



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 26, 2012

Title	Agenda Item Type
Collaborative Justice Substance Abuse Focus Grant: Funding Recommendations, 2012–2013	Action Required
	Effective Date
	July 1, 2012
Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected	Date of Report
None	October 26, 2012
Recommended by	Contact
Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee	Carrie Zoller, 415-865-8829
Hon. Richard Vlavianos, Chair	carrie.zoller@jud.ca.gov
Ms. Nancy Taylor, Manager	

Executive Summary

The Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee recommends that funding allocations for Collaborative Justice Substance Abuse Focus Grants through the California Collaborative and Drug Court Projects in the Budget Act of 2012 (Stats. 2012, ch. 21; § 45.55.020, item 0250-101-0001) be distributed to court programs as proposed in the attached table. This report details the committee's recommendations for funding programs in 47 courts for fiscal year 2012–2013 with these annual grants distributed by the Judicial Council to expand or enhance promising collaborative justice programs around the state.

Recommendation

The Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee recommends that the Judicial Council approve the distribution of Collaborative Justice Project Substance Abuse Focus Grants for 2012–2013 as proposed in the last column of the table in Attachment B, *Allocation Summary: Fiscal Years 2011–2012 and 2012–2013*.

Previous Council Action

The Judicial Council has approved the annual funding allocation for these grants 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, as shown on the grant calculation worksheet in Attachment D.

Rationale for Recommendation

This year's funding authorization for the annual grants comes from a legislative mandate under California Collaborative and Drug Court Projects in the Budget Act of 2012 as referenced in item 0250-101-0001.

This recommendation distributes the funding for fiscal year 2012–2013 in allocation amounts calculated with the same formula used in previous years. The 2012–2013 State Budget allocates \$1,160,000 for these projects. This is the same level of funding that was allocated for the Collaborative Justice Substance Abuse Focus Grants in fiscal year 2010-2011.

As in previous years, grants are awarded to all proposed projects that 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;
- Fulfillment 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 court executive officers of the superior courts of this year's grant opportunity on August 27, 2012. Forty-seven courts submitted project action plans, which staff of the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) reviewed to confirm that the proposed projects met the requirements of addressing substance abuse issues and adhering to the collaborative justice court principles; see Attachment C, *Guiding Principles of Collaborative Justice Courts*.

As in previous years, courts were permitted to apply for grants for more than one project and at more than one site. The funding formula worksheet, which weighs total adjusted funding allocation, type of program, and number of individuals served by each program, follows this report as Attachment D.

The formula starts with the presumption that all projects that meet the grant criteria start with a base funding amount of \$12,000. This base figure is then adjusted upward or downward to reflect the actual amount of total funding approved by the Legislature for the year and the

number of court projects eligible for grants from those funds. Each project's adjusted base figure may then be augmented depending on the program's focus and the number of participants who may potentially benefit from the program—programs that focus on treatment receive higher allocations than those that do not, in recognition of the intensive case management required in treatment court programs. Courts can also request grants for program planning, which may include an augmentation for the estimated number of participants if the project will become operational before the end of the fiscal year. These adjustments combine to arrive at the algorithm applied against the year's total allocation to determine each program's grant award.

Comments, Alternatives Considered, and Policy Implications

All program proposals that meet grant guidelines, including those for planning grants, are considered eligible for funding. The committee considered introducing a competitive process for determining which programs deserve awards, but rejected the idea because distributing funds to all qualified applicants by straight formula has proven such an effective and efficient process.

Representatives of the AOC's Center for Families, Children & the Courts have considered the proposed distribution of these funds and concur with the committee's recommendation.

Implementation Requirements, Costs, and Operational Impacts

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

Relevant Strategic Plan Goals and Operational Plan Objectives

This funding allocation enables interested courts to expand and enhance collaborative justice court programs that focus on improved services and outcomes for court users. The improvements introduced by these courts as a result of the grants fulfill 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: 2011–2012 Grant Performance Summary
2. Attachment B: 2011–2012 and 2012–2013 Grant Allocation Summary
3. Attachment C: Guiding Principles of Collaborative Justice Courts
4. Attachment D: 2012–2013 Caseload-Based Funding-Level Formula

2011–2012 Grant Performance Summary

Since the inception of this grant program, participating courts have continually demonstrated effective court strategies that serve substance-abusing offenders.

- Grants were awarded to 104 court projects in 48 counties.
- The types (and numbers) of projects funded were adult drug courts (27), juvenile drug courts (18), dependency drug courts (16), peer and truancy courts (8), drug court–modeled Proposition 36 courts (8), adult mental health/dual-diagnosis courts (7), juvenile mental health/dual-diagnosis courts (3), family law treatment courts (3), DUI courts (3), domestic violence courts (3), a homeless court (1), a community court program (1), and a veterans court (1), as well as educational programs, such as DUI prevention programs geared toward juveniles (5).
- More than 11,800 court users were served through these grant-funded programs, including 4,562 participants who successfully completed a program, 86 who earned GED certificates, 1,128 participants who gained employment, 331 families reunified, and 121 participants who gave birth to drug-free babies.
- The “spend-out” rate—the percentage of total grant funds spent toward these court projects—is an anticipated 98 percent for grant projects in 2011–2012.

Attachment B

Allocation Summary: Fiscal Years 2011–2012 and 2012–2013

Collaborative Justice Project—Substance Abuse Focus Grant Awards (by Court)

	County	FY 2011–2012			FY 2012–2013		
		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	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$30,096	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$30,019
2.	Amador	\$22,000	\$19,000	\$19,000	\$16,000	\$19,000	\$14,789
3.	Butte	\$32,000	\$32,000	\$27,516	\$32,000	\$32,000	\$29,685
4.	Calaveras	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$17,200	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$14,789
5.	Contra Costa	\$35,000	\$39,000	\$30,096	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$32,478
6.	Del Norte	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$13,756	\$18,000	\$18,000	\$16,651
7.	Fresno	\$37,000	\$44,989	\$31,820	\$45,000	\$45,000	\$41,788
8.	Glenn	\$38,000	\$32,000	\$32,000	\$24,000	\$24,000	\$22,237
9.	Humboldt	\$18,000	\$18,000	\$15,476	\$18,000	\$18,000	\$16,651
10.	Inyo	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$10,320	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$11,065
11.	Kern	\$42,000	\$45,000	\$36,116	\$42,000	\$42,000	\$38,995
12.	Lake	\$14,000	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$11,065
13.	Lassen	\$23,000	\$23,000	\$19,776	\$21,000	\$21,000	\$19,444
14.	Los Angeles	\$24,000	\$24,000	\$20,636	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$32,478
15.	Madera	\$24,000	\$24,000	\$20,636	\$24,000	\$24,000	\$22,237
16.	Marin	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$13,756	\$22,000	\$22,000	\$20,375
17.	Mendocino	\$26,000	\$26,000	\$22,356	\$24,000	\$24,000	\$22,237
18.	Merced	\$16,000	\$32,000	\$13,756	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$11,065
19.	Modoc	\$14,000	\$14,000	\$12,040	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$14,789
20.	Monterey	\$36,000	\$34,000	\$30,960	\$42,000	\$34,000	\$34,000
21.	Napa	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$13,756	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$14,789
22.	Nevada	\$24,000	\$24,000	\$20,636	\$24,000	\$24,000	\$22,237
23.	Orange	\$42,000	\$42,000	\$36,116	\$45,000	\$42,000	\$42,000
24.	Placer	\$24,000	\$24,000	\$20,636	\$32,000	\$16,000	\$16,000

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

² 2012–2013 total available grant funding amount: \$1,160,000.

³ The maximum grant award is capped at \$45,000. To match the projected state allocation, the maximum allowable funding amount based on formula was adjusted downward by approximately 7 percent. The courts which requested less than their maximum funding amount are not adjusted downward.

	County	FY 2011–2012			FY 2012–2013		
		Allocation Based on Formula	Court Funding Request	Final Funding Allocation ¹	Allocation Based on Formula	Court Funding Request	Final Funding Allocation ^{2,3}
25.	Plumas	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$13,756	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$14,789
26.	Riverside	\$42,000	\$42,000	\$36,116	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$32,478
27.	Sacramento	\$20,000	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$28,000	\$16,000	\$16,000
28.	San Bernardino	\$42,000	\$42,000	\$36,116	\$42,000	\$42,000	\$38,995
29.	San Diego	\$42,000	\$45,000	\$36,116	\$42,000	\$42,000	\$38,995
30.	San Francisco	\$45,000	\$42,000	\$38,700	\$42,000	\$42,000	\$38,995
31.	San Joaquin	\$32,000	\$32,000	\$27,516	\$42,000	\$42,000	\$38,995
32.	San Luis Obispo	\$32,000	\$32,000	\$27,516	\$32,000	\$32,000	\$29,685
33.	San Mateo	\$20,000	\$24,000	\$17,200	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$18,513
34.	Santa Barbara	\$42,000	\$45,000	\$36,116	\$45,000	\$47,000	\$41,788
35.	Santa Clara	\$34,000	\$34,000	\$29,236	\$34,000	\$34,000	\$31,547
36.	Santa Cruz	\$29,000	\$29,000	\$24,936	\$32,000	\$29,000	\$29,000
37.	Shasta	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$10,320	\$26,000	\$38,000	\$24,099
38.	Sierra	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$10,320	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$11,065
39.	Siskiyou	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$17,200	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$18,513
40.	Solano	\$45,000	\$57,000	\$38,696	\$39,000	\$39,000	\$36,202
41.	Sonoma	\$45,000	\$60,000	\$38,696	\$45,000	\$59,000	\$41,788
42.	Stanislaus	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$17,200	\$20,000	\$16,000	\$16,000
43.	Trinity ⁴	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$10,320	\$0	\$0	\$0
44.	Tulare	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$13,756	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$14,789
45.	Tuolumne	\$24,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$18,513
46.	Ventura	\$24,000	\$24,000	\$20,636	\$32,000	\$32,000	\$29,685
47.	Yolo	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$13,756	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$11,065
48.	Yuba	\$24,000	\$10,348	\$10,320	\$18,000	\$18,000	\$16,651
Total		\$1,272,000	\$1,302,337	\$1,081,000	\$1,288,000	\$1,273,000	\$1,160,000

⁴ The Superior Court of California, County of Trinity did not apply for funding in fiscal year 2012–2013.

Guiding Principles of Collaborative Justice Courts

Using the National Drug Court Institute's 10 key components of drug courts as a model, the Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee identified 11 essential components as the guiding principles of collaborative justice courts:

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 2012–2013
AOC Collaborative Justice Courts Substance Abuse Focus Grant Program**

NOTE: Use this tool to calculate the appropriate level of funding to request. Actual amounts awarded will depend on the number of applicant courts and the total funding available after passage of the 2012 State Budget.

Formula:

1. Program Focus Category	2. Base Amount	3. Grant Amount per Number of Total Program Participants						4. 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 participants who will be directly served by the grant program or programs for fiscal year 2012–2013:

- 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 2011–2012 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.