

*An Evaluation Study of a Criminal Justice Reform Specialty Court—CATCH Court: Changing

Actions to Change Habits

Karen Miner-Romanoff, Ph.D., J.D.

Associate Provost of Academic Quality

Executive Director of the International Institute for Innovative Instruction

Franklin University

Columbus, Ohio

*Special thanks to Dr. Lewis Chongwony, who provided statistical consultation and support on this project.

Abstract

This article reports on an evaluation of a program for convicted prostitutes who are victims of human trafficking, the Changing Actions to Change Habits (CATCH) specialized docket in Franklin County, Columbus, Ohio. Founded by Judge Paul M. Herbert in 2009, CATCH blends punitive sentences with a 2-year treatment-oriented nonadversarial program for rearrested prostitutes who suffer from posttraumatic stress syndrome, depression, and drug addiction. Based on therapeutic jurisprudence, in its 5 years of existence CATCH has served 130 participants (12% graduation rate in first 4 years). The researcher was invited by the Franklin County Municipal Court to conduct the evaluation, the first of the program, with criminal justice referrers and program participants. Data were collected from Court records, a 9-item survey for referrers by email, a 20-item survey for participants, and a roundtable discussion with 20 volunteer participants. In the quantitative component, five goals and objectives were formulated. Results of descriptive statistics on participants' experiences indicated that from 48% to 100% were positively affected by the program. Program completers had fewer jail days, arrests, and recidivism, as well as improved living conditions, than noncompleters (those who were rejected or dropped out). Results of inferential statistics for completers and noncompleters indicated that for jail time and arrests, no significant differences were found among the groups. For recidivism, a significant difference was found, indicating that program completers had a statistically significant lower recidivism rate than the other groups. The five goals and objectives were partially met. In the qualitative component, participants singled out caring by the judge and staff, lack of judgment, encouragement of their self-esteem, improved family relationships, and the difficulty of asking for help. For increased awareness, participants suggested education of law enforcement officers about the program, education in communities of young girls, and creation

of CATCH-type programs in other cities. Recommendations for future research included more frequent and discrete data collection by the court, larger sample sizes, and individual participant in-depth interviews. The success of the CATCH program indicates its use as a model for similar courts in Ohio and nationally.

Keywords: *evaluation, human trafficking, problem-solving court, prostitution, rehabilitation, specialized docket, therapeutic jurisprudence*

Introduction

Over 27 million victims of human trafficking across the globe have been reported by the U.S. Department of State (2013). Approximately 17,500 individuals are brought into the United States every year, in addition to the hundreds of thousands who are trafficked annually within the United States (Lippman, 2013). However, the actual statistics may be higher; human trafficking victims can be very difficult to identify. The practice is often carried out in the shadows and victims are often fearful (Weitzer, 2009). Common pathways include abuse, violence, victimization, and manipulation (Goodman & Mazur, 2014; Hammond & McGlone, 2014).

A major activity of human trafficking is prostitution, in which most are victims of rape and with childhood histories of sexual and physical abuse (Farley & Barkan, 1998; Flowers, 2011; Roe-Sepowitz, Hickie, Loubert, & Egan, 2011). Shdaimah and Weichelt (2012) reported that survival and coercion are often factors in victims' involvement with prostitution. Accordingly, identification, screening, and assessment become crucial to the efforts to address the needs of these victim-defendants (Crank, 2014).

Within the United States, it is estimated that from 300,000 to 2 million people are victims of human trafficking annually. As Goodman and Mazur (2014) observed,

There is growing recognition that prostitution, chronic running away, homelessness, shoplifting, substance abuse, domestic violence, and loitering are all potential red flags for sex trafficking. Given this reality, courts can play a crucial role in not only identifying victims of sex trafficking but linking them to needed services. (p. 90)

The conventional law enforcement response to street prostitution is arrest and incarceration, with over 43,000 people arrested for prostitution annually in the United States (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2012). However, as female respondents in a victimology study

explained, “punishment for prostitution is likely to have little effect when the need for food, housing, clothing, drugs or love overrides the same degradation and fear they experience with prostitution” (Shdaimah & Weichelt, 2013, p. 30). Despite the expense of jail, it failed to deter the women because they would immediately return to the environment from which they came and their previous activities. Few prostitutes successfully exit from this destructive lifestyle, with the tendency to cycle in and out of the justice system (Schweig, Malangone, & Goodman, 2012). Cimino (2013) summarized several studies that indicated exiting was successful for only 20% to 25% of the women studied, with and without intervention programs (Dalla, 2006; Davis, 2000; Saphira & Herbert, 2004).

Problem-Solving Courts

As public awareness grows, a palatable change has been taking place in public policy and attitudes (Haggerty, 2013; Hammond & McGlone, 2014). “A remarkable transformation in the judiciary has occurred over the past 20 years” (Winick, 2013, p. 211; see also Winick, 2002). Winick (2013) was referring to the establishment of problem-solving courts, which seek to address the underlying criminogenic risks that may lead to criminal behavior. The courts are an alternative approach to addressing the many and severe societal, psychological, and institutional issues that are not the tradition focus of the criminal justice or judicial system (Castellano, 2011; Wolf, 2007). Problem-solving courts originated in 1989 with a drug court in Dade County, Florida, in which offenders were sentenced to treatment rather than incarceration (Berman & Feinblatt, 2001). Since this time, many types of problem-solving courts have been established.

A number of states have developed community courts as hopefully more effective vehicles than arrest and incarceration to address prostitution and human trafficking (Crank, 2014; Roe-Sepowitz et al., 2011). These specialty or problem-solving courts or dockets (Castellano,

2011; Franklin County Municipal Court, 2014c) focus on the “victim-defendants” (Crank, 2014, p. 38). The defendants, often street prostitutes who are generally victims of human trafficking, suffer from mental and physical trauma and drug addiction, are in poor health, and have with no stable homes.

In the Ohio court system, the Changing Actions to Change Habits (CATCH) specialty docket program, the subject of this study, statistics of participants support this profile as victims of human trafficking (State of Ohio, 2012). In 2012, most of the participants, predominantly Caucasian and female, were victims of sexual abuse beginning in childhood. Approximately 87.5% reported being sexually abused before age 15. Drug use began at approximately age 12½, with 62% on crack cocaine (Begun & Hammond, 2012). Most participants had been orphaned, were raped repeatedly as children, and suffer from PTSD (Roberts, 2013).

CATCH, like other problem-solving courts, provides closely supervised, comprehensive assessment and treatment services, in which defendants are held accountable for their criminal behaviors and for adherence to the program requirements (P. M. Herbert, personal communication, November 6, 2014). The new environments provide the defendants with opportunities for recovery from what often is a lifetime of abuse, sexually transmitted diseases (STDs), posttraumatic stress disorder, and early death (Cimino, 2013; Lederer & Wetzel, 2014; Potterat et al., 2004; Roe-Sepowitz et al., 2011; Roe-Sepowitz, Hickie, & Cimino, 2012; Shdaimah & Wiechelt, 2012; Wilks, 2013).

Although drug courts are the most popular, a number of additional courts have evolved that address specific types of co-occurring outcomes, such as mental health courts, domestic violence courts, homeless courts, veterans courts, reentry courts, gambling courts, and family courts (Castellano, 2011; Huddleston, Marlowe, & Casebolt, 2008). These courts partner with a

multitude of social service agencies and employ therapeutic practices. Instead of the traditional adversarial process, courtroom professionals including the judge, empathetically and collectively address the “clients”’ pathologies and holistic needs (Castellano, 2011, p. 963).

Rising caseloads, revolving dockets, exorbitant correctional costs, unsatisfying results of sentencing, high recidivism, devastated communities, and court professionals’ frustrations at “revolving door” justice (Berman & Feinblatt, 2001, p. 129) have led to increased establishment of problem-solving courts. From 2004 to 2007, the number of courts increased by 94% nationwide, for a total of 3,204 courts, including drug courts, human trafficking, and prostitution courts, in all U.S. states as of 2007 (Huddleston et al., 2008).

With the development and increasing implementation of problem-solving courts, criminal justice professionals perceive defendants differently on basic levels. The relationship is no longer adversarial but collaborative, notwithstanding the necessary legal responses. The roles of professionals are empathic and supportive, with recognition of the societal ills that have contributed to the offenses. Castellano (2011) summarized, “In short, [problem-solving courts] are doing more than changing the way that cases are handled; they are, in effect, policy making institutions that are actively changing the way we define the problem of crime in society” (p. 965).

Study Purpose and Need

Research indicates that victims may be more willing to accept services and engage in programming while in the criminal justice system (Hammond & McGlone, 2014). Ohio, like many states, recently passed legislation that has changed the exclusively punitive human trafficking and prostitution laws and creates mandatory training for law enforcement (State of Ohio, 2011). Among other provisions, the bill requires the Ohio Department of Jobs and Family

Services and Ohio Department of Mental Health to develop appropriate services for assistance to victims of human trafficking. On this premise, the present article reports on an evaluation new and innovative specialty court program for victim-defendants in Ohio, CATCH: Changing Actions to Change Habits.

Established in 2009 by Judge Paul M. Herbert, CATCH is a specialized docket in Franklin County in Columbus, Ohio, for human trafficking victims, especially prostitutes (Franklin County Municipal Court, 2013a). This court blends punitive sentences with a treatment-oriented nonadversarial program. The program focuses on co-occurring outcomes of solicitation, trauma, depression, drug addiction, and human trafficking.

Other Programs and Evaluations

Some prostitution diversion programs exist, e.g., in New York City the STARS program (Schweig et al., 2012) and the Midtown Community Court near Times Square in Manhattan, a major neighborhood for prostitution (Crank, 2014). With recognition of similar issues and based on similar principles to the CATCH Court, the Midtown Community Court developed partnerships with community-based service providers and domestic violence agencies as well as criminal justice professionals to combat the “cycling through the system” pattern (Crank, 2014, p. 38). In the fall of 2013, 80 prostitution cases were heard in the Court, and over 80% of the defendants had histories of victimization and trauma. To help meet their needs, a psychosocial assessment is conducted prior to “an on-site evidence-based, psychoeducational program known as WISE—Women’s Independence, Safety and Empowerment” (Crank, 2014, p. 39). This is a program of 5 to 10 sessions.

However, services and duration of such programs may be limited, as is the Midtown Community Court program. Because CATCH is a unique program that is complex in its services

and longer than many other “intensive” (P. M. Herbert, personal communication, November 6, 2014) probation-type programs, it is difficult to determine applicable data-driven best practices. Nonetheless, the Center for State Court Innovation (2013), Chicago Coalition for the Homeless (Mueller, 2012), Human Trafficking and State Courts Collaborative (2013), Texas Criminal Justice Coalition (Wilks, 2013), and several scholarly articles all provide guidance for this evaluation model.

The Chicago Coalition for the Homeless (Mueller, 2012) highlighted the work of 13 courts or programs across the county, including CATCH, that addressed prostitution and human trafficking. The report made recommendations that focused on the court process, eligibility, and identification of victims, services, and safety for the defendants. The recommendations included the importance of proper training for all court personnel and social service providers, providing rewards equal to sanctions, and emphasis on community-based, not correctional-base services. The Human Trafficking and the State Courts Collaborative (2013) report also included a chapter on specialized dockets that was useful for the current evaluation, as well as information about identification and comprehensive approaches for addressing human trafficking.

Castellano (2011) summarized several problem-solving court evaluations, pointing out that most deal with drug courts and mental health, focusing on the reduction of recidivism, reaching of goals of treatment, and reduction of costs (e.g., Boothroyd, Poythress, McGaha, & Petrila, 2003; Deschenes, Ireland, & Kleinpeter, 2009; Gottfredson, Najaka, Kearley, & Rocha, 2006; McCoy, 2010; McNiel & Binder, 2007). Pertinent to the CATCH Court program evaluation, psychological interventions, such as attendance at group meetings and learning positive life skills were associated with successes in drug court (Castellano, 2011).

Mental health court outcomes were studied by Sarteschi, Vaughn, and Kim (2011), whose meta-analysis revealed decreases in participant recidivism after the programs. However, few evaluations have been conducted of the success of other problem-solving court programs (Castellano, 2011). This dearth of studies increases the importance of the evaluation of CATCH. Further, an extensive literature review by the researcher indicates that the CATCH program appears to be the only problem-solving court of its kind in its length, comprehensiveness, services, and requirements for participant accountability.

State Supreme Court Requirements for Ohio Specialty Dockets

Although CATCH had been in operation per administrative order since 2009 (Franklin County Municipal Court, 2013a), the Ohio Supreme Court published requirements for certification for Ohio specialty courts, effective January 2, 2014. Certification included the following standards and guidelines for practice (Supreme Court of Ohio and the Ohio Judicial System, 2013, pp. 505-515):

1. Collaborative Planning Process: A collaborative planning process, among relevant parties such as the specialized docket judge, court, prosecutor, defense counsel, licensed treatment providers, children's services personnel; case managers; probation department; advisory committee and treatment team; program description; and participant agreement and program handbook.
2. Nonadversarial Approach: with incorporation of a nonadversarial approach but nevertheless recognizing a prosecutor's role in pursuing justice and protecting public safety and victims' rights; a defense counsel's distinct role in preserving the constitutional rights of specialized docket participants; participants' rights to request attendance of defense counsel during the portion of a specialized docket treatment

- team meeting concerning participants; participants' rights to a detailed, written participation agreement and participant handbook outlining the requirements and process of the specialized docket.
3. **Legal and Clinical Eligibility and Termination:** To include written legal and clinical eligibility, completion, termination, and neutral discharge criteria that have been collaboratively developed, reviewed, and agreed upon by the relevant parties identified in Standard 1; discretion by the specialized docket judge to decide the admission into and termination from a specialized docket in accordance with the written criteria for the specialized docket; no right to participation as a result of the written legal and clinical eligibility and termination criteria.
 4. **Assessment and Referral:** To include assessments of chemical dependency, mental health, and other program assessments; participant's or guardian's completion of release of information form and compliance with relevant law; participants' placement in appropriate treatment services and programs.
 5. **Individualized Needs and Evidence-Based Practices:** Provision of services that meet individualized needs of participants and incorporate evidence-based, gender-responsive, and culturally appropriate strategies for the participant population, services to also effectively address co-occurring disorders.
 6. **Participant Monitoring:** To include regular treatment team meetings prior to the status review hearings, status review hearings, ongoing communication among the treatment team members with frequent exchanges of timely and accurate information, participants' progression through the specialized docket based upon participants'

- performance and compliance, explanation to participants' of compliance and noncompliance responses, including criteria for termination.
7. Status Review Hearings: To include ongoing judicial interaction with each participant as an essential component of the docket; appearance before specialized docket judge at least twice monthly during initial phase and regularly thereafter.
 8. Substance Monitoring: To include written policies and procedures for sample collection, sample analysis, and result reporting; individualized random, frequent, observed drug and alcohol testing plans; clear plans for positive test results and relapses.
 9. Treatment and Other Rehabilitation Services: To include prompt access, treatment plan and activities record, licensing and training of treatment professionals.
 10. Incentives and Sanctions: To include immediate, graduated, and individualized incentives and sanctions to govern the responses of a specialized docket to participants' compliance or noncompliance.
 11. Professional Education: To include continuing interdisciplinary education of treatment team members to promote effective specialized docket planning, implementation, and operations.
 12. Effectiveness Evaluation: To include judge's evaluation of the effectiveness of the specialized docket by reporting of data as required by the Supreme Court, including information to assess compliance with these standards; and engaging in ongoing data collection to evaluate whether the specialized docket is meeting its goals and objectives.

With regard to the twelfth standard, although data have been collected by the county on participants' demographics and associated information, no comprehensive evaluation has been conducted to date on CATCH in terms of overall effectiveness, such as whether the program's length is sufficient or whether greater focus should be directed to treatment services and, if so, which types (Franklin County Municipal Court, 2014c). The Franklin County Municipal Court invited the researcher to conduct a comprehensive evaluation to test whether the CATCH model of specialized docket programming significantly benefits the population it serves. The researcher is a criminal justice researcher (Ph.D.), attorney, and published scholar (e.g., Miner-Romanoff, 2014). She is a member of the Franklin County Municipal Court Specialized Docket advisory board and member of the Ohio Consortium of Crime Science (OCCS) Specialty Court Commission.

This article reports on the mixed-method evaluation of the CATCH program. Quantitative results are presented of the CATCH Court referrers and program participants, and qualitative findings are presented from roundtable interviews with program participants. The findings should determine the success of the current model for participants who are charged with prostitution/solicitation and are likely victims of human trafficking. This report should also confirm that the data collection fields and processes used are good indicators of evaluation and assist in defining the model of the CATCH Court program.

Theoretical Framework

The primary theoretical framework for the specialty court that is CATCH is that of therapeutic jurisprudence (TJ). Therapeutic jurisprudence is grounded in the concept that “legal processes result in both positive and negative consequences for justice involved persons” (Castellano, 2011, p. 960). First used with mental health specialty courts, TJ has become more

widely applied in other problem-solving courts. In the outlook of TJ, the law is viewed as a positive force for criminal justice professionals involved in the court to help defendants reclaim their lives and reduce recidivism.

An important aspect of TJ is the emphasis on defendants' taking responsibility for their aberrant behavior and their rehabilitative actions. Wexler and King (2011) noted that TJ focuses on the emotional and psychological well-being of offenders, aspects that are ignored, unacknowledged, or generally underappreciated in the law. Emphasis is not only on the legal rules and procedures but also on defendants' treatment and availability of services and the behavior and actions of involved legal professionals (Wexler & King, 2011).

Moreover, TJ is based on the emerging concept of positive criminology. "TJ is an interdisciplinary approach, often described as 'optimistic,' that seeks to employ insights from the behavioral sciences—most notably from psychology, criminology, and social work—to humanize the law and its administration" (Wexler, 2013, p. 907). TJ presents a "therapeutic lens" and promotes therapeutic legal practices for defendants, with their wellbeing paramount (Gal & Wexler, 2014, p. 1). This wellbeing is fostered through interventions, treatments, and services.

Development and History of the CATCH Court Program

The CATCH Court program was founded by Judge Paul M. Herbert, elected to the Franklin County Municipal Court in 2003 and a 32-year judicial veteran. Judge Herbert noticed that in his courtroom women charged with solicitation or prostitution would appear and reappear in typical "revolving door" (Berman & Feinblatt, 2001, p. 129) fashion. One woman appeared before him on 36 occasions (Carmen, 2010). Between 2003 and 2009, the number of solicitation charges filed in Franklin County Municipal Court increased by 45% per year, from 1,074 to 1,303 (Carmen, 2010; Franklin County Municipal Court, 2014a). As a result, Judge Herbert

realized that the punishments he levied, including fines defendants could never pay, failed to make any difference in their behavior or number of court appearances.

In research on the characteristics of the defendants who appeared before him, Judge Herbert found that “72 percent of women trafficked have suffered sexual and physical abuse in their lives, disassociative personality disorders . . . and other facts that disturbed him” (Tebben, 2014, para. 13). Judge Herbert realized that, although prostitution and human trafficking are different offenses, “prostitutes are often victims of human trafficking” (Tebben, 2014, para.16), and this observation was a major impetus for his founding of the CATCH specialized docket.

Specialized dockets are not unique in the nation or in Ohio. However, the program is possibly the only comprehensive rehabilitative program of its kind in the nation. In Ohio CATCH is the only docket that does not criminalize defendants but regards them as victims of crimes and human trafficking. The Court is not gender-specific, although participants are predominantly adult women who have co-occurring outcomes of drug use, depression, and/or posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) and have been arrested for prostitution (Franklin County Municipal Court, 2013a, 2014b, 2014c).

Participants in the program are referred by judges and attorneys who may be prosecutors or defense attorneys. The mission of CATCH is recorded as follows in the program certification (Franklin County Municipal Court, 2013a):

The overall goal of the CATCH program is to address the myriad of issues that the target population tackles through inappropriate and maladaptive methods, resulting in post-traumatic stress syndrome, addiction, illness, and criminal behavior. The CATCH program strives to provide a comprehensive, coordinated approach with defendants who exhibit any combination of post-traumatic stress disorder, major

depression, other mental health disorders, or drug or alcohol dependency in order to decrease criminal recidivism, jail nights, and arrests, to improve public safety, and to improve the defendant's quality of life by affording the defendant opportunities to be stabilized in the least restrictive location. (p. 1)

Judge Herbert's initial motivation to establish CATCH was consistent with other problem-solving courts (P. M. Herbert, personal communication, November 6, 2014), as the above goal indicates. However, the Court faces enormous complexities and co-occurring participant outcomes that require a myriad of agencies and support services in integrated approaches to address the participants' risks (S. Gaiter, specialized docket coordinator, & H. Mohrman, probation officer, personal communication, November 12, 2014). Moreover, many if not most of the CATCH clients are also human trafficking victims and need safe housing as victim-offenders (H. Gleason, assistant court administrator, personal communication, November 12, 2014).

In the first years, CATCH was successful in terms of decreased arrests and nights in jail. Arrests for solicitation in Franklin County decreased from 1,745 in 2009 to 1,192 in 2013 since the program began (Carmen, 2010; Franklin County Municipal Court, 2014a). Now in its 5th year, CATCH program has accepted 105 women (Hendren, 2013), with 72% having no new criminal charges (McEntyre, 2013b). Although in the first 4 years, the graduation rate was only 12% (McEntyre, 2013a), the percentage rose to 21% by the fifth year, and 90% of the graduates have progressed in their lives (e.g., recidivism rates were significantly lower for graduates than nongraduates [see below]). According to Judge Herbert, the CATCH program costs approximately \$18,000 a year per individual; this is a fraction of estimated cost of \$200,000 for a year in jail (Carmen, 2010; Leckrone, 2010).

Further, the defendants' stories are moving (Carmen, 2010; McEntyre, 2013a, 2013b) and media attention continues (Welsh-Huggins, 2014), including a website mounted by two journalism students at Ohio State University (Pierce & Johnston, 2014). The researcher's invitation to evaluate the program with funding support from the OCCS further attests the success of the program and the value and significance of increasing its reach. Finally, the program was well summarized at the 2013 graduation by Ohio First Lady Karen Kasich, who said about Judge Herbert's CATCH Court: "What his court does, and what his approach to justice does, is it offers the women of CATCH accountability, but it offers them support and a safe place to change" (McEntyre, 2013b, para. 16).

The CATCH Court Program

The presiding judge of the New York City Midtown Community Court, a program similar to CATCH, observed,

Collaboration between the judge, district attorney's office, and defense bar is crucial in prostitution cases. A partnership approach, which relies heavily on the engagement of social service agencies and their trauma-focused practices, allows me to make more informed decisions and, in many cases, seems to help people find safety or leave "the life" instead of appearing before the court time and time again. (Judge Felicia Mennin, quoted in Crank, 2014, p. 39)

CATCH Mission

The mission of CATCH is similar for Franklin County. This is establishment of an integrated approach to meet the treatment, health, and behavioral medication needs of defendants who have been charged in the Franklin County Municipal Court with prostitution, solicitation, loitering to solicit, or other offenses if the defendant has a history of being a victim of human

trafficking. CATCH presents a nonadversarial rather than an exclusively punitive approach; in lieu of jail, referrals to treatments are made. At referral to the program by one of several court professionals, the request for entry is explained by the defense counsel and must be signed by the referring judge and/or administrative judge. The 2-year intensive program emphasizes treatment for drug addiction, depression, and posttraumatic stress disorder by connecting defendants to appropriate substance abuse and mental health facilities and social services resources and by teaching healthy lifestyle choices, including stable housing, supportive interpersonal relationships, and education.

CATCH does not discriminate for admission into the program against any defendant based on race, color, religion, gender, sexual orientation, national origin, ancestry, age, citizenship, marital status, veteran status, or any disability. However, defendants must satisfy certain legal and clinical eligibility criteria to be admitted into the program, such as one or more of the following: arrest for prostitution/solicitation, with a primary Axis I diagnosis (e.g., major depressive or anxiety episodes; American Psychiatric Association, 2013), drug or alcohol dependency, a history of being a human trafficking victim, and willingness to participate in treatment that addresses behavioral healthcare diagnoses.

The majority of prostitutes have third-party “exploiters” who trap the women with drugs, coercion, and fear and shame (Jacobson, 2014, p. 1028). The CATCH staff corroborated this observation, explaining that these women have historical commonalities of shame, disgrace, and humiliation because of sexual abuse that are not always evident with clients in other specialty or problem solving-courts. For example, in drug court or mental health court the criminogenic risk factors and demographics of the clients can vary greatly. If women arrested for prostitution are placed in these courts, they feel ashamed to discuss their history with those who have not

experienced the life of a prostitute (S. Gaiter & H. Mohrman, personal communication, November 12, 2014).

CATCH Staff

The major positions in CATCH are the Specialized Docket Coordinator, Community Support Coordinator, Probation Officer, and Department Manager. These functions are more than those in many specialized dockets, which operate with only a judge and a probation officer (Crank, 2014). The additional staff in CATCH may be a factor in determination of the program's success.

The *CATCH Program Description* (Franklin County Municipal Court, 2014c, pp. 14-15) describes the functions of these staff members, which are also provided to participants in the *Participant Handbook* (Franklin County Municipal Court, 2014b, pp. 11-12):

Each member of the treatment team has been invited to participate by the CATCH judge and is responsible for the daily operations of the CATCH program. The Specialized Dockets Coordinator and all Assistant Specialized Dockets Coordinators, Community Support Coordinators, and probation officers are at-will employees of the Franklin County Municipal Court. (p. 13)

All members work closely with the community to ensure community interests are protected as well as utilize community activities to help meet the goals of CATCH (Franklin County Municipal Court, 2014c).

The Specialized Docket Coordinator is responsible for the administration of the CATCH program, including long-term strategic planning and daily support. The Community Support Coordinator participates in CATCH treatment team meetings and status review hearings, conducts the initial screenings, and meets with participants daily (Franklin County Municipal

Court, 2014b, 2014c). The Probation Officer participates in treatment team meetings and status review hearings, reviews the cases, discusses the terms and conditions of community control sanctions, coordinates with other probation officers, if applicable, and files statements of violations as necessary. (Franklin County Municipal Court, 2014b, 2014c).

A mentor is also assigned to each participant and provided by Doma International, a nongovernmental organization in Columbus, Ohio, that prepares local, adult survivors of human trafficking for economic self-sufficiency through a catering business and workforce and life skills development program. The provisions of mentors and training bridges gaps between the court process and treatment providers, such as therapists, residential caregivers, and employment services (Doma International, 2014; Franklin County Municipal Court, 2014b, p. 15; 2014c, pp. 20, 22).

CATCH Program

From the date of a defendant's admission to the program, completion is 2 years. During a given week, participants may be in treatment, taking classes, seeking employment, and meeting with probation officers. For participants who complete the program and meet all requirements, the case against them is dismissed (S. Gaiter, personal communication, October 16, 2014).

Each participant receives an Individual Treatment Service Plan, developed by CATCH staff, and a copy of the participant handbook, outlining all requirements and listing community resources to which assignments may be made. Within the program, participants must attend regular status review hearings at the court and appointments with probation officers and documentation of their progress. They must also agree to random alcohol and drug screenings and random home visits by probation officers and CATCH staff members (Franklin County Municipal Court, 2014b, 2014c).

The program is constituted in three phases, and participants may move to a succeeding phase only after satisfactory completion recommended by the judge of the previous one. Phase I, Stability and Compliance, requires participants to attend court appointments, status review hearings, and treatment appointments. Phase II, Movement and Connection, recommends to participants services such as social welfare, educational institutions, family services, and housing. They must follow and complete recommendations for such services and treatment. Phase III, Sustain and Thrive, requires participants to complete all requirements of Phases I and II in their individual plan as well as to complete two volunteer activities and lead four sober support meetings. Phase I typically takes 6 months, Phase II 3 to 6 months, and Phase III 12 months (Franklin County Municipal Court, 2014b, 2014c).

A type of group therapy that is acknowledged as very important by Judge Herbert and the CATCH staff is the participants' support of one another and support by the CATCH Court professionals (P. M. Herbert, personal communication, November 6, 2014; S. Gaiter & H. Mohrman, personal communication, November 12, 2014). The mutual and interconnected support may relate to the precept of problem-solving courts as the justice system's effort to change behaviors. The power and authority of the courts can change defendants' behavior, and many therapeutic strategies are used, including mentorship, belief in defendants' worth, helping them increase self-esteem, and the bonding that takes place with recognition of similar devastating circumstances (Castellano, 2011; Shulman, 2011). Many problem-solving courts also use "the strategic use of forgiveness" (Denckla, 1999, p. 1614).

In the present CATCH program (2014), 20 women participate. This number has been the average during the program's history. Currently this number is optimal because of the program's intensity, necessity for a cross-section of resource staff, and limited funds. As the program

continues, it is hoped that it can be expanded to accommodate and serve more participants in need.

Goals of CATCH Court Program and Evaluation Objectives

In its successful certification application to the Ohio Supreme Court (Franklin County Municipal Court, 2013a), the CATCH Court delineated the following goals. These goals served as a baseline for the evaluation outcome measures:

CATCH Court Goal 1: Reduce participants' time in jail.

Evaluation Objective 1: Participants' jail time should be reduced by 75% after acceptance into the CATCH Court program.

CATCH Court Goal 2: Reduce participants' annual arrests.

Evaluation Objective 2: Participants will decrease the number of arrests annually by 50% after acceptance into the CATCH Court program.

CATCH Court Goal 3: Maximize the number of participants who successfully complete the CATCH Court program.

Evaluation Objective 3: 30% of participants will successfully complete the CATCH Court program within 2 years from the date of admission.

CATCH Court Goal 4: Reduce recidivism among those charged with prostitution in the Franklin County Municipal Court.

Evaluation Objective 4a: Recidivism among current participants in the CATCH Court program will be no higher than 50% each year.

Evaluation Objective 4b: Recidivism among participants who have successfully completed the CATCH Court program will be no higher than 25% each year.

CATCH Court Goal 5: Improve living circumstances of participants who successfully complete the CATCH Court program.

Evaluation Objective 5a: 80% of participants will be employed, volunteering, or enrolled in education or vocational training within 1 year after successful termination.

Evaluation Objective 5b: 100% of participants will have a stable living situation within 1 year of successful completion of the CATCH Court Program (Franklin County Municipal Court, 2013b).

The current results of this evaluation provide quantitative data from referrers and participants and qualitative data from the participant-defendants, as recommended by the Bureau of Justice Assistance (Goldkamp, Weiland, & Irons-Guynn, 2001). In addition, in the evaluation of this unique program, the researcher addresses the court's processes and makes recommendations for additional data collection to provide elevated statistical comparative analysis, as recommended by the Bureau of Justice Assistance (Goldkamp et al., 2001).

In summary, the goals of this evaluation project are the following:

- a. provide a summary of current prostitution/human trafficking courts and highlight best practices in processes and treatment,
- b. analyze the CATCH Court data for participants' reduction in jail time, reduction in annual arrests; reduction in recidivism; improvement of living circumstances, including employment or training; and increase in stable living conditions 1 year after termination,
- c. compile participants' social demographic descriptive statistics (26 variables),

- d. determine any statistically relevant relationships between social demographics and program success or failure, jail time, decrease in recidivism, or increase in stable living conditions,
- e. report and assess participants’ narrative experiential contributions,
- f. identify a comparative control group of similarly situated offenders who did not voluntarily choose to participate in CATCH court,
- g. identify any new measures of success or outcomes,
- h. develop recommended actions and implications for future research.

This report did not address prostitution laws or the clinical components of the court.

Moreover, the parameters of the evaluation did not include educational outreach to address the risks of trafficking among youth, law enforcement’s efforts to identify and properly treat trafficking victims, or community views regarding CATCH, as recommended by Goldkamp et al. (2001). Nonetheless, ancillary notes and recommendations were made because evaluation of CATCH is not possible without an understanding of the true breadth of the problem and the depth of solutions necessary to decrease human trafficking.

Research Design of Evaluation

This evaluation was conducted in a mixed-methods design. In the quantitative component, retrospective data analysis was conducted of the CATCH program participants during its 5 years of services to determine the impact of the CATCH program on participants with regard to the amount of time spent in jail, number of annual arrests, number of participants who completed the program, recidivism rates, and living conditions. Data were collected from the Franklin County Municipal Court records and analyzed with regard to these variables participants’ time spent in jail, number of annual arrests, recidivism rates, and living conditions.

Quantitative surveys were administered to program participants to determine their current assessment of their CATCH experience (Appendix A). Quantitative surveys were additionally administered to criminal justice professionals who refer defendant participants to the CATCH Court program (Appendix B).

In the qualitative component, program participants were interviewed in a roundtable on a voluntary basis by the researcher. The roundtable interview (Creswell, 2013) was conducted in a group approximately 20 participants, with the purposes of gaining insight into the experiences and perceptions of the CATCH Court program from the participants' perspectives.

Quantitative Component: Research Questions and Hypotheses

Two research questions guided the quantitative component of this evaluation:

1. What is the impact of the CATCH program on participants with regard to the amount of time spent in jail, number of annual arrests, number of participants who completed the program, recidivism rates, and living conditions?
2. Is there a statistically significant difference between participants who successfully complete the CATCH program and those who are rejected or unsuccessfully discharged from the program with regard to the amount of time spent in jail, number of annual arrests, recidivism rates, and living conditions?

Following from the research questions, the following hypotheses were tested:

H₁₀: The CATCH program had no impact on participants with regard to the amount of time spent in jail, number of annual arrests, number of participants who completed the program, recidivism rates, and living conditions after successful completion of the program.

H1_A: The CATCH program had significant impact on participants with regard the amount of time spent in jail, number of annual arrests, number of participants who completed the program, recidivism rates, and living conditions after successful completion of the program.

H2₀: There is no statistically significant difference between participants who successfully completed the CATCH program and those who were rejected or unsuccessfully discharged from the program with regard to the amount of time spent in jail, number of annual arrests, recidivism rates, and living conditions.

H2_A: There is a statistically significant difference between participants who successfully completed the CATCH program and those who were rejected or unsuccessfully discharged from the program with regard to the amount of time spent in jail, number of annual arrests, recidivism rates, and living conditions.

Descriptive statistics were used to describe the sample in terms of the five variables above and participants' assessments of their CATCH experiences. To test the hypotheses, one-way ANOVAs were applied.

Quantitative Component: Reliability and Validity

Statistical tests for reliability and validity did not apply to the procedures required to test the hypotheses. However, for the participant survey of this evaluation (see below), reliability or construct validity was assessed with Cronbach's alpha. Cronbach's alpha measures how well a set of items or variables measures a single construct (Christmann & Van Aelst, 2006; Santos, 1999). The widely accepted minimum reliability alpha statistic is a minimum of .70 (Creswell, 2013; Christmann & Van Aelst, 2006; Santos, 1999). The Cronbach's alpha for the participant survey was .71, indicating acceptable reliability.

Validity in research indicates how well a measure (such as a survey, instrument) assesses what is being measured. Content validity explains the degree of comprehensiveness and representativeness of the items in a given instrument. A measure is content valid if its respective items together include the different domains of interest (Babbie, 2012). Content validity is generally assessed by examination of the process by which the items were generated (Creswell, 2013; Straub, 1989).

According to Cronbach (1971) and Kerlinger (1964), a construct valid in content is one that has drawn representative questions or items from a universal pool (Cronbach, 1971; Kerlinger, 1964). In this evaluation, items measuring constructs of interest were derived from existing literature and existing instruments which have been shown to display both face validity and sampling-content validity (Berman & Feinblatt, 2001; Goldcamp et al., 2001; Gottfredson et al., 2006; Sarteschi et al., 2011). In addition, the researcher consulted experts in the field to reassess the content validity of the items used in the instruments.

Qualitative Component: Research Question

One research question guided the qualitative component of this evaluation, a roundtable discussion with voluntary participants. This question was formulated in relation to the evaluation goals: What are the insights and observations of participants in CATCH during their attendance in the program? This question was explored by the researcher through participants' qualitative responses on the survey and their responses to the qualitative roundtable (Appendix C).

Qualitative Component: Reliability and Validity

In qualitative research, the concepts of reliability and validity are equally necessary but defined differently from those in quantitative research. In qualitative studies, researchers do not seek statistical relationships or generalizations but “illumination, understanding, and

extrapolation to similar situations” (Golafshani, 2003, p. 600). Trustworthiness addresses the research focus, conscientiousness of the research, and how well the data and processes of analysis address the intended focus (Maxwell, 2012). Thus, the same protocol was followed for each participant.

Credibility, the quality of the work’s plausibility and accurate reflection of participants’ contributions, was established by two means. These are saturation, which is the repetition of themes and patterns discovered by the researcher during data analysis (Guest, Bunce, & Johnson, 2006; Trochim & Donnelly, 2007) and member checking. Saturation indicates that the subjects of concern to participants have been adequately covered and accurately represent the total population, an aspect of reliability (Golafshani, 2003). Member checking ensures that the individual contributions have been recorded accurately and takes place after transcription of interviews by the researcher (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). In the present case, participants were asked to review their contributions to the qualitative roundtable.

Dependability refers to the demonstration of a consistent and appropriate research process. The procedures described above should contribute to the study dependability, as well as the confidentiality of the data collected. The researcher only reviewed and analyzed the roundtable interview material and kept notes on the audit trail of data collection and analysis (Creswell, 2013). In the audit trail, the researcher kept a detailed account of all activities employed in data collection and analysis (Patton, 2014).

Confirmability, parallel to quantitative objectivity (Golafshani, 2003), refers to the accuracy of data interpretation and reporting and minimizing of researcher bias (Trochim & Donnelly, 2007). To that end, the researcher noted all such responses in self-reflexive notes during the roundtable interviews and an ongoing process journal (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011;

Moustakas, 1994). Confirmability was further enhanced by triangulation of roundtable interview material with quantitative data collected from official records (Creswell, 2013).

Transferability refers to the extent to which the results and conclusions of data analysis may be transferable to similar populations, programs, and settings. Transferability overlaps with confirmability in the extent to which the findings can be confirmed by others outside the research setting or corroborated without bias (Trochim & Donnelly, 2007). In this evaluation, comparison with other program outcomes was not possible because of the uniqueness of the CATCH program. However, transferability in terms of common experiences is possible because it also overlaps with credibility as readers recognize the verisimilitude of participants' experiences and the themes that emerge.

Participants and Observations

Two categories of individuals involved in the CATCH Court program participated in this evaluation. These were referrers and program participants. Data were collected from these groups for descriptive and evaluative purposes.

Referrers

The referrers of participants to the CATCH program were criminal justice professionals, such as judges of Franklin County Municipal Court, prosecutors, or defense attorneys. In certain situations, case managers or probation and parole officers may make referrals if defendants have new pending cases. Referrers were contacted through their court emails by the researcher and provided with an introduction and informed consent (Appendix D). For those agreeing to participate, the referrer survey was administered (Appendix B).

Program Participants

The program participants for the evaluation study were defendants who have been charged with misdemeanor prostitution, soliciting, loitering to solicit, and/or other offenses with a history of human trafficking, including most nonviolent offenses. According to the *CATCH Program Description*, participants were diagnosed with posttraumatic stress disorder, major depression, other mental illnesses, drug or alcohol dependency, and/or co-occurring disorders (Franklin County Municipal Court, 2014c). Entry into the program is voluntary, based upon specified diagnoses relating to human trafficking and trauma, and subject to initial screening and assessment (Franklin County Municipal Court, 2014c).

All CATCH Court defendants were eligible for the project evaluation. To date, the CATCH Court participants have been female and transgender individuals between the ages of approximately 21 and 55. The majority of the women appearing in the court were abused at some point in their lives, and many have mental and physical health issues. They all have criminal records and have been in court on prior counts. In the 5 years of the program to the present, approximately 105 women have participated in CATCH. For current participants and others who attended the CATCH Court sessions for support, the Invitation to Participate (Appendix E) and Experience Survey (Appendix A) were administered in person at the municipal court. All who volunteered were accepted for participation.

Observations

Observations by this researcher of the court proceedings and the activities of Judge Herbert and the courtroom officials were described from several observational visits. These observations included the professionals' sharing lunch with the women, conversations and

interactions with them, and support of them. Observations also included interactions among the participants and graduates about the program and their current lives.

Protection of Participants

This evaluation study was approved by the OCCS and the Franklin University Institutional Review Board (IRB). Participants were notified of the benefits and risks, and rigorous criteria for all participant protection were met. All participants were assured that no identifying information would appear in reporting of quantitative and qualitative results (Appendices D, E).

Instruments

Retrospective Quantitative Data

The retrospective statistical data on the records of the 5 years of the CATCH court were provided by the Franklin County Municipal Court. These data were accessed to describe the sample and to test the study hypotheses in terms of the amount of time spent in jail, number of annual arrests, number of participants who completed the program, recidivism rates, and living conditions. For this component, informed consent was waived to maintain anonymity, according to the Franklin University IRB guidelines.

Surveys

In the quantitative component, surveys were administered to both referrers and participants of the CATCH Court program (Appendices D, E). The referrer survey had 6 items, and the participant survey 20 items. Survey research is best utilized with populations that can be enumerated, accessible, and cooperative (Trochim & Donnelly, 2007).

In this evaluation study, all three characteristics were applicable for the criminal justice practitioners who refer defendants; practitioners are enumerated, accessible, and cooperative, it is

anticipated, given their professional status. The CATCH Court participants are clearly enumerated, accessible, and hopefully cooperative, although their participation was voluntary. Survey items were created based on the study hypotheses, the literature, and preliminary input from the CATCH Court staff (Appendices E, D).

Qualitative Portion of Surveys

The participant survey had 2 items requesting qualitative responses (items 19, 20). Responses are reported following the participants' quantitative results (Table 2).

Interview Protocols

In the qualitative component, a roundtable interview was conducted by the researcher with the CATCH Court participants. In-depth responses were sought with rich, thick description (Merriam, 2009; Moustakas, 1994). The goal was to encourage participants' responses that captured their thoughts and feelings in relation to the interview questions (Berg & Lune, 2011; Miller & Glassner, 2004). Interview questions were created based on the literature and anecdotal evidence from the CATCH Court staff (Appendix C).

Data Collection

The setting for this evaluation study was Franklin County, Ohio. The quantitative retrospective CATCH Court data were obtained by the researcher from the Franklin County Municipal Court records. Quantitative surveys were administered in person by the researcher to referrers and participants, and qualitative interviews were administered by the researcher in person to participants. Data collection took place for study participants and others who attended the CATCH Court sessions for support on the premises of the Franklin County Municipal Court in private rooms. Data collection for graduates and former participants who may not have graduated took place by postal mail.

Results: Quantitative Component

Descriptive Statistics

For all quantitative analysis, data cleaning was performed to eliminate errors and check for missing values (Creswell, 2013). Cases missing some items were used. However, analysis was also carried out with cases with missing data and cases without missing data to determine possible different findings.

Referrers. Descriptive statistics were used to ascertain the training, criteria used, and experiences of the referrers in referring defendants to the CATCH Court program (Appendix B). A total of 60 of approximately 151 referrers responded, a 40% response rate. Table 1 shows the frequency and percentage of referrers' responses. These data were collected to render a description of how referrers viewed referring to the CATCH Court. The data also supplied information that suggests future research.

As Table 1 displays, the majority of referrers was defense attorneys (53.33%), and the majority (65.00%) had received no training. Almost one-third received training from Judge Herbert and the CATCH staff, as well as other legal professionals. Approximately three-fourths (73.33%) had referred defendants with, and approximately one-third (38.33%) used their own criteria for referral. The few who did not refer defendants (25.00%) appeared in sympathy with the CATCH Court type of program; their major reasons for nonreferral were lack of certainty about identification of potential participants (10.00%) and other unspecified reasons (15.00). Further, almost three-fourths of the referrers (71.67%) would attend educational classes for better serving the defendant population. Approximately one-fourth (26.67%) responded with additional comments, and these were mixed. Referrers cited the excellence of the program as well as lack of proper training and difficulties of gaining victim-defendants' trust and commitment.

Table 1

Referrers: Training, Criteria, and Experiences (N = 60)

Item	<i>n</i>	%
Position		
Judge	11	18.33
Prosecutor	16	26.67
Defense counsel	32	53.33
No Response	1	2.00
Training Received		
Yes	21	35.00
No	39	65.00
Length of Training		
1-2 hours	12	20.00
3-4 hours	4	7.00
Less than 1 hour	1	2.00
More than 4 hours	4	7.00
No Response	39	65.00
Individual Conducting Training		
Judge Herbert, CATCH staff, Continuing Legal Education staff (American Bar Association), Assistant Court Administrator, Salvation Army personnel, Public Defender	19	31.67
No Response	41	68.33
Have Referred Defendants		
Yes	44	73.33
No	15	25.00
No Response	1	2.00

(continued)

Item	<i>n</i>	%
Decision Based On		
Assessment tool	4	7.00
Criteria provided	6	10.00
Criteria I developed	23	38.33
None	11	18.33
No Response	16	26.67
Reason for Nonreferral		
Not sure how potential participants are identified	6	10.00
I do not support specialty or problem-solving courts	1	2.00
Other (no narratives)	9	15.00
No Response	44	73.33
Attend Education for This Population		
Yes	43	71.67
Not sure	11	18.33
No	4	7.00
No Response	2	3.00
Additional Comments	16	26.67
Awesome		
Needed		
Powerful		
Empowering		
Difficult to gain victim-defendants' trust		
Identification of most needy		
Difficulty of gaining victims' commitment to program		
Concern about proper staff training, despite training given		
No Response	44	73.33

Note. Percentages of some items total more than 100% because of rounding.

CATCH Court participants. Descriptive statistics were used for two purposes: (a) to ascertain participants' experiences in the program, and (b) to examine the data regarding the following participant variables for the program from its founding in 2009 through 2013, the last year of data collection: total referrals to the CATCH Court program; status (acceptance to the program, rejection, self-exclusion); successful (graduation) and unsuccessful discharge; jail time (number of days) before and after participation in the program; annual number of arrests before and after participation in the program; recidivism rates (after-program jail days); and living conditions (being employed, volunteering, or enrolled in educational courses or vocational training).

Participants' experiences. Descriptive statistics were used to ascertain the experiences of participants in the CATCH Court program with close-ended items (Appendix A). A total of 21 participants responded. Table 2 shows the frequency and percentage of participants' responses. These data were collected to render a description of participants' factual histories and an overview of their self-assessments of their experiences in the program. The data also supplied information that suggests future research.

Table 2 shows that most participants had been in the program from 2 to 18 months (approximately 95%), with only 5% having graduated at survey administration. The threat of punishment kept almost three-fourths (71.43%) from reoffending. The program helped increase both mental and physical health a great deal for the majority (47.62%, 61.90%, respectively). In addition, the majority felt safer with the program (85.71%), felt it helped with their families (57.14%), stable housing (71.42%), development of healthier life skills, and increase of healthy behaviors (76.20%, 71.42%, respectively).

For most participants, the most helpful components of the program were the CATCH staff (81.00%) and the judge (66.67%). Group therapy also helped maintain their probation conditions for the majority (52.39%). The judge was very influential, helping to hold participants accountable for probation conditions, positively impacting participants, and treating them with great compassion (85.71% each). The vast majority of participants also felt they were treated more fairly in CATCH than other programs (85.71%), that the program had positive effects inside the court (95.24%), and that their individual needs were addressed by the program (95.24%). Finally, similar to an early item, the vast majority felt that the CATCH staff and judge had the greatest impact on them (100.00%, 85.71%, respectively).

Table 2

Participants: Experiences in the CATCH Court Program (N = 21)

Item	<i>n</i>	%
Length of Time in Program		
Graduated	1	4.76
2 months	6	28.57
6 months	5	23.81
1 year	4	19.05
18 months	5	23.81
Threat of Punishment Kept Participant From Reoffending		
Yes	15	71.43
No. Never thought about punishment	3	14.29
No. Thought about it but reoffended anyway	3	14.29
Program Helped Increase Mental Health		
Yes, a great deal	10	47.62
Yes, somewhat	7	33.33
Yes, a little bit	1	4.76
Not sure	3	14.29
Program Helped Increase Physical Health		
Yes, a great deal	13	61.90
Yes, somewhat	5	23.81
Yes, a little bit	2	9.52
Not sure	1	4.76
Program Helped Participant Feel Safer		
Yes, a great deal	18	85.71
yes, somewhat	2	9.52
No Response	1	4.76

(continued)

Item	<i>n</i>	%
Program Helped With Family		
Yes, a great deal	12	57.14
Yes, somewhat	4	19.04
Yes, a little bit	1	4.76
Not sure	1	4.76
No	2	9.52
No Response	1	4.76
Program Helped With Stable Housing		
Yes	15	71.42
Not sure	1	4.76
No	4	19.04
No Response	1	4.76
Program Helped Development of Healthier Life Skills		
Yes, a great deal	16	76.20
Yes, somewhat	2	9.52
Not sure	1	4.76
No Response	2	9.52
Program Helped Increase Healthy Behaviors		
Yes, to a great extent	15	71.42
Yes, somewhat	3	14.29
No sure	1	4.76
No Response	2	9.52
Most Helpful Components in Maintaining Probation Conditions or Healthy Behaviors (more than one permissible)		
Mentor	9	42.86
Judge	14	66.67
CATCH staff	17	81.00
Therapy	13	62.00
Other CATCH participants	11	52.40
No Response	1	4.76

(continued)

Item	<i>n</i>	%
If Attended Group Therapy, Therapy Helped Maintain Probation Conditions		
Yes, to a great extent	11	52.39
Yes, somewhat	5	23.80
Not sure	1	4.76
No	1	4.76
No Response	3	14.29
Judge Held Participant Accountable for Probation Conditions		
Yes, to a great extent	18	85.71
Yes, somewhat	1	4.76
No	1	4.76
No Response	1	4.76
Judge Positively Impacted		
Yes, to a great extent	18	85.71
Yes, somewhat	1	4.76
No	1	4.76
No Response	1	4.76
Judge Treated Participant With More Compassion Than in Other Courtrooms		
Yes, to a great extent	18	85.71
Yes, somewhat	1	4.76
No	1	4.76
No Response	1	4.76
Treated More Fairly in CATCH Court Than in Other Courtrooms		
Yes, to a great extent	18	85.71
Yes, somewhat	2	9.52
No Response	1	4.76
Positive Effect on Participant Inside CATCH Court		
Yes, to a great extent	20	95.24
Yes, somewhat	1	4.76

(continued)

Item	<i>n</i>	%
Individual Needs Addressed by Program		
Yes, to a great extent	20	95.24
Yes, somewhat	1	4.76
Greatest Impact on Participant of CATCH Court (more than one permissible)		
CATCH Staff	21	100.00
Judge	18	85.71
Other Participants	14	66.67
Mentor	10	47.62
Therapy sessions outside Court	14	66.67

Note. Percentages of some items total more or less than 100% because of rounding. For items with more than one response permissible, percentages for each response are shown.

Two additional items were included that called for open-ended responses. If participants did not graduate from the CATCH Court program, the first item asked them to explain why. A total of nine of 21 responded. Two responded “No”; three indicated they were not that far into the program, and four asserted their strong intentions to graduate:

Nothing can stop me and I will graduate CATCH Court.

I will graduate next year. It’s been a pleasure to be in this program. I have a great life today.

I will graduate. I have all the support to help me through!

The second open-ended item requested any additional thoughts. Eight participants responded, and the thoughts were unanimous. One expressed a great liking for the program, and another praised the program: “CATCH is awesome and so is Judge Herbert. Six expressed gratitude, shared insights, and testified that the program “saved” their lives:

CATCH Court has saved my life. Without the program, the judge, and staff protecting me from myself, I wouldn't be here. They are my Angels. I love CATCH Court. I don't know what I would be doing without CATCH because I don't think I would have the life I have now. CATCH has changed my life and I will forever be thankful. Accountability is the key to success in your recovery.

Total referrals. As Table 3 shows, the total number of referrals, 2009 through 2013, was 205. Of these, 106 (51.7%) were accepted per the participant criteria and 49 (23.7%) were rejected.

Table 3

Total Referrals and Status of Participants, 2009-2013

Participants	Frequency	Percent
Accepted	105	51.7
Rejected	49	23.7
Self-excluded	50	24.4
Total	205	100.0

Table 4 shows the breakdown by year. The year 2010 was the highest for referrals, 65 (31.7%), with 2012 the lowest, 25 (12.2%). The number of accepted participants for the 5 years varied from 17 (2009) to 35 (2010).

Table 4

Referrals to CATCH Court Program by Year, 2009-2013

Year	Frequency	Percent
2009	30	14.6
2010	65	31.7
2011	40	19.5
2012	25	12.2
Total	205	100.0

Discharge results. Discharge results for the 2009-2013 period are shown in Table 5. It can be seen that 22 participants (20.8%) were successfully discharged (graduated), with 33 (31.1%) unsuccessfully discharged (dismissed because of noncompliance), and 51 (48.1%) neutrally discharged (participant’s choice to opt out).

Table 5

CATCH Court Program Discharge Results, 2009-2013

Participant	Frequency	Percent
Successful Discharge	22	20.8
Unsuccessful Discharge	33	31.1
Neutral Discharge	51	48.1
Total	106	100.0

The number of successful discharges (graduation) varied from 6 in 2009 and 2010 to 1 in 2011.

Jail time. The average number of days in jail for the preceding 10 years was compared with participants who were successfully discharged ($N = 22$) from the CATCH Court program and those who were unsuccessfully discharged ($N = 33$) and those neutrally discharged ($N = 51$) with error bar graphs, 95% confidence interval). For those successfully discharged, the average number of jail days was 300-329, compared to 480-509 for those unsuccessfully discharged and 420-449 days for those neutrally discharged. Further, based on the results, it can be predicted that in a 10-year span, those successfully discharged will spend between 180 and 479 days in jail compared with those unsuccessfully discharged, between 390 and 659 days in jail, and those neutrally discharged, between 360 and 539 days in jail. (See also Tables 7 and 8 below.)

Number of arrests. Composite arrest numbers were compared over the previous 10 years for participants successfully discharged, unsuccessfully discharged, and neutrally discharged from the CATCH Court program (error bar graphs, 95% confidence interval). The results showed that those successfully discharged had a lower number of arrests, an average 90-119 times, compared to those either unsuccessfully discharged, an average 120-149 times, or neutrally discharged, an average slightly less than 120-149 times. However, the graphs overlapped considerably and thus the differences may be due to chance.

Recidivism. Recidivism after program participation over the previous 10 years was measured as number of days in jail (error bar graphs, 95% confidence interval). The results showed that those who successfully completed the program spent an average of 0 to 4 days in jail, compared to those unsuccessfully discharged, 20 to 24 days in jail, or neutrally discharged, 10 to 14 days in jail. (See also Tables 7 and 8 below.)

Living conditions. Living conditions of participants who successfully completed the CATCH Program were measured by percentages from 2009 to 2013 who were employed,

volunteering, or enrolled in educational programs or vocational training within 1 year of successful discharge. As Table 6 shows, of the 22 graduates, data were available for 17. Of these, 77.3% were either employed, volunteering, or enrolled in educational programs or vocational training. Of the data not available, it should be noted that total number of graduates included four one honorary graduate in 2009 and four potential graduates in 2013. These circumstances may explain why data on these five participants was not available. With this explanation, the percentage of successfully discharged participants, 17, who were employed, volunteering, or enrolled in educational programs or vocational training becomes 100%.

Table 6

Participants' Living Conditions After Successful Discharge From CATCH Court Program

Participant	Frequency	Percent
Employed/Volunteering/Enrolled	17	77.3
Data Not Available	5	22.7
Total	22	100.0

Hypotheses Testing

Null Hypothesis 1. The CATCH program had no impact on participants with regard to the amount of time spent in jail, number of annual arrests, number of participants who completed the program, recidivism rates, and living conditions after successful completion of the program.

This hypothesis was tested by the descriptive statistics reported above. For amount of time in jail from 2009 through 2013, participants who were successfully discharged spent a lower number of jail days than those unsuccessfully or neutrally discharged. For number of arrests, the pattern was similar, with those successfully discharged having had a lower number of

arrests during the 5-year period than the other two groups, although overlap in arrest time could have contaminated the data.

For recidivism, again the pattern was similar, with those successfully discharged having had lower recidivism rates than those unsuccessfully or neutrally discharged. For living conditions, the results were similar, with 77% to 100% of those successfully discharged having improved their living conditions through employment, volunteer work, or enrollment in educational or vocational training programs. These results show that the null hypothesis (H_{10}) was rejected: the CATCH program did impact participants with regard to the amount of time spent in jail, number of annual arrests, number of participants who completed the program, recidivism rates, and living conditions after successful completion of the program.

Null Hypothesis 2. There is no statistically significant difference between participants who successfully completed the CATCH program and those who were rejected or unsuccessfully discharged from the program with regard to the amount of time spent in jail, number of annual arrests, recidivism rates, and living conditions.

For time in jail among the three groups, no significant differences were found. This result was likely due to the type of data available—composite rather than discrete or specific numbers for participants before, during, and after the program. For number of arrests among the three groups, no significant differences were found, again because the aggregate data overlapped. For days in jail among the three groups after the program, a one-way ANOVA was conducted. Tables 7 and 8 display the results.

Table 7

Descriptive Results for After-Program Jail Days (Recidivism), by Group

	<i>N</i>	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Interval Lower Bound	Confidence for Mean Upper Bound	Minimum	Maximum
Successful Discharge	22	1.0455	.21320	.04545	.9509	1.1400	1.00	2.00
Unsuccessful Discharge	33	5.2424	5.47169	.95250	3.3022	7.1826	1.00	21.00
Neutral Discharge	49	3.3265	3.43625	.49089	2.3395	4.3135	1.00	13.00
Total	104	3.4519	4.13341	.40531	2.6481	4.2558	1.00	21.00

Table 8

ANOVA for Test of Significance of After-Program Jail Days (Recidivism), by Group

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	<i>F</i>	Sig.
Between Groups	233.969	2	116.984	7.744	.001*
Within Groups	1525.791	101	15.107		
Total	1759.760	103			

* $p < .05$.

The results show a lower mean for those successfully discharged (1.05) compared with those unsuccessfully discharged (5.24) and those neutrally discharged (3.35; Table 5) and a significant difference ($p = .001$) among the groups. Thus, a significant difference was found with regard to recidivism among the groups. The three assumptions guiding ANOVA were tested: (a) samples must be random and independent if they are to be representative of the population, (b) the distributions of the populations from which the samples are selected are normal, and (c) the variances of the distributions in the population are equal.

To further test this variable, follow-up tests were performed. The Levene test of homogeneity of variances was not met (Levene statistic (2, 101) = 19.445, $p = .000$), indicating that the variances were significantly different. However, violation of this one assumption is not seriously detrimental because ANOVA is a robust inferential statistical test (Field, 2013).

Tukey HSD was performed to evaluate differences among the groups (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2012). The results showed a significant difference ($p < .000$) between participants who successfully completed the CATCH program and those who were unsuccessfully or neutrally discharged from the program. Thus, participants who successfully completed CATCH program had proportionately lower rates of recidivism, measured by days spent in jail after completion of the program and by a statistically significant amount.

For living conditions of those who successfully completed the program, descriptive statistics only were available. Thus, no significant differences could be tested for or were found. If information had been available for living conditions on participants who unsuccessfully or neutrally completed the program, possibly tests could have been performed for significant differences.

With regard to the two hypotheses, it should be noted that the results are based on aggregate data, and it is recognized that “impact” may be interpreted in different ways. For greater precision and accuracy, it is recommended that, to ascertain a more statistically stable impact, discrete data per participant should be collected rather than use of a composite total that does not delineate among their experiences regarding the variables.

Evaluation Objectives: Results

CATCH Court Goal 1: Reduce participants’ time in jail. Evaluation Objective 1: Participants’ jail time should be reduced by 75% after acceptance into the CATCH Court program.

This goal and objective were partially met by the program, as reported above. Noticeable differences were found in the number of average days participants spent in jail. Participants who successfully completed the program spent fewer days in jail, compared to those who unsuccessfully completed or were neutrally discharged. However, further analysis is recommended to obtain a truer picture of time in jail for the three groups. Rather than a composite number of jail days, as currently reported, the records should be analyzed for specific days in jail before participants enter the CATCH Court program, while in the program, and after the program.

CATCH Court Goal 2: Reduce participants’ annual arrests. Evaluation Objective 2: Participants will decrease the number of arrests annually by 50% after acceptance into the CATCH Court program.

From the findings reported above, this goal and objective and goal were partially met as reflected in the average number of annual arrests. Participants who successfully completed the program had far fewer arrests in the previous 10 years than those who were unsuccessfully

discharged or neutrally discharged from the program. However, because of the composite data used, it cannot be concluded that annual arrests were reduced by 50%. As for a truer picture of Goal 1, it is recommended that further analysis take place with data that clearly report number of arrests before the program, during the program, and after the program to ascertain with reasonable confidence the impact of the CATCH Court program on annual number of arrests.

CATCH Court Goal 3: Maximize the number of participants who successfully complete the CATCH Court program. Evaluation Objective 3: 30% of participants will successfully complete the CATCH Court program within 2 years from the date of admission.

Overall, the results indicate that 21% of all participants accepted into CATCH Court program successfully completed the program since its inception in 2009 through 2013 (Table 5). However, as also reported, annual completion rates were low, varying from 6 in 2009 and 2010 to 1 in 2011.

CATCH Court Goal 4: Reduce recidivism among those charged with prostitution in the Franklin County Municipal Court.

Evaluation Objective 4a: Recidivism among current participants in the CATCH Court program will be no higher than 50% each year.

Evaluation Objective 4b: Recidivism among participants who have successfully completed the CATCH Court program will be no higher than 25% each year.

The analysis was conducted on the overall reduction in recidivism among participants charged with prostitution in the Franklin County Municipal Court rather than the specific Evaluation Objectives 4a and 4b. As reported above and shown in Table 6, the conclusion can be reached that recidivism among participants who successfully completed the CATCH Court

program was significantly reduced compared to recidivism among participants who were unsuccessfully or neutrally discharged.

CATCH Court Goal 5: Improve living conditions of participants who successfully complete the CATCH Court program.

Evaluation Objective 5a: 80% of participants will be employed, volunteering, or enrolled in education or vocational training within 1 year after successful termination.

Evaluation Objective 5b: 100% of participants will have a stable living situation within 1 year of successful completion of the CATCH Court Program (Franklin County Municipal Court, 2013b).

For participants' employment, volunteering, or education, the results indicated that this goal and attendant objectives were nearly met, with 77% of participants (goal 80%) being employed, volunteering, or enrolled in educational programs vocational training after successful discharge from the program (Table 4). If missing data points are excluded from analysis, then this goal and Evaluation Objective 5a are clearly met (100%), as reported above. Nevertheless, it is recommended that a definition of stable living situation should be provided with regard to Evaluation Objective 5b.

Discussion and Recommendations for Quantitative Component

Descriptive Statistics

Results for referrers with regard to their training and experience with CATCH Court (Table 1) indicated mixed responses, with many indicating positive comments about CATCH but some pointing out drawbacks. These included lack of proper training for referrers and difficulties in gaining victim-defendants trust and commitment. Results for participants' experiences (Table 2) indicated positive responses in terms of increased mental and physical health, feelings of

physical safety, better family relationships, and development of healthier life skills and healthy behaviors. Most also credited Judge Herbert and the CATCH staff with making positive differences in their lives.

Evaluation Goals and Objectives

The results demonstrated that the CATCH Court program over the years 2009 to 2013 was partially successful in meeting the stated evaluation goals and objectives. Goals 1, 2, and 3 (reduction of jail time, reduction of annual arrests, successful completion of program) were partially met. Goals 4 and 5, reduction of recidivism and employment/stable living situations, were successfully met. As noted, for more accurate conclusions, collection of more discrete data is necessary in terms of participant demographics (e.g., age, gender, ethnicity, educational level, marital status, number of children, age at first solicitation, number of years soliciting).

In addition, additional analysis with a control group, taken as those who were rejected or self-excluded from the program, could yield more precise and enlightening findings, depending on the specific research questions. For all variables (e.g., days in jail, number of arrests, recidivism, and living conditions), more updated and specific data are needed for participants, such as at 6-month intervals, before joining the program, while in the program, and after the program, whether they were successfully discharged, unsuccessfully discharged, or neutrally discharged from the program.

An effort should be made to survey more referrers (current response rate 35%) in a more systematic manner for greater response and possibly broader picture of referrers' views and training. Similarly, graduates of the CATCH program should be located for survey administration. Their responses could be compared with those of participants presently in the

program. In addition, graduates' responses would provide a more detailed picture and statistics of the efficacy and longer-term effects of the program.

Variables investigated should be more precisely defined to indicate measurability (e.g., stable living condition). Finally, a consistent method of reporting and calculating data should be instituted to eliminate overlaps or double counts as well as greater accuracy of measurable variables. These recommendations are made to confirm some of the current findings as well as provide conclusive results on other inconclusive findings.

Results: Qualitative Component

Setting

Data analysis was also conducted from the roundtable interview in accordance with qualitative analysis principles (Seidman, 2006). On a designated day, the researcher met with 24 participants—20 current CATCH Court program members, three graduates, and one woman who had violated probation and did not graduate but was permitted to attend. An empty courtroom was assigned, and participants and researcher sat around a table.

The researcher reiterated to participants the importance of their participation for future CATCH Court programs, the voluntary nature of participation, and the preservation of their anonymity in reporting of findings. An assistant took notes as the researcher also informed them that their responses would be transcribed by her. The researcher reminded participants they could stop, leave, or not respond at any time with no detrimental consequences. The session lasted for 2 hours, with the researcher asking participants the interview questions (Appendix C). During the first hour, only the participants were present. During the second, staff members attended, seated in chairs lining the courtroom: five mentors, the probation officer, the administrator, and the judge.

The judge allowed the session to continue as long as necessary. Participants were eager to respond, and the exchanges were free-flowing and robust. When it appeared that responses were repeating, the researcher closed the meeting, with thanks to all attendees.

Research Question and Data Analysis

The research question for the qualitative component was as follows: What are the insights and observations of participants in CATCH during their attendance in the program? To answer this research question, an interview protocol of 10 items was created requesting participants' insights and observations on many aspects of the CATCH Court program and its effects on them (Appendix C).

With the protocol questions in mind, after the session, the researcher transcribed the session and submitted the transcripts to participants for member checking. Several participants made additions and all thanked the researcher. On the corrected transcript, the researcher made notations of associations, relationships, and emerging themes according to qualitative methods (Corbin & Strauss, 2014; Miles, Huberman, & Saldana, 2013; Patton, 2014). These processes led to “thematic patterns” (Groenewald, 2004, p. 21) that became the most commonly repeated subjects and recurring themes. The findings are reported by question, with the major themes of each.

Initial Information About CATCH Court

Participants cited judges as the most frequent individuals who told them about CATCH. One mentioned a public defender, another an advocate, and another an undercover police officer who provided a flyer about CATCH. One participant referred to an inmate already in the CATCH program.

Most Important Thing About CATCH Court

Participants responded with a wide range of observations, among which were staying sober, the support system, accountability, individual needs met, a safe and secure environment, the program's structure, recognition that they were victims, having offenses expunged, and understanding that they are listened to. Many brought up the following themes.

A sense of caring. One participant noted:

There is a sense of sincerity and genuine care that comes from the mentors. They do not look through you but see you as an individual that needs help.

Another participant described the mentor as "that special someone":

Having that special someone that would come and pick you up . . . and having the chance to talk during transport. Hearing positive feedback from them encourages [me] to face situations head on.

Another said, "The feeling of love is present." And another contributed, to which many nodded, "They treat us like they care."

No judgment. The sense transmitted by the staff that participants were not being judged for their previous actions was often voiced.

No one judges me.

We can talk to one another and no one judges us.

The judge and everyone listens to us and helps understand that we are not bad people.

Self-esteem. Many participants referred to their growing sense of self-esteem from the program.

It gives us a sense of self-worth.

It gives us self-esteem.

Self-esteem is everything. It keeps us from the streets.

Life-saving. Finally, almost all participants agreed that the most important thing about the CATCH Court program was its rescue from their former lives.

The actual program because it saved my life.

Impact of CATCH Court on Family and/or Their Relationships

Participants had a range of responses to the impact of CATCH on themselves in relation to their families and their family members' responses to them in the program. Several mentioned that the program supported supportive family relationships and that family members could see how sincere Judge Herbert was with regard to the program. Two themes appeared most prevalent.

Impact on participant. Participants said the program helped them become a better parent and to spend quality time with their families, One participant recognized that the atmosphere engendered “assistance to family members that may be in the ‘system’ or addicts as well.

[The program] gives them hope to see that the program is producing positive results and the opportunity to be the example for those family members.

This theme also led to the impact on family relationships.

Family relationships. Participants recognized that family members “feel better” in the program, knowing that the participant is safe. Other participants referred to healing relationships.

Has created a humbling experience for relationships to be mended.

Redeveloped trust with family members.

Sisterhood. Finally, for participants who had no families or bonds, the participants in the program felt a “sisterhood.”

Seeing how sisterhood has been in the court has helped us [form] a sisterhood. In fact, during the roundtable session, the women expressed the desire to have all the others in the room as they gained greater comfortable with the procedure. They wanted to have each other in the room, as a surrogate family.

Most Successful Factors of CATCH

Participants voiced several factors they felt contributed most importantly to the success of CATCH. Several mentioned the protection from abusers the program supplies, as well as the program supplying the “solution” to the problems participants faced. Another cited the “transformation of victim to victor status.”

Understanding, care, and concern. Many reiterated the understanding, care, and concern of the judge and all staff:

Having a judge that is passionate about human trafficking and individuals. He has a daughter and can understand why the clients feel the way they do.

All the people involved are caring and give us supportive words and actions.

Recognizing participant potential. One participant said:

Volunteers and mentors see the potential in the clients and sharing goes both ways.

Another referred to the inspiration of the graduates:

Seeing graduates from the program. They give me hope.

Help of CATCH Court With Physical Health

Participants unanimously applauded the contributions of CATCH to their physical health. They had all entered with poor physical health from their lives on “the street” and many had drug addictions. Once in the program, they referred to obtaining medical checkups, dental care, and insurance. One said she felt “relief” at the reassurance that she had not contracted STDs or AIDS. Many reported that having their medications (one acknowledged she was on 12 medications) prevented them from going “back to the street.”

The Hardest Part of CATCH Court

Participants gave thoughtful responses to this question, indicating their assimilation of many of the program’s lessons. They acknowledged having to take the risk and trust the process, be responsible and accountable, often for the first time, and fearing failure in the program. They also agreed that the extra processing time in jail was not a deterrent to joining. Rather, at that time they did not see or admit that they needed help. The jail time also helped many get detoxified. Many agreed on the following.

Asking for help. Participants admitted it was difficult for them to ask for help.

I’ve been on my own for so long thought I didn’t need anyone. And I was even proud of it.

It took a lot for me to admit I needed help, and then to ask for it.

Being honest. Participants pointed out that because so many were addicts, they were, as one put it, “good at lying and tricking people.” Once in CATCH, they did not have to engage in such behaviors. Several noted too that honesty came with legal consequences, such as revocation of their probation or additional charges.

To be true to yourself, you have to be honest that you need the help.

Honesty is kind of scary, because you don't want anything you admit to come back and bite you.

Rewiring thinking. One participant described her thinking process and many agreed:

I had to rewire my thinking process, what I used to do versus what I need to do now. I had to change my thinking.

It is interesting that the CATCH Court program acronym stands for “Changing Actions to Change Habits.” By their observations, the participants recognized also that changing actions involved changing, or “rewiring” their thinking.

What Law Enforcement Needs to Know

Participants were vocal on what police officers should know to be of maximum help. Many participants related that the same officers gave them multiple warnings while on the street but the police did nothing else. “Get me off the street,” said one. “That’s what will help.” Participants suggested that officers ask more questions at arrest, presumably so officers would recognize the dire situations of the participants and direct them to help.

Not criminals but victims. A recurring theme was participants’ fervent desire to be seen as victims and not criminals. Several participants referred to undercover officers recognizing, even in apprehending participants, that participants should be treated with dignity (to participants not being strip-searched). Some officers, unfortunately, “played on our disease,” demanding sexual favors for looking the other way. Participants also pointed out that law enforcement officers should become aware that participants and others like them were victims of human trafficking:

They are locking up individuals that are in need of help . . . who truly are victims.

We want a way to show appreciation to officers who see us as victims and treat us with compassion.

Awareness of the CATCH Court program. With enunciation that law enforcement should recognize participants as victims, several mentioned that officers should be more widely aware of the CATCH Court program and relay this information. Participants reiterated that they want to leave “the life,” and the program is an effective and immediate way to do so.

Meaning of the “No Shame Zone” Sign

In the CATCH Court office, a large sign is prominent: “NO SHAME.” Participants felt strongly about this sign. They referred to the negative effects of continued shame and the positive effects of the message.

Shame. Many agreed that continued feelings of shame trigger their going back to the streets. “Shame keeps you feeling sick inside, and you dread telling others.”

No shame. Participants acknowledged that they were overcoming the shame they had felt and others had contributed to, such as family members. Most participants were vocal about the positive effects of the message on them as they progressed through the program.

It is okay to be honest and real with your feelings because you are going to be heard and acknowledged.

We can vent and share topics that we are not comfortable talking about elsewhere.

When one participant shouted the following, most of the others agreed vociferously:

There is no shame here in the court!

What the Court Should Do to Address Human Trafficking and Participants’ Situations

Participants suggested many avenues to approach the problem of human trafficking and stem it. Their primary suggestions were education and the abusers.

Education. Participants agreed that young girls, even as early as elementary and middle school, should be educated about human trafficking and told that they can go to a “safe haven,” such as police and CATCH Court staff. Participants unanimously suggested community awareness programs:

Education on abuse and signs of abuse.

Safeguards for potential victims.

Educate the police!

Abusers. Participants also observed that abusers may not recognize the effects of their actions. “The abuser needs to see the effects.” Many also called for action with the pimps and “johns” (customers of prostitutes), who apparently think they are doing nothing wrong.

They question why they are the target.

Some participants also explained that without the demand, such as by the “johns,” there might be less trafficking.

Sharing Information With Other Cities About CATCH Court Research

Finally, participants were asked what they thought was the most pertinent information to share about the CATCH Court program and research. They recognized that many more women were being victimized “out there,” and one said, “Get them!” Most others noted that more women should be enrolled in CATCH Court-type programs. And all agreed on one participant’s comment:

Create a CATCH Court program. It works!

Discussion and Recommendations for Qualitative Component

Summary of Themes

Qualitative findings concurred generally with the quantitative survey results, in which positive effects of various aspects were cited by approximately 48% to 100% of participants (Table 2). In the qualitative segment, most participants credited a judge with giving them information about the CATCH Court program, and their assessment of the most important things about the program were a sense of caring, no judgments by others in the program, their growing sense of self-esteem and self-worth, and crediting the program with saving their lives. Participants found that the impact of CATCH Court on their family and relationships was positive, helping them become better parents, healing relationships with their own family members, and creating a sense of sisterhood as a surrogate family.

The participants identified the most successful factors of CATCH as understanding, care, and concern by all personnel, beginning with the judge, and recognition by staff of the participants' potential for positive change. All agreed that CATCH had helped them greatly with physical problems and combating their drug addictions.

The hardest part of CATCH to participants was their admitting the need for help and asking for it, being and continuing to be honest in all dealings, and “rewiring” their thinking from self-destructive to positive thoughts, behavior, and actions. Participants had strong opinions on what law enforcement should know, including taking them off the streets, seeing them as victims rather than criminals, and becoming aware of the CATCH Court program for referrals.

The “No Shame” sign in the CATCH Court office was highly significant to participants for combating their chronic feelings of shame and building on the “no shame” motto and precept. Participants strongly recommended education of young girls and law enforcement officers to

address and prevent human trafficking, as well as educate abusers to the effects. Finally, participants suggested the most pertinent information to share with other cities was to recognize that many women were being victimized in trafficking and to create CATCH Court-type programs.

These participants were passionate about the positive effects of CATCH Court in their lives as well as their enthusiasm for the program and thoughtfulness about its reach. As the data indicate, the themes of honesty, being heard, people who care, education, and appreciation for all staff were repeated throughout the roundtable discussion. In fact, at the Christmas season before the roundtable, during a prehearing lunch, the researcher witnessed Judge Herbert visiting with the women, asking them about their lives, and eating with them. Other courtroom personnel also distributed Christmas cards to the participants and graduates in the court, calling each by name, talking with them, also sharing lunch, supporting them and chiding them in compassionate, playful ways.

At this event, participants freely shared their thoughts, heralding the themes of the roundtable. The theme of caring surfaced:

I went on the run for two months and had to go back to jail. It was one year ago today. I deserve a second chance. I had a good life ahead of me and there are people now that care about me.

Participants reiterated the theme of caring:

On the streets you think no one loves me. But, this room shows you they do. I love coming to court now. Before, I didn't want to come near court.

The theme of no shame recurred:

It was my thinking, not the dope, it was my thinking! I'd say, I only got raped twice—it's ok, it was my thinking! I see the error of this now. Here NO SHAME!

Participants also singled out what they are learning and have learned. One candidly admitted:

I couldn't see past my nose in jail—time in jail—I needed that time. If I spent one less day, I would have just gotten out and used. . . . I would have banged my head against the wall again. [The program] helps you get where you want to go. Out of the street.

Another asked rhetorically:

How many Christmas cards have you gotten from people who paid for you? Here, you get an appreciation for freedom and a new life.”

And a CATCH graduate summed up:

This could be the last time you have to spend Christmas in jail, away from your children. I never thought I would get here. I now know where I am going. . . .
Now I live what they taught me.

These comments and this event, highly moving to the researcher, certainly supported what the participants reported during data collection.

Limitations

A number of limitations are acknowledged for this study. These are discussed below with reference to participants and the mixed method research design. The methodological limitations pertain to both the quantitative and qualitative components.

Quantitative: Program Population Size

Recruitment of participants who have graduated or opted out of CATCH became a problem. Some addresses were not current, and some participants may not have responded

because of distrust of the judicial system or associated projects (Jacobson, 2014). Additional studies to survey and interview participants in person individually may increase recruitment and participation. Individual interviews may also produce more in-depth experiences and explanations.

Because the CATCH program is small and still in its formative stage, the entire population of defendants referred to the program in its 5 years was used for data analysis. The total population was approximately 105 women and transgender individuals between the ages of 21 and 55 who participated in the program. This small population size for the quantitative component raised issues of power or the probability of rejecting a false null hypothesis (Type I errors). Moreover, 22 participants graduated over the 5 years (Table 5), and 21 responded to the experience survey (Table 2). These small numbers may be inadequate to generalize to larger participant populations.

With regard to referrers, the response rate was low, 40%. Because of this low percentage, generalization to referrers in other programs may not be viable.

Quantitative: Data Collection

As discussed above, data collection was problematic in terms of the variables. Composite figures were available rather than breakdowns by year or by participants who were successfully discharged, unsuccessfully discharged, or neutrally discharged from the CATCH Court program. Thus, statistical results may not accurately reflect the actualities of participant viewpoints and behavior.

Qualitative: Defendant Participation

All defendants in the 5 years of the program were sought for possible participation. However, some of their current locations were not known; when located, as with quantitative

recruitment, some were not willing to participate for reasons of shame at their behavior or lack of trust in the judicial system (Jacobson, 2014). Alternatively, some did not see themselves as victims; even after completion of the program, they preferred to continue in the life and settings they were familiar with.

The roundtable discussion took place with 20 current participants in the CATCH Court program, three graduates, and one nongraduate who had violated probation. Although participants responded forthrightly, the differentiation between current participants and graduates was not clear.

This evaluation was conducted of a single specialty court program, admittedly new, and in a single geographical location. These conditions, as well as those referred to above, may indicate that the results may be generalizable but with caution to other similar or parallel programs or locations.

Future Research

In addition to the specific recommendations for further quantitative and qualitative studies, further evaluation studies should be conducted annually, in both quantitative and qualitative designs. Studies could be conducted on participant accountability, that is, the degree to which participants in CATCH are held accountable with punitive means for violation of probation and recommit crimes. Issues to be explored would support any adversarial process and possible penalties that could become more severe than if no new charges had been filed.

Given the 2-year duration of the CATCH Court program, the court could possibly develop milestones at shorter intervals. As supported by the number of unsuccessful and neutral discharges (Table 5), many initial participants seem to drop out before completion. Anecdotal evidence reveals that participation in the program even less than the full 2 years leads to much

progress in the program. If this recommendation were implemented, goals would have to be reassessed and reformulated and data collection protocols be developed for these shorter timeframes.

Further, studies should be mounted as to the most effective ways to recruit more human trafficking victims into the program. Admittedly, funding would have to be increased and facilities expanded. Involvement of law enforcement and community organizations could be sought for recruitment strategies. In Columbus, Ohio, such an initiative has begun. At a recent meeting of the Specialty Court Advisory Commission, of which the researcher is a member, two police commanders reported on an informal policy and new paradigm for information and education. The Columbus Police Department has been working with CATCH and this Commission to distribute flyers about the CATCH Court program on the streets, to answer questions, and to respect the victims. Several participants commented on the success of this new paradigm in the roundtable discussion.

Additional research should be conducted with graduates of the CATCH program. They should be located for both survey administration and roundtable or individual interview, with the same and similar questions as those administered. Responses of graduates could be compared with those of participants presently in the program. In addition, graduates' responses, as well as the length of time since graduation, would provide a more detailed picture and statistics of the efficacy and longer-term effects of the program.

Based on initial input from CATCH staff members, some participants who appear in the court have not been victims of human trafficking in the court and do not want to be labeled as victims. A study of these individuals would be enlightening in terms of understanding their mindsets and developing programs to serve them with an emphasis on addiction treatment.

Surveys and interviews could be conducted with those who did not graduate from CATCH or who opted out before completion and exploration of the reasons why. Findings could help refine the program to meet more needs and increase the graduation rate.

With criminal justice professional referrers to CATCH, evaluations could be conducted after additional or different training. A more systematic manner of referrer survey should be implemented for greater response. A larger sample would possibly broaden the overall conclusions about referrers' views, training, and need for training. Topics to be explored could include more informed referrals, increase of knowledge, and positive changes of attitudes toward specialty courts and defendants. With social service providers and staff members of CATCH, studies could be conducted on their perceived benefits and drawbacks of the program and their recommendations for improvement.

Implications

The timeliness of CATCH Court seems evident. A tool for identification of human trafficking victims has been developed (Simich, 2014), and at this writing, and in recognition of the widespread and growing nature of human trafficking, a comprehensive anti-trafficking bill passed in the U.S. Senate, the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act (Werner, 2015). The bill provides for expansion of law enforcement strategies to target sex traffickers and creation of a fund for victims' aid.

Given this initiative and the results of this evaluation study, the CATCH Court program deserves expansion. With studies such as those suggested above and evidence of defendant progress and their successful transition to mainstream society, additional funding could be attracted to enlarge the Franklin County program and serve more defendants. Further, because some judges may indicate opposition to problem-solving and specialty courts (Berman &

Feinblatt, 2011), based on the evaluation results, a continuing legal education seminar could be developed for judges on criminogenic risks and the benefits to both defendants and court personnel of specialty courts.

Further, following from CATCH participants' suggestions, educational efforts should be expanded throughout the community. Initiatives could include additional training of referrers and law enforcement officers as well as public and private schools at all levels. Programs could include teacher training, student curricular modules in civics and diversity, and guest speakers such as Judge Herbert, police officers, and current CATCH participants and graduates.

As the Franklin County Municipal Court (2014d) stated in requesting assistance for evaluation of CATCH, the CATCH Court "has no national model or best practices upon which it was developed" (p. 1). This is the first evaluation of CATCH Court, and few evaluations have been conducted of the success of other problem-solving court programs (Castellano, 2011). Judge Herbert voiced the hope that this evaluation could make a significant contribution not only in showing the success of the CATCH Court program but also in elevating the program to the national model, based on good theory and best practices. The CATCH Court, like other problem-solving courts, has the potential not only to change clients' lives but also the social perspectives on offenders and hence the entire social fabric (Farole, Puffett, Rempel, & Bryne, 2005; Mirchandani, 2008).

This researcher is committed to continuing to study human trafficking, its victims, and the CATCH Court program. The findings presented should fulfill Judge Herbert's hope. For defendants who have made damaging choices and have been victims of human trafficking, the CATCH Court program to date has been demonstrated as beneficial and even life-saving. It can serve as a nonpunitive, nonadversarial, rehabilitative model for similar victim-defendants. With

the current and future evaluation results, it is hoped that the program can become a model for similar courts in other states as well as the basis of a national and well-funded initiative for programs for human trafficking victims based on the CATCH Court.

References

- American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (5th ed.). Arlington, VA: American Psychiatric Publishing.
- Babbie, E. (2012). *The practice of social research* (13th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Cengage Learning.
- Begun, A. L., & Hammond, G. C. (2012). CATCH court: A novel approach to “treatment as alternative to incarceration” for women engaged in prostitution and substance abuse. *Journal of Social Work Practice in the Addictions, 12*(3), 328-331.
- Berg, B. A., & Lune, H. (2011). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences* (8th ed.). London, England: Pearson Education Limited.
- Berman, G., & Feinblatt, J. (2001). Problem-solving courts: A brief primer. *Law & Policy, 23*(2), 125-140.
- Boothroyd, R., Poythress, N., McGaha, A., & Petrila, J. (2003). The Broward Mental Health Court: Process, outcomes, and service utilization. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry, 26*, 55-71.
- Carmen, B. (2010, May 30). Saving money, changing lives. *Columbus (Ohio) Dispatch*. Retrieved from <http://www.dispatch.com/content/stories/local/2010/05/30/saving-money-changing-lives.html>
- Castellano, U. (2011). Problem-solving courts: Theory and practice. *Sociology Compass, 5*(11), 957-967. doi:10.1111/j.1751-9020.2011.00422.x
- Center for State Court Innovation. (2013). *Identifying and responding to sex trafficking*. Retrieved from http://www.courtinnovation.org/sites/default/files/documents/DV_SJI_Risk%20Need_.pdf

- Christmann, A., & Van Aelst, S. (2006). Robust estimation of Cronbach's alpha. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 97(7), 1660-1674. doi:10.1016/j.jmva.2005.05.012
- Cimino, A. N. (2013). *Developing and testing a theory of intentions to exit street-level prostitution: A mixed methods study* (Doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University). Retrieved from https://repository.asu.edu/attachments/110692/content/Cimino_asu_0010E_13111.pdf
- Corbin, J. M., & Strauss, A. (2014). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded research* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Crank, K., (2014). Community courts, specialized dockets, and other approaches to address sex trafficking. In *A guide to human trafficking for state courts* (pp. 37-46). Reston, VA: State Justice Institute.
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1971). Test validation. *Educational Measurement*, 2, 443-507.
- Dalla, R. L. (2006). *Exposing the "pretty woman" myth: A qualitative investigation of street-level prostituted women*. Oxford, England: Lexington Books.
- Davis, N. J. (2000). From victims to survivors: Working with recovering street prostitutes. In R. Weitzer (Ed.), *Sex for sale* (pp. 139-155). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Denckla, D. A. (1999). Forgiveness as a problem-solving tool in the courts: A brief response to the Panel on Forgiveness in Criminal Law. *Fordham Urban Law Journal*, 27, 1613-1619.
- Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. (2011). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Deschenes, E. P., Ireland, C., & Kleinpeter, C. B. (2009). Enhancing drug court success. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 48*(1), 19-36.

De Vaus, D. (2002). *Surveys in social research* (5th ed.). Melbourne, Australia: Allen & Unwin.

Doma International. (2014). The story of freedom. *Freedom a la Carte*. Retrieved from <http://freedomalacart.org/>

Farley, M., & Barkan, H. (1998). Prostitution, violence against women, and posttraumatic stress disorder. *Women & Health, 27*(3), 37-49.

Farole, Jr., D. J., Puffett, N., Rempel, M., & Byrne, F. (2005). Applying problem-solving principles in mainstream courts: Lessons for state courts. *Justice System Journal, 26*(1), 57-75.

Federal Bureau of Investigation. (2012). *Crime in the United States, 2012*. Retrieved from <http://www2.fbi.gov/ucr/cius2012/>

Field, A. (2013). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Flowers, R. B. (2011). *Prostitution in the digital age: Selling sex from the suite to the street*. Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.

Franklin County Municipal Court. (2013a, June 18). Administrative Order No. 04-2013. *In the Franklin County Municipal Court, Columbus, Ohio*. Columbus, OH: Author.

Franklin County Municipal Court. (2013b). *Changing Actions To Change Habits, program report*. Retrieved from file:///Users/karen/Downloads/CATCH_Program%20Description%20(1).pdf

Franklin County Municipal Court. (2014a). *Annual reports*. Retrieved from <http://www.fcmcclerk.com/reports/annual.php>

Franklin County Municipal Court. (2014b). *Changing Actions To Change Habits (CATCH):*

Participant handbook. Columbus, OH: Author.

Franklin County Municipal Court. (2014c). *Changing Actions To Change Habits (CATCH):*

Program description. Columbus, OH: Author.

Franklin County Municipal Court. (2014d). *Request for evaluation assistance*. Columbus, OH:

Author.

Gal, T., & Wexler, D. B. (2014). Synergizing therapeutic jurisprudence and positive

criminology. *Arizona Legal Studies*, Discussion Paper No. 13-33. Retrieved from

<http://ssrn.com/abstract=2287424> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2287424>

Golafshani, N. (2003). Understanding reliability and validity in qualitative research. *Qualitative*

Report, 8 (4), 597-607. Retrieved from <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR8->

[4/golafshani.pdf](http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR8-4/golafshani.pdf)

Goldcamp, J. S., Weiland, D., & Irons-Guynn, C. (2001). *Developing an evaluation plan for community courts: Assessing the Hartford Community Court model*. Washington, DC:

U.S. Department of Justice Crime and Justice Research Institute. Retrieved from

<https://www.ncjrs.gov/txtfiles1/bja/185689.txt>

Goodman, M., & Mazur, R. (2014). Identifying and responding to sex trafficking. In *A guide to*

human trafficking for state courts (pp. 89-100). Reston, VA: State Justice Institute.

Gottfredson, D. C., Najaka, S. S., Kearley, B. W., & Rocha, C. M. (2006). Long-term effects of

participation in the Baltimore city drug treatment court: Results from an experimental

study. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 2, 67-98.

Groenewald, T. (2004). A phenomenological research design illustrated. *International*

Journal of Qualitative Methods, 3(1), 1-26.

- Guest, G., Bunce, A. & Johnson, L. (2006). How many interviews are enough? An experiment with data saturation and variability. *Field Methods, 18(1)*, 50-82.
- Hammond, G. H., & McGlone, M. (2014). Entry, progression, exit, and service provisions for survivors of sex trafficking: Implications for effective interventions. *Global Social Welfare Research, Policy, and Practice, 1(1)*, 1-11.
- Haggerty, G. E. (2013). *Gay histories and cultures*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hendren, S. (2013, September 27). CATCH Court holds 3rd graduation. *WOSO News* (Columbus, Ohio). Retrieved from <http://wosu.org/2012/news/2013/09/27/c-a-t-c-h-court-holds-3rd-graduation/>
- Huddleston, C. W., Marlowe, D. B., & Casebolt, R. (2008). *Painting the current picture: A national report card on drug courts and other problem-solving court programs in the United States*. Vol. 2(1), 1-29. Washington, DC: National Drug Court Institute. Retrieved from http://ndci.org/sites/default/files/ndci/PCPII1_web%5B1%5D.pdf
- Human Trafficking and State Courts Collaborative. (2013). *Guide to human trafficking for state courts*. Retrieved from <http://www.htcourts.org/portfolio/a-guide-to-human-trafficking-for-state-courts/>
- Jacobson, B.N.H. (2014). Addressing the tension between the dual identities of the American prostitute: Criminal and victim; how problem-solving courts can help. *Seattle University Law Review, 37*, 1023-1058.
- Kerlinger, F. N. (1964). *Foundations in behavioral research*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

- Leckrone, J. (2010, November 9). Ohio court aims to rehabilitate prostitutes. *WHTC News* (Holland, MI). Retrieved from <http://whtc.com/news/articles/2010/nov/09/ohio-court-aims-to-rehabilitate-prostitutes/>
- Lederer, L. A., & Wetzel, C. A. (2014). The health consequences of sex trafficking and their implications for identifying victims in healthcare facilities. *Annals of Health Law, 23*(1),
- Lippman, J. (2013). *Announcement of New York's Human Trafficking Intervention Initiative*. New York, NY: Center for Court Innovation.
- Maxwell, J. (2012). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- McCoy, C. (2010). Do drug courts work? For what, compared to what? Qualitative results from a natural experiment. *Victims and Offenders, 5*, 67-75.
- McEntyre, G. (2013a, June 26). CATCH Court changing way law looks at sex trade business. *10TVNews* (Columbus, Ohio). Retrieved from <http://www.10tv.com/content/stories/2013/06/26/wbns-10tv-news-presents-catch-court.html>
- McEntyre, G. (2013b, September 27). Former addicts, prostitutes graduate from CATCH Court. *10TVNews* (Columbus, Ohio). Retrieved from <http://www.10tv.com/content/stories/2013/09/27/columbus-catch-court-graduates.html>
- McNiel, D. E., & Binder, R. L. (2007). Effectiveness of a mental health court in reducing criminal recidivism and violence. *American Journal of Psychiatry, 164*, 1395-1403.
- Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Miles , M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2013). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Miller, J., & Glassner, B. (2004). The “inside” and the “outside”: Finding realities in interviews. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative research: Theory methods and practice* (2nd ed., pp. 125-139). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Miner-Romanoff, K. (2014). Juvenile justice education for at-risk high school youth: A pilot program. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education Online*, 1-27.
doi:10.1080/10511253.2014.922594
- Mirchandani, R. (2008). Beyond therapy: Problem-solving courts and the deliberative democratic state. *Law & Social Inquiry*, 33(4), 853-893.
- Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mueller, D. (2012, September 27). *Treatment courts and court-affiliated diversion projects for prostitution in the United States: A report from the Prostitution Alternatives Round Table of the Chicago Coalition for the Homeless*. Paper presented at the 9th International Human Trafficking, Prostitution, and Sex Work Conference, Toledo, OH.
- Patton, M. Q. (2014). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Pierce, A., & Johnston, V. (2014). *Empowering women*. Retrieved from http://amandagpierce.com/doma/?page_id=41
- Potterat, J. J., Brewer, D. D., Muth, S. Q., Rothenberg, R. B., Woodhouse, D., Muth, J. B., Stites, H. K., . . . et al. (2004). Mortality in a long-term open cohort of prostitute women. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 159(8), 778-785.

- Roberts, L. (2013). *Prostitute[d]: Why applying global anti-trafficking efforts to local sexual exploitation is necessary* (Unpublished honors research thesis). Ohio State University, Columbus, OH. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/1811/54702>
- Roe-Sepowitz, D., Hickle, K., & Cimino, A. (2012). The impact of abuse history and trauma symptoms on successful completion of a prostitution-exiting program. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 22(1), 65-77.
doi:10.1080/10911359.2011.598830
- Roe-Sepowitz, D. D., Hickle, K. E., Loubert, M. P., & Egan, T. (2011). Adult prostitution recidivism: Risk factors and impact of a diversion program. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 50, 272-285. doi: 10.1080/10509674.2011.574205
- Santos, J.R.Q. (1999). Cronbach's alpha: A tool for assessing the reliability of scales. *Journal of Extension*, 37(2). Retrieved from <http://www.joe.org/joe/1999april/tt3.html>
- Saphira, M., & Herbert, A. (2004). *Exiting commercial sexual activity*. Retrieved from <http://www.ecpat.org.nz/Other/Researches/ExitingCommercialSexualActivity.aspx>
- Sarteschi, C. M., Vaughn, M. G., & Kim, K. (2011). Assessing the effectiveness of mental health courts: A quantitative review. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 39, 12-20.
- Schweig, S., Malangone, D., & Goodman, M. (2012). *Prostitution diversion programs*, New York, NY: Center for Court Innovations. Retrieved from http://www.courtinnovation.org/sites/default/files/documents/CI_Prostitution%207.5.12%20PDF.pdf
- Seidman, I. (2006). *Interviewing as qualitative research. A guide for researchers in education and social sciences* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Shdaimah, C. S., & Wiechelt, S. A. (2013). Crime and compassion: Women in prostitution at the intersection of criminality and victimization. *International Review of Victimology*, 19(1), 23-35. doi:10.1177/0269758012447217

Shulman, L. (2011). *The skills of helping individuals, families, groups, and communities* (7th ed.). Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Simich, L. (2014). Out of the shadows: A tool for the identification of victims of human trafficking. *Research Summary: VERA Institute of Justice*. Retrieved from <http://www.vera.org/sites/default/files/resources/downloads/human-trafficking-identification-tool-summary-v2.pdf>

State of Ohio. (2011). House Bill 262. Human Trafficking/Safe Harbor. 129th General Assembly. Retrieved from <http://innovationohio.org/women-3/legislation-state/legislation-ohio-house-bill-262-human-traffickingsafe-harbor/>

State of Ohio. (2012). R.C. 2953.38 Expungement of certain crimes for victims of human trafficking. 129th General Assembly File No.142, HB 262, §1, eff. 6/27/2012.

Straub, D. W. (1989). Validating instruments in MIS research. *MIS Quarterly*, 13(2), 147-169.

Supreme Court of Ohio and the Ohio Judicial System. (2013). *Specialized dockets certification: Specialized docket standards*. Retrieved from <http://www.supremecourt.ohio.gov/JCS/specDockets/certification/default.asp>

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2012). *Using multivariate statistics* (6th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

- Tebben, S. (2014, January, 27). Human trafficking, prostitution very real in Ohio, including Athens county. *WOUB Public Media*. Retrieved from <http://woub.org/2014/01/26/human-trafficking-prostitution-very-real-ohio-including-athens-county>
- Trochim, M. W., & Donnelly, J. P. (2007). *The research methods knowledge base* (3rd ed.). Mason, OH: Thomson Custom Publishing.
- U.S. Department of State. (2013). *Trafficking in persons report 7*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.state.gov/j/tip/rls/tiprpt/2013/index.htm>
- Weitzer, R. (2009). Sociology of sex work. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 35, 213-234. doi:10.1146/annurev-soc-070308-120025
- Welsh-Huggins, A. (2014, September 26). Court program gives prostitutes another chance. *Associated Press*. Retrieved from <http://bigstory.ap.org/article/b17c98d5aa5541b3826bdd1be95bcd18/court-program-gives-prostitutes-another-chance>
- Werner, E. (2015, April 22). Senate unanimously passes human trafficking bill, setting up vote on attorney general. *US News & World Report*. Retrieved from <http://www.usnews.com/news/politics/articles/2015/04/22/anti-human-trafficking-bill-expected-to-pass-senate>
- Wexler, D. B. (2013). Getting and giving: What therapeutic jurisprudence can get from and give to positive criminology. *Arizona Legal Studies*, Discussion Paper No. 13-13. *Phoenix Law Review*, 6, 907-915. Retrieved from <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2220509>
- Wexler, D. B., & King, M. S. (2011). Promoting societal and juridical receptivity to rehabilitation: The role of therapeutic jurisprudence. *Arizona Legal Studies*, Discussion Paper No. 10-46. Retrieved from <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1722278>

Wilks, K., (2013). *Effective approaches for reducing prostitution in Texas: Proactive and cost efficient strategies to help people leave the streets*. Austin, TX: Texas Criminal Justice Coalition.

Winick, B. J. (2002). Therapeutic jurisprudence and problem solving courts. *Fordham Urban Law Journal*, 30(3), 1055-2003.

Winick, B. J. (2013). Problem solving courts: Therapeutic jurisprudence in practice. In R. L. Wiener & E. M. Branks (Eds.), *Problem solving courts* (pp. 211-236). New York, NY: Springer.

Wolf, R. V. (2007). *Principles of problem-solving justice*. New York, NY: Center for Court Innovation. Retrieved from <http://www.courtinnovation.org/sites/default/files/Principles.pdf>

Appendix A

CATCH Court Program Participants:

Experience Survey

There are no right or wrong answers. Please remember that this survey is voluntary, anonymous, and confidential. If you would like to skip any questions or stop at any time, you are free to do so. Please read each question carefully.

1. Please state how long you were in the CATCH Court program.
 - a. I graduated from the program.
 - b. About two months.
 - c. About six months
 - d. About a year
 - e. About 18 months

2. Do you think that the threat of punishment kept you from reoffending?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No, I never thought about the punishment
 - c. No, I thought about it but reoffended anyway

3. Do you think that the Catch Court program helped you increase your mental health?
 - a. Yes, a great deal
 - b. Yes, somewhat
 - c. Yes, a little bit
 - d. I am not sure
 - e. No

4. Do you think that the CATCH Court program helped you increase your physical health?
 - a. Yes, a great deal
 - b. Yes, somewhat
 - c. Yes, a little bit
 - d. I am not sure
 - e. No

5. Do you think the CATCH Court program helped you feel safer?
 - a. Yes, a great deal
 - b. Yes, somewhat
 - c. Yes, a little bit
 - d. I am not sure
 - e. No

6. Do you think the CATCH court program helped you with your family?
- a. Yes, a great deal
 - b. Yes, somewhat
 - c. Yes, a little bit
 - d. I am not sure
 - e. No
7. Do you think that the CATCH Court program helped you find stable housing?
- a. Yes
 - b. I am not sure
 - c. No
8. Overall, do you feel that the CATCH court helped you develop healthier life skills?
- a. Yes, a great deal
 - b. Yes, somewhat
 - c. Yes, a little bit
 - d. I am not sure
 - e. No

If Yes, please give examples:

9. Overall, do you feel that the CATCH Court program helped you increase healthy behaviors?
- a. Yes, to a great extent
 - b. Yes, somewhat
 - c. I am not sure
 - d. No

If Yes, please give examples: _____

10. If you answered Yes to number 9, which components of the CATCH Court program did you find helpful in maintaining your conditions of probation or healthy behaviors? You may **choose all** that apply.
- a. My mentor
 - b. The judge
 - c. The CATCH staff
 - d. Therapy
 - e. The other CATCH participants
 - f. Other (please specify) _____
11. If you attended group therapy, do you think the therapy helped you maintain the conditions of probation?
- a. Yes, to a great extent
 - b. Yes, somewhat

- c. I am not sure
 - d. No
12. Did you feel that the Judge held you accountable for your conditions of probation?
- a. Yes, to a great extent
 - b. Yes, to some extent
 - c. I am not sure
 - d. No
13. The next four questions address your experiences *inside* of the CATCH Court, during a CATCH session. Overall, do you feel that the judge positively impacted you?
- a. Yes, to a great extent
 - b. Yes, somewhat
 - c. I am not sure
 - d. No
14. Did you feel that the judge treated you with more compassion than in other courtrooms?
- a. Yes, to a great extent
 - b. Yes, somewhat
 - c. I am not sure
 - d. No
15. Do you feel you were treated more fairly in CATCH Court than in other courtrooms?
- a. Yes, to a great extent
 - b. Yes, somewhat
 - c. I am not sure
 - d. No
16. Did the environment *inside* CATCH Court have a positive effect on you?
- a. Yes, to a great extent
 - b. Yes, somewhat
 - c. I am not sure
 - d. No
17. Do you feel that your individual needs were addressed by the CATCH Court program?
- a. Yes, to a great extent
 - b. Yes, somewhat
 - c. I am not sure
 - d. No
18. Which of the following parts of CATCH Court do you think impacted you positively? You may *choose all* that you think had a positive impact.
- a. The staff of CATCH Court
 - b. The CATCH Court judge

- c. The other participants inside of the CATCH Court
 - d. My CATCH Court mentor
 - e. Therapy sessions outside of CATCH Court
19. If you did not graduate from CATCH Court, can you explain why?
-
-
20. Is there anything else you would like to add about the CATCH Court? Please feel free to share any additional thoughts.
-
-

Thank you for your participation.

Appendix B

CATCH Court Referral Criminal Justice Professionals: Training, Criteria, and Experience Survey

Several categories of criminal justice professionals may make a referral of a defendant to the CATCH Court. These include referrers include judges, prosecutors, defense counsels, case managers, and probation and parole officers if the defendant has a new, pending case. You have been identified as a professional who may refer a defendant to CATCH Court.

Thank you for completing this survey.

1. Please identify your position.

- a. Judge
- b. Prosecutor
- c. Defense Counsel
- d. Case Manager
- e. Probation Officer

2. Training

Have you received training on how to identify victims of human trafficking or training on how to identify defendants for referral to the Franklin County CATCH court?

- a. Yes
- b. No

3. If you responded Yes to question 2, how long was your training?

- a. 1-2 hours
- b. 3-4 hours

- c. Less than 1 hour
- d. More than 4 hours

4. Who conducted your training?

5. Referral

Have you referred defendants?

- a. Yes
- b. No

6. If you answered Yes to question 5, do you base your decision upon specific criteria or an assessment tool?

- a. Yes, an assessment tool
- b. Yes, criteria given to me
- c. Yes, criteria I have developed
- d. No

7. If you answered No to question 5, which of the following may be reasons that you do not refer defendants to the CATCH court?

- a. Too expensive
- b. I do not believe in its efficacy
- c. Too cumbersome
- d. I do not agree that the offenders are also victims who are in need of services
- e. I do not support specialty or problem-solving courts
- f. I am not sure how to identify potential CATCH Court participants

g. Other: _____

8. If you had the opportunity for education regarding this population, would you be willing to attend?

- a. Yes
- b. I am not sure
- c. No

9. Is there anything else you would like to say regarding the Franklin CATCH Court?

Thank you for your participation.

Appendix C

CATCH Court Program Participants:

Roundtable Interview Protocol

1. Who do you credit for information about CATCH Court?
2. What is the best (important) thing about CATCH Court?
3. How has CATCH Court impacted your family and/or relationship with your family?
4. What are the contributing factors that have caused CATCH to be successful for you?
5. How has CATCH Court helped with your physical health?
6. What has been the hardest part of CATCH Court?
7. If we could address police officers and law enforcement, what do we need them to know or share with them?
8. There is a No Shame Zone sign hanging in the office of CATCH Court, what does that mean personally for you?
9. What should we be doing to help address the issues of human trafficking, your addictions, and situations?
10. What information could be shared with other cities involving this research of CATCH Court?

Appendix D

CATCH Court Referral Criminal Justice Professionals:

Invitation to Participate and Explanation of Study

To Criminal Justice Professionals who may refer CATCH Court defendants:

You are invited to participate in a study to evaluate the outcomes of Franklin County's Changing Action to Change Habits (CATCH) court. Because you are or have been a referrer of defendants to the CATCH Court program, we would like to understand your experiences as a judge, prosecutor, defense counsel, case manager, or probation or parole agent who may refer defendants to the CATCH court.

The Ohio Consortium of Crime Science and the Franklin County Municipal Court are working together to evaluate the impact of the court on defendants who are referred so that we may understand and improve the outcomes, including lower reoffending rates, lower drug use, increased mental and physical health, increased and stable housing, and educational, vocational or employment opportunities.

You will be asked to complete a short 6-item survey on the training you received and criteria you use for referral.

Participation in this study is voluntary, anonymous, and confidential. That means you do not have to participate, and there is no incentive to participate and no punishment or negative consequence if you choose not to participate. Also, you may stop your participation at any time during the study.

You will not be identified in any manner during or after the study. Your name will be coded with a number and no names will be used. Only the researcher, Dr. K. Miner-Romanoff of Franklin University, will have access to the codes, and study results will be kept in a secured file for 5 years and then destroyed.

Your input is very valuable for this evaluation. If you have any questions, please contact Dr. Miner-Romanoff at 614 947-6241.

Thank you.

According to the Franklin County Municipal Court's and Franklin University's IRB requirements, this portion of the written consent may be waived to maintain participant anonymity.

Name:

I have read the purposes of this study and my participation, and I understand them. I voluntarily agree to participate.

Witness

Date

Appendix E

CATCH Court Program Participants:

Invitation to Participate and Explanation of Study

To Past and Present CATCH Court Defendants:

You are invited to participate in a study to evaluate the outcomes of Franklin County's Changing Action to Change Habits (CATCH) court. Because you are or have been a participant in the CATCH Court program, we would like to understand your experiences.

The Ohio Consortium of Crime Science (OCCS) and the Franklin County Municipal Court are working together to evaluate the impact of the Court so that we can understand and improve the outcomes for participants like yourself, including lower reoffending rates, lower drug use, increased mental and physical health, increased safety and stable housing, and educational, vocational, and employment opportunities.

You will be asked to complete a short 20-question survey which also has several spaces for your longer responses and take part in a roundtable discussion.

Your participation in this study is voluntary, anonymous, and confidential. That means you do not have to participate, and there is no incentive to participate and no punishment or negative consequence if you choose not to participate. Also, you may stop your participation at any time during the study or you may participate in one portion and not the other.

You will not be identified in any manner during or after the study. Your name will be coded, and no names will be used. Only the researcher, Dr. K. Miner-Romanoff of Franklin University, will have access to the codes, and study results will be kept in a secured file for 5 years and then destroyed.

Your input is very valuable for this evaluation and for improvement of the CATCH Court program.

If you have any questions, please contact Dr. Miner-Romanoff at 614 947-6241.

Thank you.

According to the Franklin County Municipal Court's and Franklin University's IRB requirements, this portion of the written consent may be waived to maintain participant anonymity.

Name

I have read or someone has read to me the purposes of this study and my participation, and I understand them. I voluntarily agree to participate.

Witness

Date

Researcher Biographical Sketch

Karen Miner-Romanoff, Ph.D., J.D.

Associate Provost

Executive Director for the International Institute of Innovative Instruction

Franklin University

Frasch Hall, Room 109

201 South Grant Avenue

Columbus, OH 43215

Office: 614-947-6241

Fax: 614-947-6166

Email: karen.miner-romanoff@franklin.edu

Dr. Miner-Romanoff is the Associate Provost of Franklin University and Executive Director for the International Institute of Innovative Instruction. Continuing her contact with students and enjoyment of teaching, she also teaches courses in criminal justice and is cofounder of a new Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences section for education and scholarship. Her predominant research interests are juvenile transfer to adult court, evidence-based policies, deterrence as crime control, and technological applications to teaching. She was appointed to the Fulbright Specialist Roster administered by the United States Department of State Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs for teaching at an international host nation in 2015-2016. Dr. Miner-Romanoff has presented invited papers at the International Conference of Social Science Research, American Society of Criminology Conference, Midwestern Criminal Justice

Association, and Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences annual meeting. She has published her work on juvenile justice and other social justice issues in, among other scholarly journals, the *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, *Criminologist*, *International Journal of Restorative Justice*, *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, and *Justice Policy Journal*.