	Police referral	Regular court or probation-based services	Drug courts	Aftercare
Point of intervention	Pre-arrest, pre- booking, or pre- court appearance	Pre-plea/pre-trial, post-plea/post- trial, or post-sentence	Pre-plea/pre-trial, post- plea/post-trial, or post- sentence	Post imprisonment/ early release
Key features: who initiates the process?	Police refer participant to education, assessment or treatment. It can either be based on police discretion or be a standard procedure that first arrest gets plan A, second arrest gets plan B, third arrest gets plan C.	 Participant is referred to treatment by court or probation service. The process is initiated by key criminal justice persons (magistrate, judge, court worker, prosecution, defence lawyer) Court oversight is generally limited to reports from the treatment sector, although the participant is required to appear in court for specific events such as treatment non-compliance or sentencing Health and justice have clearly defined and separate roles Communication between teams may be provided by a coordinator Court may pay for treatment, if necessary 	 Judge/magistrate with specialist knowledge is the leader of a multidisciplinary drug treatment service Participants are required to appear in court regularly Standardized regimens of treatment are commonly used and frequent urine testing may be required Rewards for compliance with programme conditions & sanctions for non-compliance to effect behavioural change 	- Services assess individual needs of participants prior to release from prison and provide access to a variety of medical and psychosocial services within the community including ongoing drug treatment
Advantages	 Time and cost savings on criminal justice processing Police in a good position to coordinate referral to appropriate services The offender presents at a time of crisis when motivated to enter treatment 	 Time and cost savings on criminal justice processing Large volume of participants processed Regular courts can process individuals Participants chose their own treatment 	 Judge-led multidisciplinary decision-making Authority figure of judge instrumental in therapeutic change Close supervision of participants Swift application of sanctions for non- compliance 	- Facilitates reintegration into the community
Disadvantages	Police discretion may be open to misuse	 Objectives of justice and treatment services may diverge Judicial oversight may be limited Communication between justice and health services may be limited Rewards for compliance or sanctions for non-compliance may be delayed or inadequate Judicial discretion may be open to misuse 	 Judges may lack specialist expertise in clinical decision-making There may be blurring of distinctions between criminal justice and treatment Resource intensive and potentially costly to establish Relatively few offenders processed Participants have less choice in the treatment method 	Coordination is required to ensure individualized treatment and rehabilitation needs are met and maintained over time Not a complete alternative to conviction or punishment