



Judicial Department

FY 2015-16 Performance Report

November 1, 2016

The Judicial Department (“Department”) consists of the Colorado Supreme Court, Colorado Court of Appeals, trial courts, probation, and the State Court Administrator’s Office. The Department strives to protect constitutional and statutory rights and liberties; assure equal access; provide fair, timely and constructive resolution of cases; enhance public safety; supervise offenders; and facilitate victim and community reparations. Article VI of the Colorado Constitution and section 13-4-101, C.R.S. (2015) provide the constitutional and statutory authority for the state courts. Sections 18-1.3-201 and 18-1.3-202, C.R.S. (2015) provide the statutory authority for probation.

The Department developed the following five principle strategies to meet the priorities of the Department:



1. Provide equal access to the legal system and give all an opportunity to be heard;
2. Treat all with dignity, respect, and concern for their rights and cultural backgrounds, and without bias or appearance of bias;
3. Promote quality judicial decision-making and judicial leadership;
4. Implement quality assessments and community supervision of adult and juvenile probationers to demonstrably enhance public safety and respect for victim rights; and
5. Cultivate public trust and confidence through the thoughtful stewardship of public resources.

The Department has also identified three major performance measures to gauge our success in implementing the five principle strategies. The three major performance measures include: (1) access and fairness surveys; (2) time standards for district and county courts; and (3) Probation client success rates. The Department regularly evaluates these performance measures, and the following three pages illustrate our most recent evaluation of the measures. In addition, the Department’s performance plan can be found at:

<http://www.courts.state.co.us/Administration/Division.cfm?Division=pa>

Performance Measure

Access and Fairness surveys continue to be conducted throughout the State to assess ratings of court users on the court's accessibility and its treatment of customers in terms of fairness, equality, and respect. This measure provides a tool for surveying all court users about their experience in the courthouse. Comparison of results by location and district assist in informing court management practices. To date, over 15,000 court users statewide have responded to these surveys.



Performance Measure

Performance goals for Courts and Probation have been established through various means, including Chief Justice Directive 08-05 (Case Management Standards). This directive was developed with input from judges and establishes aspirational time processing goals for each case class. Information about each district's progress in meeting the goals is reported quarterly. Information for individual judges is provided to the Judicial Performance Commission during each judge's retention evaluation. The tables below reflect the ***Time Standards for District and County courts.***

TABLE 1			
District Court Case Management Time Standards			
Established Pursuant CJD 08-05			
Case Class	Pending Cases Exceeding Target		Target
	4th Quarter FY 2015	4th Quarter FY 2016	
Civil	12.1%	10.2%	No more than 10% of cases open more than one year.
Criminal	4.5%	4.3%	No more than 5% of cases open more than one year.
Domestic Relations	3.4%	3.3%	No more than 5% of cases open more than one year.
Juvenile Delinquency	2.3%	2.6%	No more than 5% of cases open more than one year.
Dependency and Neglect (over 6 years old)*	3.2%	1.5%	No more than 5% of cases open more than 18 months
Dependency and Neglect (under 6 years old)*	7.1%	3.4%	No more than 10% of cases open more than one year.

* The standards in dependency and neglect are under review. This measure shows time to first permanency hearing.
A more optimal measure would be time to true permanent placement or termination of court jurisdiction.

TABLE 2			
County Court Case Management Time Standards			
Established Pursuant CJD 08-05			
Case Class	Pending Cases Exceeding Target		Target
	4th Quarter FY 2015	4th Quarter FY 2016	
Civil	7.5%	4.9%	No more than 5% of cases open more than six months.
Misdemeanor	13.2%	12.7%	No more than 10% of cases open more than six months.
Small Claims	3.4%	1.8%	No more than 1% of cases open more than six months.
Traffic	6.3%	6.8%	No more than 5% of cases open more than six months.
DUI/DWAI	15.3%	12.2%	No more than 20% of cases open more than seven months

Performance Measure

One of the main goals of **probation** is to effect long term behavior change. By focusing on issues that relate to criminal behavior, probation officers can increase the likelihood that adults and juveniles placed on probation will make lasting, pro-social behavior change. Measuring outcomes and providing feedback is a critical piece of implementing efficient and effective practices in probation.

This chart provides feedback for one measurement of performance: successful completion of probation. The chart lists the statewide success rates, and the percentage and actual number of terminations for FY 2015 and FY 2016.

Note: intensive program terminations include those cases terminated directly from the program as well as those probationers who completed the program and are transitioning from the intensive program to regular supervision. Due to the small number of probationers in some programs, success rates may experience fluctuations.

Colorado State Probation Success Rates		
Program	FY 2015 Statewide	FY 2016 Statewide
Regular Adult	63% (14,743)	63% (15,276)
Adult Intensive Supervision Program	49% (309)	53% (282)
Female Offender Program	57% (95)	55% (93)
Sex Offender Intensive Supervision Program	47% (144)	62% (182)
Regular Juvenile	70% (1,953)	71% (1,799)
Juvenile Intensive Supervision Program	43% (96)	41% (77)

When a probationer's case has terminated, Victim Services Officers send out a victim satisfaction survey to victims who have requested notification of probation status. Each calendar year the results are compiled into a statewide report. The results shown include the victims' responses regarding probation's performance and the performance of other criminal justice agencies.



Note: Not every question was answered by each survey respondent. The (n) indicates the number of respondents who answered each specific question.