A. Description of the Issue

The 2020 California Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant program will focus on violence reduction and recidivism. The Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC) is in year one of the California three-year state strategy. The BSCC Board approved a three-year JAG cycle covering October 1, 2019 - September 1, 2022. The Board considered modifications to the state strategy in 2018 and determined the existing strategy was reflective of the state's current needs.

<u>History</u>

In March 2013, the BSCC collaborated with the National Criminal Justice Association (NCJA) to develop a stakeholder engagement strategy. As part of this approach, input was sought from traditional and non-traditional partners to better understand:

- Past investments;
- Priority project types and initiatives within the seven JAG purpose areas; and,
- Priority purpose areas for funding.

These discussions led to the development of a 14-question JAG Survey. The survey was designed so that responses could be sorted by function within the criminal justice system. Analysis focused on finding consensus around the JAG purpose areas in greatest need of limited funds and determining which projects in each purpose area were viewed as most critical to California's state and local criminal justice systems. Almost 900 respondents provided feedback. Responses were aggregated and analyzed by NCJA to show areas of consensus. Survey results identified three Program Purpose Areas (PPA) and the top areas of need within each purpose area as shown below:

JAG 2013 Survey Results		
Top Three (3) JAG Program Purpose Areas (PPA)	Top Areas of Need within Each PPA	
Prevention and Education	Gang Initiatives	
	Juvenile Delinquency	
	Substance Abuse	
	School Violence	
Law Enforcement	Gang Violence	
	Violent Crime Reduction Drug Enforcement	
	Gun Violence Reduction	
Prosecution, Courts and Defense	Problem' Solving Courts	
	 Gun/Gang Prosecution Violent Crime Prosecution and Defense 	
	Court-Based Restorative	
	Justice Initiatives	
	Innovations in Indigent	

California State Strategy/Funding Priorities for FY 2020

On January 26, 2018 the BSCC convened an Executive Steering Committee (ESC) composed of subject matter experts to develop the state strategy and Request for Proposals (RFP). During the meeting the ESC heard presentations from JAG grantees and reviewed the results of the JAG 2013 Survey. The ESC determined that not enough time had passed to warrant a new assessment of the state strategy and that the strategy was still responsive to California's needs. The ESC recommended maintaining the current PPAs and RFP principles, including an award to the California Department of Justice (less than \$10,000 requirement).

On November 8, 2018 the Board agreed to adopt the JAG 2013 Survey responses as part of the JAG RFP and the state strategy for the period covering October 1, 2019 - September 1, 2022. A synopsis of the three-year strategy is provided below:

California Three-year Strategy for the Byrne JAG Program for 2020

- (1) The strategy will honor responses from the California stakeholders in the survey with priority given to the survey supported areas of:
 - a) Prevention and Education
 - b) Law Enforcement
 - c) Prosecution, Courts and Defense
- (2) The needs of small, medium, and large counties will be taken into account.
- (3) Funding will be based on local flexibility and on the needs of the juvenile and adult criminal justice communities and on input from a balanced array of stakeholders.
- (4) Applicants must demonstrate a collaborative strategy based on the Community Engagement Model that involves multiple stakeholders in the project or problem addressed.
- (5) Some emphasis in the strategy will be given to the development of innovative and/or promising strategies to reduce recidivism.

A competitive JAG RFP was released in December 2018. All applicants were required to submit proposals in alignment with the JAG PPAs and the state strategy. On September 12, 2019 the Board approved funding for 27 counties for approximately \$16.2 million for a period covering October 1, 2019 - September 30, 2022. On September 12, 2019 the Board was briefed on the process for completing the next five-year state strategy. The BSCC has already contacted NCJA to develop a plan for the rollout of the next statewide survey in late 2020.

Subgrantee Award Process and Timelines

To ensure successful program design and implementation, the BSCC uses Executive Steering Committees (ESCs) to make decisions related to the BSCC's programs. ESCs are composed of subject matter experts and stakeholders representing both the public and private sectors. The BSCC includes diverse representation on its ESCs in breadth of experience, geography, and demographics. ESCs are convened and approved by the BSCC Board, as the need arises, to carry out specified tasks, including state strategies and the development of RFPs for grant funds. ESCs submit grant award recommendations to the BSCC Board and the Board then approves, rejects, or revises those recommendations. This JAG ESC includes a cross-section of subject matter experts as shown below:

JAG ESC Membership		
1	Linda Penner, Chair	ESC Chairperson, Chairperson, Board of State and Community Corrections
2	Mark Delgado	Executive Director, Los Angeles County's Countywide Criminal Justice Coordination Committee, Los Angeles County
3	David Fernandez	Senior Special Agent, California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation
4	Robin Lipetzky	Public Defender, Contra Costa County
5	Lyle Martin	Police Chief, Bakersfield Police Department, Kern County
6	Steve Meinrath	Attorney, Sacramento County
7	Jonathan Raven	Chief Deputy District Attorney, Yolo County
8	Darren Thompson	Sheriff-Coroner, San Benito County
9	Erik Upson	Police Chief, Benicia Police Department, Solano County
10	Erica Webster	Juvenile Justice Advocate, Sacramento County
11	Charles Wilhite	Ph. D., Director, Criminal Justice, Azusa Pacific University, San Diego

The JAG ESC convened in January, May, and July 2019 to develop the RFP and discuss the proposals that were submitted as part of the competitive process. Thirty-two proposals were considered for funding. Eligible applicants were restricted to California's 58 counties and the RFP allowed two or more counties to partner in a submission. ESC members developed the RFP content and the criteria by which proposals would be scored. As part of the ESC process, all members were trained on how to objectively read and rate proposals in an equitable manner. The highest rated proposals were recommended for

funding. In all, 27 proposals were deemed the most meritorious through the ESC review process. The Board accepted the ESC funding recommendations in September 2019.

Program Descriptions

The BSCC limits the JAG grant funds to government programs designed within the state strategy PPAs of Prevention and Education; Law Enforcement; and Prosecution, Courts, Defense and Indigent Defense. The BSCC does not require grantees to operate specific programs but does require grantees to use principles of evidence-based practice in the selection of local projects. The state strategy also allows subrecipients to select promising and innovative projects/programs for implementation based on the needs of the community. A list of subrecipients and program descriptions of programs funded in 2020 award are provided as attachment with this application. The less-than-\$10,000 allocation is awarded non-competitively to the California Department of Justice (CA DOJ), a state-level law enforcement agency, to support regional task force commanders.

Budget Information

Pursuant to the March 13, 2020 email from the BJA Deputy Director, BSCC will submit a placeholder 2020 budget in the amount of one dollar.

B. Project Design and Implementation

State Level Engagement and Participation

Since 2012 the BSCC has embraced the leadership, direction and philosophy of both Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) and the National Criminal Justice Association (NCJA) concerning technical assistance, strategic planning, evidence-based principles, and data driven strategies for the JAG program. California has adopted the principles of the JAG program first announced in the 2013 JAG solicitation, when BJA placed an emphasize on the state strategic plan, planning, and the process of using a community-engagement model to guide local JAG projects now and in the future.

As noted previously, the BSCC used an ESC process to help inform the JAG state strategy and the develop an RFP. ESCs are appointed by the BSCC, as the need arises, to carry out specified tasks and to submit findings and recommendations to the BSCC. The Board then approves, rejects or revises those recommendations.

The current Board membership is provided below:

	Board Membership		
1	Linda Penner	Chair, Board of State and Community Corrections	
2	Ralph Diaz	Secretary of CDCR	
3	Jeffrey Green	Director of Adult Parole Operation	
4	Dean Growdon	Sheriff of Lassen County	
5	William Gore	Sheriff of San Diego County	
6	Lee Seale	Chief Probation Officer of Sacramento County	
7	Gordon S. Baranco	Retired Judge, Alameda County	
8	Michael Ertola	Chief Probation Officer of Nevada County	
9	Andrew Mills	Chief of Police of Santa Cruz	
10	Scott Budnick	Founder of Anti-Recidivism Coalition	
11	David Steinhart	Director of Juvenile Justice Program Commonweal	
12	Norma Cumpian	Women's and Non-Binary Services Manager, Anti- Recidivism Coalition	
13	Vacant	A county supervisor or county administrative officer. This member shall be appointed by the Governor, subject to Senate confirmation	

Each Board approved ESC is led by a Chair. The role of the Chair is to ensure that the Committee completes its assigned task within scope and on time. The Chair leads the meetings and facilitates the group discussion. Working with BSCC staff, the Chair names the appropriate members to the committee, develops the meeting agendas and represents the committee to the Board.

The role of the ESC member is to attend and actively participate in ESC meetings. Working collaboratively, ESC members develop recommendations and/or work product in accordance with the stated purpose of the ESC.

Community Engagement and Participation

JAG subrecipients are required to form a local JAG Steering Committee comprised of stakeholders representing diverse disciplines who have experience and expertise in the proposed local interventions. The JAG Steering Committee is tasked with developing and maintaining a local three-year strategy in one-year increments. At a minimum, the local three-year strategy is used to plan, prioritize activities, identify challenges, and foster collaborative relationships. This process has led to increased engagement from traditional and non-traditional stakeholders.

The local JAG Steering Committee shall represent a significant cross-section of juvenile and/or criminal justice stakeholders, depending on the intervention chosen, within the grantee's county. The committee's composition should include a diverse representation of traditional and non-trinational stakeholders. Examples of non-traditional stakeholders

could include community-based and faith-based organizations, educators, and social service providers, family member of a criminal justice involved person, job developers, advocacy groups, or citizens. Examples of traditional stakeholders could include law enforcement, prosecution, probation, courts, and other city and county departments. Each county shall determine the total number of members to serve on the local JAG Steering Committee and ensure the same voting rights are extended to all members.

Stakeholders identified for membership on the local JAG Steering Committee shall possess a working knowledge of the problem areas being discussed within the identified JAG priorities (Prevention and Education; Law Enforcement; and Prosecution, Courts, Defense and Indigent Defense). The local JAG Steering Committee will be used to:

- Identify priorities and the community needs. At a minimum, this should include community outreach.
- Determine the intervention (PPA) type needed to address the local need.
- Develop the local strategies to address the local community need.
- Identify the projects and/or services to be provided to address the community need.
- Develop written operational policies/procedures for the Local JAG Steering Committee to include but not be limited to meeting frequency of not less than once a year, maintenance of agendas and meeting minutes. The written policy/procedure should also include strategies for inclusion of the local community members at the meetings. Applicants may add any other information that they would like.
- Provide ongoing oversight of the project.

Addressing Gaps

JAG subrecipients are encouraged to proactively address gaps in consultation with the BSCC. Typically, subrecipients self-identify challenges and develop solutions that meet their needs. Prior subrecipients have identified supportive services, substance-abuse treatment, trauma-informed care, youth and adult reentry services, restorative justice, specialty courts, youth and adult programs, and family counseling services as necessary resources to implement effective programming. Whenever possible, BSCC staff offer technical assistance to help subrecipients address these gaps.

Coordination of State and Related Justice Funds

Although supplanting is prohibited, the BSCC encourages leveraging federal, state, local, and private funds. In instances where leveraging occurs within a program, BSCC tracks and reports all federal funds separately to ensure funds are not comingled.

C. <u>Capabilities and Competencies</u>

Additional Strategic Planning/Coordination Efforts

The BSCC was established in 2012 to serve as an independent body providing leadership and technical assistance to the adult and juvenile criminal justice systems. The BSCC is comprised of four divisions. Corrections Planning and Grant Programs (CPGP), Facilities Standards and Operations (FSO), Standards and Training for Corrections (STC), and County Facilities Construction.

FSO collaborates with local law enforcement agencies to maintain and enhance the safety and security of local adult and juvenile detention facilities. Key responsibilities include:

- Establishing minimum standards for local adult and juvenile detention facilities (California Code of Regulations, Titles 15 and 24)
- Conducting biennial inspections of local adult and juvenile detention facilities
- Conducting compliance monitoring pursuant to the federal Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (JJDPA)
- Providing technical assistance and training to local detention facilities
- Collecting data relative to operations and demographics from local detention facilities

STC works in collaboration with local corrections systems to improve the professional competence of local corrections staff in California. Key responsibilities include:

- Establishing minimum selection and training standards
- Administering the Corrections Training Fund
- Monitoring for compliance with standards
- Developing core training curricula for entry-level staff
- Administering a training course certification process
- Providing program support and technical assistance to local corrections systems
- Providing training in selected curriculum
- CPGP division administers federal and state grant programs for local partners that
- are designed to reduce recidivism through intervention, education, and prevention

CFC works in collaboration with state and local government agencies in administering financing for local adult jail/criminal justice facility and juvenile detention facility construction projects, for the purpose of enhancing public safety and conditions of confinement.

CPGP administers federal and state grant programs for local partners that are designed to reduce recidivism through intervention, education, and prevention strategies. Key responsibilities include:

- Ensure the fair, prudent and efficient distribution of state and federal grant funds
- Prevent and reduce crime by encouraging use of evidence-based practices
- Engage in collaborative planning, ongoing research and information-sharing
- Provide grant related training and other technical assistance

In addition to the JAG program, CPGP also administer the federal Title II Formula Block Grant and the Residential Substance Abuse Treatment Program.

Monitoring and Technical Assistance

BSCC staff conduct periodic monitoring of each project to assess whether the project is in compliance with grant requirements and making progress toward grant objectives. As needed, monitoring visits may also occur to provide technical assistance on fiscal, programmatic, evaluative, and administrative requirements. The underlying goal is to provide early intervention and resolution of any challenges that may arise during the term of the grant. In that spirit, the BSCC also hosts a mandatory Grantee Orientation.

Prior to delivering services, JAG subrecipients are required to attend a one-day grantee orientation led by BSCC staff. The purpose of this mandatory session is to review the program requirements, invoicing and budget modification processes, data collection and reporting requirements, as well as other grant management and monitoring activities. The orientation also provides grantees an opportunity to ask questions and receive feedback in real time. Typically, the Project Director, Financial Officer, Day-to-Day Contact, individual tasked with Data Collection and Evaluation and a minimum of one Community Partner are required to attend.

To help subrecipients comply with the terms and conditions of their JAG funded projects, the BSCC has also made its Grant Administration Guide available on its website at: <u>http://www.bscc.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/BSCC-Grant-Admin-Guide-July-2016.pdf</u>. The Guide provides information on a variety of administrative, program, and fiscal topics.

Evidence-Informed Programs

The BSCC is committed to supporting a focus on better outcomes in the criminal justice system and for those involved in it. Subrecipients were encouraged to focus on the following principles when designing their projects:

- Is there evidence or data to suggest that the intervention or strategy is likely to work, (i.e., produce a desired benefit)? For example, was the intervention or strategy you selected used by another jurisdiction with documented positive results? Is there published research on the intervention you are choosing to implement showing its effectiveness? Is the intervention or strategy being used by another jurisdiction with a similar problem and similar target population?
- Once an intervention or strategy is selected, will you be able to demonstrate that it is being carried out as intended? For example, does this intervention or strategy provide for a way to monitor quality control or continuous quality improvement? If this intervention or strategy was implemented in another jurisdiction, are there procedures in place to ensure that that you are following the model closely (so that you are more likely to achieve the desired outcomes)?
- Is there a plan to collect evidence or data that will allow for an evaluation of whether the intervention or strategy worked? For example, will the intervention or strategy you selected allow for the collection of data or other evidence so that outcomes

can be measured at the conclusion of the project? Do you have processes in place to identify, collect and analyze that data/evidence?

The state strategy notes that "some emphasis shall be given to innovative and/or promising strategies to reduce crime and recidivism." Subrecipients were encouraged to identify innovative or promising strategies in their applications for JAG funds. The BSCC defined innovative and promising as:

- "Innovative" for purposes of the JAG RFP is broadly construed to include programs or strategies that are "new" in the county or area where applied or represent expanded or reconfigured programs targeting additional populations or needs in the applicant county. Innovative programs or strategies described in the proposal must be linked to one or more components of an evidence-based practice.
- "Promising" for purposes of the JAG RFP is broadly construed to include crime-reduction and recidivism-reduction programs or strategies that have been implemented elsewhere with evidence of success, but with evidence that is not yet strong enough to conclude that the success was due to the program, or that it is highly likely to work if carried out in the applicant's circumstances. The difference between evidence-based and promising approaches is a difference in degree that depends on the number of situations in which a program or strategy has been tested and the rigor of the evaluation methods that were used. Applicants seeking to implement "promising" programs or strategies should be able to describe the documentation, data and evidence available to support the approach and why it is best suited to the needs and objectives described in the proposal.
- Evidence, which may vary in terms of its novelty or its strength, is relevant to the assessment of a program's potential benefits, whether described as innovative, promising, or evidence based.

All JAG proposals submitted through the competitive process were required to address the following:

- (1) The applicant must show, in the grant proposal, that the proposed intervention(s) whether evidence-based, innovative, or promising) are likely to achieve benefits desired in the local setting. To do this, the applicant must:
 - a. describe the intervention(s) being proposed for implementation;
 - b. discuss any evidence (e.g., research, outcome evaluations, etc.) that
 - c. indicates the intervention, or its components have been effective elsewhere;
 - d. describe the population(s) for which each intervention has been shown to be or is likely to be effective and show that it is appropriate for the proposed target population; and,
 - e. discuss what has been done to ensure that the support factors (e.g., interagency partnerships, certified trainers, auxiliary services, suitable criteria for participation, program materials, etc.) required or necessary for the intervention can be mobilized in the local setting.

Documentation of effectiveness can take the form of research or literature review, or reference to reviews of program effectiveness conducted by policy shops, some of which are listed in the subheading below titled, "EBP Informational Resources." Descriptions of local needs and agency capacities, in light of the factors that supported an intervention elsewhere, can be applied to an assessment of relevance.

- (2) Applicants must also describe how they will track operations to assess whether an intervention is being carried out as intended. This task is often referred to as a process evaluation; formative evaluation is a related term also found in the literature.
- (3) Finally, applicants must address their plans for outcome evaluation (e.g., how they will assess what happened as a result of the intervention and whether it produced its intended benefits).

D. Plan for Collecting the Data Required for this Solicitation's Performance Measures

Data Collection Plan

The BSCC emphasizes compliance with the data collection requirements of the JAG grant program by including the BJA Performance Measurement Tool (PMT) quarterly accountability metrics report and semi-annual progress reporting requirements as special conditions for subrecipients; and by monitoring subrecipient reporting compliance. Subrecipients are required to submit the PMT accountability measures that pertain to their JAG funded activities to the BSCC at the end of each quarter.

As previously noted, subrecipients are required to set aside at least five percent (or \$25,000, whichever is greater) of their total grant award for data collection and evaluation efforts, which includes the development of the Local Evaluation Plan and Final Local Evaluation Report. Subrecipients are strongly encouraged to use outside evaluators to ensure objective and impartial evaluations, especially state universities or community colleges.

Local Evaluation Plans

The purpose of the Local Evaluation Plan is to ensure that projects funded by the BSCC can be evaluated. Subrecipients include a detailed description of how they will assess the effectiveness of the proposed program in relationship to each of its goals and objectives. This relationship should be apparent in the LEP. The Plan describes the evaluation design or model used to evaluate the effectiveness of the project component(s), with the project goals and the project objectives clearly stated. Subrecipients must also address process and outcome evaluations within the plan.

Allocation Determination and State Requirements Regarding Use of JAG Funds and Units of Local Government

Less Than \$10,000 Allocations

The California Department of Justice received the less than \$10,000 allocation in compliance with the JAG solicitation.

Death in Custody Reporting Act (DCRA)

In 2020 the Death in Custody Reporting Act (DCRA) will be accomplished through a collaboration between the California Department of Justice (CalDOJ) and the Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC). Both agencies will work together to ensure all reporting is uploaded into PMT on a quarterly basis.

National Incident-Based Reporting System

In 2020 California was not certified by the FBI as complaint with the federal National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS). As such, the BSCC will set aside three percent of its award to further NIBRS compliance. The California Department of Justice (Cal-DOJ) currently acts as the Statistical Analysis Center for California. The 3 percent set aside will be used by Cal-DOJ to further NIBRS compliance. Cal-DOJ, in conjunction with the National Crime Statistics Exchange effort, is in the process of planning its transition to the California Incident Based Reporting System (CIBRS) repository which will house California's FBI mandated National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS) data collection and the mandated California specific data elements. Cal-DOJ is in process of assessing the next steps for the implementation of the NIBRS program in California

Additional Attachments and Disclosures

Disclosure of Lobbying Activities

See Attached Document

Disclosure of Pending Applications

The Board of State and Community Corrections does not have any pending applications submitted within the last 12 months for federally funded assistance that include requests for funding to support the same project being proposed under this solicitation and will cover the identical cost items outlined in the budget narrative and worksheet in the application under this solicitation.

Disclosure of High-Risk Status

The Board of State and Community Corrections is not currently designated high risk by another federal grant making agency.

Research and Evaluation Independence and Integrity

The Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC) intends to pass-through the Justice Administration Grant (JAG) funds through a competitive process to eligible jurisdictions. The BSCC will ensure that the subrecipients of JAG funds maintain research/evaluation independence; including appropriate safeguards to ensure research/evaluation objectivity and integrity, and review of potential conflicts of interest.

<u>30-Day Board Review</u>

The Board of State and Community Corrections made its Federal Fiscal Year 2020 JAG application available to Board members for review and comment on April 30, 2020.

<u>30-Day Public Posting and Public Comment</u>

The Board of State and Community Corrections made its Federal Fiscal Year 2020 JAG application available to citizens for comment on April 30, 2020. The application will be posted for 30 days on the BSCC website at <u>www.bscc.ca.gov</u>.