

BEXAR COUNTY

Judicial Services

BEXAR COUNTY JUDICIAL MANAGEMENT REPORT

SPECIALTY COURTS 3rd QUARTER REPORT FY 2015-16 (April, 2016- June, 2016)

JUDICIAL SYSTEM WORKLOAD AND EFFICIENCY MEASURES

Brief Summary:

This report is based on FY 2015-2016 between the months of April and June (Quarter 3). Bexar County operates ten Specialty Courts (also referred to commonly and in research as problem-solving courts), including,

- 1) Family Drug Court,
- 2) Felony Drug Court/ Felony Re-Entry Court
- 3) Esperanza Court (Prostitution Prevention Program)
- 4) Misdemeanor Drug Court,
- 5) Misdemeanor Mental Health Court, and
- 6) Misdemeanor Veterans Court
- 7) Misdemeanor DWI Court
- 8) Juvenile Mental Health*
- 9) Juvenile Drug Court*

* For the purpose of this report, only data from the adult courts are being presented.

These Problem Solving Courts go beyond the traditional court functions of applying the law and deciding guilt and punishment, but work on modifying criminal behavior that's harmful and costly both to the people who engage in it or to the community. The Bexar County Specialty Courts, as most specialty courts nationwide, were established to help divert certain case types of defendants from the mainstream court adjudication processes to be dealt with in a different, individualized intensive manner as the traditional court processes were found to ineffective.

This report focuses on the following five measures and shows how the individual courts performed in each of these measures.


- Measure 1: Incoming Cases
- Measure 2: Number of Participants/Caseload
- Measure 3: Number of Cases heard at Docket Meetings
- Measure 4: Retention Rates
- Measure 5; Completion Rates

Measure 1: Incoming Cases

Definition: The average monthly number of defendants or clientele referred to the Court and the number accepted into the program or denied due to ineligibility.

Analysis and Interpretation: The average monthly number of referrals to the Court is a measure of the incoming workload. Each referral is reviewed by staff from different agencies to determine eligibility to the program. The reviews result in the referrals being accepted or denied access into the program or still pending eligibility as staff waits for additional information. The following table shows the average monthly number of referrals reviewed by the Court staff during 3rd Quarter FY 2015-16 and the results of those reviews. The first chart displays the average number of referrals for a month for each Court.

Average Monthly Cases Reviewed	3rd Qtr. FY 2016				
	Reviewed	Pending	Accepted	Denied	Refused
Family Drug Court	30.0	21.0	5.7	23.7	10.0
Felony Drug Court (FDC)/Felony Re-Entry Court	25.7	4.0	14.7	7.7	0.7
Esperanza Court	4.3	8.0	0.7	1.0	1.0
Misdemeanor Drug Court	6.0	18.3	4.0	2.0	0.7
Misdemeanor Mental Health Court	135.7	98.0	6.3	107.3	14.7
Misdemeanor Veteran's Court	20.0	95.3	6.7	11.7	5.7
Misdemeanor DWI Court	11.7	50.3	4.3	6.0	2.3
Totals	233.3	295.0	42.3	159.3	35.0




Reviews of incoming referrals can result in several outcomes,


- 1) Pending - staff is waiting for additional documentation before a decision is made for eligibility;
- 2) Accepted – staff has determined the referral is eligible for program participation and the clientele has accepted the program requirements;
- 3) Denied – staff has determined the referral is not eligible for the program; or

- 4) Refused – staff has determined the referral is eligible for the program, but the clientele has refused to participate due the program requirements.

The following chart shows the average monthly results of the referral reviews for eligibility for all the specialty courts.



The following chart displays a comparison of average monthly referrals for eligibility for all the specialty courts for this quarter compared with previous quarters.




Measure 2: Caseload


Definition: The caseload is the average monthly number of participants in the court program.

Analysis and Interpretation: The caseload is the number of program participants who are seen on a routine basis, their cases reviewed by staff regularly with the Court and the participant heard at Court dockets. The caseload measures the ongoing workload of the specialty court. The first table below displays the average caseload size during the 3rd Quarter FY 2015-16 for each specialty court. The second table lists the court staffing. The chart depicts the number of participants per staff ration for each specialty court. The final chart displays a comparison of the Participants per Staff Ratio with previous quarters.

Average Specialty Court Caseload	3rd Qtr. FY 2016
<i>Family Drug Court</i>	63
<i>Felony Drug Court/Felony Re-Entry Court</i>	217
<i>Esperanza Court</i>	20
<i>Misdemeanor Drug Court</i>	57
<i>Misdemeanor Mental Health Court</i>	58
<i>Misdemeanor Veteran's Court</i>	97
<i>Misdemeanor DWI Court</i>	50




Average Specialty Court Caseload	3rd Qtr Ave.	Staffing					Participants/Staff
		Crt Mgr/Prj Dir.	Case Mgr	Prob. Off.	Other	Total	
Family Drug Court	63	1	2	0	0	3	20.9
Felony Drug Court/Felony Re-Entry Court	217	0.5	5	4	2.5	12	18.1
Esperanza Court	20	0	1	1	0	2	9.8
Misdemeanor Drug Court	57	0.5	1	2	0.2	3.7	15.5
Misdemeanor Mental Health Court	58	1	2	2	1	6	9.7
Misdemeanor Veteran's Court	97	2	1	2	0	5	19.5
Misdemeanor DWI Court	50	0.5	1	1	0.8	3.3	15.1
Total	562	6	13	12	5	35	16.0



Note:

- 1) Caseload standard is set by Community Justice Assistance Division (CJAD) of the TDCJ to be 45 cases per Probation Officer.
- 2) Bexar County staffing includes court managers or project directors, case managers, probation officers, associate judge and support staff, such as intake specialists or data analysts.

Participants/Staffing Ratio by Quarter




DRAFT

Measure 3: Number of Case Reviews


Definition: The average number of case reviews monthly at staff meetings or during court sessions.

Analysis and Interpretation: The number of case reviewed during case staffings or court sessions is a measure of the daily case work. This is a measure of the court workload and represents the actual day to day workings of the Specialty Court. Participants in the case staffings include the Judge, probation officers, case managers, prosecuting attorneys defense attorneys and often representatives of the community providers. This measure takes into consideration the number of times the case staffing were conducted to discuss cases and the number of court sessions that were held with the participant present and interacting with the Judge. The following table displays the average number of case reviews in a month during the 2nd Quarter FY 2015-16. The following 2 charts provide a breakdown by specialty court the number of case staffings and dockets


Total Monthly Case Reviews	3rd Qtr.	
	Case Staffings	Dockets
Family Drug Court	521	403
Felony Drug Court/Felony Re-Entry Court	1020	999
Esperanza Court	64	64
Misdemeanor Drug Court	259	288
Misdemeanor Mental Health Court	477	331
Misdemeanor Veteran's Court	303	303
Misdemeanor DWI Court	227	251
Total Cases Reviewed	2871	2639




3rd Qtr. Docket Reviews



Number of Staffing Reviews by Quarter







DRAFT

Measure 4: Retention Rates

Definition: The percentage of participants who remain in the program compared to the number of clients who exit the program.


Analysis and Interpretation: The retention rate is the ratio, expressed as a percentage, of participants who exited the program during the quarter compared against the number of participants who remained in the program. The higher the retention rate reflects the level sustainability of the program. The first chart displays the retention rate by specialty court for the 3rd Quarter FY 2015-16. The second graph shows a comparison of the retention rate for the quarter with the previous quarters.



Measure 5: Program Completion Rates

Definition: The percentage of clients who successfully complete the program compared to the number of participants in the program.

Analysis and Interpretation: The number of participants who successfully complete the program is a measure of the program's effectiveness. The completion rate is the ratio, expressed as a percentage, of participants who completed the program during the quarter compared against the number of participants in the program. The first chart displays the completion rate by specialty court for the 3rd Quarter FY 2015-16. The second graph shows a comparison of the completion rate for the quarter with the previous quarters.



Note: Some Specialty Courts may only graduate participants on a semi-annual basis.

