



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

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

www.courts.ca.gov

REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

For business meeting on November 16–17, 2017

Title	Agenda Item Type
Judicial Council Report to the Legislature: Recidivism Reduction Fund Court Grant Program	Information Only
Submitted by	Date of Report
Judicial Council staff Shelley Curran, Director Criminal Justice Services	November 17, 2016
	Contact
	Martha Wright, 415-865- 7649 martha.wright@jud.ca.gov

Executive Summary

The Budget Act of 2015 (Assem. Bill 93; Stats. 2015, ch. 10) requires the Judicial Council to submit an annual report to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee (JLBC) and the Department of Finance (DOF) on the Recidivism Reduction Fund Court Grant Program. The *Recidivism Reduction Fund Court Grant Program: Annual Report, 2017* documents the activities of the Judicial Council and the grantees, details court grant program implementation at the local level, and provides updates on the status of data analysis including some preliminary findings. The report is included as Attachment A.

Previous Council Action

At its meeting on October 27, 2016, the Judicial Council received the *Recidivism Reduction Fund Court Grant Program: Annual Report, 2016*. The Judicial Council directed the Administrative Director to submit the annual report to the JLBC and DOF as mandated by the Budget Act of 2014 (Sen. Bill 852) and the Budget Act of 2015 (Sen. Bill 69). The Judicial Council authorized staff to continue to work with the courts to ensure that program funding is effectively allocated and utilized to support the operation of trial court programs and practices known to reduce adult offender recidivism and enhance public safety as directed by the Legislature.

Methodology and Process

The Budget Act of 2014 directed the Judicial Council to administer Recidivism Reduction Fund grants to the courts, monitor spending, and also evaluate the program including establishing performance-based outcome measures and collecting and analyzing data from grantees. To accomplish these tasks, Judicial Council staff, in collaboration with the trial courts, identified data elements and established data collection procedures for the secure and confidential transmission of data from the counties to the council. Grantee courts provide program narrative and data reports quarterly to the Judicial Council. Data are run through a cleaning program created in the R programming language (used for statistical analysis) that identifies basic reporting errors (duplicate records, invalid entries such as out-of-range dates, etc.). More significant or system reporting errors and issues require additional follow-up with the courts and are completed on a program-by-program basis. To ensure program and data reporting compliance, Judicial Council staff spend time on data review and problem solving during all local court site visits.

Implementation Efforts

The Judicial Council will reimburse the courts monthly for their qualified expenses based on submission of invoices and financial documentation, and contingent on the timely submission of all quarterly reports. Quarterly financial and program progress reports must be submitted along with quarterly data submissions. CJS will continue to compile information annually and report aggregate-level data generated by the awarded programs to the DOF and the JLBC as required in the Budget Act of 2015.

Attachments and Links

1. Attachment A: *Recidivism Reduction Fund Court Grant Program: Annual Report, 2017*



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-3688
Tel 415-865-4200
TDD 415-865-4272
Fax 415-865-4205
www.courts.ca.gov

HON. TANI G. CANTIL-SAKAUYE
Chief Justice of California
Chair of the Judicial Council

HON. DOUGLAS P. MILLER
Chair, Executive and Planning Committee

HON. DAVID M. RUBIN
Chair, Judicial Branch Budget Committee
Chair, Litigation Management Committee

HON. KENNETH K. SO
Chair, Policy Coordination and
Liaison Committee

HON. HARRY E. HULL, JR.
Chair, Rules and Projects Committee

HON. MARSHA G. SLOUGH
Chair, Technology Committee

Hon. Marla O. Anderson
Hon. Richard Bloom
Hon. C. Todd Bottke
Hon. Stacy Boulware Eurie
Hon. Kevin C. Brazile
Hon. Kyle S. Brodie
Hon. Ming W. Chin
Hon. Samuel K. Feng
Ms. Rachel W. Hill
Hon. Harold W. Hopp
Hon. James M. Humes
Ms. Audra Ibarra
Hon. Hannah-Beth Jackson
Mr. Patrick M. Kelly
Hon. Dalila C. Lyons
Hon. Gary Nadler
Ms. Gretchen Nelson

ADVISORY MEMBERS

Mr. Jake Chatters
Ms. Kimberly Flener
Hon. Scott M. Gordon
Hon. Patricia M. Lucas
Hon. Shama Hakim Mesiwala
Hon. Stuart M. Rice
Mr. Michael M. Roddy
Ms. Andrea K. Wallin-Rohmann

MR. MARTIN HOSHINO
Administrative Director,
Judicial Council

November 2, 2017

Hon. Holly Mitchell
Chair, Joint Legislative Budget Committee
State Capitol, Room 5080
Sacramento, California 95814

Mr. Michael Cohen, Director
State of California, Department of Finance
State Capitol, Room 1145
Sacramento, California 95814

Re: *Recidivism Reduction Fund Court Grant Program: Annual Report, 2017*, as required under the Budget Act of 2015.

Dear Senator Mitchell and Mr. Cohen:

Attached is the Judicial Council report required under the Budget Act of 2015 (Sen. Bill 93; Stats. 2015, ch. 10) on the Judicial Council's Recidivism Reduction Fund Court Grant Program.

If you have any questions related to this report, please contact Shelley Curran, Director, Judicial Council Criminal Justice Services, at 415-865-4013 or shelley.curran@jud.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Martin Hoshino
Administrative Director
Judicial Council

MH/SC/ml
Attachment

Hon. Holly Mitchell
Mr. Michael Cohen
November 2, 2017
Page 2

cc: Diane F. Boyer-Vine, Legislative Counsel
Daniel Alvarez, Secretary of the Senate
E. Dotson Wilson, Chief Clerk of the Assembly
Jessica Devencenzi, Policy Consultant, Office of Senate President pro Tempore Kevin de León
Alf Brandt, Senior Counsel, Office of Assembly Speaker Anthony Rendon
Anita Lee, Senior Fiscal and Policy Analyst, Legislative Analyst's Office
Tina McGee, Executive Secretary, Legislative Analyst's Office
Rebecca Kirk, Program Budget Analyst, Department of Finance
Mary Kennedy, Chief Counsel, Senate Judiciary Committee
Julie Salley-Gray, Consultant, Senate Budget and Fiscal Review Committee
Shaun Naidu, Consultant, Senate Appropriations Committee
Matt Osterli, Consultant, Senate Republican Fiscal Office
Eric Csizmar, Consultant, Senate Republican Policy Office
Gregory Pagan, Chief Counsel, Assembly Judiciary Committee
Jazmin Hicks, Consultant, Assembly Budget Committee
Pedro Reyes, Principal Consultant, Assembly Appropriations Committee
Allan Cooper, Consultant, Assembly Republican Office of Policy & Budget
Gary Olson, Consultant, Assembly Republican Office of Policy & Budget
Amy Leach, Minute Clerk, Office of Assembly Chief Clerk
Peggy Collins, Principal Consultant, Joint Legislative Budget Committee
Cory T. Jaspersen, Director, Governmental Affairs, Judicial Council
Laura Speed, Supervising Attorney, Governmental Affairs, Judicial Council
Peter Allen, Director, Public Affairs, Judicial Council
Yvette Casillas-Sarcos, Administrative Coordinator, Governmental Affairs, Judicial Council



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-3688
Tel 415-865-4200
TDD 415-865-4272
Fax 415-865-4205
www.courts.ca.gov

HON. TANI G. CANTIL-SAKAUYE
Chief Justice of California
Chair of the Judicial Council

HON. DOUGLAS P. MILLER
Chair, Executive and Planning Committee

HON. DAVID M. RUBIN
Chair, Judicial Branch Budget Committee
Chair, Litigation Management Committee

HON. KENNETH K. SO
Chair, Policy Coordination and
Liaison Committee

HON. HARRY E. HULL, JR.
Chair, Rules and Projects Committee

HON. MARSHA G. SLOUGH
Chair, Technology Committee

Hon. Marla O. Anderson
Hon. Richard Bloom
Hon. C. Todd Bottke
Hon. Stacy Boulware Eurie
Hon. Kevin C. Brazile
Hon. Kyle S. Brodie
Hon. Ming W. Chin
Hon. Samuel K. Feng
Ms. Rachel W. Hill
Hon. Harold W. Hopp
Hon. James M. Humes
Ms. Audra Ibarra
Hon. Hannah-Beth Jackson
Mr. Patrick M. Kelly
Hon. Dalila C. Lyons
Hon. Gary Nadler
Ms. Gretchen Nelson

ADVISORY MEMBERS

Mr. Jake Chatters
Ms. Kimberly Flener
Hon. Scott M. Gordon
Hon. Patricia M. Lucas
Hon. Shama Hakim Mesiwala
Hon. Stuart M. Rice
Mr. Michael M. Roddy
Ms. Andrea K. Wallin-Rohmann

MR. MARTIN HOSHINO
Administrative Director,
Judicial Council

Report title: *Recidivism Reduction Fund Court Grant Program: Annual Report, 2017*

Statutory citation: Budget Act of 2015

Date of report: October 18, 2017

The Judicial Council has submitted a report to the Legislature in accordance with the Budget Act of 2015.

The following summary of the report is provided under the requirements of the Budget Act of 2015.

The Legislature allocated a total of \$16.3 million from the Recidivism Reduction Fund (RRF) for a competitive grant program administered by the Judicial Council. The funds are designated for courts to use in the administration and operation of programs and practices known to reduce offender recidivism and enhance public safety.

The act directed the Judicial Council to administer the program, establish performance-based outcome measures, and report annually to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee (JLBC) and the Department of Finance (DOF).*

The current report, which is the third annual RRF report documents administrative activities of the Judicial Council and the grantees, details RRF court grant program implementation at the local level and provides updates on the status of data analysis including some preliminary findings.

The full report can be accessed here: www.courts.ca.gov/7466.htm.

A printed copy of the report may be obtained by calling 415-865-8994.

* In addition, four years after the grants are awarded the Judicial Council shall provide a report to the JLBC and the DOF that addresses the effectiveness of the programs based on the reports of the established outcome measures and the impact of the monies appropriated pursuant to the acts to enhance public safety and improve offender outcomes.



**RECIDIVISM REDUCTION FUND COURT
GRANT PROGRAM: ANNUAL REPORT, 2017
Budget Act of 2015**

October 2017



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

OPERATIONS AND PROGRAMS DIVISION
CRIMINAL JUSTICE SERVICES

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

Hon. Tani G. Cantil-Sakauye

*Chief Justice of California and
Chair of the Judicial Council*

Mr. Martin Hoshino

*Administrative Director
Judicial Council*

OPERATIONS & PROGRAMS DIVISION

Ms. Millicent Tidwell

Chief Operating Officer

CRIMINAL JUSTICE SERVICES

Ms. Shelley Curran

Director

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
INTRODUCTION	4
THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL’S RECIDIVISM REDUCTION FUND COURT GRANT PROGRAM.....	4
Background	4
Final Grant Awards.....	5
GRANTEE PROJECT ACTIVITIES	6
Pretrial Program Activities	6
Pretrial Program Enhancements.....	7
Collaborative Court Program Activities.....	7
Collaborative Court Program Enhancements	8
Program Successes and Challenges	8
ROLE OF JUDICIAL COUNCIL IN STATEWIDE ADMINISTRATION	9
Training Events, Conference Calls and Technical Assistance	9
Site Visits.....	9
PROGRAM EVALUATION	10
Outcome Measurement and Data Collection	10
Data Reporting and Validation.....	10
Preliminary Data and Outcomes.....	10
CONCLUSION AND NEXT STEPS	12
ATTACHMENTS	13

Executive Summary

As part of the Budget Act of 2014 (Sen. Bill 852; Stats. 2014, ch. 25) and the Budget Act of 2015 (Assem. Bill 93; Stats. 2015, ch. 10) the Legislature allocated a total of \$16.3 million from the Recidivism Reduction Fund (RRF) for a competitive grant program administered by the Judicial Council of California (Judicial Council). The funds are designated for courts to use in the administration and operation of programs and practices known to reduce offender recidivism and enhance public safety. The Budget Acts directed the Judicial Council to administer the program, establish performance-based outcome measures, and report annually to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee (JLBC) and the Department of Finance (DOF).¹

The current report, which is the third annual RRF report, covers program activities from April 2016 to April 2017 (except, as noted, in Attachment tables). The report also documents administrative activities of the Judicial Council and the grantees, details RRF court grant program implementation at the local level, and provides updates on the status of data analysis including some preliminary findings. The preliminary findings include data from July 1, 2015 through April 30, 2017.

Judicial Council Activities

As of April 2017, the Judicial Council finalized all allocations of RRF grants to participating courts. In total, \$15,433,170 was designated to 32 courts (12 pretrial release programs and 20 collaborative court programs) in four funding phases. Two rounds of planning and implementation grant awards originally ranged from approximately \$130,000 to \$600,000. Training and technical assistance grants to 11 courts ranged from \$8,000 to \$20,000.

Per procedure approved by the council, in August 2016 staff coordinated a process for grantee courts to request unspent Year 2 funds. Unspent dollars were pooled and offered to all grantees as a supplement to their existing Year 3 awards. Eighteen courts requested additional funding for a variety of purposes including software to improve data collection, additional treatment services, and team attendance at training events. Then, in March 2017, the Judicial Council received approval from the Department of Finance to extend the spending period for Recidivism Reduction Funds through April 30, 2018, and to fully expend a remaining \$1.68 million in unallocated funding. Twenty-three courts requested additional funding and were provided amounts ranging from \$28,132 to \$79,500. Three courts (Placer, San Mateo, and Ventura) elected to complete their RRF grant in April 2017 and did not request additional funding. Four courts (Contra Costa, Los Angeles, Merced, and Tuolumne) did not request additional funding, but requested and were granted a no-cost program extension past April 2017.

¹ In addition, four years after the grants are awarded the Judicial Council must provide a report to the JLBC and the DOF that addresses the effectiveness of the programs based on the reports of the established outcome measures and the impact of the monies appropriated pursuant to this act to enhance public safety and improve offender outcomes.

Grantee Court Activities

Grantee courts were awarded funds to support continued operation of pretrial or collaborative justice court programs. Pretrial programs are designed to reduce recidivism rates and the pretrial jail population by assessing a defendant's risk of failure to appear for court hearings and/or risk of committing a new crime if released from jail. The programs then provide this information to the court for pretrial release or detention decisions and establishing conditions and/or supervision options for defendants who are released from secure custody during the pretrial phase of a case. Collaborative courts are designed to reduce criminal recidivism by addressing issues such as substance-use disorder and mental health issues that may lead to criminal activities by combining intensive judicial supervision and collaboration among justice system partners with rehabilitation services.

In this third program year, most grantees reported resolution of initial implementation challenges. Generally, partnerships that were established the previous year continued to strengthen and operate smoothly. With more experience, staff worked together to refine screening and eligibility determination policies with the goal of improving participant retention and outcomes. Data collection challenges continued for some courts and Judicial Council staff continued to provide technical assistance.

Statewide Grant Administration and Program Evaluation

In addition to administering the funding, including reallocations and contract amendments, and overseeing program and data reports, Judicial Council staff continued to directly support local RRF program activities by conducting training, hosting quarterly conference calls for judicial officers, and providing technical assistance through site visits and other methods.

The RRF grantees report data quarterly on individuals in their programs to the Judicial Council. These data provide important information on participant characteristics and outcomes and will inform the final report on program effectiveness that will be submitted to the Legislature in 2019. Although many courts faced initial challenges in data collection, all courts are now reporting data and some encouraging outcomes are emerging for both the pretrial and collaborative court programs. The number of failures to appear in court and rearrests seem to be relatively low in pretrial programs with supervision components. The two largest pretrial programs, for example, report appearance rates over 80 and 90 percent. The collaborative court preliminary outcome measure, the retention rate, is also encouraging. Nearly half of the collaborative court programs report a 12-month retention rate of 80 percent or higher. These promising initial findings will be tracked over time and more fully analyzed in subsequent reports.

Conclusion and Next Steps

The Judicial Council's Recidivism Reduction Fund Grant Program is an ambitious project that encourages collaboration among the grantee courts and justice system partners. It awarded \$15,433,170 in funding to 39 different local projects, most of which will continue operating through April 30, 2018. Encouraging preliminary outcomes are emerging that include low rates of failures to appear and rearrests for pretrial programs, and high retention rates for collaborative

court programs. With all funding allocations finalized, Judicial Council staff and RRF courts will track these outcomes over the final project year and assist courts in planning for sustaining programs in each local jurisdiction as appropriate.

Introduction

The Budget Act of 2014 (Sen. Bill 852; Stats. 2014, ch. 25) and the Budget Act of 2015 (Assem. Bill 93; Stats. 2015, ch. 10) appropriated \$16.3 million from the Recidivism Reduction Fund for a competitive grant program designed to support the administration and operation of trial court programs and practices known to reduce adult offender recidivism and enhance public safety. The legislation directed the Judicial Council to administer the program, establish performance-based outcome measures, and report annually to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee and the Department of Finance. The legislation also directed the Judicial Council to provide a report to the JLBC and DOF four years after the grants were awarded to address the effectiveness of the programs based on the established outcome measures and the impact of the monies appropriated pursuant to this act to enhance public safety and improve offender outcomes. As charged by SB 852, the Judicial Council provided a preliminary report to the JLBC and the DOF in March 2015, and then an annual report in September 2016. The 2015 report described the establishment of the RRF court grant program and the initial RRF funding allocations. The 2016 report documented subsequent allocations utilizing the \$1.3 million provided in the 2015 Budget Act, and described initial local program implementation activities, individual court program characteristics, and procedures for establishing data collection and validation procedures.

This document, the third annual RRF report, details the administrative activities of the Judicial Council and the grantees, describes continued RRF court grant program implementation at the local level, and provides updates on the status of data analysis including some preliminary findings.

The Judicial Council's Recidivism Reduction Fund Court Grant Program

Background

For over two decades, California's prison system faced many challenges with overcrowding and lawsuits related to the provision of health and mental health services in prison. The prison population increased from approximately 60,000 inmates in 1986 to an all-time high of 173,479 in 2006. In 2011, the U.S. Supreme Court upheld a lower court ruling requiring the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) to reduce the population in its institutions to 137.5 percent of the system's design capacity.²

As part of the effort to reduce the prison population and recidivism, the Budget Act of 2014 established the RRF. The Legislature allocated funding from this source for a competitive grant program to be developed and administered by the Judicial Council. The funds were designated for courts to use in the administration and operation of programs and practices known to reduce

² California Department of Finance (2016). *An Update to the Future of California Corrections*. Available at www.cdcr.ca.gov/Blueprint-Update-2016/An-Update-to-the-Future-of-California-Corrections-January-2016.pdf.

offender recidivism and enhance public safety, including pretrial programs, collaborative courts that serve moderate- and high-risk adult offenders (hereafter referred to as collaborative courts), and court use of validated risk and needs assessment information.³

Final Grant Awards

In October 2016, the Judicial Council authorized staff to work with the grantee courts to most effectively use RRF funds that were already allocated, provide supplemental funding to existing grantees, and seek possible project extension from the Legislature and Department of Finance. This authorization enabled staff to conduct two separate reallocation processes and to finalize all available RRF funding to participating courts.

First reallocation

In August 2016, staff coordinated a process for grantee courts to request unspent Year 2 funds. Courts were asked to review their originally approved Year 3 budget to determine if they needed to make any revisions and then determine whether the court wanted to request additional funds.

RRF dollars were pooled and offered to all grantees as a supplement to their existing Year 3 awards. Grantees were invited to identify specific program needs not already covered in their Year 3 budgets and to request the requisite funding with a detailed budget revision. Eighteen courts requested additional funding for a variety of purposes including software to improve data collection, additional treatment services, and team attendance at training events.

Second reallocation

In March 2017, the Judicial Council confirmed authority from the Department of Finance to continue the spending period for both allocations of Recidivism Reduction Funds through April 30, 2018, and to fully expend the \$1.68 million remaining in unallocated funding.

Notice was sent to the courts to offer an opportunity to extend their programs through April 2018 and to request additional funds. To receive additional funding, courts were required to have consistently met program and reporting obligations.

Three collaborative court programs (Placer, San Mateo, and Ventura) elected to complete their RRF grant in April 2017 and did not request additional funding. Four other collaborative court programs (Contra Costa, Los Angeles, Merced, and Tuolumne) did not request additional funding, but requested and were granted a no-cost program extension that enabled them to access funding beyond April 2017.

The Judicial Council received 23 funding requests totaling approximately \$2.5 million, for the available balance of \$1.68 million. To help ensure the funds would be disbursed equitably, all funding requests were capped at a maximum of \$100,000 per court. Due to a lack of resources, no requests were fully funded, but all requesting courts received partial funding based on their

³ No courts were awarded funding in the “court use of validated risk and needs assessment information” category.

proposed budget modifications. For a summary of all final RRF Collaborative Court and Pretrial Program grant allocations, see Attachment A.

Grantee Project Activities

The RRF program spending and implementation period spans April 1, 2015, to April 30, 2018. While not all grantees will operate projects for that entire span, all were in operation for the period covered in this report. For a summary of RRF Collaborative Court and Pretrial Program project timeframes, see Attachment B.

In the early months of RRF program implementation, the majority of grantees reported their time was largely devoted to planning activities and establishing agreements with partner agencies. But in their second year of operation, more courts began program participant placement and services. The 2016 RRF report provided full summaries of each RRF program.⁴ The section below provides an overview of any program changes or enhancements that may have taken place in the program year covered in this report. Updated program summaries and data profiles for each pretrial program are provided in Attachment C and for each collaborative court program in Attachment D.

Pretrial Program Activities

As reported in the 2016 annual report, 11 counties receive RRF funding for pretrial programs. Pretrial programs typically have three primary functions that include (1) gathering information for assessing defendant risk of failure to appear for court hearings and risk of committing a new crime if released during the pretrial phase of a case; (2) communicating information about these risks to the court for consideration in pretrial detention/release decisions; and (3) providing information on release conditions and/or a range of supervision options for defendants who are released from secure custody during the pretrial phase of a case.

Pretrial programs use pretrial risk assessment instruments to assess defendant risk of failure to appear for court hearings and risk of committing a new crime, and may include pretrial supervision and monitoring based on risk level and type of risk. The programs use risk-based assignment to a continuum of pretrial supervision options, with intensity of supervision matched to risk level, and are designed to help ensure that defendants return to court, maintain public safety, and conserve resources for the more intensive supervision of high-risk caseloads.

Pretrial programs may incorporate other important program components including automated reminders of court dates, designated prosecutors to review new arrests before initial appearance in court for bail setting, defense attorney representation at bail hearings, electronic monitoring, needs assessment for defendants on supervised release, and periodic check-ins with pretrial officers.

⁴ See California Courts, “Recidivism Reduction Fund Court Grant Program,” www.courts.ca.gov/RecidivismReduction.htm (as of Oct. 4, 2017).

Pretrial Program Enhancements

With additional funding allocations made August 2016 and March 2017, several courts enhanced their pretrial programs with added services or additional program and evaluation resources. Some of the pretrial program enhancements put in place include the following:

Superior Court of Alameda County: Expanded risk assessment to a second courthouse; prepared for implementation of new supervision services.

Superior Court of El Dorado County: Expanded risk assessment to a second courthouse.

Superior Court of Imperial County: Developed new multi-partner data and reports on recidivism rates throughout the county.

Superior Court of Monterey County: Entered into an agreement with a nonprofit research firm to conduct randomized controlled trials of effectiveness of text reminders for court hearings. Preliminary results from the study indicate that text reminders reduce failure-to-appear rates of pretrial defendants.

Superior Court of Shasta County: Purchased and implemented an automated court appearance reminder calling system.

Superior Court of Solano County: Implemented electronic criminal minute orders for their pretrial population.

Collaborative Court Program Activities

As reported in the 2016 annual report, 20 counties are receiving RRF funding for collaborative court programs. Adult criminal collaborative court programs combine intensive judicial supervision and collaboration among justice system partners with rehabilitation services to reduce recidivism and improve outcomes for moderate- and high-risk offenders with significant treatment needs. Although program models differ among court types and local jurisdictions, adult criminal collaborative courts are generally led by a judge and include an interdisciplinary team consisting of a defense attorney, a prosecutor, a representative from probation or parole, and treatment staff and/or case managers or other representatives specific to the particular court.

Collaborative court participants are typically assessed for their risk of recidivating and for their mental health issues, substance-use disorder, and other treatment needs. Community supervision and treatment plans are created based on the information obtained from these assessments. Participants also attend regularly scheduled court sessions, usually one to four times a month, to discuss their adherence to individualized supervision/treatment plans and other program requirements. Graduated sanctions (e.g., admonishments, increased frequency of court sessions, and jail sanctions) are used to respond to noncompliant behaviors, and incentives (e.g., verbal praise, reduced frequency of court hearings, and transportation or food vouchers) are used to reward prosocial behaviors and encourage participants' progress.

Collaborative Court Program Enhancements

With additional funding allocations made August 2016 and March 2017, several collaborative courts enhanced their programs with added services or additional program and evaluation resources:

Superior Court of San Francisco County: Added additional transitional housing units for clients.

Superior Court of Sacramento County: Began the process of adding a case management system that will allow the court to collect and analyze information about their collaborative courts.

Superior Court of Mendocino County: Retained a consultant to design and implement a comprehensive program evaluation.

Superior Court of Tehama County: Added residential treatment for RRF grant clients coordinated through the Tehama County Health Services Agency.

Program Successes and Challenges

The RRF grantee courts reported several program successes and challenges associated with their pretrial and collaborative court programs during this reporting period as outlined below.

Successes

Grantee courts with both pretrial and collaborative court programs continue to cite strengthening justice partner relations as one of the greatest benefits of their RRF program participation. Closer working relationships with probation and service providers, in particular, are producing wide-ranging benefits for the courts and program participants including increased access to staff cross-training opportunities, swifter communication and updates to shared written program protocols, and increased access to services.

Both pretrial and collaborative court programs are making progress with technology improvements. In Fresno County, the court and probation are working together on a new mobile application and portal for defendants on supervised pretrial release. The application provides for secure and direct communication between defendants and their probation officer to monitor hearings and other upcoming appointments. Ventura County's collaborative court program's monitoring and record keeping has been enhanced through the implementation of their collaborative court case management system.

Many pretrial programs reported successes related to having a full year of program implementation and data reporting. Initial implementation and data collection challenges have largely been addressed and programs are now able to focus efforts on evaluating and improving program processes. Some pretrial programs, for example, reported that they reevaluated release eligibility criteria to expand the number of individuals eligible for assessment and/or pretrial release.

During this timeframe, some of the collaborative court programs began holding graduation ceremonies. With participants successfully proceeding through program phases, collaborative courts began to refine graduation protocols to maximize incentive opportunities. Some, like Stanislaus County, developed phased graduations held once per quarter. Others, like Los Angeles County, facilitated “recognition” ceremonies to acknowledge progress toward full graduation.

Challenges

Some program challenges continued in this reporting period. Pretrial programs reported that data collection and reporting continues to require substantial effort. Other pretrial programs recognized that the number of individuals released on pretrial supervision was smaller than originally anticipated because many defendants who had been assessed were able to post bail, were released on their own recognizance without supervision, or were found to be ineligible for supervised release based on the program’s own exclusion criteria.

Lack of housing and treatment services availability continues to be a challenge for the collaborative courts. Some counties also reported that the change in charge from felony to misdemeanor resulting from Proposition 47⁵ (approved by California voters on November 4, 2014) made it difficult to place willing program participants.

Role of Judicial Council in Statewide Administration

In addition to administering the funding, including reallocations and contract amendments, and overseeing program and data reports, Judicial Council staff continued to directly support local RRF program activities in a variety of ways as described in the following section.

Training Events, Conference Calls and Technical Assistance

On November 7, 2016, Judicial Council staff hosted a Pretrial Summit for approximately 90 participants across 10 counties. Topics covered included the role of the presiding judge, using data to inform decision making, facilitated team discussions, predictive bias and disparate impact, and strategies for improving court appearance rates.

Quarterly conference calls for judicial officers overseeing both pretrial and collaborative court programs also continued.

Site Visits

Judicial Council staff conducted 13 site visits during this time period. Pretrial sites included El Dorado, Fresno, Orange, Alameda, Sonoma, and Imperial Counties; collaborative court sites included Santa Cruz, Santa Clara, Merced, Los Angeles, and Stanislaus Counties, and San Joaquin County DUI Court and Drug Court.

⁵ Proposition 47, the Reduced Penalties for Some Crimes Initiative, reduced several lower-level drug and property crimes from felonies to misdemeanors. Some collaborative courts report that this policy change reduces incentives for participation in drug and other collaborative court programs.

Two to three Judicial Council staff attend each site visit. Before the visit, staff work with the court to arrange an agenda for the day that includes a discussion with justice system partners involved in the project, a review of administrative activities and questions, and court observation. As of April 2017, Judicial Council staff had conducted site visits at 25 different grantee courts.

Program Evaluation

Outcome Measurement and Data Collection

The Budget Act of 2014 required that the Judicial Council establish performance-based outcome measures, collect and analyze data from grantees, and evaluate the program. To accomplish these tasks, Judicial Council staff, in collaboration with the trial courts, identified data elements and established data collection procedures for the secure and confidential transmission of data from the counties to the council. Detail about outcome measurement and data collection is provided in Attachment E.

Data Reporting and Validation

Grantee courts provide program narrative and data reports quarterly to the Judicial Council. Data are run through a cleaning program created in the R programming language (used for statistical analysis) that identifies basic reporting errors (duplicate records, invalid entries such as out-of-range dates, etc.). More significant or system reporting errors and issues require additional follow-up with the courts and are completed on a program-by-program basis. To ensure program and data reporting compliance, a portion of site visit time is also dedicated to data review and problem solving.

Preliminary Data and Outcomes

The RRF grantees report a substantial amount of data on individuals in their programs to the Judicial Council. These data provide important information on participant characteristics and outcomes and will be used to inform the final report on program effectiveness that will be submitted to the Legislature in 2019. This section describes preliminary data and outcomes based on the first seven quarters of program data collection and identifies additional analyses that will be presented in subsequent reports to the Legislature. Because the preliminary outcomes are aligned with overall program goals, different outcomes are presented for the pretrial and collaborative court programs. Pretrial program outcomes focus on failure-to-appear rates and rearrests that result in new charges, while 12-month program retention rates are presented for collaborative court programs. Attachment E provides information on how outcomes and performance measures were identified for the RRF program. Attachments C and D provide program summaries and data profiles for the Pretrial Release Program and Collaborative Court Program, respectively.

Pretrial Data and Outcomes

Over the seven-quarter period of this analysis, over 30,000 pretrial risk assessments were conducted, and more than 3,500 defendants were placed on pretrial supervision. Among those placed on pretrial supervision 31.8 percent were assessed at low risk, 44.8 percent at medium risk, and 23.4 percent at high risk. Although it was anticipated that the number of individuals placed on pretrial supervision would make up a larger proportion of the number assessed, there are several reasons that may explain why this proportion is lower than expected. Many counties place limits on the eligibility of defendants for release to pretrial supervision. In many instances those with parole or probation supervision violations, those with warrants, and those with holds are ineligible for consideration. Some counties reported that they erred on the side of caution at the program's inception, but later reevaluated exclusion criteria as the program matured. Other factors also impact the number of defendants placed on pretrial supervision. For example, some assessed defendants may choose to post bail in order to secure release before they can be placed on pretrial release supervision. A number of defendants may also be assessed and be granted an "own recognizance release" based on their assessment score, and some pretrial programs, such as in Alameda County, focused their efforts on conducting assessments and providing the information to judicial officers rather than placing defendants on supervision. The 2018 report to the Legislature will include further detail on how these factors influenced the size of the pretrial supervised population.

Preliminary data on pretrial outcomes are promising and findings suggest that failure-to-appear and rearrest rates have been relatively low. Failure-to-appear rates (Table 3, Attachment C) show wide county variation. However, much of this variation can be attributed to small sample sizes. Counties with the largest supervised populations, Fresno and Sonoma, show FTA ranges from 2.6 percent to 16.7 percent. As expected, in both counties, FTA rates increase with level of risk. For example, the FTA rate for Fresno County's low-risk participants was 10.3 percent, for medium-risk participants it was 13.2 percent, and for high-risk participants it was 16.7 percent. These results indicate that even among high-risk defendants under pretrial supervision in Fresno County, over 80 percent are making their court appearances. In Sonoma County, over 90 percent of high-risk defendants are making their court appearances.

Rearrests that result in filed charges are relatively rare events in the context of pretrial programs, and data reported here are consistent with expectations of relatively low rearrest rates. Across all counties, fewer than 50 rearrests were reported, amounting to a rearrest rate of less than 2 percent. As shown in Table 4 of Attachment C, one county reported zero rearrests. Judicial Council staff are conducting ongoing data quality checks with grantees to distinguish between missing data versus completed data reporting that reflects no arrests.

Collaborative Courts Data and Outcomes

Over the first seven quarters of data collection, collaborative court program grantees reported nearly 3,500 entries across all programs. San Diego County's Mandatory Supervision Court was the highest-volume court with over 1,000 entries, followed by the San Joaquin County DUI Court with over 600 entries (Table 1, Attachment D). Both of these programs tailor their

supervision and services to participant risks and needs. Lower risk/need participants receive minimal supervision and services so resources can be targeted to participants with higher risk and need. Lower-volume collaborative court programs tended to be those in more sparsely populated counties such as Modoc, Placer, and Lake. The grantee courts served a population that was 13 percent black, 35 percent Latino/Hispanic, 42 percent white, and 10 percent other/unknown (Table 2, Attachment D). Over three-quarters of the participants were male and the largest age group was between the ages of 26 and 35 (Tables 3 and 4, Attachment D).

The preliminary collaborative court program outcomes are promising. The 12-month retention rates were high: an average of 72 percent of participants either successfully completed or remained in the program 12 months after program entry. Four programs reported 12-month retention rates of over 90 percent, including the San Joaquin County DUI Court, which reported a 98 percent retention rate. Judicial Council staff will continue to track retention rates to determine whether these promising findings remain constant and will track and report on additional outcomes in subsequent reports.

Conclusion and Next Steps

The next RRF reporting period will cover April 2017 to April 2018, the final year of program implementation. In that time period, staff will focus on conducting additional site visits and supporting program closeout, assuring final fiscal and program reports are completed. Staff will also identify which programs plan to continue after the end of RRF funding, which do not, and identify reasons why.

Data quality monitoring, cleaning, and analysis will also continue. Judicial Council staff will work with programs to identify data and rectify data challenges. Subsequent legislative reports will document additional outcomes and track program progress over time. In the final report on program impact for 2019, staff will assess program impact, present data on outcomes, and provide information that can be used for potential program replication, as warranted.

The Judicial Council's Recidivism Reduction Fund Court Grant Program is an ambitious project that provided funding for 39 court programs encouraging collaboration among courts and justice system partners. As a result of this funding entirely new programs and partnerships were implemented in 10 counties, and 19 existing programs were either expanded or enhanced. In addition, eight technical assistance initiatives were supported, many involving multiple counties. Judicial Council staff will continue with training, outreach, technical assistance, and data collection and evaluation activities in the final implementation year of the project. RRF-funded projects will provide valuable information that can be applied to other major recidivism reduction-related programs of this type.

Attachments

Attachment A: Table of Final RRF Grant Awards

Attachment B: Table of RRF Project Time Frames

Attachment C: RRF Pretrial Program Summaries and Data Profiles

Attachment D: RRF Collaborative Court Program Summaries and Data Profiles

Attachment E: Establishing Data Elements and Outcome Measures

Attachment A. Table of Final RRF Grant Awards

Collaborative Courts:

Court	Contract Amount	Additional Funds	Final Contract Amount	% Spent as of August 2017
Contra Costa	\$533,521	\$0	\$533,521	97%
Kern	\$434,457	\$79,500	\$513,957	89%
Lake	\$289,741	\$28,132	\$317,873	63%
Los Angeles	\$216,370	\$0	\$216,370	69%
Mendocino	\$424,761	\$79,500	\$504,261	83%
Merced	\$432,178	\$0	\$432,178	80%
Modoc	\$367,626	\$60,499	\$428,125	77%
Placer	\$203,184	N/A	\$203,184	92%
Sacramento	\$592,275	\$79,500	\$671,775	50%
San Diego	\$594,441	\$79,500	\$673,941	90%
San Francisco	\$579,727	\$60,234	\$639,961	89%
San Joaquin	\$584,218	\$79,500	\$663,718	83%
San Mateo	\$593,294	N/A	\$593,294	100%
Santa Clara	\$700,000	\$79,500	\$779,500	75%
Santa Cruz	\$656,562	\$54,560	\$711,123	97%
Stanislaus	\$205,415	\$39,166	\$244,581	67%
Tehama	\$584,453	\$79,500	\$663,953	86%
Tulare	\$473,578	\$79,500	\$553,078	85%
Tuolumne	\$196,769	\$0	\$196,769	75%
Ventura	\$175,234	N/A	\$175,234	100%

Pretrial:

Court	Contract Amount	Additional Funds	Final Contract Amount	% Spent as of August 2017
Alameda	\$547,110	\$78,984	\$626,094	83%
El Dorado	\$485,509	\$79,500	\$565,009	61%
Fresno	\$656,868	\$63,458	\$720,326	89%
Imperial	\$261,731	\$33,918	\$295,649	68%
Lassen	\$169,185	(\$9,201)	\$159,984	89%
Monterey	\$363,893	\$79,500	\$443,393	86%
Orange	\$550,250	\$79,500	\$629,750	86%
Shasta	\$639,119	\$76,901	\$716,020	81%
Solano	\$307,028	\$74,092	\$381,120	63%
Sonoma	\$684,009	\$77,255	\$761,264	90%
Yuba	\$333,313	\$79,500	\$412,813	81%

*Does not include Training and Technical Assistance grantees (11/1/15 – 6/30/16) or the Superior Court of San Luis Obispo (7/1/15 – 4/1/16).

Attachment B. Table of RRF Project Time Frames

Collaborative Courts:

Court	Contract Start Date	Contract Expiration Date
Contra Costa	4/1/2015	6/30/2017
Kern	4/1/2015	4/30/2018
Lake	4/1/2015	4/30/2018
Los Angeles	7/1/2015	4/30/2018
Mendocino	4/1/2015	4/30/2018
Merced	4/1/2015	4/30/2018
Modoc	4/1/2015	4/30/2018
Placer	7/1/2015	4/30/2017
Sacramento	4/1/2015	4/30/2018
San Diego	4/1/2015	4/30/2018
San Francisco	4/1/2015	4/30/2018
San Joaquin	4/1/2015	12/31/2017
San Mateo	4/1/2015	4/30/2017
Santa Clara	4/1/2015	4/30/2018
Santa Cruz	4/1/2015	6/30/2017
Stanislaus	7/1/2015	4/30/2018
Tehama	4/1/2015	4/30/2018
Tulare	4/1/2015	4/30/2018
Tuolumne	4/1/2015	4/30/2018
Ventura	4/1/2015	4/30/2017

Pretrial:

Court	Contract Start Date	Contract Expiration Date
Alameda	4/1/2015	4/30/2018
El Dorado	4/1/2015	4/30/2018
Fresno	4/1/2015	4/30/2018
Imperial	4/1/2015	4/30/2018
Lassen	7/1/2015	4/30/2018
Monterey	4/1/2015	4/30/2018
Orange	4/1/2015	4/30/2018
Shasta	4/1/2015	4/30/2018
Solano	4/1/2015	4/30/2018
Sonoma	4/1/2015	4/30/2018
Yuba	4/1/2015	4/30/2018

Attachment C. Pretrial Program Summaries and Data Profiles

This attachment provides a brief description of the key program elements and a summary of program strengths and challenges. The summaries are drawn from program descriptions and quarterly reports submitted by each county and supplemented by information collected during site visits. The summaries are followed by data profiles for each county.

Pretrial Release Program Summaries

Alameda County

Assessment tool: Ohio Risk Assessment System (ORAS)

Assessment administered by: Court Pretrial Services (PTS) unit

Assessment conducted: At arraignment

Release decision made: At hearing subsequent to arraignment

Supervised pretrial release options: None

Treatment services offered: No

Strength: Data outcomes of those released on bail and those released on OR are comprehensive.

Alameda recently added a second courthouse where risk assessments are conducted.

Challenge: The program supervision component will be conducted by a community-based agency but was significantly delayed. The new supervision implementation is targeted to begin in the fall of 2017.

El Dorado County

Virginia Pretrial Risk Assessment Instrument (VPRAI)

Assessment administered by: Probation

Assessment conducted: At arrest

Release decision made: At arraignment

Supervised pretrial release options: Reminders and Probation meetings

Treatment services offered: Yes

Strength: The court recognized that they needed to make some program changes in order to increase the number of pretrial releases. They sought guidance from outside subject matter experts, brought in experienced personnel, and are reevaluating program policy and processes.

Challenge: The program's current pretrial release criteria limits eligibility and has resulted in relatively low program numbers.

Fresno County

Virginia Pretrial Risk Assessment Instrument (VPRAI)

Assessment administered by: Probation

Assessment conducted: At booking

Release decision made: At arraignment

Supervised pretrial release options: Reminders and monitoring

Treatment services offered: Yes

Strength: The court is starting a project to build a portal and app to facilitate secure, mobile communications between probationers on pretrial supervision and the Probation Department.

Challenge: The court faces challenges in maintaining updated information about service provider availability.

Imperial County

Pretrial Risk Assessment Tool: Correctional Assessment and Intervention System (CAIS)

Assessment administered by: Sheriff

Assessment conducted: At booking

Release decision made: At arraignment

Supervised pretrial release options: Call or report in depending on risk level

Treatment services offered: No

Strength: Imperial's Pre-Trial Assessment tool was studied and validated by San Diego State University and determined to be predictive. Suggested changes made during the validation process were implemented, including widening the "Low Risk" category.

Challenge: Configuring jail management system to interface with court and pretrial data has presented significant challenges for the program.

Lassen County

Assessment tool: Ohio Risk Assessment System (ORAS)

Assessment administered by: Probation

Assessment conducted: Pre-arraignment

Release decision made: At arraignment

Supervised pretrial release options: Monitoring via telephone; physical check-in

Drug Testing Treatment services offered: No

Strength: This small county program worked collaboratively as a partnership to craft a pretrial services agreement and make it available at the appropriate time so all parties can make informed decisions about each individual's pretrial plan.

Challenge: The county reports some challenges identifying the ideal point in the pre-arraignment process to conduct the assessment.

Monterey County

Virginia Pretrial Risk Assessment Instrument (VPRAI)

Assessment administered by: Probation

Assessment conducted: Pre-arraignment

Release decision made: At arraignment

Supervised pretrial release options: Check-in with the Pretrial Program, electronic monitoring, home visits, drug and alcohol testing, and court date reminders

Treatment services offered: No

Strength: Program staff worked with BetaGov, a nonprofit agency that promotes innovation in the public sector, to conduct a randomized control trial of the impact of court reminders on failure-to-appear rates. Preliminary results suggest that court appearance rates improved when defendants received court reminders, and the project will be extended until results are conclusive.

Challenge: Referrals for pretrial risk assessment have increased but Probation Department staff assigned to pretrial program has decreased. The court and probation are transitioning to new information management systems resulting in data collection challenges.

Orange County

Virginia Pretrial Risk Assessment Instrument (VPRAI)

Assessment administered by: Court

Assessment conducted: At booking

Release decision made: At arraignment

Supervised pretrial release options: Check-ins with Probation

Treatment services offered: Yes

Strength: Staff planned, tested, and implemented a platform and workflow to allow for electronic data capture, automatic upload to a custom database, and secure reliable data extraction for statistical analysis.

Challenge: Since the passage of Proposition 64, marijuana use is no longer factored into VPRAI risk scores. This difference in how pretrial participants are assessed and scored will be a topic of ongoing discussion by the project team.

Shasta County

Virginia Pretrial Risk Assessment Instrument (VPRAI)

Assessment administered by: Probation

Assessment conducted: Monday through Friday at booking

Release decision made: Pre-arraignment and at arraignment

Supervised pretrial release options: Reminders, check-ins

Treatment services offered: Yes

Strength: County self-identified a need to reevaluate program eligibility and expand criteria.

Challenge: High rate of FTA; data coming from three different sources sometimes conflicts and requires cross-checking.

Solano County Assessment tool: Ohio Risk Assessment System (ORAS)

Administered by: Probation

Assessment conducted: At booking

Release decision made: At arraignment

Supervised pretrial release options: Phone reminders, probation check-in

Treatment services offered: Yes

Strength: Solano County Administrator's office has been tasked with investigating expansion of pretrial programs. New probation officer resources added to the program.

Challenge: Slower than anticipated timeline for identifying IT vendor for criminal minute order project.

Sonoma County

Pretrial Risk Assessment Tool: Sonoma Pretrial Risk Assessment Tool (SPRAT)

Administered by: Sheriff

Assessment conducted: At booking

Release decision made: At arraignment

Supervised pretrial release options: Court reminders, basic supervision, moderate supervision, enhanced supervision

Treatment services offered: No

Strength: The Sonoma program has been releasing a gradually increasing number of offenders on supervised pretrial release.

Challenge: The inability to generate a unique ID for program participants so they can be tracked through data coming from multiple sources remains a challenge for Sonoma. They are also in the process of converting to a new case management system, which is consuming significant resources to put in place.

Yuba County

Assessment tool: Ohio Risk Assessment System (ORAS)

Administered by: Probation

Assessment conducted: At booking

Release decision made: Pre-arraignment and at arraignment

Supervised pretrial release options: Reminders and monitoring

Treatment services offered: No

Strength: Risk assessment information is collected in electronic form. Use of the court's JALAN case management system and a customized database allow further dynamic data tracking and predominantly automated reporting capabilities.

Challenge: The county is concerned it will not be able to continue the program without grant funding.

Pretrial Release Data Profiles

Data presented here include (1) reported number of assessments and releases to pretrial supervision; (2) the number of those released to pretrial supervision, by risk level; (3) the number and proportion of failures to appear (FTA); and (4) the number and proportion of in-program arrests that resulted in the filing of a new charge. Some data are pending county verification and should be considered preliminary as explained in endnotes.

Table 1. Assessments and Releases to Pretrial Supervision¹

	Assessments	Releases to Pretrial Supervision Program
Alameda	3,022	0
El Dorado	577	40
Fresno	7,563	1,017
Imperial	4,162	51
Lassen	635	70
Monterey	269	133
Orange	4,368	242
Shasta	440	122
Solano	1,582	346
Sonoma	6,990	1,421
Yuba	869	179
Total	30,477	3,621

Source: Assessments and Releases to Pretrial Supervision from Judicial Council of California, Recidivism Reduction Fund Quarterly Reports (July 1, 2015, to March 31, 2017).

Note: Alameda does not yet have a pretrial supervision program.

¹ There are multiple reasons that explain why assessed defendants may not be placed on supervised pretrial release supervision. Some assessed defendants post bail before they can be placed on pretrial release supervision or are release on their “own recognizance.” Additionally, counties may place limitations on release eligibility that exclude defendants under parole or probation supervision, those with warrants, and those with immigration or other holds. A subsequent report to the Legislature will include further detail on how these factors influenced the size of the pretrial supervised population.

Table 2. Assessed Risk Level of Defendants Released to Pretrial Supervision

	Low	Medium	High	Unknown	Total
Alameda	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
El Dorado	13	13	7	7	40
Fresno	262	204	72	479	1017
Imperial	3	38	3	7	51
Lassen	14	35	15	6	70
Monterey	33	75	24	1	133
Orange	36	138	50	18	242
Shasta	15	62	40	5	122
Solano	37	255	7	47	346
Sonoma	382	285	224	530	1421
Yuba	3	21	146	9	179
Total	798	1126	588	1109	3621

Source: Judicial Council of California, Recidivism Reduction Fund Quarterly Reports (July 1, 2015, to March 31, 2017).

Note: Alameda does not yet have a pretrial supervision program.

Table 3. Number and Percent of Failures to Appear, by Risk Level

	Low		Medium		High		Unknown	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Alameda	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
El Dorado	3	23.1	6	46.2	0	0	2	28.6
Fresno	27	10.3	27	13.2	12	16.7	45	9.4
Imperial	2	66.7	1	2.6	0	0	0	0
Lassen	0	0	5	14.3	6	40	1	16.7
Monterey	4	12.1	9	12	4	16.7	1	100
Orange	6	16.7	29	21	13	26	4	22.2
Shasta	1	6.7	4	6.5	8	20	0	0
Solano	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sonoma	10	2.6	15	5.3	12	5.4	11	2.1
Yuba	0	0	2	9.5	10	6.8	0	0
Total	53	6.6	107	9.5	65	11.1	64	5.8

Source: Judicial Council of California, Recidivism Reduction Fund Quarterly Reports (July 1, 2015, to March 31, 2017).

Notes: An FTA is defined as at least one FTA per unique ID. Alameda does not yet have a pretrial supervision program.

Table 4. Number and Percent of In-Program Arrests that Resulted in Filed Charges

	Low		Medium		High		Unknown	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Alameda	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
El Dorado	0	0	1	7.7	0	0	0	0
Fresno	3	1.1	5	2.5	2	2.8	0	0
Imperial	0	0	4	10.5	0	0	0	0
Lassen	1	7.1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Monterey	0	0	2	2.7	0	0	0	0
Orange	0	0	2	1.4	2	4	1	5.6
Shasta	0	0	3	4.8	6	15	0	0
Solano	1	2.7	6	2.4	2	28.6	2	4.3
Sonoma	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Yuba	0	0	0	0	3	2.1	0	0
Total	5	0.6	24	2.1	15	2.6	3	0.1

Source: Judicial Council of California, Recidivism Reduction Fund Quarterly Reports (July 1, 2015 to March 31, 2017).

Note: Alameda does not yet have a pretrial supervision program.

Pretrial Data Endnotes

Requests for data verification are still outstanding for the following grantees: Sonoma, Fresno, Imperial, Lassen, Yuba and El Dorado (Table 2 only).

Data have been verified for the following grantees: Monterey, Orange, Shasta, and Sonoma.

Alameda focused on the implementation of a new pretrial risk assessment and will not implement a pretrial supervision program until late 2017. As a result, supervision data are not reported.

Attachment D. Program Summaries and Data Profiles for RRF Collaborative Court Programs

This attachment provides a brief description of the key program elements and a summary of program strengths and challenges. The summaries are drawn from program descriptions and quarterly reports submitted by each county and supplemented by information collected during site visits. The summaries are followed by data profiles for each county. Where RRF grantees used grant funds to operate multiple types of collaborative court programs, a description of each program type is provided in the section on Collaborative Courts. In Santa Clara and San Francisco Counties, funds were devoted to providing housing for participants from multiple court programs.

Collaborative Court Program Summaries

Contra Costa County

Program type(s): Domestic Violence Intensive Support Program

Program elements: The goal of the Domestic Violence Intensive Support Program (DVISP) is to reduce recidivism among individuals convicted of felony and/or misdemeanor domestic violence offenses who have been assessed to be at medium to high risk of reoffending. To achieve these goals the court is collaborating with the district attorney, public defender, probation, and public and community agencies. Participants are interviewed using the Ontario Domestic Assault Risk Assessment tool (ODARA).

Strength: Agreements with service providers were strengthened and clarified to assure that the funding provided the maximum level of services possible.

Challenge: Program staff struggled to identify whether the District Attorney or Probation was the most appropriate justice partner for administering the ODARA with participants.

Kern County

Program type(s): Mental Health Court

Program elements: The goal of the mental health court is to identify persons in the criminal justice system whose mental health issues have contributed to their criminal behavior, with eligibility determined as soon as possible after criminal charges are filed. Persons eligible for the mental health court are offered a wide array of services including mental health and substance-use disorder treatment, and case management including facilitation of applications for housing, public benefits, and transportation.

Strength: The program has a dedicated judicial officer providing leadership for the effort, helping to bring court and county partners together.

Challenge: The program staff reported a lack of inpatient substance abuse treatment programs and limited availability of beds at sober living environments in Kern County, especially for women.

Lake County

Program type(s): Veterans Treatment Court

Program elements: The Veterans Treatment Court is a voluntary program for veterans with criminal charges. Cases are referred by judicial officers in the outlying courts under Penal Code section 1170.9 for an eligibility hearing. Treatment includes weekly individual and group counseling, drug and alcohol testing, and if applicable, mental health treatment, and regular attendance at recovery support/self-help meetings. Referrals for vocational training, education, and/or job placement, and housing services are provided.

Strength: The program includes a mentorship component for participants.

Challenge: Program staff reported challenges associated with Proposition 47 and difficulties recruiting misdemeanor participants for the program.

Los Angeles County

Program type(s): “Court to College” Program

Program elements: The Court to College program is a collaboration between the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, Cerritos Community College (CCC), Los Angeles Probation Department (LAPD), Los Angeles District Attorney, Los Angeles Public Defender, and the California Department of Justice’s Division of Recidivism Reduction and Re-Entry (DR3). The program’s central feature is to focus its participants on an educational track: obtaining a high school diploma or a GED while attending a training/academic program at CCC. Participants must be from the Southeast Judicial District and be between the ages of 18 and 25. Supportive services include intensive probation supervision and substance-use disorder treatment services, ongoing court monitoring, and judicial interaction with participants.

Strength: The program continues to move forward despite change in judicial leadership.

Challenge: With multiple new law changes, staff reported that recruitment of new participants was a challenge. Also, California Department of Justice staff assisting with the program evaluation do not have access to Probation data, and have found data on academic progress to be limited.

Mendocino County

Program type(s): Adult Drug Court

Program elements: The adult drug court program is for Mendocino residents with criminal charges who have underlying substance-use disorder issues. The program consists of six phases that are a minimum of 14 weeks. In addition to substance-use disorder treatment, participants are also required to perform a minimum of 488 hours of community service. The program uses sanctions that are graduated, therapeutic, and positive. Incentives are utilized to recognize and bolster the success of the participant.

Strength: Program staff added a peer mentor component.

Challenge: The Public Defender's Office has experienced a significant staffing shortage, and there has been significant turnover in the District Attorney's office creating a lack of continuity and teamwork in pre-court hearings.

Merced County

Program type(s): Mental Health Treatment Court and Re-Entry Program

Program elements: The Mental Health Treatment Court and Re-Entry Program focuses on medium- and high-risk offenders on postrelease community supervision (PRCS), mandatory supervision, and felony probation who have an Axis I mental health disorder and agree to participate in required counseling and treatment.

Strength: Program staff have worked to link participants to community-based services, in addition to those in their court ordered treatment plan. Services include literacy programs through the local library, Department of Rehabilitation programs offering employment skills and volunteer opportunities, National Association of Mentally Ill (NAMI) support groups for families, and probation department programs on life skills.

Challenge: Staff has struggled to find appropriate placements for participants with the most severe mental illness with acute symptoms.

Modoc County

Program type(s): Adult Drug Treatment Court

Program elements: The Adult Drug Treatment Court focuses on alcohol or drug charges or other charges where there was involvement of alcohol and/or drugs in the commission of the offense. The program is designed to last 18 months with three phases and six months of aftercare. The treatment team includes the judge (chair), defense attorney, district attorney, coordinator, chief probation officer, substance-use disorder counselors, a mental health counselor, and an employment specialist.

Strength: Program staff utilized Recidivism Reduction funding to provide needed residential treatment.

Challenge: Modoc is sparsely populated county with limited services dispersed across a wide geographic area.

Placer County

Program type(s): Drug Court, Proposition 36 Drug Court, Veterans Court, and Mental Health Court

Program elements: Placer's drug courts are alternative sentencing programs for substance-use disorder-related criminal charges. The programs are designed for participants who are high need and high risk and are on formal probation. Placer's Veterans Court is a four-phase program for veterans whose criminal charges or convictions are related to their military service. Placer's Mental Health Court is a three-phase program for individuals with a diagnosis of a psychotic disorder, bipolar disorder, or other psychiatric disorder that qualifies the participant for long-term disability.

Strength: A major accomplishment with this grant funding has been increased policy support for collaborative court programs that resulted in updates to program protocols, the revitalization of Homeless Court, the establishment of focused data collection and utilization, increased access to treatment and incentives for collaborative court participants, a successful pilot to change drug-testing practices, and increased access to training for collaborative court staff.

Challenge: The court foresees ongoing challenges related to maintaining overarching policy support for the programs absent the collaborative court coordinator position that was funded through RRF.

Sacramento County

Program type(s): Co-Occurring Mental Health Court

Program elements: The Co-Occurring Mental Health Court is a collaboration between the Superior Court of Sacramento County, the Public Defender's Office (PD), the District Attorney's Office (DA), the Sacramento County Department of Health and Human Services (Division of Behavioral Health Services), the Probation Department's Adult Community Corrections Division, and Alcohol and Drug Services, and is designed to serve defendants who have a serious mental health issues along with a co-occurring substance-use disorder.

Strength: The team refined the referral process yielding higher numbers of eligible referrals. They also worked collaboratively to finalize a program manual.

Challenge: Program staff reported that they need to discharge some participants from the program when the services available cannot meet the needs of the client (i.e., participant's cognitive functioning does not allow for them to adhere to or comply with the structure of the program). Staff also reported that they will be looking into a wider variety of services to meet more participant needs.

San Diego County

Program type(s): Veterans Treatment Court, Mandatory Supervision Program, and Reentry Court

Program elements: San Diego's Veterans Treatment Court targets moderate- to high-risk offenders who are eligible for relief under Penal Code section 1170.9 (offense must stem from military-service related trauma, traumatic brain injury, substance-use disorder, or mental health issues). The program has three phases including an additional aftercare component. San Diego's Mandatory Supervision Program is a three-phase collaborative court program for offenders who have been sentenced under Penal Code section 1170(h)(5)(B) and have entered the postrelease phase of their sentence. San Diego's Reentry Court serves high-risk felony offenders under parole, mandatory supervision, or postrelease community supervision who are either facing a new felony conviction or a revocation of their terms of supervision. Participants must be assessed as having a substance-use disorder, mental health issues, or both (co-occurring). The program aims to link participants to appropriate treatment services, including but not limited to mental health issues, substance-use disorder, housing, employment training, and prosocial skills.

Strength: San Diego County has the capacity to serve a high volume of participants, particularly in the Mandated Supervision Program.

Challenge: Staff reported that in the Veterans Treatment Court (VTC), participants remain in the screening phase for increasingly longer periods of time, due to a lack of necessary documentation (military records). This delay posed a challenge in keeping potential participants interested in participating in a highly structured program such as VTC.

San Francisco County

Program type(s): Transitional housing component for participants in Behavioral Health Court, Adult Drug Court, Intensive Supervision Court, and Community Justice Center (all existing)

Program elements: San Francisco is using the funds to support transitional housing for high-risk/high-need homeless and marginally housed clients, most of whom have co-occurring conditions, who are participating in one of the collaborative court programs listed above. The Tenderloin Housing Clinic (THC) blocks housing units for a maximum of 12 months in order to provide supported transitional housing to 80 collaborative court clients. Participants work with a THC housing specialist to plan for permanent housing once the participant finishes the supportive housing program in addition to receiving court-affiliated case management and social service support.

Strength: Staff reported that all participants receive a housing needs assessment and an individualized permanent housing plan within one week of intake.

Challenge: Staff reported that limits to affordable housing options have required staff to seek out-of-county housing options.

San Joaquin County

Program type(s): DUI Court and Adult Drug Court

Program elements: San Joaquin's DUI Court is a dual-track system of court supervision in high-risk DUI cases for repeat DUI offenders whose previous DUI was within 10 years of the current case. Track 1 is for program participants with little or no addiction issues. Track 2 is for program participants whose reoffending clearly revolves around alcoholism or substance-use disorder as determined by a licensed substance-use disorder counselor. The Adult Drug Court is a three-phase program that targets individuals charged with misdemeanor or felony offenses for which a jail or prison sentence will be imposed. The program provides intensive court monitoring so that participants can achieve total abstinence from drugs and alcohol, and become productive and responsible members of society.

Strength: Staff reported that San Joaquin has the capacity to serve a relatively large number of participants in DUI and Drug court programs. They have also secured continued funding for DUI Court and Drug Court programs through a 2017 Judicial Council Court Innovations Grant.

Challenge: Staff reported that although San Joaquin already serves a large number of participants in Drug Court, they have been experiencing an increase in the number of referrals, which may indicate greater need.

San Mateo County

Program type(s): Bridges Substance Abuse Treatment Court, Pathways Mental Health Court, Drug Court, Veterans Treatment Court (all existing)

Program elements: The San Mateo Collaborative Courts includes a courtroom-based team approach with a strong judicial leadership role. By relaxing their traditional adversarial roles, Drug Court officials work as a team to develop a strategy that is in the best interest of both the defendant and society.

The goal is to improve outcomes for participants by connecting them to needed services, such as mental health treatment and therapy, substance abuse counseling, healthcare, job training and employment, and housing assistance. Participants are intensively supervised by a Deputy Probation Officer, are expected to avail themselves of the services offered, must make restitution to their victims, and must appear in court for progress reviews. Upon graduation, participants may be eligible to have their fines reduced, have probation terminated early, and/or have their conviction expunged/dismissed.

Strength: Staff reported that RRF grants funds led to important capacity-building activity, especially for probation officers who are vital to the operations of San Mateo's Collaborative Courts. Three probation officers were able to attend the NADCP training.

Challenge: Staff reported that the court had to work closely with partner agencies to ensure timely spending of grant funds, and that some agencies had difficulty spending down allocated funds.

Santa Clara County

Program type(s): Drug Treatment Court, Mental Health Treatment Court, Veterans Treatment Court, Parolee Reentry Court (PRC), Developmentally Disabled (DD Court) and Competency Restoration Court.

Program elements: The Santa Clara collaborative justice court programs listed above are using funds to create a housing component that will serve the highest-risk participants who are dually diagnosed with mental health and substance use disorders with a high need for treatment and services. The housing component utilizes a Housing First model and is a 30- to 90-day program that provides additional treatment, case management, and other social services.

Strength: Santa Clara has a complete array of collaborative courts and has the capacity to serve many participants. This allowed Santa Clara to draw from multiple programs to provide housing to court participants. Santa Clara has recently improved its data collection and reporting capacity.

Challenge: Santa Clara's data collection capacity has lagged behind its capacity to provide services.

Santa Cruz County

Program type(s): Mental Health Court

Program elements: Santa Cruz's Mental Health Court is a supportive postadjudication review court designed to improve offender treatment outcomes, reduce recidivism, respond to public safety and victims' rights concerns, and effectively utilize public resources. The program is for individuals on specialized mental health probation supervision caseloads who agree to participate in the program. The Mental Health Court is a collaboration between the Superior Court of Santa Cruz County, probation, mental health professionals, the district attorney, defense counsel, and law enforcement.

Strength: Santa Cruz has a high degree of collaboration across partner agencies. They have also refined their referral process using their new Odyssey System.

Challenge: The Mental Health Court in Santa Cruz experienced some accounting delays that led staff to consider contracting directly with treatment providers.

Stanislaus County

Program type(s): Veterans Court

Program elements: Stanislaus' Veterans Court is a collaborative justice court for veterans with a service-related mental health problem. In order to be eligible the criminal offense must have resulted from a mental health problem, and the offense must be eligible for probation. Program

components include full-service options at the local Veterans Services Clinic, the Veterans Administration, and the county Behavioral Health Services Agency.

Strength: Implementation for this court was efficient; the court reached operating capacity quickly after implementation.

Challenge: Processes for exchanging data were challenging, but have been resolved over the past two quarters. There may be capacity constraints on this court based on the availability of probation staff.

Tehama County

Program type(s): Mental Health Court (existing)

Program elements: Tehama's mental health court is a four-phase program and targets specific outcomes related to increases in mental health functioning, successful community reintegration, and lower recidivism. Participants must be moderate to high risk for recidivating and must have a serious and persistent mental health disorder, which is the primary motivating factor in the person's involvement with the criminal justice system. There may be a dual diagnosis of chemical dependency though the substance-use disorder is not the primary diagnosis.

Strength: The court recognizes the successes among participants with services and medication stabilization, and has identified an alternative funding sources to potentially access after RRF funding ends.

Challenge: Tehama reports that there is a shortage of mental health workers and appropriate housing options in the area. The lack of the services and housing provides a challenge to the court in meeting the needs of program participants.

Tulare County

Program type(s): Domestic Violence (DV) Court and DUI Court

Program elements: Tulare's domestic violence court is a three-phased program that requires completion of a 52-week Batterer's Treatment Program. The program is incentivized by the provision of job training/job placement in Phase 3 and the ability to reduce the term of probation from three years to 18 months upon successful completion of batterer's treatment and the payment of victim restitution. The DUI court is a three-phased program that requires completion of a 12-, 18-, or 24-month Driving Under the Influence Program. The program is incentivized by the provision of job training/job placement in Phase 3 and the ability to reduce the term of probation from five years to three years upon successful completion of the designated DUI program and the payment of victim restitution.

Strength: The court has devoted resources to analysis and validation of the assessment tools being used in DV Court and DUI Court. They have also determined that staff and providers would benefit from updated training on evidence-based practice.

Challenge: The most significant challenge for the DV Court has been a higher failure rate as compared to the DUI Court. This led to a review and adjustment of the DUI supervision practices, required training for all DV providers on evidence-based practices, and the adoption of a system that tracks offenders who have failed the DV program in hopes of identifying unmet program/referral needs of these participants.

Tuolumne County

Program type(s): Adult Drug Court

Program elements: Tuolumne's adult drug court program is for offenders with criminal offenses that are related to drug addiction. The program provides outpatient groups, requires 12-step meeting attendance, frequent and random drug testing, and weekly or twice-monthly court hearings. The program also addresses issues of housing, mental health needs, employment, and education.

Strength: After graduation many participants become part of the drug court team, and act as mentors to new participants.

Challenge: Court team reports that the county jail is overcrowded limiting the ability of the court to use flash incarcerations as a sanction.

Ventura County

Program type(s): Mental Health Court and Veterans Court

Program elements: Ventura's Veterans Court is for veterans of U.S. military service that have been honorably discharged or in some cases have general/other than honorable discharges and are suspected of having sexual trauma, traumatic brain injury, posttraumatic stress disorder, substance-use disorder, or mental health problems stemming from service. The treatment services provided for veterans include residential care, intensive outpatient treatment, medically supervised care, psychiatric treatment, cognitive behavioral psychotherapy, drug and alcohol testing, drug and alcohol therapy, and veteran peer support groups that enhance the veteran's social and occupational functioning. Ventura's Mental Health Court is for adult mentally ill offenders who have a primary Axis I, DSM-IV diagnosis. Those determined to have a co-occurring substance-use disorder diagnosis, in addition to the other Axis I diagnoses, are also eligible. This program provides specialized substance-use disorder counseling, general psychotherapy, group therapy, case management services, and psychiatric medication.

Strength: The court created a database in-house to store data and run reports for both mental health and veterans treatment court program.

Challenge: The Public Defender's Office has proposed the expansion of the Ventura Veterans Treatment Court. Currently the court and other partner agencies do not have the resources to expand the program.

Collaborative Court Data Profiles

Data presented here include (1) Collaborative Court Referrals, Entries and Exits; (2) Collaborative Courts Race and Ethnic Distribution; (3) Collaborative Courts Gender Distribution; (4) Collaborative Courts Age Distribution; (5) Collaborative Courts Assessed Treatment Needs; (6) Collaborative Court 12-Month Retention Rates; and (7) Collaborative Courts Exit Types. These data tables were distributed to each RRF grantee for review and verification. The accompanying endnotes contain details on the county response to the request for data verification.

Table 1. Collaborative Court Referrals, Entries and Exits

COUNTY	COURT TYPE	QUARTERS REPORTED	REFERRALS	ENTRIES	EXITS
CONTRA COSTA	DV	5	112	90	76
KERN	MH	7	113	26	4
LAKE	VETERAN	6	23	11	2
LOS ANGELES	COLLEGE	6	0	60	12
MENDOCINO	DRUG	6	46	47	19
MERCED	MH	7	75	53	33
MODOC	DRUG	7	16	16	5
PLACER	DRUG	7	107	92	56
PLACER	MH	7	105	88	35
PLACER	PROP 36	7	92	91	32
PLACER	VETERAN	6	48	22	8
SACRAMENTO	BH	4	29	31	9
SAN DIEGO	REENTRY	7	136	80	32
SAN DIEGO	MS	7	1002	1005	338
SAN DIEGO	VETERAN	7	105	47	12
SAN FRANCISCO	MULT/HOUS	7	117	63	37
SAN JOAQUIN	DRUG	7	264	204	45
SAN JOAQUIN	DUI	7	628	628	152
SAN MATEO	MULT	7	109	118	4
SANTA CLARA	MULT/HOUS	7	48	48	14
SANTA CRUZ	MH	7	141	75	26
STANISLAUS	VETERAN	5	48	27	3
TEHAMA	MH	7	89	46	14
TULARE	DUI	7	135	125	52
TULARE	DV	7	127	87	50
TUOLUMNE	DRUG	7	103	74	44
VENTURA	MH	7	280	83	49
VENTURA	VETERAN	7	252	81	31
Grand Totals			4352	3419	1180

Source: Judicial Council of California, Recidivism Reduction Fund Quarterly Reports (July 1, 2015–March 31, 2017).

Table 2. Collaborative Courts Race and Ethnic Distribution

COUNTY	COURT TYPE	BLACK	LATINO	WHITE	OTHER	UNKNOWN	Grand Total
CONTRA COSTA	DV	23%	11%	19%	6%	41%	90
KERN	MH	19%	23%	54%	4%	0%	26
LAKE	VETERAN	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	11
LOS ANGELES	COLLEGE	17%	80%	0%	2%	2%	60
MENDOCINO	DRUG	0%	6%	83%	9%	2%	47
MERCED	MH	23%	36%	38%	4%	0%	53
MODOC	DRUG	0%	6%	81%	13%	0%	16
PLACER	DRUG	3%	17%	72%	8%	0%	92
PLACER	MH	10%	7%	75%	8%	0%	88
PLACER	PROP 36	2%	13%	74%	7%	4%	91
PLACER	VETERAN	0%	0%	68%	32%	0%	22
SACRAMENTO	BH	26%	16%	55%	3%	0%	31
SAN DIEGO	REENTRY	28%	30%	38%	5%	0%	80
SAN DIEGO	MS	16%	34%	44%	5%	0%	1005
SAN DIEGO	VETERAN	23%	26%	43%	9%	0%	47
SAN FRANCISCO	MULT/HOUS	46%	5%	38%	11%	0%	63
SAN JOAQUIN	DRUG	13%	33%	49%	4%	1%	204
SAN JOAQUIN	DUI	14%	51%	23%	12%	0%	628
SAN MATEO	MULT	7%	31%	43%	17%	3%	118
SANTA CLARA	MULT/HOUS	27%	27%	40%	6%	0%	48
SANTA CRUZ	MH	5%	16%	71%	7%	1%	75
STANISLAUS	VETERAN	4%	22%	41%	11%	22%	27
TEHAMA	MH	2%	15%	76%	7%	0%	46
TULARE	DUI	1%	86%	11%	2%	0%	125
TULARE	DV	7%	69%	20%	5%	0%	87
TUOLUMNE	DRUG	1%	9%	84%	5%	0%	74
VENTURA	MH	6%	42%	37%	7%	7%	83
VENTURA	VETERAN	6%	27%	59%	2%	5%	81
Grand Total		13%	35%	42%	8%	2%	3419

Source: Judicial Council of California, Recidivism Reduction Fund Quarterly Reports (July 1, 2015–March 31, 2017).

Table 3. Collaborative Courts Gender Distribution

COUNTY	COURT TYPE	FEMALE	MALE	OTHER/UKNOWN	Grand Total
CONTRA COSTA	DV	4%	71%	24%	90
KERN	MH	38%	62%	0%	26
LAKE	VETERAN	0%	100%	0%	11
LOS ANGELES	COLLEGE	20%	80%	0%	60
MENDOCINO	DRUG	28%	72%	0%	47
MERCED	MH	34%	66%	0%	53
MODOC	DRUG	44%	56%	0%	16
PLACER	DRUG	39%	60%	1%	92
PLACER	MH	26%	74%	0%	88
PLACER	PROP 36	32%	68%	0%	91
PLACER	VETERAN	5%	95%	0%	22
SACRAMENTO	BH	32%	65%	3%	31
SAN DIEGO	REENTRY	9%	91%	0%	80
SAN DIEGO	MS	25%	75%	0%	1005
SAN DIEGO	VETERAN	6%	94%	0%	47
SAN FRANCISCO	MULT/HOUS	16%	83%	2%	63
SAN JOAQUIN	DRUG	19%	81%	0%	204
SAN JOAQUIN	DUI	20%	80%	0%	628
SAN MATEO	MULT	26%	74%	0%	118
SANTA CLARA	MULT/HOUS	21%	79%	0%	48
SANTA CRUZ	MH	16%	84%	0%	75
STANISLAUS	VETERAN	7%	93%	0%	27
TEHAMA	MH	33%	67%	0%	46
TULARE	DUI	11%	89%	0%	125
TULARE	DV	6%	94%	0%	87
TUOLUMNE	DRUG	43%	57%	0%	74
VENTURA	MH	43%	57%	0%	83
VENTURA	VETERAN	9%	91%	0%	81
Grand Total		22%	77%	1%	3419

Source: Judicial Council of California, Recidivism Reduction Fund Quarterly Reports (July 1, 2015–March 31, 2017).

Table 4. Collaborative Courts Age Distribution

COUNTY	COURT TYPE	18-25	26-35	36-45	46-55	Over 55	Unknown	Grand Total
CONTRA COSTA	DV	9%	27%	21%	8%	3%	32%	90
KERN	MH	19%	31%	31%	8%	12%	0%	26
LAKE	VETERAN	0%	9%	18%	36%	27%	9%	11
LOS ANGELES	COLLEGE	78%	22%	0%	0%	0%	0%	60
MENDOCINO	DRUG	4%	51%	26%	9%	0%	11%	47
MERCED	MH	9%	51%	25%	9%	6%	0%	53
MODOC	DRUG	25%	25%	31%	13%	6%	0%	16
PLACER	DRUG	18%	50%	17%	11%	3%	0%	92
PLACER	MH	20%	32%	18%	15%	15%	0%	88
PLACER	PROP 36	9%	37%	34%	16%	3%	0%	91
PLACER	VETERAN	5%	27%	18%	18%	32%	0%	22
SACRAMENTO	BH	10%	39%	29%	19%	3%	0%	31
SAN DIEGO	REENTRY	3%	44%	25%	20%	9%	0%	80
SAN DIEGO	MS	11%	35%	27%	18%	9%	1%	1005
SAN DIEGO	VETERAN	0%	57%	28%	13%	2%	0%	47
SAN FRANCISCO	MULT/HOUS	2%	35%	24%	25%	14%	0%	63
SAN JOAQUIN	DRUG	11%	46%	25%	14%	4%	0%	204
SAN JOAQUIN	DUI	10%	43%	24%	13%	7%	3%	628
SAN MATEO	MULT	14%	35%	25%	15%	10%	0%	118
SANTA CLARA	MULT/HOUS	10%	17%	29%	27%	17%	0%	48
SANTA CRUZ	MH	7%	32%	24%	21%	13%	3%	75
STANISLAUS	VETERAN	0%	44%	22%	15%	19%	0%	27
TEHAMA	MH	15%	37%	24%	11%	11%	2%	46
TULARE	DUI	10%	47%	19%	13%	10%	1%	125
TULARE	DV	32%	38%	20%	9%	0%	1%	87
TUOLUMNE	DRUG	24%	41%	19%	12%	4%	0%	74
VENTURA	MH	16%	39%	18%	17%	11%	0%	83
VENTURA	VETERAN	6%	46%	23%	15%	10%	0%	81
Grand Total		12%	38%	24%	15%	8%	2%	3419

Source: Judicial Council of California, Recidivism Reduction Fund Quarterly Reports (July 1, 2015–March 31, 2017).

Table 5. Collaborative Courts Assessed Treatment Needs

COUNTY	COURT TYPE	SUBSTANCE USE TREATMENT NEEDS	MENTAL HEALTH NEEDS	MENTAL HEALTH & SUBSTANCE USE TREATMENT NEEDS	NO SUBSTANCE USE TREATMENT OR MENTAL HEALTH NEEDS INDICATED	Grand Total
CONTRA COSTA	DV	12%	11%	3%	73%	90
KERN	MH	0%	88%	4%	8%	26
LAKE	VETERAN	0%	0%	64%	36%	11
LOS ANGELES	COLLEGE	0%	0%	0%	100%	60
MENDOCINO	DRUG	70%	2%	21%	6%	47
MERCED	MH	0%	2%	60%	38%	53
MODOC	DRUG	75%	0%	13%	13%	16
PLACER	DRUG	68%	0%	29%	2%	92
PLACER	MH	0%	17%	82%	1%	88
PLACER	PROP 36	48%	0%	1%	51%	91
PLACER	VETERAN	0%	9%	86%	5%	22
SACRAMENTO	BH	42%	23%	32%	3%	31
SAN DIEGO	REENTRY	54%	0%	44%	3%	80
SAN DIEGO	MS	69%	0%	30%	1%	1005
SAN DIEGO	VETERAN	6%	15%	70%	9%	47
SAN FRANCISCO	MULT/HO US	32%	5%	56%	8%	63
SAN JOAQUIN	DRUG	88%	0%	4%	8%	204
SAN JOAQUIN	DUI	23%	1%	1%	74%	628
SAN MATEO	MULT MULT/HO	56%	8%	33%	3%	118
SANTA CLARA	US	0%	71%	0%	29%	48
SANTA CRUZ	MH	1%	5%	93%	0%	75
STANISLAUS	VETERAN	0%	33%	0%	67%	27
TEHAMA	MH	0%	7%	93%	0%	46
TULARE	DUI	74%	0%	0%	26%	125
TULARE	DV	57%	0%	0%	43%	87
TUOLUMNE	DRUG	55%	4%	28%	12%	74
VENTURA	MH	0%	0%	0%	100%	83
VENTURA	VETERAN	0%	0%	0%	100%	81
Grand Total		43%	3%	23%	31%	3419

Source: Judicial Council of California, Recidivism Reduction Fund Quarterly Reports (July 1, 2015–March 31, 2017).

Note: Multiple counties had large values in the column “no reported substance abuse treatment or mental health treatment needs indicated.” The Judicial Council is making efforts to improve the data quality in this column.

Table 6. Collaborative Court 12-Month Retention Rates

COUNTY	COURT TYPE	RETENTION		TOTAL
		NUMBER	RATE	
CONTRA COSTA	DV	11	13%	86
KERN	MH	18	82%	22
LAKE	VETERAN	5	83%	6
LOS ANGELES	COLLEGE	35	73%	48
MENDOCINO	DRUG	29	74%	39
MERCED	MH	24	52%	46
MODOC	DRUG	11	85%	13
PLACER	DRUG	37	50%	74
PLACER	MH	64	84%	76
PLACER	PROP 36	61	73%	83
PLACER	VETERAN	14	82%	17
SACRAMENTO	BH	12	71%	17
SAN DIEGO	REENTRY	18	39%	46
SAN DIEGO	MS	501	69%	723
SAN DIEGO	VETERAN	26	68%	38
SAN FRANCISCO	MULT/HOUS	28	54%	52
SAN JOAQUIN	DRUG	103	83%	124
SAN JOAQUIN	DUI	450	98%	458
SAN MATEO	MULT	94	96%	98
SANTA CLARA	MULT/HOUS	35	92%	38
SANTA CRUZ	MH	48	83%	58
STANISLAUS	VETERAN	15	88%	17
TEHAMA	MH	29	85%	34
TULARE	DUI	77	79%	98
TULARE	DV	38	57%	67
TUOLUMNE	DRUG	37	62%	60
VENTURA	MH	26	41%	64
VENTURA	VETERAN	52	93%	56
Grand Total		1912	72%	2569

Source: Judicial Council of California, Recidivism Reduction Fund Quarterly Data Reports.

Notes: Retention rate expressed as the sum of graduates and continuing participants divided by the number of entries. Table includes data from program quarters 1-3. A complete analysis of retention requires calculation of retention rates at multiple intervals. A 12-month retention rate is used for consistency.

Table 7. Recidivism Reduction Fund Collaborative Court Program Exit Types

COUNTY	COURT TYPE	STILL IN PROGRAM	UNSUCCESSFUL			SUCCESSFUL	OTHER/UNKNOWN EXIT		GRAND TOTAL
			NEW FELONY CHARGE FILED	NEW MISDEMEANOR CHARGE FILED	OTHER	GRADUATED	MOVED	UNKNOWN	
SACRAMENTO	BH	22	1	0	6	2	0	0	31
LOS ANGELES	COLLEGE	45	0	0	15	0	0	0	60
MENDOCINO	DRUG	26	0	0	14	6	1	0	47
MODOC	DRUG	11	0	0	4	1	0	0	16
PLACER	DRUG	27	4	0	41	20	0	0	92
SAN JOAQUIN	DRUG	159	1	0	20	21	3	0	204
TUOLUMNE	DRUG	30	1	0	24	19	0	0	74
SAN JOAQUIN	DUI	476	0	0	5	142	5	0	628
TULARE	DUI	73	3	0	20	29	0	0	125
CONTRA COSTA	DV	14	1	0	6	0	1	68	90
TULARE	DV	37	2	3	29	16	0	0	87
KERN	MH	22	0	0	4	0	0	0	26
MERCED	MH	20	3	0	18	10	2	0	53
PLACER	MH	53	1	0	10	22	2	0	88
SANTA CRUZ	MH	48	2	0	11	12	2	0	75
TEHAMA	MH	32	1	1	2	9	1	0	46
VENTURA	MH	33	0	0	40	7	3	0	83
SAN DIEGO	MS	627	14	4	234	90	36	0	1005
SAN MATEO	MULT	114	0	0	3	0	1	0	118
SAN FRANCISCO	MULT/HOUS	26	2	0	19	13	2	1	63
SANTA CLARA	MULT/HOUS	34	0	0	4	10	0	0	48
PLACER	PROP 36	55	2	1	14	13	6	0	91
SAN DIEGO	REENTRY	48	2	2	27	0	1	0	80
LAKE	VETERAN	9	0	0	1	1	0	0	11
PLACER	VETERAN	14	0	0	4	4	0	0	22
SAN DIEGO	VETERAN	33	0	0	12	2	0	0	47
STANISLAUS	VETERAN	24	0	0	2	1	0	0	27
VENTURA	VETERAN	49	1	1	4	26	0	0	81
Grand Total	ALL COURT TYPES	2176	41	12	593	476	66	69	3419

Source: Judicial Council of California Recidivism Reduction Fund Quarterly Reports (July1, 2015-March 31, 2017). Table includes only participants for whom exit dates were reported.

Notes: OTHER UNSUCCESSFUL includes all non-criminal, non-graduated program terminations including failure to appear, absconded, death, or other unspecified unsuccessful.

Collaborative Court Data Endnotes

Data have been verified for the following grantees: San Francisco, Santa Clara, Tehama, and Tulare.

Requests for data verification are still outstanding for the following grantees: Contra Costa, Kern, Lake, Los Angeles, Mendocino, Merced, Modoc, Placer and Sacramento.

Requests for data verification have been received and corrections are pending for the following grantees: Ventura, Santa Cruz, San Diego and San Joaquin.

San Joaquin’s data in table 5 include assessment information collected at program entry. If subsequent assessments for substance use disorder or mental health needs were administered, they are not reflected in the table.

San Diego’s overall numbers do not include individuals who were in their collaborative court programs before July 1, 2015.

Superior Court of San Diego County			
Table	Reentry Court (RCP)	Mandatory Supervision (MS)	Veterans Treatment Court
1	Note: “Entries” does not include those who were enrolled in the program before the grant reporting period began.	Note: Data was entered for those people entering mandatory supervision on/after July 1, 2015. The average length of Mandatory Supervision from July 2015 to June 2017 is one year, 10 months.	Note: “Entries” does not include those who were enrolled in the program before the grant reporting period began.
7	Note: The program graduated 10 participants during the grant reporting period. They were not counted because Entry data was not recorded for these individuals.	Note: Unsuccessful - Other category includes people who chose to serve the balance of their term in jail.	Note: VTC graduated an additional 25 participants during the grant reporting period. They were not counted because they entered the program prior to the July 1, 2015 grant start.

Attachment E. Establishing Data Elements and Outcome Measures

In addition to its grant administration duties, the Budget Act of 2014 also requires that the JCC establish performance-based outcome measures. To accomplish these tasks, Criminal Justice Services (CJS) identified data elements that will provide the basis of the outcome measurement and established data collection procedures for the secure and confidential transmission of data from the counties to CJS.

CJS reviewed and consulted with national, state, and local subject matter experts in the fields of pretrial detention and collaborative courts to identify data elements and subsequent outcomes measures for the program. The Chief Probation Officers of California and local probation officers (Orange County and Napa County) were also asked to review the data elements and provide subject matter expert feedback on their validity and feasibility of data collection. Other subject matter experts and sources are listed below.

- Pretrial Program data and performance measures sources include:
 - The National Institute of Corrections (NIC)—Pretrial Executives Network
 - The Pretrial Justice Institute (PJI), www.pretrial.org/download/performance-measures/Measuring%20What%20Matters.pdf
 - Marie Van Nostrand, Ph.D. (pretrial subject matter expert reviewed the completed list of data elements and provided feedback and recommendations)
- Collaborative Court data and performance measures sources:
 - The Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA), www.bja.gov/evaluation/program-adjudication/drug-court-logic-model.pdf
 - The National Drug Court Institute, www.ncjrs.gov/App/Publications/abstract.aspx?ID=237452
 - The National Center for State Courts (NCSC), <http://cdm16501.contentdm.oclc.org/cdm/ref/collection/spcts/id/171>
 - NPC Research (Collaborative Court Cost Benefit Study subject matter experts reviewed the completed list of data elements and provided feedback and recommendations)

CJS formed two research advisory groups (one for pretrial release programs and one for collaborative courts). These research advisory groups, comprised of three volunteer practitioners from pretrial grantee jurisdictions and three volunteer practitioners from collaborative court program grantee jurisdictions, reviewed the data elements and provided feedback regarding data collection feasibility and validity. CJS incorporated this feedback and worked collaboratively with the research advisory groups to create standardized data definitions and protocols for the collection and sharing of individual-level data to ensure data confidentiality.