

Justice Assistance Grant Program

Activity Report, September 2016¹

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 and provides them with critical funding necessary to support a range of programs.

Grantees use two data collection tools to gather the data shown in this report. Recipients of Fiscal Year (FY) 2009–2014 awards report on one set of measures that focus on aggregate totals. Recipients of FY2015 and future awards report on a revised set of measures that allow for more detailed data collection.

All data in this report are presented by the fiscal year of the award. This report includes all grantees that are or have been active as of June 30, 2016, but it is primarily focused on FY2015 grantees. Grantees that have not yet begun to expend JAG funds as of June 30, 2016, are not included.

The first two sections provide information on funding allocations in total and by program area for FY2013–2015 grantees. The rest of the report covers more detailed analysis of FY2015 grantees.

PMT Allocations

During their first reporting period, grantees are asked to provide expected funding allocations for their use of JAG funds over the life of the award.² Some funding allocations are not yet captured in the performance measurement tool (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
FY2013	\$281,029,837	\$281,057,370	99.99
FY2014	\$235,138,548	\$279,862,033	84.02
FY2015	\$116,745,909	\$246,437,148	47.37
Total	\$632,914,294	\$807,356,551	78.39

FY2013–2015 Cohorts: Program Area Allocations

FY2014 and prior grantees allocate their JAG funds into one of seven program areas plus an optional administrative set-aside for direct grantees. FY2015 grantees allocate funds into 14 activity areas that have been collapsed to mirror the 7 program areas. All 14 activity areas are detailed in the following pages. *Note that a direct comparison between FY2015 and prior awards is not appropriate due to variations in the program area definitions and the low allocation percentage (47.4 percent) for FY2015 awards.*

¹ The following data come from Performance Measurement Tool (PMT) data for BJA grant recipients of FY2012–2015 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.

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

Table 2. Funding Allocations by Program Area, FY2013–2015 Grantees

Program Area	FY13 Amount (%)	FY14 Amount (%)	FY15 Amount (%)
Administrative	\$1,510,912 (0.5%)	\$2,942,795 (1.3%)	\$1,616,543 (1.4%)
Law enforcement	\$187,398,930 (66.7%)	\$145,272,631 (61.8%)	\$74,973,475 (64.2%)
Prosecution, courts, and public defense ³	\$21,218,373 (7.6%)	\$22,675,773 (9.6%)	\$11,533,632 (9.9%)
Prevention and education	\$15,697,802 (5.6%)	\$24,256,147 (10.3%)	\$6,116,558 (5.2%)
Corrections and community corrections	\$16,794,416 (6.0%)	\$12,538,592 (5.3%)	\$7,403,161 (6.3%)
Drug treatment and courts	\$11,828,706 (4.2%)	\$7,865,946 (3.3%)	\$1,933,984 (1.7%)
Planning ⁴ and evaluation	\$21,177,709 (7.5%)	\$15,292,929 (6.5%)	\$3,891,427 (3.3%)
Crime victim and witness services	\$5,402,989 (1.9%)	\$4,293,771 (1.8%)	\$2,039,307 (1.7%)
Other ⁵	N/A	N/A	\$7,237,822 (6.2%)
Total (%)	\$281,029,837 (100%)	\$235,138,584 (100%)	\$116,745,909 (100%)

In general, funding use has remained consistent across cohorts. The FY2014 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.

³ “Public defense” was termed “Indigent defense” for FY2014 and prior grantees.

⁴ Planning funds are only captured in this category for FY2013–2014 grantees. FY2015 grantees report planning under the “Other” category.

⁵ Includes funding uses that do not clearly fit into other FY2015 categories, such as planning activities or statewide, cross-disciplinary initiatives.

The remainder of this report applies to FY2015 grantees only.

Activity Area Allocations

As already noted, FY2015 grantees fund programs and activities that are categorized into 14 activity areas (Table 3). Definitions for each activity area are in the appendix.

Table 3. Funding Allocations by Activity Area, FY2015 Grantees

Area	Allocation amount	Allocation percent	Number of grantees
Law enforcement	\$72,995,530	62.5	1,794
Prosecution	\$6,491,006	5.6	81
Crime prevention	\$6,116,558	5.2	83
Assessment and evaluation	\$3,891,427	3.3	37
Courts	\$3,309,986	2.8	74
Corrections	\$3,118,710	2.7	35
Reentry	\$2,434,457	2.1	33
Crime victim/witness services	\$2,039,307	1.7	72
Crime lab	\$1,977,945	1.7	44
Behavioral health	\$1,933,984	1.7	34
Community corrections	\$1,849,994	1.6	29
Public defense	\$1,732,640	1.5	17
Other	\$7,237,822	6.2	125
Administrative set-aside	\$1,616,543	1.4	41
Total	\$116,745,909	100.0	2,251⁶

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 defined in the appendix.

Table 4. Funding Allocations by Funding Use Area, FY2015 Grantees⁷

Area	Allocation	%
Personnel	\$51,676,136	44.3
Equipment, supplies, and technology	\$37,753,814	32.3
Consultants and contracts	\$19,350,283	16.6
Training and conferences	\$2,552,655	2.2
Other use	\$5,413,021	4.6
Total	\$116,745,909	100.0

⁶ Represents the total number of unduplicated grantees, as grantees may allocate funds to multiple areas.

⁷ Although these allocations cover all program areas, law enforcement is the largest contributor.

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 only received JAG funds as overtime pay. Overall, 1,362 personnel were funded in whole or in part with JAG funds.

Table 5. Personnel

Area	Number of personnel ⁸
Law enforcement	599
Crime prevention	105
Prosecution	99
Crime victim/witness services	90
Assessment and evaluation	74
Courts	59
Reentry services	47
Public defense	36
Community corrections	34
Behavioral health	22
Corrections	19
Crime lab/forensics	12
Other area	166
Total	1,362

Equipment, Supplies, and Technology Purchases

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

Table 6. FY2015 EST Purchases by General Category

Category	JAG funds spent	Percent of EST allocations ⁹	Percent of total allocations ¹⁰
Computer equipment	\$6,318,020	16.7	5.4
Camera/surveillance equipment	\$4,472,935	11.8	3.8
Duty equipment ¹¹	\$4,213,088	11.2	3.6
Weapons	\$2,431,311	6.4	2.1
Forensics/evidence	\$1,901,242	5.0	1.6
Vehicles and accessories	\$1,886,621	5.0	1.6
Technology	\$1,533,342	4.1	1.3
Medical	\$303,549	0.8	0.3
Controlled items ¹²	\$300,252	0.8	0.3
Animals and animal equipment	\$162,127	0.4	0.1
Total	\$23,552,487	62.3	20.1

⁸ The number of personnel comes from the April–June 2016 reporting period only to avoid duplication.

⁹ Calculated by dividing the JAG funds spent in each category by the total EST allocations (\$37,753,814). Does not total 100% because some allocated funds have not yet been spent and some funds are spent on items not captured by these categories.

¹⁰ Calculated by dividing the JAG funds spent in each category by the total allocations to all JAG areas (\$116,745,909).

¹¹ Includes soft body armor, clothing/uniforms, belts, related nonweapon equipment (handcuffs, flashlights, etc.), and portable radio equipment.

¹² Includes all equipment designated as “Controlled” under Executive Order 13688.

Training and Conferences

FY2015 JAG grantees have hosted, attended, or developed 216 trainings and conferences with JAG funds since the start of their awards. Table 7 shows the type of training/conference funded by JAG in each category. Note that some training events fell into multiple categories, so the totals of each column do not necessarily equal the number of unique training events.

Table 7. Training and Conferences

Type of training	Number of trainings attended	Number of trainings hosted	Number of trainings developed
Conference	58	5	0
Skill building	55	20	17
Certification	47	6	4
Leadership/management	22	6	2
In-service/annual	19	16	10
Other training	18	15	11
Unduplicated total¹³	140	46	30

Community Outreach

FY2015 JAG grantees and subgrantees are asked about their community outreach activities through formal surveys of community members and hosting community meetings. Thirty-nine percent of all grantees and subgrantees hosted a community meeting, and a quarter conducted a formal survey of citizens. Grantees conducting citizen surveys and hosting community meetings are more aware of the issues facing the community and can better respond to community needs.

Table 8. JAG Grantee Community Outreach

Grantee type	Number of grantees/subs	Percent of grantees conducting citizen surveys ¹⁴	Percent of grantees hosting community meetings
Law enforcement	1,788	27.5	41.8
Local government	251	26.3	39.8
Non-/for-profit organizations ¹⁵	140	9.3	30.7
Court	60	18.3	20.0
Prosecutor	56	19.6	37.5
State government	41	17.1	12.2
Correctional	26	26.9	26.9
Community corrections	24	12.5	16.7
Crime lab/forensics	10	20.0	10.0
Public defense	7	0.0	0.0
College/university	5	20.0	20.0
Tribal	2	50.0	0.0
Other	27	11.1	37.0
Total¹⁶	2,437	25.3	39.0

¹³ Represents the number of unique trainings, which is less than the column total because a training may be counted in more than one category.

¹⁴ Includes surveys of citizen satisfaction with police services, prosecution services, defense services, and courts; perceptions of crime; and personal experiences with crime.

¹⁵ Includes businesses and organizations that receive JAG funds as a subaward.

¹⁶ The majority of responses come from law enforcement grantees, which drives the overall rates.

Programs

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

Successful programs pull from best practices and evidence-based approaches. A core element we have found to underpin evidence-based practices is conducting data analysis as a means to make data-driven decisions. Overall, more than 37 percent of JAG-funded programs reported conducting analysis, an important component of many evidence-based practices. Best practices show 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 the problem. More than 62 percent of JAG-funded programs had at least one external partner.

Table 9. JAG-Funded Programs

Area	Number of programs funded	Percent of programs conducting analysis	Percent of programs with external partners
Law enforcement	377	31.0	60.2
Courts	43	67.4	100.0
Prosecution	43	16.3	72.1
Crime prevention	38	31.6	68.4
Crime victim/witness services	34	76.5	79.4
Behavioral health	25	56.0	92.0
Community corrections	24	66.7	70.8
Reentry services	22	63.6	59.1
Corrections	22	59.1	45.5
Public defense	14	42.9	64.3
Crime lab/forensics	8	50.0	50.0
Total¹⁷	650	37.7	62.9

Law Enforcement Programs

Law enforcement programs can utilize best and evidence-based practices in multiple ways besides conducting analysis and having external partners. This includes focusing efforts on specific places, people, and tactics rather than randomized patrol (Table 10) and tracking program activity and outcomes (Table 11).

Table 10. Focus of Law Enforcement Programs¹⁸

Focus	Number of programs	Percent of programs
Community-oriented approach	185	49.1
Problem-oriented approach	137	36.3
Geographic focus	188	49.9
Focused deterrence/pulling levers approach	130	34.5
Programs with one or more of the above	296	78.5

¹⁷ The majority of responses come from law enforcement grantees, which drives the overall rates.

¹⁸ Programs can have multiple foci.

Table 11. Tracking Law Enforcement Programs

Item tracked	Number of programs	Percent of programs
Program activity, progress, or performance	184	48.8
Program outcome, success, or impact	211	55.9

Conclusions

JAG funding impacts all aspects of the justice system by providing valuable funding for personnel, equipment, training, and other uses. More than 1,300 personnel had at least part of their salary paid for with JAG funds, and \$23 million in funds helped grantees purchase more than 30,000 pieces of equipment. Two hundred sixteen unique training events have been attended, hosted, or developed using JAG funds. These training sessions have been attended by more than 5,400 people across the country.

As of June 2016, FY2015 JAG funds have been used to support 684 programs, the majority of which rely on outside partners for success. Law enforcement programs are overwhelmingly likely to use an evidence-based policing model such as a community-oriented policing or a geographic focus. Program success is important to JAG grantees, as the majority of law enforcement programs track at least one outcome measure.

Technical Assistance to Improve Outcomes



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

BJA recognizes that grantees may require assistance with specific aspects of their JAG-funded program. As such, BJA 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 TA through NTTAC:

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

NTTAC Resources

Information, Webinars, and More:
<https://www.bjatrainning.org/tools>

TTA Today Blog:
<https://www.bjatrainning.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.