



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 29, 2010

Title	Agenda Item Type
Collaborative Justice Project: Substance Abuse Focus Grant Funding Allocation Recommendations for Fiscal Year 2010–2011	Action Required
Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected	Effective Date
None	Upon Passage of State Budget
Recommended by	Date of Report
Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee Hon. Harold E. Kahn, Chair Ms. Nancy Taylor, Manager	October 29, 2010
	Contact
	Francine Byrne, 415-865-8069 francine.byrne@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 2010 (Stats. 2010, ch. 712, § 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 50 applicant courts for fiscal year 2010–2011 effective upon the passage of the State Budget. 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, subject to passage of the State Budget, approve the committee's recommended allocations of fiscal year 2010–2011 Collaborative Justice Project Substance Abuse Focus Grant funds as set forth in Attachment 2, Allocation Summary: Fiscal Years 2009–2010 and 2010–2011.

Previous Council Action

The Judicial Council has approved the funding allocation for this grant, originally named the Drug Court Mini-Grant, 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 noncompetitive method for distributing the funds, using an allocation formula based on the number of individuals served, as outlined in Attachment 4.

Rationale for Recommendation

Funding authorization for the grants is based on a legislative mandate for the California Collaborative and Drug Court Projects as referenced in item 0250-101-0001 of the Budget Act of 2010.

This recommendation allocates fiscal year 2010–2011 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 proposed decrease in funding. It is anticipated that the funding level will decrease by 3.5 percent, or \$42,000, from fiscal year 2009–2010. The Budget Act of 2010 will likely provide an allocation of \$1,161,000 for these projects. Final amounts are contingent on passage of the State Budget. Should the total allocation be different than anticipated, the difference will be allocated using the same formula.

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, comprehensive action plan and budget.

Judge Harold E. Kahn, 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, 2010. Fifty interested courts submitted project action plans and proposed budgets. 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 employed collaborative justice court principles. Attachment 3, 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 4, Caseload-Based Funding-Level 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 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 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 a more 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

No additional costs are associated with this funding distribution.

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. This supports strategic plan Goal IV, Quality of Justice and Service to the Public, and operational plan Objective 1, Foster excellence in public service to ensure that all court users receive satisfactory services and outcomes.

Attachments

1. 2009–2010 Grant Performance Summary
2. Allocation Summary: Fiscal Years 2009–2010 and 2010–2011
3. Guiding Principles of Collaborative Justice Courts
4. Caseload-Based Funding-Level Formula

2009–2010 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 2009–2010 are noted below.

2009–2010 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 this grant. Program outcomes include 2,057 successful completions, 537 GED completions, 751 participants who gained employment, 307 family reunifications, and 46 drug-free babies born to participants.
- The spend-out rate¹ for this grant in 2009–2010 was 95 percent. Staff projects a spend-out rate of approximately 95 percent for project year 2010–2011.

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

Allocation Summary: Fiscal Years 2009–2010 and 2010–2011
Collaborative Justice Project Substance Abuse Focus Grant Awards

	County	2009–2010			2010–2011		
		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	\$27,300	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$28,741
2.	Amador	18,000	19,000	17,120	19,000	19,000	18,203
3.	Butte	42,000	44,000	38,320	32,000	32,000	30,657
4.	Calaveras	20,000	20,000	18,920	23,000	23,000	22,035
5.	Contra Costa	45,000	45,000	41,320	35,000	35,000	33,531
6.	Del Norte	12,000	12,000	11,670	20,000	16,000	16,000
7.	El Dorado	12,000	12,000	11,670	20,000	12,000	12,000
8.	Fresno	21,964	21,964	20,444	36,000	31,800	31,800
9.	Glenn	38,281	38,281	35,581	14,000	14,000	13,413
10.	Humboldt	18,000	18,000	17,120	18,000	18,000	17,245
11.	Inyo	14,000	14,000	13,120	16,000	16,000	15,329
12.	Kern	45,000	45,000	41,320	35,000	35,000	33,531
13.	Kings ⁴	0	0	0	16,000	16,000	15,329
14.	Lake	16,000	16,000	15,120	14,000	12,000	12,000
15.	Lassen	19,000	19,000	18,120	22,000	17,000	17,000
16.	Los Angeles	20,000	20,000	18,920	20,000	18,920	18,920
17.	Madera	35,640	35,640	32,940	24,000	24,000	22,993
18.	Marin	16,000	16,000	15,120	12,000	12,000	11,497
19.	Mendocino	24,000	24,000	22,480	24,000	24,000	22,993
20.	Merced	16,000	16,000	15,120	12,000	12,000	11,497
21.	Modoc	14,000	14,000	13,120	16,000	14,000	14,000
22.	Monterey	34,000	38,000	31,300	36,000	34,000	34,000
23.	Napa	16,000	16,000	15,120	16,000	16,000	15,329
24.	Nevada	24,000	24,000	22,480	24,000	24,000	22,993
25.	Orange	45,000	45,000	41,320	42,000	41,201	40,235
26.	Placer	29,000	30,000	27,480	24,000	15,000	15,000
27.	Plumas	20,000	20,000	18,920	16,000	14,000	14,000
28.	Riverside	32,000	32,000	29,300	45,000	45,000	42,153
29.	Sacramento	20,000	20,000	18,920	20,000	16,000	16,000
30.	San Bernardino	42,000	42,000	38,320	42,000	42,000	40,237
31.	San Diego	45,000	45,000	41,320	45,000	45,000	43,111
32.	San Francisco	35,094	35,094	32,394	45,000	42,000	42,000

		2009–2010			2010–2011		
	County	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	\$12,000	\$20,000	\$11,670	\$32,000	\$32,000	\$30,657
34.	San Luis Obispo	32,000	57,373	29,300	20,000	19,992	19,161
35.	San Mateo	20,000	24,000	18,920	20,000	20,000	19,161
36.	Santa Barbara	45,000	45,000	41,320	42,000	42,000	40,237
37.	Santa Clara	35,000	38,000	32,300	35,000	35,000	33,531
38.	Santa Cruz	29,000	29,000	27,480	27,000	27,000	25,867
39.	Shasta	32,000	32,000	29,300	28,000	28,000	26,825
40.	Sierra	12,000	12,000	11,670	12,000	12,000	11,497
41.	Siskiyou	20,000	20,000	18,920	20,000	20,000	19,161
42.	Solano	45,000	45,000	41,320	35,000	35,000	33,531
43.	Sonoma	45,000	46,000	41,320	45,000	45,000	43,111
44.	Stanislaus	20,000	20,000	18,920	20,000	20,000	19,161
45.	Trinity	12,000	12,000	11,670	12,000	12,000	11,497
46.	Tulare	45,000	45,000	41,320	16,000	16,000	16,000
47.	Tuolumne	20,000	20,000	18,920	20,000	20,000	19,161
48.	Ventura	24,000	24,000	22,480	24,000	24,000	22,993
49.	Yolo	16,000	16,000	15,120	16,000	16,000	15,329
50.	Yuba	9,420	9,420	9,332	12,000	10,348	10,348
Total		\$1,292,398	\$1,341,771	\$1,203,000	\$1,249,000	\$1,200,261	\$1,161,000

¹ 2009–2010 total available grant funding amount: \$1,203,000.

² 2010–2011 total available grant funding amount: \$1,161,000.

³ To match the projected state allocation, the maximum allowable funding amount based on formula was adjusted downward by approximately 4.2 percent.

⁴ The Superior Court of Kings County did not apply for funding in fiscal year 2009–2010.

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 2010–2011 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 2010 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.