety test results. | Yes |  |  |
| **Colorado Adult PSC Standards** | **Fundamental Practice** | **Prog. Meets Requirement** | **Waiver Requested** |
| **Key Component #6:** A coordinated strategy governs the problem-solving court use of incentives, sanctions, and other responses to participants’ compliance with program policies and procedures as well as progress accomplishing program goals and objectives. | | Y/N | Y/N |
| **[ 6.1 ]** Problem-solving courts shall create a regular schedule of review hearings occurring weekly or every other week for participants who are in the first phase of the program, and no less than once per month for participants who are in the last phase.  \*(BP)*Frequency of review hearings may vary based on a participant’s risks and needs, and/or district resources.* | Yes  \**BP in italics* =No |  |  |
| **[ 6.2 ]** Prior to program entry, all candidates shall receive a participant handbook written at an appropriate grade level for the population served. The handbook shall include information regarding program expectations and requirements, phase advancement criteria, and behaviors that will result in sanctions and incentives. Current participants shall be provided revised and updated handbooks as applicable. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 6.3 ]** Problem-solving courts shall have written policies and procedures for the use of incentives, sanctions, and therapeutic adjustments and the behaviors that elicit them. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 6.3.1 ]** Program rules, guidelines, and expectations shall be communicated in advance to candidates for admission to the program and at regular intervals to current participants. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 6.4 ]** Problem-solving courts shall organize incentives and sanctions on a gradually escalating scale, offering a range of options. Problem-solving courts shall objectively apply incentives and sanctions in a consistent and appropriate manner to match a participant’s conduct and progress accomplishing program objectives, taking into consideration the participant’s proximal and distal goals. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 6.5 ]** Responses to participant behavior shall be individualized but consistent with responses for others in the same phase for comparable conduct.  Family Treatment Courts: FTC’s shall consider the impact of a response on the needs of all family members. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 6.5.1 ]** Participant identity regarding gender and place on the LGBTQIA+ spectrum, culture, nationality, race, religion, ethnicity, language, and disability shall not be the basis for determining or changing the intensity of an incentive or sanction. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 6.5.2 ]** Problem-solving courts shall ensure that decisions regarding responses to participant behavior account for the participant’s trauma history. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 6.5.3 ]** *Problem-solving courts may intensify the response to a participant’s behavior when circumstances regarding the behavior implicate a substantial risk of serious harm to the participant or others*. | No |  |  |
| **[ 6.6 ]** Problem-solving courts shall use incentives to reinforce desired behaviors and healthy/positive lifestyle changes. Programs shall ensure a minimum proportion of incentives to sanctions based on current research and best practices. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 6.7 ]** *Problem-solving courts should include therapeutic adjustments in their contingency management practices and may use therapeutic adjustments at any time in response to participant behavior*. | No |  |  |
| **[ 6.7.1 ]** Therapeutic adjustments shall be based on recommendations of qualified treatment staff to maintain consistency with the current treatment plan. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 6.7.2 ]** Therapeutic adjustments shall not be used or classified as sanctions *but may be paired with sanctions*. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 6.8 ]**  Problem-solving courts shall ensure that incentives, sanctions, and therapeutic adjustments are immediate, certain, fair, and of appropriate intensity. Incentives and sanctions shall target specific behaviors and shall be administered with a clear direction for the desired behavior change or reinforcement.  Family Treatment Courts: *FTC’s should consider the needs of all family members when deciding incentives and sanctions* | Yes  \**BP in italics* =No |  |  |
| **[ 6.8.1 ]** Incentives and sanctions shall be administered as closely in time to the targeted behavior as possible, but no later than the next scheduled court review. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 6.8.2** **]**  Problem-solving courts shall ensure that all decisions regarding responses to participant behavior are clearly explained to the participant. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 6.8.3 ]** *Information regarding incidents of participant noncompliance should be communicated immediately to all members of the problem-solving court team to allow time for the coordination of an appropriate response/sanction.* | No |  |  |
| **[ 6.8.4 ]** *A problem-solving court judicial officer may impose an immediate sanction outside of the review docket if the participant’s behavior creates a substantial risk of serious harm to self or others. If a participant does not agree with the imposition of an immediate response, a court appearance may be set in accordance with sections 6.16 as soon as practicable after the discovery of the behavior or the imposition of the response.* | No |  |  |
| **[ 6.9 ]** Problem-solving courts shall respond to non-prescribed use of addictive or intoxicating substances when such use is detected through sobriety testing or admitted by the participant.  Family Treatment Courts: A reassessment of child safety shall be included in the FTC’s response to a parent’s use, relapse, or dishonesty about use. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 6.9.1 ]** If requested by the participant, problem-solving courts shall submit a sample provisionally testing positive for a forbidden substance to a confirmation test prior to the imposition of a sanction. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 6.10 ]** Problem-solving courts shall not allow participants to use prescriptions for controlled substances unless medically necessary.  \*(BP)*Problem-solving courts should gather information from trained medical professionals when considering whether to accept candidates who have valid prescriptions for controlled substances, such as narcotics for pain*. | Yes  \**BP in italics* =No |  |  |
| **[ 6.10.1 ]** Problem-solving courts shall rely on the judgment of the participant’s physician or other licensed medical provider as to whether a prescription for a controlled substance is medically necessary and whether non-addictive, non-intoxicating, and medically safe alternative treatments are available. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 6.10.2 ]** Problem-solving courts shall include in their policies and procedures manual policies concerning the eligibility or ineligibility for program admission of candidates with prescriptions for controlled substances | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 6.10.3 ]** *Problem-solving courts should forbid use of medical marijuana while a participant is enrolled in the court.* If a problem-solving court disallows medical marijuana, it shall advise candidates for the program that a condition of entry is a waiver of the candidate’s right to use of medical marijuana, and that use of marijuana or THC for any reason while in the program will result in a sanction or other response. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 6.11 ]** All members of a problem-solving court team shall maintain professional demeanor in all interactions with candidates and participants. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 6.11.1 ]** All members of a problem-solving court team shall not use shaming language during court reviews or any other interactions with candidates or participants. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 6.11.2 ]** Sanctions shall be delivered without anger, ridicule, or the use of foul or abusive language. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 6.11.3 ]** Problem-solving courts shall communicate with all participants in a trauma- informed manner. Additional care shall be taken when communicating with participants who have a known trauma history. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 6.12 ]** Problem-solving courts shall clearly describe objective criteria in their policies and procedures manual for deciding phase advancement, graduation, and unsuccessful termination. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 6.13 ]** Problem-solving courts shall base phase advancement on achievement of realistic and defined objectives. *Problem-solving courts may require specific and sufficient periods of sobriety prior to phase advancement*.  Family Treatment Courts: FTC’s shall base progression through the program to include the parent’s progress in the following areas, as applicable: program requirements, the treatment plan, the out-of-home placement plan, the child protective services plan  DUI Court: DUI Courts shall base phase progression in the early phases of the program to include the participant’s progress developing a written plan addressing their transportation needs during the period of their driver's license suspension, if applicable | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 6.13.1 ]** *Problem-solving courts may reduce the intensity of supervision in later phases of the program* | No |  |  |
| **[ 6.13.2 ]** *Problem-solving courts should not use phase regression as a response to noncompliance.* While phase regressions are discouraged, if a problem-solving court uses phase regression as a response to a participant’s persistent or serious noncompliance, the problem-solving court shall create a remedial plan for the participant’s return to the original phase. | \**BP in italics* =No  Yes |  |  |
| **[ 6.14]** Problem-solving courts shall create graduation requirements that successfully establish a participant’s consistent accomplishment of community-based stability factors. Community-based stability factors include but are not limited to employment, living conditions, education, and/or other prosocial activities consistent with a participant’s recovery maintenance and aftercare plan. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 6.14.1 ]** To graduate, participants shall either have paid all required court-ordered fines, fees, and/or restitution or have a court-approved waiver, a period of regular payments consistent with a payment plan, or a post-graduation payment plan. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 6.15 ]** *Problem-solving courts should use exhaustion of all available treatment and supervision options as the primary factor for deciding whether to subject a participant to unsuccessful termination.* | No |  |  |
| **[ 6.15.1 ]** A participant’s continued use of forbidden substances shall not be the basis for unsuccessful termination if the participant is otherwise compliant, unless all available responsive treatment options have been exhausted. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 6.15.2 ]** *Unsuccessful termination from the program should not be the sole reason for the imposition of an augmented sentence or disposition after revocation.* | No |  |  |
| **[ 6.15.3 ]** Active participants for whom a new charge is filed that is not an eligibility disqualifier shall not automatically be subject to unsuccessful termination. *A new charge may prompt an appropriate response, discussed collaboratively by the problem-solving court team, that accounts for proximal, distal, legal, and safety considerations.* | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 6.16]** Prior to the imposition of a response at a court review, problem-solving courts shall allow participants to explain their perspectives on factual controversies and on the imposition of incentives, sanctions, and therapeutic adjustments. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 6.17 ]** Jail sanctions shall be used judiciously and sparingly and only after less severe sanctions have been attempted | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 6.17.1 ]** Jail sanctions shall have a definite term | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 6.17.2 ]** Jail sanctions shall never exceed six consecutive days per sanction. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 6.17.3 ]** *Problem-solving courts imposing jail as a sanction should consider permitting scheduling adjustments to reduce disruption to medication-assisted treatment (MAT) and other medication management*. | No |  |  |
| **[ 6.18 ]** Before the imposition of a sanction to jail or work release, problem-solving courts shall provide participants an opportunity to either exercise their due process rights pursuant to the 5th, 6th and 14th Amendments of the U.S. Constitution and Article 2, §25 of the Colorado Constitution and challenge the grounds for the sanction or waive their due process rights and proceed to the imposition of the sanction. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 6.18.1 ]** Problem-solving courts shall include within their policies and procedures manual a written plan for the provision of due process to participants who are facing a jail or work release sanction.  \*The plan shall implement a procedure that is consistent with the requirements set forth in the “Due Process & Problem-Solving Courts” bench card, included as Appendix A.  \*The plan shall ensure that the court record reflects the participant’s full advisement as to the due process rights that apply and reflects the participant’s knowing and voluntary decision to demand or waive the hearing.[[2]](#footnote-3)  \*The plan shall allow a meaningful opportunity after the participant’s advisement of rights for the participant to consider whether to demand or waive the hearing. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 6.18.2 ]** Evidentiary hearings, if demanded by the participant, shall be held forthwith and shall be circumspect in scope and duration. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 6.18.3 ]** Participants shall not receive a more substantial or severe sanction for choosing to exercise their due process rights than they would have received had they waived their due process rights and accepted the sanction. | Yes |  |  |
| **Colorado Adult PSC Standards** | **Fundamental Practice** | **Prog. Meets Requirement** | **Waiver Requested** |
| **Key Component #7:** Ongoing judicial interaction with each problem-solving court participant is essential to create relationships for effective case management. | | Y/N | Y/N |
| **[ 7.1 ]** The problem-solving court judicial officer shall preside over the problem-solving court for at least two consecutive years. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 7.1.1 ]** *Consistency of the judicial officer correlates with better outcomes for participants of problem-solving courts. Therefore, problem-solving court judicial officers should preside over the PSC for a longer or indefinite term.* | No |  |  |
| **[ 7.1.2 ]** Routine rotation or alternating of judicial officers shall be avoided | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 7.2 ]** The problem-solving court judicial officer shall be assigned to the problem-solving court on a voluntary basis. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 7.2.1 ]** The judicial officer shall be knowledgeable about the problem-solving court model, substance use disorders, evidence-based treatment modalities, alcohol and sobriety testing, behavior modification, trauma- informed practices, and other problem-solving court related issues. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 7.2.2 ]** The judicial officer shall be current on legal, ethical, and constitutional issues applicable to problem-solving courts.  Veterans Treatment Courts: The judicial officer shall be knowledgeable about military culture, the Veterans Administration, and veteran-specific issues.  Mental Health Courts: The judicial officer shall be knowledgeable about appropriate use of psychiatric medications.  Family Treatment Courts: The judicial officer shall be knowledgeable about current dependency and neglect legal standards, procedure, and timelines. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 7.3 ]** A *The problem-solving court team structure should include a backup judicial officer who is trained in the problem-solving court model and protocols to cover staffing meetings and court reviews during the absence of the primary judge*. | No |  |  |
| **[ 7.4 ]**  The problem-solving court judicial officer shall attend and actively participate in all staffing meetings. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 7.4.1 ]** The problem-solving court judicial officer shall utilize information from the staffing meeting when interacting with participants at court reviews. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 7.5 ]** The problem-solving court judicial officer shall conduct court reviews with each participant individually. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 7.6 ]** The problem-solving court judicial officer shall spend an average of at least three minutes interacting with each participant during their court review. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 7.6.1 ]** The problem-solving court judicial officer shall engage with and positively encourage each participant regardless of performance or response. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 7.7 ]** The problem-solving court judicial officer shall make all final decisions concerning the imposition of incentives or sanctions that impact a participant’s legal status or liberty interests. The decision shall take into consideration the consensus of the team as to the specific incentive or sanction. | Yes |  |  |
| **Colorado Adult PSC Standards** | **Fundamental Practice** | **Prog. Meets Requirement** | **Waiver Requested** |
| **Key Component #8:** Problem-solving courts regularly collect, monitor, and evaluate data that demonstrates adherence to program goals, best practices, and effectiveness in maintaining fidelity to the problem-solving court model and evidenced-based recovery principles. | | Y/N | Y/N |
| **[ 8.1 ]** Program monitoring and management data shall be kept in electronic data systems, shall be easily obtainable, and shall be maintained in useful formats for regular review by problem-solving court teams, advisory and steering committees, and other applicable stakeholders. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 8.2 ]** Problem-solving court programs shall use the current statewide case management information system to maintain the formal and systematic collection of program performance data to allow for statewide evaluation and justification of outcomes and allocation of resources. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 8.3 ]** Problem-solving courts shall internally monitor and analyze collected participant data at a minimum of once per year to review program effectiveness. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 8.3.1 ]** Problem-solving courts shall consider and use findings from collected participant data when modifying program operations, procedures, and practices. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 8.4 ]** The problem-solving court team shall coordinate with applicable state agencies to obtain recidivism data*.* | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 8.5 ]** Problem-solving courts shall collect, monitor, and evaluate participant feedback, including participant satisfaction, using surveys or other evidence-based assessment tools, at regular intervals and/or at minimum at a participant’s exit from the program. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 8.6 ]** *A process and outcome evaluation should be conducted by a qualified independent evaluator within three years of implementation of a problem-solving court program and thereafter at regular five-year intervals, to the extent feasible for the program*). | No |  |  |
| **[ 8.6.1 ]** Problem-solving courts shall consider and use findings from process and outcome evaluations when modifying program operations, procedures, and practices | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 8.6.2 ]** *Problem-solving courts may conduct a cost-benefit analysis* | No |  |  |
| **[ 8.7 ]** *Problem-solving court programs should participate in the peer review process.* | No |  |  |
| **Colorado Adult PSC Standards** | **Fundamental Practice** | **Prog. Meets Requirement** | **Waiver Requested** |
| **Key Component #9:** Continuing interdisciplinary education promotes effective problem-solving court planning, implementation, operation, and knowledge of fundamental and best practices. | | Y/N | Y/N |
| **[ 9.1 ]** Problem-solving courts shall address staff training requirements and continuing education in their policies and procedures manual. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 9.1.1 ]** Recommended training shall align with state and national standards or practices endorsed by qualified national organizations and/or professional associations that have demonstrated expertise. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 9.2 ]** Training and education shall include the following topics: the problem-solving court model; NADCP Adult Drug Court Best Practice Standards; the Ten Key Components; and the Colorado Unified Problem-Solving Court Standards*.*  *Training should also include any recommendations from the Colorado Problem-Solving Court Advisory Committee’s Training and Education Subcommittee.* | Yes  \**BP in italics* =No |  |  |
| **[ 9.2.1 ]** *Problem-solving court team members should assist in cross-training other team members in their specific disciplines and areas of expertise* . | No |  |  |
| **[ 9.3 ]** *Problem-solving court team members should make every effort to attend, at least every other year, comprehensive training if available and as provided by state or national problem- solving court organizations, such as the National Association of Drug Court Professionals or the National Drug Court Institute.*  *Veterans Treatment Courts: VTC’s may also attend Justice for Vets trainings or other veteran-specific training events.*  *Family Treatment Courts: FTC’s may also attend the National Center on Substance Abuse and Child Welfare (NCSACW) trainings, and Children and Family Futures (CFF) trainings and events.* | No |  |  |
| **[ 9.4 ]** Within 60 days of joining the problem-solving court team, new team members shall receive formal training and orientation as recommended by the Training and Education Subcommittee on problem-solving courts and role-specific basics. | Yes |  |  |
| **[ 9.4.1 ]** *Ongoing problem-solving court team members should assist in the training and transition of their replacements* | No |  |  |
| **Colorado Adult PSC Standards** | **Fundamental Practice** | **Prog. Meets Requirement** | **Waiver Requested** |
| **Key Component #10:**  Programs forge diverse, data-driven partnerships among public agencies and community-based organizations to cultivate local support, enhances program effectiveness, develop resource sustainability, and support the long-term recovery of participants. | | Y/N | Y/N |
| **[ 10.1 ]** The problem-solving court team or steering committee shall meet quarterly to oversee the operations of the problem-solving court(s) and to establish and review policies and procedures.  *The problem-solving court team or steering committee should regularly address at the quarterly meetings sustainability, program resources, information management, and outcomes of program evaluations* | Yes  \**BP in italics* =No |  |  |
| **[ 10.2 ]** The problem-solving court shall organize a local Advisory Committee that meets at least twice yearly to develop and/or strengthen their cooperation with community stakeholders.  *Community stakeholders should consist of representatives from the court, community organizations, law enforcement, treatment providers, health providers, social service agencies, the business community, media, faith community, and other community groups* | Yes  \**BP in italics* =No |  |  |
| **[ 10.2.1 ]** *The local Advisory Committee may consider forming an independent 501(c)(3) organization for grants and fund-raising purposes for problem-solving court incentives, resource development, and other assistance, such as transportation, housing, or counseling*. | No |  |  |

Attestation of standards

As members of the problem-solving court team, we hereby attest that the following information has been reviewed and is correct to the best of our knowledge that this program is meeting the above standards and if not then a waiver or narrative is provided.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Presiding Judge, Problem-Solving Court Problem Solving Court Coordinator

Supplemental Narratives to key component grid (as needed):

If the program would like to provide clarification about why they are unable to meet one or more of the self-assessment components in this grid and are not requesting a waiver of accreditation or would like to provide additional clarification regarding one of the answers above, please use this space (and any subsequent pages as needed) to give supplemental information in support of the response. Each item should be addressed separately as an individual paragraph and in the format outlined below:

Accreditation Item: (e.g., 9-2)

Explanation:

(a) why the program is unable to meet this component.

(b) steps being taken to work to meet the component (if able); and,

(c) how the program is able to accommodate the intent of the component in lieu of being able to fully demonstrate that it meets the fundamental practice.

Referenced Material or Attachment Citations: (e.g., Attachment B, pages 12-13)

**If the program has provided additional materials in support of this component of reaccreditation that are not directly cited within the responses above, please complete the following table to help expedite the review of the reaccreditation request:**

Attachments Referenced: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Attachment Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Relevant Pages Numbers: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Attachment Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Relevant Pages Numbers: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Attachment Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Relevant Pages Numbers: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**SAMPLE REACCREDITATION ATTACHMENT COVER PAGE**

**ATTACHMENT A**

**POLICY & PROCEDURE MANUAL**

**Pages XX - ZZ**

[ INSERT NAME OF PROGRAM ] Accreditation Application [ Overall Pg. # ] [ Attachment Name, Page # ]

1. For information regarding evidence-based treatments, please see [NREPP Website](https://peerta.acf.hhs.gov/content/national-registry-evidence-based-programs-and-practices-nrepp-0) or [SAMHSA website](https://www.samhsa.gov/resource-search/ebp) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Examples of advisements forms are included in this document in Appendix A and are available at (SCAO website) [↑](#footnote-ref-3)