



Problem Solving Court Evaluation: Survey Results Addendum

PREPARED FOR THE CANADIAN
COUNCIL OF CHIEF JUDGES

Donaldo Canales, M.A.

Mary Ann Campbell, Ph.D.

Jessica McTague, B.B.A., B.A.(Hons)

CENTRE FOR CRIMINAL JUSTICE STUDIES, UNIVERSITY OF NEW BRUNSWICK

© 2017, JANUARY



To cite this work, please use the following reference:

Canales, D., Campbell, M.A., & McTague, J. (2017). *Problem solving courts: An evaluation guide and template. Survey results addendum*. Technical report prepared for the Canadian Council of Chief Judges. Centre for Criminal Justice Studies, University of New Brunswick; Saint John, Canada.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
SURVEY DESCRIPTION	1
PARTICIPANT RECRUITMENT	2
SURVEY RESULTS	3
SAMPLE DESCRIPTION	3
IMPLEMENTATION FACTORS	4
PROCESS FACTORS	6
OUTCOME FACTORS	7
CONCLUSION	8
APPENDIX A: PROBLEM SOLVING COURT SURVEY	9
APPENDIX B: PROBLEM SOLVING COURT SURVEY	12

PROBLEM SOLVING COURTS: AN EVALUATION GUIDE AND TEMPLATE

SURVEY RESULTS ADDENDUM

INTRODUCTION

The Canadian Council of Chief Judges (CCCJ) commissioned the Centre for Criminal Justice Studies at the University of New Brunswick to develop a problem solving court evaluation template that would facilitate the standardization of such evaluations in Canada. The resulting document included guidelines, tips, sample forms, and a template framework for problem solving court evaluations. As part of this project, a survey was also sent out to professionals working within problem solving court contexts to gain the “knowledge user” perspective with regard to the areas of problem solving court implementation, process and outcomes that they viewed as being most important to include in an evaluation. This perspective is intended to supplement the problem solving court evaluation guide and template document previously sent to the CCCJ, as these results were not yet available at the time of the initial report’s completion due to technical difficulties.

SURVEY DESCRIPTION

The goal of the survey was to gather information from professionals (i.e., knowledge user) involved in problem solving courts in Canada and the United States to gauge their perspective on the most important components with respect to the implementation, processes, and outcomes of such courts. The survey (see Appendix A) asked for basic demographic information (i.e., gender, age, country) to describe the individuals who responded to the survey. Next, participants were asked for the number of years of involvement with the problem solving court in which they work, the type of court (e.g., mental health court, domestic violence court), the population serviced by the court (i.e., adult, youth), and their role in the court (e.g., Judge, Duty Counsel, social worker). Following these questions, participants were asked to rate their views of the importance of various implementation, process, and outcome factors that are typically examined in problem solving court evaluations. Open ended responses were available to allow participants to add in their own thoughts on factors that they consider important but which were not included in the provided list of rated items.

We designed the survey to be as user-friendly as possible and to take approximately 10 minutes to complete. The survey was created in Qualtrics, which is an online survey platform widely used by researchers to conduct online survey research. The first webpage of the survey was a welcome page thanking participants for their interest in the study. The second webpage was the informed consent form (see Appendix B) that described in detail the purpose of the survey, privacy and confidentiality information, data storage procedures, a statement of ethical approval from the University of New Brunswick-Saint John Research Ethics Board, and contact information. At the bottom of this page, participants had to click “I consent” in order to proceed to the survey.

At the end of the survey, participants were given the opportunity to provide their email if they wished to receive a copy of the survey results. If they indicated “no,” then they concluded the survey at that point. If participants indicated “yes”, then they were redirected to a new Qualtrics survey page to provide their email, which was automatically stored separately from survey responses to protect the privacy and confidentiality of respondents.

PARTICIPANT RECRUITMENT

Contact information was provided by the CCCJ for Chief Judges and other justice representatives who could distribute the survey to relevant problem solving court stakeholders in their jurisdictions in Canada (estimated to be approximately 65 such courts as of August 2015). Recipients were asked to distribute the study invitation email to their problem solving court professional team members, administrative staff, and close affiliates. In addition, a similar email was sent to key academic contacts in Canada and the United States who conduct problem solving court research and who have problem solving court professionals within their network. The email consisted of an introductory statement inviting individuals to participate in the survey and included an online link to the survey. As an alternative method of recruitment, individuals were also told they could complete the survey over the telephone and were provided contact information to make arrangements; however, no one sought this option. This introductory statement in the email read as such:

Dear Problem Solving Court Community,

The Canadian Council of Chief Judges has asked the University of New Brunswick's Centre for Criminal Justice Studies to develop a template for the evaluation of problem solving courts in Canada to serve as a flexible, but standardized guide for individual problem solving courts to consider when designing evaluations of their own court programs. To inform this work, professionals working with problem solving courts are being invited to participate in a survey on what they consider to be important or relevant components of such evaluations for understanding the implementation, process, and outcomes of problem solving courts.

If you are involved as a team member, administrator, or close affiliate of a problem solving court, which could include a mental health court, drug court, domestic violence court, community court, or some other specialty court program, we would like to hear from you by completing a brief 10 minute survey (link below). This survey is anonymous, and your responses will not be shared with a third party. Information will be reported in aggregate summary form only.

Survey link: <http://bit.ly/problemsolvingcourtsurvey> . If you know of someone who also would be interested in completing this survey as a member of a problem solving court team or administrator, then please forward along this email. As an alternative, you may complete the survey via telephone if you find that option more convenient. Please allot approx. 20-25 minutes for this option. To do so, please email the researchers to arrange a time by emailing Dr. Mary Ann Campbell at mcampbel@unb.ca .

The initial recruitment email was sent in mid-October 2016, with reminder emails in early December 2016 and early January 2017. We had hoped to obtain a response rate of at least 120 individuals given the range of professionals involved in the approximately 65 problem solving type courts operating in Canada. However, it is important to note that recruiting professionals for research is a challenging task given that these professionals must find time within often busy schedules to complete the survey. Thus, we designed the survey so that respondents could come back to it, or complete it over a period of time within a 1 week duration. Our recruitment method also depended on the initial study invitation email making its way through the organizational hierarchy of many jurisdictions to reach our intended population. The advantage of using an email survey with an online link is that it maximizes the potential reach of the survey to many jurisdictions where problem solving courts are in operation more so than is possible with a paper based survey that needs to be mailed back to the researcher. The disadvantage of this method is that the study invitation may not always funnel down the chain of contacts as expected due to spam blockers, organizational policies about email use, decisions not to forward the email, lack of access to appropriate email addresses for subsequent distribution, etc.

SURVEY RESULTS

SAMPLE DESCRIPTION

A total of 91 individuals consented to participate in the survey. However, 24 (26%) participants did not complete it after consenting to do so, resulting in 67 participants with complete information to be included in the analyses. The sample was 55 years of age on average (range = 26 to 77 years), mostly female (63%), and primarily Canadian (97%).

Table 1

Role in Court	%	n
Judge	65.6	40
Admin. Staff	11.5	7
Lawyer	9.8	6
Court Coordinator	8.2	5
Probation Officer	3.3	2
Researcher	1.6	1

Missing information for 6 cases

Table 2

Type of Court	%	n
Drug court / drug treatment program	28.8	19
Mental health court / diversion program	24.2	16
Domestic violence court	13.6	9
Community wellness court	7.6	5
Indigenous people's court	7.6	5
Mixed (involved in 2 or more courts)	18.2	12

Missing information for 1 case

As shown in Table 1, the sample primarily consisted of Judges, followed by administrative staff, lawyers, court coordinators, two probation officers, and one researcher. The sample had been involved in their problem solving court for an average of 5 years (range = less than 1 year to 16 years). As indicated in Table 2, most of these survey participants were involved in either drug court / drug treatment programs (28.8%) or mental health court / mental health diversion programs (24.2%). Lastly, 95.5% of the problem solving courts represented serviced adults rather than youth.

IMPLEMENTATION FACTORS

To gather information about participants' views of relevant implementation factors to include in an evaluation of problem solving courts, participants were presented with a list of statements about potential implementation components and asked to rate the importance of each statement on a 5 point scale (1 = not at all important; 2 = slightly important; 3 = moderately important; 4 = very important; 5 = extremely important). To facilitate ease of interpretation, only the percentage of people who agreed that the content in the statement was either "very" or "extremely" important is reported in Table 3. Average scores for all listed items on the survey in this section ranged from 2.72 to 4.46, with most ratings fall in the moderately important or higher category.

The top five implementation factors perceived to be the most important to include in an evaluation were: a) the degree to which the program ensured availability of services/supports in the community; b) the nature of admission criteria; c) reference to clear program objectives/goals; d) the nature of training for court teams members/affiliates, and e) the process for communication of program rules/expectations to program clients. In contrast, gathering information that tracked the number of cases referred, number of cases screened, number of court appearances, and keeping records pertaining to costs and cost savings were less often rated as important for inclusion in an evaluation.

Table 3

Implementation Factors Rated as "Very" to "Extremely Important"	%	n
Available, sufficient and appropriate community services/supports to meet client needs	98.5	66
Nature of admission criteria	95.6	64
Clear statement of the program's objectives and goals	92.5	62
Adequate training and support of team members and support personnel	92.5	62
Process for communication of program rules and expectations with program candidates	89.6	60
Referral process	88.1	59
Screening and assessment procedures	88.1	59
Knowledge of case load or court's capacity to manage case load	77.7	52
Recording of client progress indicators	76.2	51
Recording of case/treatment plan	74.7	50
Policies for appropriate use of incentives to promote and encourage participation	65.7	44
Reason for non-completion	61.2	41
Method of selection of team members	59.7	40
Number of cases admitted	58.2	39
Duration of client's involvement in the program	54.5	36
Number of completed cases	50.7	34
Types and number of sanctions imposed	47.8	32
Number of non-completed cases	43.3	29
Number of cases referred	39.4	26
Number of cases screened	35.8	24
Number of client court appearances	33.4	22
Accounting of per participant costs of being in the program	26.9	18
Cost savings as result of being in the program	25.4	17

Table 4 lists the open-ended responses provided by survey participants about their personal views on other important factors to consider when evaluating the implementation of a problem solving court program. A total of 18 responses were provided by 11 participants. When responses recorded in Table 4 were rated in terms of importance by survey respondents, all were rated as “extremely important”.

Two comments made reference to the importance of clarifying the roles (#2 and #3) among members and affiliates of problem solving courts when assessing the implementation of a program. An additional two comments referenced the importance of assessing the program’s capacity for building relationships (#4 and #5). A further two comments referenced the importance of assessing the impact of harm reduction (#6 and #7), but that variable is best viewed as an outcome goal rather than an implementation goal. Another two comments, both from the same individual, mentioned the need to gauge the acceptance of the science used to inform and develop treatment plans for the clients involved in the problem solving court.

The remaining responses varied considerably with no discernable themes. The diversity of these open-ended responses may be due to variations in what an individual perceives as important as a result of their professional training (i.e., Judge vs probation officer) or what is considered important to the particular court in which they work (i.e., mental health court vs domestic violence court).

Table 4 – Themes identified as additional implementation factors of importance to consider when evaluating problem solving courts based on open-ended responses of survey participants

1. Buy-in of stakeholders	10. Urine drug screen results*
2. Clarification of roles and communication pertaining to risk	11. Future reduction of emergency ward visits or hospital admissions*
3. Clarity of roles for all involved	12. Science behind the treatment plans proposed
4. Community trust and support for the court must be present before the court can be discussed	13. Peer review / acceptance of form of treatment / treatment plans proposed
5. Partnerships	14. Number of health contacts
6. Future reduction of criminal charges*	15. A committee has to be struck of all participants
7. Harm reduction*	16. Steering committee of stakeholders
8. Reconciliation with Indigenous Persons*	17. Ongoing education for team members
9. Barriers to service referrals	18. Reasons for non-referrals

* These items are better represented as outcome factors rather than implementation factors, as they are consequences that are theoretically expected to occur as a result of participation in the program. We left them in this section, however, given that they were included by participants in response to the implementation question. Implementation factors are those relevant to the operation of the program, the components required for it to run as intended.

PROCESS FACTORS

Process factors were considered separately from the operational aspects of program implementation described in the previous section. Respondents were asked to rate their view of the degree of importance of a variety of process-related variables for inclusion in problem solving court evaluations. These ratings were made using the same 5 point scale described above (e.g., 1 = not at all important to 5 = extremely important). Table 5 reports the variables that were rated as very or extremely important for inclusion in such an evaluation. As shown in Table 5, most statements were rated as very or extremely important by a very high percentage of participants. Average ratings for these items ranged from 3.72 to 4.57. Two variables, monitoring adherence to court policies/procedures and timeliness of processing of clients through the program, were endorsed by the least percentage of participants but were still rated as at least “very important” for the majority of participants (71.75 and 61.2%, respectively).

Table 5

Process factors rated as “very” to “extremely important”	%	n
Successful access and linkage to supports and services	98.5	66
Collaborative work amongst supporting agencies	97	65
Multidisciplinary, interdisciplinary, or holistic approach to case management	95.5	64
Communication among all team members	94	63
Timeliness of accessing outside supports and services for clients	94	63
Nature of the environment or atmosphere during client court appearances	92.5	62
Judicial leadership	88.1	59
Monitoring adherence to court policies and procedures	71.7	48
Timeliness of processing of clients through the program	61.2	41

Table 6 lists the themes identified from the open-ended responses that survey participants indicated as important process factors for consideration in problem solving court evaluations. A total of 14 responses were provided by 6 participants. No dominant themes emerged, but two statements made reference to the importance of assessing the consistency in the court program (#8 and #9) and the presence/nature of aftercare and continued supports once a client has exited the program (#6 and #7). All of these statements were rated as either “very important” or “extremely important” by the respondents who offered them.

Table 6 - Themes identified as additional process factors of importance to consider when evaluating problem solving courts based on open-ended responses of survey participants

1. Continuing education for treatment team	8. Consistency of therapeutic workers
2. Dedicated judge and crown	9. Consistency
3. Face to face meetings with client	10. Number of participants diverted by program from other social resources such as ER visits
4. Honesty	11. Supportive atmosphere
5. Proper funding	12. Mentoring by graduates
6. Aftercare programs	13. Frequency (of court sitting)
7. Continued linkage to community supports once program is completed or exited	14. Improved access to resources that allow for drug screening and psychiatric assessments

OUTCOME FACTORS

Outcome factors were the last set of statements presented to participants, and were rated on the same 5-point scale as described above. Only those factors rated as very to extremely important by respondents are included in Table 7. All outcomes items listed on the survey were rated as moderately to highly important with average item ratings ranging from 3.31 to 4.42. As shown in Table 7, at the top of the list were outcomes that captured changes in quality of life and mental health/addiction recovery outcomes, which is very much in line with the overarching goals of most problem solving courts. Other outcomes rated as relevant included reduced criminal justice involvement and criminal activity, enhanced community engagement of participants, and satisfaction of stakeholders with the service provided. Cost savings related outcomes were less commonly endorsed by participants as essential outcomes for inclusion in evaluation of problem solving courts.

Table 7

Outcome factors rated as “very” to “extremely Important”	%	n
Enhanced quality of life	93.9	62
Mental health and/or addiction recovery	90.9	60
Improved community engagement	84.8	56
Satisfaction among program participants and families	82.1	55
Reduced criminal justice contacts post-program discharge	77.6	52
Reduced incidents of new crimes post-program discharge	77.6	52
Satisfaction among professional stakeholders	72.5	42
Evidence of plan for sustainability	72.5	42
More efficient or cost effective use of crisis/urgent care utilization	52.2	35
Cost savings as result of program participation for agencies involved and impacted by program	40.3	27

Respondents also included additional themes of relevance for consideration for outcomes when evaluating problem solving courts. These themes represented seven open-ended responses made by five participants and are provided in Table 8. Some of these themes are elaborations on factors that have been traditionally associated with criminal risk reduction, such as changes in criminal thinking and substance use. Others pertain to community engagement (i.e., community development), relationship building (i.e., constant contact with doctors), and broader themes tied to changing the criminal justice culture itself and addressing cultural considerations, such as reconciliation with Indigenous persons.

Table 8 - Themes identified as additional outcome factors of importance to consider when evaluating problem solving courts based on open-ended responses of survey participants

1. Constant contact with client’s doctors
2. Criminal thinking recovery
3. Changing criminal justice culture
4. Community development
5. Role modelling
6. Reconciliation with Indigenous Persons
7. Helping clients understand and reduce, if not eliminate, drug use

CONCLUSION

Although the sample for the survey was smaller than desired and may not represent all views, it was fairly representative of the judicial perspective given that most participants were from the justice community. It is possible that professionals from social service, health, mental health and other such service agencies might have additional insights beyond those obtained in the current survey. This group of stakeholders often sit as members of problem solving court teams or work closely with the clients involved in problem solving courts. Nevertheless, the implementation, process, and outcome variables viewed as relevant to the evaluation of problem solving courts in the current survey were generally consistent with the recommendations provided in our evaluation template and guide document previously submitted to the CCCJ. Thus, there is reasonable alignment between the knowledge user and researcher perspectives with regard to the key variables of interest to capture in a problem solving court evaluation.

With regard to implementation variables, we were surprised to see the description of such essential variables as number of cases completed, not completed, screened, etc. as being viewed as less important for the purposes of evaluating problem solving courts. However, this perspective may be a reflection of the fact that these operational items are typically what is reported in most problem solving court evaluations, and there is a desire for broader and more nuanced information to be included in evaluations of these programs, such as capturing the quality of the assessment and screening process and the nature of training for professionals involved in delivery of the program. Moreover, these operational variables were still viewed as being moderately important based on average item ratings.

All of the process variables included on our survey were rated as relevant for inclusion in evaluations of problem solving courts, with specific emphasis on the importance of gauging the access to and collaboration with services and supports necessary to achieve program success; the nature of case management approach used with program participants, and the quality and nature of communications between team members, among other factors. These are the more nuanced elements of a program, and represent survey respondents' interest in these qualitative factors that can influence program operations and goal achievement.

The majority of emphasis on problem solving court outcomes of interest among participants were in the psychosocial domains of enhanced quality of life, mental health and addiction recovery, and community engagement. Although still rated as very to extremely important for the majority of participants, criminal justice outcomes were somewhat de-emphasized as primary outcomes of interest. This perspective likely reflects the therapeutic jurisprudence philosophy underlying problem solving courts. In addition, cost savings/cost effectiveness outcomes were often viewed as the least relevant problem solving evaluation component. This latter view may reflect an awareness that providing financial and resource investment is a necessary component of problem solving courts, and that their outcomes are worth this investment. However, government funders often require information about the financial and resource impact of a program, especially in comparison to traditional or alternative services. Thus, the cost-savings accrued by problem solving courts should continue to be a focus of interest in evaluations of such initiatives, as such data could facilitate arguments in favour of continued investment or the need for additional investment in the program. At the same time, a high financial investment with little gain in terms of outcome will also highlight the need for change within the existing model to achieve better outcomes or the need to develop alternative approaches altogether.

We wish to thank the CCCJ and the initial survey contacts for assisting us with participant recruitment, and acknowledge the time dedicated by survey respondents to provide us with their thoughts regarding important aspects of problem solving court evaluation content.

PROBLEM SOLVING COURT SURVEY

In order to describe the group of individuals who respond to this survey, we would like you to provide some basic information about yourself.

1. What is your gender?
 - Male
 - Female
 - Other

2. What is your age?
 - Free form response

3. What country do you work in?
 - Canada
 - United States
 - Other, please specify: _____

For these questions, problem solving court is defined as a *specialized court with a dedicated focus on a particular problem (e.g., domestic violence, drug misuse, mental illness). These courts seek to identify, address, and ameliorate the underlying problem(s) that contribute to criminal behaviour by means of a team-based approach and by engaging with the community as an active partner.*

4. How many years have you been involved with your problem solving court?
 - Free form response (years)

5. What type of problem solving court are you primarily involved with?
 - Mental health court or mental health diversion program
 - Community wellness court
 - Drug court or drug treatment program
 - Domestic violence court
 - Other, specify.

6. What type of population does your problem solving court service?
 - Youth
 - Adult (18+)

7. What is your role in your problem solving court (e.g., Judge, Duty Counsel, social worker, etc)?
 - Free form response

The purpose of the following questions is to better understand your perspective when evaluating the implementation, processes, and outcomes of a problem solving court.

8. When evaluating the implementation of a problem solving court program, how important is it for you to know about each of the following? The term *implementation* refers to the procedures/protocols put in place that allow a program to operate as it was designed; it does not include the outcomes of a problem solving court.

	Not at all important 1	Slightly important 2	Moderately important 3	Very important 4	Extremely important 5
Clear statement of the program’s objectives and goals	1	2	3	4	5
Referral process	1	2	3	4	5
Nature of admission criteria	1	2	3	4	5
Screening and assessment procedures	1	2	3	4	5
Process for communication of program rules and expectations with program candidates	1	2	3	4	5
Knowledge of case load or court’s capacity to manage case load	1	2	3	4	5
Policies for appropriate use of incentives to promote and encourage participation	1	2	3	4	5
Available, sufficient and appropriate community services/supports to meet client needs	1	2	3	4	5
Adequate training and support of team members and support personnel	1	2	3	4	5
Method of selection of team members	1	2	3	4	5
Number of cases referred	1	2	3	4	5
Number of cases screened	1	2	3	4	5
Number of cases admitted	1	2	3	4	5
Number of completed cases	1	2	3	4	5
Number of non-completed cases	1	2	3	4	5
Reason for non-completion	1	2	3	4	5
Number of client court appearances	1	2	3	4	5
Types and number of sanctions imposed	1	2	3	4	5
Recording of case/treatment plan	1	2	3	4	5
Recording of client progress indicators	1	2	3	4	5
Duration of client’s involvement in the program	1	2	3	4	5
Accounting of per participant costs of being in the program	1	2	3	4	5
Cost savings as result of being in the program	1	2	3	4	5
Other 1: specify	1	2	3	4	5
Other 2: specify	1	2	3	4	5
Other 3: specify	1	2	3	4	5

9. Please rate the importance of the degree or quality of each of the following processes when evaluating a problem solving court.

	Not at all important 1	Slightly important 2	Moderately important 3	Very important 4	Extremely important 5
Judicial leadership	1	2	3	4	5
Collaborative work amongst supporting agencies	1	2	3	4	5
Presence of a multidisciplinary, interdisciplinary, or holistic approach to client case management	1	2	3	4	5
Communication among all team members	1	2	3	4	5
Monitoring adherence to court policies and procedures	1	2	3	4	5
Successful access and linkage to supports and services	1	2	3	4	5
Timeliness of processing of clients through the program	1	2	3	4	5
Timeliness of accessing outside supports and services for clients	1	2	3	4	5
Nature of the environment or atmosphere during client court appearances (e.g., adversarial, punitive, supportive, etc)	1	2	3	4	5
Other 1: specify	1	2	3	4	5
Other 2: specify	1	2	3	4	5
Other 3: specify	1	2	3	4	5

10. How important do you consider each of the following problem solving court outcomes?

	Not at all important 1	Slightly important 2	Moderately important 3	Very important 4	Extremely important 5
Mental health and/or addiction recovery	1	2	3	4	5
Enhanced quality of life (e.g., personal, social, family)	1	2	3	4	5
Improved community engagement (e.g., employment, volunteerism)	1	2	3	4	5
Satisfaction among program participants and their families	1	2	3	4	5
Satisfaction among professional stakeholders (e.g., professional and organizations providing services to program participants, or impacted by the program's work with this population)	1	2	3	4	5
Reduced incidents of new crimes post-program discharge	1	2	3	4	5
Reduced criminal justice contacts post-program discharge (e.g., arrests, police calls, court appearances, remand time)	1	2	3	4	5
More efficient or cost effective use of crisis/urgent care utilization	1	2	3	4	5
Cost savings as a result of program participation for agencies involved and impacted by the program	1	2	3	4	5
Evidence of plan for sustainability	1	2	3	4	5
Other 1: specify	1	2	3	4	5
Other 2: specify	1	2	3	4	5
Other 3: specify	1	2	3	4	5

PROBLEM SOLVING COURT SURVEY



Primary Investigator:
Mary Ann Campbell, Ph.D.



Co-investigators:
Jessica McTague, B.B.A., B.A.
Donaldo D. Canales, M.A.

CONSENT FORM

PURPOSE OF RESEARCH

The Canadian Council of Chief Judges has asked the University of New Brunswick (UNB)'s Centre for Criminal Justice Studies to develop a template for the evaluation of problem solving courts in Canada to serve as a flexible, but standardized guide for individual problem solving courts to consider when designing evaluations of their own court programs. To inform this work, professionals working with problem solving courts are being invited to participate in a survey on what they consider important or relevant components of such evaluations for understanding the implementation, process, and outcomes of problem solving courts. If you are involved as a team member, administrator, or close affiliate of a problem solving court, which could include a mental health court, drug court, domestic violence court, community court, or some other specialty court program, we would like to hear from you by completing the brief survey.

PRIVACY & CONFIDENTIALITY

This survey is anonymous, and no one individual's responses will be shared with a third party. Information will be reported in aggregate summary form only. We are using the online survey platform called Qualtrics, which is based in the United States and therefore subject to the U.S. Patriot Act. This means that the U.S. Department of Homeland Security could request access to information on Qualtrics connected to specific IP addresses out of national security concerns; however, the likelihood of this occurring is extremely low. Otherwise, the information you provide on the survey is encrypted and secure (for information on Qualtrics security and privacy agreement see [here](#) and [here](#)). We will not retain your IP address, and do not ask for your name, place of work, or other personal identifying information that would allow a third party to link your identity to the information you provide. You may choose not to respond to any question on the survey, but we encourage you to complete it fully so that we have a full understanding of your responses on the survey. You have the right to withdraw from the survey at any point, and may return to it to complete it up until 1 week after starting it as long as you use the same electronic device each time to access the survey. If you prefer, you may also speak with a research assistant and complete the survey over the phone. If interested in this latter option, please call 1-506-648-5969 and ask to speak to Dr. Mary Ann Campbell or email mcampbel@unb.ca

DATA STORAGE

All information gathered from the survey will be securely stored at the University of New Brunswick in Dr. Campbell's research lab, and access will be restricted to only her and her two research assistants. All information will be treated with respect, and confidentiality stored. Information will be retained for a period of 7 years, after which digital and paper records of the data will be securely destroyed.

ETHICS CLEARANCE

This research has been approved by the Human Research Ethics Board of the UNB-Saint John Campus: **REB # 030-2016**

QUERIES AND CONTACT

This research has been approved by the Human Research Ethics Board of the UNB-Saint John Campus. If you have any questions or concerns about this research, you may direct them towards the lead researcher, Dr. Mary Ann Campbell, Director of the Centre for Criminal Justice Studies at UNB, PO Box 5050, Saint John, New Brunswick, Canada, E2L 4L5, mcampbel@unb.ca or Phone 1-506-648-5869, or contact the Chair of the Ethics Board, Dr. Lisa Best, reb@unb.ca or 1-506-648-5980.

INFORMED CONSENT

If you are 19 years of age or older, and consent to participate in this survey, please click “I consent”. If you prefer not to complete the survey, or are under the age of 19, please click “I do not consent”.

- I consent
- I do not consent