



Judicial Council of California · Administrative Office of the Courts

455 Golden Gate Avenue · San Francisco, California 94102-3688

www.courtinfo.ca.gov

REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

For business meeting on October 28, 2011

Title	Agenda Item Type
Collaborative Justice Substance Abuse Focus Grant: Funding Allocation Recommendations for Fiscal Year 2011–2012	Action Required
Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected	Effective Date
None	July 1, 2011
Recommended by	Date of Report
Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee	October 28, 2011
Hon. Richard Vlavianos, Chair	Contact
Ms. Nancy Taylor, Manager	Carrie Zoller, 415-865-8829 carrie.zoller@jud.ca.gov

Executive Summary

The Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee recommends funding allocations for Collaborative Justice Project Substance Abuse Focus Grants through the California Collaborative and Drug Court Projects as referenced in the Budget Act of 2011 (Stats. 2011, ch. 33; § 45.55.020, item 0250-101-0001). Grant funding levels are determined annually based on a distribution method approved by the Judicial Council in 2005. This report outlines recommendations regarding funding distribution for 48 applicant courts for fiscal year 2011–2012. These grants will be used by the courts to expand or enhance collaborative justice programs throughout the state.

Recommendation

The Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee recommends that the Judicial Council approve the committee's recommended allocations of fiscal year 2011–2012 Collaborative Justice Project Substance Abuse Focus Grant funds as stated in Attachment B, Allocation Summary: Fiscal Years 2010–2011 and 2011–2012.

Previous Council Action

The Judicial Council has approved the funding allocation for these grants, originally named Drug Court Mini-Grants, every year since fiscal year 1998–1999. In November 2005, at the recommendation of the Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee, the Judicial Council approved a Caseload-Based Funding Level Formula for distributing the funds, using an allocation formula based on the number of individuals served, as outlined in Attachment D.

Rationale for Recommendation

Funding authorization for the grants is based on a legislative mandate for California Collaborative and Drug Court Projects as referenced in item 0250-101-0001 of the Budget Act of 2011.

This recommendation allocates fiscal year 2011–2012 funds based on the same allocation formula used in previous years; however, an adjustment to the maximum allowable amount has been made to accommodate a decrease in funding. The funding level is decreased by 6.8 percent, or \$80,000, from that of fiscal year 2010–2011. The Budget Act of 2011 provides an allocation of \$1,081,000 for these projects and was approved in the State Budget.

As in previous years, funded projects must meet the following criteria:

- Consistency with both the California Standards of Judicial Administration and the Guiding Principles of Collaborative Justice Courts;
- Involvement of a local steering committee;
- Successful completion of statistical and financial reporting requirements for previous grant funding periods (if applicable); and
- Submission of a complete and comprehensive action plan.

Judge Richard Vlavianos, chair of the Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee, informed the presiding judges and executive officers of the superior courts of the current grant opportunity on July 12, 2011. Forty-eight interested courts submitted project action plans. Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) staff reviewed the submissions to confirm that proposed collaborative justice projects met the requirements of addressing substance abuse issues and employing collaborative justice court principles. Attachment C, Guiding Principles of Collaborative Justice Courts, summarizes these principles.

As in previous years, courts were allowed to apply for more than one type of project at more than one site. The funding formula, based on the number of individuals served, is summarized in Attachment D.

According to the formula, it is anticipated that any court request that meets the grant criteria receives minimum base funding of \$12,000. However, the base funding allocation may be

adjusted upward or downward based on the amount of available funds and the number of programs receiving funding. The base can be augmented depending on program focus and the number of program participants. Programs that focus on treatment courts receive higher allocations than those that do not because of the intensive case management required in treatment court programs. Courts also may request funds for planning grants, which may include an augmentation for the estimated number of participants if the project will become operational before the end of the fiscal year. All program proposals that meet grant guidelines, including those for planning grants, are eligible for funding.

Comments, Alternatives Considered, and Policy Implications

A competitive process for fund distribution was also considered; however, the formulaic distribution of the funds has proven to be an effective and efficient process. The Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee and staff from the AOC Center for Families, Children & the Courts have considered the proposed use of these funds and concur.

Implementation Requirements, Costs, and Operational Impacts

In fiscal year 2010–2011, substance abuse focus grants changed from reimbursable to deliverable. Under the reimbursement model, to receive reimbursement for their costs, courts were required to submit semiannual statistical data reports and to provide monthly invoices to grants accounting. Under the deliverable model, courts had to submit only basic program information, two progress reports, and two invoices. This change streamlined the funding distribution to the courts, resulting in significant time savings for the courts and reduced AOC staff time spent on grant processing.

Relevant Strategic Plan Goals and Operational Plan Objectives

This funding allocation enables the courts to expand and enhance collaborative justice court programs that focus on providing services and stress improved outcomes for court users. The improvements generated by the courts as a result of the grants improvement supports strategic plan Goal IV, Quality of Justice and Service to the Public, and operational plan Goal IV, Objective 1, Foster excellence in public service to ensure that all court users receive satisfactory services and outcomes.

Attachments

1. Attachment A: 2010–2011 Grant Performance Summary
2. Attachment B: Allocation Summary: Fiscal Years 2010–2011 and 2011–2012: Collaborative Justice Project Substance Abuse Focus Grant Awards
3. Attachment C: Guiding Principles of Collaborative Justice Courts
4. Attachment D: Caseload-Based Funding-Level Formula: Fiscal Year 2011–2012 AOC Collaborative Justice Courts Substance Abuse Focus Grant Program

2010–2011 Grant Performance Summary

Since the inception of this grant program, participating courts continually demonstrate effective court strategies that serve substance-abusing offenders. Highlights of accomplishments during 2010–2011 are noted below.

2010–2011 Project Year Highlights

- Grants were awarded to 121 court projects located in 49 counties.
- The types (and numbers) of projects funded were adult drug courts (37), juvenile drug courts (24), dependency drug courts (18), peer and truancy courts (9), drug court model Proposition 36 courts (8), mental health/dual-diagnosis courts (6), family law treatment courts (4), DUI courts (3), homeless courts (2), a restorative justice court program (1), a domestic violence court (1), and an elder court (1), as well as several educational programs, such as DUI prevention programs geared toward juveniles (7).
- More than 11,000 court users were served through these grants. Program outcomes include 2,057 participants who successfully completed the program, 537 GED completions, 751 participants who gained employment, 307 family reunifications, and 46 drug-free babies born to participants.
- The anticipated spend-out rate¹ for this grant in 2010–2011 is 98 percent. Staff projects a spend-out rate of approximately 100 percent for project year 2011–2012.

¹ The percentage of the total grant funding that was expended by the participating court projects.

Allocation Summary: Fiscal Years 2010–2011 and 2011–2012
Collaborative Justice Project Substance Abuse Focus Grant Awards

		2010–2011			2011–2012		
	County	Allocation Based on Formula	Court Funding Request	Final Funding Allocation ¹	Allocation Based on Formula	Court Funding Request	Final Funding Allocation ^{2,3}
1.	Alameda	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$28,741	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$30,096
2.	Amador	\$19,000	\$19,000	\$18,203	\$22,000	\$19,000	\$19,000
3.	Butte	\$32,000	\$32,000	\$30,657	\$32,000	\$32,000	\$27,516
4.	Calaveras	\$23,000	\$23,000	\$22,035	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$17,200
5.	Contra Costa	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$33,531	\$35,000	\$39,000	\$30,096
6.	Del Norte	\$20,000	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$13,756
7.	El Dorado ⁴	\$20,000	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
8.	Fresno	\$36,000	\$31,800	\$31,800	\$37,000	\$44,989	\$31,820
9.	Glenn	\$14,000	\$14,000	\$13,413	\$38,000	\$32,000	\$32,000
10.	Humboldt	\$18,000	\$18,000	\$17,245	\$18,000	\$18,000	\$15,476
11.	Inyo	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$15,329	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$10,320
12.	Kern	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$33,531	\$42,000	\$45,000	\$36,116
13.	Kings ⁴	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$15,329	\$0	\$0	\$0
14.	Lake	\$14,000	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$14,000	\$12,000	\$12,000
15.	Lassen	\$22,000	\$17,000	\$17,000	\$23,000	\$23,000	\$19,776
16.	Los Angeles	\$20,000	\$18,920	\$18,920	\$24,000	\$24,000	\$20,636
17.	Madera	\$24,000	\$24,000	\$22,993	\$24,000	\$24,000	\$20,636
18.	Marin	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$11,497	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$13,756
19.	Mendocino	\$24,000	\$24,000	\$22,993	\$26,000	\$26,000	\$22,356
20.	Merced	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$11,497	\$16,000	\$32,000	\$13,756
21.	Modoc	\$16,000	\$14,000	\$14,000	\$14,000	\$14,000	\$12,040
22.	Monterey	\$36,000	\$34,000	\$34,000	\$36,000	\$34,000	\$30,960
23.	Napa	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$15,329	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$13,756
24.	Nevada	\$24,000	\$24,000	\$22,993	\$24,000	\$24,000	\$20,636
25.	Orange	\$42,000	\$41,201	\$40,235	\$42,000	\$42,000	\$36,116
26.	Placer	\$24,000	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$24,000	\$24,000	\$20,636
27.	Plumas	\$16,000	\$14,000	\$14,000	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$13,756
28.	Riverside	\$45,000	\$45,000	\$42,153	\$42,000	\$42,000	\$36,116
29.	Sacramento	\$20,000	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$20,000	\$16,000	\$16,000
30.	San Bernardino	\$42,000	\$42,000	\$40,237	\$42,000	\$42,000	\$36,116
31.	San Diego	\$45,000	\$45,000	\$43,111	\$42,000	\$45,000	\$36,116
32.	San Francisco	\$45,000	\$42,000	\$42,000	\$45,000	\$42,000	\$38,700

	County	2010–2011			2011–2012		
		Allocation Based on Formula	Court Funding Request	Final Funding Allocation ¹	Allocation Based on Formula	Court Funding Request	Final Funding Allocation ^{2,3}
33.	San Joaquin	\$32,000	\$32,000	\$30,657	\$32,000	\$32,000	\$27,516
34.	San Luis Obispo	\$20,000	\$19,992	\$19,161	\$32,000	\$32,000	\$27,516
35.	San Mateo	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$19,161	\$20,000	\$24,000	\$17,200
36.	Santa Barbara	\$42,000	\$42,000	\$40,237	\$42,000	\$45,000	\$36,116
37.	Santa Clara	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$33,531	\$34,000	\$34,000	\$29,236
38.	Santa Cruz	\$27,000	\$27,000	\$25,867	\$29,000	\$29,000	\$24,936
39.	Shasta	\$28,000	\$28,000	\$26,825	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$10,320
40.	Sierra	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$11,497	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$10,320
41.	Siskiyou	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$19,161	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$17,200
42.	Solano	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$33,531	\$45,000	\$57,000	\$38,696
43.	Sonoma	\$45,000	\$45,000	\$43,111	\$45,000	\$60,000	\$38,696
44.	Stanislaus	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$19,161	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$17,200
45.	Trinity	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$11,497	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$10,320
46.	Tulare	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$13,756
47.	Tuolumne	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$19,161	\$24,000	\$20,000	\$20,000
48.	Ventura	\$24,000	\$24,000	\$22,993	\$24,000	\$24,000	\$20,636
49.	Yolo	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$15,329	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$13,756
50.	Yuba	\$12,000	\$10,348	\$10,348	\$24,000	\$10,348	\$10,320
	Total	\$1,249,000	\$1,200,261	\$1,161,000	\$1,272,000	\$1,302,337	\$1,081,000.00

¹ 2010–2011 total available grant funding amount: \$1,161,000.

² 2011–2012 total available grant funding amount: \$1,081,000.

³ To match the projected state allocation, the maximum allowable funding amount based on formula was adjusted downward by approximately 14 percent.

⁴ The Superior Court of El Dorado and Kings Counties did not apply for funding in fiscal year 2011–2012.

Guiding Principles of Collaborative Justice Courts

The Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee identified the following 11 essential components, or guiding principles, of collaborative justice courts. They are based on the 10 key components of drug courts recognized by the National Drug Court Institute.

1. Integrate services with justice system processing;
2. Achieve the desired goals without the use of the traditional adversarial process;
3. Intervene early and promptly to place participants in the collaborative justice court program;
4. Provide access to a continuum of services, including treatment and rehabilitation services;
5. Use a coordinated strategy that governs the court's response to participant compliance, using a system of sanctions and incentives to foster compliance;
6. Use ongoing judicial interaction with each collaborative justice court participant;
7. Use monitoring and evaluation to measure the achievement of program goals, and gauge effectiveness;
8. Ensure continuing interdisciplinary education;
9. Forge partnerships among collaborative justice courts, public agencies, and community-based organizations to increase the availability of services;
10. Enhance the program's effectiveness, and generate local support; and
11. Emphasize team and individual commitments to cultural competency.

Caseload-Based Funding-Level Formula
Fiscal Year 2011–2012 AOC Collaborative Justice Courts Substance Abuse Focus Grant Program

NOTE: Use this tool to calculate the appropriate level of funding to request. Actual award amounts will be based on the number of applicant courts and the total allocation available after passage of the 2011 California State Budget.

Formula:

Program Focus Category	Base Amount	Grant Amount per Number of Total Program Participants						Enhancement	
		5–19	20–49	50–99	100–199	200–499	500+	10–24	25+
Treatment Court	\$12,000	\$0	\$4,000	\$8,000	\$12,000	\$20,000	\$30,000	\$2,000	\$3,000
Education / Nontreatment Program	\$12,000	\$0	\$2,000	\$4,000	\$6,000	\$10,000	\$15,000	\$1,000	\$2,000

Instructions:

1. Program Focus Category: Identify program focus of treatment or education.

2. Base Amount: Minimum base program funding level. Applicant courts can include only one base amount in their funding calculations.

3. Number of Total Program Participants: Number of total participants who will be directly served by the grant program or programs for fiscal year 2010–2011:

- a. Find the numerical range of participants for your program.
- b. Match it with the appropriate program focus category.
- c. Add the matching funding amount to the base amount. **This is your maximum level of funding.**

Example: \$12,000 (base) + \$12,000 (treatment court focus with 125 program participants) = \$24,000 maximum funding level.

4. Enhancement: Allowable if the court program or programs will serve additional participants beyond the current capacity level during the fiscal year 2010–2011 grant program. Minimum of 10 additional participants is required for enhancement funding.

Example: \$12,000 (base) + \$12,000 (treatment court focus with 125 program participants) + \$2,000 (increase in program capacity from previous year by 15 additional participants) = \$26,000 maximum funding level.

