# RECIDIVISM REDUCTION FUND COURT GRANT PROGRAM: ANNUAL REPORT 2018
# Budget Act of 2015

**November 2018**

JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

OPERATIONS AND PROGRAMS DIVISION

CRIMINAL JUSTICE SERVICES

# JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

**Hon. Tani G. Cantil-Sakauye**
*Chief Justice of California and*
*Chair of the Judicial Council*

**Martin Hoshino**
*Administrative Director,*
*Judicial Council*

**OPERATIONS & PROGRAMS DIVISION**
**Robert Oyung**
*Chief Operating Officer*

**CRIMINAL JUSTICE SERVICES**
**Shelley Curran**
*Director*

# Table of Contents

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY** ..... **1**

**INTRODUCTION** ..... **3**

**THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL'S RECIDIVISM REDUCTION FUND COURT GRANT PROGRAM** ..... **3**

Background ..... 3
Final Grant Awards ..... 4

**GRANTEE PROJECT ACTIVITIES** ..... **4**

Pretrial Programs ..... 4
Final-Year Pretrial Activities ..... 5
Pretrial Program Transitions Post-RRF ..... 6
Final-Year Collaborative Court Activities ..... 6
Collaborative Court Transitions Post-RRF ..... 7

**PROGRAM EVALUATION** ..... **8**

Outcome Measurement and Data Collection ..... 8
Data Reporting and Validation ..... 8
Preliminary Data and Outcomes ..... 8
*Pretrial Data and Outcomes* ..... *8*
*Collaborative Courts Data and Outcomes* ..... *9*

**RESEARCH NEXT STEPS** ..... **10**

Pretrial Programs Ongoing Research ..... 10
Collaborative Court Programs Ongoing Research ..... 11

**CONCLUSION** ..... **11**

**ATTACHMENTS** ..... **12**

# Executive Summary

As part of the Budget Act of 2014 (Sen. Bill 852; Stats. 2014, ch. 25) and the Budget Act of 2015 (Assem. Bill 93; Stats. 2015, ch. 10), the Legislature allocated a total of $16.3 million from the Recidivism Reduction Fund (RRF) for a competitive grant program administered by the Judicial Council of California (Judicial Council). The funds are designated for courts to use in the administration and operation of programs and practices known to reduce offender recidivism and enhance public safety. The Budget Acts directed the Judicial Council to administer the program, establish performance-based outcome measures, and report annually to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee (JLBC) and the Department of Finance (DOF).[1]

The current report, which is the fourth annual RRF report, covers program activities from April 2017 through April 2018 (except where noted in the attached tables). The report also documents the administrative activities of the Judicial Council and the grantees, details RRF court grant program implementation at the local level and provides updates on the status of data analysis.

A final report will be made to the Legislature by 2019 and will include results of the program, including whether or not programs met their goals.

### Judicial Council Activities

Judicial Council staff focused administrative efforts on working with courts to spend remaining grant funding and finalize program reporting. Judicial Council staff worked on preparing for the 2019 final report, including setting policies to obtain comparison data.

### Grantee Court Activities

During the final implementation year of the grant, courts and their partners continued program activities, including refining program procedures and formulating strategies for continuing both pretrial and collaborative court programs beyond the grant period. They wrapped up final reporting requirements and made plans for the termination of and continuation of their programs.

In total, courts and their local partners expended more than 96 percent of the funding allocated to their programs.

### Program Evaluation

This report describes preliminary data and limited, preliminary outcomes based on the first 10 quarters of program data collection for both pretrial and collaborative court program types. Overall, all pretrial programs were successful at implementing the use of a pretrial risk assessment tool, classifying defendants by risk level, and passing that information on to judicial

[1] In addition, four years after the grants are awarded the Judicial Council must provide a report to the JLBC and the DOF that addresses the effectiveness of the programs based on the reports of the established outcome measures and the impact of the monies appropriated pursuant to this act to enhance public safety and improve offender outcomes.

officers. Over the period of this analysis, programs reported over 10,000 pretrial risk assessments conducted. Ten of 11 programs implemented some form of pretrial supervision and those programs released over 6,600 defendants to pretrial services for supervision following assessment.

Over the first 10 quarters of data collection, collaborative court program grantees reported nearly 4,000 entries across all programs. The 12-month program retention rates rose to 79 percent this year (from 72 percent last year), indicating that nearly 80 percent of participants either successfully completed or remained in the program 12 months after program entry.

**Conclusion and Next Steps**

As with most grant programs, RRF funding is meant to seed programs that have the potential to be institutionalized and sustained with other sources of ongoing funding. Twenty-seven of 31 participating RRF courts reported plans to continue operating some or all components of their programs beyond the period of the RRF grant, indicating that courts and their justice system partners see the value in maintaining these efforts.

In addition to providing their communities with important services aimed at recidivism reduction, RRF grantees will also continue to serve as models for other courts on collaboration with justice system partners, and to inform important policy decisions in the years to come. With the passage of Senate Bill 10, Pretrial Release or Detention: Pretrial Services (Stats. 2018, ch. 244), signed by the Governor on August 28, 2018, courts and their probation partners are preparing for substantial changes to pretrial processes statewide. The counties that operated RRF-funded pretrial programs are at a significant advantage in undertaking preparations including establishing procedures and agreements. The RRF-funded collaborative courts will serve as important resources for others implementing veterans' or mental health diversion options as encouraged by other recent legislation.

While RRF-funded program activities have concluded, analysis of these important efforts has not. Data submitted by RRF grantees provide important details on participants and program outcomes that will be used in combination with other data sources to inform the final legislative report on program effectiveness to be submitted in 2019.

# Introduction

The Budget Act of 2014 and the Budget Act of 2015 appropriated $16.3 million from the Recidivism Reduction Fund for a competitive grant program designed to support the administration and operation of trial court programs and practices known to reduce adult offender recidivism and enhance public safety. The legislation directed the Judicial Council to administer the program, establish performance-based outcome measures, and report annually to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee and the Department of Finance. The legislation also directed the Judicial Council to provide a report to the JLBC and DOF four years after the grants were awarded to address the effectiveness of the programs based on the established outcome measures and the impact of the monies appropriated pursuant to this act to enhance public safety and improve offender outcomes.

As charged by SB 852, the Judicial Council provided a preliminary report to the JLBC and the DOF in March 2015, and annual reports in 2016 and 2017. The 2015 report described the establishment of the Recidivism Reduction Fund court grant program and the initial RRF funding allocations. The 2016 report documented subsequent allocations utilizing the $1.3 million provided in the 2015 Budget Act, and described initial local program implementation activities, individual court program characteristics, and procedures for establishing data collection and validation procedures. The 2017 report detailed the administrative activities of the Judicial Council and the grantees, described continued RRF court grant program implementation at the local level, and provided some preliminary evaluation findings. This report details final grant awards and expenditures for all participating courts; provides a summary of the final program year, including feedback from grantees; and provides updates on continuing data analysis, including a discussion of limited, preliminary findings with more complete analysis and outcomes to be provided in a final 2019 report.

# The Judicial Council's Recidivism Reduction Fund Court Grant Program

## Background

For over two decades, California's prison system faced many challenges with overcrowding and lawsuits related to the provision of health and mental health services in prison. The prison population increased from approximately 60,000 inmates in 1986 to an all-time high of 173,479 in 2006. In 2011, the United States Supreme Court upheld a lower court ruling requiring the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) to reduce the population in its institutions to 137.5 percent of the system's design capacity.[2]

[2] California Department of Finance, *An Update to the Future of California Corrections* (Jan. 2016), available at www.cdcr.ca.gov/Blueprint-Update-2016/An-Update-to-the-Future-of-California-Corrections-January-2016.pdf.

As part of the effort to reduce the prison population and recidivism, the Budget Act of 2014 established the RRF. The Legislature allocated funding from this source for a competitive grant program to be developed and administered by the Judicial Council. The funds were designated for courts to use in the administration and operation of programs and practices known to reduce offender recidivism and enhance public safety, including pretrial programs, collaborative courts that serve moderate- and high-risk adult offenders (hereafter referred to as collaborative courts), and court use of validated risk and needs assessment information.[3]

### Final Grant Awards

The Judicial Council authorized staff to work with the grantee courts to most effectively use RRF funds. This authorization enabled staff to conduct two separate reallocation processes in 2016 and 2017 and to maximize the use of RRF funding to participating courts. For a summary of all final RRF Collaborative Court and Pretrial Program grant allocations, see Attachment A.

In total, courts and their local partners expended more than 96 percent of the funding allocated to their programs. While establishing partnerships, documenting agreements, and hiring staff delayed project spending in the first year, implementation activities and associated expenditures increased steadily each year after through the end of the project on April 30, 2018.

## Grantee Project Activities

The full RRF program implementation period spanned April 1, 2015, through April 30, 2018. Not all grantees operated projects for that entire span; some projects ended June 30, 2017. For a summary of RRF Collaborative Court and Pretrial Program project implementation time frames, see Attachment B.

### Pretrial Programs

As reported in the 2016 annual report, 11 counties received RRF funding for pretrial programs. Pretrial programs typically have three primary functions that include (1) gathering information for assessing defendant risk of failure to appear for court hearings and risk of committing a new crime if released during the pretrial phase of a case; (2) communicating information about these risks to the court for consideration in pretrial detention/release decisions; and (3) providing information on release conditions and/or a range of supervision options for defendants who are released from secure custody during the pretrial phase of a case.

Pretrial programs use pretrial risk assessment instruments to assess defendant risk of failure to appear for court hearings and risk of committing a new crime and may include pretrial supervision and monitoring based on risk level and type of risk. The programs use risk-based assignment to a continuum of pretrial supervision options—with intensity of supervision matched to risk level—and are designed to help ensure that defendants return to court, public

[3] No courts were awarded funding in the "court use of validated risk and needs assessment information" category.

safety is maintained, and resources are conserved for the more intensive supervision of high-risk caseloads.

Pretrial programs may incorporate other important program components including automated reminders of court dates, designated prosecutors to review new arrests before initial appearance in court for bail setting, defense attorney representation at bail hearings, electronic monitoring, needs assessment for defendants on supervised release, and periodic check-ins with pretrial officers.

## Final-Year Pretrial Activities

During the final reporting period of the grant program, grantees enhanced existing programs and formulated strategies for continuing the pretrial release programs following the grant period. Grantees reported the following activities and accomplishments in their final quarterly reports:

- Two courts developed and implemented web-based technology to allow defendants to check in, view court hearings, and communicate with probation officers;
- Nearly all courts implemented pretrial supervision and adjusted procedures to meet best practice standards;
- Some counties implemented court appearance reminder systems—text, phone call, or email reminders—implemented to reduce failures to appear (FTAs);
- Most courts researched or completed new grant applications to allow for services provided during the RRF grant period to be continued;
- All courts developed data and information transfer mechanisms to improve communication between justice partners; and
- Most courts continued stakeholder meetings.

Grantees also reported a number of challenges. Courts reported that a significant number of staff were needed to complete screenings for potential program participants and monitor defendants to ensure compliance with the conditions of release.

Several courts reported they were often unable to make contact with potential participants before arraignment and release. In most cases this was because the individuals posted monetary bail and were released.

Data reporting also remained a challenge for grantees. Pretrial release programs typically require a significant amount of collaboration and information sharing among the justice system partners. Despite tentative agreements at the grant proposal stage, courts struggled to implement data-sharing procedures among stakeholders in many jurisdictions. The courts and justice system partners often did not have the capacity to gather the data needed for evaluation. The primary continuing challenge involved matching jail and probation personal identifiers with court data identified by case number.

## Pretrial Program Transitions Post-RRF

> *All agree that a primary benefit of this effort has been the development and strengthening of a culture of cooperation, close communication and better data sharing among all justice partners involved in Pretrial Services.*
>
> Superior Court of Monterey County, Final Report

Nine of the 11 pretrial programs funded plan to continue operating their programs. The two courts not continuing their programs both cited budget constraints as a significant factor in the decision to terminate. Several courts developed plans to integrate their pretrial programs into regular staffing operations that will allow them to continue to operate without sustaining additional costs. Other courts, such as the Superior Court of Fresno County, will continue to utilize technology developed during the grant period with only ongoing software maintenance fees to budget.

With the passage of SB 10 on August 28, 2018, courts and their probation partners are preparing for substantial changes to pretrial processes statewide. The counties that operated RRF-funded pretrial programs are at a significant advantage in making preparations, including establishing procedures and agreements among justice system partners.

## Final-Year Collaborative Court Activities

A total of 20 counties received RRF funding for collaborative court programs. Adult criminal collaborative court programs combine intensive judicial supervision and collaboration among justice system partners with rehabilitation services to reduce recidivism and improve outcomes for moderate- and high-risk offenders with significant treatment needs. Although program models differ among court types and local jurisdictions, adult criminal collaborative courts are generally led by a judge and include an interdisciplinary team consisting of a defense attorney, a prosecutor, a representative from probation or parole, and treatment staff and/or case managers or other representatives specific to the particular court.

Collaborative court participants are typically assessed for their risk of recidivating and for their mental health issues, substance-use disorders, and other treatment needs. Community supervision and treatment plans are created based on the information obtained from these assessments. Participants also attend regularly scheduled court sessions—usually one to four times a month—to discuss their adherence to individualized supervision/treatment plans and other program requirements. Graduated sanctions (e.g., admonishments, increased frequency of court sessions, and jail sanctions) are used to respond to noncompliant behaviors, and incentives (e.g., verbal praise, reduced frequency of court hearings, and transportation or food vouchers) are used to reward prosocial behaviors and encourage participants' progress.

During the final reporting period of the grant program, grantees sought to enhance existing programs and formulate strategies for continuing collaborative court programs following the grant period. Grantees reported the following activities and accomplishments in their final quarterly reports:

- Sixteen of 20 courts reported increased or new collaboration between courts, justice partners, and community organizations;
- Most reported improved quality of care to high-need and high-risk participants;
- All courts connected collaborative court participants with needed community resources, such as housing and healthcare services;
- Most courts provided educational opportunities for participants, including high school diplomas, and 55 students enrolled in coursework through courts' partnerships with their local community college;
- Some courts implemented in-house databases to address issues with information accessibility;
- All courts established data collection procedures and protocols to adhere to RRF requirements;
- All courts that intend to maintain their programs planned exit strategies and next steps for the post-grant period, including seeking or securing funding; and
- All courts provided education to project team members on treatment methods and program protocols.

## Collaborative Court Transitions Post-RRF

> *We have seen people reunite with families and reengage in society with work, education, and community activities. Those who self-medicated with illegal drugs and alcohol have been able to overcome the lure of the drugs. Participants have gained self-esteem, confidence, and joy in life. It has been a pleasure to witness their transformations.*
>
> Superior Court of Kern County, Final Report

Most grantees reported that their primary challenge in the final program year was attempting to obtain the funds necessary to continue their programs post-grant. Eight courts with collaborative court programs reported that funding and in-kind support will be provided post-grant through other justice system partners, most commonly by the local probation department. Several other courts plan to address this challenge through applying for additional funding from sources such as Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration grants and California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) assistance. Although three courts noted that their ability to provide certain services such as residential treatment will be reduced post-grant, 18 of the 20 participants plan to continue operating their programs.

In planning for the post-grant period, numerous courts reported the necessity to continue communication among justice partners. Many courts reported implementation challenges throughout the grant period related to communication, data collection, and data sharing between multiple agencies. Staff turnover was also cited as a challenge, complicating efforts to create continuity and improve program efficacy. Still, overall, 80 percent of courts reported new or

enhanced partnerships as a result of participation in the RRF program, which they intend to continue following the grant period.

# Program Evaluation

## Outcome Measurement and Data Collection

The Budget Act of 2014 required that the Judicial Council establish performance-based outcome measures, collect and analyze data from grantees, and evaluate the program. To accomplish these tasks, Judicial Council staff, in collaboration with the grantee courts, identified data elements and established data collection procedures for the secure and confidential transmission of data from the counties to the council.

## Data Reporting and Validation

Grantee courts provide program narrative and data reports quarterly to the Judicial Council. Data are run through a cleaning program created in the R programming language (used for statistical analysis) that identifies basic reporting errors (duplicate records, invalid entries such as out-of-range dates, etc.). More significant or system reporting errors and issues require additional follow-up with the courts and are completed on a program-by-program basis. To ensure program and data reporting compliance, a portion of site visit time is also dedicated to data review and problem solving.

## Preliminary Data and Outcomes

The RRF grantees report a substantial amount of data on their program participants to the Judicial Council. These data provide information on participant characteristics and program outcomes that will be used in combination with other data sources to inform the 2019 legislative report on program effectiveness. Because the reported outcome measures are aligned with overall program goals, different outcomes are collected for the pretrial and collaborative court programs. Attachments C and D provide program summaries for the Pretrial Release Program and Collaborative Court Program, respectively.

### *Pretrial Data and Outcomes*

All pretrial counties were successful at implementing or maintaining the use of a pretrial risk assessment tool and classifying defendants by risk level.[4] Over the 10-quarter period of this analysis, programs reported that over 10,000 pretrial risk assessments were conducted. Over the same period, 10 of the 11 counties were also successful at establishing or maintaining a pretrial supervision program. Overall, counties reported releasing over 6,600 defendants to pretrial services following assessment.[5] Among those released pretrial, most were either low or medium

[4] Several counties had active pretrial release programs before RRF grants were awarded.

[5] Caution is advised in interpreting and comparing the data associated with the number of assessments and number of releases for the pretrial programs. The Judicial Council requested a substantial amount of data on the participants

risk, 44 percent were assessed at low risk, 37 percent at medium risk, and 19 percent at high risk. In the final report on the RRF grant program, we will provide data on failure-to-appear (FTA) rates by risk level compared to nonparticipants in that county.

All grantees, with varying degrees of success, were able to report outcome data and generally improved their data quality in the later quarters of reporting. Judicial Council staff continue to work with grantees to interpret all available data and to highlight data patterns and issues that give grantees practical information on improving their programs, and to more accurately characterize their programs using the data they collect.

### *Collaborative Courts Data and Outcomes*

RRF collaborative court grantees vary widely in their target populations, program practices, and caseload size. Over the first 10 quarters of data collection, collaborative court program grantees reported nearly 4,000 entries across all programs. San Diego County's Mandatory Supervision Court was the highest-volume court with over 1,000 entries, followed by the San Joaquin County DUI Court with over 700 entries While an active caseload of 30 to 60 participants is common for most collaborative courts, San Diego's Mandatory Supervision Court has the largest active caseload with 680 participants, followed by San Joaquin's DUI Court with an active caseload of 417. Both of these programs tailor their supervision and services to participant risks and needs. Lower risk and need participants receive minimal supervision and services so resources can be targeted toward participants at higher risk and need levels. Lower-volume collaborative court programs tended to be those in more sparsely populated counties such as Modoc and Lake.

Collaborative courts funded through the RRF are required to adhere to the *Components of Collaborative Justice Courts* identified by the Judicial Council's Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee[6] that include an awareness of and responsiveness to cultural competency. The collaborative courts grantees reported serving a population that was 13 percent black, 36 percent Latino/Hispanic, 42 percent white, 5 percent other, and 4 percent unknown .

Research on drug courts indicate that longer retention rates are associated with success in treatment and reductions in posttreatment drug use and criminal activity.[7] The preliminary

---

who were assessed and those who were released—including those released on own recognizance (OR) or bail after assessment, as well as those released to a pretrial supervision program. Most counties were able to count all defendants who were assessed but were only able to track those who were released to pretrial supervision. Other counties were able to track both those released to pretrial supervision as well as those released to OR and bail. Due to these differences in tracking, the data cannot accurately be used to calculate a release rate. The Judicial Council is gathering additional information from jails and courts that should provide a more comprehensive understanding for the final evaluation report.

[6] See the "Collaborative Justice Courts" page on the California Courts website at *www.courts.ca.gov/programs-collabjustice.htm*.

[7] M. D. Anglin, M.-L. Brecht, and E. Maddahian, "Pretreatment Characteristics and Treatment Performance of Legally Coerced Versus Voluntary Methadone Maintenance Admissions," 27 *Criminology* 537, 556 (1989); G. DeLeon, "Legal Pressure in Therapeutic Communities," 18 *Journal of Drug Issues* 625, 640 (1988); R. Peters and M. Murrin, *Evaluation of Treatment-Based Drug Courts in Florida's First Judicial Circuit*, Tampa, FL: Department of Mental Health Law and Policy, Louis de la Parte Florida Mental Health Institute, University of South Florida (1998); F. Taxman, "Reducing Recidivism Through a Seamless System of Care: Components of Effective

collaborative court program retention rates were promising last year and continue to be positive. The 12-month retention rates as of last year averaged 72 percent, and this year rose to 79 percent, indicating that nearly 80 percent of participants either successfully completed or remained in the program 12 months after program entry. Eight programs this year reported 12-month retention rates of at least 90 percent, including the San Joaquin County DUI Court, which reported a 99 percent retention rate.

Collaborative courts funded through the RRF were designed to focus on high-risk, high-need felony offenders; however, the courts were not always able to report on information related to mental health and substance-use needs, and rarely able to report data on risk of recidivism. In order to assess program performance, collaborative courts need individual-level data on the risk and need scores for their participants. At least 7 of the 28 programs were missing data on treatment needs for at least 50 percent of their participants, and none of the programs consistently reported any data on risk of recidivism. While it may be reasonable to assume that these programs accepted only medium and high risk, the fact that we do not have recidivism risk scores limits the ability to draw conclusions about program performance, especially with respect to rearrests.

# Research Next Steps

## Pretrial Programs Ongoing Research

The data presented in this year's report show that without exception every RRF pretrial grantee county has demonstrated the basic capacity to administer pretrial risk assessments; to divide defendants into low-, medium-, and high-risk groups; to provide the results of these assessments to the court; and, to varying degrees of success, to establish a system for tracking outcomes. At a minimum each grantee now has the information needed to determine which aspects of their pretrial processing and tracking systems need improvement.

A primary challenge with California's system of pretrial release is that the data needed to implement and determine the effectiveness of these programs are generated by multiple agencies—jails, probation departments or pretrial services agencies, the courts, and the California Department of Justice. The Judicial Council staff will create a report on program effectiveness in 2019. The effectiveness report will draw on data from all of these agencies and create an individual-level data set that follows defendants from jail booking through risk assessment to release decision point, and finally to pretrial outcomes such as rearrests and FTA. Because courts were not able to consistently collect information from justice system partners, the Judicial Council will gather as much outstanding data in the fall of 2018 as possible directly from these partners. Data-linking, cleaning, and analysis phases will be completed by July 1, 2019.

---

Treatment, Supervision, and Transitional Services in the Community," The Washington/Baltimore High-Intensity Drug Trafficking Area (HIDTA) Project (1998); F. Taxman, B. Kubu, and C. DeStefano, "Treatment as Crime Control: Impact of Substance Abuse Treatment on the Individual Offending Rates of Hard-Core Substance Abusing Offenders," The Washington/Baltimore HIDTA Project (1999).

The program effectiveness report will include all counties for which complete data are available. The report will show how rearrests and FTAs compare for those released to pretrial supervision, bail, and OR release. Analyses will include controls for the effects of risk level, race, age, gender, charge level, and other available characteristics of defendants as permitted by data availability.

### Collaborative Court Programs Ongoing Research

As evidenced by the wide range of programs and the nearly 4,000 participants served, collaborative courts are widely utilized in many of California's superior courts. Given the range of different programs from veterans' treatment to DUI to reentry, it is difficult to impose the same performance standards across all program types. Because of the diversity of the collaborative court programs and the substantial body of research that already exists, continuing research on the RRF collaborative court programs will focus only on data already collected and draw descriptive comparisons with national benchmarks and local data when possible.

One practical use of this data is to compare it against local criminal justice data. For example, next year Judicial Council researchers will examine local probation completion rates and, at a minimum, compare program graduation rates with local probation completion rates. Similarly, the race/ethnic distribution of the local criminal justice–involved population will be examined to determine whether collaborative court programs are accessible or desirable across all population groups.

Throughout the RRF period, the Judicial Council has offered summarized data and special tabulations upon request. In the coming year the council will continue to provide consultation upon request. Topic areas include improving data collection, tracking program outcomes, and creating appropriate compassion groups.

## Conclusion

As with most grant programs, RRF funding is meant to seed programs that have the potential to be institutionalized and sustained with other sources of ongoing funding. Twenty-seven of 31 participating RRF courts reported plans to continue operating some or all components of their programs beyond the life of the RRF grant, indicating courts and their justice system partners see the value in continuing the efforts.

In addition to providing their communities with important services aimed at recidivism reduction, RRF grantees will also continue to serve as models for other courts and inform important policy decisions in the years to come. With the passage of Senate Bill 10 on August 28, 2018, courts and their probation partners are preparing for substantial changes to pretrial processes statewide. The counties that operated RRF-funded pretrial programs are at a significant advantage in making preparations including establishing procedures and agreements. And the RRF-funded collaborative courts will serve as important resources for others implementing veterans' or mental health diversion options per other recent legislation.

While RRF program activities have concluded, the analysis of these important efforts has not. Data submitted by RRF grantees provide important details on participants and program outcomes that will be used in combination with other data sources to inform the final legislative report on program effectiveness to be submitted in 2019.

## Attachments

1. Attachment A: Table of Final RRF Grant Awards
2. Attachment B: Table of RRF Project Time Frames
3. Attachment C: RRF Pretrial Release Program Summaries
4. Attachment D: RRF Collaborative Court Program Summaries

# Attachment A. Table of Final RRF Grant Awards*

96% of RRF grants were expended.

## Collaborative Courts:

| Court | Final Contract Amount | % Spent |
|---|---|---|
| Contra Costa | $533,521 | 97% |
| Kern | $513,957 | 100% |
| Lake | $317,873 | 85% |
| Los Angeles | $216,370 | 99% |
| Mendocino | $504,261 | 99% |
| Merced | $432,178 | 100% |
| Modoc | $428,125 | 93% |
| Placer | $203,184 | 92% |
| Sacramento | $671,775 | 78% |
| San Diego | $673,941 | 97% |
| San Francisco | $639,961 | 99% |
| San Joaquin | $663,718 | 94% |
| San Mateo | $593,294 | 100% |
| Santa Clara | $779,500 | 93% |
| Santa Cruz | $711,123 | 97% |
| Stanislaus | $244,581 | 90% |
| Tehama | $663,953 | 100% |
| Tulare | $553,078 | 100% |
| Tuolumne | $196,769 | 100% |
| Ventura | $175,234 | 100% |

* Does not include Training and Technical Assistance grantees (11/1/15–6/30/16) or the Superior Court of San Luis Obispo (7/1/15–4/1/16).

## Pretrial:

| Court | Final Award | % Spent |
|---|---|---|
| Alameda | $626,094 | 100% |
| El Dorado | $565,009 | 85% |
| Fresno | $720,326 | 97% |
| Imperial | $295,649 | 95% |
| Lassen | $159,984 | 100% |
| Monterey | $443,393 | 99% |
| Orange | $629,750 | 100% |
| Shasta | $716,020 | 100% |
| Solano | $381,120 | 95% |
| Sonoma | $761,264 | 100% |
| Yuba | $412,813 | 100% |

## Training and Technical Assistance Grants:

76% of Training and Technical Assistance grants were expended.

| Court | Final Award | % Spent |
|---|---|---|
| Alameda | $20,000 | 100% |
| Fresno | $8,260 | 81% |
| Inyo | $8,929 | 34% |
| Monterey | $20,000 | 94% |
| Plumas | $15,849 | 78% |
| Santa Clara | $15,725 | 22% |
| San Bernardino | $15,427 | 99% |
| Santa Barbara | $15,719 | 100% |

# Attachment B. Table of RRF Project Time Frames

Collaborative Courts:

| Court | Contract Start Date | Contract Expiration Date |
|---|---|---|
| Contra Costa | 4/1/2015 | 6/30/2017 |
| Kern | 4/1/2015 | 4/30/2018 |
| Lake | 4/1/2015 | 4/30/2018 |
| Los Angeles | 7/1/2015 | 4/30/2018 |
| Mendocino | 4/1/2015 | 4/30/2018 |
| Merced | 4/1/2015 | 4/30/2018 |
| Modoc | 4/1/2015 | 4/30/2018 |
| Placer | 7/1/2015 | 4/30/2017 |
| Sacramento | 4/1/2015 | 4/30/2018 |
| San Diego | 4/1/2015 | 4/30/2018 |
| San Francisco | 4/1/2015 | 4/30/2018 |
| San Joaquin | 4/1/2015 | 12/31/2017 |
| San Mateo | 4/1/2015 | 4/30/2017 |
| Santa Clara | 4/1/2015 | 4/30/2018 |
| Santa Cruz | 4/1/2015 | 6/30/2017 |
| Stanislaus | 7/1/2015 | 4/30/2018 |
| Tehama | 4/1/2015 | 4/30/2018 |
| Tulare | 4/1/2015 | 4/30/2018 |
| Tuolumne | 4/1/2015 | 4/30/2018 |
| Ventura | 4/1/2015 | 4/30/2017 |

Pretrial:

| Court | Contract Start Date | Contract Expiration Date |
|---|---|---|
| Alameda | 4/1/2015 | 4/30/2018 |
| El Dorado | 4/1/2015 | 4/30/2018 |
| Fresno | 4/1/2015 | 4/30/2018 |
| Imperial | 4/1/2015 | 4/30/2018 |
| Lassen | 7/1/2015 | 4/30/2018 |
| Monterey | 4/1/2015 | 4/30/2018 |
| Orange | 4/1/2015 | 4/30/2018 |
| Shasta | 4/1/2015 | 4/30/2018 |
| Solano | 4/1/2015 | 4/30/2018 |
| Sonoma | 4/1/2015 | 4/30/2018 |
| Yuba | 4/1/2015 | 4/30/2018 |

# Attachment C. Pretrial Release Program Summaries

This attachment provides a brief description of the key program elements and a summary of program strengths and challenges. The summaries are drawn from program descriptions and quarterly reports submitted by each county and supplemented by information collected during site visits.

**Alameda County**
Assessment tool: Ohio Risk Assessment System (ORAS-PAT)
Assessment administered by: Court Pretrial Services (PTS) unit
Assessment conducted: At arraignment
Release decision made: At hearing subsequent to arraignment
Supervised pretrial release options: None
Treatment services offered: No
Strength: Data outcomes of those released on bail and those released on OR are comprehensive. Alameda recently added a second courthouse where risk assessments are conducted.
Challenge: The program supervision component will be conducted by a community-based agency but was significantly delayed. The new supervision implementation is targeted to begin in the fall of 2017.

**El Dorado County**
Virginia Pretrial Risk Assessment Instrument (VPRAI)
Assessment administered by: Probation
Assessment conducted: At arrest
Release decision made: At arraignment
Supervised pretrial release options: Reminders and Probation meetings
Treatment services offered: Yes
Strength: The court recognized that they needed to make some program changes in order to increase the number of pretrial releases. They sought guidance from outside subject matter experts, brought in experienced personnel, and are reevaluating program policy and processes.
Challenge: The program's current pretrial release criteria limits eligibility and has resulted in relatively low program numbers.

**Fresno County**
Virginia Pretrial Risk Assessment Instrument (VPRAI)
Assessment administered by: Probation
Assessment conducted: At booking
Release decision made: At arraignment
Supervised pretrial release options: Reminders and monitoring
Treatment services offered: Yes
Strength: The court is starting a project to build a portal and app to facilitate secure, mobile communications between probationers on pretrial supervision and the Probation Department.
Challenge: The court faces challenges in maintaining updated information about service provider availability.

# Attachment C. Pretrial Release Program Summaries

**Imperial County**
Pretrial Risk Assessment Tool: Correctional Assessment and Intervention System (CAIS)
Assessment administered by: Sheriff
Assessment conducted: At booking
Release decision made: At arraignment
Supervised pretrial release options: Call or report in depending on risk level
Treatment services offered: No
Strength: Imperial's Pretrial Assessment tool was studied and validated by San Diego State University and determined to be predictive. Suggested changes made during the validation process were implemented, including widening the "Low Risk" category.
Challenge: Configuring jail management system to interface with court and pretrial data has presented significant challenges for the program.

**Lassen County**
Assessment tool: Ohio Risk Assessment System (ORAS)
Assessment administered by: Probation
Assessment conducted: Pre-arraignment
Release decision made: At arraignment
Supervised pretrial release options: Monitoring via telephone; physical check-in
Drug testing treatment services offered: No
Strength: This small county program worked collaboratively as a partnership to craft a pretrial services agreement and make it available at the appropriate time so all parties can make informed decisions about each individual's pretrial plan.
Challenge: The county reports some challenges identifying the ideal point in the pre-arraignment process to conduct the assessment.

**Monterey County**
Ohio Risk Assessment System Pretrial Assessment Tool (ORAS-PAT)
(Assessment administered by: Probation
Assessment conducted: Pre-arraignment
Release decision made: At arraignment
Supervised pretrial release options: Check-in with the Pretrial Program, electronic monitoring, home visits, drug and alcohol testing, and court date reminders
Treatment services offered: No
Strength: Program staff worked with BetaGov, a nonprofit agency that promotes innovation in the public sector, to conduct a randomized control trial of the impact of court reminders on failure-to-appear rates. Preliminary results suggest that court appearance rates improved when defendants received court reminders, and the project will be extended until results are conclusive.
Challenge: Referrals for pretrial risk assessment have increased but Probation Department staff assigned to pretrial program has decreased. The court and probation are transitioning to new information management systems resulting in data collection challenges.

# Attachment C. Pretrial Release Program Summaries

**Orange County**
Virginia Pretrial Risk Assessment Instrument (VPRAI)
Assessment administered by: Court
Assessment conducted: At booking
Release decision made: At arraignment
Supervised pretrial release options: Check-ins with Probation
Treatment services offered: Yes
Strength(s): The University of California, Irvine assessed the Pretrial Assessment and Release Supervision Program (PARS). It found that the program positively impacted release rates, and that defendants placed on PARS were significantly less likely to fail pretrial relative to those released on cash bond. Orange County also developed and implemented an electronic database and information exchange platform to automate transfer of program data between the Court and Probation Department. The county as a whole underwent cultural change in how they view and approach the pretrial population, and pretrial process.
Challenges: Legislative changes such as Prop 47, Prop 63, and SB 10 affected the number of eligible program participants, imposed additional rules that led to changes in court processes, and as of 2019 will impose new policies and procedures.

**Shasta County**
Virginia Pretrial Risk Assessment Instrument (VPRAI)
Assessment administered by: Probation
Assessment conducted: Monday through Friday at booking (formerly assessments were conducted on Saturday and Sunday)
Release decision made: Pre-arraignment and at arraignment
Supervised pretrial release options: Reminders, check-ins
Treatment services offered: Yes
Strength: County self-identified a need to reevaluate program eligibility and expand criteria.
Challenge: High rate of FTA; data coming from three different sources sometimes conflicts and requires cross-checking. More defendants than anticipated committed crimes too serious to allow their release on supervised own recognizance. Our release numbers were therefore much lower than we hoped for.

**Solano County**
Assessment tool: Ohio Risk Assessment System (ORAS)
Administered by: Probation
Assessment conducted: At booking
Release decision made: At arraignment
Supervised pretrial release options: Phone reminders, probation check-in
Treatment services offered: Yes
Strength: Solano County Administrator's office has been tasked with investigating expansion of pretrial programs. New probation officer resources added to the program.

Challenge: Slower than anticipated timeline for identifying IT vendor for criminal minute order project.

**Sonoma County**
Pretrial Risk Assessment Tool: Sonoma Pretrial Risk Assessment Tool (SPRAT)
Administered by: Sheriff
Assessment conducted: At booking
Release decision made: At arraignment
Supervised pretrial release options: Court reminders, basic supervision, moderate supervision, enhanced supervision
Treatment services offered: No
Strength: The Sonoma program has been releasing a gradually increasing number of offenders on supervised pretrial release.
Challenge: The inability to generate a unique ID for program participants so they can be tracked through data coming from multiple sources remains a challenge for Sonoma. They are also in the process of converting to a new case management system, which is consuming significant resources to put in place.

**Yuba County**
Assessment tool: Ohio Risk Assessment System (ORAS-PAT). In addition to using and ORAS-PAT score, Yuba also used and additional set of stability factors, severity of current offense factors, and severity of prior offenses to determine whether the defendant would be detained, would be released on OR pre-arraignment, released on OR with conditions pre-arraignment, or released on OR with conditions at arraignment.
Administered by: Probation
Assessment conducted: At booking
Release decision made: Pre-arraignment and at arraignment
Supervised pretrial release options: Reminders and monitoring
Treatment services offered: No
Strength: Risk assessment information is collected in electronic form. Use of the court's JALAN case management system and a customized database allow further dynamic data tracking and predominantly automated reporting capabilities.
Challenge: The county is concerned it will not be able to continue the program without grant funding.

# Attachment D. Collaborative Court Program Summaries

This attachment provides a brief description of the key program elements and a summary of program strengths and challenges. The summaries are drawn from program descriptions and quarterly reports submitted by each county and supplemented by information collected during site visits.

**Contra Costa County**

Program type(s): Domestic Violence Intensive Support Program

Program elements: The goal of the Domestic Violence Intensive Support Program (DVISP) is to reduce recidivism among individuals convicted of felony and/or misdemeanor domestic violence offenses who have been assessed to be at medium to high risk of reoffending. To achieve these goals the court is collaborating with the district attorney, public defender, probation, and public and community agencies. Participants are interviewed using the Ontario Domestic Assault Risk Assessment tool (ODARA).

Strength: Agreements with service providers were strengthened and clarified to assure that the funding provided the maximum level of services possible.

Challenge: Program staff struggled to identify whether the District Attorney or Probation was the most appropriate justice partner for administering the ODARA with participants.

**Kern County**

Program type(s): Mental Health Court

Program elements: The goal of the mental health court is to identify persons in the criminal justice system whose mental health issues have contributed to their criminal behavior, with eligibility determined as soon as possible after criminal charges are filed. Persons eligible for the mental health court are offered a wide array of services including mental health and substance-use disorder treatment, and case management including facilitation of applications for housing, public benefits, and transportation.

Strength: The program has a dedicated judicial officer providing leadership for the effort, helping to bring court and county partners together.

Challenge: The program staff reported a lack of in-patient substance abuse treatment programs and limited availability of beds at sober living environments in Kern County, especially for women.

# Attachment D. Collaborative Court Program Summaries

**Lake County**

Program type(s): Veterans Treatment Court

Program elements: The Veterans Treatment Court is a voluntary program for veterans with criminal charges. Cases are referred by judicial officers in the outlying courts under Penal Code section 1170.9 for an eligibility hearing. Treatment includes weekly individual and group counseling, drug and alcohol testing, and if applicable, mental health treatment, and regular attendance at recovery support/self-help meetings. Referrals for vocational training, education, and/or job placement, and housing services are provided.

Strength: The program includes a mentorship component for participants.

Challenge: Program staff reported challenges associated with Proposition 47 and difficulties recruiting misdemeanor participants for the program.

**Los Angeles County**

Program type(s): "Court to College" Program

Program elements: The Court to College program is a collaboration between the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, Cerritos Community College (CCC), Los Angeles Probation Department (LAPD), Los Angeles District Attorney, Los Angeles Public Defender, and the California Department of Justice's Division of Recidivism Reduction and Re-Entry (DR3). The program's central feature is to focus its participants on an educational track: obtaining a high school diploma or a GED while attending a training/academic program at CCC. Participants must be from the Southeast Judicial District and be between the ages of 18 and 25. Supportive services include intensive probation supervision and substance-use disorder treatment services, ongoing court monitoring, and judicial interaction with participants.

Strength: Despite change in judicial leadership, the program continues to move forward.

Challenge: With multiple new law changes, staff reported that recruitment of new participants was a challenge. Also, California Department of Justice staff assisting with the program evaluation do not have access to Probation data, and have found data on academic progress to be limited.

**Mendocino County**

Program type(s): Adult Drug Court

Program elements: The adult drug court program is for Mendocino residents with criminal charges who have underlying substance-use disorder issues. The program consists of six phases that are a minimum of 14 weeks. In addition to substance-use disorder treatment, participants are also required to perform a minimum of 488 hours of community service. The program uses

sanctions that are graduated, therapeutic, and positive. Incentives are utilized to recognize and bolster the success of the participant.

Strength: Program staff added a peer mentor component.

Challenge: The Public Defender's Office has experienced a significant staffing shortage, and there has been significant turnover in the District Attorney's office creating a lack of continuity and teamwork in pre-court hearings.

**Merced County**

Program type(s): Mental Health Treatment Court and Re-Entry Program

Program Elements: The Mental Health Treatment Court and Re-Entry Program focuses on medium- and high-risk offenders on post-release community supervision (PRCS), mandatory supervision, and felony probation who have an Axis I mental health disorder and agree to participate in required counseling and treatment.

Strengths: Program staff worked to link participants to community-based services, in addition to those in their court ordered treatment plan. Services include literacy programs through the local library, Department of Rehabilitation programs offering employment skills and volunteer opportunities, National Association of Mentally Ill (NAMI) support groups for families, and probation department programs on life skills. Participants were assisted with activating and applying for insurance and SSI. In some instances, probation terms were reduced for participants if they completed Behavioral Health Court. Felony charges were also reduced for some cases, and fines/fees were also significantly reduced for graduates.

Challenges: Staff sometimes struggled to find appropriate placements for participants with acute symptoms of severe mental illness. There was not always a consensus on whether to allow someone into the program. Some individuals were not accepted into the program if they did not have time left on their probation term to complete the program. Due to the challenges in recruiting staff, the program was without a clinician in the final year. Fortunately, another clinician in the Behavioral Health Court program was available to cover the necessary services for the grant participants.

**Modoc County**

Program type(s): Adult Drug Treatment Court

Program elements: The Adult Drug Treatment Court focuses on alcohol or drug charges or other charges where there was involvement of alcohol and/or drugs in the commission of the offense. The program is designed to last 18 months with three phases and six months of aftercare. The treatment team includes the judge (chair), defense attorney, district attorney, coordinator, chief probation officer, substance-use disorder counselors, a mental health counselor, and an employment specialist.

Strength: Program staff utilized Recidivism Reduction funding to provide needed residential treatment.

Challenge: Modoc is sparsely populated county with limited services dispersed across a wide geographic area.

**Placer County**

Program type(s): Drug Court/Proposition 36 Drug Court and Veterans Court

Program elements:

Mental Health Court: Placer's Mental Health Court is a three-phase program for individuals with a diagnosis of a psychotic disorder, bipolar disorder, or other psychiatric disorder that qualifies the participant for long-term disability.

Drug Court/Prop 36 Court: Placer's drug courts are alternative sentencing programs for substance-use disorder-related criminal charges. The programs are designed for participants who are high need and high risk.

Veterans Court: This court is a four-phase program for veterans whose criminal charges or convictions are related to their military service.

Strength: A major accomplishment with this grant funding has been increased policy support for collaborative court programs that resulted in updates to program protocols, the revitalization of Homeless Court, the establishment of focused data collection and utilization, increased access to treatment and incentives for collaborative court participants, a successful pilot to change drug-testing practices, and increased access to training for collaborative court staff.

Challenge: The court foresees ongoing challenges related to maintaining overarching policy support for the programs absent the collaborative court coordinator position that was funded through RRF.

**Sacramento County**

Program type(s): Co-Occurring Mental Health Court

Program elements: The Co-Occurring Mental Health Court is a collaboration between the Superior Court of Sacramento County, the Public Defender's Office (PD), the District Attorney's Office (DA), the Sacramento County Department of Health and Human Services (Division of Behavioral Health Services), the Probation Department's Adult Community Corrections Division, and Alcohol and Drug Services, and is designed to serve defendants who have a serious mental health issues along with a co-occurring substance-use disorder.

Strength: The team refined the referral process yielding higher numbers of eligible referrals. They also worked collaboratively to finalize a program manual.

Challenge: Program staff reported that they need to discharge some participants from the program when the services available cannot meet the needs of the client (i.e., participant's cognitive functioning does not allow for them to adhere to or comply with the structure of the program). Staff also reported that they will be looking into a wider variety of services to meet more participant needs.

**San Diego County**

Program type(s): Veterans Treatment Court, Mandatory Supervision Court, and Reentry Court

Program elements: San Diego's Veterans Treatment Court targets moderate- to high-risk offenders who are eligible for relief under Penal Code section 1170.9 (offense must stem from military-service related trauma, traumatic brain injury, substance-use disorder (SUD), or mental health issues). The program has three phases including an additional aftercare component. San Diego's Mandatory Supervision Court is a three-phase collaborative court program for offenders who have been sentenced under Penal Code section 1170(h)(5)(B) and have entered the post-release phase of their sentence. San Diego's Reentry Court serves high-risk felony offenders under parole, mandatory supervision, probation, or post-release community supervision who are either facing a new felony conviction or a revocation of their terms of supervision. Participants must be assessed as having a SUD, or co-occurring mental health and SUD. The program aims to link participants to appropriate treatment services, including but not limited to mental health issues, substance-use disorder, housing, employment training, and prosocial skills.

Strength: San Diego County has the capacity to serve a high volume of participants, particularly in the Mandatory Supervision Court.

Challenge: Staff reported that in the Veterans Treatment Court (VTC), participants remain in the screening phase for increasingly longer periods of time, due to a lack of necessary documentation (military records). This delay posed a challenge in keeping potential participants interested in participating in a highly structured program such as VTC.

**San Francisco County**

Program type(s): Transitional housing component for participants in Behavioral Health Court, Adult Drug Court, Intensive Supervision Court, and Community Justice Center (all existing)

Program elements: San Francisco is using the funds to support transitional housing for high-risk/high-need homeless and marginally housed clients, most of whom have co-occurring conditions, who are participating in one of the collaborative court programs listed above. The Tenderloin Housing Clinic (THC) blocks housing units for a maximum of 12 months in order to provide supported transitional housing to 80 collaborative court clients. Participants work with a THC housing specialist to plan for permanent housing once the participant finishes the supportive housing program in addition to receiving court-affiliated case management and social service support.

Strength: Staff reported that all participants receive a housing needs assessment and an individualized permanent housing plan within one week of intake.

Challenge: Staff reported that limits to affordable housing options have required staff to seek out-of-county housing options.

**San Joaquin County**

Program type(s): DUI Court and Adult Drug Court

Program elements: San Joaquin's DUI Court is a dual-track system of court supervision in high-risk DUI cases for repeat DUI offenders whose previous DUI was within 10 years of the current case. Track 1 is for program participants with little or no addiction issues. Track 2 is for program participants whose reoffending clearly revolves around alcoholism or substance-use disorder as determined by a licensed substance-use disorder counselor. The Adult Drug Court is a three-phase program that targets individuals charged with misdemeanor or felony offenses for which a jail or prison sentence will be imposed. The program provides intensive court monitoring so that participants can achieve total abstinence from drugs and alcohol, and become productive and responsible members of society.

Strength: Staff reported that San Joaquin has the capacity to serve a relatively large number of participants in DUI and Drug court programs. They have also secured continued funding for DUI Court and Drug Court programs through a 2017 Judicial Council Court Innovations Grant. They have received additional funding from an Office of a Traffic Safety (OTS) Grant for DUI Court and a Substance Abuse Focus Grant for both DUI and Drug Court.

Challenge: Staff reported that although San Joaquin already serves a large number of participants in Drug Court, they have been experiencing an increase in the number of referrals, which may indicate greater need.

**San Mateo County**

Program type(s): Bridges Substance Abuse Treatment Court, Pathways Mental Health Court, Drug Court, Veterans Treatment Court (all existing)

Program elements: The San Mateo Collaborative Courts includes a courtroom-based team approach with a strong judicial leadership role. By relaxing their traditional adversarial roles, Drug Court officials work as a team to develop a strategy that is in the best interest of both the defendant and society.

The goal is to improve outcomes for participants by connecting them to needed services, such as mental health treatment and therapy, substance abuse counseling, healthcare, job training and employment, and housing assistance. Participants are intensively supervised by a Deputy Probation Officer, are expected to avail themselves of the services offered, must make restitution

to their victims, and must appear in court for progress reviews. Upon graduation, participants may be eligible to have their fines reduced, have probation terminated early, and/or have their conviction expunged/dismissed.

Strength: Staff reported that RRF grants funds led to important capacity-building activity, especially for probation officers who are vital to the operations of San Mateo's Collaborative Courts. Three probation officers were able to attend the NADCP training.

Challenge: Staff reported that the court had to work closely with partner agencies to ensure timely spending of grant funds, and that some agencies had difficulty spending down allocated funds.

**Santa Clara County**

Program type(s): Drug Treatment Court, Mental Health Treatment Court, Veterans Treatment Court, Parolee Reentry Court (PRC), Developmentally Disabled (DD Court) and Competency Restoration Court.

Program elements: The Santa Clara collaborative justice court programs listed above are using funds to create a housing component that will serve the highest-risk participants who are dually diagnosed with mental health and substance use disorders with a high need for treatment and services. The housing component utilizes a Housing First model and is a 30-to 90-day program that provides additional treatment, case management, and other social services.

Strength: Santa Clara has a complete array of collaborative courts and has the capacity to serve many participants. This allowed Santa Clara to draw from multiple programs to provide housing to court participants. Santa Clara has recently improved its data collection and reporting capacity.

Challenge: Santa Clara's data collection capacity has lagged behind its capacity to provide services.

**Santa Cruz County**

Program type(s): Mental Health Court

Program elements: Santa Cruz's Mental Health Court is a supportive post-adjudication review court designed to improve offender treatment outcomes, reduce recidivism, respond to public safety and victims' rights concerns, and effectively utilize public resources. The program is for individuals on specialized mental health probation supervision caseloads who agree to participate in the program. The Mental Health Court is a collaboration between the Superior Court of Santa Cruz County, probation, mental health professionals, the district attorney, defense counsel, and law enforcement.

Strength: Santa Cruz has a high degree of collaboration across partner agencies. They have also refined their referral process using their new case management system.

Challenge: The Mental Health Court in Santa Cruz experienced some accounting delays that led staff to consider contracting directly with treatment providers.

**Stanislaus County**

Program type(s): Veterans Court

Program elements: Stanislaus' Veterans Court is a collaborative justice court for veterans with a service-related mental health problem. In order to be eligible, the criminal offense must have resulted from a mental health problem, and the offense must be eligible for probation. Program components include full-service options at the local Veterans Services Clinic, the Veterans Administration, and the county Behavioral Health Services Agency.

Strength: Implementation for this court was efficient. The court reached operating capacity quickly after implementation.

Challenge: Processes for exchanging data were challenging, but have been resolved over the past two quarters. There may be capacity constraints on this court based on the availability of probation staff.

**Tehama County**

Program type(s): Mental Health Court

Program elements: Tehama's mental health court is a four-phase program and targets specific outcomes related to increases in mental health functioning, successful community reintegration, and lower recidivism. Participants must be moderate- to high-risk for recidivating and must have a serious and persistent mental health disorder, which is the primary motivating factor in the person's involvement with the criminal justice system. There may be a dual diagnosis of chemical dependency though the substance-use disorder is not the primary diagnosis.

Strength: The court recognizes the successes among participants with services and medication stabilization, and has identified an alternative funding sources to potentially access after RRF funding ends.

Challenge: Tehama reports that there is a shortage of mental health workers and appropriate housing options in the area. The lack of the services and housing provides a challenge to the court in meeting the needs of program participants.

**Tulare County**

Program type(s): Domestic Violence (DV) Court and DUI Court

Program elements: Tulare's domestic violence court is a three-phased program that requires completion of a 52-week Batterer's Treatment Program. The program is incentivized by the provision of job training/job placement in Phase 3 and the ability to reduce the term of probation from three years to 18 months upon successful completion of batterer's treatment and the payment of victim restitution. The DUI court is a three-phased program that requires completion of a 12-, 18-, or 24-month Driving Under the Influence Program. The program is incentivized by the provision of job training/job placement in Phase 3 and the ability to reduce the term of probation from five years to three years upon successful completion of the designated DUI program and the payment of victim restitution.

Strength: The court has devoted resources to analysis and validation of the assessment tools being used in DV Court and DUI Court. They have also determined that staff and providers would benefit from updated training on evidence-based practice.

Challenge: The most significant challenge for the DV Court has been a higher failure rate as compared to the DUI Court. This led to a review and adjustment of the DUI supervision practices, required training for all DV providers on evidence-based practices, and the adoption of a system that tracks offenders who have failed the DV program in hopes of identifying unmet program/referral needs of these participants.

**Tuolumne County**

Program type(s): Adult Drug Court

Program elements: Tuolumne's adult drug court program is for offenders with criminal offenses that are related to drug addiction. The program provides outpatient groups, requires 12-step meeting attendance, frequent and random drug testing, and weekly or twice-monthly court hearings. The program also addresses issues of housing, mental health needs, employment, and education.

Strength: The Drug Court program's treatment team has had consistent participation from the Probation Department, Behavioral Health, and the Courts. Over the years, we have had the same clinicians, program manager, probation officer, and judge, which has resulted in a team that is cohesive, communicates well, and is committed to the program and the positive outcomes of participants.

Challenge: Court team reports that the county jail is overcrowded limiting the ability of the court to use flash incarcerations as a sanction.

# Attachment D. Collaborative Court Program Summaries

**Ventura County**

Program type(s): Mental Health Court and Veterans Court

Program elements: Ventura's Veterans Court is for veterans of U.S. military service that have been honorably discharged or in some cases have general/other than honorable discharges and are suspected of having sexual trauma, traumatic brain injury, posttraumatic stress disorder, substance-use disorder, or mental health problems stemming from service. The treatment services provided for veterans include residential care, intensive outpatient treatment, medically supervised care, psychiatric treatment, cognitive behavioral psychotherapy, drug and alcohol testing, drug and alcohol therapy, and veteran peer support groups that enhance the veteran's social and occupational functioning. Ventura's Mental Health Court is for adult mentally ill offenders who have a primary Axis I, DSM-IV diagnosis. Those determined to have a co-occurring substance-use disorder diagnosis, in addition to the other Axis I diagnoses, are also eligible. This program provides specialized substance-use disorder counseling, general psychotherapy, group therapy, case management services, and psychiatric medication.

Strength: The court created a database in-house to store data and run reports for both mental health and veterans treatment court program.

Challenge: The Public Defender's Office has proposed the expansion of the Ventura Veterans Treatment Court. Currently the court and other partner agencies do not have the resources to expand the program.