



## Judicial Council of California · Administrative Office of the Courts

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

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

---

# REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

For business meeting on August 22, 2013

---

**Title**

Collaborative Justice: Recommended  
Allocations of Fiscal Year 2013–2014  
Substance Abuse Focus Grants

**Agenda Item Type**

Action Required

**Effective Date**

July 1, 2013

**Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected**

None

**Date of Report**

August 22, 2013

**Recommended by**

Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory  
Committee  
Hon. Richard Vlavianos, Chair  
Ms. Nancy Taylor, Manager

**Contact**

Carrie Zoller, 415-865-8829  
[carrie.zoller@jud.ca.gov](mailto:carrie.zoller@jud.ca.gov)

---

### Executive Summary

The Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee recommends that funding allocations for Collaborative Justice Courts Substance Abuse Focus Grants through the California Collaborative and Drug Court Projects in the Budget Act of 2013 (Stats. 2013, ch. 20; § 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 2013–2014 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 Courts Project Substance Abuse Focus Grants for 2013–2014 as proposed in the last column of the table in Attachment B, *Allocation Summary: Fiscal Years 2012–2013 and 2013–2014*.

## **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 C.

## **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 2013, as referenced in item 0250-101-0001.

This recommendation distributes the funding for fiscal year 2013–2014 in allocation amounts calculated with the same formula used in previous years. The 2013–2014 State Budget allocates \$1,160,000 for these projects. This is the same level of funding that was allocated for the Collaborative Justice Courts Substance Abuse Focus Grants in fiscal year 2012–2013.

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 July 3, 2013. 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 B, *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 C.

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.

For the 2012-2013 fiscal year, the \$1.16 million allocation supported 118 court projects in 47 counties. The types of projects funded were adult drug courts (30), juvenile drug courts (19), dependency drug courts (16), peer and truancy courts (11), adult mental health/dual-diagnosis courts (10), juvenile mental health/dual-diagnosis courts (4), DUI courts (3), domestic violence courts (4), a homeless court (1), and veterans courts (5), as well as other collaborative justice court programs (15).

### **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: *Allocation Summary: Fiscal Years 2012–2013 and 2013–2014*
2. Attachment B: *Guiding Principles of Collaborative Justice Courts*
3. Attachment C: *Caseload-Based Funding-Level Formula: Fiscal Year 2013–2014*

**Allocation Summary: Fiscal Years 2012–2013 and 2013–2014****Collaborative Justice Project—Substance Abuse Focus Grant Awards (by Court)**

	County	FY 2012–2013			FY 2013–2014		
		Allocation Based on Formula	Court Funding Request	Final Funding Allocation <sup>1</sup>	Allocation Based on Formula	Court Funding Request	Final Funding Allocation <sup>2,3</sup>
1.	Alameda	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$30,019	\$27,000	\$27,000	\$24,741
2.	Amador	\$16,000	\$19,000	\$14,789	\$12,000	\$14,000	\$12,000
3.	Butte	\$32,000	\$32,000	\$29,685	\$32,000	\$32,000	\$29,312
4.	Calaveras	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$14,789	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$12,000
5.	Contra Costa	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$32,478	\$22,000	\$34,000	\$20,170
6.	Del Norte	\$18,000	\$18,000	\$16,651	\$18,000	\$18,000	\$16,513
7.	Fresno	\$45,000	\$45,000	\$41,788	\$44,500	\$44,500	\$40,740
8.	Glenn	\$24,000	\$24,000	\$22,237	\$32,000	\$32,000	\$29,312
9.	Humboldt	\$18,000	\$18,000	\$16,651	\$18,000	\$18,000	\$16,513
10.	Inyo	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$11,065	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$12,000
11.	Kern	\$42,000	\$42,000	\$38,995	\$42,000	\$42,000	\$38,454
12.	Kings <sup>4</sup>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$18,000	\$18,000	\$16,513
13.	Lake	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$11,065	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$12,000
14.	Lassen	\$21,000	\$21,000	\$19,444	\$19,000	\$19,000	\$17,427
15.	Los Angeles	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$32,478	\$33,000	\$33,000	\$30,249
16.	Madera	\$24,000	\$24,000	\$22,237	\$24,000	\$24,000	\$21,998
17.	Marin	\$22,000	\$22,000	\$20,375	\$22,000	\$22,000	\$20,170
18.	Mendocino	\$24,000	\$24,000	\$22,237	\$26,000	\$26,000	\$23,827
19.	Merced	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$11,065	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$12,000
20.	Modoc	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$14,789	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$14,685
21.	Monterey	\$42,000	\$34,000	\$34,000	\$45,000	\$58,000	\$41,197

<sup>1</sup> 2012–2013 total available grant funding amount: \$1,160,000.

<sup>2</sup> 2013–2014 total available grant funding amount: \$1,160,000.

<sup>3</sup> 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 8.5 percent. The courts which requested less than their maximum funding amount are not adjusted downward.

<sup>4</sup> The Superior Court of California, County of Kings did not apply for funding in fiscal year 2012–2013, but applied in fiscal year 2013–2014.

	County	FY 2012–2013			FY 2013–2014		
		Allocation Based on Formula	Court Funding Request	Final Funding Allocation <sup>1</sup>	Allocation Based on Formula	Court Funding Request	Final Funding Allocation <sup>2,3</sup>
22.	Napa <sup>5</sup>	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$14,789	\$0	\$0	\$0
23.	Nevada	\$24,000	\$24,000	\$22,237	\$24,000	\$24,000	\$21,998
24.	Orange	\$45,000	\$42,000	\$42,000	\$42,000	\$42,000	\$38,454
25.	Placer <sup>6</sup>	\$32,000	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
26.	Plumas	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$14,789	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$14,685
27.	Riverside	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$32,478	\$34,000	\$34,000	\$31,141
28.	Sacramento	\$28,000	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$24,000	\$24,000	\$21,998
29.	San Bernardino	\$42,000	\$42,000	\$38,995	\$32,000	\$32,000	\$29,312
30.	San Diego	\$42,000	\$42,000	\$38,995	\$42,000	\$42,000	\$38,454
31.	San Francisco	\$42,000	\$42,000	\$38,995	\$39,000	\$39,000	\$35,712
32.	San Joaquin	\$42,000	\$42,000	\$38,995	\$44,000	\$44,000	\$40,283
33.	San Luis Obispo	\$32,000	\$32,000	\$29,685	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$32,055
34.	San Mateo	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$18,513	\$27,000	\$27,000	\$24,741
35.	Santa Barbara	\$45,000	\$47,000	\$41,788	\$45,000	\$45,000	\$41,197
36.	Santa Clara	\$34,000	\$34,000	\$31,547	\$34,000	\$34,000	\$31,141
37.	Santa Cruz	\$32,000	\$29,000	\$29,000	\$38,000	\$38,000	\$34,798
38.	Shasta	\$26,000	\$38,000	\$24,099	\$22,000	\$24,000	\$20,170
39.	Sierra	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$11,065	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$12,000
40.	Siskiyou	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$18,513	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$18,341
41.	Solano	\$39,000	\$39,000	\$36,202	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$32,055
42.	Sonoma	\$45,000	\$59,000	\$41,788	\$45,000	\$61,000	\$41,197
43.	Stanislaus	\$20,000	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$14,685
44.	Tehama <sup>7</sup>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$24,000	\$24,000	\$21,998
45.	Tulare	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$14,789	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$14,685
46.	Tuolumne	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$18,513	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$18,341
47.	Ventura	\$32,000	\$32,000	\$29,685	\$32,000	\$32,000	\$29,312
48.	Yolo	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$11,065	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$14,685
49.	Yuba	\$18,000	\$18,000	\$16,651	\$27,000	\$27,000	\$24,741
	<b>Total</b>	<b>\$1,288,000</b>	<b>\$1,273,000</b>	<b>\$1,160,000</b>	<b>\$1,259,500</b>	<b>\$1,304,500</b>	<b>\$1,160,000</b>

<sup>5</sup> The Superior Court of California, County of Napa did not apply for funding in fiscal year 2013–2014.

<sup>6</sup> The Superior Court of California, County of Placer did not apply for funding in fiscal year 2013–2014.

<sup>7</sup> The Superior Court of California, County of Tehama did not apply for funding in fiscal year 2012–2013, but applied in fiscal year 2013–2014.

## **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 2013–2014**  
**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 from the 2013 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 2013–2014:

- 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 2012–2013 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.**