



## JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue • San Francisco, California 94102-3688  
Telephone 415-865-4200 • Fax 415-865-4205 • TDD 415-865-4272

---

### MEMORANDUM

---

Date	Action Requested
September 15, 2016	Please Review
To	Deadline
Hon. Jerilyn L. Borack, Cochair Hon. Mark A. Juhas, Cochair Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee	September 22, 2016
From	Contact
Don Will Principal Manager, Judicial Council Center for Families, Children & the Courts	Don Will Judicial Council Center for Families, Children & the Courts 415-865-7557 phone don.will@jud.ca.gov
Subject	
Proposed Allocation for Court Appointed Special Advocate (CASA) Local Assistance	

---

Attached for the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee's review is a draft Judicial Council report on the proposed allocation of the FY 2016-17 local assistance funding for CASA programs.

Please note that CASA programs are continuing to review the data used to make the calculations used in applying the Judicial Council's methodology for this allocation. Any changes in data that affect the proposed allocations will be presented by staff at the September 22, 2016 Committee meeting.



## JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

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

[www.courts.ca.gov](http://www.courts.ca.gov)

---

# REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

For business meeting on: October 28, 2016

---

Title	Agenda Item Type
Juvenile Dependency: Proposed Allocation for Fiscal Year 2016–2017 for Court Appointed Special Advocate Local Assistance	Action Required
Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected	Effective Date
N/A	October 28, 2016
Recommended by	Date of Report
Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee	September 15, 2016
Hon. Jerilyn L. Borack, Cochair Hon. Mark A. Juhas , Cochair	Contact
	Don Will, 415-865-7557 <a href="mailto:don.will@jud.ca.gov">don.will@jud.ca.gov</a>

---

### Executive Summary

The Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee recommends that the Judicial Council approve Court Appointed Special Advocate (CASA) program grant funding allocations for fiscal year 2016–2017. The recommended allocations were calculated based on the CASA funding methodology approved by the Judicial Council at the August 2013 business meeting. Allocations will fund 45 programs serving 50 counties.

### Recommendation

The Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee recommends that the Judicial Council, effective October 28, 2016, allocate \$2.21 million for CASA local assistance grants to 45 CASA programs serving 50 counties using the council's funding methodology (established in 2013).

## **Previous Council Action**

Legislation (Stats. 1988, ch. 723) amended Welfare and Institutions Code section 100 et seq. to require the Judicial Council to establish guidelines encouraging the development of local CASA programs that assist abused and neglected children who are the subject of judicial proceedings. The legislation also called for the establishment of a CASA grant program to be administered by the Judicial Council and required CASA programs to provide local matching fequal to program funding received from the Judicial Council. At the February 9, 1999 meeting, the Judicial Council delegated approval of the allocation of the Judicial Council CASA grant funds to the Executive and Planning Committee (E&P).

In August 2003, at the recommendation of the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, E&P approved a formula-based method for distributing Judicial Council CASA program funding to California CASA programs. The new funding approach replaced the previous competitive request for proposals process with predetermined program awards. When the allocation process transitioned to a formula-based method, the baseline awards were determined by averaging the amounts of the previous two years of funding. In 2011, E&P decided that the approval of budget allocations for CASA programs be made by the Judicial Council.

At the August 23, 2013 meeting, the Judicial Council approved a funding methodology that is formula based and utilizes program data submitted by local programs which evaluates efficiency and program growth.<sup>1</sup> Programs are required, through both a contract and an evaluation process, to demonstrate that they meet a number of program objectives, including compliance with rule 5.655 of the California Rules of Court, local rules of court, volunteer recruitment, volunteer training, board development, sound fiscal management, and other requirements as outlined in the National CASA Standards. This new methodology (1) establishes equitable allocations for CASA programs and eliminates wide funding variations resulting from historical funding formulas and grant applications; (2) supplements funding to local programs that work toward efficiency, effectiveness, and growth; and (3) increases the number of dependency youth served by CASA programs.

## **Rationale for Recommendation**

The state judicial branch budget for Judicial Council CASA grants for fiscal year (FY) 2015–2016 is \$2.213 million. The committee recommends applying the 2013-approved methodology to allocate this funding so that the CASA programs ; receive a baseline funding allocation and programs that are eligible for the financial incentives receive those allocations as well. These funding allocations are listed in Attachment A.

---

<sup>1</sup> Judicial Council of Cal.: Juvenile Dependency: Court Appointed Special Advocate Program Funding Methodology (Aug. 23, 2013), <http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20130823-itemM.pdf>.

## **Comments, Alternatives Considered, and Policy Implications**

There are no alternatives or policy implications to present this fiscal year.

## **Implementation Requirements, Costs, and Operational Impacts**

There are no implementation requirements and costs other than the estimated \$2.213 million state judicial branch funding to be distributed to CASA programs.

## **Relevant Strategic Plan Goals and Operational Plan Objectives**

The proposed CASA funding methodology aligns with multiple strategic and operational goals established by the Judicial Council, specifically Goals II and III.

Goal II, Independence and Accountability, specifies that “[t]he judiciary must maintain its status as an independent, separate, and co-equal branch of government. . . . The judiciary will unify in its advocacy for resources and policies that support and protect independent and impartial judicial decisionmaking in accordance with the constitution and the law. The branch will maintain the highest standards of accountability for its use of public resources, and adherence to its statutory and constitutional mandates.” The methodology incentivizes efficient and effective use of Judicial Council funding distributed to CASA programs each fiscal year.

Goal III, Modernization of Management and Administration, notes that “effective administration of justice requires deliberate attention to recruiting, developing, and retaining high-quality staff at all levels, as well as to developing and implementing appropriate accountability and compliance measures.” Recruitment of court-appointed special advocates requires extensive screening and training of individuals. The methodology incentivizes volunteer retention.

## **Attachment**

1. Attachment A: Proposed Allocation for FY 2016–2017 Judicial Council Local Assistance

**Attachment A: Proposed Allocation for FY 2016-2017  
Judicial Council Local Assistance**

<b>Local CASA Programs by County(ies)</b>	<b>Base Allocations</b>	<b>Incentive 2A*</b>	<b>Incentive 2B*</b>	<b>Total Incentives</b>	<b>Total JC Local Assistance Grant</b>
Alameda	\$50,000	0	0	\$0	\$50,000
Amador	\$26,000	1	1	\$20,900	\$46,900
Butte/Glenn	\$51,000	0	0	\$0	\$51,000
Contra Costa	\$50,000	0	0	\$0	\$50,000
Del Norte	\$26,000	0	0	\$0	\$26,000
El Dorado	\$34,000	1	1	\$20,900	\$54,900
Fresno/Madera	\$75,000	0	0	\$0	\$75,000
Humboldt	\$26,000	1	0	\$10,450	\$36,450
Imperial	\$34,000	0	1	\$10,450	\$44,450
Inyo/Mono	\$39,000	0	1	\$10,450	\$49,450
Kern	\$50,000	1	0	\$10,450	\$60,450
Kings	\$34,000	1	0	\$10,450	\$44,450
Lassen	\$26,000	1	1	\$20,900	\$46,900
Los Angeles	\$50,000	0	0	\$0	\$50,000
Marin	\$34,000	1	1	\$20,900	\$54,900
Mariposa	\$26,000	0	1	\$10,450	\$36,450
Mendocino/Lake	\$51,000	1	0	\$10,450	\$61,450
Merced	\$34,000	1	0	\$10,450	\$44,450
Modoc	\$26,000	1	1	\$20,900	\$46,900
Monterey	\$42,000	1	1	\$20,900	\$62,900
Napa	\$34,000	1	1	\$20,900	\$54,900
Nevada	\$26,000	0	1	\$10,450	\$36,450
Orange	\$50,000	1	0	\$10,450	\$60,450
Placer	\$42,000	0	1	\$10,450	\$52,450
Plumas	\$26,000	0	0	\$0	\$26,000
Riverside	\$50,000	0	0	\$0	\$50,000
Sacramento	\$50,000	0	0	\$0	\$50,000
San Benito	\$26,000	0	1	\$10,450	\$36,450
San Bernardino	\$50,000	0	0	\$0	\$50,000
San Diego	\$50,000	1	1	\$20,900	\$70,900
San Francisco	\$42,000	0	0	\$0	\$42,000
San Joaquin	\$42,000	0	0	\$0	\$42,000
San Luis Obispo	\$34,000	0	1	\$10,450	\$44,450
San Mateo	\$42,000	0	1	\$10,450	\$52,450
Santa Barbara	\$42,000	1	1	\$20,900	\$62,900
Santa Clara	\$50,000	1	1	\$20,900	\$70,900
Santa Cruz	\$34,000	0	1	\$10,450	\$44,450
Shasta/Tehama	\$51,000	0	0	\$0	\$51,000
Siskiyou	\$26,000	1	1	\$20,900	\$46,900
Solano	\$42,000	1	0	\$10,450	\$52,450
Sonoma	\$42,000	1	0	\$10,450	\$52,450

**Attachment A: Proposed Allocation Alternatives for FY 2016-2017  
Judicial Council Local Assistance**

Stanislaus	\$42,000	0	0	\$0	\$42,000
Tulare	\$42,000	0	0	\$0	\$42,000
Ventura	\$42,000	1	0	\$10,450	\$52,450
Yolo	\$34,000	0	0	\$0	\$34,000
	\$1,795,000	20	20	\$418,000	\$2,213,000

\*Incentive 2A funding is earned by the top 20 programs with the highest volunteer retention rate. Incentive 2B funding is earned by the top 20 programs with the highest dependency proportion served.

Total Local Assistance Grant	\$2,213,000
Total Base Amounts	\$1,795,000
<b>Incentive Award for Top 20 Programs @ \$10,250 (x 40)</b>	\$418,000
<b>Total expenditures= Base + 40 incentives</b>	\$2,213,000

DRAFT