

**JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS**

455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, California 94102-3688

Report (Revised)

TO: Members of the Judicial Council

FROM: Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee
Hon. Harold E. Kahn, Chair
Nancy Taylor, Manager, 415-865-7607,
nancy.taylor@jud.ca.gov
Yolanda Leung, Staff Analyst, 415-865-8075,
yolanda.leung@jud.ca.gov

DATE: November 6, 2008

SUBJECT: Collaborative Justice Project: Grant Funding Allocations for Fiscal
Year 2008–2009 (Action Required)

Issue Statement

The Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee annually recommends funding allocation for Collaborative Justice Project Substance Abuse Focus Grants through the California Collaborative and Drug Court Projects as referenced in the Budget Act of 2008 [item 0250-101-0001, Budget Act of 2008 (Stats. 2008, ch. 268, § 45.55.020)]. 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 fiscal year 2008–2009.

Recommendation

The Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee recommends that the Judicial Council, effective December 9, 2008, approve the committee's recommended allocation of fiscal year 2008–2009 Collaborative Justice Project Substance Abuse Focus Grant funds as set forth in attachment 2, Allocation Summary: Fiscal Years 2007–2008 and 2008–2009.

Program performance is summarized in attachment 1, the 2007–2008 Grant Performance Summary. Documentation supporting the funding distribution recommendation is included in attachments 2–4.

Rationale for Recommendation

Funding authorization for the Collaborative Justice Project Substance Abuse Focus Grants is based on a legislative mandate for the California Collaborative and Drug Court Projects as referenced in the Budget Act of 2008 [item 0250-101-0001, Budget Act of 2008 (Stats. 2008, ch. 268, § 45.55.020)].¹

This recommendation allocates fiscal year 2008–2009 funds based on the same allocation formula as in previous years. The Budget Act of 2008 provides for an allocation of \$1,203,000 for these projects. This funding level increased \$28,522 from fiscal year 2007–2008.

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 mini-grant funding periods (if applicable); and
- Submission of a complete, comprehensive action plan and budget.

Presiding judges and executive officers of the superior courts were informed of the current grant opportunity on July 8, 2008, in a letter from Judge Harold E. Kahn, chair of the Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee. Project action plans and proposed budgets were received from 50 interested courts. Action plans and budgets were reviewed by Administrative Office of the Courts' staff to confirm that proposed collaborative justice projects meet the requirements of addressing substance abuse issues and using collaborative justice court principles. Attachment 3, Guiding Principles of Collaborative Justice Courts, summarizes these principles.

As in previous years, courts are 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 4, Overview of Caseload-Based Formula.

According to the formula, any court request that meets the grant criteria receives a minimum base funding of \$12,000. However, the base funding allocation may be adjusted in either direction based on the amount of available funds and the number of programs receiving funding. The base can be augmented, depending on program focus and number of program participants. Programs that focus on treatment courts receive higher allocations than those that do not because of the more intensive case management in treatment court programs. Courts also may request funds for planning grants, which may include an augmentation for the

¹ The judiciary's budget as displayed in the Governor's Budget is divided into various categories and components, by program, by funding source (appropriation), and by cost component (state operations, local assistance, and capital outlay).

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.

Alternative Actions Considered

A competitive process for fund distribution was also considered; however, the formulaic distribution of these funds has proven to be a more effective and efficient process.

Comments From Interested Parties

This proposal was not distributed for public comment. 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 have concurred.

Implementation Requirements and Costs

No additional costs are associated with this funding distribution.

Attachments

Attachment 1

2007–2008 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 2007–2008 are noted below.

2007–2008 Project Year Highlights:

- Grants were awarded to 74 court projects located in 48 counties;
- Among the funded projects were adult drug court (21), juvenile drug courts (21), domestic violence courts (2), mental health/dual-diagnosis courts (3), dependency drug courts (11), peer and truancy courts (10), homeless courts (2), family law treatment courts (3), and a restorative justice court (1).
- Awards ranged from \$11,997 to \$46,385; the average award amount was \$24,468; the median award amount was \$20,385; and the modal² award amount was \$24,635 (6);
- More than 5,000 court users were served through this grant. Program outcomes include 2,073 successful completions, 198 GED completions, 1,158 participants who gained employment, 843 family reunifications, and 66 drug-free babies born to participants; and
- The spend-out rate³ for this grant in 2006–2007 was 96 percent. Staff project a spend-out rate of approximately 95 percent for project year 2007–2008.

² Relating to or constituting the most frequent value in a distribution.

³ The percentage of the total grant funding that was expended by the participating court projects.

Attachment 2

Allocation Summary: Fiscal Years 2007–2008 and 2008–2009

Collaborative Justice Project Substance Abuse Focus Grant Awards

		2007–2008			2008–2009			
County	JPE ¹	Allocation Based on Formula	Court Funding Request	Final Funding Allocation ²	Allocation Based on Formula	Court Funding Request	Final Funding Allocation ^{3,4}	
1	Alameda	85	\$45,000	\$45,000	\$46,385	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$30,000
2	Amador	3	\$20,650	\$20,650	\$21,285	\$19,000	\$19,000	\$19,000
3	Butte	14	\$42,000	\$42,000	\$43,385	\$44,000	\$44,000	\$44,000
4	Calaveras	3	\$23,000	\$23,000	\$23,635	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000
	Colusa ⁶	3	\$18,000	\$18,000	\$18,385	\$0	\$0	\$0
5	Contra Costa	47	\$39,000	\$39,000	\$40,135	\$39,000	\$39,000	\$39,000
6	Del Norte	4	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$12,135	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$12,000
7	El Dorado	9	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$16,185	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000
8	Fresno	53	\$30,986	\$30,986	\$32,121	\$23,988	\$23,988	\$23,988
9	Glenn	3	\$16,250	\$16,250	\$16,435	\$32,000	\$32,000	\$32,000
10	Humboldt	8	\$18,000	\$18,000	\$18,385	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$16,000
11	Inyo	3	\$14,000	\$14,000	\$14,135	\$14,000	\$14,000	\$14,000
12	Kern	46	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,385	\$22,000	\$22,000	\$22,000
13	Kings ⁵	10	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000
14	Lake	5	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$12,135	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$16,000
15	Lassen	3	\$17,000	\$17,000	\$17,385	\$19,000	\$19,000	\$19,000
16	Los Angeles	593	\$44,000	\$44,000	\$45,385	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000
17	Madera	12	\$24,000	\$24,000	\$24,635	\$26,000	\$26,000	\$26,000
18	Marin	16	\$18,000	\$18,000	\$18,385	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$16,000
19	Mendocino	9	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,385	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000
20	Merced	15	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$16,185	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$16,000
21	Modoc	2	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$12,135	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$12,000
22	Monterey	22	\$24,000	\$24,000	\$24,635	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$35,000
23	Napa ⁵	8	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$15,000
24	Nevada	7	\$24,000	\$24,000	\$24,635	\$24,000	\$24,000	\$24,000
25	Orange	145	\$45,000	\$45,000	\$46,385	\$42,000	\$42,000	\$42,000
26	Placer	17	\$27,000	\$27,000	\$27,885	\$29,000	\$29,000	\$29,000
27	Plumas	3	\$24,000	\$24,000	\$24,635	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000
28	Riverside	83	\$34,200	\$34,200	\$35,335	\$32,000	\$32,000	\$32,000
29	Sacramento	80	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$16,185	\$24,000	\$24,000	\$24,000
	San Bernardino	96	\$35,200	\$35,200	\$36,335	\$45,000	\$45,000	\$45,000
30	San Diego	154	\$32,000	\$32,000	\$33,135	\$45,000	\$45,000	\$45,000
31	San Francisco	64	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$31,135	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$30,000
32	San Joaquin	36	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$16,185	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000
33								

County	JPE ¹	2007–2008			2008–2009		
		Allocation Based on Formula	Court Funding Request	Final Funding Allocation ²	Allocation Based on Formula	Court Funding Request	Final Funding Allocation ^{3,4}
34 San Luis	15	\$19,000	\$19,000	\$19,385	\$19,385	\$19,385	\$19,385
35 San Mateo	33	\$24,000	\$24,000	\$24,635	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000
36 Santa Barbara	24	\$45,000	\$45,000	\$46,385	\$45,000	\$45,000	\$45,000
37 Santa Clara	89	\$24,000	\$24,000	\$24,635	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$35,000
38 Santa Cruz	14	\$29,000	\$29,000	\$29,885	\$29,000	\$29,000	\$29,000
39 Shasta	13	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,385	\$22,000	\$22,000	\$22,000
40 Sierra	3	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$12,135	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$12,000
41 Siskiyou	5	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,385	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000
42 Solano	24	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$16,185	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000
43 Sonoma	25	\$45,000	\$45,000	\$46,385	\$45,000	\$45,000	\$45,000
44 Stanislaus	27	\$26,000	\$26,000	\$26,885	\$24,000	\$24,000	\$24,000
45 Trinity	3	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$12,135	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$12,000
46 Tulare ⁵	25	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$16,000
47 Tuolumne	5	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,385	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000
48 Ventura	33	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,385	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000
49 Yolo	14	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$16,185	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$16,000
50 Yuba	6	\$11,880	\$11,880	\$11,997	\$12,000	\$9,420	\$9,627
Totals		\$1,145,166	\$1,145,166	<u>\$1,174,478</u>	\$1,205,373	\$1,202,793	<u>\$1,203,000</u>

¹ Judicial Position Equivalent

² 2007–2008 total available grant funding amount: \$1,174,478.

³ 2008–2009 total available grant funding amount: \$1,203,000.

⁴ Final allocations for 2008–2009 are as follows: court funding requests of \$12,000 to \$45,000 had no adjustment to formula allocation. Court funding requests of \$11,999 and below increased by \$207.

⁵ The Superior Courts of Kings, Napa, and Tulare Counties did not apply for funding in FY 2007–2008 but applied for funding in FY 2008–2009.

⁶ The Superior Court of Colusa County did not apply for funding in FY 2008–2009.

Attachment 3

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 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.

Attachment 4

**Overview of Caseload-Based Baseline Funding Level Formula
AOC Collaborative Justice Courts Substance Abuse Focus Grant Program**

The formula below constitutes the baseline funding formula for this grant. Final awards may be adjusted based on the number of court applicants and funding allocation.

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

Formula Instructions:

1. Program Focus Category — Nature of services directly related to the number of participants in treatment or education as the primary focus of the proposed program.

2. Base Amount — This amount provides for a minimum base funding level and for court planning programs. All courts that apply and qualify for funding will at least receive the base funding level. If your court is applying for funding for more than one court program, only one base amount can be used per court application (one single court application is allowed).

3. Number of Total Program Participants — Number of total participants directly served by the grant program for FY 2007–08:

- a. Match it with the appropriate Program Focus Category
- b. Add the matching funding amount to the Base Amount — **This is your eligible maximum funding level**

***Example: \$12,000 (Base) + \$12,000 (Treatment Court Focus with 125 program participants) = \$24,000 eligible maximum funding level**

4. Enhancement — If court programs want to serve additional participants beyond their current capacity level during the FY 2007–08 grant program, A minimum of 10 additional participants is required for enhancement funding.

***Example: \$12,000 (Base) + \$12,000 (Treatment Court Focus w/125 program participants) + \$2,000 (increase number of participants by 15) = \$26,000 eligible maximum funding level**

5. Court Calculation:	Base	Program	Enhance	Maximum Funding Level
	\$12,000	\$0	\$0	\$12,000