Whereas, “Mental health courts” are correctional diversion and rehabilitation programs used by state and local courts to support individuals with mental illness in the justice system; and

Whereas, Mental health courts connect individuals with mental illness to mental health treatment, as an alternative to incarceration or other legal sentences and penalties; and

Whereas, Two pieces of federal Congressional legislation, the America’s Law Enforcement and Mental Health Project of 2000 and the Mentally Ill Offender Treatment and Crime Reduction Act of 2004 (MIOTCRA), were enacted to improve the use of mental health personnel and resources in the justice system and to establish grants to fund mental health court programs; and

Whereas, The continued funding of MIOTCRA programs over the last two decades has been dependent on Congressional appropriations; and

Whereas, The US Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) in the Department of Health and Human Services and the US Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) in the Department of Justice administer grants to fund state and local mental health courts; and

Whereas, Research demonstrates that mental health courts appear to be associated with reductions in recidivism, length of incarceration, severity of charges, risk of violence, and rehospitalization among individuals with mental illness in the justice system; and

Whereas, SAMHSA published a 2015 report noting that because “the vast majority of individuals who come into contact with the criminal justice system appear” before municipal courts and “many of these individuals have mental illness and co-occurring substance use disorders,” municipal courts may be an especially effective “and often overlooked” method of diversion of individuals with mental illness from the justice system; and

Whereas, In addition to SAMHSA and BJA, several nonprofit advocacy organizations, including Mental Health America, the National Alliance on Mental Illness, the Treatment Advocacy Center, the National Sheriffs’ Association, the Council on State Governments, and the National Center for State Courts, support the use of mental health courts; and

Whereas, While several hundred mental health courts exist across all 50 states, mental health courts do not exist in all counties and localities, indicating that these programs may not be accessible or available to all individuals who could benefit from them; and
Whereas, Because mental health courts are dependent on participation from national, state, and local governmental agencies, justice systems, and mental health service organizations and on the appropriation of public funds, including federal monies for MIOTCRA programs and grants administered by SAMHSA and BJA\textsuperscript{10-12}, the American Medical Association can play a role in advocating for the continued support and funding of mental health courts by policymakers; and

Whereas, Courts that connect individuals with mental illness to treatment as an alternative to incarceration exist under many different names, with each focused on different types of mental illness, including “mental health courts” (for mental illness in general), “drug courts” (for substance use disorders), and “sobriety” or “sober courts” (for alcohol use disorder and sometimes certain other substance use disorders)\textsuperscript{32-35}, and AMA policy should be inclusive of all these different types; and

Whereas, Existing AMA Policy H-100.955 (passed at A-12) established support for drug courts, which are similar in function to mental health courts but narrower in scope, “for individuals with addictive disease who are convicted of nonviolent crimes”; and

Whereas, Existing AMA Policy H-510.979 (passed at I-19) established support for veteran courts, which are similar in function to mental health courts but narrower in scope, “for veterans who commit criminal offenses that may be related to a neurological or psychiatric disorder”; and

Whereas, At I-19, House of Delegates Reference Committee B originally recommended amending Resolution 202 on veteran courts to limit their use to only nonviolent offenses, to be consistent with previous Policy H-100.955 on drug courts\textsuperscript{36-37}; and

Whereas, At I-19, despite the Reference Committee B recommendation, Resolution 202 was extracted in our HOD to remove the restriction on only using veteran courts for nonviolent offenses, and our HOD ultimately passed Policy H-510.979 such that veteran courts could potentially be used for criminal offenses in general and not only for nonviolent offenses\textsuperscript{36}; and

Whereas, To be consistent with our HOD’s most recent debate on this matter, Policy H-100.955 on drug courts and any future AMA policy on alternatives to incarceration for individuals with mental illness should not be limited to only nonviolent offenses; therefore be it

RESOLVED, That AMA Policy H-100.955, Support for Drug Courts, be amended by addition and deletion to read as follows:

\textbf{Support for Mental Health Drug Courts, H-100.955}

Our AMA: (1) supports the establishment and use of mental health drug courts, including drug courts and sobriety courts, as an effective method of intervention for individuals with mental illness involved in the justice system within a comprehensive system of community-based services and supports addictive disease who are convicted of nonviolent crimes; (2) encourages legislators to establish mental health drug courts at the state and local level in the United States; and (3) encourages mental health drug courts to rely upon evidence-based models of care for those who the judge or court determine would benefit from intervention rather than incarceration. (Modify Current HOD Policy)

Fiscal Note: Not yet determined
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RELEVANT AMA POLICY

Support for Drug Courts H-100.955
Our AMA: (1) supports the establishment of drug courts as an effective method of intervention for individuals with addictive disease who are convicted of nonviolent crimes; (2) encourages legislators to establish drug courts at the state and local level in the United States; and (3) encourages drug courts to rely upon evidence-based models of care for those who the judge or court determine would benefit from intervention rather than incarceration.
Citation: Res. 201, A-12; Appended: BOT Rep. 09, I-19

Support for Veterans Courts H-510.979
Our AMA supports the use of Veterans Courts as a method of intervention for veterans who commit criminal offenses that may be related to a neurological or psychiatric disorder.
Citation: Res. 202, I-19

Maintaining Mental Health Services by States H-345.975
Our AMA:
1. supports maintaining essential mental health services at the state level, to include maintaining state inpatient and outpatient mental hospitals, community mental health centers, addiction treatment centers, and other state-supported psychiatric services;
2. supports state responsibility to develop programs that rapidly identify and refer individuals with significant mental illness for treatment, to avoid repeated psychiatric hospitalizations and repeated interactions with the law, primarily as a result of untreated mental conditions;
3. supports increased funding for state Mobile Crisis Teams to locate and treat homeless individuals with mental illness;
4. supports enforcement of the Mental Health Parity Act at the federal and state level; and
5. will take these resolves into consideration when developing policy on essential benefit services.
Citation: Res. 116, A-12; Reaffirmation A-15; Reaffirmed: Res. 414, A-22

AMA Support for Justice Reinvestment Initiatives H-95.931
Our AMA supports justice reinvestment initiatives aimed at improving risk assessment tools for screening and assessing individuals for substance use disorders and mental health issues, expanding jail diversion and jail alternative programs, and increasing access to reentry and treatment programs.
Citation: Res. 205, A-16

Prevention of Impaired Driving H-30.936
Our AMA: (1) acknowledges that all alcohol consumption, even at low levels, has a negative impact on driver skills, perceptions, abilities, and performance and poses significant health and safety risks; (2)
supports 0.04 percent blood-alcohol level as per se illegal for driving, and urges incorporation of that provision in all state drunk driving laws; and (3) supports 21 as the legal drinking age, strong penalties for providing alcohol to persons younger than 21, and stronger penalties for providing alcohol to drivers younger than 21.

Education: Our AMA: (1) favors public information and education against any drinking by drivers; (2) supports efforts to educate physicians, the public, and policy makers about this issue and urges national, state, and local medical associations and societies, together with public health, transportation safety, insurance, and alcohol beverage industry professionals to renew and strengthen their commitment to preventing alcohol-impaired driving; (3) encourages physicians to participate in educating patients and the public about the hazards of chemically impaired driving; (4) urges public education messages that now use the phrase “drunk driving,” or make reference to the amount one might drink without fear of arrest, be replaced with messages that indicate that “all alcohol use, even at low levels, impairs driving performance and poses significant health and safety risks;” (5) encourages state medical associations to participate in educational activities related to eliminating alcohol use by adolescents; and (6) supports and encourages programs in elementary, middle, and secondary schools, which provide information on the dangers of driving while under the influence of alcohol, and which emphasize that teenagers who drive should drink no alcoholic beverages whatsoever; and will continue to work with private and civic groups such as Mothers Against Drunk Driving (MADD) to achieve those goals.

Legislation: Our AMA: (1) supports the development of model legislation which would provide for school education programs to teach adolescents about the dangers of drinking and driving and which would mandate the following penalties when a driver under age 21 drives with any blood alcohol level (except for minimal blood alcohol levels, such as less than .02 percent, only from medications or religious practices): (a) for the first offense - mandatory revocation of the driver's license for one year and (b) for the second offense - mandatory revocation of the driver's license for two years or until age 21, whichever is greater; (2) urges state medical associations to seek enactment of the legislation in their legislatures; (3) urges all states to pass legislation mandating all drivers convicted of first and multiple DUI offenses be screened for alcoholism and provided with referral and treatment when indicated; (4) urges adoption by all states of legislation calling for administrative suspension or revocation of driver licenses after conviction for driving under the influence, and mandatory revocation after a specified number of repeat offenses; and (5) encourages passage of state traffic safety legislation that mandates screening for substance use disorder for all DUI offenders, with those who are identified with substance use disorder being strongly encouraged and assisted in obtaining treatment from qualified physicians and through state and medically certified facilities.

Treatment: Our AMA: (1) encourages that treatment of all convicted DUI offenders, when medically indicated, be mandated and provided but in the case of first-time DUI convictions, should not replace other sanctions which courts may levy in such a way as to remove from the record the occurrence of that offense; and (2) encourages that treatment of repeat DUI offenders, when medically indicated, be mandated and provided but should not replace other sanctions which courts may levy. In all cases where treatment is provided to a DUI offender, it is also recommended that appropriate adjunct services should be provided to or encouraged among the family members actively involved in the offender's life;

Repeat Offenders: Our AMA: (1) recommends the following measures be taken to reduce repeat DUI offenses; (a) aggressive measures be applied to first-time DUI offenders (e.g., license suspension and administrative license revocation), (b) stronger penalties be leveled against repeat offenders, including second-time offenders, (c) such legal sanctions must be linked, for all offenders, to substance abuse assessment and treatment services, to prevent future deaths in alcohol-related crashes and multiple DUI offenses; and (2) calls upon the states to coordinate law enforcement, court system, and motor vehicle departments to implement forceful and swift penalties for second-time DUI convictions to send the message that those who drink and drive might receive a second chance but not a third.

On-board devices: Our AMA: (1) supports further testing of on-board devices to prevent the use of motor vehicles by intoxicated drivers; this testing should take place among the general population of drivers, as well as among drivers having alcohol-related problems; (2) encourages motor vehicle manufacturers and the U.S. Department of Transportation to monitor the development of ignition interlock technology, and plan for use of such systems by the general population, when a consensus of informed persons and studies in the scientific literature indicate the systems are effective, acceptable, reasonable in cost, and safe; and (3) supports continued research and testing of devices which may incapacitate vehicles owned or operated by DUI offenders without needlessly penalizing the offender's family members.

Citation: (CCB/CLRDP Rep. 3, A-14)
9.7.2 Court-Initiated Medical Treatment in Criminal Cases

Court-initiated medical treatments raise important questions as to the rights of prisoners, the powers of judges, and the ethical obligations of physicians. Although convicted criminals have fewer rights and protections than other citizens, being convicted of a crime does not deprive an offender of all protections under the law. Court-ordered medical treatments raise the question whether professional ethics permits physicians to cooperate in administering and overseeing such treatment. Physicians have civic duties, but medical ethics do not require a physician to carry out civic duties that contradict fundamental principles of medical ethics, such as the duty to avoid doing harm.

In limited circumstances physicians can ethically participate in court-initiated medical treatments. Individual physicians who provide care under court order should:

(a) Participate only if the procedure being mandated is therapeutically efficacious and is therefore undoubtedly not a form of punishment or solely a mechanism of social control.
(b) Treat patients based on sound medical diagnoses, not court-defined behaviors. While a court has the authority to identify criminal behavior, a court does not have the ability to make a medical diagnosis or to determine the type of treatment that will be administered. When the treatment involves in-patient therapy, surgical intervention, or pharmacological treatment, the physicians diagnosis must be confirmed by an independent physician or a panel of physicians not responsible to the state. A second opinion is not necessary in cases of court-ordered counseling or referrals for psychiatric evaluations.
(c) Decline to provide treatment that is not scientifically validated and consistent with nationally accepted guidelines for clinical practice.
(d) Be able to conclude, in good conscience and to the best of his or her professional judgment, that to the extent possible the patient voluntarily gave his or her informed consent, recognizing that an element of coercion that is inevitably present. When treatment involves in-patient therapy, surgical intervention, or pharmacological treatment, an independent physician or a panel of physicians not responsible to the state should confirm that voluntary consent was given.

AMA Principles of Medical Ethics: I,III

The Opinions in this chapter are offered as ethics guidance for physicians and are not intended to establish standards of clinical practice or rules of law.

Citation: Issued: 2016

2.1.2 Decisions for Adult Patients Who Lack Capacity

Respect for patient autonomy is central to professional ethics and physicians should involve patients in health care decisions commensurate with the patients decision-making capacity. Even when a medical condition or disorder impairs a patients decision-making capacity, the patient may still be able to participate in some aspects of decision making. Physicians should engage patients whose capacity is impaired in decisions involving their own care to the greatest extent possible, including when the patient has previously designated a surrogate to make decisions on his or her behalf.

When a patient lacks decision-making capacity, the physician has an ethical responsibility to:

(a) Identify an appropriate surrogate to make decisions on the patient’s behalf:
(i) the person the patient designated as surrogate through a durable power of attorney for health care or other mechanism; or
(ii) a family member or other intimate associate, in keeping with applicable law and policy if the patient has not previously designated a surrogate.
(b) Recognize that the patients surrogate is entitled to the same respect as the patient.
(c) Provide advice, guidance, and support to the surrogate.
(d) Assist the surrogate to make decisions in keeping with the standard of substituted judgment, basing decisions on:
(i) the patients preferences (if any) as expressed in an advance directive or as documented in the medical record;
(ii) the patients views about life and how it should be lived;
(iii) how the patient constructed his or her life story; and
(iv) the patients attitudes toward sickness, suffering, and certain medical procedures.
(e) Assist the surrogate to make decisions in keeping with the best interest standard when the patients preferences and values are not known and cannot reasonably be inferred, such as when the patient has not previously expressed preferences or has never had decision-making capacity. Best interest decisions should be based on:
(i) the pain and suffering associated with the intervention;
(ii) the degree of and potential for benefit;
(iii) impairments that may result from the intervention;
(iv) quality of life as experienced by the patient.

(f) Consult an ethics committee or other institutional resource when:
(i) no surrogate is available or there is ongoing disagreement about who is the appropriate surrogate;
(ii) ongoing disagreement about a treatment decision cannot be resolved; or
(iii) the physician judges that the surrogates decision:
   a. is clearly not what the patient would have decided when the patients preferences are known or can be inferred;
   b. could not reasonably be judged to be in the patients best interest; or
   c. primarily serves the interests of the surrogate or other third party rather than the patient.
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