

# IDC Statutory Discretionary Grant Program

## -SUCSESSES-

- Grants got the IDC up and running. After only three years, we know a lot more about local indigent defense services successes and challenges with nearly 70% of counties using IDC funding to improve aspects of their indigent defense systems.
- Grants are the only existing mechanism and infrastructure for state oversight of indigent defense services, data collection, and IDC operation.
- Successes [achieving meaningful system improvements] is far easier where there's a shared IDC/County vision/understanding, and the problem is primarily \$\$.
- Grants succeed in areas of indigent defense where the county nexus is closest. E.g. Where county prosecutors control volume/inputs of system and independent judges adjudicate. E.g. Adult criminal & juvenile delinquency cases.

Preserves  
Local  
Control

## -LIMITATIONS-

- Ineffective for areas of indigent defense where there is no local nexus/state controls the system. E.g. Appeals & Child Welfare cases. No local prosecutor involved.
- Short term grants inadequate for long term needs.
- Cannot use grants for meaningful system change without significant stakeholder buy-in (discretionary not mandatory).
- Program is overly dependent on relationships and personalities, and is not independently sustainable.
- Cannot ensure actual attorney effectiveness or oversight because no direct contact or oversight between IDC & attorneys.
- Only enforcement option = to deny/recall funding and end state oversight. Nuclear option.