MARY JO GIOVACCHINI: Good afternoon, everybody. And welcome to today's webinar, FY 2019 Data-Led Governing Funding Opportunity, funded through the Justice Reinvestment Initiative and hosted by the Bureau of Justice Assistance. At this time, I would like to introduce you to today's presenter, Dr. Heather Tubman-Carbone, Senior Policy Advisor with the Bureau of Justice Assistance. Go ahead, Heather.

HEATHER TUBMAN-CARBONE: Thanks, Mary Jo. And thank you to NCJRS for hosting this webinar. And thank you to everyone on the line for your interest in the solicitation and for joining us today. This webinar will be delivered in four parts. First, I'll provide a very brief introduction to BJA and the funding source for the solicitation. In section two, I'll talk about the problem that led us to develop the solicitation and what we are trying to address by funding it. Then in section three, we'll get into the details of the solicitation, including the objectives and deliverables that should be proposed in all applications. And lastly in section four, I will get into specifics about what applications should include by talking about the review criteria they'll be scored against.

So let's get started with the introduction. As I'm sure many of you know, the Bureau of Justice Assistance is part of the Office of Justice Programs within the Department of Justice. BJA's mission is to provide leadership and services in grant administration, and criminal justice policy development to support local, state, and tribal justice strategies to achieve safer communities. The solicitation we're speaking about today touches all three ways that we do this: policy leadership, training and technical assistance, and even grant programs by informing future iterations.

This solicitation is funded through the Justice Reinvestment Initiative. In fiscal year 2019, Congress appropriated $27,000,000 for the Justice Reinvestment Initiative. JRI is an intense, data-driven approach that helps state, local, and tribal justice stakeholders, identify the driver's crime, and understand how they use resources to address those issues. The resulting information allows stakeholders to improve their capacities to prevent and respond to crime by knowing how to reallocate their resources into high-performing crime and recidivism reduction efforts. This initiative is most commonly pursued at the state level. And though every engagement in every state is different, we consistently hear about the need for and challenges to obtaining comprehensive data.

That led us to think about a new way to help states attack the problem. Criminal justice systems across the country have become increasingly data-driven. Law enforcement, court, and corrections agencies all want to use data to set goals and prioritize expenditures, particularly given the mismatch that often exists between the scale of crime problems faced and the resources available to address them. As state and local criminal justice systems rely on data to drive their decisions about policy, practice, and related resource allocation, new challenges have arisen. In the absence of uniform systems of data collection and analysis, state and local agencies use a variety of data systems and client identification numbers, and employ a wide variety of data collection and analysis strategies. This makes it incredibly difficult to aggregate data at the state level. As states strive to set goals for the criminal justice system and to measure whether they're achieving intended outcomes, BJA wants to offer clear

recommendations, tools, and resources to improve data collection, linkage, sharing, and analysis. And this is not an easy task.

For many states, the criminal justice system may more accurately be described as a collection of independent systems working towards a common goal, a reality that invites complications for data collection and use, and sometimes inefficiencies. This graphic depicts the major case processing points in a criminal justice system, and the agencies typically responsible for each. For many, in fact, the reality may be far more complex. And even once the system is clearly mapped, the path through it can be somewhat different for every case, which complicates data linkage and analysis.

Criminal justice data within a single agency or across localities--I'm sorry, within a single state or across localities are often incomplete because of gaps, quality control concerns, different identification numbers, and legal constraints. These are gaps between what information is needed and what is collected. Quality control concerns because data have not been collected in a consistent way, differences in how people and cases are identified across the agencies, and legal constraints that actually or are perceived to limit data sharing across agencies. In particular, the lack of unique state identification numbers for each person hinders accurate and comprehensive analysis about how people enter, move through, leave, and otherwise cycle through different components of the criminal justice system.

Legal constraints that are otherwise fundamentally sound and aim to protect the vulnerable populations and preserve privacy may inadvertently prevent seamless service provision and multiagency strategic approaches to problem-solving. And geography, state and local lines, pose another challenge. One of the difficulties we hear frequently is tracking recidivism across state and county systems. For example, if a person is processed through state court, released by state prison, and then rearrested, jailed, and released in one county, and then arrested in another, what does the state know about these events? Does the state and the county see the same record? And if not, thinking about it at the aggregate level, how does that disconnect impact states' resource allocation?

The way we see it, every criminal justice agency, the state leaders who will receive them, and the communities they serve have a vested interest in breaking down data silos between levels of government and agencies. Recent FBI crime and arrest data highlight the importance of digging into the details. For example, it is insufficient to know crime is down overall if crime is increasing in small pockets. Violent crime rates deceased overall in 31 states between 2007 and 2017. However, violent crime rates increased in some rural areas in 16 of those states. Similarly, it's not enough to know that arrests are down overall in the state if they have increased in a particular high-crime or violent area.

And then there's the disconnect between data that leaders want and what their states are collecting and able to use. For example, states want to know and frankly need to know what is driving recidivism. According to a report by the Council of State

Governments Justice Center, 32 states track and publish reincarceration data for people leaving prison. And 11 states collect and publish a measure of recidivism for the millions of people starting probation supervision each year. These numbers need to increase. Critical criminal justice challenges are not fully understood and may be overlooked due to the lack of comprehensive data. The field must enhance its data collection and analytical techniques, including learning from big data and other industries. It cannot continue to make criminal justice decisions without accurate and complete data, and the ability to analyze them in order to understand what is working and what is not. Decisionmakers must know what is a criminal justice landscape in their jurisdiction, what are the inputs, what are the outcomes. This information will, in turn, enable them to decide how best to spend limited resources on public safety, and to be held accountable.

All of this has led us to think about a new way to help states attack the problem as we see it. So with this solicitation, BJA is seeking a training and technical assistance provider to help states raise the standard for collection and use of criminal justice data. This project will help state and local criminal justice agencies collect, analyze, and share comprehensive data in a consistent manner so it can be aggregated to inform state-level decisionmaking. This project will also provide guidance to state-level decisionmakers about what data they should use and how they should use it to pursue the most effective public safety policies, practices, and resources for their communities. National scope private and nonprofit organizations are eligible to apply. This includes tribal nonprofit and for-profit organizations and both public and private colleges and universities.

BJA anticipates making one award for up to $7,000,000 for--excuse me, for a 36-month period of performance. BJA may provide additional funding in future years to the same awardee to supplement this amount. As you've seen in the solicitation, the work is divided into three phases: development, dissemination, and adoption. Now we'll talk about each phase of the work and associated objectives and deliverables that applicants should propose to accomplish.

Phase 1 of this project is to develop standards for local jurisdictions and state criminal justice agencies to accurately and comprehensively aggregate data at state and national levels. Applicants should propose to, one, delineate and define what data should be collected about criminal justice system activities and outcomes at all stages of case processing. This includes crime events in law enforcement, prosecution, courts, corrections, probation and parole, recidivism, and even social service data about high utilizers therein. For example crime data are collected inconsistently across and within states. Jurisdictions may collect data at the arrest level, incident level, and ideally they should be able to aggregate from the former to the latter. But data points vary with regard to offender and event detail. States must understand where and what crime is happening, as well as by and to whom, in order to make effective policy and budget decisions. Otherwise, resources are directed to places where crime is known, and to address the types of crime that are known rather than to the places and for the purposes that are most needed.

The National Incident-Based Reporting System, NIBRS, offers one set of standard-- excuse me, one set of standards that states could codify as requirements for their local jurisdiction. Additionally, operational definitions currently vary across and within states, demonstrating a need for commonly accepted operational definitions. Varied definitions of recidivism are just one example. Standards developed through this project should contemplate various approaches to measuring recidivism, including cohort, individual strategies, and measures of desistance such as time to failure and severity of offense. Please note BJA is not looking for a standard to be developed in a closed-door session and then declared complete. Applicants should propose how you will achieve buy-in from the field, perhaps through vetting with an appropriate advisory group or by engaging relevant professional association.

The middle box on your screen describes that applicants should also propose to define additional priorities for data collection about people, places, operations, costs, and interactions with other government systems that inform crime prevention and reduction efforts. These might include strategic threat groups within prisons, warrants, gun intelligence, housing, child protective services, and integration of real-time crime centers. And the third deliverable in Phase 1 is to develop data sharing, linkage, and analysis standards, including data points that should be connected across parts of the criminal justice system and analytic approaches necessary to get a clear and comprehensive picture of system activity. As part of this deliverable, applicants should propose to identify barriers to information sharing, inefficiencies created by keeping information compartmentalized, and develop guidelines for protecting and sharing the most relevant data. For example, states should understand the effectiveness of prosecution decisions. This means being able to connect charging decisions, including declinations to charge, to adjudication and sentencing outcomes, and then to recidivism outcomes.

For Phase 2, applicants should propose to develop tools and make them available to states and other interested jurisdictions to help them work towards the standard. Specifically, BJA is looking for tools to accomplish four objectives. First, our self-assessment tools for each type of agency to determine its level of data proficiency relative to the standard, and to identify targets for improvement. Please note the way we envision it, these standards will be the floor. Agencies and states can determine their own ceiling. But we want to give a set of standards that everyone can work towards. The second objective for the tools is recommendations for how state leaders -- that's governors, legislators, state administering agencies -- should use data to make policy and budget decisions, including what types of data should be gathered and factored into particular decisions. Planning guides for each agency and for state leaders to make progress toward data-driven decisionmaking are also sought. And lastly, applicants should propose to develop model directives to cover--excuse me, to govern data sharing and access to ensure compliance with privacy laws.

Phases 1 and 2 will culminate in Phase 3. Applicants should propose to facilitate states' adoption of standards and guidelines on data-driven decisionmaking through education and assistance. This includes providing education about data standards, demonstrating

the value of making improvements and reaching consensus among states around specific areas of need. This should be done through a website that provides resources to the field, and also through regional or national convenings that assist in the use of tools developed as part of this project. Applicants should also propose to facilitate competitive opportunities for states to receive meaningful assistance to improve their data practices in one or more areas. BJA envisions this project as a step-wise process whereby states and the agencies and localities therein will use the self-assessment tools to see where they stand with regard to the standards and identify areas for improvement in Phase 2. Then in Phase 3, states may submit those results along with requests for assistance.

BJA realizes this is a big list and a lot of thinking has already been done on this topic. So applicants may propose to reinvent the wheel or not. Applicants may propose to utilize a combination of new and existing models, resources, and/or tools. And that may vary for different parts of the system. For example, an applicant may propose the NIBRS measures as a standard or the starting point for crime event data, and then propose to develop new standards for other parts of the system. If applicants propose using existing items or standards, applicants must also include letters of support outlining specific commitments from the proprietor of those models or tools. Successful applicants will also be responsible to incorporate other relevant OJP and BJA data initiatives.

Regardless of whether applicants propose to reinvent the wheel with regard to each type of standards or not, the structure of the proposed project team should in fact look like a wheel. We're seeking applicants to propose a hub and spoke model to complete the objectives and deliverables by convening and managing a group that represents expertise in all topics required by the solicitation. This--excuse me, this includes improving data collection and linking data systems to improve services and outcomes, understanding state administering agencies and other relevant stakeholders and decisionmakers, such as Office of the Chief Information Officer, Attorney General, and Governor, and decisionmaking processes. This also includes justice system agencies and function. The team should have expertise in crime and law enforcement, prosecution, and other court--areas of court, corrections, and probation and parole. We're really looking for all levels of detail here, so for example in terms of court data, applicants should propose to consider data related to prosecution, defense, adjudication, and sentencing. This doesn't mean data from each arm of the courts will eventually make the list, but we're looking for that level of comprehensive consideration in the application.

So just to reiterate, the primary applicant will effectively serve as a project manager. We do not expect one organization to have all the required expertise for this work. Of course, if you're out there, please knock on our door. But honestly, we're envisioning a primary applicant to manage a group with practical experience in all roles and areas to work on the tool--I'm sorry, to work on the standard, develop the tool, and gain endorsement from the field as described during the discussion of Phase 1 work. And please note BJA expects that relevant experts will be involved in all three phases of the

objectives and deliverables associated with their topic in order to develop a standard, achieve buy-in, disseminate the information, and assist states with adoption and implementation of the standards.

I know that's a lot of information. Thanks for listening. And please don't hesitate to answer questions in the Q&A box as we go along. Now we're going to spend some time talking about the application. We got pretty specific with some of the review criteria in the solicitation, so I will walk through them here. First, and I cannot emphasize this enough, applicants should use a checklist to ensure everything is submitted as required. We provided one at the back of the solicitation. There are a lot of attachments that will need to be submitted so please double and triple check them. If anything is missing, applicants will receive a score of zero for that element, which can greatly impact scores for an otherwise very competitive application. So, I listed a few highlights on this slide.

First, confirm your organization is eligible to apply. Then be sure your organization has or obtained a DUNS number. You'll need to do this to submit an application. Similarly, be sure to register in Grants.gov. There's more detail on this in the solicitation. The solicitation also lists critical elements that must be submitted in order for your application to move forward. These are the narrative, budget, timeline or task plan, resumes of key project personnel, examples of work products, and a list of proposed subrecipients. Now let's talk about these in the context of review criteria or how they'll be scored.

The items on the prior slide, like timeline and resumes, all map to items on this slide. I'll explain how in the next few moments. First up is description of the issue. This is worth 15 percent of the application score. To address this, we're looking for applicants to detail the current landscape by covering three closely related things. First, describe the current state of data collection, analysis, and sharing that is used to inform criminal justice decisionmaking at the state level across the country. Second, describe the challenges of state level data analysis, including availability and impediments to aggregating local and state level data across component parts of the system. And lastly, given all that, describe why states must overcome these challenges, specifically what is at stake. To put it plainly, tell us what's going on and why it needs to improve.

Next up is project design, and this is the most significant review criteria, and it counts for 40 percent of scoring. In this section, applicants should first and foremost address in detail how you propose to undertake and accomplish each of the objectives and deliverables. Then describe how the proposed management structure and staffing of the project will facilitate completion of those. Detailed information contained in the timeline or project plan will be counted towards this criterion. I think we've been pretty clear about the areas this work should cover and what we want to accomplish, but it's up to applicants to propose how to bring that all together and make it happen. I strongly recommend proposing a clear plan and using plain language to spell out how things will be accomplished. Applicants should be both definitive about plans and also transparent if any parts of the plan are iterative. Just tell us how you plan to get there. We know this is an ambitious project. I can tell you I'm both very excited about it and have a little

heartburn, so give us your best thinking and demonstrate flexibility to deal with inevitable challenges.

Then we get to capabilities and competencies. This is 30 percent of the score. For this section, please provide a detailed description of the capacity of the applicant and subapplicants, if applicable, to achieve the objectives and deliverables. In this section, you must demonstrate that the individuals and organizations working on the project have relevant experience. Clearly articulate the organization's history leading national, state, local, and/or tribal level criminal justice data analysis and implementation projects. Specifically discuss the staffing team; were they permanent full-time staff or proposed consultants? Who's going to contribute to each objective and deliverable, and duty, and answer for us? Do the organizations and relevant staff have experience navigating the wide variety of criminal justice systems and data therein across multiple states? Position title, resumes of key project staff members, and work product examples will contribute to the assignment of points related to this criterion.

The budget is another 10 percent of the score. Applicants should submit a budget that is complete, cost effective, and allowable. Budget narratives should demonstrate generally cost effectiveness in relation to potential alternatives and the objectives of the project. You'll notice "feasibility" is in bold on this slide, as I'm sure you've all experienced and know from other projects different tasks consume different amounts of time and resources based on what we need to complete them, including expertise and rates of people involved, and a host of other factors. Those should all be reflected in the budget. So for example, we will not be looking for a budget that evenly distributes resources over all topic areas. We want to see that the budget reflects the way the project is proposed to be completed. Recall earlier slides where I talked about developing standards and gave the example of NIBRS as a possible standard or starting point for crime event data. If an applicant proposes to use something existing, something like that, then development for that element should cost less than it is to develop something brand new.

The last element is the plan for collecting performance measures and that's 5 percent of the score. The solicitation lays out potential performance measures and applicants should describe the manner in which the data required for those will be collected, including the system used and the person responsible. If you propose additional or other performance metrics related to the objectives and deliverables, please be sure to describe how they will be documented, monitored, and evaluated.

And last but certainly not least, please be certain to submit everything on time and with all attachments. Applications are due by July 16th, at 11:59 p.m. Please, please, do not attempt to submit everything at 11:50. There's lots of attachments and we'd hate to miss something critical because anyone ran out of time.

Now I'm going to turn things back to Mary Jo at NCJRS to talk about a few resources and then I'll be happy to answer any questions. Please note the host team at NCJRS will announce the questions that have been submitted. If you've been holding on to

questions or have additional ones, please do not hesitate to enter them in the Q&A box now.

MARY JO GIOVACCHINI: Hi, everybody. Thank you so much. We'll go over a couple of slides here and then we will jump into the questions as Heather pointed out. Right now, you're looking at a slide referencing the National Criminal Justice Reference Service. This service is available to you after this webinar and any time, as a matter of fact, about any solicitation. They're there to help you get answers. So, if you have a question that you think of after today, please submit it to NCJRS at grants@ncjrs.gov and they will work with Heather to get an answer to you. You can reach them via their toll-free number, 1-800-851-3420. And they are available 10 to 6 daily eastern standard time. They are not--they are closed on weekends and federal holidays. In addition, they are open late the day the solicitation is--closes. However, as Heather stated, you're not going to wait until that last hour to submit your application.

They also have available several emails. These emails are available and you can sign up to--for them through the NCJRS website at www.ncjrs.gov. In particular, there is a funding email that comes out every Friday. It announces new opportunities that are available from all the agencies within the Office of Justice Programs. It'll alert you to webinars such as this one and also let you know when artifacts from the webinar, such as the transcripts and the PowerPoints, have been posted to the applicable agency website. You can find more information about NCJRS on page 2 of your solicitation. There's also information about grants.gov. Grants.gov is the--where you're going to submit your application. So, if you're having problems with submission or technical issues with uploading any of the attachments, please reach out to them. They are available 10 to 6 eastern time, 24 hours--actually, they're available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week for you. You can reach them at 1-800-518-4726. And you can also email them at support@grants.gov. Again, these are for technical issues.

Earlier this year, the Bureau of Justice Assistance held four webinars all related to funding. These webinars are available on the BJA website at https://www.bja.gov/funding/webinars.html. These four webinars are geared around the funding process and might be a good resource for you as you move forward in the application process if you have any particular questions about how certain things work. So at this time, we are going to go and open it up to questions. If you just give me a second so I can get to our first one. "In Phase 3, does the solicitation--does the solicitation envision a system of mini grants to localities that have demonstrated readiness to innovate, but need resources--resource assistance to implement the changes?"

HEATHER TUBMAN-CARBONE: Thanks so much for submitting that question. At the moment, we do not envision a system of mini grants; meaning you do not need to budget with the current funding amount, with that $7,000,000, to administer mini grants. We have the note in there that additional funding may be made available in the future. For now, we want to see what folks propose and at the very least, you should be proposing a competitive process to select states and go in the system. And if people

want to propose that the best way to do this would be for BJA to come up with a system of awards, that's something we can discuss. But we do not envision as currently written that that $7,000,000 will go direct to sites.

MARY JO GIOVACCHINI: "The website that is expected to hold all the resources developed from this part--project, does BJA expect it to reside within the OJP website or should applicants plan on developing and maintaining it outside of the OJP website?"

HEATHER TUBMAN-CARBONE: Another great question. The applicant should plan on developing and maintaining it outside of the BJA website.

MARY JO GIOVACCHINI: "Shouldn't community be a part of the stakeholder groups?"

HEATHER TUBMAN-CARBONE: That's a question that we are holding off on answering explicitly only because we want to see what folks propose. Our thinking on this is that, as I hope you see in most of our solicitations, we believe that community groups are essential to the--to the fair and consistent administration of justice. However, with this solicitation being about developing data measures and tools, we didn't--we weren't quite sure exactly what that role looks like and so we chose to write the solicitation in a way that does not require it. Applicants are absolutely welcome to propose the involvement of community groups and other folks as members of an advisory group or however they see fit. We just--I'll just say, we have not made it a requirement, but, yes, we would absolutely love to hear about it.

MARY JO GIOVACCHINI: "May an organization apply as a prime applicant as well as being listed as a subrecipient on another organization's application?"

HEATHER TUBMAN-CARBONE: You know, if I had to predict the questions that we were going to get, this one was on that list. It's absolutely fine. Folks can submit as the-- as what we're thinking of as like the managing partner or the prime applicant and be listed as a subrecipient on another organization's application. The one thing I would caution against and I realize this is not at all what this person was asking, I'm just going to throw it out there, what I caution against is effectively having sort of one basic proposal and then just sort of alternating which group is listed as the lead. If we see the same thing come up multiple times, we'll know it, it won't reflect very well. So I think the key is just making sure that there is something--there's something distinctive or a--some difference that we can wrap our hands around within each proposal.

MARY JO GIOVACCHINI: So at this time, it looks like that is the last question that we have. I am going to give you guys a minute, though. I don't want to cut you off and give you--without giving you a chance to submit something else. In the meantime, I'm going to flip the slide to NCJRS, I'll flip it to grants.gov, so you'll have a chance to write down that information. So if you just--we'll go silent for a little while and we will be back with you. And actually, Heather, if you can look at the chat, please.

HEATHER TUBMAN-CARBONE: Sure. One sec.

MARY JO GIOVACCHINI: Okay. And we did get another question that came through. "Do you expect applicants to form teams comprised of partners from multiple states or a single state, or counties within the states?"

HEATHER TUBMAN-CARBONE: So for this particular solicitation, units of local government or state government are not eligible applicants. So, if we could jump back up, let me see what slide it is. And Mary Jo, if you don't mind taking us there.

MARY JO GIOVACCHINI: No, not at all.

HEATHER TUBMAN-CARBONE: If we could just--thank you. If we could jump back to slide 16. So the eligible applicants for this solicitation are national-scope private and nonprofit organizations, and this does include tribal nonprofit and for-profit organizations and both public and private colleges and universities. In the long term, we absolutely could see, you know, after this project wraps up, if all goes well, we could see making awards available to state and local justice agencies or state and local jurisdictions. But in an effort to develop systemwide standards, we are looking for national-scope private and nonprofit organizations. Certainly these can be informed by work with state and local jurisdictions.

MARY JO GIOVACCHINI: All right. I'm going to check the chat box to see if any questions happen to come through there, but right now, we don't have any other questions in the Q&A. So, just give me one moment. All right. I don't see any further questions, Heather. I don't know if you want to end the webinar now or if you want to give people another chance.

HEATHER TUBMAN-CARBONE: I think we can wrap up now. Just a couple of quick notes, I know Mary Jo walked through the slide for NCJRS. If anyone has any additional questions, please don't be shy, please do not hesitate to submit the question there. There's also a slide with my contact information. It is not that I wouldn't love to hear from you, it's simply that in the spirit of fairness, we want to make sure that all questions are routed through NCJRS, so that if someone asked a question that we don't feel is adequately covered in the solicitation, we want to make sure that we then have a mechanism to track those and blast it out to the whole field so everyone has access to all information. So feel free to contact me, I just want everyone to know that questions will be routed through NCJRS. If nothing else has appeared as a question on Q&A, and I don't think it has, we'll just close with saying thank you all for joining us today. Thank you for your interest in the solicitation. As I said before, we know it's big, we know it's ambitious, and that's both exciting and nerve-racking. I am very excited to see the applications come in and to see this project come to life. I think we will all learn along the way with this one. Lastly, thank you to NCJRS for hosting this webinar. And I hope everyone has a great day.