



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 July 27–28, 2017

Title	Agenda Item Type
Juvenile Dependency: Proposed Allocation for Fiscal Year 2017–2018 for Court Appointed Special Advocate Local Assistance	Action Required
Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected	Effective Date
N/A	July 28, 2017
Recommended by	Date of Report
Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee	June 22, 2017
Hon. Jerilyn L. Borack, Co-chair	Contact
Hon. Mark A. Juhas, Co-chair	Don Will, 415-865-7557 don.will@jud.ca.gov

Executive Summary

The Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee recommends approving Court Appointed Special Advocate (CASA) program grant funding allocations for fiscal year 2017–2018. The recommended allocations were calculated based on the CASA funding methodology approved by the Judicial Council at its August 2013 business meeting. Allocations will fund 45 programs serving 50 counties.

Recommendation

The Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee recommends that the Judicial Council, effective July 28, 2017, allocate \$2.213 million for CASA local assistance grants to 45 CASA programs serving 50 counties using the council’s funding methodology (established in 2013).

Previous Council Action

Legislation (Stats. 1988, ch. 723) amended Welfare and Institutions Code section 100 et seq. to require the Judicial Council to establish guidelines encouraging the development of local CASA programs that assist abused and neglected children who are the subject of judicial proceedings.

The legislation also called for the establishment of a CASA grant program to be administered by the Judicial Council and required CASA programs to provide local matching—or in-kind—funds equal to program funding received from the Judicial Council. At the February 9, 1999, meeting, the Judicial Council delegated approval of the allocation of the Judicial Council CASA grant funds to the Executive and Planning Committee (E&P).

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

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

Rationale for Recommendation

The state judicial branch budget for Judicial Council CASA grants for fiscal year (FY) 2017–2018 is \$2.213 million. The committee recommends that the methodology be applied, providing CASA programs and those programs that are eligible for the financial incentives with a baseline allocation. These funding allocations are available in Attachment A.

Comments, Alternatives Considered, and Policy Implications

The committee has no alternatives or policy implications to present this fiscal year.

Implementation Requirements, Costs, and Operational Impacts

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

¹ Judicial Council of California, Advisory Com. Rep., *Juvenile Dependency: Court Appointed Special Advocate Program Funding Methodology* (Aug. 23, 2013), www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20130823-itemM.pdf (as of June 27, 2017).

Relevant Strategic Plan Goals and Operational Plan Objectives

The proposed CASA funding methodology aligns with multiple strategic and operational goals established by the Judicial Council. The proposed methodology supports Goal II, Independence and Accountability, in that it includes revisions that incentivize efficient and effective use of Judicial Council funding distributed to CASA programs each fiscal year.

Recruitment of court-appointed special advocates requires extensive screening and training of individuals. One of the proposed incentives in the CASA funding methodology rewards programs that retain these qualified, experienced volunteers, thereby supporting Goal III, Modernization of Management and Administration.

Attachment

- 1. Attachment A: Proposed Allocation for FY 2017–2018 Judicial Council Local Assistance*

**Attachment A: Proposed Allocation for FY 2017-2018
Judicial Council Local Assistance**

Local CASA Programs by County(ies)	Base Allocations	Incentive 2A*	Incentive 2B*	Total Incentives	Total JC Local Assistance Grant
Alameda	\$50,000	0	0	\$0	\$50,000
Amador	\$26,000	1	1	\$20,900	\$46,900
Butte/Glenn	\$51,000	0	0	\$0	\$51,000
Contra Costa	\$50,000	0	0	\$0	\$50,000
Del Norte	\$26,000	0	0	\$0	\$26,000
El Dorado	\$34,000	1	1	\$20,900	\$54,900
Fresno/Madera	\$75,000	1	0	\$10,450	\$85,450
Humboldt	\$26,000	1	0	\$10,450	\$36,450
Imperial	\$34,000	1	1	\$20,900	\$54,900
Inyo/Mono	\$39,000	1	1	\$20,900	\$59,900
Kern	\$50,000	0	0	\$0	\$50,000
Kings	\$34,000	0	0	\$0	\$34,000
Lassen	\$26,000	0	1	\$10,450	\$36,450
Los Angeles	\$50,000	0	0	\$0	\$50,000
Marin	\$34,000	1	0	\$10,450	\$44,450
Mariposa	\$26,000	1	1	\$20,900	\$46,900
Mendocino/Lake	\$51,000	1	0	\$10,450	\$61,450
Merced	\$34,000	0	0	\$0	\$34,000
Modoc	\$26,000	1	1	\$20,900	\$46,900
Monterey	\$42,000	0	0	\$0	\$42,000
Napa	\$34,000	1	1	\$20,900	\$54,900
Nevada	\$26,000	1	1	\$20,900	\$46,900
Orange	\$50,000	1	0	\$10,450	\$60,450
Placer	\$42,000	1	1	\$20,900	\$62,900
Plumas	\$26,000	1	0	\$10,450	\$36,450
Riverside	\$50,000	0	0	\$0	\$50,000
Sacramento	\$50,000	0	0	\$0	\$50,000
San Benito	\$26,000	0	1	\$10,450	\$36,450
San Bernardino	\$50,000	0	0	\$0	\$50,000
San Diego	\$50,000	1	1	\$20,900	\$70,900
San Francisco	\$42,000	0	0	\$0	\$42,000
San Joaquin	\$42,000	0	0	\$0	\$42,000
San Luis Obispo	\$34,000	1	1	\$20,900	\$54,900
San Mateo	\$42,000	0	1	\$10,450	\$52,450
Santa Barbara	\$42,000	0	1	\$10,450	\$52,450
Santa Clara	\$50,000	0	1	\$10,450	\$60,450
Santa Cruz	\$34,000	0	1	\$10,450	\$44,450
Shasta/Tehama	\$51,000	0	0	\$0	\$51,000
Siskiyou	\$26,000	1	1	\$20,900	\$46,900
Solano	\$42,000	0	0	\$0	\$42,000
Sonoma	\$42,000	0	1	\$10,450	\$52,450

**Attachment A: Proposed Allocation for FY 2017-2018
Judicial Council Local Assistance**

Stanislaus	\$42,000	1	0	\$10,450	\$52,450
Tulare	\$42,000	0	0	\$0	\$42,000
Ventura	\$42,000	1	0	\$10,450	\$52,450
Yolo	\$34,000	0	1	\$10,450	\$44,450
Cost & Top Programs	\$1,795,000	20	20	\$418,000	\$2,213,000

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

Total Local Assistance Grant	\$2,213,000
Total Base Amounts	\$1,795,000
Incentive Award for Top 20 Programs @ \$10,450 (x 40)	\$418,000
Total expenditures= Base + 40 incentives	\$2,213,000