

To: Ways and Means Public Safety Subcommittee members
February 9, 2015
Follow-up to Criminal Justice Commission's testimony re KPM #2,

CJC looked at grant administration for JRI and specialty courts, as these are 97% of our grant funds. JRI resulted in a 100% as it only required a participation letter and the county to receive the funds. No monitoring or other expectations were created as part of the first allocation of funds and the primary measure in place was the overall statewide prison use, which was looked at quarterly.

We also looked at the 34 specialty court programs we fund. We looked at the following: 1) were the programs spending their grant funds as proposed, 2) were the actual numbers served consistent with what the projected numbers to be served as stated in their application, 3) were the programs current on their quarterly reporting and 4) were they missing any grant mandated requirements or training.

There were 5 programs falling short of their projected numbers, but at the same time were current with reporting, mandated training and spending as stated in their application. The programs are listed below with the "why".

1. Clackamas Juvenile Drug Court – more analysis needed, but in general juvenile courts are not faring well in the research, 77% are found to be less effective. 23% below target
2. Josephine Adult Drug Court – arrest and charging practices have impacted this court's eligible participants, 40% below target.
3. Lane Adult Drug Court – eligibility criteria and charging practices impacted this court's numbers, 44% below target
4. Jefferson & Crook Adult Drug Court – more analysis needed, however, turnover in personnel did impact eligibility and screening practices, 48% below target
5. Marion Juvenile Drug Court – more analysis needed, but in general juvenile courts are not faring well in research, 77% are found to be less effective. 25% below target.