

# Justice Assistance Grant Program

## Activity Report, Fiscal Year 2016<sup>1</sup>

The Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Program, administered by the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA), is the leading source of federal justice funding to state and local jurisdictions. The JAG Program provides states and local jurisdictions with critical funding necessary to support a range of programs, activities, and equipment purchases.

BJA’s Performance Measurement Tool (PMT) uses two data collection methods to gather the data shown in this report. Recipients of awards in fiscal years (FYs) 2009–2014 report on one set of performance measures that focus on aggregate totals. Recipients of FY 2015 and future awards report on a revised set of performance measures that allow for more detailed data collection.

All data in this report are presented by fiscal year of the award. This report includes all grantees that are or have been active as of September 30, 2017, but it is primarily focused on FY 2016 grantees. Grantees that have not yet begun to expend JAG funds as of September 30, 2017 are not included.

The first two sections of this report provide information on funding allocations by total and by program area for FYs 2014–2016 grantees. The rest of the report covers a more detailed analysis of FY 2016 grantees.

## PMT Allocations

During their first reporting period, grantees are asked to provide expected funding allocations for their use of JAG funds for the life of the award<sup>2</sup> (Table 1). Some funding allocations are not yet captured in the PMT, as grantees are only required to answer PMT questions when they begin to draw down their award. Because of this, allocations data are more complete for older cohorts than newer ones.

*Table 1. Funding Allocations in PMT Compared with BJA Award Amounts*

Cohort	Total funds allocated in PMT	Total amount awarded by BJA	Percent of funds captured in PMT
FY 2014	\$225,895,891	\$279,862,003	81%
FY 2015	\$242,414,465	\$246,437,148	98%
FY 2016	\$138,259,084	\$263,966,944	52%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$605,920,832</b>	<b>\$790,266,095</b>	<b>76.7%</b>

<sup>1</sup> The following data come from PMT data for BJA grant recipients of FYs 2014–2016 grants. Values are calculated from all available reporting periods. As with any PMT report, accurate data rely on accurate data entry by grantees. The data provided accurately reflect the information as entered by grantees.

<sup>2</sup> The PMT is not a financial reporting tool, and these allocations do not reflect amounts spent to date.

## FYs 2014–2016 Cohorts: Program Area Allocations

FY 2014 and prior grantees allocated their JAG funds into one of seven program areas plus an optional administrative set-aside for direct grantees (Table 2). FYs 2015 and 2016 grantees allocated funds into 14 activity areas that have been collapsed to mirror the seven program areas. The following pages detail all 14 activity areas.<sup>3</sup> A JAG recipient may use up to 10 percent of the award, including up to 10 percent of any earned interest, for costs associated with administering the JAG funds.

Table 2. Funding Allocations by Program Area, FYs 2014–2016 Grantees

Program Area	FY 2014 Amount (%)	FY 2015 Amount (%)	FY 2016 Amount (%)
Administrative	\$2,309,095 (1%)	\$4,354,504 (2%)	\$2,830,389 (2%)
Law enforcement	\$130,947,683 (59%)	\$162,493,981 (64%)	\$88,460,640 (64%)
Prosecution, courts, and public defense <sup>4</sup>	\$23,778,609 (10%)	\$45,930,356 (18%)	\$11,865,967 (9%)
Prevention and education	\$24,252,377 (11%)	\$8,936,787 (4%)	\$5,360,085 (4%)
Corrections and community corrections	\$15,462,545 (7%)	\$11,153,523 (4%)	\$9,059,242 (7%)
Drug treatment and courts	\$9,266,944 (4%)	\$3,126,861 (1%)	\$2,725,854 (2%)
Planning <sup>5</sup> and evaluation	\$17,513,442 (8%)	\$5,697,669 (1%)	\$4,626,047 (3%)
Crime victim and witness services	\$287,154 (<1%)	\$2,420,973 (1%)	\$2,259,468 (2%)
Other <sup>6</sup>	N/A	\$10,279,255 (4%)	\$11,071,392 (8%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$223,817,849</b>	<b>\$254,393,909</b>	<b>\$138,259,084</b>

In general, funding use has remained consistent across cohorts; however, the FY 2014 cohort did see a drop in the use of funds for law enforcement and an increase in the use of funds for prevention and education.

**The remainder of this report applies to FY 2016 grantees only.**

<sup>3</sup> A direct comparison between FY 2015 and prior awards is not appropriate due to variations in the program area definitions.

<sup>4</sup> “Public defense” was termed “Indigent defense” for FY 2014 and prior grantees.

<sup>5</sup> Planning funds are only captured in this category for FYs 2013–2014 grantees. FY 2015 grantees report planning under the “Other” category.

<sup>6</sup> Includes funding uses that do not clearly fit into other FY 2015 categories such as planning activities or statewide, cross-disciplinary initiatives.

## Activity Area Allocations

As previously noted, FY 2016 grantees fund programs and activities that are categorized into 14 activity areas (Table 3). Definitions for each activity area are included in the appendix.

*Table 3. Funding Allocations by Activity Area, FY 2016 Grantees*

Area	Allocation Amount	Allocation Percent
Law enforcement	\$84,403,302	61%
Prosecution	\$7,553,232	5%
Crime prevention	\$5,360,085	4%
Assessment and evaluation	\$4,626,047	3%
Courts	\$3,515,703	3%
Corrections	\$3,194,936	2%
Reentry	\$3,464,870	3%
Crime victim/witness services	\$2,259,468	2%
Crime lab	\$4,057,338	3%
Behavioral health	\$2,725,854	2%
Community corrections	\$2,399,436	2%
Public defense	\$797,032	1%
Other	\$11,071,392	8%
Administrative set-aside	\$2,830,389	2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$138,259,084</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Funding Use Area Allocations

Allocations can also be divided into five funding use areas (Table 4). These funding use areas are derived from the categories in the OJP budget detail worksheet and are further defined in the appendix.

*Table 4. Funding Allocations by Funding Use Area, FY 2016 Grantees<sup>7</sup>*

Area	Allocation Amount	Allocation Percent
Personnel	\$57,337,484	42%
Equipment, supplies, and technology	\$43,503,968	31%
Consultants and contracts	\$17,739,688	13%
Training and conferences	\$3,026,599	2%
Other use	\$16,546,770	12%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$138,154,600</b>	<b>100%</b>

<sup>7</sup> Although these allocations cover all program areas, law enforcement is the largest.

## Personnel

Table 5 shows the number of personnel whose salary or pay was funded at least partially by JAG. This does not include personnel who received JAG funds as overtime pay. Overall, 836,532 personnel were funded in whole or in part with JAG funds.

*Table 5. Personnel*

Area	Number of Personnel <sup>8</sup>
Crime lab/forensics	549,811 <sup>9</sup>
Law enforcement	263,188
Prosecution	23,001
Crime prevention	122
Crime victim/witness services	85
Other area	81
Community corrections	47
Behavioral health	45
Courts	44
Assessment and evaluation	36
Reentry services	32
Corrections	19
Public defense	12
<b>Total</b>	<b>836,523</b>

<sup>8</sup> To avoid duplication, the personnel numbers come from the July–September 2017 reporting period.

<sup>9</sup> One grantee entered 549,800 for this reporting period. One grantee entered a value of 22,913 for this period; one grantee entered 186,783 for this period.

## Equipment, Supplies, and Technology Purchases

One main use of JAG funds is the purchase of equipment, supplies, and technology (EST). Table 6 shows 10 categories of expenditures expressed as percentages of all EST funding allocations and all JAG allocations.

Table 6. FY 2016 EST Purchases by General Category

Category	JAG Funds Spent	Percent of Total Allocations <sup>10</sup>
Computer equipment	\$6,765,121	5%
Camera/surveillance equipment	\$5,430,092	4%
Duty equipment <sup>11</sup>	\$5,049,949	4%
Weapons	\$2,577,357	2%
Forensics/evidence	\$2,181,799	2%
Vehicles and accessories	\$2,829,629	2%
Technology	\$1,669,981	1%
Medical	\$892,128	1%
Controlled items <sup>12</sup>	\$692,260	1%
Animals and animal equipment	\$153,816	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$28,242,132</b>	<b>20%</b>

## Training and Conferences

FY 2016 JAG grantees have hosted, attended, or developed 466 trainings and conferences with JAG funds since the start of their awards. Table 7 shows the numbers and types of trainings funded by JAG. Please note that some training events fell into multiple categories, so the totals of each column do not necessarily equal the number of unique events.

Table 7. Trainings and Conferences

Type	Number of Trainings Attended	Number of Trainings Hosted	Number of Trainings Developed
Conference	123	13	1
Skill building training	136	46	29
Certification training	124	22	11
Leadership/management training	41	15	4
In-service/annual training	42	18	5
Other training	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>466</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>50</b>

<sup>10</sup> Calculated by dividing the JAG funds spent in each category by the total EST allocations (\$37,753,814). Does not total 100 percent because some allocated funds have not yet been spent and some funds are spent on items not captured by these categories.

<sup>11</sup> Includes soft body armor, clothing/uniforms, belts, related non-weapon equipment (handcuffs, flashlights, etc.), and portable radio equipment.

<sup>12</sup> Includes all equipment designated as "Controlled" under Executive Order 13688.

## Community Outreach

Grantees that conduct citizen surveys and host community meetings are more aware of the issues facing their communities and can better respond to community needs. To that end, FY 2016 JAG grantees and subgrantees are asked to report on their community outreach activities. To gather information on their activities, 54 percent of all grantees and subgrantees hosted community meetings, and 16 percent conducted formal surveys of community members (Table 8).

Table 8. JAG Grantee Community Outreach

Grantee type	Number of Grantees/Subs	Percent Conducting Citizen Surveys <sup>13</sup>	Percent Hosting Community Meetings
Law enforcement	2,054	18%	58%
Local government	298	12%	45%
Non-/for-profit organizations <sup>14</sup>	127	11%	65%
Court	59	15%	27%
Prosecutor	101	11%	47%
State government	52	12%	17%
Correctional	25	4%	44%
Community corrections	33	6%	36%
Crime lab/forensics	11	9%	18%
Public defense	5	0%	60%
College/university	12	8%	25%
Tribal	4	0%	0%
Other	0	0%	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,781</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>54%</b>

## Programs

JAG grantees and subgrantees can use their funds for a program, which is defined as a continuous initiative, process, or other focused effort defined by goals and objectives (Table 9). Program examples include a drug court, law enforcement task force, or behavioral health treatment.

Successful programs pull from best practices and evidence-based approaches. And a core element underpinning evidence-based practices is conducting data analysis to make data-driven decisions. Overall, more than 60 percent of JAG-funded programs reported conducting analysis. Using best practices shows us that programs can also benefit from including external partners. For example, a law enforcement program focused on high crime areas can partner with local businesses, public works departments, courts, and legal staff members to most effectively define, analyze, and respond to the underlying causes of a problem. More than 66 percent of JAG-funded programs had at least one external partner.

<sup>13</sup> Includes surveys of citizens' satisfaction with police services, prosecution services, defense services, and courts; perceptions of crime; and personal experiences with crime.

<sup>14</sup> Includes businesses and organizations that receive JAG funds as a subaward.

Table 9. JAG-funded Programs

Area	Number of Programs Funded	Percent of Programs Conducting Analysis	Percent of Programs with External Partners
Law enforcement	371	49%	58%
Courts	44	80%	86%
Prosecution	49	59%	59%
Crime prevention	34	68%	74%
Crime victim/witness services	30	87%	77%
Behavioral health	43	93%	91%
Community corrections	21	90%	100%
Reentry services	18	83%	94%
Corrections	18	61%	67%
Public defense	11	73%	73%
Crime lab/forensics	14	50%	36%
<b>Total<sup>15</sup></b>	<b>653</b>	<b>60.6%</b>	<b>66.5%</b>

## Law Enforcement Programs

Law enforcement programs can utilize best and evidence-based practices in multiple ways in addition to conducting analysis and having external partners. This includes focusing efforts on specific places, people, and tactics rather than randomized patrol (Table 10).

Table 10. Focus of Law Enforcement Programs<sup>16</sup>

Focus	Number of Programs	Percent of Programs
Community-oriented approach	162	44%
Problem-oriented approach	94	25%
Geographic focus	166	45%
Focused deterrence/pulling levers approach	123	33%
<b>Programs with one or more of the above</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>44.5%</b>

## Conclusions

The JAG Program impacts all aspects of the justice system by providing valuable funding for personnel, equipment, training, and other uses. More than 800,000 personnel had at least part of their salary paid for with JAG funds, and \$28 million in funds helped grantees purchase more than 30,000 pieces of equipment. Additionally, 630 unique training events and conferences have been attended, hosted, or developed using JAG funds.

As of May 2018, FY 2016 JAG funds have been used to support 653 programs, the majority of which rely on outside partners for success. And law enforcement programs are likely to use an evidence-based policing model such as community-oriented policing or implement a geographic focus.

<sup>15</sup> The majority of responses come from law enforcement grantees, which drives the overall rates.

<sup>16</sup> Programs can have multiple foci.

## Training and Technical Assistance to Improve Outcomes



<https://www.bjatrain.org/>

BJA recognizes that grantees may require assistance with specific aspects of their JAG-funded programs. As such, BJA’s National Training and Technical Assistance Center (NTTAC)’s training and technical assistance (TTA) provides many services, including:

- Assistance implementing evidence-based programs
- Crime/data analysis
- Classroom and virtual training
- Peer-to-peer visits
- Research assistance
- Strategic planning assistance

**Request TTA through NTTAC:**

<https://www.bjatrain.org/working-with-nttac/requestors>

**NTTAC Resources Information, Webinars, and More:** <https://www.bjatrain.org/tools>

**TTA Today Blog:**

<https://www.bjatrain.org/media/blog>



# Appendix

## Activity and Funding Use Area Definitions

### *Activity Areas*

**Law enforcement:** Includes all programs (e.g., crime prevention, intervention), activities, or spending conducted by a law enforcement organization. This includes all task force activity but does not include crime lab/forensics activity/programs.

**Crime lab/forensics:** Includes all programs, activities, or spending focused on the identification, collection, or processing of forensic evidence; for example, a sexual assault nurse examiner or sexual assault response team, or a sexual assault kit testing initiative or DNA backlog reduction program.

**Crime prevention (NOT as part of a law enforcement agency):** Includes all programs, activities, or spending for crime or juvenile delinquency prevention conducted through engaging communities, institutions (e.g., schools), or individuals. These include such programs as a rape aggression defense class, an alcohol/drug awareness class for students, or a bullying prevention program.

**Prosecution:** Includes all programs, activities, or spending related to the prosecution of criminal defendants.

**Public defense:** Includes all programs, activities, or spending for public defense.

**Courts:** Includes all programs, activities, or spending for courts. This includes drug courts and other specialty courts.

**Corrections:** Includes all programs, activities, or spending by a residential correctional agency such as a jail or prison. This includes corrections programs focused on reentry services for inmates.

**Community corrections:** Includes all programs, activities, or spending by a community corrections agency. This includes community correction programs focused on reentry.

**Reentry services (NOT as part of a corrections, community corrections, or court program):** Includes all programs, activities, or spending for reentry. This includes reentry programs run by private, nonprofit, or other noncorrectional government organizations.

**Behavioral health (NOT as part of a corrections, community corrections, or court program):** Includes all programs, activities, or spending for mental health, substance use disorder, or co-occurring treatment that are run by private, nonprofit, or other noncorrectional government organizations.

**Assessment and evaluation:** Includes all programs, activities, or spending for the assessment or evaluation of programs, policies, practices, or technology. This also includes strategic planning activities. For example, this could be the development of a strategic plan, an evaluation of a drug treatment service, or the cost-benefit analysis of adopting body-worn cameras.

**Crime victim/witness services:** Includes all programs, activities, or spending focused on assisting crime victims, families, or witnesses. For example, this could be a 24-hour domestic violence hotline, an emergency shelter, or food distribution services for displaced victims.

**Other Areas:** Includes all uses of JAG funding not captured in any other activity area, such as for administrative agencies that manage justice organizations, strategic planning activities, and statewide initiatives that span multiple areas.

## *Funding Use Areas*

**Personnel:** Includes any overtime or salary expenditures paid for with JAG funds.

**Equipment, supplies, and technology:** Includes all items that are paid for with JAG funds.

**Consultants and contracts:** Includes all fees associated with a consultant (including travel expenses) as well as any contract for a product or service.

**Training and conferences:** Includes costs associated with hosting, developing, or attending a training or conference such as travel, lodging, or registration. Personnel salary or pay for people attending training should be reported under the Personnel section.

**Other use:** Includes administrative costs, approved construction costs, and miscellaneous expenses such as indirect costs or investigative/confidential funds.